

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

OCT 30 2017

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

DULLA SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 16-70213

Agency No. A079-290-290

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted October 23, 2017\*\*

Before: McKEOWN, WATFORD, and FRIEDLAND, Circuit Judges.

Dulla Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the BIA's denial of a motion to reopen. *Najmabadi v. Holder*,

---

\* 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).

597 F.3d 983, 986 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Singh's motion to reopen where it was untimely and number-barred, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and where Singh failed to establish materially changed circumstances in India to qualify for the regulatory exception to the time limitations for motions to reopen, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3); *Najmabadi*, 597 F.3d at 991-92 (BIA did not abuse its discretion where petitioner failed to introduce material evidence).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**