

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 26 2016

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

VICTOR MANUEL GUARDADO
RODRIGUEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 14-70650

Agency No. A097-361-112

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted April 13, 2016**

Before: FARRIS, TALLMAN, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Victor Manuel Guardado Rodriguez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his second motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to

* 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).

reopen, *Najmabadi v. 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 Guardado Rodriguez’s motion to reopen because it was untimely and numerically-barred, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Guardado Rodriguez failed to submit material evidence of changes in Mexico to qualify for the regulatory exception to the time and number limitations for motions to reopen. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *Najmabadi*, 597 F.3d at 987-90 (evidence must be “qualitatively different” to warrant reopening). We reject his contentions that the BIA’s analysis was improper or insufficient. *See Najmabadi*, 597 F.3d at 990-91 (the BIA adequately considered evidence and sufficiently announced its decision).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.