

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 25 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

SUKHJINDER SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 25-7424

Agency No.
A205-243-315

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted September 22, 2026**

Before: OWENS, COLLINS, and SUNG, Circuit Judges.

Sukhjinder Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). We have jurisdiction

* 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).

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 within Singh's testimony and between his testimony and documentary evidence. *See id.* at 1046 (inconsistencies need not go to the heart of the claim to support an adverse credibility determination); *see also Manes v. Sessions*, 875 F.3d 1261, 1264 (9th Cir. 2017) (inconsistencies between testimony and documentary evidence undermined credibility). Singh's explanations do not compel a contrary conclusion. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1245 (9th Cir. 2000). Singh does not challenge the agency's determinations regarding the lack of detail in his testimony as well as his evasive and vague testimony, so we do not address them. *See Lopez-Vasquez v. Holder*, 706 F.3d 1072, 1079-80 (9th Cir. 2013).

In the absence of credible testimony in this case, Singh'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 Singh's CAT claim because it was based on the same evidence found not credible, and Singh 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 India. *See id.* at 1156-57.

The motion to stay removal is denied as moot.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.