

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 24 2015

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JASPREET SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 13-72474

Agency No. A096-169-770

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.

Jaspreet Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his 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, *Najambadi v.*

---

\* 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).

*Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 986 (9th Cir. 2010), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Singh’s motion to reopen because it was filed more than five years after his order of removal became final, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Singh failed to establish materially changed circumstances in India to qualify for the regulatory exception to the time limitations for motions to reopen, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *Najambadi*, 597 F.3d at 987-90 (evidence must be “qualitatively different” to warrant reopening); *see also Toufighi v. Mukasey*, 538 F.3d 988, 996-97 (9th Cir. 2007) (evidence was immaterial in light of prior adverse credibility determination).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**