

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

**Date: 20130418**

**Docket: IMM-5635-12**

**Citation: 2013 FC 377**

**Ottawa, Ontario, April 18, 2013**

**PRESENT: The Honourable Mr. Justice Rennie**

**BETWEEN:**

**MAE JOY TABINGO**

**Applicant**

**and**

**THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND  
IMMIGRATION**

**Respondent**

**REASONS FOR JUDGMENT AND JUDGMENT**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview .....	1
Legislative Background .....	2
The Applicants .....	5
Discussion.....	6
Statutory Interpretation .....	6
<i>Bill of Rights</i> .....	12
Rule of Law / Unwritten Principles of the Constitution.....	14
Judicial Independence .....	18
Applicability of the <i>Charter</i> .....	20
Life, Liberty and Security of the Person .....	26
Equality .....	32
Evidence of Discrimination.....	37
Perpetuation of Stereotype .....	41
Justification for Infringement .....	43
<i>Mandamus</i> .....	43
Humanitarian and Compassionate Relief .....	43
The Application Fees .....	45
Conclusion.....	45
JUDGMENT .....	47
ANNEX A: <i>Immigration and Refugee Protection Act</i> , SC 2001, c 27.....	49
ANNEX B: <i>Canadian Bill of Rights</i> , SC 1960, c 44.....	50
ANNEX C: Canada Permanent Residents by Source Country.....	51
ANNEX D: List of Applications Determined by this Decision.....	52

**Overview**

[1] These applications concern section 87.4 of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*, SC 2001, c 27 (*IRPA*), a recent amendment introduced by Bill C-38, known as the *Jobs Growth and Long-term Prosperity Act*. Subsection 87.4(1) provides that applications for permanent residence as a member of the federal skilled worker (FSW) class made before February 27, 2008 are terminated unless an officer had made a selection decision before March 29, 2012.

[2] The applicants applied for FSW permanent resident visas before February 27, 2008. They have been waiting many years for their applications to be processed and are now subject to legislation which purports to cancel their applications without further consideration. They seek an order of *mandamus* directing the respondent to process their applications and have filed Notices of Constitutional Question alleging that section 87.4 violates the rule of law and the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* [Part I of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, Schedule B, *Canada Act 1982*, 1982, c 11 (UK), RSC, 1985, Appendix II, No 44].

[3] Eight applicants were identified to represent approximately 1400 other individuals, all of whom had commenced applications under section 18.1 of the *Federal Courts Act*, RSC 1985, c F-7, seeking similar relief. The applicants are:

- a. Mae Joy Tabingo, who applied for permanent residence at the visa office in Manila, Philippines in 2005 (IMM-5635-12);
- b. Habibollah Abedi, who applied for permanent residence at the visa office in Damascus, Syria in 2006 (IMM-8669-12);

- c. Maria Sari Teresa Borja Austria, who applied for permanent residence at the visa office in Manila, Philippines in 2005 (IMM-10307-12);
- d. Ali Raza Jafri, who applied for permanent residence at the visa office in Islamabad, Pakistan in 2007 (IMM-4866-12);
- e. Zafar Mahmood, who applied for permanent residence at the visa office in Islamabad, Pakistan in 2006 (IMM-8302-12);
- f. Sumera Shahid, who applied for permanent residence at the visa office in Islamabad, Pakistan in 2007 (IMM-3725-12);
- g. Fang Wei, who applied for permanent residence at the visa office in Hong Kong, People's Republic of China in 2007 (IMM-6165-12); and
- h. Yanjun Yin, who applied for permanent residence at the visa office in Beijing, People's Republic of China in 2007 (IMM-8747-12).

[4] For the reasons that follow, the applications are dismissed.

### ***Legislative Background***

[5] The FSW category falls within the economic class of immigrants who, pursuant to subsection 12(2) of the *IRPA*, are selected based on their ability to become established in Canada. The economic class also includes business immigrants, provincial and territorial nominees, the Canadian experience class and live-in caregivers, as well as their spouses and dependants.

[6] Section 75 of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations*, SOR/2002-227 (*Regulations*) sets out the minimum requirements for immigration as a FSW. Sections 76 to 83 of

the *Regulations* detail the selection criteria used to determine whether an applicant is able to become economically established in Canada.

[7] The number of FSW applications has consistently exceeded both Citizenship and Immigration Canada's (CIC) processing capacity and the number of immigrants permitted under the annual immigration levels plan. It could take many years for an application to be reached, let alone assessed and the necessary information updated. This delay made it difficult to align a candidate's experience and skills to Canada's current labour market needs, or so it is contended by the respondent. The ensuing backlog of FSW applications has been a concern of CIC for a number of years.

[8] To address this problem, the *IRPA* was amended in February of 2008 to introduce section 87.3. Section 87.3 authorized the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (the Minister) to issue Ministerial Instructions regarding the priority in which applications would be processed, and removed the obligation to process every application received. The Ministerial Instructions provided for a triage of applications according to revised eligibility criteria, including the establishment of categories of applicants and quotas. However, and of importance for the purposes of these proceedings, the Ministerial Instructions only applied to applications submitted after February 27, 2008.

[9] The first set of Ministerial Instructions was unsuccessful in restraining the growth of applications and reducing the backlog. A second set of Ministerial Instructions was thus introduced. The second set imposed a global cap on FSW applications; a maximum of 20,000 applications

(excluding those with an arranged employment offer) were to be processed each year. Within that cap, a maximum of 1,000 applications per occupational category were to be processed each year. Applications exceeding those limits would be returned unprocessed. A third set of Ministerial Instructions lowered this cap to 10,000 FSW applications per year and 500 per occupation.

[10] The Ministerial Instructions had two consequences. First, the annual caps on total applications prevented the backlog from growing. Second, the Instructions created a hierarchy of processing priority. Applications received under the third Ministerial Instructions were given the highest priority, followed by applications received under the second and then the first Ministerial Instructions and finally, applications from before February 27, 2008. The Ministerial Instructions slowed, but did not completely halt, the processing of applications from before February 27, 2008.

[11] CIC also attempted to reduce the backlog by confirming whether applicants were still interested in immigrating to Canada. In 2009, CIC sent letters to pending FSW applicants offering to return the application fee if applicants wished to withdraw their application. These letters stated; “No further offers to return your fee will be sent.”

[12] By April, 2011 the backlog had been reduced by 50%. Despite this progress, the government determined that further measures to eliminate the backlog were required.

[13] Before Bill C-38 received Royal Assent, CIC issued Operational Bulletin 400, which instructed that processing should not commence or continue for any FSW application received before February 27, 2008 for which a selection decision had not been made before March 29, 2012.

The application of this bulletin was successfully challenged on the grounds that it implemented proposed legislation that had not yet become law. CIC subsequently issued Operational Bulletin 413, stating that managers must continue processing all FSW applications until Bill C-38 came into force.

[14] Bill C-38 received Royal Assent on June 29, 2012. CIC issued Operational Bulletin 442 to provide guidance on its implementation. Bulletin 442 provided that applications were terminated in two situations: (1) if an officer had not made a selection decision prior to March 29, 2012; or (2) if an officer made a selection decision on or after March 29, 2012 and the application had not been finalized as of Royal Assent. This is, in fact, a subset of the first situation.

### ***The Applicants***

[15] The applicants share the common characteristic of having their FSW applications terminated. The eight applicants are citizens of diverse nationalities and applied at different Canadian visa posts, including Islamabad, Beijing, Manila and Damascus. As noted, the eight applicants represent, in turn, several thousand FSW applicants who have had their applications terminated and who have commenced applications for judicial review.

[16] The applicants, collectively, raise the following issues:

- a. Whether section 87.4 applies retrospectively and terminated the applications upon its coming into force;
- b. Whether subsections 1(a) and 2(e) of the *Canadian Bill of Rights*, SC 1960, c 44 apply to provide procedural safeguards;

- c. Whether section 87.4 is compliant with the rule of law;
- d. Whether section 87.4 respects judicial independence;
- e. Whether section 87.4 is compliant with the *Charter*;
- f. Whether the Court may issue an order for *mandamus*;
- g. Whether the applicants may request humanitarian and compassionate relief;
- h. Whether section 87.4 complies with the *Financial Administration Act*, RSC 1985, c F-11; and
- i. Whether the applicants are entitled to interest on their application fees.

## ***Discussion***

### ***Statutory Interpretation***

[17] The first, and perhaps most significant issue, is that of statutory interpretation. The applicants submit that section 87.4 (Annex A), properly construed, does not apply retrospectively to interfere with vested rights. Further, they submit that it does not operate to terminate the applications as a matter of law, but rather that individualized adjudication must follow to determine what applications the provision in fact captures; put otherwise, the applications remain extant until a subsequent administrative action or adjudicative decision is made.

[18] As I will explain, these arguments cannot be sustained. It is evident, on a principled reading of the provision, that section 87.4 was intended to terminate the applications upon its coming into force. This requires that it apply retrospectively, cancelling any entitlement the applicants may have had to have their applications considered.



[19] The modern approach to statutory interpretation is set out by E. A. Driedger in *Construction of Statutes* (2nd ed. 1983), p 87: "...the words of an Act are to be read in their entire context and in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament." As a corollary to this, when the language of the statute is precise and unequivocal, the ordinary meaning of the words plays a dominant role in the interpretive process: *Celgene Corp v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2011 SCC 1, [2011] 1 SCR 3, para 21.

[20] Section 12 of the *Interpretation Act*, RSC 1985, c I-21 also instructs that:

12. Every enactment is deemed remedial, and shall be given such fair, large and liberal construction and interpretation as best ensures the attainment of its objects.	12. Tout texte est censé apporter une solution de droit et s'interprète de la manière la plus équitable et la plus large qui soit compatible avec la réalisation de son objet.
--	--

[21] When determining what Parliament or the legislature intended, a court may reference the various ancillary principles of statutory interpretation. The applicants urge this Court to apply the presumption against interference with vested rights, the presumption against retrospectivity and the presumption that the legislature does not intend absurd or inequitable results. For the purpose of the statutory interpretation question I will assume that the applicants had a vested right to the processing of their application.

[22] Courts will not interpret legislation in a manner that removes existing rights or entitlements unless Parliament's intention to do so is clear. However, when a statute is unambiguous, there is no role for presumptions or interpretive aids, and the courts may not apply any of the interpretive presumptions noted earlier: *Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada v Canada*

*(Attorney General)*, 2012 SCC 71, paras 95, 159-160; *British Columbia v Imperial Tobacco Canada Ltd*, 2005 SCC 49, [2005] 2 SCR 473, para 71; *Gustavson Drilling (1964) Ltd v Canada (Minister of National Revenue)*, [1977] 1 SCR 271.

[23] Here, the ordinary meaning of the provision governs. The meaning and effect of the word “terminated” is clear. Section 87.4, by its terms, is explicitly designed to apply retrospectively to applications dated before February 27, 2008 and to eliminate the obligation to further process pending applications. The plain and obvious meaning of section 87.4 requires that the provision be retrospective and interfere with vested rights, regardless of any perceived unfairness. The three presumptions relied on by the applicants are displaced by the clarity of Parliament’s intention. Further, to interpret the section otherwise would leave it without any effect beyond refunding the application fee.

[24] The applicants point to various terms in section 87.4 which they contend are ambiguous and vague. In particular, the applicants identify the terms “selection criteria” and “other requirements applicable to that class” as undefined and as having multiple meanings. Additionally, the applicants argue that preliminary assessments are made at various stages in the processing of an application and therefore it is not clear what constitutes a selection decision and when it arises. Individualized evaluation is thus required.

[25] The wording does not demonstrate any ambiguity such that presumptions are triggered.

[26] The term “selection criteria” is used elsewhere in the *IRPA* and *Regulations*. Section 70 of the *Regulations* provides that a visa officer shall issue a permanent resident visa if it is established that a foreign national meets various conditions, including the “selection criteria”. Section 76 of the *Regulations* is titled “Selection Criteria” and provides the criteria on which applicants will be assessed. When read in context, as it must, this term is not vague.

[27] The phrase “other requirements applicable to that class” is also familiar to the *Regulations*. Satisfying such other requirements is a precondition for obtaining permanent residence visas and status in sections 65.1, 70 and 72 of the *Regulations*. The “other requirements” would include, for example, the minimum requirements set out in section 75 of the *Regulations*.

[28] It is apparent from the plain reading of the section that only the final decision given by an officer qualifies as a selection decision. When an application is brought forward for processing, applicants are asked to provide updated forms and supporting documents. At this stage staff at the visa office perform an initial paper screening of the file. The file is then forwarded to an officer who decides whether the applicant meets the selection criteria and other requirements applicable to the FSW class. The language of subsection 87.4(1) specifically refers to this decision, as it is the only one made under the *IRPA* by an officer.

[29] Having determined that section 87.4 is intended to operate retrospectively, the question remains whether the FSW applications at issue were terminated by operation of law when section 87.4 came into force, or whether the applications are to be terminated following an individualized assessment and decision.

[30] The respondent takes the position that the applications were terminated by operation of law at the time of Royal Assent, on June 29, 2012. The applicants submit that the termination only takes effect once an officer determines whether section 87.4 applies. I conclude that what subsection 87.4(1) entails is a non-discretionary application of the law to incontestable facts.

[31] The applicants' position is premised on the language of section 87.4, contending it necessitates a decision-making process. As I have previously found, the language in section 87.4 is clear. Section 87.4 creates objective, factual criteria for termination: (1) the application was made before February 27, 2008; and (2) an officer has not made a selection decision before March 29, 2012. These conditions either existed or did not exist for each application as of the date of Royal Assent. The legislation does not contemplate any subsequent adjudicative process, nor does it authorize the exercise of judgment or discretion in applying the law to each application. An officer is not entitled to consider an applicant's unique circumstances or to weigh various factors. No new factual determination must be made other than to identify whether or not the file contains a selection decision.

[32] It was only necessary for CIC to identify, through an administrative review, which applications had been terminated. This is distinguishable from an adjudicative process whereby an officer would decide whether to terminate an application. Again, section 87.4 entails a non-discretionary application of law to verifiable and incontrovertible facts.

[33] The applicants' statutory interpretation argument also fails when viewed through the lens of section 12 of the *Interpretation Act*. If the files are not terminated, as a matter of law, but terminated only upon some subsequent assessment, then the plain and obvious meaning of section 87.4 would be undermined.

[34] The applicants point to CIC's Operational Bulletin 442 which provides that applicants who had not received a selection decision prior to March 29, 2012 but who had subsequently received a selection decision and had their application finalized before June 29, 2012 are not affected by section 87.4. This ensures that even if an application should have been terminated by section 87.4, i.e., captured by having been decided during the transition period, the positive selection decision stands if it was made before section 87.4 became law.

[35] In my view, if the FSW application had been determined before Bill C-38 received Royal Assent then there was no pending application for section 87.4 to terminate. It ceased to be "pending". It was now spent. Section 87.4 only purports to terminate applications, not an applicant's file indicating that he or she has been accepted, much less a permanent residence visa once it has been issued. Operational Bulletin 442 is consistent with this interpretation.

[36] Finally, the applicants submit that there must be some individualized decision so that the applicants could seek judicial review in the event that their application was terminated in error. I disagree. An applicant may apply to this Court for an order of *mandamus* to compel the Minister to process an application which had been identified as terminated if in fact a positive selection decision had been made. The Court will then determine whether the application is in fact caught by section

87.4. If not, then it was never terminated (only mistakenly classified as terminated) and an order for *mandamus* may follow. Accordingly, applicants have a process for redress if their application is identified as terminated in error.

[37] My conclusion on the issue of statutory interpretation is that section 87.4 terminates the applications at issue by operation of law. The presumptions put forward by the applicants do not apply and there is no requirement for individualized adjudication. Therefore, the application for *mandamus* must fail unless the legislation is unconstitutional or contrary to the *Bill of Rights*.

### ***Bill of Rights***

[38] The *Bill of Rights* was enacted in 1960 as a statute of Parliament. While it has diminished importance in light of the *Charter*, as the *Charter* does not contain a general guarantee of “due process” or any protection for economic rights, the *Bill of Rights* retains continued significance in the landscape of Canadian jurisprudence.

[39] The applicants submit that section 87.4 violates their rights under subsection 1(a) of the *Bill of Rights*, which protects the right not to be deprived of property except by due process of law and subsection 2(e), which guarantees a fair hearing for the determination of rights and obligations (Annex B).

[40] My conclusion that there is no adjudicative process involved in terminating the applications is determinative of this issue. The due process protections of the *Bill of Rights* do not apply to legislative enactments: *Authorson v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2003 SCC 39, [2003] 2 SCR 40,

paras 42-46 and 59 and, as there is no individualized decision to terminate the applications, the *Bill of Rights* is inapplicable. The *Bill of Rights* only guarantees the fairness of proceedings before a tribunal or administrative body that determines rights and obligations.

[41] In *Authorson*, disabled war veterans relied on the *Bill of Rights* to claim interest on pension funds held in trust on their behalf by the federal government. Parliament had enacted legislation which barred any claim for interest that might otherwise be payable on the funds prior to 1990. The Supreme Court of Canada agreed that the effect of the statute was to take a property interest from a vulnerable group, in disregard of the government's fiduciary duty. However, this taking was within the power of Parliament.

[42] The Supreme Court of Canada rejected the argument that subsection 1(a) was triggered by the deprivation of property and the bar of judicial recourse. Major J, speaking for the Court, wrote:

What procedural protections for property rights are guaranteed by due process? In my opinion, the *Bill of Rights* guarantees notice and some opportunity to contest a governmental deprivation of property rights only in the context of an adjudication of that person's rights and obligations before a court or tribunal.

[...]

Similarly, s. 1(a) may be seen as conferring procedural protections against the deprivation of property that existed in 1960. Certain procedural rights in this regard have long been recognized. In *Lapointe v. Association de Bienfaisance et de Retraite de la Police de Montréal*, [1906] A.C. 535, the Privy Council recognized a right to have notice of accusations made and an opportunity to make a defence where the board of directors of a pension board stripped a police officer, who had resigned, of his pension. Where the law requires the application of discretion or judgment to specific factual situations, notice and an opportunity to contest may be required. For example, such rights may exist where the government eliminates a veteran's benefits because it believes he is no longer disabled, or

because it believes he was never a member of the armed forces. However, notice and an opportunity to make a defence are not required where the government legislates to completely eliminate such benefits.

[43] To conclude, the language of *Authorson* is dispositive of this issue:

The respondent submitted that the clear, uncontested interpretation of s. 5.1(4) of the *Department of Veterans Affairs Act* is that it is an expropriation of disabled veterans' interest on DVA-administered pensions, and as such is inoperative. But no adjudicative procedure is necessary for the non-discretionary application of a law to incontestable facts. A taxpayer could not claim procedural protections against a change in income tax rates that adversely affected him.

[44] While I accept that the applicants have incurred various expenses in making their FSW applications this is not equivalent to a deprivation of property. Rather, the applicants have freely chosen to apply to come to Canada and to incur the related expense. Their FSW application did not provide any right to, or recognizable legal interest in, the potential future economic opportunities that might come their way if they were successful. At best, the applicants possessed a mere chance to gain access to economic opportunities in Canada. No economic right had vested and any opportunity remained prospective, contingent and speculative. In sum, a pending FSW application does not constitute property within the meaning of subsection 1(a) of the *Bill of Rights*. Even if it was considered property, the *Bill of Rights* does not prevent the expropriation of property without compensation by the passage of unambiguous legislation.

***Rule of Law / Unwritten Principles of the Constitution***

[45] The applicants contend that section 87.4 is unconstitutional. They argue that the provision violates the rule of law because it is vague and has retrospective effects.



[46] Three principles underlie the rule of law. First, the law is supreme over both the government and individuals. Second, law must be created and maintained to preserve and embody a normative order. Third, the relationship between individuals and the state must be regulated by law.

[47] None of these principles speak directly to the content of legislation. In consequence, as noted by the Supreme Court of Canada “it is difficult to conceive of how the rule of law could be used as a basis for invalidating legislation ... based on its content”. The rule of law is primarily concerned with the relationship between the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government, and the legislature is only constrained in the sense that it must comply with the procedural requirements for enacting, amending and repealing legislation: *Imperial Tobacco Canada*, paras 58-60.

[48] There has been some debate as to the extent to which the rule of law and unwritten principles of the Constitution have embedded within them principles that would permit the invalidation of legislation on the basis of its content. This issue was joined in *Babcock v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2002 SCC 57, [2002] 3 SCR 3. Section 39 of the *Canada Evidence Act*, RSC 1985, c C-5, barred the production of documents and their admission into evidence upon certification by the Clerk of the Privy Council that they were confidences of the Queen’s Privy Council. It was contended that the unfairness of creating special evidentiary rules that favoured the Crown and the absence of judicial oversight of the certification process offended the rule of law. The Supreme Court of Canada rejected the argument: *Babcock*, para 57.

[49] The Supreme Court of Canada returned to the question three years later in *Imperial Tobacco* (paras 61-64) concluding that there is no constitutional guarantee that law be general in character and not confer special privileges on the government:

Nonetheless, considerable debate surrounds the question of what *additional* principles, if any, the rule of law might embrace, and the extent to which *they* might mandate the invalidation of legislation based on its content.

[...]

This debate underlies Strayer J.A.'s apt observation in *Singh v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2000 CanLII 17100 (FCA), [2000] 3 F.C. 185 (C.A.), at para. 33, that “[a]dvocates tend to read into the principle of the rule of law anything which supports their particular view of what the law should be.”

The appellants’ conceptions of the rule of law can fairly be said to fall at one extreme of the spectrum of possible conceptions and to support Strayer J.A.’s thesis. They submit that the rule of law requires that legislation: (1) be prospective; (2) be general in character; (3) not confer special privileges on the government, except where necessary for effective governance; and (4) ensure a fair civil trial. And they argue that the Act breaches each of these requirements, rendering it invalid.

A brief review of this Court’s jurisprudence will reveal that none of these requirements enjoy constitutional protection in Canada.

[50] With the exception of criminal offences and sanctions there is no requirement that legislation be prospective, even though retrospective and retroactive legislation can overturn settled expectations and be perceived as unjust: *Imperial Tobacco*, paras 69-72. Whatever personal and economic opportunities a pending FSW application may represent to an applicant, it does not equate

with, or possess the characteristics of an interest that would preclude its termination on the basis of the rule of law. Here, Parliament has expressed a clear intention that section 87.4 apply retrospectively. Though this may be perceived as unjust, it does not violate the rule of law.

[51] Section 87.4 is also not contrary to the rule of law due to vagueness. I have found that its meaning is readily apparent on a plain and obvious reading. Second, vagueness has only been used to invalidate legislation in exceedingly rare circumstances and then only in a criminal law context: *R v Spindloe*, 2001 SKCA 58, para 78.

[52] As was the case in *Imperial Tobacco*, the applicants have argued for an understanding of unwritten constitutional principles that would expand on the rights specifically provided for in the written Constitution. In particular, the applicants have argued that, embedded in the rule of law, there is a broader equality right than that provided for in section 15 of the *Charter*. Acceptance of this argument would render the written constitutional rights redundant. The recognition of unwritten constitutional principles is not an invitation to dispense with the written text of the Constitution: *Reference re Secession of Quebec*, [1998] 2 SCR 217, para 53, and, while the parameters of the unwritten principles of the Constitution remain undefined, they must be balanced against the concept of Parliamentary sovereignty which is also a component of the rule of law: Warren J Newman, *The Principles of the Rule of Law and Parliamentary Sovereignty in Constitutional Theory and Litigation* (2005) 16 NJCL 175.

[53] The argument predicated on the rule of law and unwritten principles of the Constitution is therefore dismissed.

### ***Judicial Independence***

[54] Although unwritten, judicial independence is a foundational principle of the Constitution. Judicial independence safeguards the judiciary's freedom to render decisions based solely on the requirements of the law, without interference from the executive branches of government. There are three essential conditions of judicial independence: security of tenure, financial security and administrative independence. The applicants have not identified a basis on which section 87.4 interferes with any of the essential conditions of judicial independence.

[55] In *Imperial Tobacco*, the Supreme Court of Canada emphasized that judicial independence does not include the freedom to apply only laws of which the judiciary approves. This would require "a constitutional guarantee not of judicial independence, but of judicial governance."

[56] The rule of law mandates that the government is not beyond the law. However, the government is only bound by the law as it exists from time to time. Subject always to the Constitution, both written and unwritten, Parliament may change the law and this includes barring certain claims through limitation and Crown immunity statutes: *Bacon v Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corp*, [1999] 11 WWR 51 (Sask CA), leave denied [1999] SCCA No 437.

[57] The applicants argue that section 87.4 unduly interferes with the courts by prescribing certain outcomes. They draw support for this from subsection 87.4(3) which they argue excludes any form of judicial supervision, and subsection 87.4(5) which bars any right of recourse against the Crown for damages.

[58] This argument misunderstands the origins and purpose of judicial independence. Parliament is free to craft legislation and the courts must, assuming it is constitutional, interpret and apply that legislation as written. It is not interference with judicial independence for Parliament to write legislation which leads to a certain outcome when properly applied. This is the proper function of lawmaking, of which there are many examples. *Authorson*, *Imperial Tobacco*, and *Babcock* involved legislative change or adaptation to what would otherwise be decided through judicial process. In *Authorson*, causes of action to recover interest were barred; in *Imperial Tobacco*, a duty of care and causation were decreed by legislation and in *Babcock*, relevant evidence could be rendered inadmissible by a certificate of the Clerk of the Privy Council.

[59] As I have previously explained, if any applicants believe their applications were improperly identified as terminated and can point to a positive selection decision before March 29, 2012, they may apply to the Court for an order of *mandamus*. The rule of law mandates that all administrative action must have its source in law. If CIC improperly identifies an application as terminated and refuses to process it, that action would be without a source in law and therefore amenable to the Court's jurisdiction. Additionally, this Court is not prevented from scrutinizing the legislation to ensure it is compliant with the Constitution and the *Bill of Rights*. Section 87.4 does not bar access to the courts.

[60] Finally, Crown immunity clauses, such as that contained in subsection 87.4(5), are not unconstitutional unless the statute itself is *ultra vires* on division of powers grounds: *Alberta v Kingsway General Insurance Company*, 2005 ABQB 662, para 67. In *Kingsway General Insurance Company*, the legislature of Alberta passed legislation to immunize the government from liability

resulting from insurance reforms, targeting a specific action which was pending before the Court of Queen's Bench. The Court determined that the legislation was within the competence of the legislature and did not violate the rule of law even though it barred a specific, pending action.

### *Applicability of the Charter*

[61] The applicants contend that section 87.4 infringes their rights under sections 6, 7 and 15 of the *Charter*. At the hearing, the applicants abandoned their reliance on subsection 2(d) of the *Charter*, the right to freedom of association.

[62] As a threshold issue, there is the question whether the applicants, as non-citizens residing outside of Canada, are entitled to the protection of the *Charter*. This question is one of application of the *Charter*, and not to be confused or conflated in its analysis with that of standing. The applicants are "directly affected" by the passage of Bill C-38, as to have sufficient legal interest to commence the applications. Whether the *Charter* applies or extends to non-residents is a discrete legal question.

[63] Without a doubt, as legislation enacted by Parliament, section 87.4 must be *Charter* compliant. If not, a remedy is available under section 52 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*. Similarly, *Charter* compliant legislation must be administered in a manner consistent with the *Charter*. If not, a remedy is available under section 24 of the *Charter*. In all cases, the central and controlling frame of analysis is that constitutionality is governed by effect and consequence, not legislative intent. In this case, the repercussions and effects of section 87.4 are outside of Canada, and fall upon nationals of other countries. At issue, therefore, is whether section 7 and section 15 rights are vested in

foreign, non-resident applicants. The legislation would not violate the applicants' *Charter* rights if they do not have those rights to begin with.

[64] Section 6 of the *Charter* is explicitly limited to citizens and permanent residents. Therefore, the applicants' reliance on that section must fail. However, section 7 and section 15 do not contain that explicit limitation, applying to "everyone" and "every individual" respectively.

[65] There has been clear guidance from the Supreme Court of Canada and the Federal Court of Appeal as to when the *Charter* applies to the actions of Canadian officials outside of Canada. The present case has a significant distinction from these authorities. The issue here is not whether the *Charter* applies to officers and agents of the Government of Canada when abroad, but whether it affords rights to foreign nationals outside of Canada who are affected only by legislative change of Parliament. The weight of the case law indicates that non-citizens outside of Canada may not claim the protection of the *Charter*, absent exceptional circumstances involving the actions of Canadian officials or agents abroad.

[66] Justice Edmond Blanchard considered this issue in *Slahi v Canada (Minister of Justice)*, 2009 FC 160 (aff'd 2009 FCA 259), in the context of a section 7 *Charter* claim brought by foreign nationals who had been detained at Guantanamo Bay and questioned there by Canadian officials. Justice Blanchard conducted a detailed review of the law on extra-territorial application of the *Charter*, starting with *Singh v Minister of Employment and Immigration*, [1985] 1 SCR 177. In *Singh*, it will be recalled, Justice Wilson accepted that the term "everyone" in section 7 of the

*Charter* “includes every human being who is physically present in Canada and by virtue of such presence amenable to Canadian law”.

[67] Justice Blanchard also noted Justice L'Heureux-Dubé's dissenting reasons in *R v Cook*, [1998] 2 SCR 597 wherein she noted:

I am not convinced that passage of the *Charter* necessarily gave rights to everyone in the world, of every nationality, wherever they may be, even if certain rights contain the word "everyone". Rather, I think that it is arguable that "everyone" was used to distinguish the rights granted to everyone on the territory of Canada from those granted only to citizens of Canada and those granted to persons charged with an offence.

[68] The majority in *Cook* had determined that the *Charter* did apply in the context of an American citizen who had been questioned by Canadian authorities in the United States and then faced trial for murder in Canada, without explicitly addressing Justice L'Heureux-Dubé's concern.

[69] More recently, in *R v Hape*, 2007 SCC 26, [2007] 2 SCR 292 the Supreme Court of Canada effectively overruled the majority in *Cook* and determined that the *Charter* did not apply to Canadian police officers while conducting an extraterritorial search and seizure under the authority of local officials. Writing for the majority, Justice LeBel emphasized that Canada cannot act to enforce or give effect to its laws, including the *Charter*, within the territory of another state absent that state's consent or some other exceptional basis in international law. Justice LeBel also acknowledged, but did not explicitly endorse, Justice L'Heureux-Dubé's dissent in *Cook*. I note, parenthetically, that the circumstances of this case do not involve the application of Canadian law within the territory of another state.



[70] Having reviewed these authorities, Justice Blanchard concluded, at paragraphs 47-48 that:

In summary, the jurisprudence of the Supreme Court teaches that section 7 Charter protections may be available to non-Canadians when they are physically present in Canada or subject to a criminal trial in Canada, and that Canadian citizens, in certain circumstances, may assert their section 7 Charter rights when they are outside Canada.

[...] The Applicants are not Canadian citizens. They have failed to establish the required connection to Canada. Consequently, their circumstances cannot engage a section 7 Charter right.

[71] This decision was upheld by the Federal Court of Appeal in *Slahi v Canada (Minister of Justice)*, 2009 FCA 259. The Court agreed with Justice Blanchard's determination "that section 7 was inapplicable to the applicants while detained by U.S. authorities at Guantànamo Bay because they are not Canadian citizens".

[72] In *Canada (Justice) v Khadr*, 2008 SCC 28, [2008] 2 SCR 125, the Supreme Court of Canada found that the *Charter* applied to Canadian agents who questioned Omar Khadr, a Canadian citizen, while he was detained in Guantanamo Bay. Two factors distinguish *Khadr* from the present case. First, Mr. Khadr was a Canadian citizen. Second, it was accepted that Canada had participated in a process that violated Mr. Khadr's fundamental human rights under both Canadian law and international law. This finding was at the core of the decision in *Khadr*.

[73] *Amnesty International Canada v Canada (Chief of the Defence Staff)*, 2008 FC 336 (aff'd 2008 FCA 401), involved detainees held by the Canadian Forces in Afghanistan in the context of an ongoing armed conflict. The Federal Court of Appeal upheld Justice Anne Mactavish's conclusion that while the detainees were protected by international humanitarian law, they did not have *Charter*

rights as “there has been no consent by the Government of Afghanistan to having Canadian *Charter* rights conferred on its citizens, within its territory”: *Amnesty International*, para 172.

[74] It is significant that the jurisprudence interpreting section 15 has developed in reference to Canadian society and Canadian norms and values. In *Law v Canada (Minister of Employment and Immigration)*, [1999] 1 SCR 497, Justice Iacobucci explained that discrimination promotes the view that an individual has less value “as a human being or as a member of Canadian society.” In determining whether a claim for discrimination has been made out, a court is to consider whether the claimant has a “disadvantaged position within Canadian society.” The Supreme Court of Canada recently endorsed this language in *Quebec (Attorney General) v A*, 2013 SCC 5, para 151.

[75] Other recent decisions of this Court have found that non-citizens outside of Canada generally do not hold *Charter* rights: *Zeng v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2013 FC 104, paras 70-72; *Kinsel v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2012 FC 1515, paras 45-47; *Toronto Coalition to Stop the War v Canada (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness)*, 2010 FC 957, paras 81-82. These three decisions followed Justice Blanchard’s determination that a *Charter* claim may only be advanced by an individual who is present in Canada, subject to criminal proceedings in Canada, or possessing Canadian citizenship.

[76] This limitation on the application of the *Charter* is not a recent development. Even prior to *Slahi*, the Federal Court and the Federal Court of Appeal had interpreted *Singh* as barring *Charter* claims from non-citizens outside Canada: *Canadian Council of Churches v Canada (Minister of Employment and Immigration)*, [1990] 2 FC 534 (CA) (aff’d on other grounds [1992] 1 SCR 236);

*Ruparel v Canada (Minister of Employment and Immigration)*, [1990] 3 FC 615; *Lee v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, [1997] FCJ No 242; *Deol v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, [2001] FCJ No 1034 (aff'd on other grounds 2002 FCA 271).

[77] The only exception counsel identified involved an applicant claiming the right to citizenship, rather than the privilege of immigration: *Crease v Canada*, [1994] 3 FC 480. In that case the applicant had applied for citizenship from within Canada and had a Canadian mother.

[78] The respondent does not dispute either the applicants' standing or the application of the *Charter*. The parties appear to coalesce around the proposition that the FSW applications establish a sufficient nexus with Canada to extend the reach of sections 7 and 15. The jurisprudence does not support this concession. What is in issue involves the repercussions abroad of domestic legislation. In this case, there is no question of the extra-territorial application of the *Charter* as an adjunct of the actions of Canadian officials abroad, nor is there, as I conclude on the evidence, non-compliant administration of the legislation. The issue framed by this case is whether the protections provided by sections 7 and 15 reach foreign nationals, when residing outside of or beyond Canadian territory.

[79] Despite my reservations as to the correctness of the concession, given that there is no *lis* between the parties on the issue, I will not determine the point. *Charter* jurisprudence should develop incrementally through the interface of opposing positions and interests. In any event, it is unnecessary to determine the point, as I find that the claims of infringement fail on their merits.

***Life, Liberty and Security of the Person***

[80] Section 7 of the *Charter* provides that:

<p>7. Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.</p>	<p>7. Chacun a droit à la vie, à la liberté et à la sécurité de sa personne; il ne peut être porté atteinte à ce droit qu'en conformité avec les principes de justice fondamentale.</p>
--	---

[81] A prerequisite to a discussion of the principles of fundamental justice is that the applicants' life, liberty or security interests be demonstrated to have been engaged: *Blencoe v British Columbia*, 2000 SCC 44, [2000] 2 SCR 307, para 47. I have concluded that the applicants' argument under section 7 fails at that threshold question.

[82] In *Canada (Minister of Employment and Immigration) v Chiarelli*, [1992] 1 SCR 711, the Supreme Court of Canada concluded that deportation of a non-citizen for committing serious crimes did not violate section 7. While the respondent urges *Chiarelli* as a conclusive answer to the section 7 challenge, the applicants say that this is too broad a reading, noting that the Court in *Chiarelli* did not determine whether deportation could be conceptualized as a deprivation of the right to liberty, only that it did not violate the principles of fundamental justice.

[83] In a subsequent decision the Supreme Court of Canada relied on *Chiarelli* in support of its conclusion that "the deportation of a non-citizen in itself cannot implicate the liberty and security interests protected by s. 7": *Medovarski v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2005 SCC 51, [2005] 2 SCR 539, para 46. In both decisions, the Supreme Court of Canada emphasized

that, “The most fundamental principle of immigration law is that non-citizens do not have an unqualified right to enter or remain in Canada.”

[84] These decisions are dispositive of the applicants’ section 7 arguments. While the focus was on the right to remain in Canada consequent to criminal conduct, the Supreme Court of Canada spoke at a higher level of principle when it concluded that there is no unqualified right to enter into Canada.

[85] The applicants seek to confine the scope of *Chiarelli* and *Medovarski*. They contend that their liberty and security of the person interests are engaged because immigration is a decision of fundamental personal importance and because of the psychological stress they have experienced. The applicants were assured that their applications would be processed. They incurred substantial costs and made personal sacrifices in hopes of immigrating. They waited patiently in the queue, for many years. They are now dismayed to learn that it was all for nothing.

[86] Mae Joy Tabingo, a qualified nurse, waited seven years, only to find that it was for naught. As the door she was seeking to enter closed, another door opened to other nurses who had not stood in the same line. I accept her evidence that she perceives this to be unfair.

[87] Fang Wei applied to immigrate to Canada in order to join her husband who landed as a permanent resident on June 14, 2006. Because her husband did not disclose their marriage on landing, she cannot be sponsored by him as a spouse. Ms. Wei and her husband have delayed having children as a result of their separation and her life has been “on hold”. CIC repeatedly

reassured her that “all of the applications in our inventory will be processed” and she was not advised that she could reapply under that the new Ministerial Instruction scheme.

[88] Sumera Shahid made her application in September of 2007. CIC mistakenly returned her file on the erroneous basis that she had failed to include the appropriate fee. CIC confirmed acceptance of her application in November of 2007 and advised that processing would take three to three and a half years. Ms. Shahid repeatedly inquired as to the status of her application and was reassured that a decision would be forthcoming.

[89] Ali Raza Jafri also applied in 2007 at the Islamabad visa office, based on his experience as a marketing manager. His wife and children were listed as his dependants. In 2009 he requested that his application be transferred to another visa office but this was denied. He now feels “completely betrayed” by the termination of his application. He gave up job opportunities and delayed buying a home in anticipation of immigrating.

[90] Habibollah Abedi is a citizen of Iran where he has worked as an aircraft maintenance engineer. He applied at the Damascus visa office in 2006, listing his wife and children as dependants. In 2010, his file was transferred to Warsaw and in 2012 the Warsaw office advised that it was trying to “manage arrivals” and needed to “stagger” the issuance of visas.

[91] Maria Sari Teresa Borja Austria applied at the visa office in Manila in 2005, listing her son as a dependant. She hoped to be reunited with her sister in Canada. When she applied, Ms. Austria was 49 years old and would have received 10 out of 10 points for her age. Now, she is outside of

the prescribed age range and would not be entitled to any points for her age. For Ms. Austria, the possibility of submitting a new application is no solution to having her pending application terminated.

[92] Zafar Mahmood applied in 2006 at the Islamabad visa office, with his wife and three children as dependants. CIC informed him that the anticipated processing time was 36 – 42 months, and so he expected a decision by May of 2010. His application was transferred to London in 2010 and by then the anticipated processing time had increased to 88 months.

[93] Yanjun Yin applied in 2007, listing his wife as his dependant. In March of 2010, he provided updated documentation to the Beijing visa office, as requested by that office, and anticipated that a decision would be forthcoming. Mr. Yin has been diligent in corresponding with CIC and the Minister regarding his pending application. He and his wife pursued English language and professional education in anticipation of immigrating.

[94] These circumstances are said to engage the applicants' section 7 interests.

[95] Section 7 is primarily, but not exclusively, concerned with the rights of individuals in the criminal justice context, including rights on search, seizure, detention, arrest, trial and imprisonment. However, the liberty interest protected by section 7 encompasses more than freedom from physical restraint and includes the freedom to make fundamental personal choices: *Blencoe*, paras 49, 54. Additionally, security of the person can protect both physical and psychological integrity: *New Brunswick (Minister of Health and Community Services) v G(J)*, [1999] 3 SCR 46.

[96] The applicants contend that their pending FSW applications engage these fundamental interests. The FSW process provides the sole path by which they can attain additional rights and a standard of living essential to their physical and psychological integrity. They also say that completing their applications and emotionally investing in the decision to leave their country of origin constitutes a fundamental personal choice. However, giving section 7 its widest scope, I find that there are no section 7 interests engaged by section 87.4.

[97] In *R v Morgentaler*, [1988] 1 SCR 30, Justice Wilson, speaking for herself, determined that a woman's liberty interest was engaged by restricting access to abortion. She explained at page 166, that the right to liberty "grants the individual a degree of autonomy in making decisions of fundamental personal importance." Justice La Forest endorsed this passage in *B (R), v Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto*, [1995] 1 SCR 315 at page 369, in deciding that section 7 protected the rights of parents to care for their children.

[98] In *Rodriguez v British Columbia (Attorney General)*, [1993] 3 SCR 519, Justice Sopinka wrote that personal autonomy and basic human dignity are encompassed within security of the person. This includes the right to make choices concerning one's own body and control over one's physical and psychological integrity. In *Blencoe*, the Court cautioned that only serious, state-imposed impacts on a person's psychological integrity may engage section 7: *Blencoe*, paras 56-57.

[99] I accept that the applicants have experienced stress and hardship; I also accept that the circumstances of some of the applicants are compelling. However, immigration is not of such an



intimate, profound and fundamental nature as to be comparable with a woman's right of reproductive choice, or the freedom of parents to care for their children. The ability to immigrate, particularly as a member of an economic class, is not among the fundamental choices relating to personal autonomy which would engage section 7. While it may have life-altering consequences, the possibility of immigrating to Canada as a successful FSW applicant does not engage life or liberty interests.

[100] The voluntary character of the applicants' decision to apply for a FSW visa, and to voluntarily put major life decisions in abeyance pending the outcome, is determinative of the question as to whether security of the person is engaged. Voluntariness distinguishes the applicants' situation from that in *Rodriguez*. Sue Rodriguez suffered from amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, a terminal illness. She challenged the law against assisted suicide so that she could die at the time and in the manner of her choosing. The Supreme Court of Canada accepted that she would slowly deteriorate, become dependent and lose her dignity. The hardship she experienced is incomparable in extent and dimension to that experienced by the applicants, and more importantly, she had no choice.

[101] The applicants' situation is also unlike that in *New Brunswick v G(J)* wherein the Supreme Court of Canada found that an application by the state to remove children from a parent affected the parents' security of the person. Child apprehension is a profound intrusion into private life and stigmatizes the parent who is judged as "unfit." In reaching this conclusion, Chief Justice Lamer emphasized that, "the right to security of the person does not protect the individual from the

ordinary stresses and anxieties that a person of reasonable sensibility would suffer as a result of government action.”

[102] The loss of the expectation or hope is understandably distressing. I also accept that, given the passage of time, the effect on the points awarded on the basis of age and the shift in occupational priorities reflected in successive Ministerial Instructions, the opportunity of re-applying has evaporated. Nevertheless, I find that the interests protected by section 7 are not engaged in these circumstances. In my view, the applicants have experienced the ordinary stresses and anxieties that accompany an application to immigrate. All section 87.4 did was terminate the opportunity. Therefore, the section 7 argument fails at the threshold question.

### *Equality*

[103] Subsection 15(1) of the *Charter* provides that:

15.(1) Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.

15.(1) La loi ne fait acception de personne et s'applique également à tous, et tous ont droit à la même protection et au même bénéfice de la loi, indépendamment de toute discrimination, notamment des discriminations fondées sur la race, l'origine nationale ou ethnique, la couleur, la religion, le sexe, l'âge ou les déficiences mentales ou physiques.

[104] The applicants argue that section 87.4 codifies and legitimizes past discrimination on the basis of national origin and country of residence. As such, the application and implementation of the law is discriminatory.

[105] It is also axiomatic to *Charter* analysis that, regardless of Parliament's intention or purpose, the legislation is assessed by its effects on individuals and groups. It is not enough for legislation itself to be constitutional; legislation must also be administered in a *Charter* compliant manner: *Little Sisters Book and Art Emporium v Canada (Minister of Justice)*, 2000 SCC 69; [2000] 2 SCR 1120.

[106] The applicants' evidence is that approximately 92% of the terminated applications originated in Africa, the Middle East, Asia and the Pacific, while 8% of the terminated applications originated in Europe and the Americas. They argue that the sole conclusion that can be drawn from these differential rates in the clearance of FSW backlogs is that CIC's manner of implementing the *IRPA*, namely the allocation of resources and other operational decisions, has resulted in differential treatment on the basis of national origin or residence.

[107] From this global analysis of the evidence the applicants point to specific visa posts for further support. The rate of reduction varied dramatically depending on the visa office in question. For example, Mae Joy Tabingo is a citizen of the Philippines and applied at the Manila visa office. Manila had a backlog of 21,581 files as of February 27, 2008. On June 29, 2012, there were 13,733 files remaining. In contrast, the Buffalo office in the United States had 17,225 applications in its backlog as of February 27, 2008. On June 29, 2012, there were only 9 remaining files to be terminated.

[108] This is significant because subsection 11(1) of the *Regulations* requires persons applying for a permanent resident visa to apply at the visa office serving their country of citizenship or residence.

The objective of this regulation is to ensure that applications are assessed by the visa posts best situated to verify and assess the application materials. This does not mean, however, that applications, once received, are necessarily processed in that country's visa post.

[109] As a matter of first impression, the visa office processing rates support the inference that nationals of the Americas and Europe have been prioritized over those from Asia, the Pacific, the Middle East and Africa, and support the claim of differential treatment based on national origin. Closer examination reveals a different picture.

[110] As a preliminary issue, I note that national origin is an enumerated ground of discrimination and that citizenship has been recognized as an analogous ground. The applicants primarily rely on national origin for their section 15 argument. They have placed less emphasis on country of residence, which they argue is a ground of discrimination analogous to those set out in section 15.

[111] There is no case law which suggests that country of residence is an analogous ground.

[112] Analogous grounds arise or are established on the basis of personal characteristics that are immutable, or changeable only at unacceptable cost to personal identity. When determining whether grounds of discrimination are analogous to those listed in section 15, courts should consider whether the characteristics at issue have historically served as “illegitimate and demeaning proxies for merit-based decision making” and whether the distinction being drawn affects a “discrete and insular minority or a group that has been historically discriminated against”: *Corbiere v Canada (Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs)*, [1999] 2 SCR 203, para 13.

[113] The applicants point to *R v Turpin*, [1989] SCR No 1296 wherein the Supreme Court of Canada left it open that a person's province of residence might, in appropriate circumstances, ground a claim of discrimination. Further, in *Corbiere*, the Court found that the residence of aboriginal Canadians, specifically the question of whether an aboriginal band member lives on or off a reserve, is an analogous ground of discrimination. However, the Court made it clear that residence decisions faced by non-aboriginal Canadians should not be confused with the profound decisions aboriginal band members make to live on or off their reserves, assuming choice is possible. Aboriginal identity, including identification with an ancestral land, is unique. The situation in *Corbiere* is not comparable to that of the applicants.

[114] It is doubtful that country of residence could be an analogous ground. Country of residence is not an immutable characteristic, nor is it vital to identity, given the applicants' willingness to immigrate. Nor are the applicants a discrete and insular minority, and certainly not such a group within Canadian society. Country of residence, in contrast to race and religion, does not have the same historical antecedence of being a basis for discrimination, nor is there sufficient evidence that would establish that residence is an illegitimate or demeaning proxy for merit-based decision making. Accordingly, I find that country of residence is not an analogous ground of discrimination under section 15 of the *Charter* and turn to the applicants' argument based on national origin.

[115] Finally, it is said that the applicants share the common characteristic or condition of economic disadvantage and in some cases, poverty. It is difficult to make a singular finding of financial circumstances across a broad class of individuals, resident in all corners of the globe. This

aside, poverty or economic disadvantage is not an immutable, indelible personal characteristic.

Financial circumstances and the associated social conditions change; individual fortunes may ebb and flow, several times, over a lifetime, as may the general social and economic condition of their country of origin.

[116] In *Withler v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2011 SCC 12, [2011] 1 SCR 396 the Supreme Court of Canada cautioned against a formalistic approach to section 15 and the rigid reliance on comparator groups. The Court re-focused section 15 on the core question of substantive discrimination, the foundational principle expressed in *Andrews v Law Society of British Columbia*, [1989] 1 SCR 143.

[117] Section 15 does not guarantee identical treatment. Given that the search is for substantive discrimination, differential treatment is not necessarily discriminatory. Justice McIntyre explained discrimination in *Andrews* as follows:

[...] discrimination may be described as a distinction, whether intentional or not but based on grounds relating to personal characteristics of the individual or group, which has the effect of imposing burdens, obligations, or disadvantages on such individual or group not imposed upon others, or which withholds or limits access to opportunities, benefits, and advantages available to other members of society. Distinctions based on personal characteristics attributed to an individual solely on the basis of association with a group will rarely escape the charge of discrimination, while those based on an individual's merits and capacities will rarely be so classed.

[118] In determining whether a law is discriminatory within the meaning of section 15, there is a two part test: (1) whether the law creates a distinction based on an enumerated or analogous ground;

and (2) whether the distinction creates a disadvantage by perpetuating prejudice or stereotyping:

*Withler*, paras 30-31. Put otherwise, not all distinctions are discriminatory.

### ***Evidence of Discrimination***

[119] On its face, section 87.4 only differentiates FSW applicants based on the date of application. However, I accept the applicants' evidence that processing rates varied between visa offices, such that section 87.4 had a differential impact and outcome depending on where an applicant applied. That however, does not necessarily indicate a distinction based on an enumerated or analogous ground.

[120] The applicants are a diverse group. They share no commonality of race, national or ethnic origin, colour or religion. They are nationals of various countries, having made their FSW applications in the Philippines, Syria, Pakistan and China. The eight applicants in turn represent hundreds of additional applicants across the global spectrum of race, nationality and religion.

[121] There is some dispute between the parties with regards to the statistical evidence. The applicants have argued that the respondent's evidence should be given little weight because its affiants do not have personal knowledge of the statistical evidence they provided. While the statistics are hearsay, I consider the evidence reliable and necessary in the circumstances. I doubt that statistics regarding the FSW program in an organization as large and complex as CIC could be within the personal knowledge of any particular affiant. Additionally, apart from the objection raised at the level of principle against the receipt of hearsay evidence, no precise or particular deficiency was raised that might call the accuracy or reliability of the evidence into question.

[122] Once received, CIC transferred many applications between visa offices for processing. 10,000 applications were transferred from the Islamabad visa office to London and of these, 512 were processed. Ali Raza Jafri, Sumera Shahid and Zafar Mahmood's applications are among those that were transferred from Islamabad to London in 2010 and 2011. Additionally, 6,000 files and 4,600 files were transferred from Damascus and New Delhi, respectively, to Warsaw. Nearly 10,000 of these applications were processed in Warsaw. The applicant Habibollah Abedi's application was transferred to Warsaw in 2010.

[123] On February 27, 2008, there were 29,423 files in the backlog inventory at the visa offices in Africa and the Middle East. On June 29, 2012, 17,257 files remained in the backlog, a 41% reduction. However, the applicants note that 769 files which originated in Damascus were transferred to Warsaw but not processed. Adding these files back, there were 18,026 files remaining which originated from the Africa and Middle East region, a 39% reduction in the backlog from this region.

[124] For the Asia and Pacific region, there were 123,923 applications in the backlog on February 27, 2008. As of June 29, 2012, 62,265 files remained, indicating the backlog was reduced by 50%. Again, adding back the 9,503 files transferred from Islamabad and New Delhi but not processed, 71,768 files remained, a 42% reduction in the backlog.



[125] Overall, 39% of the backlog files originating in Africa and the Middle East and 42% of the files originating in Asia and the Pacific were processed before section 87.4 became law. In comparison, 88% of the backlog files from Europe and 92% from the Americas were processed.

[126] This evidence demonstrates, in the applicants' view, that the Africa, Asia and Middle East visa posts were chronically and deliberately under-resourced, reflecting discrimination against FSW applicants from countries served by those offices. Applicants from those regions were presumed to be less worthy, less capable of being successful immigrants, and therefore the corresponding visa posts were resourced at lower levels.

[127] The respondent provided evidence to explain the different processing rates between the various offices.

[128] James McNamee is the Director for the Immigration Strategies and Analysis Division, Strategic Policy and Planning Branch for CIC. He explained that each mission receives a varied mix of applications including temporary resident visa applications and non-FSW permanent resident applications such as those in the family class. Temporary resident visas, which include visitors, international students and temporary foreign workers, may be prioritized because they are time sensitive.

[129] David Manicom, Director General of the Immigration (Policy) Branch for CIC gave evidence that external factors influence CIC's ability to resource certain visa offices. For example, natural disasters, political instability and regional conflicts resulted in temporary and partial closures

at the visa offices in Islamabad and Damascus. Additionally, staff turnover varies between offices. During 2007 and 2008, the Accra, Ghana regional processing centre lost five of its six decision makers. Finally, Mr. Manicom noted that there are physical and security limitations to adding more resources. At various times in the past six years, the Accra, Cairo, Damascus, Islamabad, Manila, Nairobi, New Delhi and Pretoria offices have been staffed at their maximum, given the availability of space.

[130] Mr. Manicom also explained that applications from certain regions require more time and resources to process. The Accra office is illustrative. Mail service is unreliable and bandwidth for e-mail and other telecommunications has been problematic. Documentation can be of poor quality and fraud is elevated, requiring additional verification measures. Local conditions make verification of birth, education and training credentials more difficult and time-consuming.

[131] Additionally, Mr. Manicom testified that certain visa offices had different priorities. The Damascus, Cairo and Nairobi offices processed large numbers of refugees. For Manila, the Live-In Caregiver Program and Provincial Nominee Program were of increased importance.

[132] Mr. Manicom also gave evidence regarding the Buffalo regional processing centre, which was responsible for applications out of the United States and Canada. Because many of the applications in Buffalo were by persons already in Canada, it was allocated a larger portion of the total FSW immigration targets. This is because applicants applying in Buffalo are often already studying, living and working in Canada. Additionally, many of these applicants had arranged employment opinions or work permits which rendered them eligible for priority processing.

[133] There is one element of the evidence which is particularly compelling on the question as to whether the difference in clearance rates is evidence of discrimination. Each visa office processes applicants from many different countries. For example, citizens of the United States, Great Britain and France represent a only a small percentage of cases processed at the Buffalo, London and Paris offices, 7%, 14% and 7% respectively. Applicants from India represent 26% of the cases processed in Buffalo and 21% of the cases processed in London. Applicants from China represent 18% of the total cases processed in Buffalo while applicants from Iran represent 9% of the cases processed at that post. Citizens of Pakistan represented 17% of all applications processed in London.

[134] Having reviewed this evidence, I conclude that the applicants have not demonstrated that section 87.4 has had a disproportionate impact on the basis of national origin. The evidence is that CIC transferred files from high demand posts to lower demand posts in order to facilitate timelier processing. Additionally, the high clearance rate at the Buffalo post does not represent a bias towards applicants from the United States, as only 7% of the applicants at that office were in fact Americans. Rather, the Buffalo office managed time-sensitive and priority applications from individuals already lawfully in Canada. The applicants submit that CIC discriminated against individuals from Asia, the Middle East and Africa; however, 69% of the applications processed in Buffalo, which had one of the highest clearance rates, were from citizens of those regions.

#### *Perpetuation of Stereotype*

[135] Turning to the second part of the section 15 test, the evidence does not indicate that section 87.4 perpetuates a disadvantage through prejudice or stereotyping. The applicants contend that in

failing to dedicate the necessary resources to the posts in Africa, the Middle East and Asia, CIC perpetuated the view that individuals in those countries are less worthy or desirable. Again, however, this argument fails under closer scrutiny. Persons from Africa and the Middle East represented about 23% of those who entered Canada in the economic class between 2002 and 2011. Half of all economic immigrants during that time were from Asia and the Pacific. In total, approximately 73% of Canada's economic immigrants are from the very regions that the applicants argue are viewed as undesirable (Annex C).

[136] The applicants have argued that section 87.4 perpetuates the mistaken belief that applicants who applied before February 27, 2008 are less qualified to immigrate. I accept the applicants' evidence that there are many qualified applicants in the backlog. Notably, Mr. McNamee gave evidence that, even up to the date the backlog was terminated, the backlog was successfully mined to find qualified applicants for the Provincial Nominee Program. Additionally, approximately one-third of all FSW permanent resident visas in 2011 were issued to applicants in the backlog. These visas would not have been issued if the applicants were not qualified. However, the date of application is not an enumerated or analogous ground and so stereotyping on this basis does not constitute discrimination.

[137] Section 87.4 must be considered in light of the wider immigration context. Visa offices do not only process FSW applications, but also a wide-range of visa applications, which have different priorities. Certain visa offices face unique challenges, such as weaker infrastructure, higher instances of fraud, or an influx of refugee claims. As the historical evidence consistently indicated, globally viewed, economic immigrants from Asia, the Middle East and Africa become Canadian

permanent residents in large numbers. The evidence does not support the claim that section 87.4 is discriminatory.

### ***Justification for Infringement***

[138] As I have found that no section 7 interest is triggered by the termination of the FSW files, and that section 87.4, in its purpose or effect, is not discriminatory within the meaning of section 15, I will not address section 1 of the *Charter*.

### ***Mandamus***

[139] *Mandamus* is available to compel a public authority to perform a duty that it is obligated to do under its enabling statute. As I have found that section 87.4 of the *IRPA* unambiguous and constitutionally valid legislation, the applications are terminated and the respondent has no legal duty to continue to process them. There can be no order for *mandamus*.

[140] The applicants have argued that, even before section 87.4 came into force, the respondent had already breached their rights to timely processing of their applications and that there must be some remedy for this past breach. This argument fails as *mandamus* cannot remedy a past breach when there is no present duty.

### ***Humanitarian and Compassionate Relief***

[141] The applicants advance an alternative argument. They say that even if their files were terminated, they are entitled, under section 25 of the *IRPA*, to apply for humanitarian and compassionate (H&C) relief from the application of section 87.4. The applicants note that the

Minister used a similar section to assist applicants who were issued visas in error even though their applications were captured by section 87.4. On the basis of the Minister's own conduct, it is said that the applicants are entitled to H&C consideration.

[142] Section 25.2 allows the Minister to grant permanent resident status to a foreign national who is otherwise inadmissible or who does not meet the requirements of the *IRPA* if the Minister is satisfied that the decision is justified on public policy considerations. It is axiomatic that, save for the public policy exception, an H&C application is not a free-standing, independent vehicle for entry; rather it is an authority in the Minister to grant relief from requirements or provisions of the *IRPA* in an otherwise deficient application or claim. Here, there is no application, nor any requirements which could be waived on H&C grounds.

[143] Applicants who were issued a visa in error were sent a letter informing them that their visa was invalid. They were then sent a subsequent letter explaining that the Minister considered there to be public policy considerations which warranted granting the visa and necessary exemptions. The letter asked the applicants to sign and date the letter to indicate that they wished to take advantage of the provision and to return it along with certain documents.

[144] The applicants submit that if the underlying application had been terminated, then the Minister could not invoke section 25.2. Those individuals had already been issued permanent resident visas; some may have already landed in Canada. I see no conflict between the Minister's decision under section 25.2 and his position in the present applications. The nature of the discretion

conferred under section 25.2 is very broad, and, in any event, no request has been made to the Minister nor is there a refusal. The argument is thus premature.

### ***The Application Fees***

[145] The applicants submit that subsection 87.4(4), which provides that the application fees will be returned, is outside of the jurisdiction of the *IPRA* because only the *Financial Administration Act* can bind the Treasury Board. However, I agree with the respondent's submission that there is concurrent authority for this under the *IRPA* and the *Financial Administration Act*. The applicants also argue that subsection 87.4(4) violates subsection 19(2) of the *Financial Administration Act* which provides that application fees cannot exceed the costs. They argue that the respondent is required to pay interest on the application fees.

[146] There is no indication in the record that interest was earned or that the fees exceeded the costs associated with the applications. While the applications were not ultimately processed to conclusion, CIC still required resources to initially accept and manage the applications. In any event, even if there was an evidentiary foundation to the argument, any entitlement to interest was extinguished by section 87.4. For this reason, the applicants' unjust enrichment argument must also fail: *Authorson*.

### ***Conclusion***

[147] As noted earlier, the applicants have waited in the queue for many years only to find the entrance door closed. They see the termination of their hope for a new life in Canada to be an unfair, arbitrary and unnecessary measure. However, section 87.4 is valid legislation, compliant

with the rule of law, the *Bill of Rights* and the *Charter*. The applications have been terminated by operation of law and this Court cannot order *mandamus*.

[148] In light of the serious issues raised and the general importance of this matter to many thousands of applicants the following questions will be certified:

- a. Does subsection 87.4(1) of the *IRPA* terminate by operation of law the applications described in that subsection upon its coming into force, and if not, are the applicants entitled to *mandamus*?
- b. Does the *Canadian Bill of Rights* mandate notice and an opportunity to make submissions prior to termination of an application under subsection 87.4(1) of the *IRPA*?
- c. Is section 87.4 of the *IRPA* unconstitutional, being contrary to the rule of law or sections 7 and 15 the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*?



## JUDGMENT

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

1. The application for judicial review is dismissed.
2. The applications for judicial review in the following proceedings are dismissed for the reasons given in this proceeding:
  - a. IMM-8669-12: Habibollah Abedi v Minister of Citizenship and Immigration;
  - b. IMM-10307-12: Maria Sari Teresa Borja Austria v Minister of Citizenship and Immigration;
  - c. IMM-4866-12: Ali Raza Jafri v Minister of Citizenship and Immigration;
  - d. IMM-8302-12: Zafar Mahmood, Shabnum Zafar, Abdul Majid Zafar, Abdul Sammad Zafar v Minister of Citizenship and Immigration;
  - e. IMM-3725-12: Sumera Shahid v Minister of Citizenship and Immigration;
  - f. IMM-6165-12: Fang Wei v Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; and
  - g. IMM-8747-12: Yanjun Yin v Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.
3. These Reasons for Judgment and Judgment apply in respect of all files listed in Annex D hereto.
4. Leave is hereby granted to the parties to bring a motion beyond the ten day requirement specified in Rule 397 to vary the terms of this judgment by amending Annex D to address any omissions or errors in that Annex.
5. The following questions are certified pursuant to subsection 74(d) of the *IRPA*:

- a. Does subsection 87.4(1) of the *IRPA* terminate by operation of law the applications described in that subsection upon its coming into force, and if not, are the applicants entitled to *mandamus*?
  - b. Does the *Canadian Bill of Rights* mandate notice and an opportunity to make submissions prior to termination of an application under subsection 87.4(1) of the *IRPA*?
  - c. Is section 87.4 of the *IRPA* unconstitutional, being contrary to the rule of law or sections 7 and 15 the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*?
6. Submissions on costs are due within twenty days of the date of this decision.

"Donald J. Rennie"

---

Judge

## ANNEX A

***Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, SC 2001, c 27*****Section 87.4**

87.4 (1) An application by a foreign national for a permanent resident visa as a member of the prescribed class of federal skilled workers that was made before February 27, 2008 is terminated if, before March 29, 2012, it has not been established by an officer, in accordance with the regulations, whether the applicant meets the selection criteria and other requirements applicable to that class.

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply to an application in respect of which a superior court has made a final determination unless the determination is made on or after March 29, 2012.

(3) The fact that an application is terminated under subsection (1) does not constitute a decision not to issue a permanent resident visa.

(4) Any fees paid to the Minister in respect of the application referred to in subsection (1) — including for the acquisition of permanent resident status — must be returned, without interest, to the person who paid them. The amounts payable may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

(5) No person has a right of recourse or indemnity against Her Majesty in connection with an application that is terminated under subsection (1).

***Loi sur l'immigration et la protection des réfugiés (LC 2001, ch 27)*****article 87.4**

87.4 (1) Il est mis fin à toute demande de visa de résident permanent faite avant le 27 février 2008 au titre de la catégorie réglementaire des travailleurs qualifiés (fédéral) si, au 29 mars 2012, un agent n'a pas statué, conformément aux règlements, quant à la conformité de la demande aux critères de sélection et autres exigences applicables à cette catégorie.

(2) Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas aux demandes à l'égard desquelles une cour supérieure a rendu une décision finale, sauf dans les cas où celle-ci a été rendue le 29 mars 2012 ou après cette date.

(3) Le fait qu'il a été mis fin à une demande de visa de résident permanent en application du paragraphe (1) ne constitue pas un refus de délivrer le visa.

(4) Les frais versés au ministre à l'égard de la demande visée au paragraphe (1), notamment pour l'acquisition du statut de résident permanent, sont remboursés, sans intérêts, à la personne qui les a acquittés; ils peuvent être payés sur le Trésor.

(5) Nul n'a de recours contre sa Majesté ni droit à une indemnité de sa part relativement à une demande à laquelle il est mis fin en vertu du paragraphe (1).

## ANNEX B

**Canadian Bill of Rights, SC 1960, c 44****subsection 1(a)**

1. It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed and shall continue to exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely,

(a) the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law;

**subsection 2(e)**

2. Every law of Canada shall, unless it is expressly declared by an Act of the Parliament of Canada that it shall operate notwithstanding the *Canadian Bill of Rights*, be so construed and applied as not to abrogate, abridge or infringe or to authorize the abrogation, abridgment or infringement of any of the rights or freedoms herein recognized and declared, and in particular, no law of Canada shall be construed or applied so as to [...]

(e) deprive a person of the right to a fair hearing in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice for the determination of his rights and obligations;

**Déclaration canadienne des droits (SC 1960, ch 44)****paragraphe 1(a)**

1. Il est par les présentes reconnu et déclaré que les droits de l'homme et les libertés fondamentales ci-après énoncés ont existé et continueront à exister pour tout individu au Canada quels que soient sa race, son origine nationale, sa couleur, sa religion ou son sexe :

a) le droit de l'individu à la vie, à la liberté, à la sécurité de la personne ainsi qu'à la jouissance de ses biens, et le droit de ne s'en voir privé que par l'application régulière de la loi;

**paragraphe 2(e)**

2. Toute loi du Canada, à moins qu'une loi du Parlement du Canada ne déclare expressément qu'elle s'appliquera nonobstant la *Déclaration canadienne des droits*, doit s'interpréter et s'appliquer de manière à ne pas supprimer, restreindre ou enfreindre l'un quelconque des droits ou des libertés reconnus et déclarés aux présentes, ni à en autoriser la suppression, la diminution ou la transgression, et en particulier, nulle loi du Canada ne doit s'interpréter ni s'appliquer comme [...]

e) privant une personne du droit à une audition impartiale de sa cause, selon les principes de justice fondamentale, pour la définition de ses droits et obligations;

## ANNEX C

## Exhibit "K"

## Facts and figures 2011 – Immigration overview: Permanent and temporary residents

## Permanent residents

## Canada – Permanent residents by source country

Number										
Source country	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Philippines	11,011	11,987	13,303	17,525	17,718	19,067	23,727	27,277	36,580	34,991
China, People's Republic of	33,304	36,251	36,429	42,292	33,078	27,013	29,337	29,051	30,195	28,696
India	28,838	24,594	25,573	33,141	30,746	26,047	24,548	26,117	30,252	24,965
United States	5,294	6,013	7,507	9,263	10,943	10,449	11,216	9,723	9,245	8,829
Iran	7,889	5,651	6,063	5,502	7,073	6,663	6,010	6,064	6,815	6,840
United Kingdom	4,724	5,199	6,062	5,864	6,541	8,128	9,243	9,565	9,499	6,550
Haiti	2,217	1,945	1,657	1,719	1,650	1,614	2,509	2,085	4,552	6,208
Pakistan	14,173	12,351	12,793	13,575	12,329	9,545	8,051	6,213	4,986	6,073
France	3,962	4,127	5,028	5,430	4,915	5,526	6,383	7,299	6,934	5,867
United Arab Emirates	4,444	3,321	4,358	4,053	4,100	3,368	4,695	4,640	6,796	5,223
Iraq	1,365	969	1,140	1,316	977	1,601	2,570	4,567	4,545	4,698
Korea, Republic of	7,334	7,089	5,337	5,819	6,178	5,866	7,246	5,864	5,539	4,573
Colombia	3,225	4,273	4,438	6,031	5,813	4,833	4,995	4,240	4,796	4,317
Morocco	4,057	3,243	3,471	2,692	3,109	3,789	3,906	5,221	5,946	4,155
Algeria	3,030	2,786	3,209	3,131	4,513	3,172	3,228	4,785	4,124	3,800
Mexico	1,918	1,738	2,245	2,854	2,830	3,224	2,831	3,104	3,866	3,642
Egypt	1,634	1,929	2,051	2,062	1,651	1,969	2,314	2,486	4,305	3,403
Sri Lanka	4,968	4,448	4,134	4,690	4,490	3,934	4,508	4,270	4,181	3,104
Nigeria	1,281	931	1,369	2,034	2,481	2,255	1,837	2,661	3,268	2,768
Ukraine	3,576	2,781	2,401	2,317	1,880	2,170	1,874	2,300	3,097	2,455
Bangladesh	2,615	1,896	2,374	3,940	3,838	2,735	2,716	1,854	4,364	2,449
Lebanon	1,723	2,600	2,673	3,122	3,290	3,018	2,827	2,531	2,453	2,335
Saudi Arabia	2,538	2,042	2,111	2,364	2,227	1,649	2,357	2,025	2,801	2,299
Germany	1,624	2,098	2,387	2,635	3,030	2,555	4,057	4,081	3,190	2,254
Ethiopia	802	1,326	1,439	1,370	1,647	1,424	1,473	1,212	1,746	2,038
Jamaica	2,457	1,983	2,130	1,880	1,686	2,113	2,312	2,427	2,256	2,021
Afghanistan	2,971	3,010	2,527	2,908	2,552	2,262	1,811	1,507	1,549	1,977
Israel	2,605	2,366	2,857	2,549	2,692	2,446	2,633	2,364	2,798	1,967

## ANNEX D

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Mae Joy TABINGO</b>	<b>IMM-5635-12</b>
1	Michael Rashin	IMM-5481-12
2	Adewale Soneye	IMM-5482-12
3	Kakaly Sultana	IMM-5483-12
4	Salman Fazal Mohamed Elrafie Mustafa Salih	IMM-5484-12
5	Mamdouh Adib Ghattas Mikhail	IMM-5485-12
6	Chih Ming Tseng	IMM-5486-12
7	Mangala Janaki Rajapakse	IMM-5487-12
8	Nabil Zein	IMM-5490-12
9	Emmanuel Chinonyelum Uba	IMM-5493-12
10	Arunangshu Dutta	IMM-5494-12
11	Maria Adaku Obi	IMM-5496-12
12	Odai Ja'afar Sadik	IMM-5498-12
13	Ibrahim Mahmoud AbdelRahman Ibrahim	IMM-5499-12
14	Ribhi Asfour	IMM-5500-12
15	Farouk Abdel-Hamid Farid Mahmoud	IMM-5501-12
16	Antonio Hilarion Manuel	IMM-5502-12
17	Bolormaa Dorjpalam	IMM-5503-12
18	Cheng Wah Cheow	IMM-5505-12
19	Cherry Corpuz	IMM-5506-12
20	Neil Smith	IMM-5507-12
21	Sanja Culakovska	IMM-5508-12
22	Abdelghani Ahmed Said	IMM-5509-12
23	Dharmendra V Shunmugam	IMM-5511-12
24	Qutaiba Soufi	IMM-5512-12
25	Nowfal Hani Taha	IMM-5514-12
26	Edwin Chime Oji	IMM-5515-12
27	Thomas Thompson Talabi	IMM-5516-12
28	Imran Muhammad Aslam	IMM-5517-12
29	Mamour Ba	IMM-5519-12
30	Flochova Jana	IMM-5520-12
31	Nohra Eugenia Posada	IMM-5521-12
32	Jyotinder Singh	IMM-5524-12
33	Amith Krishnan	IMM-5525-12
34	Jaime Garcia	IMM-5526-12
35	Ramiz Raci	IMM-5527-12
36	Kaan Alkan	IMM-5528-12
37	Fareeha Rasool	IMM-5529-12
38	Rahat Kazi	IMM-5530-12
39	Sonia Rohama Gill	IMM-5533-12
40	Ahmed Ismail	IMM-5534-12
41	Bassem Koujak	IMM-5540-12
42	Leslie, Whai Lee Low	IMM-5541-12
43	OLUWATOYIN Muraina Lawal	IMM-5542-12
44	Aigbe Olotu	IMM-5543-12
45	Mahmoud Terri	IMM-5544-12
46	Hana Al-Jarrah	IMM-5546-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Mae Joy TABINGO</b>	<b>IMM-5635-12</b>
47	Estela Aclan	IMM-5547-12
48	Mahajaheen Shirazi	IMM-5548-12
49	Venkatesh Subbiah	IMM-5553-12
50	Vittal Reddy Suriyagari	IMM-5555-12
51	Amrit Singh Randhawa	IMM-5557-12
52	Azeem Adnan	IMM-5558-12
53	Amit Singh	IMM-5560-12
54	Willy Diakola Mvemba	IMM-5562-12
55	AdelGaber Aly Mansi	IMM-5564-12
56	Vijay Vishwabandhu Jobanputra	IMM-5566-12
57	Swhail Najim Abbood Al-Jubouriy	IMM-5567-12
58	Chetan Hirubhai Patel	IMM-5568-12
59	Houda Kabalan EP, Omar Houssami	IMM-5569-12
60	Nagalakshmi, Shanmugam	IMM-5570-12
61	Lawrence Uchenna Oguejiofor	IMM-5571-12
62	Watanjot Kaur	IMM-5572-12
63	Zaid Abdulatteef Enayatullah Alemari	IMM-5573-12
64	Oluwayemisi Ruth Oyewumi	IMM-5574-12
65	Nidhi Sood	IMM-5575-12
66	Sarafa Adetona Soyemi	IMM-5576-12
67	Selma Elizabeth Malathi D'Souza	IMM-5577-12
68	Hemantkumar Chhotalal Joshi	IMM-5578-12
69	Ifeoluwa Dorcas Akintade	IMM-5579-12
70	Tammy Patience Egwe	IMM-5580-12
71	Sriram Raj Pande	IMM-5581-12
72	Olusegun Olutobi Sobande	IMM-5582-12
73	Pratap Sinha	IMM-5583-12
74	Jacintha Victor	IMM-5584-12
75	Esther Folashade Moronkeji	IMM-5585-12
76	Emmanuel Onyedika Okpara	IMM-5586-12
77	Adefemi Adetayo Adsina	IMM-5590-12
78	Tigura Sankar Reddy	IMM-5591-12
79	Jude Idemudia Okoh	IMM-5592-12
80	Clifford Obiyo Ofurum	IMM-5593-12
81	Asim Nasarullaha	IMM-5594-12
82	Ada Chibuzor Emekoba	IMM-5595-12
83	Ikechukwu Ufoeze	IMM-5596-12
84	Henrykennedy Jide Onwuka	IMM-5597-12
85	Farooq Akhtar	IMM-5598-12
86	Oladunni Monsurat Akhtar	IMM-5599-12
87	Olusola Kunle Egbesola	IMM-5600-12
88	Victoria Zakka	IMM-5602-12
89	Adeniran Olufemi Adeyemi	IMM-5604-12
90	Augustine Olusegun Iiori	IMM-5607-12
91	Michael Tamuno-Elekima Kio	IMM-5608-12
92	William Suico	IMM-5609-12
93	Emilson Paul Madrid	IMM-5610-12
94	Oluwagbemileke Adewumi	IMM-5619-12
95	Adesodun Kolawole Olabiran	IMM-5622-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Mae Joy TABINGO</b>	<b>IMM-5635-12</b>
96	Farida Hassan Goronga	IMM-5623-12
97	Dennis Tamunoipirinye Minimah	IMM-5625-12
98	Anthony Lun	IMM-5626-12
99	Johannes Petrus Louis Van den berg	IMM-5627-12
100	Rasha Salsaa	IMM-5628-12
101	Ali Mabrouk Ghaith	IMM-5629-12
102	Ambareen Ahmed	IMM-5630-12
103	Shashi Rammarain	IMM-5631-12
104	Mayurkumar Prafulchandra Patel	IMM-5633-12
105	Vikram Joachim Arouza	IMM-5634-12
106	Irene Akpoegberibo Imoukhuede	IMM-5637-12
107	Kirti Wardhen Sharma	IMM-5638-12
108	Hitesh Sehgal	IMM-5639-12
109	John Ohiolere Unuigboje	IMM-5640-12
110	Padamprasad Upadhyay	IMM-5641-12
111	Edwin Magtanum Tejon	IMM-5642-12
112	Hakim Uddeen	IMM-5643-12
113	Hany Mohamed Ahmed Khamis	IMM-5644-12
114	Constantino Arcabos Lumanlan	IMM-5646-12
115	Adewale Michael Badmus	IMM-5647-12
116	Sajid Abdur Rahim	IMM-5648-12
117	John Owuike Itheme	IMM-5649-12
118	Charles Chukwuka Oranyeli	IMM-5650-12
119	Anthony Abu Ikpea	IMM-5657-12
120	Olusola Adeola Akinola	IMM-5658-12
121	Patrick Ikechukwu Igboke	IMM-5659-12
122	Innocent Uchechukwu Mmuoh	IMM-5660-12
123	Rasheed Akinkunmi Adigun	IMM-5662-12
124	Ahmed Nasr El Din Fathalla Ahmed	IMM-5663-12
125	Ayman Al-khatab	IMM-5667-12
126	Ibilola Aina Aridegbe	IMM-5671-12
127	Abiola Oladipupo Fatukasi	IMM-5674-12
128	Tarig Abel Magid Khalid Ibrahim	IMM-5675-12
129	Omagbitse Emmanuel Ayavoro	IMM-5676-12
130	Valiya Gangadharan	IMM-5677-12
131	Dipakkumar Dhirubhai (Dipak) Patel	IMM-5679-12
132	Ahmed Khaled Abdal Sadek Mohamed Mohamed	IMM-5680-12
133	Joshua Katebe Mwenya	IMM-5681-12
134	Ambreen Ali	IMM-5682-12
135	Christo Ludick	IMM-5683-12
136	Ata Taher Abdul Aziz Ata	IMM-5684-12
137	Jacques Ambrose Van Rensburg	IMM-5686-12
138	Atique Ahmed Minhas	IMM-5687-12
139	Gulamabbas Hassanali Chagani	IMM-5688-12
140	Jignasa Dharmesh Desai	IMM-5689-12
141	Mohammad Zubair	IMM-5690-12
142	Sajeeda Murtadha Suleiman	IMM-5691-12
143	Shereef Zaghloul	IMM-5694-12
144	Isa Balarabe Salau	IMM-5695-12



<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Mae Joy TABINGO</b>	<b>IMM-5635-12</b>
145	Rowland Ayodele Adeyemi	IMM-5698-12
146	Nasreen Eisakhani	IMM-5703-12
147	Ali Saadatpajouh	IMM-5704-12
148	Amir Naraghizadeh	IMM-5705-12
149	Moloud Faradjpour Tabrizi	IMM-5706-12
150	Oluwaseyi Sunday Sowemimo	IMM-5709-12
151	Khaled Ladki	IMM-5712-12
152	Antonio Rios	IMM-5716-12
153	Irene Allo Osamor	IMM-5717-12
154	Esteban Macaraig Ramirez	IMM-5718-12
155	Hiwot Gebremeskel Reda	IMM-5719-12
156	Leila Dayan	IMM-5723-12
157	Jorge Conrad Villacarlos	IMM-5724-12
158	Ibe Godwin Egwuatuonwu	IMM-5726-12
159	Samuel Walter Frederick	IMM-5728-12
160	Sohail Akhtar Tiwana	IMM-5730-12
161	Omolola Taiwo Segun-Idahor	IMM-5731-12
162	Shahina Hanif	IMM-5734-12
163	Celestina Uzoezi Ogba	IMM-5735-12
164	Laeya (Laya) Moosae	IMM-5736-12
165	Omoverere Agarin	IMM-5741-12
166	Seyed Sepher Saremi	IMM-5778-12
167	Balraj Bhatt	IMM-5779-12
168	Folake Lawal	IMM-5781-12
169	Olufisayo Olayemi Dipeolu	IMM-5783-12
170	Ebrima Njie	IMM-5785-12
171	Hiam Nasrallah	IMM-5866-12
172	Kambiz Kiamehr	IMM-5867-12
173	Cherry Lee Chavez	IMM-5869-12
174	Karim Salehi	IMM-6030-12
175	Srividhya Rajagopaul	IMM-6031-12
176	Sham M. J. Saadaldin	IMM-6032-12
177	Fidelia Ometere Ofuje Ogoh	IMM-6033-12
178	Wilbert Brako	IMM-6034-12
179	Pat Eloka Onukwuli	IMM-6036-12
180	Raymond Georges Ayaovi	IMM-6467-12
181	Arturo Banez II Panaligan	IMM-7388-12
182	Huda Mohammed Abdullaziz Al-Safar	IMM-7389-12
183	Cherilyn Martinez	IMM-7390-12
184	Samuel Aderemi Awoyinka	IMM-7391-12
185	Ahmed Abdel Rahman Hashem Khalifa	IMM-7393-12
186	Stephen Talugende	IMM-7394-12
187	Moronke Olupero Bamgbala	IMM-7395-12
188	Timur Ergashev	IMM-7396-12
189	AHMED Zahid	IMM-7983-12
190	RAHMAN Mahbubur	IMM-7987-12
191	RAHMAN Mustafizur	IMM-7988-12
192	GHOSIAL Tapan Kumar	IMM-7990-12
193	KNATNANI Sunilkumar Monandas	IMM-7991-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Mae Joy TABINGO</b>	<b>IMM-5635-12</b>
194	TUTEJA Poonam	IMM-7992-12
195	ZGHEIR Khalid	IMM-7993-12
196	MANNAN Farzana	IMM-7994-12
197	AMAL Boutrous	IMM-8151-12
198	SAMIR Yaakoub	IMM-8154-12
199	ALAA Al-Tae	IMM-8156-12
200	ESSAM Saleh	IMM-8158-12
201	SAMIR Yousif	IMM-8166-12
202	LOUAY Wahbi	IMM-8170-12
203	SHERIF Ghobrial	IMM-8171-12
204	SAMIH Yehia	IMM-8173-12
205	MAHA Yehia	IMM-8175-12
206	KHALID Abdouni	IMM-8176-12
207	BADER Kabbara	IMM-8178-12
208	FOUAD Safi	IMM-8180-12
209	ASHRAF Habash	IMM-8184-12
210	RIMON Gaid	IMM-8186-12
211	Ahmad Todd Sameh (Moh'd Ali)	IMM-8377-12
212	Ramy Shaker	IMM-8378-12
213	Topia Olutoyin	IMM-8379-12
214	Desai Hitesh Piyush	IMM-8380-12
215	Farzana Begum	IMM-8381-12
216	Veena Kumari Kaushal	IMM-8382-12
217	Kishore Sangani	IMM-8383-12
218	Ozair Khan	IMM-8384-12
219	Ramir Varon	IMM-8385-12
220	Suvra Sengupta Datta	IMM-8386-12
221	Vijar Kumar Saini	IMM-8388-12
222	Aamir Fareed Khan	IMM-8390-12
223	Wael Mukalled	IMM-8391-12
224	Mohammad Ali	IMM-8392-12
225	Khalid Mahmood	IMM-8393-12
226	Shehzard Ahmad	IMM-8394-12
227	Amin Afridi	IMM-8395-12
228	Muhammad Azam Khan	IMM-8397-12
229	Olorunjube Ojomo	IMM-8398-12
230	Md Talukder	IMM-8399-12
231	Sean Mathews	IMM-8401-12
232	Gagandeep Sidhu	IMM-8402-12
233	Shaun Gleen Bernados	IMM-8403-12
234	Qing Wei	IMM-8570-12
235	Md. Rashed Ali Khan	IMM-8574-12
236	Shatha Saeed	IMM-8575-12
237	Abed Saleh	IMM-8577-12
238	Asif Zaman	IMM-8580-12
239	Tammam Al-Sarraj	IMM-8718-12
240	Kakuyo Kagumaho	IMM-8803-12
241	Gill Mahanveer Kaur	IMM-8804-12
242	Phatra Rupinder Singh	IMM-8806-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Mae Joy TABINGO</b>	<b>IMM-5635-12</b>
243	Sandhu Paramjiti Singh	IMM-8807-12
244	Kushan Mandeep	IMM-8809-12
245	Aomreore Atinuke	IMM-8810-12
246	Abbas Shoaib	IMM-8811-12
247	Olubobokun Samuel	IMM-8812-12
248	Sarrosa Joel Landazabal	IMM-8813-12
249	CasseeramComalprasad	IMM-8814-12
250	Urama Benedict	IMM-8815-12
251	Tamang Jay Kumar Lopchan	IMM-8817-12
252	Kerim Ragia Abdel	IMM-8818-12
253	Villahermosa Pamela	IMM-8819-12
254	Dsouza Keith	IMM-8820-12
255	Taleb Mustapha	IMM-8821-12
256	Hamed Mohammad	IMM-8822-12
257	Albheisi Ismail	IMM-8824-12
258	Lorenzo Luzviminda Paz-San	IMM-8860-12
259	Luna Immanuel	IMM-8861-12
260	Oyeniran Gbade Oluwayomi	IMM-8864-12
261	Syeda Zahra	IMM-8867-12
262	Idowu Olufunmilola	IMM-8870-12
263	Engelbrecht Jan-Michael	IMM-8873-12
264	John Anil	IMM-8875-12
265	Lamidi Adetunji	IMM-8881-12
266	Abdullah Zead	IMM-8882-12
267	Mehmood Mubashir	IMM-8883-12
268	Eideh Shadi	IMM-8885-12
269	Braudo Colette Carmel Deanna	IMM-8887-12
270	Akash Mohamad	IMM-9125-12
271	Arafeh Rim	IMM-9126-12
272	Farahini Farhang Jalali	IMM-9127-12
273	Ismail Zakaria	IMM-9128-12
274	Tayarah Iyad	IMM-9129-12
275	Khetarpal Shivani	IMM-9130-12
276	Masri Nisreen	IMM-9133-12
277	Al-Droubi Mohamad Moussalam	IMM-9134-12
278	Ahmad Zeina Ali	IMM-9136-12
279	Atasi Kasem	IMM-9137-12
280	Charanbir Sidhu	IMM-9332-12
281	Nestor Guillermo	IMM-9335-12
282	Paramjit Aulakh	IMM-9338-12
283	Marjan Merat	IMM-9339-12
284	Sameh William Melek Azab	IMM-9341-12
285	Rajneet Kaur Sandhu	IMM-9342-12
286	Zaman Ashraf	IMM-9343-12
287	Omar Nazhat	IMM-9347-12
288	Jose Johnny Jose	IMM-9351-12
289	Amritpal Dhaliwal	IMM-9391-12
290	Ashutosh Nath	IMM-9393-12
291	Ujiro Bovi	IMM-9395-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Mae Joy TABINGO</b>	<b>IMM-5635-12</b>
292	Abiodun Seriki	IMM-9398-12
293	Chinyere Amaechina	IMM-9400-12
294	Ahmed Al-Quzweny	IMM-9401-12
295	Siddarth Kapila	IMM-9402-12
296	Gervase Oliver Percus	IMM-9405-12
297	Drusilla Mukasa	IMM-9407-12
298	Farhanaz Beg	IMM-9410-12
299	Abdulaziz Mohammed	IMM-9411-12
300	Joel Batarina Primero	IMM-9412-12
301	Waseem Al-Shadeedi	IMM-9415-12
302	Ester Wairimu Kamunya	IMM-9417-12
303	Janak Thapa	IMM-9419-12
304	Ahmed Mohamed	IMM-9421-12
305	Manraj Kaur Bhullar	IMM-9423-12
306	Manu Sobti	IMM-9427-12
307	Rekha Prasad	IMM-9428-12
308	Annu Malhotra	IMM-9429-12
309	Ella Olivier	IMM-9430-12
310	Maher Jadallah	IMM-9433-12
311	Waqas Hussain Tiwana	IMM-9434-12
312	Antowan Hanna Shehata Samaan	IMM-9438-12
313	Tendal Chikuku	IMM-9440-12
314	Mahabub Sadik	IMM-9442-12
315	Temitope Adenike Awe	IMM-9444-12
316	Ahmad Golzadeh	IMM-9531-12
317	Meynard Yuzon Gloria	IMM-9533-12
318	Abu Saleh Md. Shabbir	IMM-9534-12
319	Bhawna Parbhakar	IMM-9535-12
320	Jaswinder Singh Rooprai	IMM-9536-12
321	SYED MUHAMMAD SHAMSHAD AKHTAR	IMM-9635-12
322	SYED MUHAMMAD IRSHAD AKHTAR	IMM-9636-12
323	Muhammad Abbas Khan	IMM-9637-12
324	SYED MUHAMMAD DILSHAD AKHTAR	IMM-9638-12
325	Ghazak Jamil	IMM-9646-12
326	SYED MUHAMMAD NAUSHAD AKHTAR	IMM-9648-12
327	Ravinder Bilkhu	IMM-10421-12
328	Amany Abdel Malek	IMM-10415-12
329	Paul Olukayode Solola	IMM-10416-12
330	Rahul Taneja	IMM-10418-12
331	Chi-Ying Luo	IMM-10419-12
332	Kirtan Varasia	IMM-10420-12
333	Haleema Jihad	IMM-10423-12
334	Hosam Bashandy	IMM-10425-12
335	Aseel Shawqi	IMM-10428-12
336	Anela Nazir	IMM-10429-12
337	Gopala Pillai Sreekumar	IMM-10430-12
338	Hafiz Muhammad Nadeem Majeed	IMM-10431-12
339	Rolla Abou Hasera	IMM-10432-12
340	Ravi Srinivasa	IMM-10434-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Mae Joy TABINGO</b>	<b>IMM-5635-12</b>
341	Wissam Ambriss	IMM-10798-12
342	Alison Wilson	IMM-10800-12
343	Abdelkarim Al-Raie	IMM-10801-12
344	Ala Aldakak	IMM-10803-12
345	Virk Simratjit	IMM-11006-12
346	Ahmed Munawwar	IMM-11008-12
347	Afshar Mohammad H.M.	IMM-11011-12
348	Bahari Maha	IMM-11012-12
349	Wajih Abbasi	IMM-11355-12
350	PERVEZ AMIR Khambati	IMM-11356-12
351	Seyi Awofeso	IMM-11360-12
352	Hani Al Soufi	IMM-11362-12
353	Samatha Katz	IMM-11369-12
354	Kifah Samara	IMM-11373-12
355	MYRNA Aouad	IMM-11374-12
356	Elahee-Dinaully Roukayya Nessah Rassool	IMM-11579-12
357	Bissoondoyal Karuna Devi	IMM-11585-12
358	Ping Sam Pong Sum	IMM-11587-12
359	Aubeeluck Gunneeta	IMM-11588-12
360	Appadoo Sarvapalli Balram	IMM-11590-12
361	Dumur Toosmawtee	IMM-11591-12
362	Samaye Monahar	IMM-11592-12
363	MARIE-CLAIRE CHUNG CHIN KIOW YUEN ZING	IMM-11594-12
364	Sang Fong Fong Ng Wing	IMM-11596-12
365	VERONIQUE MARJORIE LISEBETH AH LEUNG	IMM-11599-12
366	Ahyen Ng Tin Yun	IMM-11600-12
367	Drioux Dolly	IMM-11601-12
368	Muttur Bibi Rehana	IMM-11602-12
369	Kin Suzy Chan	IMM-11605-12
370	Thaman Rashmi	IMM-11606-12
371	Brar Sawrnjit	IMM-11607-12
372	Khon Li Live Chew Chong Tet	IMM-11609-12
373	Aubeeluck Indira	IMM-11610-12
374	Khan Farooq	IMM-11611-12
375	Thomas Joseph Henrio	IMM-11612-12
376	Peerbuccus Tahyab	IMM-11626-12
377	Aumeer Komulpersad	IMM-11627-12
378	Yelim Mary Joan Ng	IMM-11631-12
379	Fat Marie Luisa Seu Yane Ah	IMM-11633-12
380	Hok Men Kong Li Chen	IMM-11634-12
381	Chin Lee Foon Fok Soy	IMM-11651-12
382	Dhany Satcheedanand Singh	IMM-11652-12
383	DEEPAK CHOPRA	IMM-11665-12
384	HARITH AHMAD	IMM-11666-12
385	SAIMA QAYYUM	IMM-11670-12
386	HANAA ABD ELMALAK ISKANDER HANA	IMM-11671-12
387	YASSER IBRAHIM HASSANEIN	IMM-11676-12
388	ASHRAF KAMEL MOUSSA KAMEL	IMM-11677-12
389	YAZID OUALI	IMM-11678-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Mae Joy TABINGO</b>	<b>IMM-5635-12</b>
390	RANDA HANI HASSAN MOST AHMED	IMM-11679-12
391	MAGED NASSIF MORCOS RAFAT	IMM-11680-12
392	REFAAT REFAAT KAMEL	IMM-11681-12
393	KARIM MOHAMED ABDEL MOHSEN	IMM-11682-12
394	MOHAMED ABDEL-KADER ABDEL-ATIF NADA	IMM-11683-12
395	NASHWA HELMY IMAM MORSY	IMM-11684-12
396	NERMIN AHMED ALI M AL SHAIBA	IMM-11685-12
397	MERVETTE MOHAMED ELHAMY HUSSEIN	IMM-11686-12
398	ATEF SABRY MORGAN BESHAI	IMM-11687-12
399	MINA SAMIR GAD BEN EL SABAGH	IMM-11688-12
400	ALAA MOHAMED EL SALAMOUNY	IMM-11691-12
401	MAGED MAGDY ISAAC MIKHAIL	IMM-11692-12
402	SHAHEER FARAG SELIM FARAG	IMM-11694-12
403	MAURICE GUIRGUIS IBRAHIM GHOBRIAL	IMM-11697-12
404	CHOUCRALLAH ABOU-SAMRA	IMM-11698-12
405	HAZEM HAMDY AWADEL-ADLY	IMM-11699-12
406	CHRISTINE NAGAH EMIL MEKHAIL	IMM-11702-12
407	LAMA ABDO	IMM-11704-12
408	BALJINDER SINGH MANDER	IMM-11705-12
409	MOHAMED ABDEL RAOUF ABDEL AZIZ SHARSHAR	IMM-11706-12
410	Dincecco Nevio	IMM-11767-12
411	Jhita Lakhbir Singh	IMM-11769-12
412	CANCEL JENNY	IMM-11771-12
413	BIMAL KUMAR PRAMANIK	IMM-11772-12
414	AMWER RAFIQUE	IMM-11773-12
415	CHUKWUEBUKA OFOR	IMM-11774-12
416	Khaled Mahmoud Lotfy Mahmoud Selim	IMM-12857-12
417	Carol Zouein	IMM-12858-12
418	Delman Ali Ahmed	IMM-12859-12
419	Rupinder Kaur	IMM-12860-12
420	Eric Cajetan Dominique Fernandes	IMM-12861-12
421	Ayman Adel Goubran Girgis	IMM-12864-12
422	Malini Varma Beeponee	IMM-12865-12
423	Olugbenga Taiwo	IMM-12866-12
424	Alexander Anda	IMM-12867-12
425	Ammar Falih	IMM-12870-12
426	AdhamEl Sayed	IMM-12871-12
427	MOSHIRI Amir-Ehsan	IMM-12930-12
428	ELUYINKA Awoyelu	IMM-12933-12
429	BATBAYAR Erdenebayar	IMM-12934-12
430	Hope Chijioke Amadi	IMM-12937-12
431	GURJANT Sidhu	IMM-12941-12
432	Tammy Jalboukh	IMM-103-13
433	Vidhu Khanna	IMM-104-13
434	Fatemeh Ghoulamipoor-Baroogh	IMM-105-13
435	Geukjoon Park	IMM-106-13
436	Sundeep Mehra	IMM-107-13
437	Paul Thompson	IMM-108-13

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Mae Joy TABINGO</b>	<b>IMM-5635-12</b>
438	Mdna Elsayed	IMM-109-13
439	Sung-Lung Shih	IMM-110-13
440	Shadhon Kumar Ray	IMM-112-13
441	BassamMura	IMM-114-13
442	Kaweepoj Phacharintankul	IMM-116-13
443	Kesiena Akpojetavwo	IMM-281-13
444	Saulat Masood	IMM-283-13
445	Bahman Farokhi	IMM-284-13
446	Tamer Kirolos	IMM-286-13
447	Maziar Nematpour	IMM-287-13
448	Margaret Ralph Cabral	IMM-288-13
449	Fatma Mahmoud Mangoud El Sadany	IMM-289-13
450	Edha Lilly D'Souza	IMM-290-13
451	Lorriane D'Souza	IMM-291-13
452	Lani Louise Hardy	IMM-292-13
453	Barbhuiya Md Abdul Jalil	IMM-378-13
454	Eldin Serag Eldin Adel Serag	IMM-379-13
455	Sujan Naveen Bahar	IMM-380-13
456	Bola Raywant Kaur	IMM-381-13
457	Sabet Iman	IMM-382-13
458	Burbridge Craig Garth	IMM-384-13
459	Barua Kiran	IMM-385-13
460	Rahman A-K-M Mizanur	IMM-388-13
461	Ayobami Olubiya	IMM-486-13
462	Omar Ahmed Esmaeel	IMM-668-13
463	SRIRAMACHANDRAN Srinivasan	IMM-669-13
464	SHAHREZA Shahryar Niroomand	IMM-804-13
465	SONIA PARVINDER KAUR SOHAL	IMM-1101-13
466	VINCENTE EUGENIO ILLINGWORTH ASHTON	IMM-1103-12
467	Karroum Yasser Bou	IMM-1105-13
468	Tabch Amira	IMM-1107-13
469	El-Omari Tarek	IMM-1108-13
470	KHALIL Ahsan Mohiuddin	IMM-1428-13
471	Ziauddin Qazi	IMM-1769-13
472	MICHAEL EDWARD AZIZ Sawiris	IMM-1927-13
473	Sanjaykumar Patel	IMM-2096-13
474	Christian Hubert Gravelean	IMM-2097-13
475	Meena Kashyap	IMM-2098-13
476	Ranjit Singh Padda	IMM-2100-13
477	Sushma Sharma	IMM-2103-13
478	Kulwinder Kaur Nanglu	IMM-2104-13
479	Narinder Jeet Jassi	IMM-2107-13
480	Amanjit Kaur Padda	IMM-2109-13
481	Harjeet Bala Heer	IMM-2110-13
482	Rakesh Kumar Verma	IMM-2112-13
483	Pankaj Kumar Sharma	IMM-2113-13
484	Gurpiar Singh Dhani	IMM-2114-13
485	Bhupinder Bhushan Dembla	IMM-2132-13
486	Varinder Singh Sohal	IMM-2133-13

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Mae Joy TABINGO</b>	<b>IMM-5635-12</b>
487	Harjinder Singh Bhardwaj	IMM-2134-13
488	Rupinder Kaur	IMM-2135-13
489	Tricia Murray	IMM-2313-13
490	Enayat Boostanabadi	IMM-2471-13
491	Mehra Jalili	IMM-2472-13
492	Aroub Soubh	IMM-2473-13
493	TEJASKUMAR JITENDRABHAI PATEL	IMM-2560-13
494	PARISA SADRI	IMM-2562-13

<b>Lead</b>	<b>Habibollah ABEDI</b>	<b>IMM-8669-12</b>
1	DABAL, MARAL	IMM-8636-12
2	FATHIRAD, ATABAK	IMM-8644-12
3	GHIGHANI, MASOUMEH	IMM-8646-12
4	MOGHADDAM, NASSIM SAMADI	IMM-8653-12
5	AGHILI, SEYED MAHDI	IMM-8655-12
6	ROUHANI, SHOLEH	IMM-8657-12
7	RASHTI, KOBRA TAJADDODITALAB	IMM-8659-12
8	POURAMINI, MOHAMMAD	IMM-8661-12
9	MAHJOUBI, PARSА	IMM-8662-12
10	AHMADI, NAJMEH	IMM-8671-12
11	BASHIR RAD, ALIREZA	IMM-8672-12
12	MAGHDOUR MASHHOUR, ALI	IMM-8674-12
13	HASSANZADEHNADERI, ABTIN	IMM-8675-12
14	NIKOUKAR, MEHRNAZ	IMM-8679-12
15	CHEGINI, GOSHTAB	IMM-8688-12
16	MELIKA NASSIRI	IMM-9094-12
17	ALIREZA SHENAVAEI	IMM-9095-12
18	ZAHRA GHANADIAN	IMM-9465-12
19	ROSHANAK LARY	IMM-9914-12
20	REZA AZARI MOHEBI	IMM-9915-12
21	SHAHLA AMRI SAROUKOLAEI	IMM-9916-12
22	FOROUZAN POURDAYLAMI	IMM-9917-12
23	EBRAHIM GHORESHI	IMM-9918-12
24	FARAHNAZ MATALEBI	IMM-9919-12
25	AREZU EGHTEHARI	IMM-9920-12
26	SAEED NAJARANTOUS	IMM-9921-12
27	SANAZ RAZMDIDEH	IMM-11525-12
28	SHAHRAM KAHKOUEE	IMM-11526-12
29	SYLVANA SEYFAIE	IMM-11527-12
30	OSSIANI MARNANI ALI	IMM-11528-12
31	PARISA NOROUZI	IMM-11796-12
32	IRAJ TAKI	IMM-11798-12
33	MOHSEN IMANI	IMM-11800-12
34	SHAHRIAR MINAEI	IMM-11801-12
35	AZADEH MAZAHERI TEHRANI	IMM-11802-12
36	SHAHRAM TAHERI	IMM-11803-12
37	ALIREZA SALIMIKHAH	IMM-11806-12



<b>Lead</b>	<b>Habibollah ABEDI</b>	<b>IMM-8669-12</b>
38	KAVEH IRANZADEH BOOKANI	IMM-11808-12
39	Rezaei, Ali	IMM-12460-12
40	Saneei, Davood	IMM-12461-12
41	Miripour, Arsham	IMM-12462-12
42	RAEISI NOUR-MOHAMMAD	IMM-852-13
43	FARZAD KHODSIANI	IMM-855-13
44	KAMBOD EGHBAI TALAB	IMM-857-13

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Maria Sari Teresa Borja AUSTRIA</b>	<b>IMM-10307-12</b>
1	FAIZAN NAKHUDA	IMM-5265-12
2	JAGDEEP HARIRAM MALHOTRA	IMM-5267-12
3	WAF A JAWAD ABID	IMM-5268-12
4	SARATHI BARDHAN	IMM-5270-12
5	WISAM JASIM HILO	IMM-5271-12
6	NURREIN MWATSAHU	IMM-5272-12
7	SILPA SUMANTH TORANALA	IMM-5273-12
8	MAEREG TAFERE ADHANOM	IMM-5276-12
9	GRACE GHANTOUS	IMM-5277-12
10	RESHIMA ANJUM	IMM-5278-12
11	BAKER BASIL AL-BAHRI	IMM-5279-12
12	JAGMOHAN SINGH	IMM-5281-12
13	GEORGE REMON KASER	IMM-5282-12
14	PAUL CRAAN	IMM-5284-12
15	CHOWDHURY SHAKURUL (SOHER) ISLAM	IMM-5288-12
16	SHAHANA AFROSE CHOWDHURY	IMM-5289-12
17	SIMON HODKINSON	IMM-5290-12
18	NG SIEW KUAN	IMM-5291-12
19	AUXEELIYA JESUDOSS	IMM-5293-12
20	SUFIAN KHALIL ALOTAIBI	IMM-5294-12
21	FATAI THOMAS ALAO	IMM-5295-12
22	SANTHI KUMARAN	IMM-5296-12
23	DHEFAF MOHAMED MOHSIN	IMM-5297-12
24	DIEMI ESTHER AKPOTOR	IMM-5298-12
25	COLIN VAZ	IMM-5300-12
26	GODSON CHUKWUEMEKA OKONWO	IMM-5302-12
27	JOKOTADE CATHERINE AGBONYIN	IMM-5303-12
28	RAMI AHMED FATHALLA	IMM-5354-12
29	LANIE RAMOS	IMM-5359-12
30	LORNA HARRIS	IMM-5360-12
31	MICHAEL NSOBANI	IMM-5361-12
32	MUHAMMAD FAHEEM JAMIL	IMM-5362-12
33	SHEILA IFEOMA ONWUGHARA	IMM-5363-12
34	HASSAN Y. HAMID	IMM-5366-12
35	OLGA LOBO	IMM-5367-12
36	MARWAN KACHEF	IMM-5368-12
37	AHMAD A.H. MAH	IMM-5369-12
38	AJA YI IFEDAYO FRANCIS	IMM-5370-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Maria Sari Teresa Borja AUSTRIA</b>	<b>IMM-10307-12</b>
39	JOE KWABENA ASIEDU	IMM-5372-12
40	GADA K. DHEA	IMM-5424-12
41	Gursewak Singh Pannu	IMM-8907-12
42	Pawan Jyoti Ghumman	IMM-8908-12
43	Ravinder Singh Tamber	IMM-8909-12
44	Reema Atwal	IMM-8910-12
45	Parminder Jit Singh Gill	IMM-8911-12
46	Rupinderjeet Kaur Ghuman	IMM-8912-12
47	Sakinder Singh Gill	IMM-8913-12
48	Rashpal Kaur Chahal	IMM-8914-12
49	Neel Money Sharma	IMM-8915-12
50	Rashpaul Singh Bhamra	IMM-8916-12
51	Devinderjit Singh	IMM-8917-12
52	Sardarjit Singh Aulakh	IMM-8918-12
53	Usama Wasfy Roumany Gendy	IMM-8919-12
54	Mohammed Salim-Ul-Mukim	IMM-8920-12
55	Hargopal Singh	IMM-8921-12
56	Rashpal Kaur	IMM-8922-12
57	Prabhjit Kaur Brar	IMM-8923-12
58	Rajdawinder Kaur Sandhu	IMM-8924-12
59	Davinder Pal Singh Sapra	IMM-8926-12
60	Prem Kumar	IMM-8927-12
61	Paramjit Kaur Sandhu	IMM-8928-12
62	Alpana Jayanand Rathod	IMM-8930-12
63	Arpana Behla	IMM-8931-12
64	Amir Shahzad Chaudhry	IMM-8932-12
65	Harmandeep Kaur Dhaliwal	IMM-8933-12
66	Syed Masood Ali	IMM-8934-12
67	Vijay Kumar Thakur	IMM-8935-12
68	Sukhmit Kaur Boparai	IMM-8936-12
69	Aneet Pal Kaur	IMM-8938-12
70	Twinklejit Kaur	IMM-8939-12
71	Parminder Singh Randhawa	IMM-8940-12
72	Anu Sharma	IMM-8941-12
73	Gurmeet Kaur Loomba	IMM-8942-12
74	Ajay Pal Singh Bhurji	IMM-8943-12
75	Rahul Mukand	IMM-8944-12
76	Satpal Singh	IMM-8945-12
77	Amandeep Kaur Randhawa	IMM-8947-12
78	Jagpal Kaur Sandhu	IMM-8948-12
79	Deepak Issar	IMM-8949-12
80	Sandeepkumar Amrarlal Patel	IMM-8950-12
81	Puja Katyial	IMM-8951-12
82	Ruplesh Kaur Mann	IMM-8952-12
83	Jasjit Singh Ghatahra	IMM-8953-12
84	Bhupinder Singh Sangatpuri	IMM-8954-12
85	Narinderjit Singh Dhaliwal	IMM-8955-12
86	Avinash Chander Pathak	IMM-8956-12
87	Rajpal Kaur Brar	IMM-8957-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Maria Sari Teresa Borja AUSTRIA</b>	<b>IMM-10307-12</b>
88	Harjinder Kaur Heer	IMM-8958-12
89	Sandeep Kumar Vohra	IMM-8959-12
90	Harpreet Singh Tung	IMM-8960-12
91	Mahanbir Singh Randhawa	IMM-8961-12
92	Inderpreet Kaur	IMM-8962-12
93	Hussain Fida	IMM-8963-12
94	Jagdish Kaur Sohi	IMM-8964-12
95	Surinder Kaur	IMM-8965-12
96	Devinder Pal Singh Pawar	IMM-8966-12
97	Amit Puri	IMM-8967-12
98	Clayton Baptist	IMM-8968-12
99	Sanjeev Kumar Bedi	IMM-8969-12
100	Dhiraj Nangia	IMM-8970-12
101	Satwant Kaur Kaloty	IMM-8971-12
102	Syed Navid Hasan Bokhari	IMM-8972-12
103	Sukhbir Mann	IMM-8973-12
104	Clement Udo Achor	IMM-8974-12
105	Lakhwinder Kaur Saran	IMM-8975-12
106	Kulwinder Singh Gill	IMM-8976-12
107	Obaidur Rahman	IMM-8977-12
108	Jagjit Singh Dhaliwal	IMM-8979-12
109	Prabhjot Kaur Chahal	IMM-8980-12
110	Sukhbir Kaur Randhawa	IMM-8981-12
111	Rupinder Kaur Bajwa	IMM-8982-12
112	Damanjeet Kaur Bhangu	IMM-8983-12
113	Ravinder Kaur Kang	IMM-8984-12
114	Amiteshwar Singh Chandok	IMM-8985-12
115	Gurwinderbir Kaur	IMM-8986-12
116	Adeel Ajaz	IMM-8988-12
117	Bandral Manjunath Reddy	IMM-8989-12
118	Randhir Singh Sagoo	IMM-8990-12
119	Syed Asim Ali	IMM-8991-12
120	Balbir Kaur Sandhu	IMM-8993-12
121	Sawinder Singh Sandhu	IMM-8996-12
122	Sher Singh Malhotra	IMM-8997-12
123	Bhupinder Singh Kainth	IMM-9001-12
124	Manjit Kaur Sandhu	IMM-9002-12
125	Satinder Kaur Babrah	IMM-9003-12
126	Rupinder Kaur Dhillon	IMM-9005-12
127	Harwinder Kaur Baidwan	IMM-9006-12
128	Shereen Adwer Abdel Meseeh Louka	IMM-9021-12
129	Dimple Jha	IMM-9026-12
130	Rajveer Kaur Bumrah	IMM-9046-12
131	Baljeet Singh Batth	IMM-9063-12
132	Satpal Singh Sidhu	IMM-9068-12
133	Sodhi Singh Jhaji	IMM-9070-12
134	Davinder Singh Bajwa	IMM-9072-12
135	Jagmit Singh	IMM-9074-12
136	Jiten Chopra	IMM-9077-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Maria Sari Teresa Borja AUSTRIA</b>	<b>IMM-10307-12</b>
137	Kamal Kumar Badhan	IMM-9080-12
138	Lalita Sharma	IMM-9082-12
139	Gurinderjit Singh Pawar	IMM-9083-12
140	Manpreet Kaur Sandhu	IMM-9081-12
141	Puri Rajni	IMM-9204-12
142	Lin Yih Liang	IMM-9205-12
143	Justin Matthew Borja Austria	IMM-9206-12
144	Jagminder Singh Sran	IMM-9209-12
145	Harold Rabeca Rebuldela	IMM-9210-12
146	Harjit Kaur	IMM-9212-12
147	Krishnadas Thindiyath	IMM-9213-12
148	Laveet Kaur Gill	IMM-9215-12
149	Baljinder Kaur Aulakh	IMM-9216-12
150	Sara Saleh	IMM-9218-12
151	Rana Asim Sarwar	IMM-9220-12
152	Sukhraj Singh Gill	IMM-9221-12
153	Hassan Bahij Rahal	IMM-9222-12
154	Manjit Kaur Gill	IMM-9223-12
155	Amandeep Kaur Gill	IMM-9224-12
156	Harbrinder Singh Chandi	IMM-9225-12
157	Kabal Aingh	IMM-9246-12
158	Tejpal Singh Sandhu	IMM-9247-12
159	Sukhpal Veer Singh Mrahard	IMM-9248-12
160	Sandeep Kaur	IMM-9249-12
161	Gurpreet Singh Kainth	IMM-9250-12
162	Parveen Sharma	IMM-9251-12
163	Turna Navdeep Singh	IMM-9265-12
164	Amandeep Kaur Gabi	IMM-9266-12
165	Molokwu Azikiwe	IMM-9267-12
166	Rajwinder Kaur Tatla	IMM-9268-12
167	Bhupinderpal Singh Chumber	IMM-9269-12
168	Zeyad Ahmed	IMM-9270-12
169	Jagmohan Singh Bawa	IMM-9271-12
170	Muller Sobhy Adeeb Matta	IMM-9272-12
171	Peerzada Nusrat Aijaz	IMM-9273-12
172	Manjeet Kumar Vishvkarma	IMM-9274-12
173	Eseine Akhirebulu	IMM-9275-12
174	Sylvester Okworu	IMM-9276-12
175	Lalit Kumar Sharma	IMM-9277-12
176	Mary Nassif	IMM-9278-12
177	Kawaljit Zande	IMM-9279-12
178	Karamjeet Kaur Sangha	IMM-9280-12
179	Bal Rajwinder Singh	IMM-9281-12
180	Fareedullah Fareedullah	IMM-9282-12
181	Santhoshi Nallur Haleshappa	IMM-9283-12
182	Tariq Ahmed Patoli	IMM-9284-12
183	Harmandeep Singh Sandhu	IMM-9285-12
184	Sukhbir Kaur Aulakh	IMM-9286-12
185	Devinder Mohan Kaushal	IMM-9288-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Maria Sari Teresa Borja AUSTRIA</b>	<b>IMM-10307-12</b>
186	Modaber Ahmed Khan	IMM-9289-12
187	Vaneeta Mitul Mehta	IMM-9290-12
188	Ekta Singh Bhupal	IMM-9291-12
189	Maher Fayek Abd El Malek	IMM-9292-12
190	Navdeep Singh Masoun	IMM-9293-12
191	Monika Mengi	IMM-9294-12
192	Surinder Pal Singh Multani	IMM-9295-12
193	Rajwant Singh Sohi	IMM-9296-12
194	Narinder Kaur Birdi	IMM-9297-12
195	Amarjit Kaur Brar	IMM-9298-12
196	Parveen Kumar Singla	IMM-9299-12
197	Amritpal Kaur Gill	IMM-9300-12
198	Amanpreet Kaur Manesh	IMM-9301-12
199	Maher Al-Hasswy	IMM-9302-12
200	Balwinder Singh Dhillon	IMM-9303-12
201	Hartaj Singh Sidhu	IMM-9305-12
202	Baljinder Kaur Gill	IMM-9306-12
203	Rajinder Kaur Kahlon	IMM-9307-12
204	Yashpal Kaur Cheema	IMM-9308-12
205	Dhillon Jaswinder Kaur	IMM-9309-12
206	Gurcharan Singh Saggu	IMM-9310-12
207	Baljit Singh Jandu	IMM-9311-12
208	Gurmail Singh Madahar	IMM-9312-12
209	Jas anjeet Kaur Sishu	IMM-9313-12
210	Rupinder Kaur Bhoi	IMM-9314-12
211	Kiran Kumar Nangunoori	IMM-9315-12
212	Kamaljeet Kaur Hundal	IMM-9316-12
213	Avtar Singh	IMM-9317-12
214	Pushvinder Kaur Khokhar	IMM-9318-12
215	Baldev Singh Kahlon	IMM-9319-12
216	Mandeep Kaur Sidhu	IMM-9320-12
217	Inderpal Kaur Johal	IMM-9321-12
218	Amarjit Singh Bhinder	IMM-9322-12
219	Taranjeet Kaur Sethi	IMM-9323-12
220	Surinder Pal Singh Kaler	IMM-9326-12
221	Gamal Said M. H. Abu Daken	IMM-9327-12
222	Baljit Singh	IMM-9328-12
223	Gurmeet Kaur Dhillon	IMM-9329-12
224	Dalbir Singh Sadiora	IMM-9330-12
225	Kirandeep Singh Preet	IMM-9331-12
226	Mandeep Singh Bilkhu	IMM-9336-12
227	Gurdeep Singh Sekhon	IMM-9337-12
228	Naveed Sarwar Rana	IMM-9340-12
229	Ajaypal Singh Multani	IMM-9344-12
230	Harminder Singh	IMM-9345-12
231	Kaur Satpal	IMM-9346-12
232	Baldev Singh Pandher	IMM-9348-12
233	Gagandeep Kaur Rai	IMM-9349-12
234	Stephen Baptist	IMM-9350-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Maria Sari Teresa Borja AUSTRIA</b>	<b>IMM-10307-12</b>
235	Akshra Kumari	IMM-9352-12
236	Rangaswamy Jayaprakash	IMM-9353-12
237	Korba Alakhras Shafik	IMM-9354-12
238	Harbans Singh Jhajj	IMM-10248-12
239	Nabila Rais	IMM-10249-12
240	Eman Abd El Razek Mohamed Abd El Razek	IMM-10250-12
241	Chetan Singh Bisht	IMM-10251-12
242	Vinay Sharma	IMM-10252-12
243	Farhana Saeed	IMM-10253-12
244	Jagjit Singh Hundal	IMM-10254-12
245	Sukhdeep Kaur Sekhon	IMM-10255-12
246	Ashfa Saeed	IMM-10256-12
247	Emmanuel Ademola Adegboye	IMM-10257-12
248	Davinder Kaur Loi	IMM-10258-12
249	Sameh Sizostri Mikhail	IMM-10259-12
250	Sujata Mahal	IMM-10260-12
251	Njoud Haddad	IMM-10261-12
252	Clifford Raymond Pereira	IMM-10262-12
253	Ussama Francis Kamel Rezkalla Megaly	IMM-10263-12
254	Harpal Singh	IMM-10264-12
255	Parmjit Singh Kackkar	IMM-10265-12
256	Abdulkader Alshaar	IMM-10266-12
257	Bhangu Manjeet Kaur	IMM-10267-12
258	Harminder Kaur Hallan	IMM-10268-12
259	Farah Ali	IMM-10269-12
260	Pardeep Dhawan	IMM-10270-12
261	Singh Darshan	IMM-10271-12
262	Raminderjit Singh Minhas	IMM-10272-12
263	Muhammed Bilal	IMM-10273-12
264	Mamdouh Louis Samaan Shenoda	IMM-10274-12
265	Masoud Gaffarian Asl	IMM-10275-12
266	Jujhar Singh Sagoo	IMM-10276-12
267	Rajwant Kaur Bhangu	IMM-10277-12
268	Jhand Surinder Singh	IMM-10278-12
269	Baljit Kaur Randhawa	IMM-10279-12
270	Harjit Kaur Chohan	IMM-10284-12
271	Gurdit Singh Sandhu	IMM-10285-12
272	Basma Khalid Maged	IMM-10286-12
273	Ashwani Kumar Bakshi	IMM-10287-12
274	Inderbir Kaur Randhawa	IMM-10289-12
275	Ritu Attri	IMM-10290-12
276	Harpal Singh Randhawa	IMM-10293-12
277	Mohammad Junaid Aziz	IMM-10294-12
278	Vani Saini	IMM-10295-12
279	Mukhvir Singh Badesha	IMM-10296-12
280	Manjit Kaur Gill	IMM-10298-12
281	Khaled Abdulfattah M. Al-Alusi	IMM-10299-12
282	Titus Terhempa Agbecha	IMM-10300-12
283	Jasbir Singh Khangura	IMM-10301-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Maria Sari Teresa Borja AUSTRIA</b>	<b>IMM-10307-12</b>
284	Jagjit Singh Kainth	IMM-10303-12
285	Wilson Lo Uy	IMM-10304-12
286	Jokotade Catherine Agbonyin	IMM-10305-12
287	Santokh Singh Sehmbi	IMM-10308-12
288	Sher Singh Toorey [Sher Singh(2)]	IMM-10310-12
289	Athman Salim Mwinyi	IMM-10311-12
290	Naomi Eileen Garcia Tejero	IMM-10312-12
291	Ranjeet Kaur	IMM-10313-12
292	Chowdhury Shakurul(Sohel) Islam	IMM-10314-12
293	Saeed Ahmed	IMM-10316-12
294	Gulnaz Cyrus Mondegarian	IMM-10317-12
295	Elizabeth Legaspi	IMM-10318-12
296	Riaz Ahmed	IMM-10319-12
297	Thaer Yousif Naom	IMM-10320-12
298	Hameeduddin Ali	IMM-10321-12
299	Jesus F. Dutong	IMM-10323-12
300	Syed Muhammad Naved Ali	IMM-10324-12
301	Rami Ahmed Fathalla Moustafa	IMM-10327-12
302	Lin Zheng	IMM-10328-12
303	Ng Siew Kuan	IMM-10329-12
304	Godson Chukwuemeka Okokkwo	IMM-10331-12
305	Harjap Singh	IMM-10332-12
306	Dina Nour El Din AbdelAziz AbdelRahman	IMM-10333-12
307	Amandeep Kaur	IMM-10334-12
308	Ibrahim El Hajj	IMM-10335-12
309	Hassan Yousif Hamid	IMM-10336-12
310	Youland Chamas	IMM-10337-12
311	Claudine Stephenson	IMM-10338-12
312	Ahmad A. H. Mah	IMM-10342-12
313	Krithika Manoharan Devanand	IMM-10346-12
314	Ogareet Khoury	IMM-10348-12
315	Muthukumar Sudhakar	IMM-10350-12
316	Mayaz Al Dalal	IMM-10351-12
317	Cheong Yuen Foong	IMM-10353-12
318	Lada Yzgiaev	IMM-10356-12
319	Le Quoc Cuong	IMM-10358-12
320	Josan Arvinder Jeet Kaur	IMM-10360-12
321	Gurjinder Kaur Dang	IMM-10361-12
322	Arvinder Kumar Gumber	IMM-10362-12
323	Parminderjit Kaur Bains	IMM-10363-12
324	Kanwaljit Kaur Chahal	IMM-10364-12
325	Geoffrey Ezepue	IMM-10368-12
326	Mukarram Bhagat	IMM-10369-12
327	Baljeet Kaur Aujla	IMM-10370-12
328	Vikram Karthick Ragupathy	IMM-10373-12
329	Jagraj Singh Kaul	IMM-10374-12
330	Bajwa Harjeet Kaur	IMM-10375-12
331	Sarbjit Kaur Toor	IMM-10378-12
332	Avtar Digh Khaira	IMM-10381-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Maria Sari Teresa Borja AUSTRIA</b>	<b>IMM-10307-12</b>
333	Parminder Singh Mangat	IMM-10382-12
334	Tejpreet Singh Pannu	IMM-10386-12
335	Gurvinder Kaur	IMM-10389-12
336	<del>Arvinder Kaur Soray</del>	<del>IMM-10392-12</del>
337	RIZALINA VILLAFUERTE ROSALES v. MCI	IMM-10516-12
338	REMONDA YOUSSEF RAFLA YASSA	IMM-10761-12
339	FAZELI HOKMABAD	IMM-10762-12
340	Bansal Monika	IMM-11024-12
341	Surinder Kaur Saini	IMM-11025-12
342	Harpreet Kaur Bhullar	IMM-11026-12
343	Paramjit Kaur Purewal	IMM-11029-12
344	Parnjit Kaur Sandhu	IMM-11030-12
345	Nasir Raza Khan	IMM-11031-12
346	Rakesh Kumar Garg	IMM-11032-12
347	Narinder Singh Lobana	IMM-11033-12
348	Harpal Kaur Bath	IMM-11034-12
349	Chahal Bhupinder Singh	IMM-11035-12
350	Narinder Kaur Aulakh	IMM-11036-12
351	Shakti Suman	IMM-11037-12
352	Malkit Singh Bajwa	IMM-11038-12
353	Satinderjit Singh Daroch	IMM-11040-12
354	Reena Chugh	IMM-11041-12
355	Sukhwinder Singh Kaul	IMM-11042-12
356	Narinderjit Kaur Sahi	IMM-11043-12
357	Mandeep Singh Mann	IMM-11044-12
358	Jaspreet Kaur Randhawa	IMM-11046-12
359	Kamaljit Kaur Somal	IMM-11047-12
360	Darbara Singh Sidhu	IMM-11048-12
361	Bhardwaj Prem Sagar	IMM-11049-12
362	Harbans Singh	IMM-11050-12
363	Jaswinder Kaur Badesha	IMM-11053-12
364	Kiran (Sharma) Rajpal	IMM-11054-12
365	Savita Sidhu	IMM-11055-12
366	Rimple Kaur Bath	IMM-11057-12
367	Kanwaldeep Singh Gosal	IMM-11058-12
368	Choudhary Kamaljeet Kaur	IMM-11059-12
369	Ajit Kaur	IMM-11060-12
370	Amandeep Dhillon	IMM-11061-12
371	Harbinder Singh Gill	IMM-11062-12
372	Gagandeep Kaur Bal	IMM-11064-12
373	Parampal Kaur Sidhu	IMM-11065-12
374	Balwinder Singh Verka	IMM-11066-12
375	Aprajita Kapoor	IMM-11068-12
376	Amrit Pal Singh Dhamrait	IMM-11069-12
377	Davinder Kaur Bains	IMM-11070-12
378	Dhillon Kulwinder Kaur	IMM-11071-12
379	Sarabjit Kaur	IMM-11072-12
380	Raminder Jit Kaur	IMM-11077-12
381	Makkena Suresh	IMM-11164-12



<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Maria Sari Teresa Borja AUSTRIA</b>	<b>IMM-10307-12</b>
382	Vanita Arora	IMM-11166-12
383	Sarbjit Kaur Birdi	IMM-11169-12
384	Yuvrajbir Singh	IMM-11170-12
385	Paramjit Singh Manes	IMM-11171-12
386	Aabroo Mahal	IMM-11172-12
387	Nokinka Kalhan	IMM-11173-12
388	Neeta Singh	IMM-11174-12
389	Simeon Ng Tan	IMM-11175-12
390	Amarjit Singh Garha	IMM-11176-12
391	Frederick Tan	IMM-11177-12
392	Naginder Singh Bansal	IMM-11178-12
393	Chi Wi Welfred Chan	IMM-11179-12
394	Alayo Adebisi Saheed	IMM-11180-12
395	Akinwumi Temitope Toyin	IMM-11181-12
396	Khemraj Maharaj	IMM-11183-12
397	Shams Ul Haq Khan Zai	IMM-11184-12
398	Surinder Kumar Kakkkar	IMM-11186-12
399	Harbinder Singh Thind	IMM-11187-12
400	Tarsem Singh Gill	IMM-11188-12
401	Surinder Kaur Saini	IMM-11203-12
402	Paramjit Kaur Sandhu	IMM-11204-12
403	Sarbjit Singh Randhawa	IMM-11205-12
404	Poonam Sharma	IMM-11206-12
405	Gurpreet Singh Sadhu	IMM-11207-12
406	Rajni Sharma	IMM-11210-12
407	Amrit Pal Singh Dhillon	IMM-11211-12
408	Devgan Gagadeepkaur	IMM-11212-12
409	Nirmal Singh Gill	IMM-11213-12
410	Dilbagh Singh Bal	IMM-11214-12
411	Rajwinder Kaur	IMM-11215-12
412	Harjinder Singh Brar	IMM-11227-12
413	Kanwaljit Kaur	IMM-11228-12
414	Gill Sukpreet Singh	IMM-11231-12
415	Satwinder Singh	IMM-11233-12
416	Kuljeet Kaur Arora	IMM-11234-12
417	Jojanpreet Kaur	IMM-11236-12
418	Tarsem Singh Brar	IMM-11237-12
419	Sukhwinder Singh	IMM-11238-12
420	Rajwant Kaur Saran	IMM-11239-12
421	Rajesh Kumar Banga	IMM-11240-12
422	Patel Umeshkumar Manubhai	IMM-11241-12
423	Tarsem Singh Kambo	IMM-11242-12
424	Kashmir Singh Sandhu	IMM-11243-12
425	Jamil Ammar	IMM-11248-12
426	Abdul Karim Rustoum	IMM-11250-12
427	Mohammed Hilili	IMM-11253-12
428	Gurmeet Kaur Toor	IMM-11257-12
429	Kanwaljit Singh Ahluwalia	IMM-11258-12
430	Gurpreet Singh Gill	IMM-11270-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Maria Sari Teresa Borja AUSTRIA</b>	<b>IMM-10307-12</b>
431	Naresh Kumar Arora	IMM-11271-12
432	Mandeep Kaur Grewal	IMM-11272-12
433	Sundeep Kaur Sidhu	IMM-11273-12
434	Anoopjit Kaur Puar	IMM-11274-12
435	Sangha Sukhwinderjit	IMM-11275-12
436	Rajan Gupta	IMM-11276-12
437	Ushvinder Kaur Popli	IMM-11280-12
438	Harpreet Kaur Thind	IMM-11282-12
439	Manjit Hampaul	IMM-11283-12
440	Remigio Tiangco Jr.	IMM-11998-12
441	Francis Jeyakumar Joseph	IMM-11999-12
442	Juliet Puzon	IMM-12001-12
443	Darshan Singh Mahal	IMM-12898-12
444	BALJEET SINGH BAL	IMM-12903-12
445	MOHINDER SINGH MAAN	IMM-12904-12
446	NIRVAN SINGH GILL	IMM-12905-12
447	FAROOQ KHIMANI	IMM-12911-12
448	MANDEEP KAUR GOHAL	IMM-12913-12
449	BHAGWINDER SINGH GILL	IMM-12915-12
450	MANISH KUMAR RISHIRAJ	IMM-12917-12
451	DHANJAL PARAMJEET KAUR	IMM-12918-12
452	VIRPAL KAUR JOSAN	IMM-12919-12
453	ARMAJIT KAUR OTHEE	IMM-12963-12
454	GURVINDER SING SIDHU	IMM-12964-12
455	SARABJEET KAUR DHINDSA	IMM-12965-12
456	GEILAN HASSAN MOHAMED ELSEBILGY	IMM-12966-12
457	PARAMJEET SINGH SAINI	IMM-12967-12
458	SANJEEF KUMAR AARYAN	IMM-12968-12
459	AMRIK SINGH	IMM-12969-12
460	SUKHJINDER KAUR GILL	IMM-12971-12
461	OSAMA SAID	IMM-12972-12
462	SARTAJ SINGH KULAR	IMM-12973-12
463	ARUN KUMAR ROHILLA	IMM-13057-12
464	CHARN PUSHPINDER SINGH	IMM-13058-12
465	RAM PHAL RUHAL	IMM-13059-12
466	NARINDER SINGH BHARDWAG	IMM-13060-12
467	KANU PRIYA	IMM-13061-12
468	MANDEEP SINGH PUNIA	IMM-13063-12
469	RAJNI MISSRA	IMM-13064-12
470	SARABJEET KAUR MANGAT	IMM-13065-12
471	BHAWNA SHARMA	IMM-13067-12
472	BINDHU NATARAJAN	IMM-13068-12
473	EMAN ESMAT MAHMOUD SABRY	IMM-13069-12
474	NANNUAN JUGBADAL SINGH	IMM-13070-12
475	JASPREET SINGH DHALIWAL	IMM-13072-12
476	GURSHARAN KAUR NAGPAL	IMM-13074-12
477	CHARANJIT KAUR BEDI	IMM-13076-12
478	JAGJIT SINGH PANDEY	IMM-13078-12
479	RAJ KUMAR JAMAL	IMM-13079-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Maria Sari Teresa Borja AUSTRIA</b>	<b>IMM-10307-12</b>
480	MOHAMED SAMY ELKHATIB	IMM-13080-12
481	RAJPAL KAUR BHANGU	IMM-13082-12
482	HARJEET KOUR	IMM-13084-12
483	BALTEJ SINGH	IMM-305-13
484	JONG YEOL KIM	IMM-306-13
485	MEENU BALA SHARMA	IMM-307-13
486	KAINTH AMANDEEP KAUR	IMM-308-13
487	BAKER BASIL ALI GHALIB AL-BAHRI	IMM-309-13
488	CHUN MIN SOOK	IMM-310-13
489	BALWINDER KAUR	IMM-311-13
490	KHO YOUNG KYU	IMM-312-13
491	JONGHWA LEE	IMM-313-13
492	JAGTAR SINGH CHAUHAN	IMM-314-13
493	GURMIT SINGH BOPARAI	IMM-315-13
494	MIRAH OH	IMM-316-13
495	YOUNG JAPAEK	IMM-317-13
496	IN KI PARK	IMM-318-13
497	VIPIN BALI	IMM-319-13
498	DILWANDER SINGH GREWAL	IMM-320-13
499	ROHIT SHARMA	IMM-321-13
500	NASIB CHAND	IMM-322-13
501	RANGIT SINGH SIDHU	IMM-324-13
502	PARMJIT SINGH BADHAN	IMM-325-13
503	SONIKA SHARMA	IMM-326-13
504	SURINDER LAUR SAINI	IMM-327-13
505	MAN MOHAN SINGH	IMM-328-13
506	PARDEEP KAUR SAINI	IMM-329-13
507	SONA CHOCHAN	IMM-330-13
508	KARNAIL SINGH	IMM-332-13
509	MAKHAN SINGH GHARU	IMM-333-13
510	KULDEEP SINGH SAIN	IMM-334-13
511	DEVINDER SINGH BAIDWAN	IMM-335-13
512	DEVINDER SINGH BAIDWAN	IMM-336-13
513	TARANJIT KAUR GREWAL	IMM-338-13
514	SURINDER SINGH GREWAL	IMM-341-13
515	MONA MAKARY	IMM-342-13
516	NASIB KAUR SIMAK	IMM-343-13
517	GAGANPAL SINGH SAHNI	IMM-344-13
518	JAGJIT SINGH SANDHU	IMM-345-13
519	CHOONRAK KIM	IMM-346-13
520	LAKHWIND3ER SINGH RANDHAWA	IMM-347-13
521	GURMAIL SINGH KOROTANIA	IMM-348-13
522	RUPINDER KAUR	IMM-349-13
523	KULWANT SINGH GREWAL	IMM-351-13
524	SANDEEP KAUR DHALIWAL	IMM-352-13
525	SUKHWINDER KAUR DHILLON	IMM-353-13
526	HARDEEP SINGH SIVIA	IMM-354-13
527	KAMAL CHAWLA	IMM-355-13
528	JAG AMAN SINGH SHOKER	IMM-356-13

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Maria Sari Teresa Borja AUSTRIA</b>	<b>IMM-10307-12</b>
529	KULWANT SINGH PATWALIA	IMM-357-13
530	JASPAL KAUR BHUNDAR	IMM-358-13
531	KAMALJEET SINGH SAINI	IMM-359-13
532	RAJINDER KAUR PAWAR	IMM-360-13
533	ASWANIDATTA	IMM-361-13
534	RANJIT KAUR SOHI	IMM-362-13
535	HARPREET SINGH HUNDAL	IMM-363-13
536	SHASHI BHUSHAN SHARMA	IMM-364-13
537	JATINDER KAUR SAINI	IMM-365-13
538	KIM DONG HEE	IMM-366-13
539	YASER ABU SHAIPI	IMM-367-13
540	PARK KYUNG BAE	IMM-368-13
541	LEE SONG HEE	IMM-370-13
542	RITU SHARDA	IMM-371-13
543	NIDHI BAJAJ	IMM-387-13
544	HARDEEP SINGH DHILLON	IMM-389-13
545	SHAMA KHAN	IMM-390-13
546	NAGENDRA KUMAR GUPTA	IMM-391-13
547	SUMANPREET KAUR	IMM-392-13
548	KULVINDER KAUR ALIAS SIMRAN PARMAR	IMM-394-13
549	AMARJEET SINGH	IMM-396-13
550	PARAMJIT KAUR HUNDAL	IMM-397-13
551	VIPIN CHOPAL	IMM-398-13
552	RAMANDEEP KAUR	IMM-400-13
553	Farnoush Tarighat Manesh	IMM-436-13
554	Reheana Mohammad Wasim Wakil	IMM-437-13
555	Mohammad Zahidul Islam	IMM-438-13
556	Noora Hassan Sami Merei	IMM-439-13
557	Muhammad Rafiullah Masood	IMM-440-13
558	Aaron Alexander Pinto	IMM-441-13
559	Sushil Kumar Gambhir	IMM-443-13
560	Kanwarjit Singh Johal	IMM-444-13
561	Rupinder Toor	IMM-445-13
562	Joonhoo Woo	IMM-446-13
563	Jaskaran Singh Sandhu	IMM-447-13
564	Harinderjit Singh Sidhu	IMM-448-13
565	Daljit Singh	IMM-449-13
566	Hardval Singh	IMM-450-13
567	Dhuppar Mani Ram	IMM-451-13
568	Vinor Kumari Sharma	IMM-452-13
569	GLORIA KASIGAZI	IMM-535-13
570	KULJEET SINGH SUDAN v. MCI	IMM-619-13
571	SEEMA CHANDAN v. MCI	IMM-621-13
572	BHUPINDER SINGH JANUA v. MCI	IMM-622-13
573	GENIE M. AUSTRIA v. MCI	IMM-623-13
574	SUKHJINDER SINGH BAL v. MCI	IMM-812-13
575	ARORA VEETA RANI v. MCI	IMM-813-13
576	Baljinder Kaur Heer v. MCI	IMM-1008-13
577	Bhajan Singh Bhanbra v. MCI	IMM-1010-13

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Maria Sari Teresa Borja AUSTRIA</b>	<b>IMM-10307-12</b>
578	PARMJEET SINGH SANDHU	IMM-1251-13
579	Damodaran Mangannan	IMM-1349-13
580	Maha Al-Qudwa	IMM-1350-13
581	Mohammad-Shadi, Rabah	IMM-1783-13
582	Jagmohan Singh Bawa	IMM-1784-13
583	Baljit Singh Brar	IMM-1785-13
584	Umesh Dhupar	IMM-2193-13
585	S.I.M.M. Elmahdy	IMM-2194-13
586	Jagdeep Singh Sarai	IMM-2195-13
587	Sivia Swaran	IMM-2196-13
588	Sukhdev Singh Smagh	IMM-2197-13
589	Jaswinder Singh	IMM-2198-13
590	Sunil Ghandi	IMM-2248-13
591	LITA MORAGA HERAS	IMM-2370-13
592	LILY DYCHYINGCO CHUA	IMM-2372-13
593	SIMON SYKIANLIN	IMM-2373-13
594	BRIGIDO SANTOS III	IMM-2380-13
595	AILEEN UY TAN	IMM-2382-13
596	JOAN LAO LIM	IMM-2391-13
597	THERESA ALVAREZ	IMM-2393-13
598	NATHANIEL COO CHUA	IMM-2406-13
599	CAROLYN DELEGENCIA	IMM-2418-13
600	AILEEN JANE CHUAHUICO YAO LIM	IMM-2421-13
601	LUIS VILLACERAN	IMM-2377-13
602	RICHIE DY TAN	IMM-2392-13
603	LUIS NOLASCO	IMM-2390-13
604	RODNEY BRINGAIS	IMM-2389-13
605	RIUO RAYMUNDO NISCE	IMM-2388-13
606	ROSANNA SIY	IMM-2387-13
607	RYAN JORDAN RAMOS	IMM-2386-13
608	JAMES CHUAUNSU	IMM-2385-13
609	GRACE THERESA ONG	IMM-2383-13
610	ESTHER NG	IMM-2381-13
611	JOHN LAO LIM	IMM-2407-13
612	CHRISTOPHER BRIAN YU	IMM-2409-13
613	RAMON ONG LIM	IMM-2410-13
614	ROWENA (WINNIE) FERNANDEZ	IMM-2420-13
615	Berry Lim Ongdueco	IMM-2425-13
616	Greg Amanze	IMM-2522-13
617	Narinder Singh Sandhu	IMM-2523-13
618	Teddy Sy	IMM-2524-13
619	Baljit Singh Gill	IMM-2525-13
620	Jartinder Pal Singh Khosa	IMM-2526-13
621	Dharminder Singh Mattu	IMM-2527-13
622	MAHBOBEH TARAGHI	IMM-125-13
623	NENA ADAME CACA YURIN	IMM-12747-12
624	ARVINDER KAUR SAROY	IMM-10392-12
625	KULWANT KAUR SANDHU	IMM-2576-13
626	HENRY TOBY	IMM-5365-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>ALI RAZA JAFRI</b>	<b>IMM-4866-12</b>
--------------	-----------------------	--------------------

1	MARIA THERESA REINOSO BELMONTE	IMM-4865-12
2	REGINA NNENNA IGBOKO	IMM-4869-12
3	LETICIA IGBOKO	IMM-4868-12
4	DAVID CYRIL RILEY	IMM-4870-12
5	PATRICK TOBIAS KUTEPA	IMM-4871-12
6	<del>MARCUS SAYWLU WLEH</del>	<del>IMM-4872-12</del>
7	RAMAN THAKUR	IMM-4879-12
8	CLAUDE BANZA NTOMBE	IMM-4880-12
9	JITENDER BAHADUR SINGH	IMM-4882-12
10	VINOD KUMAR GUNYA	IMM-4883-12
11	GURJIT KAUR	IMM-4884-12
12	PHILIP DAYSON	IMM-6142-12
13	AHSAN BIN ASLAM	IMM-7306-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Zafar MAHMOOD et al</b>	<b>IMM-8302-12</b>
--------------	----------------------------	--------------------

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Sumera SHAHID</b>	<b>IMM-3725-12</b>
--------------	----------------------	--------------------

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Fang WEI</b>	<b>IMM-6165-12</b>
--------------	-----------------	--------------------

1	CHUANYUE XIE	IMM-4619-12
2	MAN YANG	IMM-4620-12
3	JING YANG	IMM-4624-12
4	SIU LAI WOO	IMM-4625-12
5	HONGBING BI	IMM-4626-12
6	XIANGYANG LIN	IMM-4627-12
7	YING HUANG	IMM-4628-12
8	XIANGNING DENG	IMM-4634-12
9	SHANGSI LING	IMM-4635-12
10	CHENGXIANG LIU	IMM-4641-12
11	FAN ZHANG	IMM-4642-12
12	YINGHONG ZHANG	IMM-4644-12
13	ZIJUN LIU	IMM-4645-12
14	BAOQING ZHOU	IMM-4646-12
15	ZHENDONG WANG	IMM-4647-12
16	HUIQIANG PENG	IMM-4648-12
17	YANG TIAN	IMM-4649-12
18	CHANGYING CHEN	IMM-4650-12
19	XIAOMIN ZENG	IMM-4651-12
20	<del>FEI ZHU</del>	<del>IMM-4654-12</del>

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Fang WEI</b>	<b>IMM-6165-12</b>
21	QIONG ZHANG	IMM-4656-12
22	TINGTING ZHAO	IMM-4657-12
23	YAN TU	IMM-4658-12
24	JIAN HEI	IMM-4659-12
25	YAN XU	IMM-4662-12
26	FUCHUAN NI	IMM-4663-12
27	XUEJUN WANG	IMM-4666-12
28	YUN ZHOU	IMM-4668-12
29	NING LI	IMM-4669-12
30	XIN LI	IMM-4670-12
31	PING GUO	IMM-4671-12
32	HAIJUN LU	IMM-4672-12
33	TONG QI	IMM-4673-12
34	SHUNHUA YE	IMM-4674-12
35	HONGQI LIN	IMM-4675-12
36	KAMFAING	IMM-4676-12
37	LIANG CHEN	IMM-4677-12
38	BO LIU	IMM-4678-12
39	ZHENGHUI XU	IMM-4679-12
40	SONG LIN	IMM-4680-12
41	XUANJIN ZHU	IMM-4681-12
42	ZHIQIANG GUO	IMM-4682-12
43	PEIFENG HAO	IMM-4683-12
44	YING BAI	IMM-4684-12
45	SHUXUN CHEN	IMM-4685-12
46	YUN LI	IMM-4686-12
47	LING XIAO	IMM-4698-12
48	LIANZHU CHAI	IMM-4700-12
49	YING ZHANG	IMM-4703-12
50	SHAOPING CAO	IMM-4704-12
51	GUIMEI JING	IMM-4706-12
52	LIN ZHANG	IMM-4707-12
53	WEI CHEN	IMM-4709-12
54	PAN QIN	IMM-4710-12
55	JINGJING WENREN	IMM-4712-12
56	YIDAN LU	IMM-4713-12
57	GUI MA	IMM-4714-12
58	XIAOXIAO LIU	IMM-4715-12
59	YU SHEN	IMM-4716-12
60	WEIJUAN WU	IMM-4717-12
61	MINGYU WU	IMM-4718-12
62	WENJUN XUE	IMM-4719-12
63	BING ZHANG	IMM-4720-12
64	KUN ZHU	IMM-4721-12
65	CHUXIAO LI	IMM-4722-12
66	XINYAN JIA	IMM-4723-12
67	JUAN LUO	IMM-4724-12
68	CHUAN HUO	IMM-4725-12
69	MINGMING LUI	IMM-4726-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Fang WEI</b>	<b>IMM-6165-12</b>
70	TIANFU	IMM-4728-12
71	HUIXIAN LONG	IMM-4730-12
72	XIAOJIAN YAN	IMM-4733-12
73	HONGWEI YANG	IMM-4735-12
74	YU HE	IMM-4736-12
75	GEQI WENG	IMM-4738-12
76	ERLI SUN	IMM-4740-12
77	QIZHI FENG	IMM-4741-12
78	SHAOCHI WANG	IMM-4743-12
79	JIANZHONG TANG	IMM-4747-12
80	CHUN CHU	IMM-4749-12
81	LI LIANG	IMM-4753-12
82	JIANCUN HUANG	IMM-4754-12
83	XIAOYU LIU	IMM-4755-12
84	DEJIAN LI	IMM-4757-12
85	XUELIAN BIAN	IMM-4759-12
86	RUOCHUN LI	IMM-4760-12
87	RUI ZHANG	IMM-4761-12
88	YANLING LIU	IMM-4762-12
89	AIPING ZHANG	IMM-4764-12
90	FEI WANG	IMM-4766-12
91	WEN LU	IMM-4770-12
92	LIPING QIU	IMM-4772-12
93	JIANG LUO	IMM-4774-12
94	YILI WANG	IMM-4775-12
95	JIONG ZHANG	IMM-4779-12
96	SHI SUN	IMM-5841-12
97	JIONG WANG	IMM-5842-12
98	XILEI SONG	IMM-5843-12
99	MIN QIAN	IMM-5845-12
100	JIANGPING LU	IMM-5847-12
101	JIONG GU	IMM-5848-12
102	GUOYIN WANG	IMM-5972-12
103	LIJING XIAN	IMM-5975-12
104	YUAN XU	IMM-5986-12
105	YINZI GUAN	IMM-5988-12
106	JIN LIU	IMM-5995-12
107	LEI WU	IMM-5996-12
108	ZHAOHUI SUN	IMM-5997-12
109	XIAODONG HUANG	IMM-5998-12
110	PING YU	IMM-5999-12
111	YANGCHUN YANG	IMM-6000-12
112	HUIMING HU	IMM-6001-12
113	JIEMIN XIA	IMM-6002-12
114	YAPING WANG	IMM-6003-12
115	QUTING ZHANG	IMM-6004-12
116	JIAWEI WANG	IMM-6005-12
117	XIN LIU	IMM-6006-12
118	JIE AN	IMM-6009-12



<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Fang WEI</b>	<b>IMM-6165-12</b>
119	PENG XU	IMM-6011-12
120	MENG LUO	IMM-6012-12
121	SHUNHONG YAN	IMM-6013-12
122	CAIHUA YU	IMM-6014-12
123	WUSAN DA	IMM-6015-12
124	QIFENG HOU	IMM-6016-12
125	DAYU LIU	IMM-6040-12
126	HONGWEN TIAN	IMM-6042-12
127	JIAJIA CHEN	IMM-6044-12
128	CHENGGANG HUANG	IMM-6045-12
129	YURONG BIAN	IMM-6048-12
130	CHUNYANG HUA	IMM-6049-12
131	CHAO LI	IMM-6051-12
132	JIE YI TIAN	IMM-6052-12
133	YONG QIANG WU	IMM-6054-12
134	SHAO RU HE	IMM-6056-12
135	MING MING YANG	IMM-6058-12
136	SHUN PING LI	IMM-6060-12
137	YAN JIANG	IMM-6061-12
138	PEIDE FU	IMM-6062-12
139	YI HAI ZHONG	IMM-6064-12
140	XINGFEN FANG	IMM-6065-12
141	JIAN ZHOU	IMM-6066-12
142	ZIEN LI	IMM-6067-12
143	WEI NIU	IMM-6069-12
144	YUTAO HE	IMM-6070-12
145	RAN ZHOU	IMM-6072-12
146	WEI FENG	IMM-6073-12
147	YING WU ZHANG	IMM-6074-12
148	XIAOLEI CHEN	IMM-6076-12
149	XIAO LONG RAN	IMM-6077-12
150	YONG LU ZUO	IMM-6080-12
151	HAITAO LAN	IMM-6083-12
152	XIAOZHONG HE	IMM-6084-12
153	BIN MA	IMM-6085-12
154	GUIPING RAN	IMM-6087-12
155	HUAN LIU	IMM-6091-12
156	JIE CAO	IMM-6092-12
157	GUANGYING XIAO	IMM-6098-12
158	MING CHEN	IMM-6100-12
159	LIXIA SHAO	IMM-6103-12
160	ZHAOSAN YIN	IMM-6104-12
161	BO HUANG	IMM-6105-12
162	HUI YING HUAN	IMM-6106-12
163	CHUN TING LI	IMM-6107-12
164	XIANGXIAN LI	IMM-6108-12
165	YAPING YANG	IMM-6109-12
166	BING CHEN	IMM-6110-12
167	FEI KONG	IMM-6112-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Fang WEI</b>	<b>IMM-6165-12</b>
168	LI ZHANG	IMM-6113-12
169	XIAO XIA LIU	IMM-6121-12
170	PING DENG	IMM-6157-12
171	JIAN XU	IMM-6162-12
172	TING GAO	IMM-6167-12
173	XIPING LUO	IMM-6168-12
174	SONGMIN WANG	IMM-6169-12
175	YIBO WANG	IMM-6170-12
176	SHUMEI WANG	IMM-6171-12
177	ZHI YI LI	IMM-6172-12
178	SHIMIN DAI	IMM-6173-12
179	JING LI	IMM-6174-12
180	CHENXI ZHAO	IMM-6175-12
181	YANG LIU	IMM-6176-12
182	MEI ZHANG	IMM-6177-12
183	MAN YI MICHELLE TANG	IMM-6178-12
184	XUELIN ZHANG	IMM-6179-12
185	YANLI WEI	IMM-6180-12
186	JIN LIU	IMM-6181-12
187	YUANYUAN DONG	IMM-6182-12
188	ENNIAN JIN	IMM-6183-12
189	ZHI LI	IMM-6203-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>YanJun YIN</b>	<b>IMM-8747-12</b>
1	Jiandong Yao	IMM-3779-12
2	Yinhua Zhong	IMM-3783-12
3	Qianqi Li	IMM-3784-12
4	Gang Sun	IMM-3785-12
5	Xinyu Bai	IMM-3786-12
6	Jinzhong Ma	IMM-3787-12
7	Kai Zhang	IMM-3788-12
8	Yang Shen	IMM-3792-12
9	Xiaoyou Xu	IMM-3796-12
10	Jianyi Chen	IMM-3800-12
11	YanJun Yin	IMM-3801-12
12	Kefei Li	IMM-3802-12
13	Jie Shen	IMM-3804-12
14	Wenling Liu	IMM-3807-12
15	Xi Long Cheng	IMM-3838-12
16	Yang Liu	IMM-3841-12
17	Wenqian Zhang	IMM-3846-12
18	Wei Zhang	IMM-3847-12
19	Pei Chen	IMM-3848-12
20	Yanbin Zhang	IMM-3850-12
21	Kun Chen	IMM-3852-12
22	<del>Xin Yu</del>	<del>IMM-3855-12</del>
23	Tao Jiang	IMM-3856-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Yanjun YIN</b>	<b>IMM-8747-12</b>
24	Shengxue Song	IMM-6606-12
25	Lei Ma	IMM-6610-12
26	Shengquan Duan	IMM-6612-12
27	Dong Li	IMM-6617-12
28	SEYED MAJID MOHAMMADIAN ABKENAR	IMM-7335-12
29	Jiao Jiang	IMM-7337-12
30	Xiao Hua Su	IMM-7338-12
31	Neeru Mittal	IMM-7342-12
32	Jawed Akhter	IMM-7343-12
33	Waqar Ahmed	IMM-7347-12
34	AAMIR NAWAZ ALI KARIM	IMM-7351-12
35	Allah Dino Khowaja	IMM-7392-12
36	Rohinton Daruwalla et al.	IMM-7397-12
37	Syed Mohammad Ali	IMM-7398-12
38	Lubna Imran	IMM-7401-12
39	Muhammad Sajjad Hassan	IMM-7402-12
40	Mehdi Hasan	IMM-7405-12
41	Imran Khalid	IMM-7406-12
42	MANASKUMAR PAL	IMM-7432-12
43	ANDREA PERES	IMM-7437-12
44	ASIF IQBAL BHATTI	IMM-7438-12
45	YANRONG LIANG	IMM-7491-12
46	CHUN CHENG WANG	IMM-7492-12
47	LAI LING RITA SO	IMM-7494-12
48	ZIHAN QUI	IMM-7504-12
49	WEI WANG	IMM-7506-12
50	YING JIANG	IMM-7507-12
51	Fei Chen	IMM-7531-12
52	Ying Zhao	IMM-7532-12
53	Ailing Chen	IMM-7534-12
54	Haijun Deng	IMM-7535-12
55	Di Hou	IMM-7536-12
56	Shuang Song	IMM-7537-12
57	John Rizvi	IMM-7582-12
58	Grace Hipona	IMM-7586-12
59	Muhammad Tayyab	IMM-7590-12
60	Li Xu	IMM-7593-12
61	Ejaz Ahmed Ahmed	IMM-7594-12
62	Jia Liu	IMM-7597-12
63	Chuanxiang Jiao	IMM-7598-12
64	HASEEN ABDULRAHIMAN PADIYATH	IMM-7601-12
65	NAEEM AHMAD	IMM-8211-12
66	TINU BAJWA	IMM-8893-12
67	F. MARK ORKIN ET AL	IMM-9389-12
68	PRIYA KUNAN	IMM-9483-12
69	Dawei Deng	IMM-9574-12
70	Jin Zhang	IMM-10132-12
71	Gurvinder Singh Bhatti	IMM-10133-12
72	Parkash Kaur Hallan	IMM-10202-12

<b>Lead:</b>	<b>Yanjun YIN</b>	<b>IMM-8747-12</b>
73	DILPREET SINGH HOTHI	IMM-10204-12
74	VIDA MODARRES NEJAD	IMM-10464-12
75	Nathalia Elizabeth Jones	IMM-10504-12
76	Shannon Joseph Jones	IMM-10505-12
77	Shivan Raj Ayyanathan	IMM-10506-12
78	Vivek Meenakshi Sundaram	IMM-10507-12
79	Ramprasad Balasubramaniam	IMM-10561-12
80	Samuel Moses Nelson	IMM-10563-12
81	Ravi Shankar Kollengode Ramachandran	IMM-10564-12
82	Kamini Neville Bilimoria	IMM-10566-12
83	CHRISTABEL MCPHERSON	IMM-10599-12
84	DEVA MURALI PURUSHOTHAMAN	IMM-10601-12
85	LIU XIANGZHI	IMM-10717-12
86	Melville Brooks	IMM-10924-12
87	Ivan Alfonso Lozano	IMM-10925-12
88	Reem Basheer Hassan Mahdi	IMM-11365-12
89	Larson Manickam Lawrence	IMM-11608-12
90	Joe Joseph	IMM-11613-12
91	Helene Burger	IMM-11620-12
92	Sudhir Anand	IMM-11632-12
93	Paul Vijayan Basker	IMM-11635-12
94	Robert Prathip Singh Michael	IMM-11639-12
95	Lixia Shao	IMM-11915-12
96	HARSHAD VIJA YKUMAR DEWALIA	IMM-12509-12
97	Cyrus Latifi	IMM-139-13
98	Bahareh Deyed-Aghazadeh	IMM-140-13
99	Ghasem Fallahi	IMM-167-13
100	Alireza Rashid-Beigi	IMM-168-13
101	Sarah Vahidi	IMM-169-13
102	Behrad Agah	IMM-170-13
103	Namavar	IMM-256-13
104	Fallah-Asharzadeh	IMM-257-13
105	Pour-Jafar	IMM-258-13
106	Zamanifard	IMM-259-13
107	SABAH KETAN	IMM-487-13
108	MERIE SAAD TAWFIK TAWDROUS ELRAHEB	IMM-742-13
109	CHU-HUA	IMM-745-13
110	Jaspreet Kaur	IMM-878-13
111	Muhammad M. S. A. Y. Mosli	IMM-879-13
112	BANAFSHEH GERANMA YEH	IMM-1384-13
113	DIVYA GUPTA	IMM-1457-13
114	MOHAMMAD TANVIR QURESHI	IMM-1607-13

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

**DOCKET:** **IMM-5635-12**  
**STYLE OF CAUSE:** MAE JOY **TABINGO** v THE MINISTER OF  
CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**DOCKET:** **IMM-8669-12**  
**STYLE OF CAUSE:** HABIBOLLAH **ABEDI** v THE MINISTER OF  
CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**DOCKET:** **IMM-10307-12**  
**STYLE OF CAUSE:** MARIA SARI TERESA BORJA **AUSTRIA** v THE  
MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**DOCKET:** **IMM-4866-12**  
**STYLE OF CAUSE:** ALI RAZA **JAFRI** v THE MINISTER OF  
CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**DOCKET:** **IMM-8302-12**  
**STYLE OF CAUSE:** ZAFAR **MAHMOOD**, SHABNUM ZAFAR, ABDUL  
MAJID ZAFAR, ABDUL SAMMAD ZAFAR v THE  
MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**DOCKET:** **IMM-3725-12**  
**STYLE OF CAUSE:** SUMERA **SHAHID** v THE MINISTER OF  
CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**DOCKET:** **IMM-6165-12**  
**STYLE OF CAUSE:** FANG **WEI** v THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP  
AND IMMIGRATION

**DOCKET:** **IMM-8747-12**  
**STYLE OF CAUSE:** YANJUN **YIN** v THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP  
AND IMMIGRATION

**PLACE OF HEARING:** Toronto, ON

**DATES OF HEARING:** January 14, 15, 16, 2013

**REASONS FOR JUDGMENT  
AND JUDGMENT:** RENNIE J.

**DATED:** April 18, 2013

**APPEARANCES:**

Mr. Mario Bellissimo  
Ms. Erin Roth

FOR APPLICANT - MAE JOY TABINGO  
IMM-5635-12

Mr. Lorne Waldman  
Ms. Jacqueline Swaisland

FOR APPLICANT - YANJUN YIN  
IMM-8747-12

Mr. Matthew Jeffery

FOR APPLICANT - ALI RAZA JAFRI  
IMM-4866-12

Mr. Rocco Galati  
Mr. Lawrence S. Wong

FOR APPLICANT - SUMERA SHAHID  
IMM-3725-12

Mr. Rocco Galati  
Mr. Lawrence S. Wong

FOR APPLICANT - FANG WEI  
IMM-6165-12

Mr. Keith Reimer  
Mr. Martin Anderson  
Ms. Jocelyn Espejo-Clarke  
Mr. C. Julian Jubenville

FOR THE RESPONDENT

**SOLICITORS OF RECORD:**

Bellissimo Law Group  
Toronto, Ontario

FOR APPLICANT  
MAE JOY TABINGO  
IMM-5635-12

Lorne Waldman & Associates  
Toronto, Ontario

FOR APPLICANT  
YANJUN YIN  
IMM-8747-12

Matthew Jeffery  
Barrister & Solicitor  
Toronto, Ontario

FOR APPLICANT  
ALI RAZA JAFRI  
IMM-4866-12

Cecil L. Rotenberg, Q.C.  
Barrister & Solicitor  
Toronto, Ontario

FOR APPLICANT  
MARIA SARI TERESA BORJA AUSTRIA  
IMM-10307-12

Lawrence S. Wong  
Mississauga, Ontario

FOR APPLICANT  
FANG WEI  
IMM-6165-12

Blanshay & Lewis  
Barristers & Solicitors  
Toronto, Ontario

FOR APPLICANT  
HABIBOLLAH ABEDI  
IMM-8669-12

Mary L. F. Lam  
Toronto, Ontario

FOR APPLICANT  
ZAFAR MAHMOOD et al  
IMM-8302-12

Lee & Company  
Immigration Advocacy, Counsel &  
Litigation  
Ms. Wennie Lee  
Toronto, Ontario

FOR APPLICANT  
SUMERA SHAHID  
IMM-3725-12

William F. Pentney,  
Deputy Attorney General of Canada

FOR THE RESPONDENT