Federal Court  Cour fédérale

Date: 20130325

Docket: IMM-2716-12

Citation: 2013 FC 297

Ottawa, Ontario, March 25, 2013

PRESENT: The Honourable Madam Justice Gagné

BETWEEN:

MARTHA DELIA SANDOVAL MARES
KEVIN ANTONIO CASTILLO SANDOVAL
JOSE ANGEL CATILLO SANDOVAL
(BY THEIR LITIGATION GUARDIAN,
MARTHA DELIA SANDOVAL MARES)

Applicants

and

THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP
AND IMMIGRATION

Respondent

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT AND JUDGMENT

[1] This is an application pursuant to subsection 72(1) of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*, SC 2001, c 27 [Act], for judicial review of a decision of the Refugee Protection Division of the Immigration and Refugee Board [panel], dated February 21, 2012, which determined that Ms. Sandoval Mares [applicant] and her two minor children, Kevin and José

[collectively called the applicants], were not Convention refugees or persons in need of protection as defined in sections 96 and 97 of the Act.

[2] For the reasons that follow, I have concluded that the Court's intervention is not warranted in this case. The applicants' arguments amount to no more than a disagreement with the panel's credibility findings, and it is not the role of this Court to substitute its own assessment of the evidence to that of the panel. In any event, I find that the panel could reasonably conclude that there was adequate state protection and that the applicants failed to rebut the presumption of state protection in the circumstances.

Facts

[3] The applicants are citizens of Mexico from Ciudad Juarez in the state of Chihuahua. They arrived in Canada on July 11, 2009 and immediately made a claim for refugee protection. In the applicant's initial Personal Information Form [PIF], submitted in July 2009 in support of her claim, the only stated ground for the refugee claim was the applicant having been a victim of domestic violence at the hands of her former common law spouse, the father of her children. The applicant stated that her former partner was a drug addict and was physically, verbally and sexually abusive towards her throughout their relationship. The applicant also declared to immigration authorities that she was abused and threatened by her former spouse's family in the United States.

[4] In December 2000, the applicant applied for and was granted a ten-year visa for the United States. However, she stayed in Mexico until May 2007.

[5] The applicant lived with her former spouse from July 2002 to June 2005 in Mexico. As the applicant stated in her initial PIF, in May 2003 she found out that her husband consumed cocaine on a frequent basis. She also noticed at one occasion in December 2003 that her spouse's sister and her husband arrived with a small luggage in their house and left two bags containing a certain quantity of cocaine. As the applicant questioned her spouse about what he was doing, he became violent and threatened to kill her siblings.

[6] The applicant left her former partner in June 2005 in order to protect her children from their abusive father and his family, including his brother who has been accused and convicted of child abuse.

[7] In 2006, the applicant entered into a homosexual relationship with her current partner, an American citizen who then lived in the United States and often travelled to Mexico to visit the applicant. The applicant alleges that as she moved in with her female partner in Juarez, her former partner became increasingly violent and abusive. At one point, he put a gun to her head in front of her children. The applicant fled to the United States on May 22, 2007, leaving her children in Mexico in the care of their maternal grandparents. She lived in California until January 2009.

[8] In January 2009, she returned to Mexico and applied for a visa to bring her children to the United States, having found out that her parents were allowing her former spouse to see the children. As the applicant's visa application for her children was refused, she decided to travel to Canada to seek refugee protection and her female common law partner joined her in Canada.

[9] On July 4, 2011, the applicant submitted an amended PIF in which she added two new grounds for her claim, stating that she feared her former spouse not just because of the domestic violence but also because he was involved in organized crime and drug trafficking as a member of Los Aztecas drug cartel in Mexico. The applicant also described her former spouse's family members in the United States as having ties to organized crime and to corrupt police officers in Mexico.

[10] In addition, the applicant stated in her amended PIF that she was subjected to increased threats of violence by her former spouse, that she was rejected by her own family, and that she suffered harassment due to her lesbian identity. The applicant alleged that her parents disapprove of her being a lesbian and wish her to return to her former partner despite the abuse.

Decision under Review

[11] The panel conducted a thorough and lengthy analysis of the applicant's various allegations and came to the conclusion that she lacked both a subjective and an objective fear of persecution. The panel considered the determinative issues to be the applicant's lack of credibility with respect to some of her new allegations, the availability of adequate state protection, an internal flight alternative [IFA] in Mexico, as well as the applicant's failure to demonstrate a subjective fear of persecution. As I find the panel's reasons to be comprehensive and reasonable in all respects, I will summarize them in relative detail below.

Adverse credibility findings

[12] The panel found that the applicant was credible in regard to her identity as a lesbian and as a victim of domestic violence at the hands of her former common law spouse in Mexico. However, the panel found that, on a balance of probabilities, the applicant embellished her allegations to include in her second PIF narrative the allegation that her former spouse and his family were members of Los Aztecas drug cartel and had connections within the police. The panel found that nothing in the evidence demonstrated that the applicant's former partner had a formal affiliation with any drug cartel in Mexico and that had this been the case, the applicant would have undoubtedly mentioned it in her initial narrative.

[13] The applicant's explanations regarding why she did not state these facts in her initial PIF were not found reasonable or credible by the panel. The applicant notably stated that she did not know how much information to provide as she completed her PIF alone. She also stated that her basic English allowed her to understand the PIF but not the narrative, and that she was told by a translator from the community agency to focus on the information relating to domestic violence. She later mentioned that she did not remember the details of her spouse's association with Los Aztecas at the time she completed her PIF as she had tried to forget everything. The panel found that the applicant offered contradictory explanations for this major omission and was not spontaneous and trustworthy in her oral testimony.

State Protection Analysis

[14] The panel further found that the applicant's lack of concerted effort to seek any protection from the police or the judiciary at any time throughout the period when she lived with her former

spouse, or after her return from the United States, was fatal to her claim. According to her oral testimony, the applicant's former spouse was imprisoned in January 2009, prior to her leaving for Canada, and was released in November 2011. The panel found that since the applicant's former spouse was repeatedly arrested by the police and then released and that the Mexican police and judiciary had demonstrated a willingness to charge and prosecute him in regard to crimes he had committed, the applicant should have sought protection for herself and her children.

[15] The applicant testified that she did not approach the police because she had witnessed police officers engaged in the drug trade and because she believed police officers to be corrupt. She also stated that she did not seek help at any state agencies, such as women's shelters or legal advisors, because she was ashamed of having been abused. The panel found that the applicant adduced insufficient evidence to rebut the presumption of state protection or establish that the protection was inadequate in her circumstances.

[16] In view of the relevant documentary evidence, including the Hellman Report ("*Report on Human rights in Mexico*", Judith Adler Hellman), the panel determined that even though some inconsistencies existed among the sources, "the preponderance of the objective evidence regarding current country conditions suggest that, although not perfect, there is effective and adequate protection in Mexico and that Mexico is making serious efforts to address the problem of domestic violence and that police are both willing and able to protect such victims." The panel concluded that according to the jurisprudence, the applicant's subjective reluctance to seek help and her doubts concerning the effectiveness of the protection offered by the state were insufficient to rebut the presumption of state protection.

[17] The panel noted that the applicant had not taken any legal precautions to ensure that she retains legal custody of her children although she claimed that she feared her former spouse would take the children away from her. The panel further noted that during his non-custodial visits, the children's father never refused to return them to the applicant and never harmed or abused them in any way. He also consented to providing his signature and related authorisation for the purposes of procuring passports for the children to travel outside of Mexico in 2009. The panel found that there was no persuasive evidence upon which it could determine that the children's father or his family had any intention to harm them in the future or that they did so in the past. To conclude, the panel found that, on a balance of probabilities, the minor applicants faced no risk of harm at the hands of their father or his extended family in Mexico.

Persecution versus discrimination

[18] The applicant alleged that given her identity as a lesbian she faced an increased risk of harm in Mexico. She provided oral evidence regarding discriminatory remarks and actions by her former spouse, her own family or unknown community members in Mexico. The panel found that although the seriousness of such incidents cannot be understated, they do not rise to the level of persecution, as according to section 54 of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Handbook on Procedures and Criteria for Determining Refugee Status, Geneva, 1992. As per that documentation, alleged differences in treatment or discrimination amount to persecution "if the measures of discrimination will lead to consequences of a substantially prejudicial nature for the person concerned, e.g. serious restrictions on her right to earn a livelihood, her right to practice her religion or her access to normally available education facilities."

[19] Furthermore, the panel noted that the applicant did not provide any evidence of having endured persecutory practices in her daily life and did not face any restrictions to her rights that would be characterized as persecution.

Internal Flight Alternative

[20] The panel stated that since the applicant lived in Juarez with her former spouse and that, according to the documentary evidence, homophobic attitudes continue to persist particularly in smaller urban areas in Mexico, the applicant and her children could find a reasonable and accessible IFA in Guadalajara or in Mexico City. The panel stated that the applicant admitted that she and her children could live safely in one of those cities but her partner would not be able to live with them because she has no legal status in Mexico. The panel added that the applicant and her partner could return to California where the applicant's partner previously resided and where, contrary to the applicant's belief, same sex marriage is recognized.

[21] The two-part test for a finding of an IFA was established by the Federal Court of Appeal in *Rasaratnam v Canada (Minister of Employment and Immigration)*, [1992] 1 FC 706 (CA) and *Thirunavukkarasu v Canada (Minister of Employment and Immigration*), [1994] 1 FC 589 (CA). The onus was on the applicants to show, on a balance of probabilities, that i) there is a serious possibility of persecution in all parts of the country, even in the alleged IFA area, i.e. Guadalajara and Mexico City; and that ii) it would not be unduly harsh for the applicants to relocate to Guadalajara or Mexico City. Both prongs of the test were explored by the panel.

[22] Applying the first prong of the IFA test, the panel considered the applicant's allegation that she feared her former spouse would be able to find her anywhere in Mexico, with the help of his family or associates, by accessing government databases through their contacts in police and governmental authorities. The panel considered whether it would be possible for criminals to track the applicant through government databases using, for instance, the Voter's Registration Card [VRC] issued by the Mexican Federal Electoral Institute, and came to the conclusion that according to the information found in the objective documentary evidence, the VRC information is confidential and protected by law, and the Board's Research Directorate could not find any concrete example of illegal use by unauthorized parties among sources consulted (National Documentation Package, April 20, 2011, item 3.4 MEX101353.E. 2 June 2006. *Voter's Registration Card (Credencial para votar)*; item 3.6 MEX41642.E. 24 June 2003. *Information on the Clave Unica de Registro de Poblacion (CURP)*; item 14.1 Canada. October 2005. *Immigration and Refugee Board (IRB). Mexico: Selected Issues of Internal Flight Alternatives (July 2003 - July 2005)*). The panel stated that even if the database was vulnerable and not sufficiently protected, nothing indicated that specifically-targeted individuals could be tracked in the system within a reasonable time frame and the current limitations of data processing technology. The panel concluded that, on a balance of probabilities, VRC could not be used by the applicant's former spouse to track her down in Mexico.

[23] As regards the applicant's homosexuality, the panel found that although discrimination against homosexuals remains a serious issue in Mexico, the government has demonstrated a strong commitment to protect homosexual citizens, and has shown that it can provide them with adequate protection. In addition, the panel noted that there is anti-discrimination legislation in place in Mexico City as well as mechanisms through which the applicant can ensure that her rights as a

lesbian are protected (National Documentation Package, April 20, 2011, item 6.1 Reding, Andrew. December 2003. World Policy Institute. "Mexico." Sexual Orientation and Human Rights in the Americas; item 6.3 Global Rights / International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (IGLHRC) / International Human Rights Clinic (IHRC) (Harvard Law School) / Colectivo Binni Laanu A.C. March 2010. Virginia Corrigan. *The Violations of the Rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Persons in Mexico: A Shadow Report*; item 6.4 MEX102682.E. 9 January 2008. *Reports of sexual abuse committed by police officers against homosexuals, and against other vulnerable individuals* (2006 - November 2007); item 6.5 MEX103460.FE. 21 April 2010. The panel concluded that on a balance of probabilities, the applicant would not face a serious possibility of persecution due to her sexual orientation in Mexico City, or in the alternative, in Guadalajara.

[24] Applying the second prong of the IFA test, the panel noted that the applicant expressed no concerns regarding employment and housing or other relocation issues should she return to Mexico with her children, and determined that, on a balance of probabilities, she could find employment in the populous cities of Mexico City and Guadalajara.

Subjective fear analysis

[25] Lastly, the panel found that the applicant's choice not to make a claim for refugee protection in the United States was inconsistent with a subjective fear of persecution and undermined her various allegations that she feared serious harm in Mexico.

[26] The applicant offered two explanations for failing to make a refugee claim in the United States. She stated that she did not wish to be legally tied down to another country while her children

were in Mexico and further testified that she was unaware that she could file a refugee claim in the United States. The panel rejected both explanations, stating that the applicant had an American common law partner and relatives in the area she lived and worked, and could have reasonably sought consultation about obtaining legal status in that country.

[27] The panel also noted the applicant left Mexico in 2007 with the assurance that her children would be properly taken care of by her parents. According to her oral testimony, the applicant returned to Mexico in February 2009 when her former partner expressed willingness to take custody of the children, while the documentary evidence showed that the applicant's former partner was imprisoned as of January 2, 2009. The panel there concluded that the applicant's reason to return to Mexico remained unclear but the reason for her failure to seek refugee protection in the United States could not be the fact that her children were in Mexico. The panel further stated that the evidence did not demonstrate any serious possibility of persecution on a Convention ground or risk of cruel and unusual treatment or punishment or danger of being tortured in the proposed IFA area.

Issues and Standard of Review

[28] The applicant raised the following issues in this application for judicial review:

a. Did the panel err in law in making its credibility findings regarding:

i. the applicant's abuser and his family's association with a drug crime group, and,

ii. the applicant's reasons for returning to Mexico in 2009?

b. Did the panel err in law in making a veiled credibility finding regarding the children's fear of being kidnapped by their father and in doing so, ignored the evidence before it?
c. Did the panel err in law in assessing the applicant's burden to seek state protection and in doing so, misconstrued and ignored the relevant evidence and Guideline 4, *Women Refugee Claimants Fearing Gender-related Persecution*? [Gender Guidelines]?
d. Did the member err in law by ignoring evidence in the application of the IFA test?
e. Did the member err in law in misapplying the subjective fear test in relation to the applicant's failure to claim refugee protection in the United States?

[29] Although the applicant did not specifically address the issue of the appropriate standard of review, the jurisprudence has consistently held that questions of credibility, just like questions as to whether an applicant has rebutted the presumption of state protection and IFA findings, are questions of mixed fact and law, to be reviewed on a standard of reasonableness (*Villegas v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2011 FC 699 at paras 11-12; *Lopez v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2011 FC 1349 at para 14; *Soto v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2011 FC 360 at paras 17-19). In reviewing the panel's decision against the standard of reasonableness, the Court considers "the existence of justification, transparency and intelligibility within the decision-making process" and "whether the decision falls within a range of possible, acceptable outcomes which are defensible in respect of the facts and law" (*Dunsmuir v New Brunswick*, 2008 SCC 9 at para 47).

Analysis

Did the panel err in law in making its credibility findings?

[30] The applicant takes issue with a number of credibility findings made by the panel.

[31] Having carefully read the applicant's initial PIF narrative, it is clear to me that the applicant only referred to her former spouse's drug consumption and described one incident where her sister-in-law arrived at their place with a luggage and presumably left two bags of cocaine. Nothing in the narrative unequivocally indicates that the applicant's former partner or any members of his family were engaged in drug trafficking and there is no mention of them being connected in any way to drug cartels or to organized crime. The panel reasonably found that the applicant's omission was more general than a simple failure to mention the name of the group. It was open to the panel to find that if the applicant's former partner was in a notorious drug cartel, she would have stated it in more explicit terms even if she did not mention the name of the group or other details, especially considering that the applicant did elaborate in some detail on her partner's drug habit. The panel was reasonable in making an overall adverse credibility finding based on the applicant's omission to include an essential aspect of her claim in the initial narrative. As a result, the panel could reasonably reject her explanation that she was told to concentrate on the domestic violence allegations or that her basic knowledge of the English language did not allow her to understand the translated version of her narrative before signing it.

[32] The applicant takes issue with the panel's finding that her reasons for returning to Mexico in January 2009 were unclear as her former partner was in prison at that time and could not seek custody of the children or try to take them away. The applicant asserts that only after she heard that

his former spouse planned to kidnap the children she was told that he was in jail. Besides, she decided to go to Mexico because her former partner was in prison and she left shortly after she heard that he was coming out.

[33] Again, I cannot agree with the applicant that the panel erred by misstating the evidence. Firstly, the applicant did not state these details in her amended PIF narrative or in her oral testimony. As such, it was open to the panel to make this finding based on the evidence. Secondly, the panel did not base its negative credibility finding on the implausibility of the reason for her travel to Mexico, but exclusively when determining her lack of subjective fear. As a result, even if an error was committed in the assessment of the evidence, it would not be determinative of this application for judicial review (see *Hernandez v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration*), 2012 FC 197 at paras 25-32).

[34] The applicant challenges the panel's finding regarding the risk of harm faced by the minor applicants at the hands of their father or his extended family in Mexico. The applicant submits that the panel ignored the evidence regarding the criminal record and the abusive behaviour of the children's father, and made a veiled credibility finding that they did not fear being kidnapped by their father. Furthermore, the applicant argues that because the panel dismissed the children's claim without sound reasons, it also denied the minors a state protection analysis in light of their own circumstances as minors.

[35] There cannot be finding that a person is a refugee under the Act unless it is demonstrated that that person has subjective fear of persecution or risk of harm and that his or her fear or risk is

objectively well-grounded (*Flores v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2010 FC 503 at paras 26-27). Only those risks raised by the refugee claimant will be assessed.

[36] In the case at bar, no risks were raised as being faced by the minor applicants separate from those faced by their mother. Given that the principal applicant has custody of the children and that their father has had limited visitation rights since their separation in 2005, it is reasonable to find, as the panel did, that the children's subjective and objective fear is closely intertwined with their mother's. It was therefore not an error to address all claims simultaneously and come to what the Court holds to be a reasonable decision regarding the applicant's lack of objective fear. Furthermore, in reaching this conclusion the panel could reasonably rely on the evidence that the presence of the children's father in their lives has never been harmful to them. In addition, the fact that the principal applicant's parents are suspected to be in touch with her former partner is not determinative of their risk insofar as the principal applicant is the custodial parent and can take the required measures to protect her children from the alleged harm.

[37] Similarly, I find that in assessing the children's subjective fear, the panel could reasonably rely on the testimony of the principal applicant acting as the children's designated representative. As Justice Lagacé stated in *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Patel*, 2008 FC 747 at paras 21-38, where a claimant is not competent, whether by age or disability, and the evidence establishes an objective basis for his fear, the panel should determine whether the designated representative established a subjective fear in his or her role as designated representative and whether the subjective fear be inferred from the evidence. The Court accordingly held that it is not unreasonable or incorrect not to explicitly address the subjective fear of the minor child, as it is open

to the panel "to infer the subjective fear of the minor child from the evidence presented, including the testimony of the child's designated representative who was speaking on his behalf."

Did the panel err in law in assessing the applicant's burden to seek state protection and in doing so, misconstrue and ignore the relevant evidence and the Gender Guidelines?

[38] The applicant submits that the panel erred by ignoring the evidence of lack of state protection in Ciudad Juarez and in the state of Chihuahua, where the applicant lived and where the persecution took place, while there was ample evidence on this location which characterize it as a high-risk area for women.

[39] I agree with the applicant that as per the principles established in *Canada (Attorney General) v Ward*, [1993] 2 SCR 689, "[w]here a tribunal determines the applicant has failed to take steps to seek protection this finding is only fatal to the claim if the tribunal also finds that protection would have been reasonably forthcoming. A determination of reasonably forthcoming requires that the tribunal examine the unique characteristics of power and influence of the alleged persecutor on the capability and willingness of the state to protect." (*Mendoza v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2010 FC 119 at para 33(6)).

[40] However, the evidence relied upon by the applicant is essentially statistical in nature and lacks context. As a result, I am unable to conclude that this evidence should be considered "relevant, reliable and convincing evidence which satisfies the trier of fact on a balance of probabilities that the state protection is inadequate" in the applicant's specific circumstances (*Carillo v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2008 FCA 94 at para 30). It is important to bear in mind that the Court is required to presume that the panel has weighed and considered all of the evidence

unless the contrary is shown (*Florea v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)* (FCA), [1993] FCJ No 598). The panel acknowledged that all was not well in Mexico, and that there were conflicting reports as to the effectiveness of existing legislation, and reached a finding that is defensible in respect of the law and the facts of this case.

[41] Justice Russell reached a similar conclusion regarding analogous statistical evidence of lack of state protection invoked by the applicants in *Jimenez v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2011 FC 1523 at paras 33-35, where he wrote:

> Refugee protection is available to those at risk who can establish a nexus to a Convention ground. Protection is also available to those who face a personalized risk of harm in their home country. In either circumstance, the home state must be either unwilling or unable to protect its own citizens before international protection is engaged. In the present case, the state is not the agent of persecution and the Applicants, who have lived in the USA for a considerable time, did not approach the authorities in El Salvador in a meaningful way to ask for protection against those who would cause them harm.
>
> A high homicide rate in El Salvador tells us nothing about what the state can and/or will do if approached by the Applicants for protection. In order to have any relevance, in my view, the statistics would have to show what happens to those whose lives are threatened and who approach the state and ask for protection. The general homicide rate, which will include those people murdered for non-Convention reasons, as well as people who never seek protection, tells us little about the case at hand. Homicides may be epidemic in El Salvador and the authorities may be finding it difficult to improve the figures, but this does not mean they cannot or will not protect potential refugees who ask for protection.
>
> The RPD looked at the evidence and concluded that, if the authorities are approached and asked for protection in El Salvador, they can and will provide adequate protection. Reliance upon general homicide statistics does not really go to this issue and the RPD's failure to specifically address those statistics does not render the Decision unreasonable. Homicide rates vary considerably around the world. They are not in themselves a measure of the extent to which a state is willing or able to protect those who could seek protection from

> persecution under section 96, or are at risk under section 97, of the Act if given the opportunity to do so. Protection requires communication from, and the cooperation of, the person who feels at risk. In the present case, the Applicants' cooperation was not forthcoming.

[42] Furthermore, I find that the panel's findings regarding the applicant's complete failure to seek any kind of protection in Mexico do not display a lack of the sensitivity or the contextualization called for by the Gender Guidelines or the Supreme Court's decision in *R v Lavallee*, [1990] 1 SCR 852.

[43] The Court is mindful of the importance of clearly applying the Gender Guidelines and the necessity for the panel to carefully, knowledgeably, and understandingly assess what actions can be realistically expected of a woman who has suffered violence (see *Debora De Araujo Garcia v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2007 FC 79 at paras 24-28 and *Yoon v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2010 FC 1017). However, the applicant raised no specific issues or findings of fact, and I find none, that would demonstrate a lack of understanding or sensitivity on the panel's part. As Justice Layden-Stevenson pointed out in *Canseco v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, [2007] FCJ No 115 at para 10, "the gender guidelines do not necessarily absolve applicants from seeking the protection of the state." In absence of any specific allegations demonstrating a misapplication of the Gender Guidelines, I find that the panel's finding is reasonable and sufficiently supported by the evidence that the applicant did not seek protection in Mexico at any point of time. She even failed to take legal precautions to ensure that she retains legal custody of the children although she allegedly feared her former spouse might take them away from her.

[44] It is well established that a reasonable finding of adequate state protection is fatal to claims under both sections 96 and 97 of the Act. Consequently, the impugned decision must stand (*Macias v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2010 FC 598 at para 14).

[45] No question of general importance has been proposed for certification by counsel and none will be certified.

JUDGMENT

THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that:

a. This application for judicial review is dismissed.

b. No question of general importance is certified.

"Jocelyne Gagné"
Judge

FEDERAL COURT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD

DOCKET:	IMM-2716-12
STYLE OF CAUSE:	MARTHA DELIA SANDOVAL MARES ET AL v MCI
PLACE OF HEARING:	Toronto, Ontario
DATE OF HEARING:	February 12, 2013
REASONS FOR JUDGMENT AND JUDGMENT:	GAGNÉ J.
DATED:	March 25, 2013

APPEARANCES:

Eugenia Cappellaro	FOR THE APPLICANTS
Sophia Karantonis	FOR THE RESPONDENT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD:

Eugenia Cappellaro Toronto, Ontario	FOR THE APPLICANTS
Sophia Karantonis Myles J. Kirvan Deputy Attorney General of Canada Toronto, Ontario	FOR THE RESPONDENT