

CANADA / JUDGMENT

Khangura v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)

2025 FC 1953

COURT

Federal Court

DECIDED

11 December 2025

Source: norma.lexum.com · Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified.

Khangura v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration) Court (s) Database Federal Court Decisions
Date 2025-12-11 Neutral citation 2025 FC 1953 File numbers IMM-18987-24 Decision Content Date:
20251211 Docket: IMM-18987-24 Citation: 2025 FC 1953 Ottawa, Ontario, December 11, 2025
PRESENT: Madam Justice Pallotta BETWEEN: JASKARAN SINGH KHANGURA Applicant and
MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION Respondent JUDGMENT AND REASONS

- [1] Jaskaran Singh Khangura challenges a decision of an Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) officer that refused his application for permanent residence as a member of the Canadian Experience Class (CEC). The officer was not satisfied, based on the documents Mr. Khangura provided, that he had two years of work experience under National Occupation Classification (NOC) 60020 – Retail and Wholesale Trade Managers, as declared in his application. Specifically, Mr. Khangura claimed that he had worked as an assistant branch manger at Enterprise Holdings from July 2023 to November 2023, but the officer excluded this period when calculating Mr. Khangura’s Canadian work experience because the officer was not satisfied that he “performed the lead statement and a significant number of the main duties of the declared NOC 60020” for the period in question.
- [2] Mr. Khangura submits that the officer’s decision was both unreasonable and procedurally unfair. Mr. Khangura’s supporting materials for the CEC application included: i) a July 25, 2023 letter of employment from Enterprise Holdings stating he had been promoted to the position of assistant branch manager on July 24, 2023, and outlining his main duties; and ii) all his payslips, including those covering the period he was employed as an assistant branch manager. Mr. Khangura contends the officer’s decision was neither intelligible nor reasonable in view of the evidence. The officer failed to explain why the payslips, in conjunction with the employer’s letter, were insufficient to demonstrate the required employment experience. While an officer is not expected to provide extensive reasons, they must evaluate the evidence before them and explain how it does not fulfill the eligibility requirement for which they are refusing the application: *Safdar v Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2022 FC 189 at para 11.

- [3] Mr. Khangura submits the decision was also procedurally unfair. He contends his evidence was sufficient to support the claimed Canadian work experience, and if the officer had concerns with the credibility, accuracy, or genuine nature of the information submitted, he should have been given an opportunity to respond: *Song v Canada* (Citizenship and Immigration), 2015 FC 141 at paras 20-21; *Singh v Canada* (Citizenship and Immigration), 2010 FC 1306 at para 41.
- [4] The respondent objects to some of Mr. Khangura's evidence filed in support of this judicial review proceeding, on the basis that it was not before the officer. The evidence includes i) a letter from Enterprise Holdings dated September 17, 2024, describing the nature of Mr. Khangura's duties from July 2023 to November 2023; and ii) a record of employment covering this period. The respondent's objection is valid. I have not considered evidence that was not before the officer.
- [5] I find that the officer's decision was reasonable. The Enterprise Holdings letter was dated July 25, 2023, one day after Mr. Khangura was promoted to assistant branch manager. It was open to the officer to find that, by not submitting a current employment letter, Mr. Khangura had not shown that he performed the lead statement and a significant number of the main duties of the declared NOC 60020 Canadian work experience for the period from July 2023 to November 2023.
- [6] Mr. Khangura argues that the payslips could have reasonably filled the gap. I disagree. While payslips may be evidence of continued employment after his promotion, they do not confirm that Mr. Khangura completed the duties set out in the July 25, 2023 employment letter.
- [7] The officer's reasons were adequate. They allowed Mr. Khangura to understand why the officer refused his application.
- [8] Mr. Khangura has not shown that the decision was procedurally unfair. *Song* and *Singh* do not assist Mr. Khangura—the circumstances of those cases are distinguishable from his own. In *Song* the Court found that the officer had no grounds for concluding that the applicant did not fulfill the requirements of the applicable NOC. *Song* did not involve a “forward looking” employment letter, and I agree with the respondent that the Court's decision turned on whether the officer had reasonably assessed duties that were described in an employment letter. In *Singh*, the officer had concerns with the veracity of letters outlining the applicants' experience and training. I agree with the respondent that Mr. Khangura's application was not refused because the officer had concerns with the credibility or authenticity of his evidence. Mr. Khangura's application was refused because he failed to demonstrate a program requirement. An officer is not required to provide notice and an opportunity to address concerns that arise directly from the requirements of the legislation or regulations—such as relevant work experience: *Saatchi v Canada* (Citizenship and Immigration), 2018 FC 1037 at para 40.

- [9] Mr. Khangura has not shown that the decision refusing his application for permanent residence was unreasonable or procedurally unfair. Accordingly, I must dismiss this application.
- [10] There is no question of general importance for certification.
- [11] The parties agree that Mr. Khangura's application for leave and judicial review identifies the wrong IRCC file number (E004086167). The correct IRCC file number is E004026167. This judgment amends the IRCC file number in the application for leave and judicial review to E004026167, with immediate effect. JUDGMENT IN IMM-18987-24 THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that: This application for judicial review is dismissed. The IRCC file number in the application for leave and judicial review is amended to E004026167, with immediate effect. There is no question to certify. "Christine M. Pallotta" Judge FEDERAL COURT SOLICITORS OF RECORD DOCKET: IMM-18987-24 STYLE OF CAUSE: JASKARAN SINGH KHANGURA v MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION PLACE OF HEARING: Ottawa, Ontario DATE OF HEARING: December 4, 2025 JUDGMENT AND REASONS: PALLOTTA J. DATED: December 11, 2025 APPEARANCES: Simarpreet Singh Singara Contreras Law For The Applicant Charles Barnes For The Respondent SOLICITORS OF RECORD: Invictus Law LLP Barristers and Solicitors Langley, British Columbia For The Applicant Attorney General of Canada Vancouver, British Columbia For The Respondent

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.

ORIGINAL SOURCE <https://norma.lexum.com/fc-cf/decisions/en/item/529494/index.do>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/canada/khangura-v-canada-citizenship-and-immigration-2025>

Prepared on 27 October 2026 · Esheria