

NOV 30 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

VIRGINIA TAMBUNAN,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 08-74354

Agency No. A079-195-334

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted November 16, 2010\*\*

Before: TASHIMA, BERZON, and CLIFTON, Circuit Judges.

Virginia Tambunan, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying her motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen, *Malty v. Ashcroft*, 381 F.3d 942, 945 (9th Cir. 2004), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Tambunan's motion to reopen as untimely where Tambunan filed the motion almost four years after the BIA's final order of removal, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and failed to submit material evidence of changed circumstances in Indonesia that would excuse the late filing, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *see also Malty*, 381 F.3d at 945 (requiring circumstances to have changed sufficiently that a petitioner who previously did not have a legitimate claim for asylum now has a well-founded fear of future persecution).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**