

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

Date: 20260128

Docket: IMM-18647-24

Citation: 2026 FC 121

Ottawa, Ontario, January 28, 2026

PRESENT: Mr. Justice Pentney

BETWEEN:

**FATEMEH TAJIK
KOUROSH EHSANI**

Applicants

and

**MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND
IMMIGRATION**

Respondent

JUDGMENT AND REASONS

[1] The Applicants, Fatemeh Tajik and her minor son Kourosch Ehsani, are seeking judicial review of the decision refusing their applications for temporary resident visas (“TRV”). The Applicants are citizens of Iran. Ms. Tajik (the “Principal Applicant” or “PA”) runs a dentistry practice in Iran and wanted to come to Canada to attend the 2024 Pacific Dentistry Conference in Vancouver, as well as for tourism purposes. Her son would accompany her on this trip, but her husband would remain in Iran.

[2] The TRV application was first refused on January 16, 2024, because the Officer was not convinced that the Applicants would leave Canada at the end of their stay. Notably, the Officer found that the purpose of the visit was not consistent with a temporary stay.

[3] The PA commenced an application for leave and judicial review which was discontinued in July 2024, based upon an offer to resolve the matter made by the Respondent in May 2024. The parties agreed to remit the decision for reconsideration. The PA was given an opportunity to submit additional materials on reconsideration, which she did on September 17, 2024.

[4] The Applicants' second TRV application was refused on September 26, 2024. The key reasons for the Visa Officer's (the "Officer") refusal are that:

- The date of the 2024 conference had already passed and it was unclear whether the PA planned to attend the event in 2025.
- The event was for dental professionals in Canada and the USA, and the PA did not give a clear reason for attending a North American dental conference.
- Certain submitted bank transaction summaries showed volatile transactions involving large amounts and the provenance of these funds was not made clear in supporting documents.
- The PA's travel history was not sufficient to count as a positive factor.

[5] Based on these considerations, the Officer was not satisfied that the PA's reason for travel was credible and was not satisfied she would depart Canada at the end of her authorized stay.

[6] 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*].

[7] This Court has discussed the legal framework that governs the judicial review of denials of TRV applications in a large number of recent decisions, including: *Kashefi v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 856; *Bawa v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 1605; *Malik v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 755; *Quraishi v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2021 FC 1145. The following summary captures the key elements of the relevant principles:

- 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. While “boilerplate” language is not inherently unreasonable, reasons must show an actual engagement with the specific situation of the applicant: *Saad v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 1302 at para 16. The reasons, when viewed in light of the record, must 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 for a TRV, 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 and the nature of the interests involved.
- 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.

[8] Visa officers considering a TRV application exercise a wide discretion, based on a host of factors including the details provided in the actual application documents, their knowledge of relevant country conditions and/or travel or other patterns. Such decisions deserve deference, but they must still meet the standard of responsive justification in *Vavilov*.

[9] Finally, it is important to note that people request TRVs for all sorts of reasons, and this may be a relevant consideration in examining the reasonableness of the reasons for the refusal. For example, denying a TRV request to visit an immediate family member at the end of their life may require a more thorough explanation than a refusal where a person simply wanted to come to Canada to visit a tourist destination: see *Vavilov* at para 133.

[10] Applying the principles set out above, I find the decision in this case to be reasonable. The PA simply did not provide sufficient information on points that were vital to her application. The Officer's reasons clearly explain the basis for refusing the TRV, and the key points in the analysis reflect what was included – and missing – in the application and supporting documents. In particular, the PA did not provide sufficient detail about the purpose of her trip to Canada in the further documentation she submitted on reconsideration, given that the 2024 conference she had intended to attend had already happened. The PA also did not explain why she would want to attend a dental conference in Canada; the further information included in her affidavit on judicial review was never put before the Officer, and therefore is not admissible.

[11] The following discussion addresses the main issues raised by the Applicants:

- The Officer was aware that the PA worked as a dentist in Iran and that her husband and other immediate family members lived there. There was no evidence of any particular dependency or degree of reliance on the PA and the husband's letter simply acknowledged her trip and gave permission for their son to accompany her;
- The Officer did not ignore the evidence of the PA's travel history. It is specifically mentioned but found not sufficient to outweigh the other deficiencies in the application;
- As for the financial information, I do not agree that the Officer focused only on the prior banking records that were submitted with the original application. Instead, the reasons show that the Officer examined the additional banking records but concluded that some of the updated banking records suffered from the same main flaw, because there was no explanation for the source of funds for the large deposits that were made, and the PA's account showed a modest amount of savings. This is a reasonable finding on the record, and the Applicants do not point to any additional information the Officer ignored that would explain the source of these funds.

[12] The Applicants also raised a question regarding the location of the office where the decision was made, noting that Canada did not have a diplomatic presence in Iran at the time the decision was made. I will not discuss this point any further because the Applicants have not provided any basis to find that the decision is unreasonable because of where it happened to be made.

[13] Having reviewed the evidence, and considered the submissions of the parties, I find that the decision is reasonable. The application for judicial review is dismissed.

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

JUDGMENT in IMM-18647-24

THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that:

1. The application for judicial review is dismissed.
2. There is no question of general importance for certification.

“William F. Pentney”

Judge

FEDERAL COURT
SOLICITORS OF RECORD

DOCKET: IMM-18647-24

STYLE OF CAUSE: FATEMEH TAJIK, KOUROSH EHSANI v
MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

PLACE OF HEARING: TORONTO, ON

DATE OF HEARING: JANUARY 19, 2026

JUDGMENT AND REASONS: PENTNEY J.

DATED: JANUARY 28, 2026

APPEARANCES:

Babak Vosooghi Zadeh
Saudia Samad

FOR THE APPLICANT
FOR THE RESPONDENT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD:

Barrister & Solicitor
Vaughan, Ontario

Attorney General of Canada
Toronto, Ontario

FOR THE APPLICANT

FOR THE RESPONDENT