

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

**Date: 20251110**

**Docket: IMM-12889-25**

**Citation: 2025 FC 1803**

**Ottawa, Ontario, November 10, 2025**

**PRESENT: Mr. Justice Sébastien Grammond**

**BETWEEN:**

**ANA KAREN JUAREZ LOPEZ**

**Applicant**

**and**

**THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND  
IMMIGRATION**

**Respondent**

**JUDGMENT AND REASONS**  
**(Simplified Procedure-Study Permit Pilot Project)**

[1] Ms. Juárez is seeking judicial review of the refusal of a study permit. This case was dealt with in writing, on consent of the parties, as part of the Court's Study Permit Pilot project. I am granting leave. However, I am dismissing the application on the merits, as the visa officer did not disregard evidence concerning Ms. Juárez's reasons for her proposed studies and did not reach an unreasonable conclusion. My reasons follow.

[2] Ms. Juárez is a citizen of Mexico. She is now 30 years of age. She obtained a bachelor's degree in special education from a Mexican institution and initially worked as a teacher. She then studied for a bachelor's degree in commerce and international trade at a Mexican university. Since finishing her degree, she has been working in the field of logistics.

[3] She has been accepted for a two-year college diploma in personal fitness training at Mount Royal University. She then applied for a study permit. A visa officer denied her application, finding that she would not leave Canada at the end of her authorized stay. The reasons for this finding were as follows:

The proposed study plan is inconsistent with the applicant's academic/work history and does not outline a clear career path for which such an educational program would be of benefit. It is not evident why applicant would study this program at such great expense when applicant already possesses a higher level of education. I am not satisfied that this is a reasonable progression of studies.

[4] On judicial review, the Court's role is not to reweigh the evidence nor to craft reasons that the officer failed to provide. Rather, the Court's role is to decide whether the officer's decision was reasonable, in light of the record. Officers are not required to provide lengthy or detailed reasons, as long as the Court can understand why the decision was made.

[5] Ms. Juárez's main argument appears to be that the officer's finding regarding the lack of benefit to her of studying in Canada is unreasonable and incompatible with the evidence. However, it is entirely reasonable for a visa officer to inquire as to the benefits that the proposed program of study would bring to the applicant: *Ali v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 FC 608 at paragraph 13; *Rajabi v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 371 at

paragraph 12. Ms. Juárez's motivation letter included two paragraphs dealing with this issue. She stated that she has "developed a growing passion for fitness and wellness," that the program at Mount Royal University is of better quality than similar programs in Mexico and that upon return, she intends to open a fitness centre with her father. While her counsel states that she has a detailed business plan, no evidence of this is found in the record.

[6] The reasons Ms. Juárez put forward to explain the benefits of the proposed program of study were extremely vague. The officer could thus reasonably find that she failed to put forward a "clear career path." The officer was also entitled to rely on the fact that Ms. Juárez already holds two university degrees and that studying for a diploma in personal fitness training did not appear a reasonable progression. Of course, one is entitled to change careers and to seek training in a new field for that purpose. Nevertheless, the vagueness of Ms. Juárez's explanations for doing so distinguishes her case from cases such as *Khosravi v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 FC 805, where a much more detailed plan was provided. Insufficient explanations regarding the benefits of the proposed course of study may reasonably lead an officer to deny a study permit: *Marcelin v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2021 FC 761 at paragraphs 11–15; *Rezvani Gilkolaei v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2025 FC 194.

[7] The reasons for refusing Ms. Juárez's application for a study permit did not include a lack of financial resources or insufficient ties to her home country. Her submissions regarding those issues miss the mark, as the visa officer did not make any finding in this regard and did not rely on those issues. It is not necessary for me to address her submissions in this regard.

[8] Lastly, Ms. Juárez takes issue with the officer's use of Chinook 3+. Without more, however, this Court has consistently held that the use of Chinook 3+ is not unreasonable nor gives rise to a breach of procedural fairness: see, for example, *Mehrara v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 1554. It is true that the GCMS entries containing the officer's reasons and the statement that Chinook 3+ was used bear the same time stamp. This, however, does not show what amount of time the officer devoted to the review of Ms. Juárez's application. The evidence is insufficient to rebut the presumption that the officer considered all the evidence, to demonstrate that the officer was unduly influenced by the information provided by Chinook 3+ or to suggest that the officer did not really make the decision.

[9] As the officer's decision was reasonable, Ms. Juárez's application for judicial review will be dismissed.

**JUDGMENT in IMM-12889-25**

**THIS COURT’S JUDGMENT is that**

1. Leave to bring the application for judicial review is granted.
2. The application for judicial review is dismissed.
3. There is no question of general importance for certification.

“Sébastien Grammond”

---

Judge

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

**DOCKET:** IMM-12889-25

**STYLE OF CAUSE:** ANA KAREN JUAREZ LOPEZ 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:** GRAMMOND J.

**DATED:** NOVEMBER 10, 2025

**WRITTEN PRESENTATIONS BY:**

Mario D. Bellissimo FOR THE APPLICANT

Jake Boughs FOR THE RESPONDENT

**SOLICITORS OF RECORD:**

Bellissimo Law Group PC FOR THE APPLICANT  
Toronto, Ontario

Attorney General of Canada FOR THE RESPONDENT  
Toronto, Ontario