

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

**Date: 20251003**

**Docket: IMM-14625-24**

**Citation: 2025 FC 1637**

**Vancouver, British Columbia, October 3, 2025**

**PRESENT: The Honourable Mr. Justice Pentney**

**BETWEEN:**

**SANAZ MOHAMMAD ABADI**

**Applicant**

**and**

**THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND  
IMMIGRATION**

**Respondent**

**JUDGMENT AND REASONS**

[1] The Applicant, Sanaz Mohammad Abadi, is seeking judicial review of a negative study permit decision. She is a citizen of Iran who wanted to come to Canada to enrol in English for Academic Purposes and the Post-Degree Marketing Management program at Langara College.

[2] The Visa Officer (the “Officer”) refused the application for three key reasons: (i) similar programs are available closer to the Applicant’s home for a fraction of the cost; (ii) the Applicant did not provide enough details on why studying in Canada at such a huge cost was necessary and beneficial; and (iii) the Officer was not satisfied that she demonstrated the academic proficiency

needed to complete her studies. Based on this, the Officer was not satisfied that the Applicant would depart Canada at the end of her authorized stay.

[3] The only issue in this case is whether the Officer’s decision is reasonable, applying the framework set out in *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65 (*Vavilov*) and confirmed in *Mason v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 SCC 21 (*Mason*)).

[4] This Court has discussed the legal framework that governs the judicial review of student visa denials in a large number of recent decisions (see for example: *Nesarzadeh v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 FC 568 at paras 5–9; *Safarian v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 FC 775 at para 2; *Amini v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 653 at para 4; *Kandath v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 1130 at para 5). These decisions confirm the following:

- A reasonable decision must explain the result, in view of the law and the key facts.
- *Vavilov* seeks to reinforce a “culture of justification,” requiring the decision-maker to provide a logical explanation for the result and to be responsive to the parties’ submissions, but it also requires the context for decision-making to be taken into account.

- Visa Officers face a deluge of applications, and their reasons do not need to be lengthy or detailed. However, their reasons do need to set out the key elements of the Officer's line of analysis and be responsive to the core of the claimant's submissions on the most relevant points.
- The onus is on the Applicant to satisfy the Officer that they meet the requirements of the law that applies to the consideration of student visas, including that they will leave at the end of their authorized stay.
- Visa Officers must consider the "push" and "pull" factors that could lead an Applicant to overstay their visa and stay in Canada, or that would encourage them to return to their home country.
- The decision must be assessed in light of the context for decision-making, including the high volume of applications to be processed, the nature of the interests involved, and the fact that in most instances an applicant can simply reapply.
- It is not open to the Minister's counsel or the Court to fashion their own reasons to buttress or supplement the Officer's decision: see *Ajdadi v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 754 at para 6.

[5] Applying the principles set out above, I find the decision to be unreasonable.

[6] In this case, the Officer's reasons do not demonstrate "responsive justification" as required under the *Vavilov* framework: *Farkhondehfal v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 692 at para 17. Read as a whole, the reasons indicate that the Officer was not convinced that the Applicant had demonstrated why coming to Canada to study in this particular program was beneficial to her.

[7] I agree with the Respondent's submission that in some respects the Applicant's study plan provided generic and somewhat vague reasons for coming to study in Canada. For example, she stated that Canadian educational institutions are "renowned for offering advanced and contemporary courses... providing students with the knowledge and skills needed to excel in a global marketplace."

[8] However, I find that on the crucial question of why the Applicant wanted to enrol in the specific program at Langara College, the Officer's reasons do not engage with the evidence the Applicant provided. In particular, the Applicant set out the reasons she needed to improve her knowledge of marketing and business management as well as improving her English: she had a job opportunity that demanded these precise things. The Applicant also submitted a letter from her employer indicating that they wanted to open a new department for marketing and promotion and they set out the skills and abilities they were looking for in the person to lead this initiative. The employer then stated that they believed the Applicant was "a good candidate for management of this new department." The employer states that upon her successful completion of the program at Langara College, the Applicant's salary would be doubled and her commissions increased. It is difficult to imagine a better justification for coming to Canada to

study at a particular program, but there I no mention of this in the Officer's notes: *Raoufi v Canada (MCI)*, 2024 FC 550 at para 9.

[9] While this would be sufficient to find the decision unreasonable, I will add a few additional comments on other troubling aspects of the decision. The Officer found that the Applicant had failed to show justify the cost of studying in Canada when programs of a similar nature were available closer to her home. However, the Officer did not mention any programs, or any other objective evidence that would explain this reasoning: *Yuzer v Canada (MCI)*, 2019 FC 781 (*Yuzer*) at paras 21-22.

[10] I accept that a reviewing Court should defer to an Officer's knowledge and expertise regarding local educational programs and their cost: *Cayanga v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2017 FC 1046 at para 13. However, after *Vavilov* it is no longer sufficient for that local knowledge to stay entirely inside the head of the Officer; at least some of it has to find its way into the decision. This could, for example, be the name of a program, or a reference to an objective source listing local educational offerings - anything to indicate that the Officer has a source for their information and is not making a bald statement.

[11] Finally, the Officer expressed doubts about the Applicant's academic proficiency to succeed in completing the program, but this statement is neither supported by any explanation, nor is it explained by the record. The Applicant obtained a cumulative GPA of 14.67 out of 20 in her associate's degree, and 14.38 out of 20 in her bachelor's degree. She submitted a letter of acceptance from Langara College. In the absence of an explanation as to why the Officer found

the Applicant did not have the academic proficiency necessary to complete studies in Canada, I find that this is an unreasonable conclusion.

[12] In closing, I will repeat what this Court has said, repeatedly. Reasons for refusing a student visa do not need to be long or detailed. Officers only need to demonstrate an engagement with the crucial evidence submitted by the Applicant, and the reasons must explain the key points of the reasoning to justify the result: *Farkhondehfal v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 692 at para 17. I find the reasons in this case fall short.

[13] For the reasons set out above, the application for judicial review is granted.

[14] There is no question of general importance for certification.

**JUDGMENT in IMM-14625-24**

**THIS COURT’S JUDGMENT is that:**

1. The application for judicial review is granted.
2. The decision is quashed and set aside. The matter is remitted back for reconsideration by a different officer.
3. There is no question of general importance for certification.

“William F. Pentney”

---

Judge

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

**DOCKET:** IMM-14625-24

**STYLE OF CAUSE:** SANAZ MOHAMMAD ABADI v MINISTER OF  
CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

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

**DATE OF HEARING:** OCTOBER 2, 2025

**JUDGMENT AND REASONS:** PENTNEY J.

**DATED:** OCTOBER 3, 2025

**APPEARANCES BY:**

Samin Mortazavi	FOR THE APPLICANT
Matisse Emanuele	FOR THE RESPONDENT

**SOLICITORS OF RECORD:**

Samin Mortazavi Barrister & Solicitor North Vancouver, BC	FOR THE APPLICANT
Attorney General of Canada Vancouver, BC	FOR THE RESPONDENT