

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

Date: 20250912

Docket: IMM-11079-24

Citation: 2025 FC 1512

Ottawa, Ontario, September 12, 2025

PRESENT: Madam Justice McDonald

BETWEEN:

AL SHAHRIAR MOHAMMOD

Applicant

and

**MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND
IMMIGRATION**

Respondent

JUDGMENT AND REASONS

[1] On this judicial review application, the Applicant, a citizen of Bangladesh, seeks review of the Visa Officer's decision refusing his study permit application. The Applicant applied for a study permit to complete a 3-month program at Hanson Language School's "English for

Academic Purposes” as a pre-condition to his acceptance into a Project Management program at Cambrian College.

[2] The Officer refused the study permit, finding that the purpose of the Applicant’s travel to Canada was not reasonable, given the costs of the studies.

[3] The core issue raised by the Applicant is the reasonableness of the decision (*Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65 [*Vavilov*]).

I. Analysis

[4] The Applicant argues that the Officer’s decision is not reasonable. He argues that the Officer failed to engage with his stated reasons for wanting to study in Canada and the financial resources of his family to support his study.

[5] The Officer assessed the study permit application in relation to the English language program. The Applicant’s only explanation for wanting to study English in Canada is:

Since I did not appear in IELTS examination till yet, I have chosen to study English language program at the Hanson Language School from Jan. 29, 2024 to ensure that my language skills are up to the mark and meet the Canadian education requirements when I start my classes for the post graduate certificate in May 2024. I have been granted conditional acceptance from the Cambrian College and I am very excited on being enrolled in both the programs.

He does not explain why it is necessary to do the English training in Canada, nor does he explain why he cannot do that training in his home country.

[6] The Officer properly considered the study permit application in its context, namely, that the Applicant was seeking a study permit for language proficiency training. As noted by the Officer:

I have reviewed the application.

I have considered the following factors in my decision.

PA going for a college grad cert program, which is conditional upon first completing successfully ESL [English as a second language].

I acknowledge that PA would be undertaking an ESL program, however I am not satisfied that the applicant has provided satisfying explanation as to why they chose to travel to Canada while ESL courses are widely available in their country of origin and in the region. Although an experience in Canada could be valuable, I am not satisfied that this outweighs my concerns, given the English level of the applicant and the costs incurred.

The applicant has limited financial and professional ties to their home country and I am not satisfied that the purpose of travel is reasonable, given the cost of the proposed travel and studies.

Weighing the factors in this application. I am not satisfied that the applicant will depart Canada at the end of the period authorized for their stay.

For the reasons above, I have refused this application.

[7] In the circumstances, it was reasonable for the Officer to consider the costs of this program and the availability of such programs in the Applicant's home country.

[8] The Applicant relies on cases where this Court has found it "unreasonable for an officer to have suspicions of an applicant merely because a particular individual puts a high value on higher education" (*Najmi v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 FC 132 at paras 24-25,

citing *Caianda v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2019 FC 218 at para 5 and *Lingepo v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2021 FC 552 at para 18).

[9] Other cases have found that it is not unreasonable for a visa officer to consider the availability of similar programs offered elsewhere at a lower cost as “simply one factor to be considered by a visa officer in assessing an applicant’s motives for applying for a study permit” (*Zuo v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2007 FC 88 at para 23; see also *Bestar v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2022 FC 483 at para 23; *Cayanga v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2017 FC 1046 at para 13).

[10] In this case, the Officer considered the nature of the program – English language training – the relatively short duration of the program – 3 months – and the cost of the program. The refusal was based upon the consideration of several factors, including the Applicant’s limited family and professional ties to his home country. The availability of other programs was simply one of the factors considered by the Officer in their decision.

[11] Overall, the decision is reasonable. The Officer reasonably assessed the application in the context of a request for a study permit to study English, and the Officer’s decision is based upon an internally coherent and rational chain of analysis and is justified in relation to the facts and the law within the *Vavilov* framework.

[12] Finally, the Applicant’s procedural fairness arguments are without merit. The procedural fairness obligations of a visa officer to an applicant are at the low end of the scale and there is no

positive obligation on visa officers to advise applicants of their concerns with the sufficiency of a study visa application (*Nourani v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 FC 732 at para 50). Furthermore, the obligation to provide all the necessary information in support of the application rests solely on the Applicant.

II. Conclusion

[13] This judicial review is dismissed. There is no question for certification.

JUDGMENT IN IMM-11079-24

THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that:

1. This judicial review is dismissed.
2. There is no question for certification.

"Ann Marie McDonald"

Judge

FEDERAL COURT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD

DOCKET: IMM-11079-24

STYLE OF CAUSE: MOHAMMOD V MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND
IMMIGRATION

PLACE OF HEARING: TORONTO, ONTARIO

DATE OF HEARING: SEPTEMBER 8, 2025

JUDGMENT AND REASONS: MCDONALD J.

DATED: SEPTEMBER 12, 2025

APPEARANCES:

| | |
|----------------|--------------------|
| Sayed Mosaad | FOR THE APPLICANT |
| Gregory George | FOR THE RESPONDENT |

SOLICITORS OF RECORD:

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Mosaad Law PC Toronto, Ontario | FOR THE APPLICANT |
| Attorney General of Canada Toronto, Ontario | FOR THE RESPONDENT |