

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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>KIRIN DEVI, a.k.a. Kiran Devi, a.k.a. Rita Patel,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
--

No. 11-72638

Agency No. A096-191-210

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.

Kirin Devi, a native and citizen of India, petitions pro se 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 BIA's denial of a motion to reopen. *Malty v. Ashcroft*, 381 F.3d 942, 945 (9th Cir. 2004). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion by denying Devi's motion to reopen as untimely where the motion was filed more than five years after the BIA's final order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Devi failed to present sufficient evidence of changed circumstances in India 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 Malty*, 381 F.3d at 945 ("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 persecution."). Devi's contention that the BIA failed to consider all the evidence she presented with the motion to reopen is not supported by the record.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.