LAW360™ Canada

Law360 Canada | 111 Gordon Baker Road, Suite 900 | Toronto, ON, M2H 3R1 Canada | www.law360.ca
Phone: (800) 668-6481 | customerservice@lexisnexis.ca

Immigration decision signals tougher era for security inadmissibility cases

By **Sergio R. Karas**

Law360 Canada (February 23, 2026, 12:17 PM EST) -- The recent Federal Court's ruling in *Sowane v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2026 FC 89 should command the close attention of immigration practitioners. Although the facts concern the used-vehicle export industry and alleged ties to Hezbollah money-laundering networks, the judgment's implications extend well beyond any single sector.

Sergio R. Karas

The court's analysis cements, and arguably expands, three systemic trends: reduced disclosure obligations for the government, heightened evidentiary burdens for applicants and a broadening of administrative discretion under security-related inadmissibility provisions. The decision can be an important tool to prevent individuals linked to terrorist organizations or criminal networks to gain entry to Canada.

KadnikovValerii: ISTOCKPHOTO.COM

Fahed Sowane and his son, Fayeiz Sowane, both dual Belgian-Lebanese citizens, sought judicial review of an Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) decision refusing their permanent residence application on security grounds.

Sowane worked for decades in the international used-vehicle trade. He applied for permanent residence with an Ontario nomination in 2019. After lengthy delays, he obtained a mandamus order in 2022 compelling IRCC to finalize the application. IRCC later issued three procedural fairness letters outlining concerns related to money-laundering risks associated with the used-car export industry and possible links to Hezbollah, a listed terrorist organization.

A minimalist interpretation of procedural fairness

A key pillar of the decision is the court's reaffirmation that IRCC need only provide applicants with the "gist" of its concerns. The procedural fairness letters in *Sowane* demanded extensive business, banking and transactional records from the applicant while identifying only the general typology of the alleged money-laundering scheme — namely, the use of automobile exports to funnel funds to

Hezbollah. The court unequivocally held that this level of disclosure was sufficient, even though the underlying intelligence, including CSIS and CBSA material, remained partially or fully undisclosed under s. 87 of the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* (IRPA) that allows the minster, during a judicial review, to apply for the non-disclosure of information or other evidence.

For future cases, the message is unmistakable: procedural fairness in the national-security context is a low bar, and officers are not required to provide granular evidence or detailed allegations. Applicants will continue to face the daunting task of rebutting suspicions without seeing the full case against them.

Adverse inferences and the expanding evidentiary burden

One of the most consequential aspects of the decision is the court's acceptance of adverse inferences drawn from incomplete or missing records. The applicant in *Sowane* did not provide a comprehensive documentary trail for all business transactions — some dating years back, some involving foreign jurisdictions and some potentially hard to retrieve. The court held that such gaps justified the officer's conclusions, especially given the nature of the concerns.

This effectively shifts the evidentiary dynamic: in security-screening cases, the absence of documentary proof becomes affirmative evidence of risk. For clients with long entrepreneurial histories, particularly in sectors associated with cash-intensive or transnational trade, this standard imposes a heavy compliance burden. The court's endorsement means officers can expect applicants to produce years' worth of detailed, often foreign-sourced business documentation — and can reasonably draw negative conclusions when they do not.

Patterns over proof: The rise of typology-based reasoning

The officer's security assessment in *Sowane* relied heavily on publicly available reports and case studies describing how automobile exports have been used in Hezbollah-linked money-laundering operations, rather than direct evidence tying the applicant to the organization. The Federal Court found this approach reasonable. It also rejected arguments based on religious or ideological implausibility (i.e., the applicant's Sunni identity vs. Hezbollah's Shia affiliation), recognizing profit motive as a plausible bridge.

This signals a significant jurisprudential shift: IRCC need not show individualized involvement, only that the applicant's activities fit an established risk pattern. As typology-based risk analysis becomes entrenched, applicants engaged in global commerce — particularly in industries susceptible to misuse — may increasingly find themselves caught in broad risk nets.

Judicial deference in the security context remains high

The court applied the reasonableness standard under *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v. Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65, but did so with notable deference. It emphasized that the officer identified the concerns, articulated a chain of reasoning and applied the correct legal test for "danger to the security of Canada." That was enough. The judge refused to reweigh the evidence, question the breadth of the procedural fairness letters or demand a more detailed exposition of the alleged security threat.

For practitioners, this reinforces a practical reality: judicial review is an uphill battle. Once IRCC articulates a coherent narrative grounded in risk assessment, even if circumstantial or pattern-based, the court is reluctant to intervene.

Implications for future cases

The *Sowane* decision has several practical consequences for the handling of security-inadmissibility matters:

- Expect more expansive procedural fairness letters. Officers are now implicitly encouraged to seek sweeping sets of records when assessing security risk.

- Prepare for aggressive adverse inferences. Any gap — whether due to the age of documents, foreign business practices or natural limitations on recordkeeping — may be taken as evidence of concealment.
- Typology will dominate. Applicants in industries linked to prior money-laundering or terrorist-financing patterns should expect heightened scrutiny, regardless of individual intent or ideology.
- Judicial review will rarely rescue a weak documentary record. Courts will not act as second-level fact finders in these cases.

Conclusion

Sowane v. Canada underscores a significant tightening of the security-inadmissibility regime. The decision affirms a model where limited disclosure, broad adverse inferences and pattern-based reasoning form a durable foundation for refusal decisions. The court's message is clear: in national-security screening, the burden rests heavily on applicants — and the threshold for IRCC to act remains low. Hopefully, this decision will serve to prevent nefarious actors from gaining residency in Canada. Still, the lengthy proceedings raise questions of how quickly anyone found to be a security risk can be deported or denied entry to Canada, and that is a problem that the authorities must address.

Sergio R. Karas, principal of Karas Immigration Law Professional Corporation, is a certified specialist in Canadian Citizenship and Immigration Law by the Law Society of Ontario. He is Division Chair of the ABA International Law Section, past chair of the Ontario Bar Association Citizenship and Immigration Section, past chair of the International Bar Association Immigration and Nationality Committee, and a fellow of the American Bar Foundation. He can be reached at karas@karas.ca