UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

GUIHUA GU,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 11-72220

Agency No. A088-483-488

MEMORANDUM<sup>\*</sup>

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

Submitted July 24, 2013\*\*

Before: ALARCÓN, CLIFTON, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

Guihua Gu, 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

JUL 31 2013

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**NOT FOR PUBLICATION** 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 standards governing adverse credibility determinations created by the Real ID Act. *Shrestha v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 1034, 1039 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny the petition for review.

The agency concluded Gu was not credible for a number of reasons, including the implausibility that Gu - whose claim rested on his purported confrontations with government officials over compensation for demolished properties - would not bother to inquire whether the government had ultimately compensated landowners, his general testimony that lacked detail, and the inconsistencies and implausibilities related to his employment. Substantial evidence supports the agency's finding. *See id.* at 1048 (adverse credibility finding reasonable under totality of the circumstances). We reject Gu's contention that the agency did not give his documentary evidence adequate weight. Accordingly, Gu's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

## PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.