NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

OCT 27 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

GLENDA MARICELA GONZALEZ-PEREZ; R. J. T.-G., Petitioners, v. TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General, Respondent.	No. 25-7159 Agency Nos. A215-936-350 A215-936-351 MEMORANDUM[*]

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

Submitted October 23, 2026[**]
Pasadena, California

Before: MURGUIA, Chief Judge, and GOULD and JOHNSTONE, Circuit Judges.

Glenda Gonzalez-Perez and her daughter, R.J.T.-G. (collectively "Gonzalez-Perez"), natives and citizens of El Salvador, petition for review of a decision by the Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA") denying her motion to reopen proceedings

[*] 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).

based on changed country conditions. The BIA determined that the motion was untimely, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(7)(C)(i), and that Gonzalez-Perez had not met her burden of showing changed country conditions or her prima facie eligibility for relief or for protection from removal, *see id.* § 1229a(c)(7)(C)(ii). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252 and review the BIA's denial of a motion to reopen for abuse of discretion. *Toufighi v. Mukasey*, 538 F.3d 988, 990, 992 (9th Cir. 2008). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in concluding that Gonzalez-Perez did not establish that changed country conditions in El Salvador warranted reopening her removal proceedings. 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(7)(C)(ii). Based on the country conditions reports and articles, the BIA reasonably determined that violence against women in El Salvador has been an ongoing problem for many years, and has "remained a widespread and serious problem" since September 2019. Gonzalez-Perez's "references to 'continuing' or 'remaining' problems [are] not evidence of a *change* in a country's conditions." *Rodriguez v. Garland*, 990 F.3d 1205, 1210 (9th Cir. 2021) (emphasis in original); *see also Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 989 (9th Cir. 2010) (affirming the BIA's denial of a motion to reopen when a subsequent country conditions report "merely describe[d]

conditions similar to those found in the" earlier report).[1]

Because the BIA's decision was not an abuse of discretion, we deny the petition for review.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.

[1] Because Gonzalez-Perez failed to establish changed country conditions, we need not reach the BIA's alternative grounds for denying the motion to reopen: that Gonzalez-Perez had not shown prima facie eligibility for asylum, withholding of removal, or Convention Against Torture protection. 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(7)(C)(ii); *see Toufighi*, 538 F.3d at 996 (holding the BIA can deny a motion to reopen if an applicant fails to establish any of the four elements).