

NOV 16 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

KNARIK MKRTCHYAN; SAMVEL
MKRTCHYAN; KRISTINE
MKRTCHYAN,

Petitioners,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY,

Respondent.

No. 08-71730

Agency Nos. A075-690-229
 A075-690-230
 A078-015-989

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted November 9, 2012**
San Francisco, California

Before: FARRIS, NOONAN, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Petitioners Knarik Mkrтчhyan, Samvel Mkrтчhyan, and Kristine Mkrтчhyan,
citizens of Armenia, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals'

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

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

affirmance of the Immigration Judge's (IJ) denial of their applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under article 3 of the Convention against Torture. The IJ found Petitioners' claim incredible based on "significant discrepancies and inconsistencies" in their testimony. We find that the IJ's adverse credibility determination is supported by substantial evidence and deny the petition for review. *See Rivera v. Mukasey*, 508 F.3d 1271, 1274 (9th Cir. 2007).

Knarik, the lead petitioner, asserted past persecution and fear of future persecution on account of her membership in the Armenian National Movement and related actions. The IJ correctly found that Knarik provided insufficient credible or specific evidence to show there is a reasonable possibility that either she or her husband Samvel would be subject to persecution in Armenia. *See* Immigration and Nationality Act, § 101(a)(42)(a), 8 U.S.C.A. § 1101(a)(42)(A). There were numerous discrepancies in the testimony of both Knarik and Kristine, the only witnesses to testify. The discrepancies concerned significant facts going to the heart of their claims. Knarik testified inconsistently regarding the number of times she was detained by police and alleged threats made against her daughters, and Kristine testified inconsistently regarding her whereabouts during periods material to her claim.

Because the IJ cited specific reasons to doubt Petitioners' credibility, this

court finds that substantial evidence supports the adverse credibility finding. We therefore deny Petitioners' petition for review.

PETITION DENIED.