

CANADA / JUDGMENT

Sangarappillai v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)

2026 FC 426

COURT

Federal Court

DECIDED

1 April 2026

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

Sangarappillai v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration) Court (s) Database Federal Court
Decisions Date 2026-04-01 Neutral citation 2026 FC 426 File numbers IMM-3510-25 Decision
Content Date: 20260401 Docket: IMM-3510-25 Citation: 2026 FC 426 Toronto, Ontario, April 1, 2026
PRESENT: Mr. Justice Sébastien Grammond BETWEEN: RASUKI SANGARAPPILLAI Applicant
and MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP & IMMIGRATION Respondent JUDGMENT AND REASONS
(Delivered from the Bench in Toronto, Ontario, on April 1, 2026)

- [1] Ms. Sangarappillai, a citizen of Sri Lanka, has been present in Canada since 2019. She applied for permanent residence on humanitarian and compassionate [H&C] grounds. She based her application on (1) the best interests of her two Canadian grandchildren, who she is caring for on a daily basis, and (2) hardship upon returning to her home country because of gender-based violence and persecution of Tamils. Her application was dismissed. She now seeks judicial review of the dismissal.
- [2] An H&C applicant bears the burden of establishing the facts supporting their application. Ms. Sangarappillai concedes that the factual portion of her application was thin. On judicial review, she essentially argues that the officer made findings that were unsupported by the evidence.
- [3] I disagree. Ms. Sangarappillai's submissions are the paradigmatic example of the "line-by-line treasure hunt for error" that Vavilov cautioned us against: Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov, 2019 SCC 65 at paragraph 102, [2019] 4 SCR 653. It is true that the reasons for the decision could have been worded more carefully. However, many of the excerpts of the decision highlighted by counsel are general statements that can be supported by judicial notice. Moreover, when the evidence supporting the application is thin, it is not always easy for the officer to provide reasons without resorting to the kind of generalizations that counsel highlighted.
- [4] With respect to hardship, Ms. Sangarappillai argues that the officer disregarded the country condition evidence she provided and made unwarranted assumptions as to the support she would have in Sri Lanka. I disagree. In her application, she provided generalized

submissions as to persecution of Tamils and gender-based violence in Sri Lanka. However, she did not provide any specific information as to her situation, beyond the fact that she is widowed. Thus, there was very little for the officer to consider. In my view, she is simply asking me to reweigh the evidence.

- [5] With respect to the best interests of the children [BIOC], I am of the view that the decision was reasonable. The evidence concerning BIOC consisted of two paragraphs in the submissions. As Ms. Sangarappillai had the burden of proof, there is little that the officer could say. General statements about the possibility of remaining in contact through technological means do not render the decision unreasonable. In addition, having reviewed the decision, I do not agree with counsel that the officer imposed a test of hardship.
- [6] In summary, Ms. Sangarappillai has not convinced me that the refusal of her H&C application was unreasonable. Thus, her application for judicial review will be dismissed. JUDGMENT in IMM-3510-25 THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that: The application for judicial review is dismissed. No question is certified. "Sébastien Grammond" Judge FEDERAL COURT SOLICITORS OF RECORD DOCKET: IMM-3510-25 STYLE OF CAUSE: RASUKI SANGARAPPILLAI v. MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP & IMMIGRATION PLACE OF HEARING: Toronto, Ontario DATE OF HEARING: April 1, 2026 JUDGMENT and REASONS: GRAMMOND J. DATED: April 1, 2026 APPEARANCES: Robert Israel Blanshay For The Applicant Jack Davidson FOR THE RESPONDENT SOLICITORS OF RECORD: Blanshay Law Toronto, Ontario For The Applicant Attorney General of Canada Toronto, Ontario 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/530273/index.do>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/canada/sangarappillai-v-canada-citizenship-and-immigration-2026>

Prepared on 27 October 2026 · Esheria