UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

XI AN HE,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 10-73102

Agency No. A099-717-997

MEMORANDUM<sup>\*</sup>

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

Submitted January 17, 2012\*\*

Before: LEAVY, TALLMAN, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

Xi An He, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the Board of

Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's

decision denying his application for asylum and withholding of removal. We have

jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the

## FILED

JAN 24 2012

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

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION** 

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>\*\*</sup> The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

agency's factual findings, applying the new standards governing adverse credibility determinations created by the REAL ID Act, *Shrestha v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 1034, 1039-40 (9th Cir. 2010), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's adverse credibility determination based on both the omission of He's mother's arrest and detention from his asylum application, and on his inconsistent testimony regarding the length of her detention. *See id.* at 1045-48 (adverse credibility determination was reasonable under the Real ID Act's "totality of the circumstances" standard). The record does not compel acceptance of He's explanations. *See Zamanov v. Holder*, 649 F.3d 969, 974 (9th Cir. 2011) (acceptance of plausible explanation not compelled "in light of the importance of the omitted incident to [petitioner's] asylum claim"). In the absence of credible testimony, He's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

## **PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**