

OCT 21 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>KULDIP SINGH; et al.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioners,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
---

No. 09-71810

Agency Nos.   A077-829-737  
                          A077-829-739  
                          A077-829-740

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted October 15, 2013\*\*

Before:     FISHER, GOULD, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Kuldip Singh and his family, natives and citizens of India, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying their motion to reopen. 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 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 petitioners' motion to reopen as untimely because the motion was filed nearly five years after the BIA's final decision, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and petitioners failed to demonstrate changed circumstances in India to qualify for the regulatory exception to the time limit for filing motions to reopen, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *Najmabadi*, 597 F.3d at 989-90.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**