



**DISCUSSION:** The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a motel. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a maintenance technician. The director determined that the petitioner had not establish that it was eligible to receive a visa by failing to submit any requested evidence to determine petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage of \$33,000.00 per annum from the priority date, and denied the petition accordingly.

Counsel submitted a Form I-290B appeal in this matter. In the section reserved for the basis of the appeal, the counsel inserted, "Petitioner had a demonstrated ability to pay, thus the I-140 was erroneously denied. We will be sending in additional evidence of the company's financial standing." By letter received July 7, 2004, counsel submitted six federal W-2 Wage and Tax Statements for 2003 without explanation.

Counsel's statement on appeal contains no specific assignment of error. Alleging that the director erred in some unspecified way is an insufficient basis for an appeal.

8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part: "An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal."

The purpose of the request for evidence is to elicit further information that clarifies whether eligibility for the benefit sought has been established, as of the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(b)(8) and (12). The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14). As in the present matter, where a petitioner has been put on notice of a deficiency in the evidence and has been given an opportunity to respond to that deficiency, the AAO will not accept evidence offered for the first time on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533 (BIA 1988). If the petitioner had wanted the submitted evidence to be considered, it should have submitted the documents in response to the director's request for evidence. *Id.* Under the circumstances, the AAO need not, and does not, consider the sufficiency of the evidence submitted on appeal. Consequently, the appeal will be dismissed.

Counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal and the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is summarily dismissed.