

OCT 2 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

HARPINDER S. CHAHAL; GURMEET  
K. CHAHAL,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 13-70347

Agency Nos.       A078-361-295  
                              A078-361-296

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted September 23, 2014\*\*

Before:       W. FLETCHER, RAWLINSON, and CHRISTEN, Circuit Judges.

Harpinder S. Chahal and Gurmeet K. Chahal, natives and citizens of India, 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' third motion to reopen as untimely and number-barred where the motion was filed more than eight years after the BIA's final order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and petitioners failed to demonstrate changed conditions that 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). The record does not support petitioners' contention that the BIA did not fully consider the evidence of police raids at Harpinder's father's house.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**