

APR 23 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>KULWINDER SINGH,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
---

No. 09-71662

Agency No. A095-564-359

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted April 17, 2012\*\*

Before: LEAVY, PAEZ, and BEA, Circuit Judges.

Kulwinder Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying his motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for an abuse of discretion the

---

\* 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).

BIA's denial of a motion to reopen. *Toufighi v. Mukasey*, 538 F.3d 988, 992 (9th Cir. 2008). We deny the petition for review.

The agency did not abuse its discretion in denying Singh's motion to reopen because it considered the record and acted within its broad discretion in determining that the evidence was insufficient to establish prima facie eligibility for asylum, withholding of removal, or CAT relief. *See Mendez-Gutierrez v. Gonzales*, 444 F.3d 1168, 1172 (9th Cir. 2006); *Gomes v. Gonzales*, 429 F.3d 1264, 1267 (9th Cir. 2005) (prior relocation was evidence that petitioners could again relocate).

Singh's contention that the agency failed to consider how his new evidence related to a future fear of persecution is belied by the record.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**