

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

Date: 20250217

Docket: IMM-4185-24

Citation: 2025 FC 305

Toronto, Ontario, February 17, 2025

PRESENT: The Honourable Mr. Justice Ahmed

BETWEEN:

FARHAN AHMED SIDDIQUI

Applicant

and

**THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP
AND IMMIGRATION**

Respondent

JUDGMENT AND REASONS

(Delivered orally from the bench on February 17, 2025, and subject to stylistic, editorial, and syntax edits, as well as reference to jurisprudence and legal citations)

[1] The Applicant seeks judicial review of the refusal of his application for a temporary resident visa (“TRV”) pursuant to paragraph 179(b) of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations*, SOR/2002-227 (the “Regulations”).

[2] The Applicant is a citizen of Pakistan. In October 2023, the Applicant applied for a TRV to visit his sister and brother-in-law. At the time, his brother-in-law was receiving care due to heart, kidney, and liver conditions.

[3] A visa officer refused the TRV application in February 2024. The officer was “not satisfied that [the Applicant] will leave Canada at the end of [his] stay” pursuant to paragraph 179(b) of the Regulations. The officer determined that “[the Applicant’s] assets and financial situation are insufficient to support the stated purpose of travel” and “[t]he purpose of [his] visit to Canada is not consistent with a temporary stay.”

[4] The Applicant submits that the officer’s decision is unreasonable and was made in a procedurally unfair manner. However, the Applicant’s only argument with respect to procedural fairness is a bare assertion that the officer fettered their discretion. As a result, I find that the sole issue raised in this application is whether the refusal decision is reasonable (*Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65 at para 99 (“Vavilov”)).

[5] In my view, it is.

[6] The officer’s determination that “[the Applicant’s] assets and financial situation are insufficient” was justified in light of the facts and law (*Vavilov* at para 99). The Applicant’s bank statements show total funds of less than \$2,000. The Officer rightly determined that this amount was “insufficient to support the stated purpose of travel,” as the Applicant’s costs would necessarily include the price of airfare to and from Pakistan in addition to expenses related to

visiting sick relatives. Pursuant to paragraph 179(b) of the Regulations, refusal is justified on this basis alone.

[7] I am also not persuaded by the Applicant's assertion that the officer erred in finding "[t]he purpose of [the Applicant's] visit to Canada is not consistent with a temporary stay." The Applicant submits the officer disregarded his explanation for visiting Canada and the medical evidence of his brother-in-law. However, the jurisprudence is clear that, given the "large volume of decisions" made by visa officers, "extensive reasons are not required for the decision to be reasonable" (*Nimely v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2020 FC 282 at para 7). The officer was not obliged to address these specific materials. The Applicant has not demonstrated that these materials "squarely contradict[ed]" the officer's decision (*Kheradpazhooh v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2018 FC 1097 at para 18). The Applicant's submissions are therefore not supported by the record or reasons.

[8] In his written submissions, the Applicant made additional submissions that the officer disregarded his travel history and his family ties, emotional ties, and financial ties to Pakistan. However, these factors had no bearing on the refusal decision. They are therefore not relevant to the present proceeding.

[9] For these reasons, this application for judicial review is dismissed. There is no question for certification.

JUDGMENT in IMM-4185-24

THIS COURT’S JUDGMENT is that:

1. This application for judicial review is dismissed.
2. There is no question to certify.

“Shirzad A.”

Judge

FEDERAL COURT
SOLICITORS OF RECORD

DOCKET: IMM-4185-24

STYLE OF CAUSE: FARHAN AHMED SIDDIQUI v THE MINISTER OF
CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

PLACE OF HEARING: BY VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE OF HEARING: FEBRUARY 17, 2025

JUDGMENT AND REASONS: AHMED J.

DATED: FEBRUARY 17, 2025

APPEARANCES:

Amit Vinayak	FOR THE APPLICANT
Pavel Filatov	FOR THE RESPONDENT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD:

Amit Vinayak Barrister and Solicitor Mississauga, Ontario	FOR THE APPLICANT
Attorney General of Canada Toronto, Ontario	FOR THE RESPONDENT