

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 3 2016

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RIKA FRISTDA SIRINGO RINGO,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 12-73936

Agency No. A095-875-142

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted February 24, 2016**

Before: LEAVY, FERNANDEZ, and RAWLINSON, Circuit Judges.

Rika Fristda Siringo Ringo, 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 abuse of discretion the agency's denial of a motion to

* 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).

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 Siringo Ringo’s third untimely motion to reopen because she failed to establish prima facie eligibility for the relief sought. *See Toufighi v. Mukasey*, 538 F.3d 988, 996 (9th Cir. 2007) (stating the hurdles a petitioner needs to clear in order to prevail on a motion to reopen based on changed country conditions); *see also Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1066 (9th Cir. 2009) (“[a]n applicant for withholding of removal will need to adduce a considerably larger quantum of individualized-risk evidence to prevail”).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.