

Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have 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, *Shrestha v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 1034, 1039-40 (9th Cir. 2010), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA’s adverse credibility determination based on inconsistencies between Soghatyan’s testimony and visa documents regarding his work history. *See id.* at 1048 (adverse credibility determination was reasonable under the “totality of circumstances”). The record does not support Soghatyan’s contention that the IJ did not consider his explanations, and Soghatyan’s explanations for the inconsistencies do not compel a contrary conclusion, *see Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1245 (9th Cir. 2000). Thus, in the absence of credible testimony, Soghatyan’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Finally, Soghatyan’s CAT claim fails because it is based on the same evidence the BIA found not credible, and he does not point to any other evidence that compels the conclusion that it is more likely than not he would be tortured by

or with the acquiescence of the government if returned to Armenia. *See id.* at 1156-57.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.