

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

February 13, 2008

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

---

No. 07-60024  
Summary Calendar

---

NAZRUL ISLAM IMTIAZ

Petitioner

v.

MICHAEL B MUKASEY, U S ATTORNEY GENERAL

Respondent

---

Petition for Review of an Order  
of the Board of Immigration Appeals  
BIA No. A73 544 941

---

Before GARWOOD, GARZA and OWEN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Nazrul Islam Imtiaz petitions for review of the final order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) that dismissed his appeal of the Immigration Judge's (IJ) denial of his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). On a petition for review of a BIA decision, this court reviews factual findings for substantial evidence and questions of law de novo. *Lopez-Gomez v. Ashcroft*, 263 F.3d 442, 444 (5th Cir.

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

2001). The substantial-evidence standard requires only that the BIA's conclusion be based on the evidence presented and that the decision is substantially reasonable. *Carbajal-Gonzalez v. I.N.S.*, 78 F.3d 194, 197 (5th Cir. 1996). The IJ has the duty to make credibility determinations concerning witnesses. *Chun v. I.N.S.*, 40 F.3d 76, 78 (5th Cir. 1994).

Imtiaz's brief supporting his petition for review points to no evidence in the record, other than his own testimony, to support his argument attacking the credibility determination. Imtiaz has not shown that the record compels that the finding be reversed. The IJ's adverse credibility determination, adopted by the BIA, is supported by substantial evidence and should be upheld. *Chun*, 40 F.3d at 79. To the extent that Imtiaz's brief raises his other claims of non-discretionary withholding of removal and CAT relief, substantial evidence also supports the rejection of his applications for withholding of removal and for CAT relief. See *Efe v. Ashcroft*, 293 F.3d 899, 906-08 (5th Cir. 2002). Imtiaz's petition for review is

DENIED.