

CANADA / JUDGMENT

TB9-12391

COURT

Refugee Appeal Division

DECIDED

7 February 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 : TB9-12391 TB9-12392 / TB9-12393 Private Proceeding / Huis clos
Reasons and decision ? Motifs et décision Persons who are the subject of the appeal XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXX XXXX Personnes en cause Appeal considered / heard
at Toronto, ON Appel instruit / entendu à Date of decision February 7, 2020 Date de la décision
Panel S. Thompson Tribunal Counsel for the persons who are the subject of the appeal
Aleksandar Jeremic Conseil des personnes en cause Designated representative XXXX XXXX
XXXX Représentant(e) désigné(e) Counsel for the Minister N/A Conseil du ministre REASONS
FOR DECISION OVERVIEW

- [1] XXXX XXXX XXXX (the principal Appellant), his spouse XXXX XXXX (the associate Appellant) and their daughter XXXX XXXX XXXX (the minor Appellant), all citizens of Nigeria, are appealing a decision of the Refugee Protection Division (RPD) dated April 30, 2019, rejecting their claims for refugee protection. BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW OF APPEAL The Appellants' claim, the RPD's decision, and the Appellants' arguments before the Refugee Appeal Division (RAD)
- [2] Before the RPD the Appellants alleged they faced a serious risk of persecution from the principal Appellant's father who wants to subject the minor Appellant to female genital mutilation (FGM), and who also wants to harm the associate Appellant.
- [3] The RPD refused the Appellants' claim for lacking credibility. The RPD found inconsistencies in key parts of the Appellants' evidence about the alleged risk at the heart of their claim. It also found that XXXX reports submitted by the principal and associate Appellants failed to adequately explain deficits in their testimony and other evidence that undermined their credibility. In light of its negative credibility assessment, the RPD gave little weight to affidavits from the Appellants' family members and others, concerned that they were non-neutral sources.
- [4] Before the RAD the Appellants submit the RPD erred in its credibility assessment: that it took an overly microscopic approach to the evidence and was insensitive to stressors of the hearing room; that the RPD relied excessively on notes from port of entry (PoE) interviews to impugn the Appellants' credibility; held the Appellants to Canadian standards in assessing their testimony and evidence; and did not raise any concerns with the Appellants about an e-mail address on a Nigeria police report they disclosed, which denied them a chance to

address those concerns directly, even though they did provide post-hearing submissions on the issue.

DETERMINATION

- [5] The RAD dismisses the appeal and confirms the decision of the RPD that the Appellants are neither Convention refugee nor persons in need of protection, pursuant to section 111(1)(a) of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA). THE ROLE OF THE RAD
- [6] The role of the RAD is to review RPD decisions by applying the correctness standard of review after conducting its own analysis of the record with a view to determining whether, as the appellant submits, the RPD erred.¹ The RAD will only show deference to RPD findings based on the assessment of the credibility or weight to be granted to the oral evidence given before it, in situations where it enjoys a particular advantage. If the RAD finds that the RPD had a particular advantage, the reasons will indicate as much. ADMISSIBILITY OF NEW EVIDENCE ON APPEAL
- [7] The Appellants have asked for new evidence to be admitted in these proceedings in accordance with subsection 110(4) of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA), namely bank statements and a photograph of a police station in Nigeria. They have also asked the RAD to convene an oral hearing in accordance with subsection 110(6) of the IRPA.² Legal test for admitting evidence under s. 110(4) of IRPA
- [8] New evidence will only be admitted where that evidence: 1) arose after the rejection of the claim by the RPD; 2) was not reasonably available; or 3) the appellant could not reasonably have been expected in the circumstances to have presented the evidence, at the time of the rejection. The RAD has no discretion to admit new evidence unless it falls under one of these three statutory categories. If the new evidence meets the above statutory requirements, the RAD must then go on to assess whether the new evidence is credible, relevant, and new in deciding whether to admit it. The legal test applied to the evidence
- [9] The Appellants have asked that copies of bank statements from the principal Appellant's XXXX account dating from between XXXX and XXXX 2017 be admitted as new evidence in these proceedings, in accordance with subsection 110(4) of the IRPA.
- [10] The bank statements pre-date the RPD's determination of the Appellants' claim on April 30, 2019. The Appellants submit they "could not reasonably have [been] expected [...] to have provided it" to the RPD as they "could not have known that the RPD would disbelieve their reasonable explanation" for failing to mention their time in hiding in Onitsha in their Schedule A forms, or that the RPD "would ignore the bank statement that was on the record placing [them] in Onitsha."

- [11] Given the Federal Court of Appeal's statement in Singh, however, that "[t]he role of the RAD is not to provide the opportunity to complete a deficient record submitted before the RPD"³, this is not a basis to admit the bank statements, which were all submitted by the Appellants in an effort to repair their deficient record before the RPD. These documents fail the statutory test to be admitted in accordance with subsection 110(4).
- [12] The Appellants also submit further that they could not have known the RPD would not believe that the "Area M" Nigeria Police station did not exist. The photograph of the "Area M" Nigeria Police station in Lagos, however, was taken in XXXX 2019.⁴ As this document was created after the RPD's determination of the Appellants' claim, it is new. It is also prima facie credible and it is relevant to my assessment of the Appellants' allegation that they complained to police about attempts to subject the minor Appellant to FGM. It will therefore be admitted into evidence in these proceedings. REQUEST FOR AN ORAL HEARING UNDER S. 110(6) OF IRPA Legal test for an oral hearing under s. 110(6) of IRPA
- [13] When read together, subsections 110(3), (4), and (6) of the IRPA establish that the RAD must not hold a hearing in an appeal such as this unless there is new evidence, in which case the RAD may hold a hearing if that new evidence raises a serious issue with respect to the credibility of the appellant, is central to the RPD decision, and that, if accepted, would justify allowing or rejecting the refugee protection claim.⁵ Decision on appellant's request for an oral hearing
- [14] In my assessment the new evidence does not raise a serious issue with respect to the Appellants' credibility. I will therefore determine this matter in writing.

ANALYSIS

- [15] My determination is based on my independent assessment of the evidence before me. This includes the records prepared by the RPD and the Appellants, an audio recording of the Appellants' RPD hearing on April 10, 2019, and documents contained in the current compilation of the National Documentation Package (NDP) for Nigeria. Credibility The omission of Onitsha from the Appellants' Schedule A forms
- [16] Regarding the failure of the principal Appellants to refer to Onitsha in their Schedule A forms⁶ listing the places they had lived before coming to Canada, they explained to the RPD that they had not had adequate time to include the information about Onitsha because they were rushed in completing their intake forms shortly after arriving in Canada; that other refugee claimants advised them; and because refugee claimants were helped in groups to complete forms.⁷ The RPD rejected the Appellants' explanations for the omission and found the Appellants never hid from their alleged agents of persecution in Onitsha.⁸

- [17] The Appellants submit the RPD ignored evidence before it that they were in fact in hiding in Onitsha, in the form of "a bank statement showing a withdrawal from an ATM in Onitsha, during the period of their alleged stay there."⁹ Having examined the bank statement¹⁰ that was before the RPD in light of the Appellants' other evidence, I reject their submission that it supports a finding that they were in Onitsha at or about the time stated in their BOC narrative.
- [18] According to their Basis of Claim (BOC) narrative the Appellants left Lagos for Onitsha on XXXX XXXX XXXX 2017, to escape their alleged agents of persecution, however, it does not state explicitly when they returned to Lagos from Onitsha. Having read the BOC narrative, I find that it strongly suggests the Appellants left Onitsha by XXXX XXXX XXXX 2017 to escape threats from Igbo nationalists to inflict violence against any non-indigenes remaining in Onitsha as of that date.¹¹ I listened to the audio recording of the hearing and the principal Appellant testified that he and his family left Onitsha on XXXX XXXX XXXX 2017, shortly after the beginning of unrest in that city.¹²
- [19] The bank statement, however, shows XXXX XXXX XXXX Naira was withdrawn from the principal Appellant's account at XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX in Onitsha on XXXX XXXX XXXX 2017¹³, just over one month after the Appellants were no longer in that city. The bank statement establishes only that the principal Appellant withdrew funds from his account in Onitsha on XXXX XXXX XXXX 2017, one month after he testified he and his family had already returned to their home in Lagos. I find this undermines the credibility of the Appellants' allegation that they fled to Onitsha on the date given in their BOC narrative.
- [20] The Appellants submit further that the RPD erred by relying excessively on their port of entry and intake documents to impugn their credibility.¹⁴ The Appellants also state they "were never alerted to the fact that this auxiliary form [...] would be crucial to their credibility assessment."¹⁵
- [21] I do note the Federal Court advises decision-makers to interpret notes of port-of-entry interviews with caution as "minor discrepancies between port of entry statements and oral testimony are not sufficient to determine whether an applicant is not credible". The Court also affirms, however, that "the RPD may conclude that an applicant lacks credibility if an omission concerns a central element of the refugee protection claim [...]"¹⁶
- [22] I will not speculate on what advice the Appellants may or may not have received from their then counsel about the significance of representations made in writing in their intake forms for their refugee claim. I do find, however, that in this case the omission of Onitsha from the Appellants' Schedule A forms is relevant to their allegation that they took refuge in that city to escape threats and targeting from their agents of persecution, the allegation that was central to their claim and highly relevant to the assessment of their subjective fear of persecution. The RPD did not err by citing the omission from the Appellants' Schedule A forms to test the credibility of the Appellants' allegation that they fled Lagos for Onitsha.

- [23] As well, based on my review of the relevant portion of the audio recording of the RPD hearing¹⁷ I reject their explanations for the omission for the same reasons as those given by the RPD.¹⁸
- [24] Based on the foregoing I find not only that the RPD did not err in drawing a negative inference concerning the Appellants' credibility, but also that the Appellants never took refuge from their agents of persecution in the city of Onitsha as they alleged in their BOC narrative. New evidence: photo of "Area M" police station
- [25] I have considered the new evidence admitted in these proceedings, and I find the photograph of the "Area M" police station establishes the existence of the police station.
- [26] For the reasons given below, however, the photograph warrants no further weight in my assessment, as a mere photo is unable to redeem the deficits in other areas of the Appellants' evidence concerning their alleged reporting of the FGM-related threat allegedly made by the principal Appellant's father to the police, and discrepancies in the Appellants' evidence concerning events and supporting documents central to their allegations of persecution. Date of principal Appellant's letter to Nigeria Police
- [27] The Appellants submit the RPD took a microscopic approach to the evidence in impugning the principal Appellant's testimony about when he wrote a letter to the Nigeria Police "to obtain the report" of XXXX XXXX XXXX 2018.¹⁹ The report, which I have examined, refers to a "letter dated XXXX XXXX XXXX 2018" from the Appellant.²⁰
- [28] According to the RPD the principal Appellant's testimony that he gave the police a statement in XXXX 2017 "saying that his father is after him" was inconsistent with the content of the police report itself outlined above. The RPD's Reasons state that when this inconsistency was pointed out to him the principal Appellant "then testified that he had asked [the police] for a letter asking for a police report." The RPD rejected his testimony as lacking credibility.²¹
- [29] The Appellants, who do not dispute the RPD's account of the principal Appellant's explanation, submit "[i]t is apparent" from the principal Appellant's testimony that his explanation that there was "one document" referred to "complaints in relation to the persecution for the father, rather than all the correspondence with the police."²²
- [30] I reject the Appellants' submission. First, it fails to address the inconsistency between the date of the principal Appellant's "one statement" to the police in XXXX 2017 and the reference in the report to a letter dated XXXX XXXX XXXX 2018. Second, the principal Appellant's explanation was that he complained to the police about his father's alleged threats by making a statement, which is completely different from the police report's indication that he wrote a letter. Third, the RPD's questioning on this point was not concerned with "all [the Appellants'] correspondence with the police"²³ but with the one letter referenced in the police report.

- [31] In my independent assessment the principal Appellant's explanation was inadequate because it failed to address the inconsistency in the evidence. I find the RPD did not err in drawing a negative inference from this inadequate explanation. The Nigeria Police investigation report of XXXX XXXX XXXX 2018
- [32] Having reviewed the relevant portion of the Nigeria Police investigation report of XXXX XXXX XXXX 2018²⁴ I agree with the Appellants that the RPD's finding that discrepancies in the Appellants' evidence about the number of men who came to their home on XXXX XXXX XXXX 2017 ("some gang of men" versus two men)²⁵ could be attributed to "trivial mistakes and regionalisms in expression"²⁶ on the part of the police officer who completed the report.
- [33] I also agree with the Appellants that the RPD panel failed to properly consider the list of Nigeria Police Force public relations contacts disclosed by the Appellants with their post-hearing written submissions. While the list did not specifically identify the "Area M" police station that produced the Appellants' XXXX XXXX XXXX 2018 police investigation report, many of the command posts identified appear to be at the municipal or state level, with one public relations officer named for each municipal or state command, rather than at the area level.
- [34] The RPD also found the list did not support a finding "that police stations [in Nigeria], in the course of their police work on individual files, provide and use 'yahoo' accounts for their criminal investigations and follow ups and would provide no address for the office itself in its letterhead".²⁷
- [35] I am concerned by the RPD's failure to point to any objective source of information as the basis for its finding. Consequently, the RPD's negative credibility finding concerning the contact e-mail address in the XXXX XXXX XXXX 2018 police investigation report was made in error.
- [36] Having examined the sample copies of Nigeria Police Form investigation reports attached to a XXXX 2019 Response to Information request (RIR) in the Board's current compilation of the National Documentation Package (NDP) for Nigeria, however, I am also concerned that none of the sample police investigation reports includes an e-mail address for the issuing station.²⁸ The fact that the police investigation report of XXXX XXXX XXXX 2018 disclosed by the Appellants does feature a "yahoo.com" e-mail address distinguishes that document from the sample documents attached to the RIR.
- [37] In my independent assessment, therefore, the inclusion of the "yahoo.com" e-mail address in the XXXX XXXX XXXX 2018 police investigation report somewhat undermines that document's reliability because it differs from the format of the sample police investigation reports and other documents appended to the RIR. Police efforts to apprehend the principal Appellant's father

- [38] At paragraphs 19 to 21 of its Reasons the RPD found the principal Appellant's testimony evolved in an attempt to explain inconsistencies between his testimony, that after he complained to police in XXXX 2017 "they went to his father's home", and the XXXX XXXX XXXX 2018 police letter, which is silent about the police having visited the principal Appellant's father even though it post-dates his alleged complaint.²⁹
- [39] The RPD characterized the principal Appellant's testimony on this issue as "inconsistent, evolving and generally lacking in credibility."³⁰ The Appellants do not dispute this finding, a finding that further undermines not only the principal Appellant's credibility but also the reliability of the XXXX XXXX XXXX 2018 police investigation report, which is based on the reporting of the principal Appellant to the police.
- [40] Based on this finding and my previous finding concerning the inclusion of the "yahoo.com" e-mail address in the XXXX XXXX XXXX 2018 police report, I give that report no weight. Dates of key incidents and principal Appellant's first police complaint
- [41] The Appellants submit the RPD "focused on 'trivial and illusory' contradictions" in their evidence about when the principal Appellant first complained to police. According to them, what is "crucial [...] is that the [principal] Appellant correctly recalled when he went to the police" and that the two events he testified about he had always maintained took place.
- [42] The RPD noted that the principal Appellant "became frazzled" when it pointed out to him that his testimony that his parents and two elders tried to kidnap his daughter on XXXX XXXX XXXX 2017 was inconsistent with his BOC narrative, which stated that this event took place on XXXX XXXX XXXX 2017. Although it noted the principal Appellant amended his testimony to agree with his BOC narrative, the RPD drew a negative inference about his credibility because in its opinion the BOC narrative clearly stated the dates of each of the key alleged events.
- [43] For similar reasons, the RPD rejected the principal Appellant's explanation for inconsistencies between his initial testimony, that he was confused. He testified initially that he first approached the police on XXXX XXXX XXXX 2017, then that he first complained to them on XXXX XXXX XXXX 2017, then later testified that he did not go the police on XXXX XXXX or XXXX XXXX 2017. All the dates given were inconsistent with his BOC narrative, which fails to mention when he first went to the police.³¹
- [44] The RPD found that the inconsistencies were likely the product of "a lack of truthfulness surrounding alleged events including approaching the police" and stated that it expected the principal Appellant to have remembered the date of his first complaint to the police.³²
- [45] The Appellants submit the principal appellant "simply confused when two events, that he consistently alleged occurred, took place" and that the RPD erred in finding that he was not credible, given "the stressful environment of the hearing" and the principal Appellant's nervousness.³³ For the following reasons, I reject this submission. The Appellants' XXXX status during the hearing

- [46] The Appellants' submissions on the two points previously mentioned are related to their submission that the RPD's credibility finding was "insensitive to the stresses of the hearing room."³⁴ By contrast, the RPD's Reasons state that the panel was "mindful of and considered" both "the XXXX report of XXXX XXXX XXXX" concerning the principal and associate Appellants along with "the stresses of the hearing room."³⁵
- [47] The RPD does not appear to dispute the diagnosis³⁶ of "XXXX XXXX XXXX of moderate XXXX and XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX".³⁷ Based on its earlier finding that the Appellants were not credible, however, the RPD was "not satisfied" that the allegations central to the Appellants' claim were in fact the underlying cause of these XXXX XXXX³⁸
- [48] The RPD was entitled to weigh the XXXX report as part of its assessment of the Appellants' claim. The report states generally that "[c]oncentration and XXXX problems are common among people exposed to XXXX XXXX" and that XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX problems can lead to difficulties in providing clear and consistent testimony." According to the report, the principal Appellant "has difficulty recalling the dates and details of past events" but also states that he "did not report XXXX XXXX problems" even as it speculated that such problems could "intensify at his [RPD] hearing."³⁹
- [49] According to the RPD's Reasons, the principal Appellant testified that "he felt better XXXX" at the time of the hearing than he did at the time of his assessment by XXXX XXXX XXXX. This suggests that the RPD turned its mind to the Appellants' XXXX state during the hearing and solicited evidence from the principal Appellant about his state. The Appellants' submission that the RPD was insensitive to the impact their XXXX state might have had on their participation in the hearing fails to address this portion of the RPD's Reasons for Decision.
- [50] Moreover, having listened to the audio recording of the hearing I find nothing in the RPD's conduct that demonstrates insensitivity either to the kinds of stresses that are normally attendant on refugee claimants, or to the Appellants during their RPD hearing in particular. In fact, when the principal Appellant gave testimony about the date of his first visit to the police that was inconsistent with the account in his BOC narrative, he told the RPD panel that he needed to be calm. The RPD responded: "Try to be calm. I understand that people can be nervous."⁴⁰
- [51] Furthermore, when the principal Appellant later testified that he was nervous and had been so since the start of the proceeding and that he felt "unstable", the RPD panel called for a ten minute-long break in the proceedings in hopes that he could calm himself.⁴¹ When the hearing resumed after this recess, the RPD panel remarked to the principal Appellant, "I hope that- I hope that that was a helpful break for you," and asked him "Do you feel a little bit better now?" She resumed questioning the principal Appellant after he answered "Yes."⁴² I therefore reject the Appellants' submission on this point.

- [52] In short, this is not a situation in which the RPD failed to engage with the XXXX assessment report and/or was insensitive to the Appellants' nervousness.
- [53] Having dismissed the Appellants' submission that the RPD was insensitive to the Appellants' XXXX state, I also reject their submission that this means the RPD erred in making a negative credibility finding based on the problems with their evidence.
- [54] Rather, the RPD had "doubts regarding the existence of the facts underlying the claim for refugee protection"⁴³ flowing from its assessment of the principal Appellant's credibility in light of the totality of the evidence.
- [55] I share the RPD's doubts, and find that while no single one of my previous adverse findings is a sufficient basis on which to reject this appeal, taken cumulatively they support a finding that the Appellants are not credible witnesses. Because I do not believe the allegations at the heart of their claim, it is not necessary for me to consider the other documents they disclosed to the RPD in support of their claim.⁴⁴
- [56] As the Appellants do not face a serious risk of persecution in Nigeria, their appeal fails.

CONCLUSION

- [57] The RAD dismisses the appeal and confirms the decision of the RPD that the Appellants are neither Convention refugees nor persons in need of protection, pursuant to section 111(1)(a) of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA). (signed) "S. Thompson" S. Thompson February 7, 2020 Date 1 M.C.I. v. Huruglica, Bujar (F.C.A., no. A-470-14), Gauthier, Webb, Near, March 29, 2016, 2016 FCA 93. 2 Exhibit P-2, Appellants' Record, p. 1. 3 Canada (Citizenship and Immigration) v. Singh, 2016 FCA 96, [2016] 4 FCR 230 at para. 54. 4 Exhibit P-2, Appellants' Record, p. 5 at para. 24. 5 See Malambu v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration), 2015 FC 763 at paras. 28-36 and 59. 6 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, Exhibit 1, pp. 50, 54. 7 Audio recording of hearing in RPD file no. TB8-12245 on April 10, 2019 at timestamps 01:00:55 to 01:02:13. 8 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, p. 7 at para. 13. 9 Exhibit P-2, Appellants' Record, p. 3. 10 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, Exhibit 7, p. 167. 11 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, Exhibit 2.1, p. 24 at lines 79-100. 12 Audio recording of hearing in RPD file no. TB8-12245 on April 10, 2019 at timestamps 00:58:00 to 00:59:35. 13 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, Exhibit 7, p. 167. 14 Exhibit P-2, Appellants' Record, pp. 51-52 at paras. 31-35. 15 Exhibit P-2, Appellants' Record, p. 51 at para. 31. 16 Avrelus v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration), 2019 FC 357 at para. 14 (Roussel J). 17 Audio recording of hearing in RPD file no. TB8-12245 on April 10, 2019 at timestamps 01:00:55 to 01:02:13. 18 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, p. 7 at para. 13. 19 Exhibit P-2, Appellants' Record, p. 53 at para. 37. 20 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, Exhibit 7, p. 181. 21 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, pp. 7-8 at paras. 14-17. 22 Exhibit P-2, Appellants' Record, p. 53 at para. 37. 23 Exhibit P-2, Appellants' Record, p. 53 at para. 37. 24 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, Exhibit 7, p. 182 at para. 5. 25 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, p. 8 at para. 18. 26 Exhibit P-2, Appellants' Record, p. 54 at para. 40. 27 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, p. 10 at para. 24. 28 National Documentation Package, Nigeria, 29

November 2019, item 10.3: Documents issued by police during criminal investigations or in response to a complaint; procedures for an individual to obtain a copy of a police report within the country as well as from abroad; appearance of police reports, including whether ... Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada. 7 November 2019. NGA106379.E at pp. 12-14. 29 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, pp. 8-9 at para. 20. 30 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, p. 9 at para. 21. 31 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, p. 6 at paras. 9-10. 32 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, p. 6 at para. 11. 33 Exhibit P-2, Appellants' Record, p. 50 at paras. 29, 27. 34 Exhibit P-2, Appellants' Record, Appellants' Memorandum, p. 47 at para. 20. 35 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, p. 4 at para. 3. 36 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, p. 10 at para. 25. 37 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, p. 10 at para. 28. See also RPD Record, Exhibit 6, pp. 117, 120. 38 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, p. 10 at para. 28. 39 Exhibit RPD-1, RPD Record, Exhibit 6, p. 116. 40 Audio recording of hearing in RPD file no. TB8-12245 on April 10, 2019 at timestamps 00:43:57 to 00:44:02. 41 Audio recording of hearing in RPD file no. TB8-12245 on April 10, 2019 at timestamps 00:56:06 to 00:57:44. 42 Audio recording of hearing in RPD file no. TB8-12245 on April 10, 2019 at timestamps 00:57:45 to 00:57:59. 43 Nteta-Tshamala v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration), 2019 FC 1191 at para. 35 (Pamel J). 44 Exhibit P-2, Appellants' Record, pp. 56-57 at paras. 48-49.

RAD File / Dossier de la SAR : TB9-12391 TB9-12392 / TB9-12393 RAD.25.02 (April 04, 2019)
Disponible en français 2 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 (April 04, 2019) Disponible en français

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--6a40c3b24cf2c72690fb1f8a>

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

Prepared on 28 October 2026 · Esheria