

APR 16 2015

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

RAJVIR SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 09-70603

Agency No. A097-587-029

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted April 7, 2015\*\*

Before: FISHER, TALLMAN, and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges.

Rajvir Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of

---

\* 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).

discretion the BIA's denial of a motion to reopen, *Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 986 (9th Cir. 2010), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Singh's untimely motion to reopen, because it considered the record and Singh's evidence, and acted within its broad discretion in determining it was insufficient to warrant reopening. *See Singh v. INS*, 295 F.3d 1037, 1039 (9th Cir. 2002) (the BIA's denial of a motion to reopen shall be reversed only if it is "arbitrary, irrational, or contrary to law."); *see also Shin v. Mukasey*, 547 F.3d 1019, 1025 (9th Cir. 2008) (petitioner failed to satisfy "'heavy burden' of proving that, if proceedings were reopened, the new evidence would likely change the result in the case.") (quoting *Matter of Coelho*, 20 I. & N. Dec. 464, 473 (BIA 1992)).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**