

APR 16 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>JIN HONG JIANG, a.k.a. JIN HONT JAING</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
---

No. 07-74656

Agency No. A072-994-299

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted April 5, 2010\*\*

Before: RYMER, McKEOWN, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Jin Hong Jiang, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his motion to reopen to file a successive asylum application. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for

---

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

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

abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen, *Perez v. Mukasey*, 516 F.3d 770, 773 (9th Cir. 2008), and we deny the petition for review.

The agency did not abuse its discretion in denying Jiang's motion to reopen as untimely because Jiang filed it over ten years after the BIA issued its final removal order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Jiang failed to demonstrate changed circumstances in China to qualify for the regulatory exception to the time limit for filing motions to reopen, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *He v. Gonzales*, 501 F.3d 1128, 1132 (9th Cir. 2007).

Jiang's argument that he is entitled to file a successive asylum application is foreclosed by this court's decision in *Chen v. Mukasey*, 524 F.3d 1028, 1032 (9th Cir. 2008) (the BIA reasonably concluded that an alien could file a successive asylum application only in connection with a motion to reopen, subject to the time and number limitations).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**