NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

JUN 26 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

WILMER ANTONIO SORIANO LUNA, Petitioner, v. TODD BLANCHE, Acting Attorney General, Respondent.	No. 25-2645 Agency No. A202-007-707 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.

Wilmer Antonio Soriano Luna, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions pro se 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 and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252.

[*] 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).

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 review de novo questions of law and constitutional claims. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's adverse credibility determination based on inconsistencies in Soriano Luna's statements as to his reasons for leaving El Salvador and the nature of his fear. *See Rodriguez-Ramirez v. Garland*, 11 F.4th 1091, 1093 (9th Cir. 2021) (agency properly relied on inconsistencies); *Shrestha*, 590 F.3d at 1048 (adverse credibility finding reasonable under the totality of the circumstances). Soriano Luna's explanations do not compel a contrary conclusion. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1245 (9th Cir. 2000). Thus, in the absence of credible testimony, in this case, Soriano Luna's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

In light of this disposition, we need not reach Soriano Luna's remaining contentions regarding the merits of his claims. *See Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004) (courts and agencies are not required to decide issues unnecessary to the results they reach).

Soriano Luna's claim that the agency violated due process by preventing him from presenting testimony and misconstruing evidence fails because he has

not shown error. *See Padilla-Martinez v. Holder*, 770 F.3d 825, 830 (9th Cir. 2014) ("To prevail on a due-process claim, a petitioner must demonstrate both a violation of rights and prejudice.").

The motion to stay removal is denied as moot.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.