

FEB 25 2015

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

OLVYKE CHANETTE LANGIE,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 13-71283

Agency No. A079-535-288

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.

Olvyke Chanette Langie, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying her 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, and we

* 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).

review for substantial evidence the BIA's factual findings. *Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 986 (9th Cir. 2010). We review the BIA's findings of fact for substantial evidence. *Id.* We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Langie'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 Langie failed to establish changed circumstances in Indonesia to qualify for an exception to the time limitations for a motion to reopen, *see* 8 C.F.R. 1003.2(c)(3)(ii).

Finally, we reject Langie's contention that the BIA's bases for denial were unclear, or that it applied an incorrect legal standard, and/or inadequately reviewed the evidence. *See Najmabadi*, 597 F.3d at 990-91 (BIA adequately considered evidence and sufficiently announced its decision). Thus, we need not address Langie's remaining challenges to the BIA's denial of the motion to reopen.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.