

1415560 (Refugee) [2016] AATA 3429 (29 February 2016)

### DECISION RECORD

<b>DIVISION:</b>	Migration & Refugee Division
<b>CASE NUMBER:</b>	1415560
<b>COUNTRY OF REFERENCE:</b>	Cambodia
<b>MEMBER:</b>	Nicole Burns
<b>DATE:</b>	29 February 2016
<b>PLACE OF DECISION:</b>	Melbourne
<b>DECISION:</b>	The Tribunal affirms the decision not to grant the applicants Protection visas.

Statement made on 29 February 2016 at 12:13pm

Any references appearing in square brackets indicate that information has been omitted from this decision pursuant to section 431 of the Migration Act 1958 and replaced with generic information which does not allow the identification of an applicant, or their relative or other dependant.

## STATEMENT OF DECISION AND REASONS

### APPLICATION FOR REVIEW

1. This is an application for review of a decision made by a delegate of the Minister for Immigration to refuse to grant the applicants Protection visas under s.65 of the *Migration Act 1958* (the Act).
2. The applicants who claim to be citizens of Cambodia, applied for the visas [in] September 2013 and the delegate refused to grant the visas [in] August 2014.
3. The first named applicant (hereafter the applicant) appeared before the Tribunal on 23 February 2016 to give evidence and present arguments. The Tribunal hearing was conducted with the assistance of an interpreter in the Khmer and English languages.
4. The applicants were represented in relation to the review by their registered migration agent. He attended the Tribunal hearing.

### CONSIDERATION OF CLAIMS AND EVIDENCE

5. The criteria for a protection visa are set out in s.36 of the Act and Schedule 2 to the Migration Regulations 1994 (the Regulations). An applicant for the visa must meet one of the alternative criteria in s.36(2)(a), (aa), (b), or (c). That is, the applicant is either a person in respect of whom Australia has protection obligations under the 'refugee' criterion, or on other 'complementary protection' grounds, or is a member of the same family unit as such a person and that person holds a protection visa of the same class.
6. Section 36(2)(a) provides that a criterion for a protection visa is that the applicant for the visa is a non-citizen in Australia in respect of whom the Minister is satisfied Australia has protection obligations under the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees as amended by the 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees (together, the Refugees Convention, or the Convention).
7. Australia is a party to the Refugees Convention and generally speaking, has protection obligations in respect of people who are refugees as defined in Article 1 of the Convention. Article 1A(2) relevantly defines a refugee as any person who:  
owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.
8. If a person is found not to meet the refugee criterion in s.36(2)(a), he or she may nevertheless meet the criteria for the grant of a protection visa if he or she is a non-citizen in Australia in respect of whom the Minister is satisfied Australia has protection obligations because the Minister has substantial grounds for believing that, as a necessary and foreseeable consequence of the applicant being removed from Australia to a receiving country, there is a real risk that he or she will suffer significant harm: s.36(2)(aa) ('the complementary protection criterion').
9. In accordance with Ministerial Direction No.56, made under s.499 of the Act, the Tribunal is required to take account of policy guidelines prepared by the Department of Immigration – PAM3 Refugee and humanitarian - Complementary Protection Guidelines and PAM3 Refugee and humanitarian - Refugee Law Guidelines – and any country information

assessment prepared by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade expressly for protection status determination purposes, to the extent that they are relevant to the decision under consideration.

10. The primary issue in this review is whether there is a real chance that, if they return to Cambodia, the applicants will be persecuted for one or more of the five reasons set out in the Refugees Convention for the purpose of s.36(2)(a) of the Migration Act and, if not, whether there are substantial grounds for believing that, as a necessary and foreseeable consequence of them being removed from Australia to Cambodia, there is a real risk that they will suffer significant harm for the purpose of s.36(2)(aa) of the Migration Act.
11. For the following reasons, the Tribunal has concluded that the decision under review should be affirmed.
12. The applicant is [an age] year old divorced woman from Phnom Penh, Cambodia. She came to Australia in December 2009 on a [temporary] visa. She has two [children]: one born in [year] who currently lives in Cambodia with the applicant's ex-husband and the other born in Australia in [year] (the second named applicant, who is a member of the applicant's family unit). The applicant's parents and [siblings] live in Phnom Penh.
13. Based on a copy of her passport on file, the Tribunal finds that the applicant is a citizen of Cambodia and has assessed her protection claims accordingly. On the basis that the second named applicant's mother is a Cambodian citizen (and she has no father) the Tribunal also has considered Cambodia as her country of nationality (and receiving country) for assessing whether or not Australia owes her protection obligations.
14. The applicant initially presented her claims for protection in her visa application in September 2013 as follows:

**Why did you leave that country?**

I am pregnant to a stranger who is against my culture and tradition. My child will not be allowed to get birth certificate in Cambodia and therefore will not be allowed to attend school.

Furthermore, Cambodia is a communist country. I cannot live under a dictatorship ruling. So I cannot return to Cambodia.

**Have you experienced harm in that country?**

I know for the fact that pregnant women like me will be degraded and people in the community will talk bad about me. I will not be allowed to be part of the community which I used to belong.

Most importantly, Cambodia does not protect the right of woman and human rights. Records would show that this government, i.e. the local authority will look down on me and thus me and my child will not get a fair chance to live in this society.

Being born in Cambodia and grown up there, I have seen many unjust things that have happened to women. So I will face harm in Cambodia if I return.

**What do you fear may happen to you if you go back to that country?**

I fear that the communist government in Cambodia will harm me physically and mentally as I am pregnant without husband. I fear that I will not get my child a birth certificate and therefore my child will not have a chance in Cambodia.

**Who do you think may harm/mistreat you if you go back?**

Local authority and local community do not approve of pregnant women without a husband.

**Why do you think this will happen to you if you go back?**

I know Cambodian culture and tradition as I was born and grown up there.

**Do you think the authorities of that country can and will protect you if you go back?**

There are many reasons that the local authorities or government will not protect me about the government does not care about the rights and protection of its own citizens.

The government protects the rich and powerful people. The government does not protect the poor and the weak.

15. The delegate was not satisfied that Australia owed the applicant protection obligations, concluding among other things that she made new assertions to enhance her protection claims at interview which were not apparent in the protection visa application.
16. On review the applicant claims to fear returning to Cambodia for a number of reasons. That is, she claims to fear harm from the authorities on the basis of her (anti-government) political opinion. She claims to fear harm from her ex-husband whom she claims was violent toward her in the past. She also claims to fear harm from society in general because she is a single mother.

*Claims related to political opinion*

17. The applicant told the Tribunal her greatest fear on return to Cambodia is that she will be harmed by soldiers and police because she has a history of being a person who is against the government and no one can help her in Cambodia.
18. In her oral evidence to the Tribunal the applicant claimed to have a strong anti-government political opinion because the (Cambodian) government is "bad" and does not look after the people, especially women. She told the Tribunal that she expressed this opinion all the time whilst working at the [workplace] [in] Phnom Penh, including to customers and other [colleagues].
19. The applicant claims she was threatened by soldiers and police as a result of being outspoken against the government: once at a gathering at the [workplace] where she worked sometime in 2007 or 2008 and not long after whilst walking home from work. She said they were armed, showed her their gun, and told her to stop talking about the government. She said she decided she needed to leave Cambodia after the second incident. She continued working at the [workplace], but reduced her time there, and stopped talking out against the government after she managed to find an agent to organise her departure (she was unable to recall when this was).
20. The Tribunal does not accept the applicant's claims to have been outspoken against the government and threatened by police and soldiers as a result. That is because she made no mention of these claims in her protection visa application – i.e. that she was a critic of the government and was threatened by the authorities as a consequence. When the Tribunal asked the applicant why she failed to mention this core claim in her protection visa application the applicant replied that she did mention it to her representative. Given the significant nature of these claims the Tribunal would have expected the applicant to have raised them at the application stage (and the representative to have included them in the

application form). The Tribunal also found the applicant's oral evidence about her alleged outspokenness against the government vague and lacking in details. For instance she said the government was bad and did not look after the people, especially women. When pressed she said that the government was corrupt, they rob land from the people, and they suppress and take people's rights. However apart from these general statements she did not provide any specific examples of why she disliked the government. As well, the applicant was vague about what forums she spoke out against the government and how often, claiming to have "always" spoken ill about the government and when asked further, said she did so to customers and other [colleagues] at the [workplace]. However she was unable to recall when she started expressing such opinions. Given these concerns the Tribunal does not accept that the applicant was outspoken against the Cambodian government in the past as claimed. It follows that the Tribunal does not accept the applicant's claims – raised for the first time at the Tribunal hearing – that police and soldiers had visited her parents' house in Cambodia looking for her, about a couple of months after she left Cambodia.

21. For the reasons above the Tribunal does not accept that the applicant expressed anti-government political opinions in the past in Cambodia and is not satisfied that she would do so on return in the foreseeable future. The Tribunal also does not accept that the applicant was ever threatened by the authorities in relation to her political opinion in the past in Cambodia. Therefore it finds that there is not a real chance that she would face serious harm at the hands of the authorities on the basis of her (anti-government) political opinion on return to Cambodia now or in the reasonably foreseeable future. Her fears of persecution on this basis are not well founded.

*Claims as a single mother*

22. The primary protection claim set out in the visa application relates to the applicant's alleged fear of harm and discrimination from society and the authorities as a pregnant woman without a husband. At the hearing the representative submitted that the applicant fears degrading treatment<sup>1</sup> on this basis – or now as a single mother given her child was born in [year]. He stated that whilst country information paints a good picture of Cambodia, a closer look at other sources (he did not specify which sources) show human rights abuses and submitted that the applicant is fearful of her well-being as a single mother (of whom the father is unknown), which is culturally unacceptable in Cambodia.
23. The Tribunal notes that the applicant did not spontaneously state that she was fearful about returning to Cambodia as a single mother at the hearing, and focused her claims on her political opinion and ex-husband, as discussed (above and below). When asked directly the applicant stated that being a single mother on return is also part of her fears, noting that if she goes back she will be criticised by her family, friends and neighbours who will not accept her as before. She fears her [child] will suffer emotionally as a result. She also fears that she will not have enough money to send her [child] to school or pay for medical assistance when sick. In the visa application she states that she knows "for a fact that pregnant woman like me will be degrading and people in the community will talk bad about me. I will not be able allow to be part of the community which I used to belong." She also stated that she fears the Cambodian government will harm her "physically and mentally" because she (was) pregnant without a husband.
24. The Tribunal accepts the applicant is a single mother and would likely be on return to Cambodia, at least initially. The applicant has provided a copy of her [child]'s Australian birth certificate, which does not list a father. The applicant told the Tribunal that she only met her [child]'s father once or twice, that he is not in their lives and does not even know that he has a [child]. When asked, she said she is unsure if he is an Australian citizen.

---

<sup>1</sup> Submitting that the Complementary Protection provisions apply in the applicant's case

25. The Tribunal accepts that it may be difficult for the applicant returning to Cambodia as a single mother, particularly given her [child] is still young. It accepts that she may face family and broader societal disapproval given her status. It accepts that she may be talked about. The applicant told the Tribunal that her parents were very angry when she told them about the matter over the telephone and that they blame her. The Tribunal accepts that they have verbally expressed their disapproval, which is not surprising given the persisting cultural expectations that women do not have children out of wedlock. The Tribunal accepts that the applicant is upset and worried about her family's reaction to her status as a single mother. The Tribunal is not satisfied, however that the applicant's family members actually intend to seriously harm the applicant because of this. That is because the applicant told the Tribunal that they have maintained a relationship, despite the birth of her (second) [child], and that she speaks to her mother over the phone at least once a week and her father and siblings less often. Whilst upset, the Tribunal does not find that the applicant or her [child] would be face a real chance of serious harm from family members on return to Cambodia because she is a single mother or because her [child] does not have a father.
26. The Tribunal accepts that the applicant will face a level of social discrimination as a single mother in Cambodia. Independent reports indicate that divorced Cambodian women face social stigma and isolation, economic hardship, and limited options for supporting themselves.<sup>2</sup> More generally, attitudes towards women in Cambodia are strongly influenced by traditional codes of conduct. There are historically unequal power relations between men and women and pervasive discrimination against women in both the public and private spheres.<sup>3</sup> Education and employment opportunities for women are limited and so men remain the predominant income-earners.<sup>4</sup> *Divorced women do face many obstacles...it is very difficult to be a single mother in Cambodia because she will often be regarded as a "bad woman and mother" and face economic difficulties.*<sup>5</sup>
27. In assessing whether there is a real chance that the applicant in her particular circumstances will face a level of social stigma and discrimination that can be regarded as serious harm, the Tribunal notes that the applicant told the Tribunal that she lived in Cambodia for around five to six months after she was separated and before she came to Australia and did not indicate that she experienced any problems from the community as a result. She was supported by her family then and although they have expressed their disappointment and anger that she has had another child, the evidence before the Tribunal does not indicate that they will cast her out or not support her (and her [child]) on return to Cambodia. The Tribunal notes in this regard the applicant's oral evidence that her mother was the one who facilitated visits with her elder [child] after she had separated, and continued to engage with her a few times after the applicant left Cambodia, which is indicative of her ongoing support to her [child], despite her single status. The Tribunal also notes that the applicant worked in Cambodia and has worked in Australia and in the Tribunal's view the applicant does not fit the profile of a woman who will face economic difficulties because of the stigma attached to being a separated woman and a single mother, to the extent that she will not be able to subsist.
28. When these matters were discussed at hearing, the applicant said every day she regrets causing a lot of problems and difficulties for her [child], who is innocent.

<sup>2</sup> *Cast Aside (Divorced and Bereaved Women Still Lack Equal Rights)' 2010*, Peace Women website, source: Legal Aid of Cambodia website, 22 June.

<sup>3</sup> DFAT 2012, Cambodia Ending Violence Against women Concept Note, DFAT website, April, p.2

<sup>4</sup> Brickell, K., Prak, B. and Poch, B. 2014, *Domestic Violence Law The gap between legislation and practice in Cambodia and what can be done about it*, London; Royal Holloway, University of London, p.18.

<sup>5</sup> German Technical Assistance (GTZ), Human Rights in Cambodia Project (HRCP) and United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) 2005, *Violence Against Women: A Baseline Survey*, CEDAW South East Asia website, p.10.

29. Taking into account these considerations, the Tribunal finds remote the chance that members of the community or the authorities would seriously harm the applicant on this basis.
30. Given the Tribunal's finding that the applicant still has a relationship and support from her family in Cambodia, it also finds that her parents would be in a position to assist her financially on return to Cambodia, including to help pay school fees and doctor's fees for her [child] if required. The Tribunal notes in this regard the applicant's evidence at hearing that her father still [works]. She did say that her parents are old now and cannot do "full" work as before. The Tribunal is willing to accept that may be the case, and acknowledges that it may be difficult financially for a period of time on her return, but notes that the applicant's father continues to work nonetheless. As well, although the applicant left school at a young age, she gave evidence that she worked for [number] years [in] Cambodia and has worked in Australia doing [work], and there is nothing to indicate that she would be prevented from getting a job on return to Cambodia. The Tribunal is satisfied that the applicant would be able to obtain employment on her return and that she would be able to pay for her [child]'s school fees and medical expenses. The Tribunal finds neither the applicant nor her [child] (the second named applicant) faces a real chance of serious harm arising on these bases.
31. The Tribunal has considered the applicant's claim in her visa application that she will not be able to get a birth certificate for her [child] in Cambodia and therefore her [child] will not be able to attend school. Country information indicates that if a child is born overseas to at least one parent of Cambodian citizenship – as is the case with the second named applicant – that child will be eligible for citizenship<sup>6</sup>. When this matter was discussed at hearing, the applicant said she thought she would have a problem because her [child] was born overseas. Based on this country information and the fact that the applicant is a Cambodian citizen, the Tribunal is satisfied that the second named applicant would be able to have [his/her] birth registered on return to Cambodia and neither applicant will face a real chance of serious harm on return to Cambodia on this basis.
32. Given these considerations, whilst the Tribunal accepts that the applicant may face some verbal abuse and disapproval from family members and possibly members of the community on return to Cambodia as a single mother, the Tribunal is satisfied that the evidence does not indicate that this will be to an extent that it can be regarded as serious harm. Her fears of persecution on this basis are not well founded.

#### *Claims as a woman*

33. The Tribunal has also considered the applicant's claims in the protection visa application that she will face harm in Cambodia on return as a woman, noting that she has seen many unjust things that have happened to women whilst growing up in Cambodia. When asked what she was referring to specifically at hearing, the applicant said that the (Cambodian) government has no measure to help single mothers to protect them against mistreatment or discrimination and that will affect her child's future and create a lot of difficulties. The applicant has not put forward any specific claim to fear persecution on the basis of her status as a woman (except in relation to being a single woman, considered above) or elaborated further in respect to her status as a woman. Nonetheless, the Tribunal acknowledges country information indicating that attitudes towards women in Cambodia are strongly influenced by traditional codes of gender conduct and that there are historically unequal power relations between men and women and discrimination against women in both the public and private spheres.<sup>7</sup> Accordingly, the Tribunal accepts that the applicant may face discrimination as a woman in Cambodian society in that she would be expected to adhere to

<sup>6</sup> US Department of State, *Country Report on Human Rights Practices in Cambodia* for 2013

<sup>7</sup> DFAT 2012, Cambodia Ending Violence Against women Concept Note, DFAT website, April, p.2

traditional codes of gender conduct and may not be treated equally with men in the public sphere. However, the evidence before the Tribunal does not suggest that discrimination against women as a whole in Cambodia rises to the level of serious or significant harm, as discussed at the hearing. The applicant's evidence regarding her background indicates that she was able to find employment despite any discrimination she may face as a woman in Cambodian society. The Tribunal does not accept on the evidence before it that being a single woman or a single mother increases the risk of harm to the applicant to a degree such that it becomes a real chance of serious harm as required.

34. In the application form the applicant also claims to fear living under a dictatorship, claiming that Cambodia is a communist country. The applicant has not elaborated further on her fears in this regard, despite having the opportunity to do so at hearing, and did not provide details as to why she may fear harm on return to Cambodia on the basis of it being a dictatorship and a Communist country. Therefore the Tribunal is not satisfied that the applicant has a well-founded fear of persecution on this basis.

*Claims related to her ex-husband*

35. The applicant told the Tribunal that her ex-husband was violent towards her in the past in Cambodia and that they had a particularly nasty fight about five months before she left Cambodia where he threatened her with a knife and said he would harm her if he saw her again. They separated after that fight, with the applicant's ex-husband taking their [child] with him. The applicant has not spoken to her ex-husband since. She saw her (eldest) [child] a couple of times before she left Cambodia, whilst she was visiting her parents' house (organised through her mother). About a year after the applicant left Cambodia her ex-husband filed for divorce and her parents signed the papers on her behalf. He and their [child] moved house around this time and the applicant has not heard from them since and her parents do not know where they have gone.
36. The applicant said she reported the matter to the police in Cambodia in an attempt to be able to have access to her [child]. The police talked to her ex-husband, but he refused her access. The applicant said she thought this took place in 2008, which does not accord with her oral evidence to the Tribunal that she separated from her ex-husband about five months before she departed Cambodia in December 2009. However the Tribunal is willing to give the applicant the benefit of the doubt on this matter, noting that it is sometimes difficult to recollect events from some time ago, and accepts that she sought police help to see her [child] sometime around 2008/2009. Apart from asking her mother to visit her [child] – which she did about two times in 2010 – the applicant did not indicate that she has made any other efforts to try and locate her [child], noting that her ex-husband has refused her access in the past, and that she is afraid of him. She also said she does not want to see him again.
37. Although the applicant did not mention that she had experienced violence at the hands of her ex-husband in her protection visa application, the Tribunal is willing to accept her claims in this respect. However, the applicant told the Tribunal that her ex-husband does not want to see her again and that he has remarried. She also said she does not want to see him again and gave no indication that she would attempt to locate her elder [child] on return to Cambodia, even after the Tribunal asked her a number of times. For these reasons the Tribunal finds remote the chance that the applicant would be seriously harmed by her ex-husband on return to Cambodia now or in the reasonably foreseeable future.
38. The Tribunal has considered if the applicant will suffer harm in the form of mental anguish on return to Cambodia as a result of her ex-husband's denial of access to her elder [child]. The Tribunal accepts that this situation is distressing for the applicant and would be on return. However, the applicant did not make any specific claims to fear persecution on this basis and did not elaborate further at hearing, despite having the opportunity to do so and the



Tribunal is not satisfied that the applicant has a well-founded fear of persecution in the form of mental anguish as a result to her ex-husband's denial of access to her elder [child] on return to Cambodia in the reasonably foreseeable future.

*Conclusion – refugee grounds*

39. For these reasons and having considered the applicants' claims individually and cumulatively, the Tribunal finds that the first named applicant does not face a real chance of serious harm on return to Cambodia for reasons of her political opinion, status as a single mother, or from her ex-husband, as a woman in Cambodia or any Convention reason in the foreseeable future. Her fears of persecution are not well founded.
40. Given this finding and for reasons above the Tribunal also finds that the second named applicant does not face a real chance of serious harm on return to Cambodia on the basis of [his/her] mother being a single mother or as a woman. The Tribunal notes in this respect the applicant's claim in the visa application in the context of the government not protecting women's rights that her child "will not get a fair chance to live in this society". However as the Tribunal has found that the applicant does not face a real chance of serious harm for the reasons advanced and addressed above, the Tribunal finds that the second named applicant does not face a real chance of serious harm as a consequence of any discrimination faced by [his/her] mother as a woman and/or single mother on return to Cambodia in the foreseeable future.
41. In reaching this conclusion the Tribunal has also taken into consideration the fact the applicant arrived in Australia [in] December 2009 yet did not seek protection until August 2014, despite the fact that she claimed she left Cambodia because of alleged problems with the authorities and her ex-husband. It is well established that delay in applying for refugee status is a relevant consideration. In *Anandaraj Subramaniam v MIMA* (unreported, Federal Court of Australia, Carr J, 10 March 1998) Justice Carr agreed with Heerey J in *Selvadurai v MIEA & Anor* (1994) 34 ALD 346 as a matter of principle that the period of time which elapses between an applicant's arrival in Australia and the time when he or she claims refugee status is a legitimate matter to take into account when assessing the genuineness or at least depth of an applicant's fear of persecution. His Honour went further and found that such a delay is a legitimate matter which the Tribunal is entitled to take into account when deciding whether to believe an applicant. The Tribunal does not find the applicant's explanation for the delay she gave at the hearing that she did not know anything about the law or know anyone to help her adequately explains the delay.

*Complementary protection*

42. For reasons set out above, the Tribunal has not accepted there to be a real chance that the applicant will suffer serious harm if she returns to Cambodia now or in the foreseeable future on the basis of her political opinion, status as a single mother, as a woman in Cambodia or from her ex-husband. In *MIAC v SZQRB*, the Full Federal Court held that the 'real risk' test imposes the same standard as the 'real chance' test applicable to the assessment of 'well-founded fear' in the Refugee Convention definition.<sup>8</sup> For the same reasons the Tribunal does not accept that there is a real risk the applicant will suffer significant harm on the basis of her political opinion, status as a single mother, as a woman, or from her ex-husband as a necessary and foreseeable consequence of the applicant being removed from Australia to Cambodia. The Tribunal also does not accept that there is a real risk that the second named applicant will suffer significant harm as a consequence of any discrimination faced by [his/her] mother as a woman and/or single mother if removed to Cambodia.

<sup>8</sup> *MIAC v SZQRB* [2013] FCAFC 33 (Lander, Besanko, Gordon, Flick and Jagot JJ, 20 March 2013) per Lander and Gordon JJ at [246], Besanko and Jagot JJ at [297], Flick J at [342].

43. For these reasons the Tribunal is not satisfied that there are substantial grounds for believing that, as a necessary and foreseeable consequence of the applicants' removal from Australia to Cambodia, there is a real risk that they will suffer significant harm. Therefore the applicants do not satisfy the criterion set out in s.36(2)(aa).

**CONCLUSION**

44. For the reasons given above the Tribunal is not satisfied that any of the applicants is a person in respect of whom Australia has protection obligations. Therefore the applicants do not satisfy the criterion set out in s.36(2)(a) or (aa) for a protection visa. It follows that they are also unable to satisfy the criterion set out in s.36(2)(b) or (c). As they do not satisfy the criteria for a protection visa, they cannot be granted the visa.

**DECISION**

45. The Tribunal affirms the decision not to grant the applicants Protection visas.

Nicole Burns  
Member