

SEP 18 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

|   |
|---|
| <p>JASBIR SINGH UPPAL; et al.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioners,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p> |
|---|

No. 10-71494

Agency Nos.   A077-843-988  
                          A077-843-989  
                          A077-843-990

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted September 10, 2012\*\*

Before:       WARDLAW, CLIFTON, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Jasbir Singh Uppal and his family, natives and citizens of India, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying their motion to reopen. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of

---

\* 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).

discretion the denial of a motion to reopen, *Toufighi v. Mukasey*, 538 F.3d 988, 992 (9th Cir. 2008), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioners' motion to reopen as untimely because the motion was filed almost five years after the BIA's final administrative order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and petitioners failed to demonstrate changed circumstances in India to qualify for the regulatory exception to the time limitation, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *see also Toufighi*, 538 F.3d at 996 (requiring movant to produce material evidence with motion to reopen that conditions in country of nationality had changed).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**