

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

No. 19-60112
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

July 21, 2020

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

ETENGENE WENDOLINE,

Petitioner

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, U. S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
BIA No. A216 217 987

Before CLEMENT, ELROD, and OLDHAM, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Etengene Wendoline petitions for review of the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) dismissing her appeal from the order of the immigration judge (IJ) denying her application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). The BIA held that the IJ did not clearly err by finding Wendoline not credible based upon, inter alia, her failures to (1) recount, either during her initial border

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

No. 19-60112

interview or in her I-589 application, that a police officer allegedly beat her in 2016 for educating others about the Southern Cameroons National Council (SCNC), and (2) her failure to state during her initial border interview that she belonged to the SCNC and was threatened and beaten in 2017 during a political celebration. Because the BIA adopted and relied upon the IJ's decision, we may review the decisions of both the BIA and the IJ. *See Efe v. Ashcroft*, 293 F.3d 899, 903 (5th Cir. 2002).

We review for substantial evidence the findings that Wendoline is not credible, *see Wang v. Holder*, 569 F.3d 531, 536-40 (5th Cir. 2009), and that she is not eligible for asylum, withholding of removal, or CAT relief. *See Zhang v. Gonzales*, 432 F.3d 339, 344 (5th Cir. 2005). Under this standard, we may not reverse a factual finding unless the evidence compels it. *Wang*, 569 F.3d at 536-37; 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B). Wendoline must carry the burden of demonstrating that the evidence compels a contrary conclusion. *See Zhao v. Gonzales*, 404 F.3d 295, 306 (5th Cir. 2005).

The trier of fact must consider “the totality of the circumstances[] and all relevant factors” in making a credibility determination. 8 U.S.C. § 1158(b)(1)(B)(iii). The IJ and the BIA “may rely on *any* inconsistency or omission in making an adverse credibility determination as long as the totality of the circumstances establishes that an asylum applicant is not credible.” *Wang*, 569 F.3d at 538 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted) (emphasis in original).

In arguing that the BIA erred in affirming the IJ's adverse credibility determination, Wendoline neglects to cite the relevant legal authorities or standard of review, nor does she provide the required citations to the parts of the record she relies upon. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8)(A) and (B). In any event, while Wendoline contends that she was not provided sufficient

No. 19-60112

opportunities to address the identified inconsistencies, the record belies her contentions; she fails to show that the credibility determination was not supported by substantial evidence. *See Wang*, 569 F.3d at 536-40.

Given the adverse credibility determination and Wendoline's failure to identify with specificity any other record evidence supporting her claims for asylum and CAT relief, she fails to show that the denials of those claims were unsupported by substantial evidence. *See Zhang*, 432 F.3d at 344. Because Wendoline fails to show that she is entitled to asylum, she necessarily fails to show that she is entitled to withholding of removal. *See Efe*, 293 F.3d at 906.

Wendoline's petition for review is DENIED.