

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 21-60650
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

March 30, 2022

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

PRINCELY MALONGE FRU,

Petitioner,

versus

MERRICK GARLAND, *U.S. Attorney General,*

Respondent.

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
BIA No. A213 455 140

Before JOLLY, WILLETT, and ENGELHARDT, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Princely Malonge Fru, a native and citizen of Cameroon, petitions us for review of a decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) upholding the denial of his asylum claims that are based on alleged persecution by the military of Cameroon. He now argues that the negative credibility

* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 21-60650

determination is not based on substantial evidence. He further argues that he has proven his fear of future persecution and Convention Against Torture claims.

On petition for review of a BIA decision, we review factual findings for substantial evidence and questions of law de novo. *Lopez-Gomez v. Ashcroft*, 263 F.3d 442, 444 (5th Cir. 2001). Under this standard, reversal is improper unless the evidence compels a contrary conclusion. *Carbajal-Gonzalez v. INS*, 78 F.3d 194, 197 (5th Cir. 1996).

Fru provides a list of reasons why the asylum interview is unreliable, but this argument is unexhausted. *Lopez-Dubon v. Holder*, 609 F.3d 642, 644 (5th Cir. 2010). Moreover, we are not compelled to find that Fru's explanations for the inconsistencies found by the Immigration Judge compel a contrary conclusion as to the Immigration Judge's credibility determination. *See Carbajal-Gonzalez*, 78 F.3d at 197.

Fru's argument regarding fear of future persecution is unexhausted. *Lopez-Dubon*, 609 F.3d at 644

Finally, Fru's argument that the BIA denied his claim for relief under the Convention Against Torture based on the credibility finding and his failure to provide corroborating evidence lacks a factual basis. The BIA and the Immigration Judge both addressed country condition evidence when addressing the torture claim.

DENIED IN PART, DISMISSED IN PART.