

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 18 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

YAN LIU,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 20-72549

Agency No. A087-807-603

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted April 11, 2022\*\*

Before: McKEOWN, CHRISTEN, and BRESS, Circuit Judges.

Yan Liu, a native and citizen of China, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying her motion to reopen removal proceedings. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*,

---

\* 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).

400 F.3d 785, 791 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Liu’s motion to reopen as untimely, where it was filed more than five years after the order of removal became final, and where Liu failed to establish changed country conditions in China to qualify for an exception to the time limitation for filing a motion to reopen. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(7)(C)(ii); 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), (3)(ii); *see also He v. Gonzales*, 501 F.3d 1128, 1132-33 & n.9 (9th Cir. 2007) (change in petitioners’ personal situation was insufficient to establish changed circumstances in China to support untimely motion to reopen but could be a basis for filing a new asylum application).

We lack jurisdiction to review the BIA’s denial of sua sponte reopening where Liu has not asserted a legal or constitutional error. *See Bonilla v. Lynch*, 840 F.3d 575, 588 (9th Cir. 2016) (“[T]his court has jurisdiction to review Board decisions denying *sua sponte* reopening for the limited purpose of reviewing the reasoning behind the decisions for legal or constitutional error.”).

The temporary stay of removal remains in place until issuance of the mandate. The motion for a stay of removal is otherwise denied.

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