NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

OCT 28 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

RANA MUHAMMAD MASOOD, Petitioner, v. TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General, Respondent.	No. 12-71882 Agency No. A097-620-974 MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted October 27, 2026**

Before: SILVERMAN, FORREST, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Rana Muhammad Masood, a native and citizen of Pakistan, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reopen removal proceedings. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791 (9th Cir. 2005). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We deny the petition for review.

---

* 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).

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Masood's motion to reopen as untimely, where it was filed over four years after the final removal order, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(7)(C)(i) (motion to reopen must be filed within ninety days of the final removal order), and he did not show changed country conditions in Pakistan to qualify for an exception to the filing deadline, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(7)(C)(ii); *Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 989-90 (9th Cir. 2010) (petitioner's evidence lacked materiality because "it simply recount[ed] generalized conditions" in the country of removal).

In light of this disposition, we need not reach Masood's remaining contentions regarding his credibility. *See Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004) (courts and agencies are not required to decide issues unnecessary to the results they reach).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.