Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada **Immigration Appeal Division**



Commission de l'immigration et du statut de réfugié du Canada Section d'appel de l'immigration

IAD File No. / No dossier de la SAI: TB6-08922

Client ID No. / No ID client: 6112-0320

Appellant(s)

Gursewak Singh Puni

Appelant(s)

Respondent

The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration Le Ministre de la Citoyenneté et de l'Immigration Intimé

Date(s) and Place

of Hearing

In Chambers Toronto, Ontario Date(s) et Lieu de l'audience

Date of Decision

March 29, 2017

Date de la Décision

Panel

V. Zanfir

Tribunal

Appellant's Counsel

Gurpreet Khaira

Conseil de l'appelant(s)

Minister's Counsel

Andy Mavroudis

Certified True Copy Copie Conforme

NOTICE OF DECISION (AND REASONS)

Sponsorship Appeal

Member's Decision made at Toronto, Ontario in chambers.

Case Officer Agent préposé au cas

After reviewing the information in this appeal, and the consent and joint recommendation of both parties. as indicated in the attached signed Summary of Agreement, this appeal is allowed.

The officer's decision to refuse a permanent resident visa is set aside, and the officer must continue processing the application in accordance with the consent / joint recommendations of the parties, as set out in the attached Summary of Agreement.

I certify that this is the decision and reasons of the member in this appeal,

Roslyn Talusan For Registrar April 04, 2017

Judicial review - Under section 72 of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, you may make an application to the Federal Court for judicial review of this decision, with leave of that Court. You may wish to get advice from counsel as soon as possible, since there are time limits for this application.

Disponible en français



Immigration and Refugee Board Commission de l'immigration et du statut de réfugié

Immigration Appeal Division

Section d'appel de l'immigration

ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION

SUMMARY OF AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES

Appellant: PUNI, Gursewak Singh

File No: TB6-08922

Client ID: 6112-0320

This appeal is from a refusal that was based on grounds that the applicant and appellant do not share a genuine marriage and that the marriage was entered into primarily for the purpose of acquiring a status or privilege under the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA).

As a result of information heard at an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) process today, the Minister's Counsel is satisfied that this is a genuine marriage and that the applicant did not marry the appellant primarily for the purpose of acquiring a status or privilege under IRPA.

The Minister's Counsel is of the opinion that the appellant has provided a detailed and credible history of the relationship and has adequately addressed the issues that led to the visa officer's initial refusal of the application.

The appellant answered questions put to him in a straightforward manner. He provided detail about how he was first introduced to his wife through a friend, and he provided detail about their first telephone contact. He described how their relationship evolved, the meetings between the families, his first meeting with his wife at the engagement ceremony, and the marriage. He provided detail about the time spent together after the marriage until he returned to Canada. He provided detail about his trips to India to visit his wife since their marriage, from May to June 2015, and from September to November 2016. The appellant also provided details about his plans for the future with his wife, which include her working as a housewife in Canada in his family's home where he lives, and then when she gets a few years older, having children. It is noted that the appellant and his wife are compatible in number of marriages (first for both), religion, language, and regional heritage.

The appellant has also provided additional documentation, including phone records, travel information, greeting cards, money transfer receipts, insurance papers, and photographs.

The Minister's Counsel is of the opinion that if this case proceeded to a hearing before the Immigration Appeal Division, the appellant would likely win her appeal. Consequently, it is not in the public interest to litigate this matter further.

Appellant: PUNI, Gursewak Singh

File No: TB6-08922

Client ID: 6112-0320

The parties agree that this Summary of Agreement is the basis upon which the Minister's Counsel consents to the appeal being allowed under s.67(1) of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act. The parties jointly recommend that the Immigration Appeal Division allow this appeal.

Signed:

Gurpreet Khaira

Andy Mavroudis

Counsel for the Appellant

March 27, 2017

Counsel for the Minister

March 27, 2017

Appeal allowed:

IAD Member

Date