

SEP 30 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>ELIZA VARDUMYAN,</p> <p>Petitioners,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 10-71340

Agency Nos. A078-245-819

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted September 24, 2013**

Before: RAWLINSON, N.R. SMITH, and CHRISTEN, Circuit Judges.

Eliza Vardumyan, a native and citizen of Armenia, 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).

an abuse of discretion the BIA's denial of a motion to reopen. *Toufighi v. Mukasey*, 538 F.3d 988, 992 (9th Cir. 2008). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Vardumyan's motion to reopen as untimely where the motion was filed over five years after the BIA's final order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Vardumyan failed to present material evidence of changed circumstances in Armenia 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); *Malty v. Ashcroft*, 381 F.3d 942, 945 (9th Cir. 2004) ("The critical question is . . . whether circumstances have changed sufficiently that a petitioner who previously did not have a legitimate claim for asylum now has a well-founded fear of future persecution.").

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.