


identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services



FILE: [REDACTED]  
EAC 03 207 51982

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: **OCT 19 2006**

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]  
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The service center director denied the employment-based visa petition, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is an auto service company for foreign and domestic autos. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an automobile mechanic. As required by statute, a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification approved by the Department of Labor, accompanied the petition. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition and denied the petition accordingly.

On appeal, counsel states that the director erred in his decision that the petitioner did not have the ability to pay the proffered wage. In the appeal dated January 5, 2004, counsel states that she is sending a brief and/or evidence to the AAO within 30 days; however, the AAO has received no further evidence. In response to a FAX sent by the AAO enquiring as to any further materials that might have been submitted to the AAO, counsel sent the AAO correspondence dated September 14, 2006 and stated that she withdrew as the petitioner's attorney of record.<sup>1</sup>

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. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Thus, the petitioner is self-represented.