

MAR 09 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>ZHEN ZHOU YUN,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 09-71792

Agency No. A078-751-008

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted February 15, 2011**

Before: CANBY, FERNANDEZ, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Zhen Zhou Yun, a native and citizen of China, 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 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. *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 Yun's second motion to reopen as untimely, because she filed it over four years after the BIA issued its final administrative order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Yun 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); *see also* *Lin v. Holder*, 588 F.3d 981, 988-89 (9th Cir. 2009) (concluding record did not establish change in family planning laws or enforcement of such laws that would establish changed country conditions excusing untimely motion to reopen).

Contrary to Yun's contention, the BIA adequately considered the evidence presented with the motion to reopen. *See* *Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 990-91 (9th Cir. 2010) (BIA must consider issues raised and announce its decision in a manner sufficient for reviewing court to perceive that it has heard and thought and not merely reacted).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.