

MAY 22 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

HARJINDER KUMAR,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 09-71392

Agency No. A071-944-709

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted May 15, 2012**

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

Harjinder Kumar, a native and citizen of India, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reopen removal proceedings. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review

* 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).

for abuse of discretion, *Toufighi v. Mukasey*, 538 F.3d 988, 992 (9th Cir. 2008), and we deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Kumar's second motion to reopen as untimely where the motion was filed over a year and a half after the BIA's final decision, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Kumar failed to present sufficient evidence of changed circumstances in India to qualify for an exception to the time limit, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *see also* *Toufighi*, 538 F.3d at 996-97 (evidence must demonstrate prima facie eligibility for relief in order to reopen proceedings based on changed country conditions).

This court lacks jurisdiction to review Kumar's contention that his former counsel was ineffective. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 678 (9th Cir. 2004) (court lacks jurisdiction to review contentions not raised before the agency).

Finally, Kumar's remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.