

DEC 12 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JINPO LIN,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 12-72263

Agency No. A094-938-697

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted December 5, 2014\*\*

Before: HAWKINS, McKEOWN, and FRIEDLAND, Circuit Judges.

Jinpo Lin, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). We have jurisdiction under

---

\* 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).

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. *Shrestha v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 1034, 1039-40 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA's adverse credibility determination based on an inconsistency between Lin's testimony and his written statement regarding when he began attending a house church, and based on an inconsistency between his testimony and his asylum application regarding his employment in China. *See id.* at 1048 (adverse credibility finding reasonable under the totality of circumstances). Lin's explanations do not compel a contrary result. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1245 (9th Cir. 2000). In the absence of credible testimony, Lin's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Further, because Lin's CAT claim is based on the same testimony found not credible, and he does not point to any other evidence that compels the finding that it is more likely than not he would be tortured if returned to China, his CAT claim also fails. *See id.* at 1156-57.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**