Federal Court  Cour fédérale

Date: 20260121

Docket: IMM-22920-24

Citation: 2026 FC 88

Toronto, Ontario, January 21, 2026

PRESENT: Mr. Justice Diner

BETWEEN:

ABDUL SAMAD IQBAL

Applicant

and

THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Respondent

JUDGMENT AND REASONS

[1] The Applicant seeks judicial review of a decision of a visa officer [the Officer], dated December 5, 2024 [the Decision], refusing his application for a study permit [Study Permit]. The matter took place within the format of a 45-minute hearing, given the Federal Court's revised practice to hold shorter hearings for non-complex, temporary residence files, which streamlines the litigation process. I dismissed the Application from the bench, summarizing the key reasons for doing so at the time, and promising more detailed written reasons to follow.

[2] The Applicant is a citizen of Pakistan, who originally sought a study permit in an application which was refused on January 19, 2024. The refusal decision was challenged by way of judicial review, ultimately settled and returned to the decision maker for redetermination. That redetermination consideration refused the application in a decision dated June 7, 2024. The Applicant challenged the second refusal decision by way of judicial review and again, the matter was settled. The impugned Decision in this judicial review results from this third assessment in respect of the Applicant's study permit application.

[3] The Officer refused the Applicant's study permit application on the basis that the Applicant had not established that he would leave Canada at the end of the period authorized for his stay. In reaching this conclusion, the Officer assessed the Applicant's submissions concerning his employment, economic establishment, and family ties in Pakistan, and weighed those factors against the Applicant's circumstances in Canada. The Officer was not satisfied that the Applicant's ties to Pakistan were sufficient to motivate his departure from Canada following his proposed studies.

[4] The Applicant advances arguments framed as errors of law, unreasonable findings of fact, and breaches of procedural fairness. In substance, however, the Applicant challenges the manner in which the Officer weighed the evidence concerning his employment prospects, financial circumstances, and family ties. The presumptive standard of review applicable to the merits of the Officer's decision is reasonableness (*Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65 at paras 15-17).

[5] Having reviewed the full record, including the Global Case Management System [GCMS] notes which form part of the Decision, as well as the submissions made to the visa office and subsequently to this Court, I am satisfied that the Officer's reasoning is clear and responsive to the evidence. The Officer engaged with the Applicant's submissions regarding his education, employment, financial resources, and family circumstances, and explained why those factors did not establish a sufficient incentive to return to Pakistan.

[6] The Applicant's employer at the relevant time (which he advises is no longer the case today) was an e-commerce service targeting online businesses. The Officer gave the Applicant's motivation to return to his employer limited weight due to the company's significant ties to North America and the fact that their business model did not require his physical presence in Pakistan. For those reasons, the Applicant failed to establish employment in his country of residence as a compelling factor to leave Canada at the conclusion of his stay. This finding was solidly grounded in the material before the Officer and is connected to the statutory requirement that the Applicant demonstrate an intention to leave Canada at the end of the authorized stay (*Daniko v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2006 FC 479 at para 37; *Dorrazaei v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2026 FC 3 at paras 2-3 [*Dorrazaei*]).

[7] The Officer has expertise in assessing study permit applications, and deference should be paid to their assessments (*Dorrazaei* at para 12). A foreign national seeking entry to Canada bears the burden of satisfying the officer that they seek admission on a temporary basis. It was therefore incumbent on the Applicant to demonstrate, with clear and credible evidence, that he would leave Canada at the end of the authorized period of stay. He was not able to do so,

including due to the nature of his family relationships. Again, the Officer cited a lack of evidence with respect to establishing strong family ties in Pakistan. Given the gaps in the evidence, including a failure to provide addresses for most of those family members on the relevant form, and a lack of any other evidence to speak to purported close ties in Pakistan, the Officer's finding was reasonable. The Officer also noted that the mere fact that the Applicant's wife was not applying for a temporary resident visa concurrently did not mean that she would stay in Pakistan; she would be able to obtain a work permit should the Applicant decide to stay to work after his graduation.

[8] Finally, on procedural fairness, the Applicant argues the visa office should have followed up to obtain information it felt was missing. Rather, it is the Applicant's onus to put their best foot forward to provide sufficient evidence to support a study permit application *(Sungai v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration*), 2025 FC 825 at paras 8-9).

[9] The Decision falls within the range of acceptable outcomes defensible in light of the facts and the law. An administrative decision should be left in place if this Court can discern from the record why the decision was made if the decision is otherwise reasonable (*Vavilov*, at paras 120-122).

[10] Finally, The Applicant has asked the Court for costs in this matter, citing similar circumstances to those cited in *Aniekwe v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2023 FC 1477. Here, the factual circumstances are materially different. In any event, this Applicant was unsuccessful in his outcome before the Court. Costs are therefore denied.

I. Conclusion

[11] For the reasons set out above, this application for judicial review is dismissed. Neither party proposed a question for certification, and I agree that none arises.

JUDGMENT in IMM- 22920-24

THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that:

1. The application for judicial review is refused.

2. No questions for certification were argued, and I agree none arise.

3. There is no award as to costs.

"Alan S. Diner"
Judge

FEDERAL COURT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD

DOCKET:	IMM-22920-24
STYLE OF CAUSE:	ABDUL SAMAD IQBAL v MCI
PLACE OF HEARING:	HELD BY WAY OF VIDEOCONFERENCE
DATE OF HEARING:	JANUARY 14, 2026
JUDGMENT AND REASONS:	DINER J.
DATED:	JANUARY 21, 2026

APPEARANCES:

Abdul Samad Iqbal	FOR THE APPLICANT ON HIS OWN BEHALF
Brendan Stock	FOR THE RESPONDENT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD:

Attorney General of Canada Toronto, Ontario	FOR THE RESPONDENT