

JUN 02 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

|   |
|---|
| <p>SATWINDER SINGH,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p> |
|---|

No. 08-70337

Agency No. A071-768-170

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted May 25, 2010\*\*

Before: CANBY, THOMAS, and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Satwinder Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reopen exclusion proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. Reviewing for abuse of discretion, *Malty v. Ashcroft*, 381 F.3d 942, 945 (9th Cir. 2004), we

---

\* 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).

deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Singh's motion to reopen because the motion was filed more than two years after the BIA's May 4, 2005, order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Singh failed to demonstrate materially changed circumstances in India to qualify for the regulatory exception to the filing deadline, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *see also Maly*, 381 F.3d at 945 ("The critical question is . . . whether circumstances have changed sufficiently that a petitioner who previously did not have a legitimate claim for asylum now has a well-founded fear of future persecution.").

Singh's remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**