

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

Date: 20260416

Docket: IMM-2789-25

Citation: 2026 FC 510

Toronto, Ontario, April 16, 2026

PRESENT: Madam Justice McDonald

BETWEEN:

SAEEDREZA GHAFOURI

Applicant

and

**THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND
IMMIGRATION**

Respondent

JUDGMENT AND REASONS

[1] The Applicant, a citizen of Iran, seeks judicial review of a Visa Officer's decision refusing to grant him, his wife, and his daughter a 1-month visitor visas. The Officer was not satisfied that they would leave Canada at the end of their authorized stay.

[2] The Officer determined that the Applicant lacked sufficient family ties outside Canada, noting that the Applicant, his wife, and daughter would be travelling as a family unit. The Officer did consider the Affidavit of the Applicant's mother in Iran, who stated that she was dependant on the principal Applicant as her primary caretaker due to her health issues. However, the Officer gave the Affidavit reduced weight because there was no explanation accounting for her daily care needs during the planned 1-month absence.

[3] The Officer also considered the Applicant's bank statements but noted the documents did not demonstrate the source of the funds, and therefore gave the information reduced weight. The Officer also found the Applicant's travel history insufficient to count as a positive factor in their assessment.

I. Issues

[4] The Applicant argues the decision is unreasonable and he alleges a breach of procedural fairness, as he was not provided an opportunity to address the Officer's concerns.

II. Analysis

[5] The Applicant argues that the decision was unreasonable because the Officer did not sufficiently assess three main factors, namely: care for his elderly mother; financial resources; and travel history.

[6] The Applicant argues that the Officer unreasonably considered the evidence of his family ties and obligations in Iran, specifically regarding his mother. The Officer noted the Affidavit of the Applicant's mother, noted that she has health issues and requires daily assistance from the Applicant. However, the Officer, reasonably, notes that the evidence was silent on who would care for her during the Applicant's 1-month absence. This is a reasonable consideration, given that the Affidavit indicates that she has daily care needs, and the Applicant does not explain how her care needs will be met during his absence. The Applicant has not pointed to any evidence that was overlooked by the Officer in this regard. In my view, it was open for the Officer to draw this conclusion from the evidence and it is not the Court's role to reweigh the evidence and insert its own conclusions (*Solopova v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2016 FC 690 at para 33 (*Solopova*)).

[7] The Applicant also argues that the Officer's assessment of his financial resources was unreasonable, as he provided evidence of holding over \$47,000 CAD in his bank accounts, based on bank statements from Melli Bank of Iran, Parsian Bank, and Tourism Bank. The Officer gave reduced weight to the bank statements from Parsian Bank and Tourism Bank because they lacked transaction history, and therefore the source of the funds was unclear.

[8] However, "[b]ank transaction histories can help to demonstrate the source and stability of an applicant's funds" and "[t]his Court has repeatedly held that the absence of this information can be a reasonable basis to find that an applicant has not established that they have sufficient and available funds" (*Hadian v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2025 FC 414 at para 10). In this case, the Melli Bank statement, which included a transaction history, contained roughly

\$4,000 CAD at the time of its issuance . The two bank accounts without transaction histories held the majority of the Applicant's funds. It was open to the Officer to give this important evidence of the Applicant's finances reduced weight and find their financial evidence insufficient.

[9] On travel history, the Officer noted the Applicant only had two trips outside Iran since 2015 and found this insufficient to constitute a strong positive factor in the Applicant's favour. Although the Applicant challenges this finding, it is a finding that was open to the Officer to make. The Applicant has not pointed to any evidence on travel history that was overlooked.

[10] Ultimately, the Applicant bore the burden of satisfying the Officer that they would leave Canada (*Danioko v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2006 FC 479 at para 15; *Rahman v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2016 FC 793 at para 16). He did not meet that burden. He has not identified any error in the decision that would render it unreasonable.

[11] Finally, the Applicant claims that he was denied procedural fairness because he did not have the opportunity to respond to the deficiencies noted by the Officer. However, there is no requirement for a visa officer to provide an applicant an opportunity to respond to deficiencies in their application (*Chhetri v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2011 FC 872 at para 10; *Solopova* at para 38).

III. Conclusion

[12] This judicial review is dismissed. There is no question for certification.

JUDGMENT IN IMM-2789-25

THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that:

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

"Ann Marie McDonald"

Judge

FEDERAL COURT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD

DOCKET: IMM-2789-25

STYLE OF CAUSE: GHAFOURI V MCI

PLACE OF HEARING: TORONTO, ONTARIO

DATE OF HEARING: APRIL 2, 2026

JUDGMENT AND REASONS: MCDONALD J.

DATED: APRIL 16, 2026

APPEARANCES:

Sadeq Ziaee Bigdeli

FOR THE APPLICANT

Michael Butterfield

FOR THE RESPONDENT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD:

Sadeq Ziaee Bigdeli
Barrister and Solicitor
North York, Ontario

FOR THE APPLICANT

Attorney General of Canada
Toronto, Ontario

FOR THE RESPONDENT