



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

B6




File: WAC-03-176-53404

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: DEC 19 2005

In re: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:



Petition: Immigrant petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, California Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3) as a skilled worker. The director determined that the petitioner failed to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage and denied the petition accordingly.

On appeal, counsel indicated that he would submit a brief and/or evidence to the AAO within 30 days and stated the following: “[The] [p]etitioner had and continues to have sufficient funds to pay salary at time of filing. We are obtaining [a] letter from CPA to further establish ability to pay proffered wage”.

Counsel dated the appeal on August 17, 2004. As of this date, more than 15 months later, the AAO has received nothing further. The AAO sent a fax to counsel on November 3, 2005 informing counsel that no separate brief and/or evidence was received and to confirm whether or not he would send anything else in this matter. To date, more than 4 weeks later, no reply has been received.

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v), an appeal shall be summarily dismissed if the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

Counsel here has not specifically addressed the reasons stated for denial and has not provided any additional evidence. He has not even expressed disagreement with the director's decision. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.