

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

Date: 20250424

Docket: IMM-7650-23

Citation: 2025 FC 736

Ottawa, Ontario, April 24, 2025

PRESENT: The Honourable Mr. Justice Manson

BETWEEN:

**JEETENDER BHARDWAJ
REENA BHARDWAJ**

Applicants

and

**THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND
IMMIGRATION**

Respondent

JUDGMENT AND REASONS

I. Introduction

[1] This is an application for judicial review of two decisions (the “Decisions”) by a Visa Officer refusing the Applicants’ request for temporary resident visas (“TRVs”).

[2] For the reasons below, the application is dismissed.

II. Background

[3] The Applicants, Jeetender Bhardwaj and Reena Bhardwaj, are citizens of India. In May 2023, they applied for TRVs to visit their adult daughter in Calgary, Alberta from August 5, 2023 to August 25, 2023.

III. The Decisions

[4] In two separate letters dated May 30, 2023, the Officer refused the Applicants' TRV applications, providing the following reasons:

I am not satisfied that you will leave Canada at the end of your stay as required by paragraph 179(b) of the IRPR (<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-2002-227/section-179.html>). I am refusing your application because you have not established that you will leave Canada, based on the following factors:

- Your assets and financial situation are insufficient to support the stated purpose of travel for yourself (and any accompanying family member(s), if applicable).
- The purpose of your visit to Canada is not consistent with a temporary stay given the details you have provided in your application.

[5] In the Global Case Management System notes, which form part of the reasons for the Decisions, the Officer explained that the bank statements were not supported with evidence of transactions and that “in the absence of satisfactory documentation showing the source of these funds, I am not satisfied the [Applicants] ha[ve] sufficient funds for the intended proposed stay in Canada.”

IV. Issues

[6] Are the Decisions reasonable?

V. Analysis

[7] The standard of review with respect to the Officer's substantive findings is reasonableness (*Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65 [Vavilov] at para 25).

[8] The Applicants assert that the Decisions are unreasonable because the Applicants' familial ties to India and their available financial resources demonstrate that their visit is consistent with a temporary stay.

[9] Review of the Certified Tribunal Record shows that the Decisions are reasonable.

[10] This Court has held that absence of adequate documentation confirming the availability of funds is sufficient on its own to refuse an application (see *Kassira v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2025 FC 310 at para 18 and cases cited therein). Additionally, it is reasonable for an officer to assess the origin, nature and stability of an applicant's funds in determining whether the applicant has sufficient resources (*Salemi v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 1858 at para 33).

[11] The Applicants filed no personal affidavit evidence and provided minimal documents to demonstrate they have available financial resources to fund their trip. As the Respondent points out, the Applicants did not comply with the TRV application instructions that set out the required proof of financial support for visitors from India, which includes a detailed history of at least six months of their bank account. For example, they provided a “balance confirmation certificate” dated April 5, 2023, but do not provide a detailed history of transactions or proof of the source of these funds. Additionally, although the Applicants assert that they have assets in bank accounts, stocks, jewelry and other “immovable assets”, they fail to address the Officer’s concerns regarding the source of the funds.

[12] Given the lack of support as to the source and availability of these funds, it was reasonable for the Officer to refuse the Applicants’ TRVs on the basis that they had not established sufficient funds for their stay.

[13] The Applicants have failed to demonstrate that the Decisions were unreasonable in light of the record before the Officer.

VI. Conclusion

[14] This application is dismissed.

[15] There is no question for certification.

JUDGMENT in IMM-7650-23

THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that:

1. This application is dismissed.
2. There is no question for certification.

"Michael D. Manson"

Judge

FEDERAL COURT
SOLICITORS OF RECORD

DOCKET: IMM-7650-23

STYLE OF CAUSE: JEETENDER BHARDWAJ AND REENA BHARDWAJ
v THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND
IMMIGRATION

PLACE OF HEARING: TORONTO, ONTARIO

DATE OF HEARING: APRIL 22, 2025

JUDGMENT AND REASONS: MANSON J.

DATED: APRIL 24, 2025

APPEARANCES:

Rajender Singh	FOR THE APPLICANTS
Kareena Wilding	FOR THE RESPONDENT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD:

RST Law Professional Corporation Barrister and Solicitor Mississauga, Ontario	FOR THE APPLICANTS
Attorney General of Canada Toronto, Ontario	FOR THE RESPONDENT