

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JUL 15 2022

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

MIN XU,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 15-72066

Agency No. A205-784-529

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted July 12, 2022**

Before: SCHROEDER, R. NELSON, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Min Xu, a native and citizen of China, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying her 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 Ninth Circuit Rule 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 under 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 agency's adverse credibility determination based on inconsistencies in Xu's testimony and documentary evidence regarding whether Chinese authorities confronted her about her second pregnancy and forced abortion prior to the day of the procedure, and inconsistencies between Xu's United States and Canadian asylum applications. *See id.* at 1048 (adverse credibility finding reasonable under the totality of the circumstances). Xu's explanations 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, in this case, Xu's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003). In light of this disposition, we need not reach Xu's remaining contentions regarding corroboration or the merits of her claims. *See Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004) (courts and agencies are not required to decide issues unnecessary to the results they reach).

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Xu's claim was based on the same testimony the agency found not credible, and Xu does not point to any other evidence in the record that compels the conclusion

that it is more likely than not she would be tortured in China. *See Farah*, 348 F.3d at 1157.

We do not consider the materials Xu references in her opening brief that are not part of the administrative record. *See Fisher v. INS*, 79 F.3d 955, 963-64 (9th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

The temporary stay of removal remains in place until issuance of the mandate.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.