

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**FILED**

NOV 16 2009

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

JERONIMO DAVID SIQUINA-CHOX,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 06-72530

Agency No. A070-918-992

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Argued and Submitted November 6, 2009  
Portland, Oregon

Before: FISHER and PAEZ, Circuit Judges, and FOGEL, District Judge.\*\*

Jeronimo David Siquina-Chox petitions for review of a Board of  
Immigration Appeals (BIA) order affirming an Immigration Judge's (IJ) denial of  
his applications for asylum, withholding of removal and relief under the

---

\*This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent  
except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\*The Honorable Jeremy D. Fogel, United States District Judge for the  
Northern District of California, sitting by designation.

Convention Against Torture. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a), and we deny the petition for review.

The IJ identified specific and cogent reasons to support his adverse credibility finding. *See Kaur v. Ashcroft*, 379 F.3d 876, 884 (9th Cir. 2004). He properly relied on both Siquina-Chox's initial omission of the guerrillas as a source of persecution and his failure, upon being reminded of his past statements about the guerrillas, to give an account consistent with those past statements. Because these discrepancies regarding the source of his persecution go to the "heart of the asylum claim," the IJ's adverse credibility finding is supported by substantial evidence. *Ceballos-Castillo v. INS*, 904 F.2d 519, 520 (9th Cir. 1990).

We need not decide whether guidelines issued by the United Nations and the Immigration and Naturalization Service regarding the treatment of minor asylum applicants apply here, because the IJ's treatment and evaluation of Siquina-Chox, who was 17 at the time of the relevant events and 28 at the time of the hearing, would not have violated those guidelines.

The petition for review is **DENIED**.