

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 15 2019

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ARTUR HOVHANNISYAN,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 16-70263

Agency No. A095-764-520

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted March 12, 2019\*\*

Before: LEAVY, BEA, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Artur Hovhannisyán, a native and citizen of Armenia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' 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

---

\* 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).

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). We dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to consider Hovhannisyan's contention that his detention impeded his ability to obtain supporting documentation because he raises it for the first time in his opening brief. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 677-78 (9th Cir. 2004) (court lacks jurisdiction to review claims not presented to the agency).

Substantial evidence supports the agency's adverse credibility determination based on an inconsistency between Hovhannisyan's testimony and declaration as to his hospitalization after an alleged 2004 attack, and on inconsistencies and omissions in Hovhannisyan's two declarations as to the alleged attacks he suffered in 2007 and 2008. *See Shrestha*, 590 F.3d at 1048 (adverse credibility finding reasonable under the totality of the circumstances). Hovhannisyan's explanations do not compel a contrary conclusion. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1245 (9th Cir. 2000). In this case, in the absence of credible testimony, Hovhannisyan's

asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Hovhannisyan's CAT claim fails because it is based on the same testimony the agency found not credible, and Hovhannisyan does not point to any other evidence in the record that compels the conclusion that it is more likely than not he would be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government of Armenia. *See id.* at 1156-57.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.**