

NOV 25 2015

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PAULINO LUIS MARTINEZ-MENA,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 13-72351

Agency No. A095-617-745

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted November 18, 2015\*\*

Before: TASHIMA, OWENS, and FRIEDLAND, Circuit Judges.

Paulino Luis Martinez-Mena, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reopen. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of

---

\* 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).

discretion the denial of a motion to reopen. *Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 986 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Martinez-Mena's motion to reopen as untimely, where it was filed six years after the BIA's final order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Martinez-Mena failed to present material evidence of changed conditions in Mexico to qualify for the regulatory exception to the filing deadline, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *Malty v. Ashcroft*, 381 F.3d 942, 945 (9th Cir. 2004).

Martinez-Mena's contentions that the BIA failed to discuss the positive aspects of the evidence he submitted or adequately explain its decision are not supported. *See Najmabadi*, 597 F.3d at 990 ("What is required is merely that [the BIA] consider the issues raised, and announce its decision in terms sufficient to enable a reviewing court to perceive that it has heard and thought and not merely reacted." (internal quotation marks omitted)).

In light of this disposition, we do not reach Martinez-Mena's remaining contentions regarding whether he has demonstrated prima facie eligibility for relief. *See Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**