

JAN 24 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

No. 12-72296

Agency No. A078-706-866

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted January 21, 2014**

Before: CANBY, SILVERMAN, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Yanyun Ren, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) denial of her motion to reopen removal proceedings. 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). Thus, we deny Ren’s request for oral argument.

discretion the BIA's denial of a motion to reopen, *Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 986 (9th Cir. 2010), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Ren's motion to reopen as untimely because the motion was filed over four years after the BIA's final decision, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Ren failed to establish materially changed circumstances in China to qualify for the regulatory exception to the time limitation for motions to reopen, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *Najmabadi*, 597 F.3d at 987 (new evidence "must be 'qualitatively different' from the evidence presented at the previous hearing").

We reject Ren's contention that the BIA's analysis was inadequate or incomplete. *See Najmabadi*, 597 F.3d at 990 (the BIA "does not have to write an exegesis on every contention").

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.