

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

Date: 20251010

Docket: IMM-9952-25

Citation: 2025 FC 1676

Ottawa, Ontario, October 10, 2025

PRESENT: The Honourable Madam Justice Furlanetto

BETWEEN:

GOLD NGOZI ADEOYE

Applicant

and

**THE 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 brought pursuant to subsection 72(1) of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*, SC 2001, c 27 [IRPA], in which the Applicant requests leave to commence an application for judicial review and a favourable result on her application. The Applicant seeks to review an April 2, 2025 decision of an Officer of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada [IRCC] in file number S307835629 [Decision].

[2] The Court grants leave to commence the application for judicial review but dismisses the judicial review application for the reasons set out below.

[3] The Applicant is a citizen of Nigeria with a degree in Psychology and over 10 years work experience as a therapist and counsellor. She seeks to pursue a post-graduate certificate in Continuing Care Assistance at Carlton Trail College.

[4] In the Decision, the Officer refused the application on the basis that insufficient information was provided on the purpose/intention to pursue studies in Canada. In the Global Case Management System [GCMS] notes the Officer provided the following additional reasons:

... Study plan submitted does not outline a clear career/educational path for which the sought educational program would be of benefit. It refers to her exposure to caregiving through her current position and used her elderly father as an example of the care she wishes to provide, however, the applicant's focus has been on providing clinical expertise as a certified psychologist. Based on the documentation on file, I am not satisfied that the applicant has provided sufficient information on the purpose/intention to pursue studies in Canada and how the proposed program would be of benefit. Application refused as per R216(1)(b)

[5] The Applicant asserts that the Officer did not engage with key aspects of her Study Plan where she explains that her counselling and therapy experience revealed the importance of integrated emotional, social, and physical support for seniors. She refers to her experiences with caregiving grounding her desire to complement her existing counselling services with caregiving services for seniors.

[6] While I agree that the Officer has not referenced this explanation in the reasons, I do not consider this omission to render the Decision unreasonable. As highlighted by the Respondent, the reasons make clear that the primary concern of the Officer was that the Applicant had not sufficiently explained how the proposed program would be of benefit.

[7] As explained by Justice Shirzad Ahmed in *Amiri v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 FC 1532 at paragraph 30, with reference to *Mehrjoo v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 FC 886:

... applicants must convince an officer of the merits of their study plan, providing sufficient information about the benefits of the program they wish to pursue (*Mehrjoo* at paras 12, 15). It is not enough to provide general assertions about how the proposed program would benefit an applicant, especially should the proposed course of study appear redundant or not a logical progression (*Mehrjoo* paras 12-13).

[8] In this case, I agree with the Respondent, it was reasonable for the Officer to find that the Applicant had not established that there were career or employment benefits to the proposed program especially in view of the Applicant's professional background. There was no evidence before the Officer to explain how the proposed program would benefit the Applicant, over the knowledge she had already acquired through her work and volunteer experiences.

[9] Similarly, while the Applicant explained her desire to integrate caregiving with her practice, she provided only limited, vague and speculative assertions regarding how the proposed program might advance that goal. The Study Plan stated only that the proposed program was "designed to provide specific skills required for caregiving roles" that "could include practical training and knowledge". It did not provide a definite benefit for the program.

[10] For all of these reasons, the application is dismissed.

[11] In view of the structure of the Study Permit Pilot Project, there is no question for certification.

JUDGMENT IN IMM-9952-25

THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that:

1. Leave is granted to commence the application for judicial review.
2. The judicial review application is dismissed.
3. There is no question for certification.

"Angela Furlanetto"

Judge

FEDERAL COURT
SOLICITORS OF RECORD

DOCKET: IMM-9952-25

STYLE OF CAUSE: GOLD NGOZI ADEOYE v THE 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 FURLANETTO J.
**(SIMPLIFIED PROCEDURE-
STUDY PERMIT PILOT
PROJECT)**

DATED: OCTOBER 10, 2025

WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS BY:

Karunvir Samra FOR THE APPLICANT

Leah Bowes FOR THE RESPONDENT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD:

Karunvir Samra FOR THE APPLICANT
Barrister and Solicitor
Toronto, Ontario

Attorney General of Canada FOR THE RESPONDENT
Toronto, Ontario