

JUL 16 2020

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>RAJA GULFAM SARWAR, AKA Gulfam Sarwar Raja,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
--

Nos. 17-73303  
18-71556

Agency No. A070-646-737

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted July 14, 2020\*\*

Before: HAWKINS, GRABER, and CLIFTON, Circuit Judges.

Petitioner Raja Gulfam Sarwar seeks review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") denials of his motion to reopen and his motion for reconsideration, which we review for abuse of discretion. Mohammed v. Gonzales, 400 F.3d 785, 791 (9th Cir. 2005). We have jurisdiction under

---

\* 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).

8 U.S.C. § 1252, and we deny the petition.

1. The BIA did not abuse its discretion by denying Petitioner's motion to reopen. Although Petitioner's personal circumstances changed when he converted to Christianity, he did not provide "evidence of changed country conditions that are relevant in light of [his] changed circumstances." Chandra v. Holder, 751 F.3d 1034, 1037 (9th Cir. 2014). The record shows that the deplorable conditions for Christians in Pakistan have existed since before 1994, when Petitioner's removal hearing occurred. See Salim v. Lynch, 831 F.3d 1133, 1138 (9th Cir. 2016) (stating that we must compare "the country conditions at the time of the instant motion" with "those at the time of the prior hearing").

2. Even assuming that Petitioner did not forfeit any challenge to the BIA's denial of his motion for reconsideration, that denial was not an abuse of discretion. Petitioner failed to identify any "legal or factual error in the BIA's prior decision." Ma v. Ashcroft, 361 F.3d 553, 558 (9th Cir. 2004) (citing 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1)).

**PETITIONS DENIED.**