Immigration and
Refugee Board of Canada

Immigration Appeal Division

Commission de l'immigration et
du statut de réfugié du Canada

Section d'appel de l'immigration

IAD File No. / N° de dossier de la SAI : TB9-14904
Client ID No. / N° ID client : 5759-5738

Reasons and Decision – Motifs et décision

Sponsorship

Appellant(s)	ADEOLA ADEYINKA OLOMOLA	Appelant(e)(s)
Respondent	The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration Le Ministre de la Citoyenneté et de l'Immigration	Intimé(e)
Date(s) of Hearing	February 4, 2020	Date(s) de l'audience
Place(s) of Hearing	Toronto, Ontario	Lieu de l'audience
Date of Decision	March 9, 2020	Date de la décision
Panel	A. Jung	Tribunal
Counsel for the Appellant(s)	Sonia Akilov Matkowsky Barrister and Solicitor	Conseil(s) de l'appelant(e)/ des appelant(e)(s)
Counsel for the Minister	Andrew Ross	Conseil du ministre

REASONS FOR DECISION

INTRODUCTION

[1] On May 29, 2019, the appellant, Adeola Adeyinka Olomola, filed a Notice of Appeal against the refusal of the permanent resident visa application made by her husband, Omotayo Sanmi Famoroti (the applicant), which was refused pursuant to section 4(1) of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations*[1] (the *Regulations*). The visa officer was not satisfied that the appellant's and applicant's marriage is genuine and that it was not entered into primarily for the purpose of acquiring status or privilege under the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*[2] (the *Act*).

[2] The reasons for the refusal by the visa officer are set out in the Record.[3] Exhibits include the Record and documentary evidence from the appellant and the Minister's counsel.[4] The appellant and the applicant testified at the hearing.

[3] For the reasons set out below, the appeal is allowed.

BACKGROUND

[4] The appellant is a 29-year-old Canadian citizen. The applicant is a 36-year-old citizen of Nigeria. The appellant and applicant were married in the United States on April 20, 2018. This is the appellant's first marriage and the applicant's second.

ANALYSIS

Development of the relationship

[5] The appellant and the applicant testified in a consistent manner of the genesis of their relationship which began in Nigeria in January 2007 when they met at a party to celebrate the applicant's 23rd birthday. The appellant was invited by a friend to accompany her to the party where she was introduced to the applicant. The appellant and the applicant met again the following Sunday at church at which time they exchanged telephone numbers. They began communicating and a few weeks later started dating. Their relationship continued until the

appellant left Nigeria and landed as a permanent resident of Canada on May 30, 2008. The appellant and the applicant lost contact thereafter despite efforts made by both the appellant and the applicant to reconnect. It was in April 2016 when the appellant and the applicant made contact once again through their mutual friend in Nigeria who provided the appellant's telephone number to the applicant. Both the appellant and the applicant were involved in relationships with other partners at the time. They formed a long-distance friendship and in September 2016 the appellant testified she returned to Nigeria for a visit during which time she and the applicant met. The appellant and the applicant developed a close friendship and communicated every other day following the appellant's September 2016 trip. The appellant stated her close friendship with the applicant evolved into a romantic relationship in approximately mid to late 2017. The appellant and the applicant were married on April 20, 2018.

[6] The appellant and the applicant testified in a detailed, straightforward and forthright manner of their initial relationship in 2007, the circumstances of their separation in 2008, their reconnection in 2016, and the development of their romantic relationship in 2017 which ultimately led to marriage. No inconsistencies or discrepancies arose between the appellant's oral testimony and the applicant's oral testimony in this regard.

[7] Concerns were raised with respect to the lack of documentary evidence of the appellant's and applicant's 2007 relationship and the plausibility of the appellant and the applicant losing touch after the appellant's immigration to Canada in 2008.

[8] The appellant was 16 years of age when she was dating the applicant in 2007 and she explained that their relationship consisted of going to each other's homes, occasionally going out, and attending church. The applicant was 23 years of age at the time and had finished his schooling. The appellant was still attending school. The appellant testified that she and the applicant did not use email to communicate while they dated in 2007 and 2008 and neither did they use Facebook. While the appellant and the applicant met each other's families and spent time together, they did not have mutual friends with whom they socialized. The appellant's counsel acknowledged in her reply submissions that there is an absence of documentary evidence going back to 2007 and 2008 but that the evidence is that the appellant and the applicant did not

use email, they did not have smartphones with data capabilities but simple analog phones, and at the appellant's age of 16 and 17 neither she nor the applicant would have thought to keep records of their telephone calls. In reviewing the evidence, I note that while there are no communication records from 2007 and 2008 between the appellant and the applicant, there is a letter from the applicant's father who writes the following[5]:

> My wife and I have been married for over 37 years now and every Parent's dream is for our kids to be happy in Life. We have known Adeola Yinka Olomola since her teen-age firstly and specifically at my son's 23rd birthday celebration and subsequently whenever she comes around with my son, back then. Also, my Wife attended her Elder sister's wedding Ceremony sometimes in 2008 and knows the family background from the community. We are also pleased with our in-laws now and communicate with them from time to time; we are all in total support of their blessed union.
>
> We indeed know they were both in a relationship then, and we were also glad when our son; Omotayo told us about his intension and choice to re-settle down with my daughter-in-law Adeola in 2017 after his first marriage to his ex-wife Sandra had failed.

[9] No credibility concerns were raised with respect to the letter from the applicant's father and I therefore accept the letter from the applicant's father as evidence in support of the appellant's and applicant's account of their former relationship. In considering the points made by the appellant's counsel's in her submissions, the letter from the applicant's father, as well as the consistency of oral evidence provided by the appellant and the applicant of their meeting in January 2007, how and when they began dating, how they spent their time together during their relationship, as well as the consistent evidence provided by the appellant and the applicant that they did not email each other at the time, were not active on any social media platforms, and only communicated by way of telephone calls, I find there is sufficient persuasive evidence before me, that the appellant and the applicant were involved in a romantic relationship in 2007 and 2008.

[10] Credibility concerns were also raised with respect to the appellant's and applicant's inability to contact each other by email or telephone after the appellant's departure from Nigeria in May 2008, given that the appellant and the applicant are educated, living in the largest city in Nigeria, and given the fact that the appellant was attending computer school prior to her landing in Canada and would therefore have access to email.

[11] The appellant testified that she left Nigeria very suddenly when her mother, who was already in Canada, called her and informed her that arrangements had been finalized for the appellant to leave Nigeria. At that time the applicant was out of town and travelling for business purposes. The appellant was unable to reach him before she left to inform him of her departure. The applicant explained that while he was away he lost his phone and in replacing it was given a new telephone number. By the time the applicant began trying to contact the appellant with his new phone, the appellant had already left Nigeria for Canada. The appellant and the applicant consistently testified of the details that led to their disconnection as well as the efforts made by the applicant in sending his sister to the appellant's apartment to reach the appellant without success as the appellant and the appellant's siblings had already left the rental apartment. The appellant testified that she tried numerous times to call the applicant from Canada after her arrival without success. The appellant explained that she became busy with her schooling in Canada, resigned herself to the end of her relationship with the applicant, and moved on with her new life in Canada.

[12] Regardless of the fact that the appellant was attending computer school in 2008, the evidence before me is that the appellant and the applicant did not use email to communicate in 2007-2008 and did not use any other means of communicating with each other than by telephone. The appellant and the applicant provided consistent and detailed oral testimony of the appellant's sudden departure from Nigeria without more than a few days' notice, the applicant travelling for business purposes, the applicant misplacing his phone, and the applicant's sister going to the appellant's apartment to search for the appellant on behalf of the applicant who was living out of town. No inconsistencies or discrepancies were noted between the appellant's and applicant's oral testimony. There is no documentary evidence, oral testimony, inconsistencies or discrepancies that may be relied upon to conclude that the appellant's and applicant's account of how they came to lose contact is lacking in credibility. It may be that the appellant and the applicant could have done more to reconnect, pursued other avenues to reach other, and invested more time and resources to find each other; however, the circumstances of the appellant at the time was such that the appellant was 17 years of age when she landed in Canada and after she tried to reach the applicant without success, she accepted the circumstances, became involved

with her new life and schooling in Canada, and simply moved on. The applicant was also a young adult, busy with his new job, travelling, and settling in a new city. While I acknowledge the Minister's counsel's dissatisfaction with this version of events, there is a lack of evidence before me that establishes, on a balance of probabilities, the appellant's and applicant's account of how they lost contact in 2008 and the extent of the efforts made by the appellant and the applicant to reconnect is not credible or lacking in credibility.

[13] Concerns were raised with respect to the appellant's September 2016 trip to Nigeria. The Minister's counsel submitted that credibility concerns arise from the insufficiency of documentary evidence corroborating the appellant's and applicant's oral testimony of the appellant's September 2016 trip to Nigeria that prompted the appellant's and applicant's current relationship. The Minister's counsel also disclosed the ICES Traveller History report which does not show the appellant entering Canada in September 2016.[6] The Minister's counsel submits that the testimonies of the appellant and the applicant are not credible in this respect.

[14] The appellant's and applicant's oral testimony of the appellant's 2016 visit to Nigeria was consistent. The appellant and the applicant consistently testified of how they came to reconnect in April 2016 when the applicant attended church and met the appellant's friend who gave the applicant the appellant's telephone number. The appellant and the applicant were both involved with other partners at that time. The appellant spoke of her decision to travel to Nigeria in September 2016 in order to distance herself from the difficult personal circumstances she was experiencing at the time with her former partner. The appellant testified that the purpose of the trip was to "just go far away". The appellant met the applicant on three occasions during this trip. She stated that she and the applicant spoke and caught up with their lives and that the applicant took her to see a pastor for counselling in respect of her relationship problems. The applicant's testimony of the number of times he saw the appellant, their discussions, and the visit to see the pastor was consistent with the appellant's.

[15] The appellant submitted her electronic ticket for her September 2016 trip to Nigeria.[7] There was no evidence or arguments presented to undermine the authenticity or veracity of the electronic plane ticket. I therefore accept the e-ticket as evidence corroborating the appellant's

testimony that she went to Nigeria in September 2016. The appellant stated she travelled to Nigeria using her Nigerian passport which has since been lost. There was no evidence to undermine the credibility of the appellant's account of her Nigerian passport being lost. The ICES Traveller History report does not reflect the appellant's entry into Canada in September 2016. This is a concern as it is reasonable to expect that the appellant's re-entry into Canada after her visit to Nigeria would be reflected in the ICES Traveller History report. The appellant had no reasonable explanation for the absence of her entry to Canada in September 2016 from the ICES Traveller History report. While there is no documentary evidence before me that ICES Traveller History reports are always accurate and without error, there is also no documentary evidence before me that ICES Traveller History reports are or may be inaccurate. In other words, there is no evidence before me of the extent of the reliability and accuracy of ICES Traveller History reports.

[16] The totality of the evidence surrounding the appellant's September 2016 to Nigeria is mixed. On the one hand there is consistent oral testimony from the appellant and the applicant which was delivered in a spontaneous manner without hesitation or evasiveness as well as a copy of the appellant's return trip e-ticket to Nigeria. On the other hand, there is an ICES Traveller History report which does not reflect the appellant's return to Canada on September 24, 2016 and a lack of documentary evidence of the trip aside from an e-ticket. In weighing this evidence on a balance of probabilities, I conclude that the evidence weighs in favour of the appellant and the applicant given the consistency of their oral evidence and the e-ticket. I am mindful of the ICES Traveller History report not reflecting the appellant's re-entry to Canada in September 2016; however, there is simply insufficient evidence before me of the accuracy and reliability of the appellant's ICES Traveller History report such that it may be relied upon to outweigh the appellant's and applicant's oral evidence and the e-ticket documentary evidence. I also note the Minister's counsel's concerns with respect to the absence of documentary evidence of the trip (aside from the e-ticket); however, once again, I find this to be insufficient to outweigh the appellant's and applicant's oral evidence and the e-ticket to establish that the appellant's and applicant's account of the September 2016 is not credible.

[17] In addressing the lack of evidence of the September 2016 trip, the Minister's counsel expressed concerns of the credibility of the appellant's and applicant's relationship since the September 2016 prompted the whole relationship. Having reviewed the evidence, I do not necessarily find this to be the case. The appellant and the applicant had already reconnected and were communicating with each other since April 2016, five months prior to the appellant's September 2016 trip. While the appellant and the applicant saw each other three times during the appellant's trip, there was no evidence presented that the purpose of the trip was to see each other; but rather, for the appellant to distance herself and gain some "space" from her relationship problems in Canada. The appellant testified that she and the applicant were close friends and that a romantic relationship did not begin between them until mid- to late 2017 which is approximately one year after the appellant's trip to Nigeria. There was no evidence from either the appellant or the applicant that the appellant's September 2016 trip to Nigeria was the catalyst for their romantic relationship or that it set in motion romantic overtures in their relationship. While it may be that their existing friendship deepened after the trip, I find there is insufficient evidence establishing the September 2016 prompted the whole relationship as the Minister's counsel submits. There is a lack of evidence establishing that the development of the appellant's and applicant's romantic relationship is built upon the appellant's September 2016 trip or that the genesis of the romantic relationship between the appellant and the applicant in 2017 is directly correlated to the September 2016 trip. There is little evidence that the September 2016 trip was an important or critical element in the development of the appellant's and applicant's romantic relationship.

[18] Further concerns were raised with respect to the appellant's and applicant's efforts, or lack thereof, to see each other during the period the applicant resided in the United States, from approximately November 2017 to May 2019. The appellant travelled to the United States on three occasions during this period: December 2017, April 2018, and September 2018. Each visit lasted no longer than 3 days. The Minister's counsel expressed concerns for the lack of efforts made by the appellant and the applicant to see each other in person given the relatively close proximity between Canada and the United States. The explanation provided by the appellant was that she was a single mother with a young child and was intensely involved in legal custody

proceedings with her ex-partner. The appellant explained she was in and out of court at the time, did not have any support from her ex-partner, and as her mother was working, the appellant had difficulties arranging childcare for her son who was born on January 15, 2016. Furthermore, the appellant faced court-imposed restrictions against leaving Canada with her son. The appellant also testified of her employment-related concerns at the time as she held contract jobs which did not allow her vacation leave. I acknowledge the Minister's counsel's submissions of the travel time between Toronto and Buffalo and the short amount of time the appellant and the applicant have spent together since the applicant moved to the United States in November 2017; however, I find the appellant's explanations are not unreasonable nor were there credibility concerns raised with respect to the appellant's ongoing custody proceedings, travel restrictions for her son, unstable employment circumstances or the lack of availability of childcare. The appellant provided documentary evidence in this respect that established the ongoing legal proceedings and restricted travel access for her son at the time.[8] Given the explanations provided by the appellant, which was supported by the documentary evidence, I do not find the lack of visits between the appellant and the applicant during the period the applicant was in the United States to be reflective of a lack of genuineness in their relationship.

[19] Concerns were raised with respect to the appellant's decision to travel to Ghana in May 2019 to attend the visa office interview with the applicant. The Minister's counsel expressed concern that while the appellant made little effort to visit the applicant from November 2017 to May 2019 while he was in the United States, the appellant then took the time to make an international trip to Ghana despite her employment, child care, and custody circumstances. The appellant explained that although she was concerned about the expense, she decided to go to Ghana in order to support the applicant. The appellant's trip to Ghana lasted two days. The appellant stated that she was motivated to support the applicant who gets very nervous and is an introvert. The appellant explained that the visa office interview was a significant event in their relationship and it is reasonable, despite the limitations faced by the appellant in her life at the time, that the appellant would have wanted to make a particular effort to be with the applicant during that time. I find there is insufficient evidence before me to conclude that the appellant's decision not to visit the applicant more often in the United States and her subsequent decision to

make the effort to be with the applicant in Ghana for his visa office interview is indicative of a lack of genuineness.

[20] Similarly, concerns were raised with respect to the appellant's Dubai trip in December 2019. The appellant travelled with her son to see the applicant in Dubai. This trip lasted 11 days. The appellant explained that she banked all her vacation leave and took her son out of Canada despite court orders not to do so. Concerns were raised that the appellant and her son went to Dubai in December 2019 after the application was refused whereas in all the years beforehand the appellant did not contravene court orders to take her son to visit the applicant. There is insufficient evidence to conclude that the Dubai trip in December 2019 is reflective of a lack of genuineness in the relationship. It is not unreasonable that following the refusal of the applicant's permanent resident visa application that the appellant and the applicant would be highly motivated to gather further evidence of their relationship in order to substantiate their marriage. While this may be reflective of a non-genuine relationship, it may also be reflective of a genuine relationship. There is also insufficient evidence to conclude that the appellant choosing not to contravene court orders not to take her son out of Canada in the past means that the appellant's and applicant's relationship is not genuine. There is simply a lack of persuasive evidence to conclude that the motivation for the appellant's and applicant's trip to Dubai in December 2019 stems from a lack of genuineness and not for any other reason.

[21] Concerns were raised with respect to the consistency of evidence of when the applicant moved out of the family home he shared with his ex-wife as well as the overlap of the appellant's relationship with her ex-partner with the timing of the relationship with the applicant.

[22] The applicant testified he left the family home he shared with his wife in March 2016 after discovering his wife's infidelity and began living in his parents' family home. The applicant explained that he returned to the home he shared with his wife in April 2017 in order to retrieve his belongings and physically move out but explained that he and his ex-wife had had no contact since March 2016. The applicant explained that he told the visa officer he moved out in April 2017 because that was the time he physically moved out from the home. Given the

explanation provided by the applicant, I do not find this to be a material credibility concern in respect of the genuineness of the appellant's and applicant's marriage.

[23] The appellant testified her relationship with her ex-partner ended in September 2017 at which time she moved out of their shared home. The appellant and the applicant had reconnected by telephone in April 2016. The appellant's and appellant's romantic relationship did not begin until mid to late 2017. I do not find the timing of the appellant's and applicant's romantic relationship or the appellant's and applicant's friendship from April 2016 onwards in conjunction with the breakdown of the appellant's relationship with her ex-partner to be a credibility concern in respect of the genuineness of the appellant's and applicant's marriage. The appellant and the applicant provided consistent and forthright evidence of the appellant's relationship with her ex-partner during the time they were communicating as friends.

[24] Having considered all the evidence, I find, on a balance of probabilities, there is sufficient evidence establishing the development and progression of the appellant's and applicant's relationship which supports the genuineness of the marriage.

Financial support

[25] The applicant testified that the appellant supported him financially after their marriage including while the applicant was residing in the United States. The appellant disclosed receipts for transfers to the applicant in 2018, 2019 and 2020.[9] The appellant and the applicant provided consistent testimony of the appellant's financial support of the applicant and no credibility concerns were raised in this respect. I find, on a balance of probabilities, the evidence of financial support is supportive of a genuine relationship.

Communication

[26] The appellant and the applicant have been communicating regularly since 2016. The appellant disclosed communication records[10] and testified of her frequent and regular communication with the applicant. No credibility concerns arose with respect to communication between the appellant and the applicant and I find, on a balance of probabilities, there is

sufficient persuasive evidence establishing the appellant and the applicant communicate on an ongoing, regular basis which is reflective of a genuine marriage.

Compatibility of the appellant and the applicant

[27] The appellant and the applicant share the same cultural, ethnic, and religious backgrounds. There is a seven-year age gap between the appellant and the applicant. The appellant and the applicant are both accountants. There were no concerns raised with respect to a lack of compatibility between the appellant and the applicant. The evidence of compatibility between the appellant and the applicant as well as the appellant's and applicant's understanding of each other's character supports the genuineness of the marriage.

Future plans

[28] Both the appellant and the applicant testified in a consistent manner of their plans to have children, for the applicant to find employment in the accounting field, reside in the home in Brampton the appellant and the applicant both invested in, plan a traditional wedding for June 2020 and to live together with all their children. The appellant and the applicant provided consistent evidence in this respect and I find there is sufficient persuasive evidence to establish that the appellant and the applicant have discussed and planned their future lives together which is indicative of a genuine marriage.

The appellant's children

[29] The appellant has one child from her previous relationship. The applicant and the appellant's son met in December 2019 in Dubai. They also communicate through various communication applications. The appellant testified that her son bonded well with the applicant and that they get along very well. The appellant also testified that she has not met the applicant's two children as they are currently in the custody of the applicant's ex-wife, but that she had spoken with them by video call and telephone. The appellant also explained that the applicant's children were supposed to join them in Dubai but that their mother remarried and took the children with her. The appellant readily testified of the applicant's children's current living

circumstances with their mother, the time period of when they had previously resided with the applicant in his family home, their names, their ages, and their months of birth. I find the evidence pertaining to the appellant and the applicant as it relates to their children supports the genuineness of the relationship.

Return visits

[30] Since their romantic relationship began in 2017, the appellant has made three trips to the United States to see the applicant, one trip to Ghana to attend the interview with the applicant, and a family trip to Dubai in 2019. The appellant explained the circumstances relating to her employment circumstances, custody proceedings, court-imposed travel restrictions for her son, financial constraints and childcare issues that prevented her from travelling more frequently or for longer durations. As discussed earlier in these reasons, I do not find the fact that the appellant did not travel more frequently to the United States, or that fact that the appellant travelled to Ghana and Dubai to see the applicant to undermine her credibility or to be indicative of a lack of genuineness in the marriage. Based on the evidence, I find the efforts made by the appellant in her specific circumstances to visit the applicant is sufficient persuasive evidence that is supportive of a genuine relationship.

Visa officer's concerns

[31] Concerns were raised by the visa officer in the following areas:

i) The applicant stated during the visa officer interview that after the wedding in April 2018 he next saw the appellant in person in May 2019 in Ghana. The appellant stated that she and the applicant met in Buffalo, New York in September 2018 but did not have any documentary evidence of that trip. The applicant was unable to explain why he did not mention the Buffalo meeting when asked by the visa officer. The applicant explained at the appeal hearing that he was feeling overwhelmed during the visa office interview and was under stress. The appellant also provided documentary evidence of her visit to Buffalo in September 2018 which includes a letter from the applicant's friend confirming that he and the

applicant went on a road trip to Buffalo, New York, arriving on September 2, 2018, to spend time with the appellant at a mutual friend's home.[11] I find there is sufficient evidence to establish the appellant and the applicant met in Buffalo in September 2018. Given the applicant's explanation and the documentary evidence, I find the applicant's response to the visa officer in not mentioning the Buffalo trip during the interview is not a material credibility concern.

ii) The visa officer expressed concerns of very little evidence of an ongoing, spousal relationship, lack of photographs, and no proof of financial support. The appellant has provided evidence of financial support of the applicant at the hearing which date back to 2018.[12] The appellant has also provided communication records, photographs, screenshots from video calls, letters from family members and a friend confirming knowledge of the appellant's and applicant's relationship, health benefits cards from Great West Life for the appellant and the applicant, and a purchase of property where she and applicant plan to reside.[13] Based on the evidence presented at the hearing, I find there is sufficient documentary evidence to corroborate the appellant's and applicant's testimony of an ongoing spousal relationship.

iii) The visa officer expressed concerns that the applicant had not met important people in the appellant's life, like her son. The appellant's son has since met the applicant in December 2019 in Dubai and the evidence establishes the appellant's son and the applicant communicate by telephone and video calls. The appellant provided an explanation of the ongoing custody proceedings in respect of her son, the travel restrictions that were in place for her son, and her employment-related circumstances which limited her ability to take vacation leave. The appellant disclosed documentary evidence to corroborate her oral testimony in this respect.[14] I find the appellant has provided reasonable explanations why the applicant had not met the appellant's son at the time of the visa office interview.

CONCLUSION

[32] I find the appellant and applicant are compatible with respect to their age, religion and cultural background. The appellant and the applicant have provided persuasive evidence of: the origin and development of their relationship, their conduct during their relationship, their level of knowledge of each other, and the demonstration by the appellant and the applicant of continuing communication, care, and responsibility towards each other and the appellant's son that in my view support the case that this is a genuine marriage. In weighing the appellant's and applicant's spontaneity, their consistency of testimony, and the explanations given by the appellant and applicant to address the areas of concern in conjunction with the corroborating materials submitted by the appellant, the totality of the evidence weighs in favour of the genuineness of the marriage. I find that, on a balance of probabilities, there is sufficient evidence that this is a genuine marriage for the appellant and the applicant and not one that was entered into primarily to acquire any status or privilege under the *Act*.

[33] I find the appellant has met her onus to demonstrate that, on a balance of probabilities, the marriage is genuine and was not entered into primarily for the purpose of acquiring status or privilege under the *Act*.

[34] The appeal is allowed.

DECISION

The appeal is allowed. The officer's decision to refuse a permanent resident visa is set aside, and an officer must continue to process the application in accordance with the reasons of the Immigration Appeal Division.

A. Jung
A. Jung

March 9, 2020
Date

Judicial Review – Under section 72 of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act,* you may make an application to the Federal Court for judicial review of this decision, with leave of that Court. You may wish to get advice from counsel as soon as possible, since there are time limits for this application.

---

[1] *Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations*, SOR, 2002-227, as amended.
[2] *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*, S.C. 2001, c. 27, as amended.
[3] Record, pp. 23-44.
[4] Record; Exhibits R-1, A-1, A-2, A-3.
[5] Exhibit A-1, p. 195.
[6] Exhibit R-1.
[7] Exhibit A-3, pp. 1-2.
[8] Exhibit A-1, pp. 204-266.
[9] Exhibit A-1, pp. 167-179; Exhibit A-2, pp. 138-143.
[10] Exhibit A-1, pp. 27-166; Exhibit A-2, pp. 89-137.
[11] Exhibit A-1, p. 202.
[12] Exhibit A-1, pp. 167-179; Exhibit A-2, pp. 138-143.
[13] Exhibit A-1, pp. 1-166, 180-197; Exhibit A-2, pp. 39-137, 144-145; Exhibit A-3, pp. 20-22.
[14] Exhibit A-1, pp. 204-266.