

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

**Date: 20250716**

**Docket: IMM-8030-24**

**Citation: 2025 FC 1265**

**Ottawa, Ontario, July 16, 2025**

**PRESENT: Madam Justice Sadrehashemi**

**BETWEEN:**

**HODA SEIGHAL ZANAN MASHHADI**

**Applicant**

**and**

**THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND  
IMMIGRATION**

**Respondent**

**JUDGMENT AND REASONS**

[1] The Applicant, Hoda Seighal Zanan Mashhadi, applied for a temporary resident visa (“TRV”) to Canada to visit her family for a period of twenty days. An officer at Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (“the Officer”) refused her application on May 1, 2024. Ms. Mashhadi is challenging this refusal on judicial review.

[2] The Officer refused the application because they found the Applicant had not established under paragraph 179(b) of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations*, SOR/2002-227 [IRPR] that she would leave Canada by the end of the period authorized for her stay based on the following factors: (i) insufficient finances to support her visit and (ii) significant family ties in Canada. The determinative issue on judicial review is the Officer's assessment of Ms. Mashhadi's available financial resources for her twenty-day visit.

[3] I find that the decision is unreasonable because relevant evidence contradicting the Officer's findings was not addressed. While extensive reasons are not required, an officer's decision must be transparent, intelligible and justified (*Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65 [Vavilov] at para 15. There needs to be a "rational chain of analysis" so that a person impacted by the decision can understand the basis for the determination (*Vavilov* at para 103; see also *Patel v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2020 FC 77 at para 17; *Samra v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2020 FC 157 at para 23; and *Rodriguez Martinez v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2020 FC 293 at paras 13-14).

[4] The Officer found that Ms. Mashhadi had not demonstrated sufficient funds for her twenty-day visit based on the limited bank statements and significant influxes in the account. Ms. Mashhadi and her husband also provided employment verification letters that confirm their salaries. The Officer does not mention the employment verification letters, but even more significantly, the Officer fails to address Ms. Mashhadi's brother's affidavit that explains he would financially fully support Ms. Mashhadi's stay in Canada. There is no mention of this financial support in the Officer's reasons, though it is critical in the evaluation of whether Ms.

Mashhadi has sufficient finances for her visit. On this basis alone the decision should be sent back to be redetermined.

[5] The application for judicial review is granted. Neither party raised a question for certification and I agree none arises.

**JUDGMENT in IMM-8030-24**

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

1. the application for judicial review is granted;
2. the decision dated May 1, 2024 is quashed and sent back to be redetermined by a different decision maker; and
3. no serious question of general importance is certified.

"Lobat Sadrehashemi"

---

Judge

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

**DOCKET:** IMM-8030-24

**STYLE OF CAUSE:** HODA SEIGHAL ZANAN MASHHADI v THE  
MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**PLACE OF HEARING:** TORONTO, ONTARIO

**DATE OF HEARING:** JULY 10, 2025

**JUDGMENT AND REASONS:** SADREHASHEMI J.

**DATED:** JULY 16, 2025

**APPEARANCES:**

Shahab Nazarinia	FOR THE APPLICANT
Veronica Cham	FOR THE RESPONDENT

**SOLICITORS OF RECORD:**

NIA LAW PC Barristers and Solicitors Toronto, Ontario	FOR THE APPLICANT
Attorney General of Canada Toronto, Ontario	FOR THE RESPONDENT