

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 22 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

BRADLEY JIMMY MICHAEL  
PRATASIK,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFF B. SESSIONS, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 12-74017

Agency No. A095-315-676

MEMORANDUM \*

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

Submitted February 14, 2017\*\*

Before: GOODWIN, FARRIS, and FERNANDEZ, Circuit Judges.

Bradley Jimmy Michael Pratasik, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his untimely 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

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 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 Pratasik's motion to reopen because he failed to establish materially changed country conditions in Indonesia to qualify for an exception to the time limitation for filing a motion to reopen. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii), *Najmabadi*, 597 F.3d at 978-79 (evidence must be “qualitatively different” to warrant reopening).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**