

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

**Date: 20250528**

**Docket: IMM-5444-25**

**Citation: 2025 FC 963**

**Toronto, Ontario, May 28, 2025**

**PRESENT: The Honourable Justice Battista**

**BETWEEN:**

**MUHAMMAD ASIF AKRAM**

**Applicant**

**and**

**MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND  
IMMIGRATION**

**Respondent**

**JUDGMENT AND REASONS**  
**(Simplified Procedure-Study Permit Pilot Project)**

[1] The Applicant applied for a study permit to study at the Centre de formation professionnelle ACCESS in Québec. That application was refused because an Officer of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada was not satisfied that the Applicant's study in Canada was a logical academic progression given his academic past and employment history.

[2] This case was dealt with in writing, on consent of the parties, as part of the Court's Study Permit Pilot Project. I grant leave to commence the judicial review application and I grant the application for judicial review.

[3] As stated above, the Officer found that the Applicant's proposed study was not a logical academic progression given the Applicant's academic past and employment history. The Officer supported the decision by relying upon the Applicant's post-secondary credential, his gainful employment, and the fact he would be enrolling at considerable expense and losing employment and/or residency status in Pakistan.

[4] This conclusion was not reasonable in light of the Applicant's study plan. The plan specifically noted that his educational background, a BSc in Mechatronics Engineering, provided a theoretical foundation and that the proposed program provided hands-on, practical training in areas that were crucial to his line of work, mentioning specific courses that would assist him in applying his expertise to "real-world industrial systems". He also mentioned specific features of the program that would assist his career aspirations, including, for example, a desire to collaborate with UNESCO-UNEVOC. Contrary to the Respondent's submissions, the Applicant clearly articulated in his study plan the benefits he would gain (*Kamali Kermani v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2024 FC 1251 at para 37, citing *Akomolafe v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2016 FC 472).

[5] Overall, the Officer's finding that the proposed study was not logical was unjustified given the Applicant's study plan clearly outlined the logic of his plans. The applicant is granted.

**JUDGMENT in IMM-5444-25**

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

1. The application for leave to commence judicial review is granted.
2. The application for judicial review is granted, the decision rendered on the Applicant's study permit application is quashed, and the matter is remitted to a different Officer for reconsideration.
3. There is no question for certification and no order regarding costs.

"Michael Battista"

---

Judge

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

**DOCKET:** IMM-5444-25

**STYLE OF CAUSE:** MUHAMMAD ASIF AKRAM v THE MINISTER  
OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**SUBMISSIONS ON STUDY PERMIT PERFECTED LEAVE APPLICATION  
CONSIDERED AT OTTAWA, ONTARIO PURSUANT TO SECTION 72 OF THE  
*IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE PROTECTION ACT***

**JUDGMENT AND REASONS:** BATTISTA J.

**DATED:** MAY 28, 2025

**APPEARANCES:**

Muhammad Asif Akram

FOR THE APPLICANT  
(SELF-REPRESENTED)

Larry Wu

FOR THE RESPONDENT

**SOLICITORS OF RECORD:**

Attorney General of Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario

FOR THE RESPONDENT