

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 25-3176

MARIA ALEJANDRA LLERENA PILICITA;
CRISTOPHER JORETH CHANCHICOCHA LLERENA; D. J. C.L.,
Petitioners

v.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals
Temporary Appellate Immigration Judge Jankhana Desai, Nos. A246-410-291, -292 &
-293

Before: HARDIMAN, BIBAS, and RENDELL, *Circuit Judges*
Submitted: Sept. 15, 2026; Filed: Sept. 17, 2026

NONPRECEDENTIAL OPINION*

BIBAS, *Circuit Judge*. Maria Llerena Pilicita and her two teenage children (Cristopher and D. J.) are Ecuadorians. Pilicita worked for a financial office in an Ecuadorian hospital. Criminals started threatening her, demanding that she authorize government payments to a drug supplier, but she refused. Then she was reassigned to work elsewhere in the hospital. After a new president of Ecuador took office, her supervisors harassed and disparaged her (supposedly because of her political affiliation) and asked her to sign off on fraudulent purchases, but again she refused. Finally, Pilicita opened a store. Twice, criminals tried to extort a few hundred dollars from her; she paid them \$100, but they demanded more.

Pilicita and her two children left Ecuador and came here illegally. After they were caught, they sought asylum and withholding of removal. The immigration judge denied

*This is not an opinion of the full Court and, under 3d Cir. IOP 5.7, is not binding precedent.

relief, finding that Pilicita had not suffered harm rising to the level of persecution and that Pilicita's oppressors were motivated by greed, not politics. Her children's claims, dependent on hers, failed as well. The Board of Immigration Appeals affirmed in July 2024, making their order of removal final.

Nine months later, Pilicita and her two children moved to reopen, claiming that Ecuador had become more violent. The Board denied their motion as untimely, noting that it was filed long after the ninety-day window for such motions. 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(7)(C)(i). And though there is an exception to the ninety-day window for changed country conditions, the Board held that it did not apply. True, Ecuador had grown more violent over the previous year. Even so, the Board noted, the increase in crime did not undercut the prior ruling because it did not show that Pilicita now had a well-founded fear of persecution based on her politics. So it refused to reopen on her motion or sua sponte, finding no basis for asylum, withholding of removal, or protection under the Convention Against Torture. We review that ruling for abuse of discretion, giving the Board "broad deference." *Pllumi v. Att'y Gen. of U.S.*, 642 F.3d 155, 158 (3d Cir. 2011).

The only evidence specific to Pilicita was already in the record of the first proceeding, so it cannot show a *change* in country conditions. The new country-conditions evidence was about general violence and crime in Ecuador, not crime based on political affiliation. There was still nothing in the record to support her fear of political persecution, nor reason to think that the government would acquiesce in any torture. On the contrary, as the Board

stressed, the Ecuadorian government is trying to fight violence. We will thus DENY the petition for review.