

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JAN 19 2010

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

MING JIN; RUIFEN WAN,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 07-73378

Agency Nos. A079-522-796
A079-522-795

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted January 11, 2010**

Before: BEEZER, TROTT, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Ming Jin and Ruifen Wan, natives and citizen of China, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying their motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen. *Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 894 (9th Cir. 2003). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioners' motion to reopen as untimely where the motion was filed over a year after the BIA's final decision, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and petitioners failed to establish changed circumstances in China to qualify for the regulatory exception to the time limitation, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *see also Toufighi v. Mukasey*, 538 F.3d 988, 996 (9th Cir. 2008) (in order to prevail on a motion to reopen based on changed country conditions, petitioner must produce "new facts" showing changed conditions that now establish a prima facie case for relief).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.