

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 20 2016

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RICARDO MEJIA SORIANO,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 15-73738

Agency No. A206-407-141

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted December 14, 2016\*\*

Before: WALLACE, LEAVY, and FISHER, Circuit Judges.

Ricardo Mejia Soriano, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reopen. Our jurisdiction is governed by 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

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

983, 986 (9th Cir. 2010), and we deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Mejia Soriano's motion to reopen as untimely where the motion was filed over eleven months after the BIA's final order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Mejia Soriano failed to demonstrate material changed circumstances in El Salvador to qualify for a regulatory exception to the time limitations for filing a motion to reopen, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *Najmabadi*, 597 F.3d at 991-92 (evidence must be "qualitatively different" to warrant reopening).

We lack jurisdiction to review the BIA's discretionary decision not to reopen proceedings sua sponte. *See Mejia-Hernandez v. Holder*, 633 F.3d 818, 823-24 (9th Cir. 2011); *cf. Bonilla v. Lynch*, 840 F.3d 575, 588 (9th Cir. 2016). We also lack jurisdiction to consider Mejia Soriano's contentions challenging the BIA's October 15, 2014, order because Mejia Soriano did not petition for review of that order. *See Membreno v. Gonzales*, 425 F.3d 1227, 1229 (9th Cir. 2005).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.**