

TB9-05495

COURT
Refugee Appeal Division

DECIDED
26 September 2020

Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified. A source URL was not supplied in the case record.

RAD File / Dossier de la SAR : TB9-05495 TB9-05496 / TB9-05497 / TB9-05498 TB9-05499 /
TB9-05500 Private Proceeding / Huis clos Reasons and decision ? Motifs et décision Persons who
are the subject of the appeal XXXX XXXX XXXX (a.k.a XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX) XXXX XXXX (a.k.a XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX)
XXXX XXXX (a.k.a XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX) XXXX XXXX XXXX
(a.k.a XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX) XXXX XXXX XXXX(a.k.a XXXX
XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX) XXXX XXXX (a.k.a XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX)
Personnes en cause Appeal considered / heard at Toronto, ON Appel instruit / entendu à Date of
decision September 26, 2020 Date de la décision Panel Colin Anderson Tribunal Counsel for the
persons who are the subject of the appeal Joseph P Granton Conseil de la|des personne|s en
cause Designated representative XXXX XXXX XXXX Représentant(e) désigné(e) Counsel for the
Minister N/A Conseil du ministre REASONS FOR DECISION INTRODUCTION AND DECISION

[1] The following reasons explain why I am dismissing the appeals of Mr. XXXX XXXX XXXX (the Principal Appellant), his wife Ms. XXXX XXXX XXXX, and their children Saima XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX (the Male Appellant), XXXX XXXX XXXX and XXXX XXXX. The Appellants have appealed the Refugee Protection Division's (RPD) May 31, 2017 decision that denied their claims for refugee protection. The Appellants have asked that I either find them to be Convention refugees or persons in need of protection, or send their claims back to the RPD for redetermination, with directions to seal the previous RPD record. I agree with the RPD that the Appellants are neither Convention refugees nor are they persons in need of protection.

BACKGROUND

[2] The Appellants have made the following key allegations in their Basis of Claim forms and at the RPD hearing: * That they all actively observe the Ahmadi faith, and were involved in the Ahmadi jamaat in Bahrain; * That Bahraini authorities placed the Appellants under surveillance and harassed their family because of their religious activities; and * That Bahraini authorities returned their Pakistani passports without explanation, because the Bahraini authorities are preparing to strip them of citizenship and deport them to Pakistan (where they will face religious persecution).

- [3] The RPD found that the Appellants' claims failed because material aspects of the Principal Appellant and the Male Appellant's testimony were not credible. Specifically, the RPD found that the Appellants were not told that their phones were tapped by the Bahraini government, nor that a complaint had been filed against them with the government. The RPD also found that the Appellants did not face persecution in Bahrain due to their Ahmadi faith. The RPD found that the Appellants' allegation that their Bahraini citizenships were to be stripped was only a mere speculation. The RPD determined the Appellants' do not have a well-founded fear of persecution in Bahrain and they are not persons in need of protection. The RPD found the Appellants were citizens of both Bahrain and Pakistan. However, the RPD found the Appellants did not face risk in Bahrain and so did not assess their risk in Pakistan.
- [4] The Appellants argue on appeal that the RPD erred as follows: * By failing to confront the Appellants on a lack of corroborating documents, and by failing to give the Appellants a chance to explain this lack of evidence; * By misapprehending the Appellants' evidence with regard to the reason for and timing of their flight from Bahrain and so erring in its subjective fear finding; * By making unsustainable findings of implausibility; * By engaging in a microscopic credibility analysis and by using peripheral findings to undermine the Appellants' general credibility; and * By making findings on objective basis that are not supported by the evidence. PRELIMINARY MATTERS All the new evidence is admissible
- [5] The Appellants have submitted voluminous new evidence on country conditions in Bahrain in support of their appeal. I have reviewed all of this new evidence and find that it is all admissible. It is admissible because it all post-dates the RPD decision date and therefore meets the statutory requirements set out in IRPA s. 110(4). It further meets the factors set out in Singh and Raza. The new evidence consists of numerous reports on the human rights and religious conditions in Bahrain, including reports from well-known agencies such as Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, the United States Department of State, and the United Nations. The new evidence is relevant, because it speaks to the Appellants' risk profiles in Bahrain, it is credible, because it comes from recognized organizations that this Board regularly relies upon, and it is new, because it contains information that has been updated after the RPD decision. No oral hearing is permitted
- [6] The Appellants have asked that I hold a RAD oral hearing if credibility remains a live issue in this appeal. In this case, I find that no RAD oral hearing is permitted. IRPA s. 110(6) specifies that I may hold a RAD oral hearing if, among other things, the new evidence admitted raises a serious issue with respect to the credibility of the persons who are the subject of the appeal. None of the new evidence raises a serious issue with respect to the Appellants' credibility. The role of the Refugee Appeal Division
- [7] I have reviewed the entirety of the written record and have listened to the audio recording of the RPD hearing. The RPD had no meaningful advantage over me in assessing the credibility of oral testimony. I have therefore undertaken a review of the correctness of the RPD decision throughout.

ANALYSIS

Credibility and no objective basis are the determinative issues on appeal

- [8] As I will explain below, I agree with the RPD that the Appellants have not demonstrated that their fear of persecution in Bahrain is well-founded. This is because the evidence adduced by the Appellants indicates their fear of persecution lacks an objective basis. The RPD found the Appellants did not establish that they had a subjective fear of returning to Bahrain, and the Appellants have argued on appeal that the RPD erred in its subjective fear analysis. However, where I find the Appellants have not established they have an objective basis, and where this is fatal to their not having a well-founded fear of persecution, it is not necessary for me to address RPD's subjective fear finding or the arguments raised on appeal in respect of this issue. I have not drawn a negative credibility inference against the Appellants in relation to the timing of when they chose to leave Bahrain. The Appellants also have not demonstrated, on a balance of probabilities, that they would face a risk to life, risk of torture, or risk of cruel and unusual treatment or punishment should they return to Bahrain. A refugee claim cannot succeed when it lacks an objective basis. The Appellants' allegations that they are under state surveillance lack credibility
- [9] The RPD correctly found that the Appellants' allegations that they were subject to surveillance at the hands of Bahraini state agents were not credible. The RPD was correct because significant central and material testimony regarding when and how they came to know they were under surveillance was inconsistent between the Principal Appellant, the Male Appellant, and their Basis of Claim narratives. The inconsistencies go well beyond mere specifics like dates and names, and include serious discrepancies in the richly-described accounts of how they were told and in what ways. I agree with the RPD's finding that on a balance of probabilities the Appellants' were not told their phones were being monitored and they were not told that a complaint had been filed against them with the government.
- [10] All of the Appellants rely on the Basis of Claim narrative of the Principal Appellant in support of their claims. The narrative indicates that in XXXX 2016, a member of the Ahmadi community who worked for Bahrain's intelligence agency informed the Appellants that they were under surveillance.¹ The narrative further indicates that, on a separate occasion, a friend of the Principal Appellant, who worked for the Bahraini Ministry of the Interior, directly warned the Appellants that a local Sunni cleric had complained about the Appellants and other Ahmadis and had accused them of being non-Muslims.²
- [11] When the RPD questioned the Principal Appellant about these allegations, the Principal Appellant offered extremely confusing testimony. At approximately 00:53:00 in the RPD hearing, the Principal Appellant said "we were told that the CID is doing investigation. They check our telephone calls." When asked when he was told that, the Principal Appellant said "in 2015." When asked if he remembered when in 2015, the Principal Appellant said "the XXXX of 2015." When asked who told him the CID was listening to calls, the Principal

Appellant said "someone who was working for the CID, that person told me." When asked who specifically, the Principal Appellant said "XXXX XXXX." The Principal Appellant eventually corrected himself, and said "I originally said it was 2015, it was actually the XXXX of 2016." At approximately 01:37:10 in the hearing, the RPD asked the Principal Appellant, "how do you know they [the Bahrainian state] had found out you were Ahmadis?" The Principal Appellant said, "well, because of the gatherings, because people inform us that tell them and let them know they are assembling and this is their faith." When asked to be more specific, the Principal Appellant said "they could have found out listening to the phone calls." When asked "other than the friend telling you specifically about the phone calls was there any other specific event that led you to believe that the government [of Bahrain] was specifically aware of your family?" The Principal Appellant said, "yeah, it was from other people." The RPD asked "who?" The Principal Appellant said, "people living around us, particularly people from Pakistan... they are not that concerned about Shiite, Sunnis." The RPD then said "your basis of claim form indicates that in XXXX 2016 a friend who works for the XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX warned you that a Sunni cleric had made complaints against your family. Can you comment on this?" The Principal Appellant said, "he tell us that we should attend the mosque. This is what he told me." The RPD asked, "did he say anything else?" The Principal Appellant said, "this is all he said, that you should come over here." The RPD asked again, "did he say anything else?" The Principal Appellant said "he said you should attend this Mosque. And he told my children that you should leave your faith..." The RPD said, "your basis of claim form says that a friend of yours who worked in the Ministry of the Interior warned you that the local Sunni cleric had made complaints about your family. Did he do this?" The Principal Appellant said, "he told me that your phone calls are being checked, and that's all. That was it." The RPD asked, "so why does your Basis of Claim form indicate that a friend from the Ministry of the Interior told you that a Sunni cleric had made complaints?" The Principal Appellant said, "no, it was not like that." After a long pause, the Principal Appellant changed his testimony and said, "yeah it is right. He said that there is a complaint against you people. You should be cautious." The RPD asked, "so why did you just say that it was not like that?" The Principal Appellant said, "yeah there was a complaint, but our phone call had been checked." When asked again why there was a discrepancy, the Principal Appellant said, "he told us that your phone calls are being tapped. There was a complaint before, this is why your phone calls are being tapped."

- [12] The Principal Appellant's testimony reproduced in the paragraph above appears to me to confuse a number of important and central details in the Appellants' allegations of harm. The Principal Appellant appears to confuse the fact that these two instances in which he was informed about key threats to the family allegedly happened on separate occasions (according to the written narrative), and allegedly from separate people. The Principal Appellant, in his testimony, appears to completely disregard his narrative allegations that the Sunni cleric made complaints to Bahrainian government officials, and instead testified that the cleric attempted to recruit the family to join the Sunni mosque. When reminded repeatedly of his Basis of Claim narrative contents, the Principal Appellant then suggested

that the complaint had occurred before - and was the cause of - the telephone surveillance, and that they were warned of both at the same time, and by the same person. The Basis of Claim narrative specifies that this happened in reverse order, at different times, and that the warnings came from different people.

- [13] The testimony from the Male Appellant further confuses the record. This is because, at approximately 00:24:00 of the second RPD hearing date, the Male Appellant testified that, while he didn't remember exactly, the warning from the friend at the Ministry of the Interior regarding the cleric's complaint occurred in 2015. When asked to be more specific about what happened with regard to the Sunni cleric's complaint, the Male Appellant said, "one Ahmadi member who was in the CID informed us that there has been complaint received against our family and another family. Then there was a meeting called by our organization and we were advised steps we shall take and what not to do. And they also identified some families saying that they are monitoring those families, and the complaints have been made against those families in the area." When asked how the XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX informant relayed this information, the Male Appellant testified, "he works in the office, and he has contacts with the CID people." When asked what office the informant works in, the Male Appellant testified, "the one person works in the department where the phone calls are being tapped, and the other person is working in the police headquarter, and he told us complaints are coming in our office against you." The RPD member then asked if the Male Appellant was talking about one or two different people, and the Male Appellant testified, "I now mentioned about two persons, but what I mentioned earlier was one person." When the RPD asked the Male Appellant to explain further, the Male Appellant said, "I mentioned about one person, the incident happened, but there was another incident happened, where we were informed that our phone calls are being tapped." The RPD member then informed the Male Appellant that things were getting very confused, and to focus on the first incident. The RPD member asked the Male Appellant who first made him aware that the government was watching his family. The Male Appellant replied, "one Ahmadi friend, XXXX XXXX XXXX, he told us about this." When the RPD asked how XXXX knew about the surveillance, the Male Appellant replied, "he was working in an office, and his office had interaction with others... he was in the CID." When asked how XXXX relayed the information to the Appellants, the Male Appellant replied, "he conveyed it to our jamaat members, and they carried it on to us. And then there was a meeting called, and in it was discussed that such incident has happened, and for further precautions." The RPD then asked about the second time the Appellants became aware that the government was monitoring the family. The Male Appellant then testified that it was "when another member advised us that your phone calls are being tapped." The RPD asked who this member was, and the Male Appellant replied, "he was working in the phone calls tracking department of the CID." When asked how he knew this person, the Male Claimant replied, "we know all the members of the jamaat." The RPD asked when he told the Appellants this information, and the Male Appellant replied, "I don't remember exactly, but it was in 2015 after that." When asked if this individual told them any other information other than that their calls were being tapped, the

Male Appellant replied, "no, but this was relayed to the higher members of our jamaat and they relayed it to us." The RPD member then asked again, "how do you know specifically that your family was being watched by the government?" The Male Appellant replied, "firstly we found out that our complaint has been made there. Secondly we were also told that our phone calls are being tracked." The RPD member asked, "who told you that a complaint had been made against you?" The Male Appellant replied, "XXXX XXXX, he told us that along with our family, other families have also been lodged there." When asked when XXXX XXXX told them that, the Male Appellant replied, "mid or XXXX of 2015." The RPD member then asked why the Male Appellant's testimony that this happened in mid of XXXX 2015 was inconsistent with the Basis of Claim narrative, which states that the incident happened in XXXX 2016. The Male Appellant replied, "the first time that I mentioned XXXX 2016, it was when we were approached while we were walking." The RPD member then reminded the Male Appellant about the Basis of Claim narrative, which states, "in XXXX 2016 a friend of mine who works in the XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX warned me that local Sunni cleric had made complaints about my family." The RPD member asked why the Male Appellant was testifying that this warning happened in 2015. The Male Appellant then testified, "recently, my father's friend, who was working in the XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX, he was in the normal police department, and he told him that the local religious mullahs, they have complained that we have gone for Umrah, and religious gatherings, and that the government has found out that you are Ahmadis, and there is strict punishment for that." The Male Appellant testified that this person's name is XXXX XXXX.

- [14] The Male Appellant's testimony introduces a largely different version of events that those outlined by the Principal Appellant and by the Basis of Claim narrative. In the Male Appellant's testimony, there are three informants, whereas there are only two described by the narrative and the Principal Appellant. The Male Appellant's testimony describes that the family was informed about complaints, then about phone taps, then about a further complaint from the Sunni cleric. The Male Appellant's version is inconsistent with the Principal Appellant and the narrative about dates, but when reminded of discrepancies, evolves to offer different information. The Male Appellant's testimony offered a version of events that took place in a different order than the ones in the narrative and the Principal Appellant's testimony.
- [15] The Appellants argue on appeal that the RPD made microscopic findings that relied on memory tests. While I can understand that specific dates may be hard to remember, I do not find that the RPD was microscopic in this case. This is because, as the RPD noted, the richly described accounts of what happened, who was involved, and the order in which events occurred was largely inconsistent between the Principal Appellant, the Male Appellant, and their narrative. The Appellants have further argued that the RPD's findings are on peripheral issues and should therefore not be used to make a negative credibility inference. Again, I disagree with the Appellants. This is because these allegations form the core of the Appellants' allegations that they are being surveilled and harassed by the Bahrainian state because of their religion. The RPD's findings on this issue go to the core of these claims.

- [16] As a result of the analysis above, I find that the Appellants' confusing, inconsistent and evolving testimony on the core allegations in their claims undermine the credibility of their accounts that they have been surveilled by Bahrainian state agents. I agree with the RPD's finding that the Appellants did not adduce sufficient credible evidence to establish on a balance of probabilities that they were told their phones were being monitored or that a complaint had been filed against them with the government. Allegations are not corroborated by evidence
- [17] The Appellants correctly point out that the RPD erred when it stated in its decision that the lack of corroborating documentary evidence undermined the credibility of the Appellant's allegations of harm. The reason this is an error on the part of the RPD is because the RPD never confronted the Appellants with the RPD's concerns regarding the lack of corroborative evidence and the Appellants therefore did not have a chance to explain the reason this evidence was omitted or was not reasonably available.
- [18] The RPD should have instead written that, apart from the viva voce testimony and written Basis of Claim narrative that has arisen directly from the Appellants, the Board has been presented with no evidence corroborating the Appellants' specific allegations of harm. The Board was given no access to documentation or testimony from any of the alleged informants, no evidence or testimony from any of the other Ahmadi jamaat members in Bahrain (or who have apparently left Bahrain for other countries), and no documentation of any kind that refers to the treatment of Ahmadi Muslims in Bahrain.
- [19] The Federal Court has been clear that allegations do not necessarily require corroborating evidence. What a lack of corroborating evidence means, however, is that the Board must rely solely on the Appellants' narrative and testimony in support of their allegations. I have started from the presumption of truthfulness. In my assessment of the Appellants' credibility I did not draw a negative credibility inference in respect of the lack of corroborative evidence. As mentioned above, I also did not draw a negative credibility inference in relation to the timing of when the Appellants chose to leave Bahrain or why they did not leave using their USA visas. My credibility findings were based on my assessment of their oral testimony and their narrative for the reasons explained above. I agree with the RPD's ultimate conclusion that in this case the presumption of truthfulness has been rebutted. No serious possibility of citizenship being revoked or being deported
- [20] The RPD correctly found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Appellants are at risk of having their Bahrainian citizenship revoked and being forcibly deported to Pakistan. The RPD found, and I agree, that this is mere speculation on the part of the Appellants and was not supported by the evidence.
- [21] The Appellants have argued that the RPD's findings on this issue amount to implausibility findings that do not meet the test prescribed in Valtchev. I disagree. Instead, this is an assessment of the likelihood of a future event that relates to the Appellants' risk. There was insufficient evidence presented that the Bahrainian government has taken any steps to

revoke the Appellants' citizenship or that their citizenship has in fact been revoked. The Appellants' evidence is that in 2016 the Bahrainian government returned their Pakistani passports to them without an explanation. The Principal Appellant testified that it was his belief that the passports being returned was an indication that the government intended to strip the family of citizenship and deport them. However, I agree with the RPD that this belief of the Appellants is no more than speculation. In this case, the Appellants have argued that their country condition evidence shows that they are at forward-looking risk of having their citizenships revoked and at a subsequent risk of deportation to Pakistan on the basis of their religion. I disagree.

- [22] The Appellants have adduced very large volumes of country condition evidence, including voluminous new evidence on appeal, in support of their argument on forward-looking risk. Unfortunately for the Appellants, in all the many hundreds of pages of documentation, there is not a single mention of persecution or targeting of Ahmadis in Bahrain. In my opinion, this is significant, because the human rights situation and treatment of religious groups (including both Muslim and non-Muslim groups) is highly scrutinized in the evidence by many highly regarded international organizations such as Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, the United Nations, and the United States Department of State.
- [23] Articles from Human Rights Watch and others indicate that it is political dissidents who are at risk of having their citizenships revoked.³ The article specifies that those having their citizenships revoked are required to hand over their Bahraini passports and national identification cards. No request of this nature has been made of the Appellants.
- [24] According to the Aljazeera article submitted by the Appellants, Bahrain publishes lists of people stripped of citizenship on their website.⁴ The Board has no evidence that the Appellants' names have ever been published on this website.
- [25] The same article specifies that, according to a Bahrainian human rights lawyer, "the majority of the people on the list are just regular Shiite academics, human rights activists, lawyers, clerks and business people. But by placing them on a list with actual terrorists, the government hopes to discredit those who have done nothing wrong."⁵ The Appellants do not fit the profile of any of the people identified above as being at risk.
- [26] The article discussing Bahrain's proposed blasphemy law includes no information it has ever been used against an Ahmadi or a person of any minority religious group.⁶ The article specifies that human rights defenders and activists are at risk.
- [27] The article by the Bahrain Institute for Rights and Democracy reveals some of the process of denaturalization.⁷ The article specifies that a political activist intellectual who was being deported had received a denaturalization order approximately one year before he was deported. The article specifies that this formal order was confirmed by the Bahraini appellate court. There is no indication in this case that the Appellants have ever received an order or had any court action taken against them.

- [28] The report by the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom states that Shia clerics may be at risk.⁸ There is no indication that the Appellants have ever been imputed to be involved with Shia clerics or the Shia sect. The same report notes that the government of Bahrain recognizes 19 Christian denominations, a tiny Jewish community, Hindus, Sikhs, and a Baha'i community. The report details religious discrimination against majority Shia Muslims (who are seen as a threat to the minority ruling Sunnis), but notes a high degree of tolerance for other religious groups. There is no specific mention of minority Ahmadi Muslims.
- [29] The 2018 Bahrain human rights report, submitted as new evidence, lists a great many human rights concerns in the country.⁹ Persecution of religious minorities is not one of the concerns listed in this report. The same report specifies that Bahrain has been known to use surveillance and invasions of privacy against political dissidents. There is no indication in this report that such tactics have been used against religious minorities.¹⁰
- [30] The 2017 Bahrain human rights report, submitted as new evidence, documents in great detail the struggles of majority Shia Muslims in the country.¹¹ It makes no mention of Ahmadi Muslims. The article specifies that according to non-Muslim religious groups, there was a high degree of tolerance within society for minority religious beliefs and traditions, although societal attitudes and behavior discouraged conversion from Islam. The same article states, "adherents of minority religious groups replied they were able to produce religious media and publications and distribute them in bookstores and churches, although the government did not permit publications that were perceived to criticize Islam. According to non-Muslim religious groups, the government did not interfere with religious observances and encouraged tolerance for minority religious beliefs and traditions."¹²
- [31] When I look at the entirety of the evidence, which I have summarized above, I find that the evidence does not support that the Appellants face a serious possibility of their citizenship being revoked or their being deported. I agree with the RPD in that regard, however, I have assessed the likelihood of this future event happening on the standard of serious possibility rather than balance of probabilities. Ahmadis do not face serious possibility of persecution in Bahrain
- [32] I agree with the RPD finding that the Appellants do not face a serious possibility of persecution by reason of their being Ahmadi or practicing their Ahmadi faith in Bahrain. This is because there is no country condition evidence that Ahmadi Muslims are targeted by the Bahrainian government or by Bahrainian society on the basis of their religion. The evidence indicates that when the Bahrainian government intends to strip citizenship, they do so very publicly, via court processes, and that they require Bahrainian passports to be returned. The Appellants are still in possession of their Bahrainian passports, and there is no evidence that any public or court process has ever been initiated against them. The objective evidence indicates that it is majority Shia Muslims, political opponents, human rights activists, opposition intellectuals, and criminals that are targeted by citizenship revocation laws. The Appellants do not fit the profile of any of the above. I find the evidence

does not support that the Appellants have an objective basis and so their fear of persecution in Bahrain by reason of their religion is not well-founded.

- [33] I have carefully considered the Appellants' testimony at the RPD and their later arguments on appeal surrounding the alleged raid on the house of a person known as Homayoun. In my review I agree with the RPD, which wrote in paragraph 11 of its decision that there was no information connecting that raid to the Appellants' personal identities as Ahmadis and no information showing that the raid was an act of religious persecution. I have no information about what became of Homayoun after the raid, or if he was ever charged with anything, or if Bahrain ever attempted to deport him. The evidence before the Board is that the Ahmadi community in Bahrain continued to operate and worship after the raid.
- [34] I have also carefully considered the Appellants' testimony that two of the minor Appellants were, at one point, stopped by a Bahraini police officer while on their way to worship. According to the narrative and testimony, the boys were stopped on a public street and asked where they were going. The boys stated that they were on their way to the prayer centre. The information before the Board is that the boys were not detained beyond that one question and that they were allowed to go on their way. The information before the Board is that this only happened on one occasion. In my opinion, and in light of my other findings, I do not see how this encounter can reliably be connected to the Appellants' personal religious identities or how it can be seen as a reliable indication that the state had placed the Appellants under surveillance. No residual claims on the basis of employment or Pakistani ethnicity
- [35] The RPD correctly found that the Appellants do not face a serious possibility of persecution on the basis of the Principal Appellant's former employment as a police officer in Bahrain, or because of the Appellants' Pakistani ethnicities.
- [36] The Appellants have not challenged these findings on appeal. I have conducted an independent assessment of the evidence and I agree with the RPD's findings and I adopt the RPD's reasons in respect of these findings.

CONCLUSION

- [37] For the reasons detailed above I agree with the RPD's finding that the Appellants do not face a serious forward-looking possibility of persecution, or a risk to life, a risk of cruel and unusual treatment or punishment, or a risk of torture should they return to Bahrain.
- [38] The Appellants are not Convention refugees and are not persons in need of protection. The appeal is dismissed pursuant to IRPA s. 111(1)(a). (signed) "COLIN ANDERSON" Anderson, Colin September 26, 2020 Date 1 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, BOC Narrative, p. 29, para. 31. 2 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, BOC Narrative, p. 30, para. 33. 3 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, pp. 918, 1022. 4 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, pp. 925-926. 5 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, p. 928. 6 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, p. 932. 7 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, p. 945. 8 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, p. 1031. 9 Exhibit P-2, Appellant's Record, p. 43. 10 Exhibit P-2,

Appellant's Record, p. 56. 11 Exhibit P-2, Appellant's Record, p. 84. 12 Exhibit P-2, Appellant's Record, p. 96.

RAD.25.02 (January, 2020) Disponible en français Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada
Refugee Appeal Division Commission de l'immigration et du statut de réfugié du Canada Section
d'appel des réfugiés RAD.25.02 (January, 2020) Disponible en français RAD File / Dossier de la
SAR : TB9-05495 TB9-05496 / TB9-05497 / TB9-05498 TB9-05499 / TB9-05500

Source & reproduction note

Judgment wording, source notices and original paragraph numbers are retained. Esheria supplies the layout and this PDF's page numbers; these are not the source pagination. This is a research copy, not an official or certified court document. Check quotations, citations and publication restrictions against the original source before relying on it.

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/canada/Credibilityassessment-refugee-appeal-division-2020--6a40c3b24cf2c72690fb1e08>

A source URL was not supplied in the case record. Consult the court's original record before reliance.

Prepared on 28 October 2026 · Esheria