

FEB 13 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>BALJIT KUMAR,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 10-73639

Agency No. A096-178-285

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted February 11, 2013**

Before: FERNANDEZ, TASHIMA, and WARDLAW, Circuit Judges.

Baljit 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. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the

* 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).

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 Kumar's motion to reopen as untimely because the motion was filed nearly four years after the BIA's final administrative order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Kumar 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). Further, we reject Kumar's contention that the BIA failed to adequately explain its decision. Finally, we decline to consider any challenge Kumar raises to the agency's adverse credibility determination because this court already decided that issue in *Kumar v. Holder*, 325 Fed. Appx. 625 (9th Cir. 2009).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.