

CANADA / JUDGMENT

# Sherkhil v. Canada

## (Citizenship and Immigration)

2026 FC 615

COURT

Federal Court

DECIDED

11 May 2026

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

Sherkhil v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration) Court (s) Database Federal Court Decisions  
Date 2026-05-11 Neutral citation 2026 FC 615 File numbers IMM-16973-24 Decision Content Date:  
20260511 Docket: IMM-16973-24 Citation: 2026 FC 615 Toronto, Ontario, May 11, 2026 PRESENT:  
The Honourable Madam Justice Ayles BETWEEN: NOOR MOHAMMAD SHERKHIL Applicant and  
THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION Respondent REASONS AND JUDGMENT

- [1] The Applicant applied for a permanent resident visa under the Temporary Public Policy for the Resettlement of Afghan Nationals with a Significant and/or Enduring Relationship to Canada. He reported that he had served as an interpreter for the Canadian Armed Forces in Afghanistan from April 2010 to mid-2011.
- [2] The Applicant participated in an in-person interview with a Migration Officer, during which, the Officer expressed concerns to the Applicant regarding information contained in his application and answers given by the Applicant during his interview. The Officer told the Applicant that they were concerned he may not have answered all of the questions put to him truthfully.
- [3] Following the interview, the Officer sent the Applicant a procedural fairness letter outlining the specific concerns raised during the interview and providing him with an opportunity to respond. The letter detailed the following concerns: The Applicant's difficulty in clearly expressing the dates of his personal history and the evasiveness of his responses to questions asked during his interview. Inconsistencies with respect to his periods of unemployment from 2012-2014, 2015-2016 and 2019-2021, which raised truthfulness concerns. The reasons why the Applicant left the National Directorate of Security (the state intelligence and security service of Afghanistan) after four months. The Applicant's failed security screening with the government of the United States of America for a job with the United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan in or around 2012. The discrepancy in his stated dates of unemployment between what the Applicant included on his application form and what was stated during his interview. The discrepancy in his stated period of employment with the National Directorate of Security between what he included in his application and

what was stated during his interview.

- [4] The Applicant responded to the letter and provided additional information regarding the concerns raised by the Officer.
- [5] By letter dated April 9, 2024, the Applicant's application was refused because the Officer was not satisfied the Applicant was not inadmissible and that he met the requirements of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, SC 2001, c 27. The Officer found that the responses provided by the Applicant to the letter did not alleviate the Officer's concerns regarding the truthfulness of the information the Applicant had provided in his application and during his interview.
- [6] The Applicant has advanced only one argument on this application for judicial review. He asserts that the Officer's decision is unreasonable because the Officer failed to "properly read and interpret the evidence available in the files."
- [7] The problem with the Applicant's argument is that it is nothing more than a bald allegation. The Applicant has not identified any particular portion of the evidence that the Officer failed to consider nor any evidence that was improperly interpreted or misconstrued.
- [8] To the contrary, the Global Case Management System notes reveal that the Officer was well aware of the Applicant's response to the procedural fairness letter, as the Applicant's response is set out in detail in the notes. The Officer also considered the Applicant's explanation that he had issues during the interview remembering specific dates and converting dates from the Afghan calendar to the Gregorian calendar. Notwithstanding the Applicant's response to the letter, the Officer's concerns were not alleviated and the reasons why were set out in detail in the notes. Indeed, the Officer reasonably found that the Applicant's response to the letter not only failed to alleviate the Officer's initial concerns but added to the discrepancies already observed in the Applicant's evidence.
- [9] As the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the Officer's decision was unreasonable, this application for judicial review shall be dismissed.
- [10] No question for certification was raised and I agree that none arises. JUDGMENT in IMM-16973-24 THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that: The application for judicial review is dismissed. The parties proposed no question for certification and none arises. "Mandy Aylen" Judge FEDERAL COURT SOLICITORS OF RECORD DOCKET: IMM-16973-24 STYLE OF CAUSE: NOOR MOHAMMAD SHERKHIL v THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION PLACE OF HEARING: TORONTO, ONTARIO DATE OF HEARING: MAY 11, 2026 REASONS AND JUDGMENT: AyLEN J. DATED: MAY 11, 2026 APPEARANCES: Murad Ali Khan For The Applicant Lorne McClenaghan For The Respondent SOLICITORS OF RECORD: MAKs Law Firm Barristers and Solicitors Mississauga, 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/530549/index.do>

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

Prepared on 28 October 2026 · Esheria