NOT FOR PUBLICATION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

SYLVIANA CHANDRA; et al., Petitioners, v. TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General, Respondent.	No. 18-70326 Agency Nos. A088-558-608 A088-558-609 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.

Sylviana Chandra and her husband, natives and citizens of Indonesia, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying their 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). Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We deny in part and

* 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).

dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying the untimely and number-barred motion to reopen where petitioners failed to establish prima facie eligibility for relief. *See Bhasin v. Gonzales*, 423 F.3d 977, 984 (9th Cir. 2005) ("An applicant must demonstrate that the new evidence, when considered together with the evidence presented at the original hearing, would establish prima facie eligibility for the relief sought.").

As to sua sponte reopening, we have jurisdiction to review this discretionary determination only for legal or constitutional error. *See Lona v. Barr*, 958 F.3d 1225, 1227 (9th Cir. 2020). We find no legal or constitutional error underlying the BIA's decision.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.