

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 25 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

OBERSON CAMILLE,

Petitioner,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Acting Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 22-875

Agency No.
A209-867-601

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted June 22, 2026**

Before: CANBY, BENNETT, and BADE, Circuit Judges.

Oberson Camille, a native and citizen of Haiti, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

(“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings, applying the standards governing adverse credibility determinations under the REAL ID Act. *Shrestha v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 1034, 1039-40 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s adverse credibility determination based on inconsistencies between Camille’s testimony and his documentary evidence. *See id.* at 1048 (adverse credibility finding reasonable under the totality of the circumstances); *see also Manes v. Sessions*, 875 F.3d 1261, 1264 (9th Cir. 2017) (inconsistencies between testimony and documentary evidence undermined credibility). Camille’s explanations do not compel a contrary conclusion. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1245 (9th Cir. 2000). In the absence of credible testimony in this case, Camille’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s denial of Camille’s CAT claim because it was based on the same evidence found not credible, and Camille does not point to any other evidence in the record that compels the conclusion that it is more likely than not he would be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to Haiti. *See Shrestha*, 590 F.3d at 1048-49.

We do not address Camille’s contentions as to his Form I-213 because the

BIA found it unnecessary to rely on the form. *See Santiago-Rodriguez v. Holder*, 657 F.3d 820, 829 (9th Cir. 2011) (“In reviewing the decision of the BIA, we consider only the grounds relied upon by that agency.” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

We do not consider the materials Camille references in the opening brief that are not part of the administrative record. *See Fisher v. INS*, 79 F.3d 955, 963-64 (9th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

The temporary stay of removal is lifted and the motion to stay removal is denied.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.