

**FILED**

**January 9, 2004**

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 02-61008  
Summary Calendar

---

JINGHUA DI

Petitioner

v.

JOHN ASHCROFT, US ATTORNEY GENERAL

Respondent

\* \* \* \* \*  
Consolidated with  
\* \* \* \* \*

---

No. 02-61014

---

XING GANG LIU

Petitioner

v.

JOHN ASHCROFT, US ATTORNEY GENERAL

Respondent

- - - - -  
Petition for Review of an Order  
of the Board of Immigration Appeals  
BIA No. A76-898-950  
- - - - -

Before KING, Chief Judge, and HIGGINBOTHAM and WIENER, Circuit  
Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined  
that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent

The petitioners, Jinghua Di (Di) and her husband Xing Gang Liu (Liu) whose claims are dependent upon Di's, are natives and citizens of the Peoples' Republic of China. They request review of the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA), which affirmed the decision of the immigration judge (IJ) to deny their application for asylum, withholding of deportation, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). Because the BIA employed the streamlined review process of 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(a)(7), we review the IJ's decision. See Soadjede v. Ashcroft, 324 F.3d 830, 832 (5th Cir. 2003).

The IJ based his decision to deny relief on his explicit findings that Di was not credible. We do not "review decisions turning purely on the immigration judge's assessment of the alien petitioner's credibility." Chun v. INS, 40 F.3d 76, 78 (5th Cir. 1994) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). In light of the IJ's explanation of the credibility determination, that determination was "a reasonable interpretation of the record," and the evidence does not compel the conclusion urged by Di and Liu. See id. at 78-79.

The petition for review is DENIED.

PETITION DENIED.