

**Inspection of
Maddox Ungar Silberstein, PLLC
(Headquartered in Bingham Farms, Michigan)**

**Issued by the
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
December 21, 2009**

THIS IS A PUBLIC VERSION OF A PCAOB INSPECTION REPORT

**PORTIONS OF THE COMPLETE REPORT ARE OMITTED
FROM THIS DOCUMENT IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH
SECTIONS 104(g)(2) AND 105(b)(5)(A)
OF THE SARBANES-OXLEY ACT OF 2002**



Notes Concerning this Report

1. Portions of this report may describe deficiencies or potential deficiencies in the systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct of the firm that is the subject of this report. The express inclusion of certain deficiencies and potential deficiencies, however, should not be construed to support any negative inference that any other aspect of the firm's systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct is approved or condoned by the Board or judged by the Board to comply with laws, rules, and professional standards.
2. Any references in this report to violations or potential violations of law, rules, or professional standards should be understood in the supervisory context in which this report was prepared. Any such references are not a result of an adversarial adjudicative process and do not constitute conclusive findings of fact or of violations for purposes of imposing legal liability. Similarly, any description herein of a firm's cooperation in addressing issues constructively should not be construed, and is not construed by the Board, as an admission, for purposes of potential legal liability, of any violation.
3. Board inspections encompass, among other things, whether the firm has failed to identify departures from U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP") or Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission") disclosure requirements in its audits of financial statements. This report's descriptions of any such auditing failures necessarily involve descriptions of the related GAAP or disclosure departures. The Board, however, has no authority to prescribe the form or content of an issuer's financial statements. That authority, and the authority to make binding determinations concerning an issuer's compliance with GAAP or Commission disclosure requirements, rests with the Commission. Any description, in this report, of perceived departures from GAAP or Commission disclosure requirements should not be understood as an indication that the Commission has considered or made any determination regarding these issues unless otherwise expressly stated.



INSPECTION OF MADDOX UNGAR SILBERSTEIN, PLLC

The Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") has conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Maddox Ungar Silberstein, PLLC ("the Firm"). The Board is issuing this report of that inspection in accordance with the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("the Act").

The Board is making portions of the report publicly available. Specifically, the Board is releasing to the public Part I of the report and portions of Part IV of the report. Part IV of the report consists of the Firm's comments, if any, on a draft of the report.^{1/}

The Board has elsewhere described in detail its approach to making inspection-related information publicly available consistent with legal restrictions.^{2/} A substantial portion of the Board's criticisms of a firm (specifically criticisms of the firm's quality control system), and the Board's dialogue with the firm about those criticisms, occurs out of public view, unless the firm fails to make progress to the Board's satisfaction in addressing those criticisms. In addition, the Board generally does not disclose otherwise nonpublic information, learned through inspections, about the firm or its clients. Accordingly, information in those categories generally does not appear in the publicly available portion of an inspection report.

^{1/} The Board does not make public any of a firm's comments that address a nonpublic portion of the report unless a firm specifically requests otherwise. In addition, pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), if a firm requests, and the Board grants, confidential treatment for any of the firm's comments on a draft report, the Board does not include those comments in the final report at all. The Board routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any portion of a firm's response that addresses any point in the draft that the Board omits from, or any inaccurate statement in the draft that the Board corrects in, the final report.

^{2/} See Statement Concerning the Issuance of Inspection Reports, PCAOB Release No. 104-2004-001 (August 26, 2004).

PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") conducted primary procedures for the inspection from October 21, 2008 to October 24, 2008 and from October 28, 2008 to October 29, 2008. These procedures were tailored to the nature of the Firm, certain aspects of which the inspection team understood at the outset of the inspection to be as follows:

Number of offices	1 (Bingham Farms, Michigan)
Ownership structure	Professional limited liability company
Number of partners	3
Number of professional staff ^{3/}	3
Number of issuer audit clients ^{4/}	36

^{3/} "Professional staff" includes all personnel of the Firm, except partners or shareholders and administrative support personnel. The number of partners and professional staff is provided here as an indication of the size of the Firm, and does not necessarily represent the number of the Firm's professionals who participate in audits of issuers or are "associated persons" (as defined in the Act) of the Firm.

^{4/} The number of issuer audit clients shown here is based on the Firm's self-reporting and the inspection team's review of certain information for inspection planning purposes. It does not reflect any Board determination concerning which, or how many, of the Firm's audit clients are "issuers" as defined in the Act. In some circumstances, a Board inspection may include a review of a firm's audit of financial statements of an issuer that ceased to be an audit client before the inspection, and any such former clients are not included in the number shown here.

Board inspections are designed to identify and address weaknesses and deficiencies related to how a firm conducts audits.^{5/} To achieve that goal, Board inspections include reviews of certain aspects of selected audits performed by the firm and reviews of other matters related to the firm's quality control system.

In the course of reviewing aspects of selected audits, an inspection may identify ways in which a particular audit is deficient, including failures by the firm to identify, or to address appropriately, respects in which an issuer's financial statements do not present fairly the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with GAAP.^{6/} It is not the purpose of an inspection, however, to review all of a firm's audits or to identify every respect in which a reviewed audit is deficient. Accordingly, a Board inspection report should not be understood to provide any assurance that the firm's audits, or its issuer clients' financial statements, are free of any deficiencies not specifically described in an inspection report.

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included a review of aspects of the Firm's auditing of financial statements of two issuers. The scope of this review was determined according to the Board's criteria, and the Firm was not allowed an opportunity to limit or influence the scope.

The inspection team identified what it considered to be audit deficiencies.^{7/} The deficiencies identified in both of the audits reviewed included deficiencies of such

^{5/} This focus necessarily carries through to reports on inspections and, accordingly, Board inspection reports are not intended to serve as balanced report cards or overall rating tools.

^{6/} When it comes to the Board's attention that an issuer's financial statements appear not to present fairly, in a material respect, the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with GAAP, the Board's practice is to report that information to the SEC, which has jurisdiction to determine proper accounting in issuers' financial statements.

^{7/} PCAOB standards require a firm to take appropriate actions to assess the importance of audit deficiencies identified after the date of the audit report to the firm's present ability to support its previously expressed opinions. See AU 390, *Consideration*

significance that it appeared to the inspection team that the Firm did not obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements.^{8/} Those deficiencies were –

- (1) the Firm's failure to address appropriately a departure from GAAP that it identified related to a potentially material misstatement in the audited financial statements concerning the presentation of revenue; and
- (2) the Firm's failure to identify, or to address appropriately, a departure from GAAP that related to a potentially material misstatement in the audited financial statements concerning the classification of debt.

B. Review of Quality Control System

In addition to evaluating the quality of the audit work performed on specific audits, the inspection included review of certain of the Firm's practices, policies, and procedures related to audit quality. This review addressed practices, policies, and procedures concerning audit performance, training, compliance with independence standards, client acceptance and retention, and the establishment of policies and

of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date, and AU 561, Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Auditor's Report (both included among the PCAOB's interim auditing standards, pursuant to PCAOB Rule 3200T). Failure to comply with these PCAOB standards could be a basis for Board disciplinary sanctions.

^{8/} In some cases, an inspection team's observation that a firm failed to perform a procedure may be based on the absence of documentation and the absence of persuasive other evidence, even if a firm claims to have performed the procedure. PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 3, *Audit Documentation* ("AS No. 3"), provides that, in various circumstances including PCAOB inspections, a firm that has not adequately documented that it performed a procedure, obtained evidence, or reached an appropriate conclusion must demonstrate with persuasive other evidence that it did so, and that oral assertions and explanations alone do not constitute persuasive other evidence. See AS No. 3, paragraph 9; Appendix A to AS No. 3, paragraph A28. For purposes of the inspection, an observation that the Firm did not perform a procedure, obtain evidence, or reach an appropriate conclusion may be based on the absence of such documentation and the absence of persuasive other evidence.

procedures. As described above, any defects in, or criticisms of, the Firm's quality control system are discussed in the nonpublic portion of this report and will remain nonpublic unless the Firm fails to address them to the Board's satisfaction within 12 months of the date of this report.

END OF PART I



PCAOB Release No. 104-2009-201
Inspection of Maddox Ungar Silberstein, PLLC
December 21, 2009
Page 6

PARTS II AND III OF THIS REPORT ARE NONPUBLIC
AND ARE OMITTED FROM THIS PUBLIC DOCUMENT

PART IV

RESPONSE OF THE FIRM TO DRAFT INSPECTION REPORT

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the Firm provided a written response to a draft of this report. Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the Firm's response, minus any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.^{9/}

^{9/} In any version of an inspection report that the Board makes publicly available, any portions of a firm's response that address nonpublic portions of the report are omitted. In some cases, the result may be that none of a firm's response is made publicly available.

Maddox Ungar Silberstein, PLLC CPAs and Business Advisors

Phone (248) 203-0080
Fax (248) 281-0940
30600 Telegraph Road, Suite 2175
Bingham Farms, MI 48025-4586
www.maddoxungar.com

October 30, 2009

George H. Diacont, Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Re: Response to Part 1 A of Draft Report on the Inspection in October of 2008

Dear Mr. Diacont:

Maddox Ungar Silberstein, PLLC (hereinafter referred to as "MUS" and the "Firm") is pleased to submit its response to the Public Company Oversight Board's (the "Board" and the "PCAOB") October 1, 2009 draft of its Report on the Inspection in October of 2008 (the "Draft Report"). We are supportive of the inspection process and believe the Board's comments and observations enhance the ability of MUS to achieve our shared objective of improving audit quality.

MUS is committed to the highest standards of audit quality. We continually monitor the systems and processes for our audit practice, including quality control, and, among other things, make changes to methodologies, policies, and procedures when we identify improvements that could enhance audit quality. We will thoroughly consider the Board's comments and concerns addressed in the Draft Report, assess whether we have already initiated actions that address those concerns, and consider whether additional actions are necessary.

We understand that there can be reasonable differing views between the inspection team and the Firm as to accounting treatment and audit procedures performed based on the complexity of transactions and due to the judgmental nature of such matters. The engagements reviewed by the inspection team involved decisions and judgments made by our audit professionals, some of which may be subject to different reasonable interpretations.

We believe that for both Issuer's reviewed, the MUS audit reports were appropriate as issued and were sufficiently supported by the evidential matter reviewed during the audit process. We strongly disagree with the findings of the inspection team that we failed to obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to support our opinion on the Issuers' financial statements, and we believe this PCAOB conclusion is wholly unsupported by the discussions we had with the

PCAOB during the inspection process. We note that both Issuers received what are known as "going-concern" opinions. We also believe that, for Issuer B, the debt at issue was properly classified as long-term and note that only an immaterial amount ended up being repaid during the subsequent year – all of which was paid at the Company's discretion and none of which was paid because of a demand for payment (no demand for payment was ever made during the subsequent year).

As noted in the audit opinion and the PCAOB standards, management of the issuer is responsible for the fair presentation of the financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles of the United States of America. It is the auditor's responsibility to determine that management's assertions in the financial statements are fairly stated in all material respects.

The auditor's judgment is the determinant of which assertions are material to the fair presentation of the financial statements, and which are not. A material misstatement of an immaterial or inconsequential fact does not result in a material misstatement to the financial statements. In the context of a public company, a material misstatement is one that would have affected an investor's decision to invest or not invest in the stock of that entity, or have affected the trading price of the stock.

We believe that the PCAOB has failed to demonstrate any inaccuracy in the audit opinions MUS issued on the two clients that were reviewed, and how the investment decision of a reasonable person would have been adversely affected had the financial statements of both Issuer A and Issuer B been in accordance with the PCAOB inspection team conclusions. We also note that our audit opinion, as well as total assets, total liabilities, total equity/(deficit), and net (loss) of each Issuer would have remained exactly the same as what each Issuer reported.

We are available to the Board and its staff to discuss our response in further detail. Please contact Ronald N. Silberstein at (248)341-1264 with any questions.

Sincerely,

Maddox Ungar Silberstein PLLC

Maddox Ungar Silberstein, PLLC