

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

Date: 20250925

Docket: IMM-17436-24

Citation: 2025 FC 1577

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, September 25, 2025

PRESENT: Madam Justice Go

BETWEEN:

**SEYEDNASER MOOSAVI
AZAM TAHERI**

Applicants

and

**THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND
IMMIGRATION**

Respondent

JUDGMENT AND REASONS

I. Overview

[1] Mr. Seyednaser Moosavi and Ms. Azam Taheri [together “Applicants”] are a married couple and citizens of Iran. The Applicants applied for a Temporary Resident Visa [TRV] to come to Canada for three months in 2024 to visit their two daughters who are study permit holders in Canada.

[2] An Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada [IRCC] officer [Officer] refused the Applicants' TRV application [Decision]. The Officer was not satisfied the Applicants would leave Canada at the end of their stay, as required by paragraph 179(b) of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations*, SOR/2002-227 for two reasons: a) the Applicants' assets and financial situation are insufficient to support the stated purpose of travel and b) the purpose of the Applicants' visit is not consistent with a temporary stay.

[3] The Applicants seek judicial review of the Decision. For the reasons set out below, I grant the application.

II. Analysis

[4] The Applicants raise several arguments to challenge the Decision. Applying the reasonableness standard of review set out in *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65 [Vavilov], I find the Officer's reasons in finding that the Applicants' assets and financial situation are insufficient to support the stated purpose of travel lack the requisite hallmarks of justification, transparency and intelligibility: *Vavilov* at para 99.

[5] The Officer's Global Case Management System notes include reasons for the refusal of each of the Applicants. The reasons for the refusal for each of the Applicants are identical and state as follows:

I have reviewed the application. I have considered the following factors in my decision. The applicant's assets and financial situation are insufficient to support the stated purpose of travel for themselves (and any accompanying family member(s), if applicable). The purpose of the applicant's visit to Canada is not consistent with a

temporary stay given the details provided in the application. Weighing the factors in this application. I am not satisfied that the applicant will depart at the end of the period authorized for their stay. For the reasons above, I have refused this application.

[6] The Applicants submit, and I agree, that in arriving at this conclusion, the Officer did not mention any of the proof of fund documentation that the Applicants provided, nor was there any indication that the Officer has reviewed the proof of fund evidence.

[7] The Applicants submitted several financial documents including their pension income statements, bank account summary statements for the Applicants and their two daughters, and the title deed of the Applicants' real estate property in Iran. The Officer did not refer to any of these documents in their reasons, nor did the Officer explain why the documents in question were insufficient to satisfy the Officer of the Applicants' financial ability to support their travel to Canada.

[8] While I note the Respondent's submission that, in accordance with the IRCC guidelines for processing visitor visas from Iran, the Applicants were required to, but did not provide six months of transaction history with respect to their bank accounts, along with other required financial information of their host, I note that the Respondent's submission is not reflected in the Decision. I agree with the Applicants that the Respondent should not bolster the reasons for the Decision after the fact.

[9] The Court has found, on many occasions, that an officer's failure to provide a transparent and intelligible basis for their conclusion renders their finding unreasonable: *Raoufi v Canada*

(Citizenship and Immigration), 2024 FC 550 at para 11; *Sangha v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2020 FC 62 at para 17; *Jalali v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 603 at paras 26-29.

[10] Even accepting that a visa officer's duty to provide reasons when evaluating a TRV application is minimal due to the volume of their work, the Decision and the reasons in this case are so bare bones that the Court is not in a position to understand, let alone assess, the reasonableness of the process whereby the Officer reached their conclusion.

[11] Due to the Officer's failure to engage with the evidence submitted by the Applicants, and the Officer's lack of explanation for finding the Applicants' financial situation insufficient, I conclude that the Decision is unreasonable. For this reason alone, I grant the application. I need not address the Applicants' remaining arguments.

III. Conclusion

[12] The application for judicial review is granted.

[13] There is no question for certification.

JUDGMENT in IMM-17436-24

THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that:

1. The application for judicial review is granted and the matter sent back for redetermination by a different officer.
2. There is no question for certification.

"Avvy Yao-Yao Go"
Judge

FEDERAL COURT
SOLICITORS OF RECORD

DOCKET: IMM-17436-24

STYLE OF CAUSE: SEYEDNASER MOOSAVI, AZAM TAHERI v THE
MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

PLACE OF HEARING: SASKATOON, SASKATCHEWAN

DATE OF HEARING: SEPTEMBER 23, 2025

JUDGMENT AND REASONS: GO J.

DATED: SEPTEMBER 25, 2025

APPEARANCES:

Oluwadamilola Asuni	FOR THE APPLICANTS
Evan Morrow	FOR THE RESPONDENT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD:

Crest Attorneys Saskatoon, Saskatchewan	FOR THE APPLICANTS
Attorney General of Canada Saskatoon, Saskatchewan	FOR THE RESPONDENT