

OCT 22 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

No. 12-70624

Agency No. A095-634-616

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted October 15, 2013**

Before: FISHER, GOULD, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Driawan Lukman, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying his 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. *See Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 986 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Lukman's motion to reopen as untimely where the motion was filed over four years after the BIA's final order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Lukman failed to present sufficient evidence of changed circumstances in Indonesia 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); *Najmabadi*, 597 F.3d at 989. We reject Lukman's contentions that the BIA failed to explain its decision adequately and failed to consider evidence. *See Najmabadi*, 597 F.3d at 990 (“[t]he [BIA] does not have to write an exegesis on every contention.”) (internal quotes omitted).

In light of our prior decision in *Lukman v. Holder*, No. 07-74179 (9th Cir. Aug. 23, 2010), the BIA also did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion to reopen to consider our decisions in *Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 2009), and *Tampubolon v. Holder*, 610 F.3d 1056 (9th Cir. 2010).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.