

MAY 21 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>SRI ENDANG; HERMAN SUHENDRA,</p> <p>Petitioners,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 12-74056

Agency Nos. A096-048-710
 A096-048-711

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.

Sri Endang and Herman Suhendra, natives and citizens of Indonesia, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying their motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the BIA’s denial of a motion to reopen.

* 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).

Najmabadi v. Holder, 597 F.3d 983, 986 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion by denying petitioners' motion to reopen as untimely because the motion was filed more than four years after the BIA's final order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and petitioners did not demonstrate materially changed conditions 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 987 (evidence must be "qualitatively different" from the evidence presented at the previous hearing). In light of this conclusion, we need not address petitioners' remaining contentions.

Finally, our review is limited to the administrative record, and thus we do not consider materials referenced in petitioners' opening brief that were not part of the record before the agency. *See Fisher v. INS*, 79 F.3d 955, 964-64 (9th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.