

SEP 04 2015

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FRANCISCO ALVARO-IRAETA,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 12-71287

Agency No. A071-644-613

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted August 25, 2015**

Before: McKEOWN, CLIFTON, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

The 90-day stay of proceedings in this case expired on July 7, 2015. Thus, respondent's motion to lift the stay is denied as moot.

Francisco Alvaro-Iraeta, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an

* 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).

immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency's factual findings, including adverse credibility findings. *Chebchoub v. INS*, 257 F.3d 1038, 1042 (9th Cir.2001). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's adverse credibility determination based on the inconsistencies between Alvaro-Iraeta's asylum application and his testimony regarding events in El Salvador and his reason for fleeing. *See Ceballos-Castillo v. INS*, 904 F.2d 519, 520 (9th Cir. 1990); *Zamanov v. Holder*, 649 F.3d 969, 973 (9th Cir. 2011). We reject Alvaro-Iraeta's contention that the IJ failed to properly consider his explanations for the inconsistencies. *See Zamanov*, 649 F.3d at 974. In the absence of credible testimony, Alvaro-Iraeta's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Alvaro-Iraeta does not raise any arguments challenging the agency's denial of CAT relief. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259 (9th Cir. 1996) (issues not supported by argument are deemed abandoned).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.