

MAR 03 2016

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ZHIH HUA WU, AKA John Doe, AKA  
Zhi Hua Wu,  
  
Petitioner,  
  
v.  
  
LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,  
  
Respondent.

No. 11-71879

Agency No. A072-094-123

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted February 24, 2016\*\*

Before: LEAVY, FERNANDEZ, and RAWLINSON, Circuit Judges.

Zhih Hua Wu, a native and citizen of China, 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 an abuse of discretion the

---

\* 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).

BIA's denial of a motion to reopen. *He v. Gonzales*, 501 F.3d 1128, 1130-31 (9th Cir. 2007). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion by denying Wu's third motion to reopen as untimely and number-barred because the motion was filed over seventeen years late, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and he failed to demonstrate a material change in circumstances in China to qualify for the regulatory exception to the time and number limits for filing a motion to reopen, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *see also* *Lin v. Holder*, 588 F.3d 981, 988-89 (9th Cir. 2009) (the BIA did not abuse its discretion by denying an untimely motion to reopen where the record did not establish change in family planning laws or enforcement of such laws); *He*, 501 F.3d at 1132 (change in personal circumstances does not establish changed circumstances in country of origin). We reject Wu's contentions that the BIA failed to fully consider evidence he submitted with his motion and that the BIA's analysis was deficient. *See Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 2010) (BIA adequately considered evidence and sufficiently announced its decision).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**