

FEB 24 2015

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

## NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JOSE DANIEL MACEDO-CAMPOS,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 12-74108

Agency No. A078-988-682

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted February 17, 2015\*\*

Before: O'SCANNLAIN, LEAVY, and FERNANDEZ, Circuit Judges.

Jose Daniel Macedo-Campos, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reopen. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the BIA's denial of a motion to reopen. *Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d

---

\* 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).

983, 986 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Macedo-Campos’s untimely motion to reopen because he did not establish materially changed circumstances in Mexico to qualify for the regulatory exception to the time limit. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *Najmabadi*, 597 F.3d at 990 (evidence lacked materiality because it simply recounted “generalized conditions” in country that did not show petitioner’s situation was “appreciably different from the dangers faced by her fellow citizens”).

We lack jurisdiction to review the BIA’s decision not to invoke its *sua sponte* authority to reopen proceedings. *See Mejia-Hernandez v. Holder*, 633 F.3d 818, 823-24 (9th Cir. 2011).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.**