

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

OCT 3 2017

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

KARINE MOVSESYAN,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 14-73887

Agency No. A095-294-250

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted September 26, 2017**

Before: SILVERMAN, TALLMAN, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Karine Movsesyan, a native and citizen of Armenia, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying her motion to reopen removal proceedings. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen. *Najmabadi v.*

* 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).

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

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Movsesyan's motion to reopen as untimely where the motion was filed more than four years after the BIA's final order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Movsesyan failed to establish a material change in circumstances in Armenia to qualify for the regulatory 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 990 (evidence must be material); *Toufighi v. Mukasey*, 538 F.3d 988, 996-97 (9th Cir. 2008) (evidence immaterial in light of prior adverse credibility determination). We reject Movsesyan's contentions that the BIA failed to consider arguments.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.