

Federal Court



Cour fédérale

**Date: 20110613**

**Docket: IMM-6637-10**

**Citation: 2011 FC 679**

**Toronto, Ontario, June 13, 2011**

**PRESENT: The Honourable Mr. Justice Hughes**

**BETWEEN:**

**BRAULIA GUADALUPE RANGEL GOMEZ,  
LORENA GEORGETTE CARDENAS  
RANGEL, KARLA YORDANA CARDENAS  
RANGEL**

**Applicants**

**and**

**MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND  
IMMIGRATION**

**Respondent**

**REASONS FOR JUDGMENT AND JUDGMENT**

[1] The Applicants seek judicial review of a decision of a Pre Removal Risk Assessment (PRRA) Officer dated October 28, 2010 in which it was determined that the Applicants would not be at risk if they were returned to Mexico. That decision will be set aside.

[2] The Applicants are citizens of Mexico. They sought refugee protection in Canada. By a decision dated 14 August 2009 their application was denied. That date is important since the events relevant to the PRRA decision occurred afterward.

[3] The events must be looked at beginning in 2005 when a prominent Mexican X was kidnapped and murdered. It was alleged that relatives of the Applicants were implicated in the kidnapping and death of X. One relative was residing in the United States and extradited to Mexico in 2008 where she was imprisoned. X's mother has apparent influence with the Mexican police authorities. The RPD was aware of this and in its decision accepted that X's mother was influential in the arrest of the relative extradited from the United States.

[4] Since the RPD decision was given further events, as put in evidence before the PRRA Officer, have taken place. The woman who was extradited and imprisoned in Mexico was beaten and tortured in the hands of prison officials including being threatened with injection of AIDS containing blood. Contrary to the findings of the PRRA Officer this woman did complain to the authorities to no apparent avail.

[5] The issue is whether adequate state protection is available should the Applicants be returned to Mexico. The PRRA Officer did not squarely address this issue and, to the extent that the reasons can be understood to address this issue, the Officer mingled the findings of the RPD which predated the imprisonment, torture and complaint to no avail, of the relative with the question of risk to which the Applicants would likely be exposed.

[6] That matter will be returned to be determined by a different officer. No party requested certification.

**JUDGMENT**

**FOR THE REASONS above.**

**THIS COURT ORDERS AND ADJUDGES that:**

1. The application is allowed.
2. The matter is returned for re-determination by a different officer.
3. There is no question for certification.
4. There is no Order as to costs.

---

Judge

**FEDERAL COURT**  
**SOLICITORS OF RECORD**

**DOCKET:** IMM-6637-10

**STYLE OF CAUSE:** *BRAULIA GUADALUPE RANGEL GOMEZ, LORENA  
GEORGETTE CARDENAS RANGEL, KARLA YORDANA  
CARDENAS RANGEL  
v. MINISTER OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION*

**PLACE OF HEARING:** TORONTO, ONTARIO

**DATE OF HEARING:** JUNE 13, 2011

**REASONS FOR JUDGMENT  
AND JUDGMENT:** HUGHES J.

**DATED:** JUNE 13, 2011

**APPEARANCES:**

Jeremiah A. Eastman FOR THE APPLICANTS

Nadine Silverman FOR THE RESPONDENT

**SOLICITORS OF RECORD:**

EASTMAN LAW OFFICE FOR THE APPLICANTS  
PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION  
Barrister & Solicitor  
Brampton, Ontario

Myles J. Kirvan FOR THE RESPONDENT  
Deputy Attorney General of Canada  
Toronto, Ontario