Federal Court  Cour fédérale

Date: 20151209

Docket: T-693-15

Citation: 2015 FC 1363

Ottawa, Ontario, December 9, 2015

PRESENT: The Honourable Mr. Justice O'Keefe

BETWEEN:

THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Applicant

and

SUNG HOON GOO

Respondent

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT AND JUDGMENT

[1] Pursuant to section 22.1 of the *Citizenship Act*, RSC 1985, C-29, as amended [the Act], the applicant, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, asks the Court to set aside the decision of a citizenship judge, dated April 2, 2015, that approved the citizenship application of the respondent, Sung Hoon Goo, pursuant to subsection 5(1) of the Act. The application is being heard concurrently with the application to set aside the decision relating to the respondent's wife, Hye Young Lee.

I. Facts

[2] Mr. Sung Hoon Goo [the respondent] is a citizen of South Korea. He was granted permanent residence in Canada on May 24, 2005.

[3] The respondent applied for citizenship on October 28, 2009.

[4] The respondent alleges that in the four years preceding the application for citizenship (the relevant period between October 28, 2005 and October 28, 2009), he has been residing in Canada and been physically present in Canada, apart from short visits to the United States and South Korea. The respondent alleges that during the relevant period, he and his wife had identical travel itineraries. The respondent worked as a freelance translator and web designer during the relevant period.

[5] An officer of Citizenship and Immigration Canada [the reviewing officer] reviewed the respondent's application, prepared a "File Preparation and Analysis Template" and recommended a hearing. The reviewing officer noted various deficiencies in the documentation: the place of issue was not indicated on the respondent's passports; there was no supporting documentation of the respondent's attendance at ESL classes; the evidence of the respondent's children's attendance at school was incomplete (it did not include every semester in the relevant period); there was incomplete income tax information presented as evidence of employment; the respondent's home ownership was not documented; the passports were missing re-entry stamps;

the documentation provided as an indicator of residence was mostly passive; and there was no supporting documentation of the respondent's self-employment as a translator and web designer.

[6] The respondent attended a hearing before the citizenship judge on March 23, 2015. He recounts in his affidavit that the citizenship judge questioned him regarding most of the reviewing officer's concerns and he provided explanations. There is no transcript of the hearing on the record.

II. Issue

[7] The applicant raises the issue that the citizenship judge's reasons are not sufficient because they do not allow the Court to understand how the judge reached his decision.

III. Decision

[8] In a decision dated April 2, 2015, the citizenship judge found that the respondent meets the residence requirement under paragraph 5(1)(c) of the Act and approved his application for citizenship. The decision for the respondent is almost identical to that for his wife, with the exception of the analysis of their respective business activities and travel outside of Canada.

[9] The citizenship judge noted that the respondent had declared 1,407 days of presence and 53 days of absence in the relevant period. The citizenship judge noted that there were concerns regarding the credibility of the respondent because of discrepancies between the declared

absences in the application form and residency questionnaire and a lack of documentation related to his business activity.

[10] Under the heading, "Facts", the citizenship judge explained that during the interview, the respondent explained that he had mistakenly left out trips to the United States in 2006 from his residency questionnaire, but that the correct list of absences was the one presented in the application form. The citizenship judge explained that there was an undeclared entry stamp to the United States in the respondent's passport on March 13, 2006; however, this entry was included in the respondent's list of absences in the application form.

[11] On the issue of his business activities, the citizenship judge noted that there are a few positive indicators of his business activity. He confirmed at the hearing that he is a professional translator and receives work through email. He provided copies of these emails.

[12] On the issue of travel to the United States, the citizenship judge noted that he had reviewed the "ICES Traveller History" report, which revealed an additional undeclared re-entry stamp on March 18, 2009. However, the citizenship judge found that, because his last exit from Canada was on December 20, 2008, even if he had been absent from December 2008 to March 2009, he would still have been present in Canada for 1,317 days, which is higher than the minimum of 1,095 days.

[13] The citizenship judge stated that he applied the residency test set out in *Pourghasemi (Re)*, [1993] FCJ No 232 (TD) [*Pourghasemi*]. He explained that the respondent bears the burden

of proving that he meets the residency requirements. He found that there were not valid elements to dispute the respondent's statements regarding his days of physical presence in Canada.

IV. Applicant's Written Submissions

[14] The applicant submits that an applicant for citizenship bears the onus of providing sufficient objective evidence to demonstrate that the requirements of paragraph 5(1)(c) of the Act are met. The applicant argues that the evidence before the citizenship judge was not sufficient to establish that the respondent had met the requirements set out in paragraph 5(1)(c) of the Act.

[15] In particular, the applicant argues that the citizenship judge failed to account for the concerns that the reviewing officer noted in the application. The citizenship judge did not address: that the respondent's passport is missing re-entry stamps to Canada for the declared absences; that only two of the respondent's ten declared absences were verified in their entirety; how he was able to conclude that the respondent was physically present in Canada for 1,095 days; that the respondent's passport does not indicate its place of issue; that the respondent provided mostly passive indicators of residence; that the declared absences were not accompanied by reasons for the absences; that there was no supporting documentation to support that the respondent attended ESL classes; the inconsistency between the respondent taking ESL classes and working as a translator; that only limited evidence of the respondent's children's education was provided (i.e., no end-of-year report cards were provided); and the inconsistency between the application form and residency questionnaire regarding whether the respondent is the president of a South Korean company. There is only a limited discussion of the evidence

provided to support the respondent's business activities and no discussion of his failure to provide income tax information for the relevant period.

[16] The applicant submits that, in light of the record before the citizenship judge, the reasons are not clear, precise and intelligible. They do not allow a reviewing court to understand why the decision was made or whether the conclusion falls within a range of reasonable outcomes (*Newfoundland and Labrador Nurses' Union v Newfoundland and Labrador (Treasury Board)*, 2011 SCC 62 at paragraph 16 [*Newfoundland Nurses*]). The reasons simply state that the residency requirements were met, but do not explain how this finding was made in light of the above-noted discrepancies and deficiencies in the evidence.

[17] In reply, the applicant also submits that it is not proper for the respondent to proffer affidavit evidence that supplements the reasons of the decision-maker to address shortcomings of the decision. The applicant submits that this is analogous to situations where the Minister proffers affidavit evidence from the decision-maker, as the respondent, to address shortcomings in the decision.

V. Respondent's Written Submissions

[18] The respondent submits that the decision of a citizenship judge to find that an applicant meets the residence requirement is entitled to a high degree of deference (*Al-Askari v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2015 FC 623 at paragraphs 18 and 19; *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Patmore*, 2015 FC 699 at paragraphs 14 and 24).

[19] The respondent submits that the Court should not re-weigh evidence of residency. Residency is a factual finding, can be interpreted in a range of different ways and this interpretation is within the purview of the citizenship judge (*Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Anderson*, 2010 FC 748 at paragraph 26 [*Anderson*]; *Khalfallah v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2009 FC 1132 at paragraph 23).

[20] The respondent submits that the reasons do not need to be perfect, as long as there is a reasonable basis for the decision (*Newfoundland Nurses* at paragraph 12; *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Lee*, 2013 FC 270 at paragraphs 48 to 51; *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Sadek*, 2009 FC 549 at paragraphs 15 to 19). If it is apparent that the Minister considered the totality of the facts, the Court should not intervene (*Anderson* at paragraph 21).

[21] The respondent submits that there was sufficient evidence before the citizenship judge to allow the citizenship judge to reasonably conclude that the residence requirement was met. In particular, the respondent provided:

i. For 2005, doctor's letters indicating that the respondent, his wife and his daughter had visited that year; report cards indicating his son was enrolled in school that year; a Rogers bill from one month of that year; and a utility bill from several months of that year.

ii. For 2006, a notice of assessment; a doctor's letter indicating that his daughter had visited that year; a tax bill indicating home ownership; a letter confirming insurance coverage; report cards indicating his son and daughter were enrolled in school that year; and a receipt confirming a charitable donation in Canada that year.

iii. For 2007, doctor's letters indicating that the respondent had visited twice and his wife had visited twice; a letter confirming insurance coverage; report cards indicating his son and daughter were enrolled in school that year; bank statements

for two months of that year; a Bell bill for one month of that year; and a utility bill for several months of that year.

iv. For 2008, a Canada Revenue Agency letter indicating he was eligible for a tax credit; a doctor's letter indicating that his son had visited that year; a letter confirming insurance coverage; a letter confirming an insurance claim for a car accident that year; a report card indicating his son was enrolled in school that year; a school report of absences indicating his daughter was enrolled in school that year; bank statements for three months of that year; a letter confirming family membership at the YMCA that year; a property assessment notice for that year; and utility bills for several months of that year.

v. For 2009, correspondence from CRA to a Canadian address; a letter from CRA confirming child tax benefits received that year; a doctor's letter indicating that the respondent had visited, his wife had visited twice, his daughter had visited and his son had visited four times that year; a tax bill showing home ownership; a report card showing his son was enrolled in school; bank statements for three months of that year; a credit card statement for one month of that year; a letter confirming family membership at the YMCA that year; Rogers and Bell bills for two months of that year; and utility bills for that year.

[22] The respondent also submits that he is entitled to the presumption of truth, given that he and his wife confirmed their travel history under oath at the hearing and there is no substantially contradictory evidence (*Westmore v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2012 FC 1023 at paragraph 44).

[23] The respondent further submits that the concerns set out in the reviewing officer's memorandum, relied on by the applicant, were either unreasonable or addressed by the citizenship judge.

[24] Regarding the concern that the citizenship judge did not explain how he was able to conclude that the respondent was physically present in Canada for 1,095 days, the respondent

submits that he and his wife's testimony is entitled to the presumption of truth and there was no objective evidence indicating that they did not meet the residency requirements.

[25] Regarding the lack of re-entry stamps to Canada, the respondent and his wife explained under oath that Canadian officials had not stamped their passports upon re-entry. The Court has recognized that CBSA does not keep complete records of entry into Canada and this is beyond the control of applicants (*Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Purvis*, 2015 FC 368 at paragraphs 37 to 39 [*Purvis*]).

[26] Regarding the location where the respondent renewed his passport, the respondent submits that the passport does not indicate where it was issued and the respondent and his wife confirmed to the citizenship judge that it was obtained from the South Korean Consulate in Canada.

[27] Regarding the concern that the respondent provided primarily passive indicators of residence, the respondent submits that this concern is not reasonable in light of the evidence that he and his family were physically present in Canada, as set out above.

[28] Regarding the concern that the respondent did not provide supporting documents relating to his employment, the respondent submits that he provided numerous emails and plausibly explained that his work was assigned remotely.

[29] Regarding the concern that the respondent did not provide income tax documentation, the respondent did provide documents that proved he made payments and received refunds in the relevant period, which proves his income was reported. He and his wife also stated under oath that their income was reported. Moreover, this was not a significant factor to the citizenship judge.

[30] Regarding the concern that the respondent generated business activity in the United States and may have travelled to the United States for business purposes. His application and residency questionnaire do not declare the reasons for travel. The respondent and his spouse addressed this concern at the hearing. They stated that the visits were for family trips, not business. The respondent confirmed that all his work was done remotely.

[31] Regarding the lack of documentation for the ESL course the respondent and his spouse attended, they reasonably explained at the hearing that they did not complete the course and therefore did not receive a certificate. Regarding the fact that there was inconsistent information provided relating to the months of attendance in ESL courses, the respondent submits that this minor inconsistency would not provide a reasonable basis for rejecting the respondent's application for citizenship (*Purvis* at paragraphs 37 to 39).

[32] Regarding the concern that the respondent worked as a translator but also attended ESL classes, the respondent submits that he reasonably explained to the citizenship judge that he wished to improve his spoken English.

[33] Regarding the incomplete information regarding the respondent's children's schooling, the respondent submits that this would not provide a reasonable basis for rejecting the application. It was reasonable for the citizenship judge to conclude that the children were in school for the years for which some report cards were provided, given that it is unlikely and unsupported by the evidence that they would be in and out of school in Canada. Moreover, the citizenship judge reasonably accepted the explanation that these were the only school records the family could find at the date of the application.

[34] Regarding the concern about the inconsistency between the application form and residency questionnaire regarding whether the respondent was a president of a company in South Korea, the respondent acknowledges the inconsistency. He states that the citizenship judge did not question him regarding this inconsistency. The respondent explains that he incorrectly stated that the company existed in 2011 in his application and the company actually wound down in 2006. He submits that it was open to the citizenship judge to accept that he met the residency requirement despite this inconsistency.

VI. Analysis and Decision

[35] Given that the citizenship judge applied the quantitative test from *Pourghasemi*, the burden was on the respondent to establish with clear and compelling evidence the number of days he was physically present in Canada (*Abbas v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2011 FC 145 at paragraph 8). As the citizenship judge applied one of the acceptable tests, the standard or review for the remaining parts of the decision is reasonableness.

[36] In a recent case, *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Abdulghafoor*, 2015 FC 1020 [*Abdulghafoor*], Mr. Justice Denis Gascon provided a summary of the case law on the sufficiency of reasons in the context of a decision by a citizenship judge:

> [31] The decision-maker is not required to refer to each and every detail supporting his or her conclusion. It is sufficient if the reasons permit the Court to understand why the decision was made and determine whether the conclusion falls within the range of possible acceptable outcomes (*Newfoundland Nurses* at para 16). The reasons are to be read as a whole, in conjunction with the record, in order to determine whether the reasons provide the justification, transparency and intelligibility required of a reasonable decision (*Dunsmuir* at para 47; *Agraira v Canada (Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness)*, 2013 SCC 36 at para 53; *Construction Labour Relations v Driver Iron Inc.*, 2012 SCC 65 at para 3). This Court discussed the issue of adequacy of reasons in a citizenship judge's decision in the recent *Safi* decision. In that decision, Justice Kane echoed the *Newfoundland Nurses* principles and stated that the decision-maker is not required to set out every reason, argument or detail in the reasons, or to make an explicit finding on each element that leads to the final conclusion. The reasons are to "be read together with the outcome and serve the purpose of showing whether the result falls within a range of possible outcomes" (*Safi* at para 17).
>
> [32] In this case, the citizenship judge's decision meets this standard; the reasons explain why he decided that Mr. Abdulghafoor met the residency requirement and how he considered the evidence.
>
> [33] Reasonableness, not perfection, is the standard. In citizenship matters, reasons for decision are often very brief and do not always address all discrepancies in the evidence. However, even where the reasons for the decision are brief, or poorly written, this Court should defer to the decision-maker's weighing of the evidence and credibility determinations, as long as the Court is able to understand why the citizenship judge made its decision (*Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v. Thomas*, 2015 FC 288 at para 34 [*Thomas*]; *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Purvis*, 2015 FC 368 at paras 24-25).
>
> [34] In *Thomas*, for example, the citizenship judge found that the respondent was credible, addressed the citizenship officer's concerns and accepted the respondent's explanations. In response to the Minister's argument that there was insufficient evidence,

> Justice Mosley noted that "although the notes could have been clearer and more thorough, the ultimate decision rested on a reasonable assessment of the evidence, including the explanations provided by [the respondent]" (at para 34). Justice Mosley pointed out that the case did not contain unexplained gaps in the evidence, as the respondent had provided explanations that the citizenship judge found credible. Justice Mosley reminded that the Court must defer to the decision-maker's weighing of the evidence and credibility determination in absence of clear error (*Thomas* at paras 33-34).
>
> …
>
> [36] The present case is different. The citizenship judge identified the residency test he relied on and addressed the credibility concerns raised by the citizenship officer; there were no gaps in evidence or periods unaccounted for. I conclude that the reasons are sufficient and adequate with regard to the test established by *Newfoundland Nurses*. I am able to understand the citizenship judge's reasoning and to understand which factors and evidence led him to be satisfied that Mr. Abdulghafoor had been in Canada for the requisite number of days.

[37] In *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Suleiman*, 2015 FC 891 [*Suleiman*], Justice Gascon provides a useful summary and commentary on the use of the record in the reasonableness analysis and the use of a citizenship applicant's affidavit where no transcript of the hearing is available in the review of decisions by citizenship judges:

> [23] A decision-maker like a citizenship judge is deemed to have considered all the evidence on the record (*Hassan v Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, [1992] FCJ No 946 (FCA) at para 3). A failure to mention an element of evidence does not mean that it was ignored or that there was a reviewable error. In this case, the judge has also had the benefit of a long hearing with Mr. Suleiman, for which there is no transcript to contradict the evidence on the record or the affidavit filed by Mr. Suleiman. The decision of the citizenship judge evidently took into account the oral evidence provided by Mr. Suleiman. A review of the decision shows that the judge found the following:

> Mr. Suleiman terminated his employment in Dubai at the beginning of 2005 and returned to Canada in March 2005, after finalizing his affairs in Dubai;
>
> Mr. Suleiman left Canada only twice since March 2005 for short visits to Dubai to see his family;
>
> Mr. Suleiman had places of residence in Canada when he returned to Canada in 2005 and throughout the period of reference, first with his cousin and afterwards in an apartment owned by his brother;
>
> Mr. Suleiman had not travelled outside of Canada other than for his declared absences;
>
> There were satisfactory explanations for the absence of Canadian re-entry stamps on Mr. Suleiman's passport, the alleged "25 May 2005" stamp date and the UAE residence visa in Mr. Suleiman's passport.

[24] In view of these elements, it was reasonable for the citizenship judge to conclude that Mr. Suleiman met the residency requirement. I further note that this is not a situation where Mr. Suleiman was close to the minimum number of days required to meet the physical test of residence; even with some minor discrepancies in the evidence relating to some travel dates, he was well above the 1095 day threshold.

…

[27] The Minister is right to point out that there remains at all times a positive obligation on the citizenship applicants to provide true, correct, and complete information and to refrain from making false declarations. This however does not mean that corroborative evidence is required on every single element. It is well recognized that the *Citizenship Act* does not require corroboration on all counts; instead, it is "the responsibility of the original decision-maker, taking the context into consideration, to determine the extent and nature of the evidence required" (*Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v El Bousserghini*, 2012 FC 88 at para 19 [*El Bousserghini*]). The citizenship judge may not have reconciled the apparent discrepancy as clearly as the Minister would have liked to see it in his reasons, or explained in as much detail as the Minister would have hoped how Mr. Suleiman convinced the judge that the discrepancy did not harm his credibility. But there is nothing to indicate that the judge's finding

> on Mr. Suleiman's return to Canada prior to the beginning of the reference period was not reasonable.

[38] I note that the Court rarely intervenes unless there are significant unaddressed inadequacies which make it impossible to determine how the citizenship judge weighed the evidence such as contradictions between the decision and the record.

[39] Although the citizenship judge's decision may not have explained in as great a detail the errors alleged by the Minister, or was not as clear as the Minister believed it should be, I am of the view that the decision was reasonable when it is read with the record. I am satisfied that the decision allows a reader to understand why the decision was made.

[40] The citizenship judge applied the test from *Pourghasemi*. As a result, the quantitative analysis of the number of days that the respondent was physically present in Canada was central. The citizenship judge addressed most of the evidence and gaps relating to the respondent's travel from Canada (when he would not be physically present in Canada): the application form, the residency questionnaire, the passport stamps and the ICES report. It is clear that the citizenship judge accepted the respondent's travel history and related days that he was physically present in Canada, as credible.

[41] The citizenship judge is presumed to have considered all of the evidence (*Suleiman* at pargraph 23). In my opinion, the gaps in the evidence that are noted by the applicant and that were not specifically addressed by the citizenship judge do not likely reveal anything that would make it impossible to determine how the citizenship judge came to his conclusion:

- *Lack of re-entry stamps*: The respondent's affidavit indicates that he stated at the hearing that the passports were not stamped by Canadian officials. Like in *Suleiman*, this information is not contradicted and there is nothing to suggest that the citizenship judge did not take this explanation into account (at paragraph 23).

- *Only two of the respondent's ten declared absences were verified in their entirety*: The decision indicates that he found the respondent's record of absences to be credible. *Suleiman* provides that corroborative evidence is not required on every single element of a citizenship decision (at paragraph 27).

- *How the citizenship judge was able to conclude that the respondent was physically present in Canada for 1,095 days*: The decision indicates that the respondent's record of absences was found to be credible. The citizenship judge clearly turned his mind to the number of days the respondent was absent (calculated from the travel dates), because he indicated that, in case an omitted passport stamp was a longer trip to the United States, the respondent still met the criteria of being physically present in Canada for 1,095 days.

- *It cannot be ascertained where the respondent renewed his passport*: The respondent explains that he stated at the hearing that he received it from the Consulate and this evidence is not contradicted. Like in *Suleiman*, there is nothing to suggest that the citizenship judge did not take this into account (at paragraph 23).

- *Failure to address that the respondent provided mostly passive indicators of residence and the declared absences were not accompanied by reasons for the absences*: There is nothing to indicate that the citizenship judge did not consider this evidence and he states that he considered all of the evidence. Moreover, the respondent's affidavit states that the citizenship judge requested additional evidence in response to the concerns raised by the reviewing officer and the respondent provided this evidence, proof of the self-employment activity and doctor's visits.

- *Evidence relating to ESL classes*: There is nothing to suggest that the citizenship judge did not consider the evidence relating to ESL classes. Moreover, whether the respondent attended ESL classes would be unlikely to be dispositive of the application.

- *Limited evidence of children's education*: There is nothing to suggest that the citizenship judge did not consider the evidence of the children's education. The respondent's affidavit provides that he stated at the hearing that these were the report cards they could find.

- *Failure to address the inconsistency between the application form and the residency questionnaire relating to the respondent's claim to be the president of a South Korean company*: In my view, this is the most significant inconsistency in the evidence. It seems to be the unlikely subject of a "typo" and likely should have alerted the citizenship judge to probe further (*Safi* at paragraph 45). However, I am not convinced that the failure to address this inconsistency, which may not even relate to the respondent's physical presence in Canada, renders the decision unreasonable.

- *Limited discussion of the evidence provided to support the respondent's business activities and no discussion of his failure to provide income tax information*: There is nothing to indicate that the citizenship judge did not consider this and he states that he considered all of the evidence. The respondent recounts in his affidavit that the citizenship judge noted at the hearing that income tax returns do not necessarily prove residency and did not request them, but they could have been provided. However, I note that the above-noted inconsistency in whether the respondent is a president of a South Korean company might alert the citizenship judge to probe further regarding the respondent's income in Canada (*Safi* at paragraph 45).

[42] I note that unlike in *Suleiman*, which I rely on above, the citizenship judge did not specifically refer to the reviewing officer's concerns in his decision. However, he does generally note the credibility concerns and deficient evidence in the respondent's application at the beginning of the decision.

[43] It is not disputed that when the Minister is the respondent in a matter, it is not proper for the Minister to submit affidavit evidence from the decision maker to address shortcomings in the decision. That, however, is not what happened in the present case. The respondent, who was the applicant at the citizenship hearing, is offering the affidavit evidence, not the decision maker. There was no transcript of the hearing and the affidavit evidence relates to the evidence the citizenship judge considered. This Court has accepted this type of affidavit evidence in the absence of a transcript of the hearing before a citizenship judge.

[44] For the above reasons, I am of the view that the decision of the citizenship judge was reasonable and the application for judicial review must be dismissed.

[45] Neither party wished to submit a proposed serious question of general importance for my consideration for certification.

JUDGMENT

THIS COURT'S JUDGMENT is that the application for judicial review is dismissed.

"John A. O'Keefe"

Judge

ANNEX

Relevant Statutory Provisions

***Citizenship Act*, RSC 1985, C-29**

5. (1) The Minister shall grant citizenship to any person who	5. (1) Le ministre attribue la citoyenneté à toute personne qui, à la fois :
…	…
(c) is a permanent resident within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, has, subject to the regulations, no unfulfilled conditions under that Act relating to his or her status as a permanent resident and has, since becoming a permanent resident,	c) est un résident permanent au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la Loi sur l'immigration et la protection des réfugiés, a, sous réserve des règlements, satisfait à toute condition rattachée à son statut de résident permanent en vertu de cette loi et, après être devenue résident permanent :
(i) been physically present in Canada for at least 1,460 days during the six years immediately before the date of his or her application,	(i) a été effectivement présent au Canada pendant au moins mille quatre cent soixante jours au cours des six ans qui ont précédé la date de sa demande,
(ii) been physically present in Canada for at least 183 days during each of four calendar years that are fully or partially within the six years immediately before the date of his or her application, and …	(ii) a été effectivement présent au Canada pendant au moins cent quatre-vingt trois jours par année civile au cours de quatre des années complètement ou partiellement comprises dans les six ans qui ont précédé la date de sa demande, …

FEDERAL COURT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD

DOCKET:	T-693-15
STYLE OF CAUSE:	THE MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION v SUNG HOON GOO
PLACE OF HEARING:	TORONTO, ONTARIO
DATE OF HEARING:	OCTOBER 19, 2015
REASONS FOR JUDGMENT AND JUDGMENT:	O'KEEFE J.
DATED:	DECEMBER 9, 2015

APPEARANCES:

David Knapp	FOR THE APPLICANT
Daniel Kingwell	FOR THE RESPONDENT

SOLICITORS OF RECORD:

William F. Pentney Deputy Attorney General of Canada Toronto, Ontario	FOR THE APPLICANT
Mamann, Sandaluk and Kingwell LLP Barristers and Solicitors Toronto, Ontario	FOR THE RESPONDENT