

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

**Date: 20250214**

**Docket: IMM-3117-24**

**Citation: 2025 FC 296**

**Ottawa, Ontario, February 14, 2025**

**PRESENT: Madam Justice Sadrehashemi**

**BETWEEN:**

**SEYED RYAN JAFARI**

**Applicant**

**and**

**MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND  
IMMIGRATION**

**Respondent**

**JUDGMENT AND REASONS**

[1] The Applicant, Seyed Ryan Jafari, applied for a temporary resident visa (“TRV”) to Canada to visit his sister. An officer at Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (“the Officer”) refused his application on January 31, 2024. Mr. Jafari is challenging this refusal on judicial review.

[2] The Officer refused the application because they found the Applicant had not established under paragraph 179(b) of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*, SC 2001, c 27 [IRPA] that he will leave Canada by the end of the period authorized for his stay based on the following factors: (i) insufficient family ties; (ii) insufficient employment ties in home country; and (iii) the visit was not a reasonable expense when considering the history of fund accumulation in his bank account.

[3] I find that the decision is unreasonable because relevant evidence contradicting the Officer's findings was not addressed. While extensive reasons are not required, an officer's decision must be transparent, justified and intelligible. There needs to be a "rational chain of analysis" so that a person impacted by the decision can understand the basis for the determination (*Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65 at para 103; see also *Patel v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2020 FC 77 at para 17; *Samra v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2020 FC 157 at para 23; and *Rodriguez Martinez v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2020 FC 293 at paras 13-14).

[4] The Officer found that visiting Mr. Jafari's sister in Canada for a month was not a reasonable expense given Mr. Jafari's funds in his bank account and the appearance of a sudden influx of funds in the account. In this assessment, the Officer does not mention Mr. Jafari's sister's affidavit that sets out that she would financially fully support Mr. Jafari's stay in Canada. Mr. Jafari's sister and her husband also provided employment verification letters that confirm their salaries. There is no mention of this financial support in the Officer's reasons, though it is

critical in the evaluation of whether the visit would be a reasonable expense for Mr. Jafari. On this basis alone the decision should be sent back to be redetermined.

[5] Further, I cannot understand how the Officer reached the conclusion about Mr. Jafari's employment ties to Iran. The Officer states, "taking the applicant's current employment situation into consideration, the employment does not demonstrate that the applicant is sufficiently well established who [*sic*] would leave Canada at the end of the period of authorized stay." The Officer does not explain how they reached this conclusion based on the evidence in the record.

[6] The evidence in the record reveals that Mr. Jafari started his current employment in April 2009. His employer provided a letter confirming his salary and that Mr. Jafari will hold his current position until 2029. Further, Mr. Jafari's employer provided an additional letter advising that Mr. Jafari was permitted to take a 30 day leave to visit his sister. None of this relevant evidence is mentioned by the Officer, nor is their conclusion about lack of sufficient establishment explained in light of any evidence in the record. This conclusion also lacks transparency, intelligibility and justification.

[7] The application for judicial review is granted. Neither party raised a question for certification and I agree none arises.

**JUDGMENT in IMM-3117-24**

**THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that:**

1. The application for judicial review is allowed;
2. The decision dated January 31, 2024 is set aside and sent to a different decision-maker for redetermination; and
3. No serious question of general importance is certified.

"Lobat Sadrehashemi"

---

Judge

**FEDERAL COURT**  
**SOLICITORS OF RECORD**

**DOCKET:** IMM-3117-24

**STYLE OF CAUSE:** SEYED RYAN JAFARI v MINISTER OF  
CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**PLACE OF HEARING:** VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA

**DATE OF HEARING:** FEBRUARY 13, 2025

**JUDGMENT AND REASONS:** SADREHASHEMI J.

**DATED:** FEBRUARY 14, 2025

**APPEARANCES:**

Ramanjit Sohi	FOR THE APPLICANT
Charles Barnes	FOR THE RESPONDENT

**SOLICITORS OF RECORD:**

Raman Sohi Law Barristers and Solicitors Surrey, BC	FOR THE APPLICANT
Attorney General of Canada Vancouver, BC	FOR THE RESPONDENT