

SEP 30 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ESPERANZA RUVALCABA-  
SANDOVAL,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 08-70298

Agency No. A078-650-226

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted September 13, 2010\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, CALLAHAN, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Esperanza Ruvalcaba-Sandoval, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying her 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 concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

review for abuse of discretion, *He v. Gonzales*, 501 F.3d 1128, 1130-31 (9th Cir. 2007), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Ruvalcaba-Sandoval's motion to reopen as untimely where it was filed over one year after the BIA's final order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Ruvalcaba-Sandoval failed to establish changed circumstances in Mexico 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) (evidence must demonstrate prima facie eligibility for relief in order to reopen proceedings based on changed circumstances).

Ruvalcaba-Sandoval's contentions that the BIA failed to apply the correct legal standard and did not consider the facts are belied by the record.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**