

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

**Date: 20260410**

**Docket: IMM-21551-24**

**Citation: 2026 FC 475**

**Ottawa, Ontario, April 10, 2026**

**PRESENT: Mr. Justice McHaffie**

**BETWEEN:**

**GLORY BARIKDER**

**Applicant**

**and**

**MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND  
IMMIGRATION**

**Respondent**

**JUDGMENT AND REASONS**

[1] For the reasons set out below, Glory Barikder’s application for judicial review of the refusal of her visitor visa application is granted and her application is remitted for redetermination by another officer.

[2] Ms. Barikder applied for a temporary resident visa [TRV] in the visitor class to visit her parents, who are Canadian permanent residents, for three weeks and to assist her father as he

recovers from a car accident. In her application, she presented information about her own financial situation, including a letter from her employer and bank account statements. She also provided an invitation letter from her father confirming he would host his daughter and be responsible for her travel expenses from Bangladesh, and the cost of her food and accommodation during her stay. With his letter, her father provided his financial information, including confirmation of his employment, pay stubs, and bank account information.

[3] On November 13, 2024, an officer with Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada sent a letter refusing Ms. Barikder's application. The letter states that the officer was not satisfied Ms. Barikder would leave Canada at the end of her stay, based on four factors: (i) she did not have significant family ties outside Canada; (ii) the purpose of her visit was not consistent with a temporary stay given the details provided; (iii) her assets and financial situation were insufficient to support the stated purpose of travel for her "(and any accompanying family member(s), if applicable)"; and (iv) she had significant family ties in Canada.

[4] These statements are supplemented by the officer's notes in the Global Case Management System [GCMS], which form part of the reasons for decision. Those GCMS notes read, in their entirety, as follows:

I have reviewed the application. I have considered the following factors in my decision. The purpose of the applicant's visit to Canada is not consistent with a temporary stay given the details provided in the application. The applicant's assets and financial situation are insufficient to support the stated purpose of travel for themselves (and any accompanying family member(s), if applicable). I am not satisfied with the proof of funds demonstrated by the PA. Although financial documentation has been provided showing available funds (statement shows recently deposited lump sums), there is insufficient evidence regarding the origin of these

funds. Considering this factor, I am not satisfied that the PA is sufficiently established and has the financial ability to justify such travel expense. The applicant does not have significant family ties outside Canada. The applicant has significant family ties in Canada. Weighing the factors in this application, I am not satisfied that the applicant will depart Canada at the end of the period authorized for their stay. For the reasons above, I have refused this application.

[5] Ms. Barikder's central argument is that the officer's assessment of her financial situation and evidence is unreasonable. She also argues that the officer failed to explain either their assertion that "the purpose of her visit was not consistent with a temporary stay," or how they weighed her family ties outside and within Canada against other evidence.

[6] As the parties agree, the standard of review applicable to a visa officer's decision is that of reasonableness: *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65 at paras 16–17, 23–25; *Nimely v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2020 FC 282 at para 5. Reasonableness review is a deferential, but robust, form of review in which the Court considers the reasons given by a decision-maker and will only interfere with the decision if it fails, in a significant way, to exhibit the justification, intelligibility and transparency required of a reasonable decision: *Vavilov* at paras 12–13, 26, 67, 99–100. When conducting reasonableness review, the Court's role is not to conduct a new hearing, reassessing and reweighing the evidence and reaching its own conclusions on the issues. Rather, its role is solely to review the decision in light of the evidence and submissions before the decision-maker to determine whether the decision reasonably addresses the evidence and grapples with the central issues: *Vavilov* at paras 125–128.

[7] In *Jafarkhani*, Justice Pentney reviewed and restated the principles set out in the jurisprudence regarding the application of the reasonableness standard in the context of a visa decision: *Jafarkhani v Canada (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship)*, 2024 FC 1633 at para 5, citing, among others, *Nesarzadeh v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 FC 568 at paras 5–9. I adopt Justice Pentney’s summary of the relevant principles from *Jafarkhani*:

- 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 [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.

[Citation omitted.]

[8] Applying these principles, Ms. Barikder has satisfied me that the officer's findings regarding her financial situation and evidence are unreasonable.

[9] The officer found that Ms. Barikder's assets and financial situation were "insufficient to support the stated purpose of travel." In particular, while the financial documentation showed available funds, the officer found that they showed recently deposited lump sums and that there was insufficient evidence regarding the origin of the funds. The officer's reasons are brief, but they must be read in light of the record and, in particular, the evidence before the officer: *Vavilov* at paras 91–94. I agree with the Minister that the officer's reasons can be read and understood as they relate to the evidence provided by Ms. Barikder regarding her *own* financial situation, which included a bank statement showing one very large, very recent, and unexplained deposit.

[10] However, even when read in light of the record, the officer's reasons do not show an engagement with, or provide any reasonable analysis of, the evidence regarding the financial situation of Ms. Barikder's father, who invited her to Canada and agreed to be responsible for her costs during her visit. The Minister suggests that the officer's reasons can be read to apply to both Ms. Barikder's financial situation and that of her father, and that the officer's parenthetical reference to "statement shows recently deposited lump sums," should not be read in the singular as referring only to Ms. Barikder's statement. However, even if I accept that the reference to "statement" should be read in the plural, I am not satisfied that the reasons overall show that the officer engaged or grappled with the father's financial evidence. While the Court is readily able to understand the officer's brief references to recently deposited lump sums and the origin of

funds when read in light of Ms. Barikder's financial documentation, the same cannot be said with respect to her father's financial documentation.

[11] The Minister points to some transactions in the father's account and contends that they can be characterized as "recently deposited lump sums." However, the origin of some of these deposits is in fact explained on the record, and it is neither the Minister nor the Court's role to conduct its own analysis of the evidence to buttress the officer's reasoning when it is not clear from the decision when read in light of the record: *Jafarkhani* at para 5; *Singh v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2025 FC 976 at para 11; *Vavilov* at para 96. In my assessment, reading the officer's decision as a whole, in the context of the record, it is far from clear that they reviewed and reasonably considered the father's financial information or why they concluded that his assets were insufficient: *Akhoondian v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2025 FC 1181 at para 7; *Gill v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 807 at paras 18–20.

[12] In this regard, it is important to note that (a) the officer's statements regarding lump sum deposits and the origin of funds relate to their central conclusion that Ms. Barikder's assets and financial situation were insufficient to support the proposed visit or justify the travel expense; and (b) the visit in question was a three-week visit to stay with family. The officer's reasons simply do not explain how the financial information presented by Ms. Barikder's father was insufficient to support a visit of this nature.

[13] I therefore conclude that the officer's findings regarding Ms. Barikder's overall financial situation, including that of her father, was unreasonable. As this finding was central to the officer's decision, the unreasonableness of the finding is sufficient to render the decision as a whole unreasonable: *Vavilov* at para 100.

[14] As a result, I need not address Ms. Barikder's other arguments regarding the officer's assessment of the purpose of her visit and her family ties. I do note, however, that the officer provided little explanation as to why the "purpose of the applicant's visit to Canada," *i.e.*, a three-week visit to stay with family including a recently injured father, was not consistent with a temporary stay: see *Singh* at paras 14–18; *Patel v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2025 FC 947 at paras 8–10; *Gao v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2025 FC 127 at para 10.

[15] I therefore conclude that the officer's decision must be set aside and Ms. Barikder's application for a TRV in the visitor class returned for redetermination by a different officer.

[16] Neither party proposed a question for certification pursuant to paragraph 74(d) of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*, SC 2001, c 27, and I agree that none arises in the matter.

**JUDGMENT IN IMM-21551-24**

**THIS COURT’S JUDGMENT is that**

1. The application for judicial review is granted. The decision of an officer with Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada dated November 13, 2024, refusing the applicant’s application for a temporary resident visa (visitor visa) is set aside and the applicant’s application is remitted for redetermination by a different officer.

“Nicholas McHaffie”

---

Judge

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

**DOCKET:** IMM-21551-24

**STYLE OF CAUSE:** GLORY BARIKDER v MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP  
AND IMMIGRATION

**PLACE OF HEARING:** TORONTO, ONTARIO

**DATE OF HEARING:** MARCH 31, 2026

**JUDGMENT AND REASONS:** MCHAFFIE J.

**DATED:** APRIL 10, 2026

**APPEARANCES:**

Sean Alexander Yauk

FOR THE APPLICANT

Saudia Samad

FOR THE RESPONDENT

**SOLICITORS OF RECORD:**

Zarei Law Professional  
Corporation  
Toronto, Ontario

FOR THE APPLICANT

Attorney General of Canada  
Toronto, Ontario

FOR THE RESPONDENT