

MAR 02 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>ZHENGRONG PENG,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 08-73078

Agency No. A099-369-837

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted February 21, 2012\*\*

Before: FERNANDEZ, McKEOWN, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Zhengrong Peng, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have

---

\* 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).

jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency's factual findings, applying the standards governing adverse credibility determinations created by the Real ID Act. *See Shrestha v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 1034, 1039 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's adverse credibility determination because Peng's testimony regarding when he began attending the home church was inconsistent with his written declaration. *See id.* at 1046-1047 ("inability to consistently describe the underlying events that gave rise to his fear was an important factor that could be relied upon by the IJ in making an adverse credibility determination"). In the absence of credible testimony, Peng's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Because Peng's CAT claim is based on the same testimony found to be not credible, and he points to no other evidence that shows it is more likely than not he would be tortured if returned to China, his CAT claim also fails. *See id.* at 1156-57.

We reject Peng's due process contention. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1246 (9th Cir. 2000) (requiring error and prejudice to prevail on due process claim).

Finally, Peng's request for oral argument is denied.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**