

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

Date: 20260323

Docket: IMM-23176-24

Citation: 2026 FC 391

Ottawa, Ontario, March 23, 2026

PRESENT: The Honourable Madam Justice Ngo

BETWEEN:

MOHAMMADMAHDI SHATERHOSSEINI

Applicant

and

**THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND
IMMIGRATION**

Respondent

JUDGMENT AND REASONS

[1] The Applicant, Mohammadmadhi Shaterhosseini [Applicant], seeks judicial review of a decision from Immigration, Refugee and Citizenship Canada [IRCC] denying his temporary resident visa [TRV]. He requested a TRV to visit his common-law spouse and their children, who were living in Vancouver.

[2] In a letter dated November 8, 2024, the Officer denied the application because they were not satisfied that the Applicant would leave Canada at the end of his stay, as required by paragraph 179(b) of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations*, SOR/2002-227, and citing three reasons: the Applicant did not have significant family ties outside of Canada; the purpose of his visit was not consistent with a temporary stay in Canada given the details provided in his application; and, the Applicant has significant family ties in Canada.

[3] The Applicant argued that the lack of transparency and the Officer's failure to consider the evidence submitted lead to a breach of procedural fairness. However, upon considering the Applicant's submissions and the specific case law cited at the hearing, the Applicant's challenge is more accurately framed as a question of reasonableness. The Applicant did not argue that he did not know the case he had to meet or was not able to be fully heard.

[4] As a result, the issue on judicial review is whether the IRCC's Decision was unreasonable. A reasonable decision is one that is justified in relation to the facts and the law that constrain the decision-maker. When conducting a reasonableness review, this Court must defer to an administrative decision-maker's assessment of the evidence unless an applicant can show a mistake on a key point (*Ebada v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2026 FCA 47 at para 4, citing *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65 at para 85 [*Vavilov*], *You v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2025 FCA 44 at para 6).

[5] Although the Decision is brief, applying the reasonableness standard of review (*Vavilov* at paras 10, 25), I do not find that the Decision was unreasonable.

[6] The Applicant, a citizen of Iran, applied for a TRV to visit his common-law spouse and their children who live in Vancouver. In the Decision dated November 8, 2024, an Officer of the IRCC [Officer] denied the TRV Application. The refusal letter and the Officer's Global Case Management System [GCMS] notes, form the Decision subject to this judicial review.

[7] The GCMS notes are short and use boilerplate language. The parties agree that the use of boilerplate language has been found to be appropriate, in certain circumstances. So long as the conclusion flows from the premises, or the use of boilerplate language does not give cause to doubt that the officer duly considered the facts, the decision at issue may still be reasonable (*Malik v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 755 at paras 2–3). Officers have a significant volume of visa applications to process, and their written reasons must not be assessed against a standard of perfection (*Tayabi v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 FC 453 at paras 19–21; *Hasanalideh v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2022 FC 1417 at para 8, citing *Vavilov* at para 96).

[8] The Applicant argued that the Officer ignored or overlooked relevant and contradictory evidence about his family ties in Iran. Failing to engage with this “contradictory evidence” is a reviewable error (citing *Cepeda-Gutierrez v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 1998 CanLII 8667 (FC) at para 17). The Applicant submits that the Decision did not consider his family members in Iran and was not transparent in assessing the “push” and “pull” factors that must be considered.

[9] Despite the Applicant's characterization of the Decision, I am not persuaded that there was no consideration of the Applicant's family situation in both countries or the "push and pull" factors. Indeed, both the letter communicating the refusal and the GCMS notes state that the "Applicant did not have significant family ties outside Canada" and that the Applicant "has significant ties in Canada."

[10] The Applicant identified that he listed his family members in his TRV application form, including his two parents and four siblings who live in Iran. The Applicant also wrote that "my ties to Iran are strong, especially due to my family connections and employment." However, he did not point to any other evidence to demonstrate that the Officer omitted to consider contradictory evidence about his family ties in Iran. I therefore cannot find that the Decision failed to justify the conclusion that the Applicant "did not have significant family ties outside Canada."

[11] The Respondent has argued, and I agree, that in these circumstances, it was open for the Officer to find that the Applicant may be less motivated to leave Canada because of his immediate family's presence here, and to refuse the TRV on this basis (*Sayyar v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 FC 494 at para 15).

[12] The Decision is not unreasonable and as a result, the application for judicial review is dismissed. There parties do not propose any question for certification, and I agree that in these circumstances, none arise.

JUDGMENT in IMM-23176-24

THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that:

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

"Phuong T.V. Ngo"

Judge

FEDERAL COURT
SOLICITORS OF RECORD

DOCKET: IMM-23176-24

STYLE OF CAUSE: MOHAMMADMAHDI SHATERHOSSEINI v THE
MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

PLACE OF HEARING: VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE OF HEARING: MARCH 16, 2026

JUDGMENT AND REASONS: NGO J.

DATED: MARCH 23, 2026

APPEARANCES:

Carrie-Lynn E. Barkley FOR THE APPLICANT

Janan Arafa FOR THE RESPONDENT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD:

Carrie-Lynn E. Barkley FOR THE APPLICANT
Barristers and Solicitors
Ottawa (Ontario)

Attorney General of Canada FOR THE RESPONDENT
Ottawa (Ontario)