

OCT 20 2014

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

## NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

GOENAWAN BOEDIJONO; MEYKE  
MARGARETHA,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 13-70805

Agency Nos. A096-362-468  
A099-887-499

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted October 14, 2014\*\*

Before: LEAVY, GOULD, and BERZON, Circuit Judges.

Goenawan Boedijono and Meyke Margaretha, natives and citizens of Indonesia, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") denial of their motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under

---

\* 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). Thus, we deny Ren's request for oral argument.

8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of 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 petitioners’ motion to reopen as untimely because the motion was filed over three years after the BIA’s final decision, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and they failed to establish materially changed circumstances in Indonesia to qualify for the regulatory exception to the time limitation for motions to reopen, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *Najmabadi*, 597 F.3d at 987 (new evidence “must be ‘qualitatively different’ from the evidence presented at the previous hearing”).

We reject petitioners’ contention that the BIA’s analysis was inadequate or incomplete. *See Najmabadi*, 597 F.3d at 990 (the BIA “does not have to write an exegesis on every contention”).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**