

SEP 30 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

VARDAN KARAPETYAN;  
PAYTSAR HOVAKIMYAN,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 08-75153

Agency Nos. A079-276-882  
A079-276-883

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.

Vardan Karapetyan and Paytsar Hovakimyan, natives of the former Soviet Union and citizens of Armenia, 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 review for abuse of discretion, *He v.*

---

\* 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).

*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 petitioners' motion to reopen as untimely where it was filed over four years after the BIA's final order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and petitioners failed to establish changed circumstances in Armenia to qualify for the regulatory exception to the time limitation, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *see 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 country conditions).

We reject petitioners' contention that the BIA did not adequately consider the issues raised in the motion. *See Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 2010).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**