

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

**Date: 20260410**

**Docket: IMM-12337-24**

**Citation: 2026 FC 479**

**Vancouver, British Columbia, April 10, 2026**

**PRESENT: The Honourable Mr. Justice Gleeson**

**BETWEEN:**

**GOLNAZ HADIAN**

**Applicant**

**and**

**THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP  
AND IMMIGRATION**

**Respondent**

**JUDGMENT AND REASONS**

[1] The Applicant, Golnaz Hadian, is a citizen of Iran. She applied for a temporary resident visa [TRV] to visit her siblings in Canada, particularly her sister, and for tourism. In a decision dated May 31, 2024, a visa officer with Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada [Officer] refused her TRV application, not being satisfied the Applicant would leave Canada at the end of the authorized stay period. She seeks judicial review of that decision under subsection 72(1) of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*, SC 2001, c 27.

[2] In refusing the TRV the Officer determined that the Applicant had not established that the purpose of the proposed visit was consistent with a temporary stay given the details included in the TRV application. The relevant portions of the Global Case Management System notes, which form part of the Officer's decision, state:

I have reviewed the application. I have considered the following factors in my decision. Applicant is an Iranian national and is travelling for the following purpose: sister The applicant's plan of visit appears insufficiently substantiated. The purpose of visit does not appear reasonable given the applicant's socio-economic situation and therefore I am not satisfied that the applicant would leave Canada at the end of the period of authorized stay. Integrated FOSS search information on the (inviter/host) family member noted. Given family ties or economic motives to remain in Canada, the applicant's incentives to remain in Canada may outweigh their ties to their home country. The applicant's travel history is not sufficient to count as a positive factor in my assessment. 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.

[3] The Applicant argues that the Officer's decision is unreasonable because the reasons are inadequate and the Officer ignored evidence contrary to their findings. The Applicant also alleges the Officer rendered credibility findings without first providing an opportunity to respond, thereby breaching her right of procedural fairness. The Respondent submits the Applicant failed to provide sufficient evidence in support of the TRV application and, in the absence of evidence, the Officer reasonably concluded she had failed to demonstrate that she would leave Canada at the end of her authorized period of stay.

[4] The Applicant's limited arguments asserting a breach of procedural fairness challenge the Officer's conclusion that "[g]iven family ties or economic motives to remain in Canada, the applicant's incentives to remain in Canada may outweigh their ties to their home country." This

finding does not raise an issue of credibility, but rather relates to the reasonableness of the Officer's determination that insufficient evidence had been provided to establish ties to Iran. No issue of fairness has been raised. The sole issue before me is whether the decision was reasonable.

[5] The substance of the Officer's refusal of the TRV application is reviewable on the presumptive standard of reasonableness. A reasonable decision is "one that is based on an internally coherent and rational chain of analysis and that is justified in relation to the facts and law that constrain the decision maker" (*Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65 at para 85 [*Vavilov*]; *Mason v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 SCC 21 at para 8).

[6] The party challenging a decision has the burden of demonstrating to a reviewing court "sufficiently serious shortcomings in the decision such that it cannot be said to exhibit the requisite degree of justification, intelligibility and transparency" (*Vavilov* at para 100). The Applicant has not satisfied this burden.

[7] The Applicant's record filed on September 3, 2024, includes an affidavit sworn by the Applicant on August 22, 2024 [Affidavit]. The Affidavit is improper in a number of respects. First, it attaches documents and discloses information that are not found in the Certified Tribunal Record [CTR]. Second, it contains documents and information that either contradict or seek to bolster that which was in the CTR. Finally, it omits documents that are expressly identified as being attached. These deficiencies were raised with Applicant's counsel at the outset of the

hearing, and counsel acknowledged this application was to be decided based solely on the contents of the CTR. I have therefore not considered the Affidavit.

[8] The CTR discloses that the TRV application before the Officer was limited to (1) an application summary, (2) a letter from the Applicant stating her intention to apply for a visitor visa and containing various assertions relating to the purpose of the visit, the length of the visit, her ties to Iran, and her financial circumstances, (3) a one-page document reporting a bank balance, (4) a family information form that had not been completed, (5) a letter that had not been translated into English or French, (6) a copy of the photo identification page of the Applicant's passport, and (7) a separate photo of the Applicant.

[9] It was on the basis of this limited record that the Officer noted the insufficiency of the evidence provided and subsequently concluded that the Applicant had failed to demonstrate that she would depart Canada at the end of her stay.

[10] The Officer did not ignore or overlook evidence corroborating the Applicant's assertion of deep roots in Iran – with the exception of the one-page bank statement, there was none. Nor did the Officer ignore the Applicant's reported travel history; instead, the Officer acknowledged the reported travel history but reasonably concluded it to be insufficient to weigh in favour of a positive outcome.

[11] Although the Officer's decision is brief, the reasons – when considered within the context of the evidence before the Officer – are intelligible and reveal a rational chain of analysis. This is

particularly so where visa officers are not required to provide extensive reasons (*Quraishi v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2021 FC 1145 at paras 14–15).

[12] The application for judicial review is dismissed. Neither Party has proposed a question of general importance for certification, and I agree that none arise.

**JUDGMENT IN IMM-12337-24**

**THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that:**

1. The application for judicial review is dismissed.
2. No question is certified.

“Patrick Gleeson”

---

Judge

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

**DOCKET:** IMM-12337-24

**STYLE OF CAUSE:** GOLNAZ HADIAN v THE MINISTER OF  
CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**PLACE OF HEARING:** VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA

**DATE OF HEARING:** APRIL 9, 2026

**JUDGMENT AND REASONS:** GLEESON J.

**DATED:** APRIL 10, 2026

**APPEARANCES:**

Ramanjit Sohi FOR THE APPLICANT

Lucas Kam FOR THE RESPONDENT

**SOLICITORS OF RECORD:**

Raman Sohi Law Corporation FOR THE APPLICANT  
Surrey, British Columbia

Attorney General of Canada FOR THE RESPONDENT  
Vancouver, British Columbia