

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

Date: 20250825

Docket: IMM-8894-25

Citation: 2025 FC 1415

Ottawa, Ontario, August 25, 2025

PRESENT: The Honourable Mr. Justice Gleeson

BETWEEN:

ARPANPREET KAUR

Applicant

and

**MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP
AND IMMIGRATION**

Respondent

JUDGMENT AND REASONS

(Simplified Procedure-Study Permit Pilot Project)

[1] This is an application under the Study Permit Pilot Project on behalf of the Applicant pursuant to subsection 72(1) of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*, SC 2001, c 27, for leave to commence an application for judicial review of a decision of an Officer with Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada [Officer] dated April 11, 2025, refusing the Applicant's study permit application.

[2] Leave to commence the application for judicial review is granted. However, the Application is dismissed for the reasons that follow.

[3] On judicial review, it is not the Court's role to reweigh evidence nor craft reasons that a decision maker failed to provide. Rather, the reviewing court must determine whether the officer's decision is reasonable in light of facts and law that constrain the decision maker, and assess – within the decision making context – whether the process was fair (*Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65 at paras 77, 85, 97 and 125).

[4] The Applicant argues that the Officer erred in assessing (1) her motivation for pursuing a two-year academic studies program in Canada; (2) the financial evidence provided in support of the application; and (3) her academic record. She further submits a breach of procedural fairness because of the Officer's failure to allow her the opportunity to address their financial sufficiency concerns.

[5] I am prepared to accept that in assessing the benefits of pursuing studies in Canada, the Officer may have unreasonably assumed the role of a career counselor (*Farzadniya v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2025 FC 615 at para 54). However, the benefit of studying in Canada was not determinative in this instance. This error alone does not warrant intervention.

[6] In considering the sufficiency of finances, the Officer acknowledged the payment of the first year's tuition, the Guaranteed Investment Certificate and the Balance Certificate provided, but accurately noted the absence of evidence establishing the provenance of these funds. In the

absence of this evidence, it was reasonable for the Officer to conclude that they were not satisfied the Applicant had demonstrated that “sufficient finances [were] readily available to fully cover their tuition and living costs while studying in Canada.”

[7] In considering the Applicant’s academic record in the areas of study that would form the core of her academic program, the Officer’s analysis again accurately summarizes the evidence. The Officer then reasonably relied upon this evidence to express the concern that the Applicant would not successfully complete the program of study. That the Applicant had received an offer from a designated learning institution does not render the Officer’s stated concerns unreasonable, nor was the Officer required to speculate as to future academic performance, as the Applicant suggests.

[8] Finally, the Officer was under no obligation to provide notice and the opportunity to correct deficiencies in the application (*Solopova v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2016 FC 690 at para 38). There was no breach of procedural fairness in this context.

[9] The application for judicial review is dismissed. No question for certification arises.

JUDGMENT IN IMM-8894-25

THIS COURT’S JUDGMENT is that:

1. Leave is granted to commence the application for judicial review.
2. The application for judicial review is dismissed.
3. No question is certified.

“Patrick Gleeson”

Judge

FEDERAL COURT
SOLICITORS OF RECORD

DOCKET: IMM-8894-25

STYLE OF CAUSE: ARPANPREET KAUR v MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP
AND IMMIGRATION

**SUBMISSIONS ON STUDY PERMIT PERFECTED LEAVE APPLICATION
CONSIDERED AT OTTAWA, ONTARIO PURSUANT TO SECTION 72 OF THE
*IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE PROTECTION ACT***

JUDGMENT AND REASONS: GLEESON J.

DATED: AUGUST 25, 2025

WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS BY:

Arpanpreet Kaur

FOR THE APPLICANT/
(ON HER OWN BEHALF)

Jan Jensen

FOR THE RESPONDENT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD:

Attorney General of Canada
Halifax, Nova Scotia

FOR THE RESPONDENT