

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

Date: 20250130

Docket: IMM-1846-24

Citation: 2025 FC 194

Vancouver, British Columbia, January 30, 2025

PRESENT: Mr. Justice Sébastien Grammond

BETWEEN:

HENGAMEH REZVANI GILKOLAEI

Applicant

and

**THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND
IMMIGRATION**

Respondent

JUDGMENT AND REASONS

(Delivered from the bench in Vancouver, British Columbia, on January 30, 2025)

[1] Boilerplate is everywhere.

[2] The reasons given by a visa officer for refusing Ms. Rezvani Gilkolaei’s application for a study permit consist of six boilerplate sentences. The only meaningful one is “PA [principal applicant] does not demonstrate to my satisfaction reasons for which the international educational program would be of benefit.”

[3] But Ms. Rezvani Gilkolaei's application consisted also largely of boilerplate. Leaving aside family ties and financial resources, on which the officer did not rely to deny the application, what we know about her motivation to study in Canada is limited to what follows.

[4] She is a citizen of Iran, aged 36. She obtained bachelor's degrees in Green Space Engineering and Law. She has been working for Boland Martabeh Sazan Bonyan Co since 2015, as a "Technical and Engineering Affairs Expert." She has been accepted at Langara College, for a year of English for academic purposes, followed by a post-degree diploma in business administration. Her employer granted her a leave of absence and stated that upon return, she would be promoted to "Manager of Technical & Engineering Affairs Expert," on condition, however, that she "acquires a creditable academic degree in this field in Canada."

[5] We know nothing more. Beyond what we can surmise from the job titles, we have no information whatsoever about the tasks Ms. Rezvani Gilkolaei is currently performing, nor about the description of the job she was offered. We do not even know the nature of her employer's business, other than to speculate that it has something to do with engineering. Contrary to most applications of this kind, she did not provide a curriculum vitae.

[6] To be sure, Ms. Rezvani Gilkolaei submitted a "study plan" with her application. But again, it consists mainly of boilerplate. She described four courses she would take at Langara College in generic terms that are hardly related to her specific career path. Consider, for instance, the statement that "The insights gained from the Business Strategy course will allow me to contribute to the development and execution of effective business strategies." Likewise, she

provided reasons for studying in Canada that are highly generic and could apply to any Iranian citizen who wishes to study here. Her study plan is also highly generic with respect to career advancement, with nothing more precise than “This promotion will enhance my professional status and provide me with more significant responsibilities and opportunities to contribute to the company’s success.”

[7] Contrary to Ms. Rezvani Gilkolaei’s submissions, a visa officer may inquire as to the benefits that the proposed program of study would bring to the applicant: *Ali v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 FC 608 at paragraph 13; *Rajabi v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 371 at paragraph 12. Considering this does not amount to adding a criterion beyond what the law requires.

[8] Boilerplate reasons may not always be sufficient to enable the reviewing court to understand why the officer found that these benefits were lacking: *Safarian v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 FC 775. For instance, boilerplate may not provide an adequate explanation if it overlooks significant evidence pointing to the opposite conclusion.

[9] Here, however, there was little for the officer to consider beyond what I have summarized above. There was no evidence pointing to the opposite conclusion. Ms. Rezvani Gilkolaei’s study plan boiled down to an assertion that she wanted to study business administration because she wanted to work in business administration. The letters from her employer did not describe how the program would be relevant to her new position nor explain why she would be promoted only if she obtained a Canadian degree. Given that the officer based the decision on the benefits

derived from the program of study alone, there was no need to address what counsel described as “positive factors” regarding funding or family ties.

[10] In light of this, the officer’s statement that Ms. Rezvani Gilkolaei did not “demonstrate to my satisfaction reasons for which the international educational program would be of benefit” adequately justifies the denial of the study permit. The officer was entitled to respond to boilerplate with boilerplate. In fact, there was little more the officer could say. It is reasonable to deny a study permit where the applicant provides little information regarding their motivations, choice of program and career plans: *Marcelin v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2021 FC 761 at paragraphs 11–15.

[11] For these reasons, Ms. Rezvani Gilkolaei’s application for judicial review will be dismissed.

JUDGMENT in IMM-1846-24

THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that

1. The application for judicial review is dismissed.
2. No question is certified.

"Sébastien Grammond"

Judge

FEDERAL COURT
SOLICITORS OF RECORD

DOCKET: IMM-1846-24

STYLE OF CAUSE: HENGAMEH REZVANI GILKOLAEI v THE
MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

PLACE OF HEARING: VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA

DATE OF HEARING: JANUARY 30, 2025

JUDGMENT AND REASONS: GRAMMOND J.

DATED: JANUARY 30, 2025

APPEARANCES:

Samin Mortazavi	FOR THE APPLICANT
Richard Li	FOR THE RESPONDENT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD:

Pax Law Corporation North Vancouver, British Columbia	FOR THE APPLICANT
Attorney General of Canada Ottawa, Ontario	FOR THE RESPONDENT