

MAY 16 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

No. 12-70596

Agency No. A046-988-737

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted May 13, 2014\*\*

Before: CLIFTON, BEA, and WATFORD, Circuit Judges.

Muhammad Parvez, a native and citizen of Pakistan, 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 abuse of discretion, *Toufighi v. Mukasey*, 538 F.3d 988, 992 (9th Cir. 2008), and

---

\* 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).

we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Parvez's motion to reopen because it was untimely, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Parvez failed to establish materially changed circumstances in Pakistan to qualify for the regulatory exception to the time limitations for motions to reopen, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3); *see also He v. Gonzales*, 501 F.3d 1128, 1133 (9th Cir. 2007) (The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying motion where petitioners "provided insufficient support to establish changed circumstances"); *Toufighi*, 538 F.3d at 996 (setting forth requirements for prevailing on a motion to reopen based on changed country conditions). Contrary to Parvez's contentions, the BIA did not otherwise abuse its discretion in denying his motion. *See Toufighi*, 538 F.3d at 992 ("This Court defers to the Board's exercise of discretion unless it acted arbitrarily, irrationally or contrary to law.").

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**