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## Reasons and Decision − Motifs et décision

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Person who is the subject of the appeal** | **XXXX XXXX XXXX** | **Personne en cause** |
|  |  |  |
| **Appeal considered / heard at** | Montréal, Quebec | **Appel instruit / entendu à** |
|  |  |  |
| **Date of decision** | March 11, 2021 | **Date de la décision** |
|  |  |  |
| **Panel** | Me Agnès Connat | **Tribunal** |
|  |  |  |
| **Counsel for the person who is the subject of the appeal** | Odette Desjardins | **Conseil de la personne en cause** |
|  |  |  |
| **Designated representative** | N/A | **Représentant(e) désigné(e)** |
|  |  |  |
| **Counsel for the Minister** | N/A | **Conseil du ministre** |
|  |  |  |

### **REASONS FOR DECISION**

**OVERVIEW**

1. **XXXX XXXX XXXX** (the appellant) is a citizen of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). He fears the authorities of his country, who have accused him of belonging to a group of criminals, the kuluna. He left the DRC for XXXX on XXXX 17, 2016, and then went to the United States (U.S.) in XXXX 2017 before reaching Canada on XXXX XXXX, 2017.
2. The Refugee Protection Division (RPD) found that the appellant was not credible due to omissions, contradictions and inconsistencies between his Basis of Claim Form (BOC Form) and his testimony, and because his answers were not spontaneous and he was hesitant. It considered his story to be inconsistent with the documentary evidence on the kuluna.
3. The appellant alleges that the RPD erred in its assessment of his credibility and the situation with respect to the kuluna.
4. The determinative issue for the Refugee Appeal Division (RAD) is whether the RPD erred in its assessment of the appellant’s credibility and risk.

**DETERMINATION**

1. I dismiss the appeal. The RPD correctly determined that the appellant is neither a Convention refugee nor a person in need of protection.

**ANALYSIS**

1. My role is to examine all of the evidence, including reading the transcript and listening to the hearing, and to establish whether the RPD’s decision is correct.[[1]](#endnote-1)

**Operation Likofi and the kuluna**

1. The kuluna phenomenon and Operation Likofi are central to the refugee protection claim. The appellant presented no documentary evidence before either the RPD or the RAD. I conducted a detailed analysis of the evidence in the National Documentation Package (NDP).
2. The kuluna are street gangs, members of organized criminal gangs.[[2]](#endnote-2) They are mainly young men under 20 years old, sometimes under the influence of drugs, many of whom come from “poor families”. They commit robberies, rapes, and murders using machetes, bottles, knives and firearms. These gangs terrorize the residents of Kinshasa. They operate in gangs of 10 to 20 members with a leader. The “general coordination” of the gang maintains good relations with influential administrative, political and business authorities.
3. In November 2013, the state launched Operation Likofi against the kuluna. Operation Likofi II followed on December 15, 2013, and ended on February 15, 2014. Although the operation was well received by the public, the primary victim of insecurity at the hands of the kuluna, the methods used by the Congolese police raised a number of concerns and criticisms from MONUSCO and UNICEF[[3]](#endnote-3) in particular regarding respect for the human rights of the kuluna. The operation reportedly resulted in 51 deaths and 33 forced disappearances at the hands of law enforcement.
4. Operation Likofi is described as follows:[[4]](#endnote-4)

In raids across the city, uniformed police who had covered their faces with black masks dragged suspected kuluna at gunpoint out of their homes at night with no arrest warrants. In many cases, the police shot and killed the unarmed youth outside their homes, often in front of family members and neighbors. Others were apprehended and executed in the open markets where they slept or worked or in nearby fields or empty lots. Five of those who were killed during Operation Likofi were between the ages of 14 and 17. Many others were taken to unknown locations and forcibly disappeared. (Human Rights Watch 17 Nov. 2014, 1).

1. Although Operation Likofi had ended in 2014, a number of organizations demanded in 2016 that the Congolese government resume its practice of hunting down the kuluna to help stabilize the DRC. The government reportedly announced the resumption of this fight and made a number of arrests in 2016. The evidence notes that complaints against the rise of the kuluna may go unanswered and that police operations may be insufficient due to a lack of personnel, sometimes making room for acts of popular justice.[[5]](#endnote-5)

**The appellant would not have been able to obtain a passport from the Congolese authorities if he were being sought by the police**

1. The RPD draws a negative inference with respect to the appellant’s credibility due to the fact that he obtained a diplomatic passport from the country’s authorities even though he was being sought by the police for his membership in the kuluna criminal group. The RPD acknowledges that the DRC authorities are very corrupt and accept bribes to issue documents to the highest bidder; however, according to the appellant’s testimony, there was no exchange of bribes to obtain his diplomatic passport and he obtained it even though his sister was not yet even at her post in XXXX.
2. The appellant asserts that he explained at the hearing that the different branches of government are corrupt and do not communicate amongst themselves. He adds that, according to the NDP, passport applicants must pay a bribe to the government in order to get their passports as quickly as possible. He states that he testified that his stepsister had taken the necessary steps to get him the diplomatic passport.
3. The RPD’s conclusion is correct. To respond to the appellant’s submission, I conducted a detailed analysis of the documentary evidence relating to the procedure for obtaining a passport, diplomatic or otherwise, in the DRC. Considering each step, I do not believe, on a balance of probabilities, that a person actively being sought by the police would be able to obtain a passport issued by the Congolese authorities.
4. To obtain a diplomatic or other passport,[[6]](#endnote-6) a person must file an application with the country’s National Intelligence Agency (Agence nationale de renseignements, ANR), whose mission is to ensure the internal and external security of the state.[[7]](#endnote-7) I consider it unlikely that the ANR, the country’s political police, would allow a person being actively sought by the police to obtain a passport, especially since the kuluna issue is a challenge to the country’s stabilization.
5. The person must go in person to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to have a photograph and fingerprints taken, as the appellant did. He testified that he went there with his sister, not that she took the steps on her own. The authorities took his photograph and his fingerprints.[[8]](#endnote-8) I do not believe that he would have been able to enter the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to have his fingerprints taken if the police were actively looking for him. His sister was not yet a diplomat but a mere citizen and lawyer, and the appellant did not contend that she may have used any favouritism to get the photograph and fingerprints taken.
6. To obtain a passport, diplomatic or otherwise, a person must file different documents, including a police certificate. A police certificate is a criminal record extract issued by the Ministry of Justice[[9]](#endnote-9) that can be obtained by going [translation] “in person” to the nearest judiciary police station, proving one’s identity and having one’s fingerprints taken.[[10]](#endnote-10) I do not believe that a person actively being sought by the Congolese national police (PNC) could go to the police station, have fingerprints taken and obtain a police certificate.
7. The appellant argues that it is possible to obtain a passport by offering a bribe. As he asserts, a bribe, according to the evidence, makes it possible to obtain a passport quickly, not to avoid an ANR check or avoid having to present a police certificate. He filed no evidence in this regard. Even if his sister had paid a bribe, there is nothing in the evidence that leads me to conclude that this would have enabled him to avoid the security services.
8. The appellant asserts that the different state bodies do not communicate amongst themselves, which would explain how he was able to obtain a passport.
9. I do not accept this argument. I saw nothing in the documentary evidence that would lead me to believe that the ANR would not identify a person with an active search warrant against them from the PNC or that the police would provide a police certificate to a wanted person. The appellant did not produce any.
10. The appellant does not challenge the RPD when it considered that, if the appellant had had problems with the DRC authorities in 2014, his stepsister would not have taken the chance of compromising her posting by obtaining a diplomatic passport for the appellant in XXXX 2015. I share the opinion of the RPD.
11. After assessing the passport application process in the DRC, I conclude that it is unlikely that the appellant could have obtained a passport from the Congolese authorities if he were actively being sought by the police. I draw a negative inference regarding his credibility and do not believe that he was wanted by the Congolese authorities in XXXX 2015 at the time of his passport application.

**The notice to appear does not corroborate the appellant’s allegations that he was wanted for being a kuluna**

1. The RPD found that the appellant was not credible because he testified that he had not been personally targeted by the police, while Exhibit P‑4 is a notice to appear that establishes the opposite. It is of the opinion that if he had been targeted by the authorities he should have spontaneously stated this at the first opportunity. The RPD notes that the appellant indicated in his BOC Form that he received two notices from the police, on XXXX XXXX and XXXX XXXX, but that he only submitted to the RPD one notice, not reported in his BOC Form, dated XXXX XXXX, 2014. It is of the opinion that he did not make the necessary efforts to prove that he was targeted by the authorities of his country in 2014.
2. The appellant asserts that his testimony on this aspect of his story is consistent with his BOC Form, that he produced the notice to appear to corroborate his story to the best of his abilities and that he was unable to get his hands on the other two notices to appear.
3. In his BOC Form, the appellant indicates that his mother received a notice the day after XXXX XXXX, 2014, and then a second one in XXXX 2014 (without specifying the date). In his amendment, he corrects his BOC Form and writes: [translation] “In XXXX 2014, my mother received a third notice, while she had received a second one in XXXX 2014.” At the hearing, he testified that he received a notice on XXXX XXXX, a second one in XXXX and the third on XXXX XXXX.[[11]](#endnote-11) He explained that his mother lost the first two.[[12]](#endnote-12)
4. The initial BOC Form only mentions two notices, while the amended BOC Form and his testimony at the hearing mention three. The appellant can correct his BOC Form before the hearing, but there is a difference between receiving two notices and three notices. While not determinative, this contradiction undermines the credibility of the appellant’s allegations and adds to the claimant’s other credibility issues.
5. The appellant filed only one of the three notices to appear. This document indicates that the police summoned the appellant on XXXX XXXX, 2014, to appear at the office of the OPJ on the grounds of: “RENS” and that it is the third notice. This notice to appear allows me to corroborate that the appellant was summoned by the police in XXXX 2014 but does not confirm for what reason.
6. Even if the appellant had been summoned by the police in 2014, the summons does not allow me to corroborate that it is because he was suspected of being a kuluna.

**Operation Likofi did happen as the appellant describes**

1. When the RPD asked him if he had been targeted by the police, the appellant said that he did not understand the question, then corrected himself and said that yes, he had been. He then explained that the police were targeting the young people in his neighbourhood. I am reproducing here the exchange with the RPD. [translation]

MEMBER: Were you targeted directly by the police?

CLAIMANT: Yes, yes, I was targeted.

MEMBER: Tell me when and in what context.

CLAIMANT: It was because, first, I was young… I was young. And second, it was… it was because of the neighbourhood where I was living, it was just a neighbourhood that was really targeted and so they weren’t concerned with finding out who was a criminal and who was not. They just arrested all the young people.

MEMBER: But, you know, my difficulty is that if the police had to arrest all the young people, I think that there would be… universities, colleges and high schools would be empty, they would be transformed into prisons if the authorities were arresting all the young people, as you are insinuating. Do you understand?

CLAIMANT: No, no, it’s not that they were going door to door, knocking and then arresting young people. It was, they might see you on your way somewhere and would come and arrest you. And when they arrested you, they would take you to unknown destinations. They even started killing young people. There were a lot of deaths.

MEMBER: What was the name of your neighbourhood?

CLAIMANT: XXXX.

MEMBER: XXXX?

CLAIMANT: XXXX.

MEMBER: XXXX?

CLAIMANT: Yes.

MEMBER: With XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX?

CLAIMANT: Yes.

MEMBER: **Okay, the fact that you were young, you lived in this notorious neighbourhood. Are there any other reasons why you were targeted by the police**?

CLAIMANT: **No, no, there is no other reason.**

MEMBER: So, then…

CLAIMANT: **And it’s not that they targeted me knowing my name, my house. No, it wasn’t that. It was more because of the fact that I was young.**

MEMBER: Okay, and did you have problems directly with the police?

CLAIMANT: No, no, I never had problems.

1. After this exchange, the appellant’s counsel had a discussion with the RPD to ensure that his client understood the meaning of the word directly.
2. The RPD then asked the appellant, [translation] “So you were not targeted by the police in your own name.” The appellant responded, [translation] “No, no, I was not targeted.” The RPD then showed the summons (P‑4) to the appellant and asked him to explain why he had stated earlier that he was not personally targeted. The appellant explained that he had done nothing, because[[13]](#endnote-13) [translation] “to be targeted, you have to have done something. I know I never had problems with the police or with… with anyone at all,” that like many young people, the police were after him.

[translation] Yes, because… first, it was an operation that had been… that had been launched by the country’s authorities. And then, it normally consisted in arresting young offenders, but there had been some confusion and blunders, they started arresting all the… the young people.[[14]](#endnote-14)

1. The appellant argues that he had therefore allegedly had been “targeted,” not for an act he may have committed personally, but as part of the PNC’s Operation Likofi against members of kuluna gangs. The police allegedly attacked him because he was [translation] “a young person” and young people were facing arbitrary arrests.
2. The documentary evidence corroborates how the operation happened, as I indicated at paragraph 10 of these reasons.[[15]](#endnote-15)

**Operation Likofi ended in 2014**

1. When the appellant’s mother received the visit from police officers, Operation Likofi (November 2013) and Operation Likofi II (December 15, 2013, to February 15, 2014) had both ended. According to the appellant’s allegations, the first visit from police officers occurred at his mother’s home right after the end of Operation Likofi II, on the night of XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX, 2014. The other two police notices were allegedly filed nearly two weeks after Operation Likofi II, and only one was provided as evidence. The appellant did not produce any documentary evidence to show that police action continued after that date.
2. The operation’s end in 2014 is confirmed by the documentary evidence. The statistics available on the young victims of police action reported by human rights organizations refer to 2013–2014 (51 deaths and 33 forced disappearances).[[16]](#endnote-16) The appellant alleges that the police came to his home in XXXX 2014, again in XXXX 2014 and XXXX 2014, and then arrested and imprisoned him in XXXX 2014. However, Operation Likofi, which involved systematically hunting down kuluna, had ended on February 14, 2014. If the appellant was not being sought personally but as part of the overall operation, as he testified at the hearing, I find it difficult to understand why the authorities still would have been interested in him after Operation Likofi had ended.
3. Even if they had done so, the documentary evidence confirms that the large-scale anti‑kuluna operations are over. In 2016, a number of organizations requested that the Congolese government resume hunting down the kuluna to help stabilize the DRC, which implies that this operation had in fact ceased.[[17]](#endnote-17) Moreover, even if I were to admit that the police raids and the appellant’s arrest took place as part of Operation Likofi in 2014, I consider that he was no longer wanted in 2015 when he obtained his passport.
4. Furthermore, if he were to return to the DRC, there is nothing in his profile to indicate that the PNC would consider him a kuluna.

*The appellant does not have the profile of a kuluna*

1. After having assessed the evidence in the NDP on the kuluna, the RPD concluded that the appellant does not have the profile of a kuluna because they act as a group and come from poor communities. It concluded that it is unlikely that the police were looking for the appellant because they had reasonable grounds to believe that he was part of the kuluna. It noted that he was a full‑time student. It considers that the appellant’s claim that he was targeted because he was young and because of his imputed political opinion is not supported by the documentary evidence or by his testimony.
2. The appellant asserts that the RPD’s conclusion is unreasonable because it is based on a stereotype that members of armed gangs are all from underprivileged neighbourhoods. He adds that there is a real possibility that a young man from the outskirts of Kinshasa could be targeted by police, especially if he is a full‑time student. He insists that the search for the kuluna was a pretext for going after students protesting against the ruling government.
3. The question posed to me by the appellant is whether the police might target him because of his membership in the kuluna if he were to return to the DRC since that is the reason he is seeking Canada’s protection.
4. The kuluna are criminals. According to the documentary evidence, many are from poor families. That does not actually mean they all are. However, if the appellant were to return to the DRC in 2021, his profile does not match that of a kuluna, as I indicated at the beginning of these reasons. He would be over the age of 20 (22 years old in 2021), would still be from a family that he does not describe as [translation] “poor” and would still be educated. This makes it an unlikely possibility that he would be targeted as a kuluna based on his profile if he were to return to the DRC.
5. Even if he were, there is nothing in the evidence to suggest that the treatment contrary to their human rights that kuluna were subjected to in 2013–2014 during Operation Likofi is still happening in 2021. The appellant did not produce any.
6. Although the evidence points to some connections between kuluna and politicians and indicates that some political leaders may pay the kuluna to participate in political demonstrations and inflate the number of their supporters or to sow disorder, there is nothing that leads me to think that the government used Operation Likofi to silence the political opposition. The appellant did not produce any.

**The appellant’s error in his initial BOC Form regarding the identity of the person who hid him for nearly two years undermines his credibility**

1. The RPD notes that the appellant is not credible due to an amendment made to his story following the submission of evidence. In his BOC Form, he writes that he hid at his aunt’s place after escaping from prison when he in fact amended his BOC Form to state that he was actually hiding at his uncle’s place.
2. The appellant argues that his story is dated [translation] “XXXX 2013” and that a long time had passed between the start of his problems and his hearing date. He adds that it is normal for him to have amended his story to include this detail.
3. In his BOC Form, the appellant writes that after XXXX XXXX, 2014, he was in hiding at the home of his aunt XXXX XXXX. in the XXXX neighbourhood, municipality of Kalamu, for a few weeks (lines 36 to 38). He amended his BOC Form, clarifying this aunt’s real name. He explained that he went back to his studies while continuing to live with this aunt (lines 46 to 48). Police officers allegedly came to her home on the night of XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX, 2014, to arrest him (lines 50 to 54). After escaping on the night of XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX, 2014, he hid at the home of his aunt XXXX XXXX in XXXX (lines 66 to 68). He amended his BOC Form to state that it was actually his uncle XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX.
4. The RPD’s conclusion is correct. It is true that refugee protection claimants may elaborate on certain aspects of their story, add details or clarify the evidence in amended versions of their BOC Form or even at the hearing. However, in this case, this amendment is not clarifying his story or correcting an error, but rather changing the identity of the person at whose home he allegedly went to hide when he was being sought by the police. For example, the appellant could have corrected a clerical error that might have slipped in, such as writing aunt instead of uncle. Here, he does not simply indicate that it was his uncle instead of his aunt, but he also changes the person’s full name. The place where he was hiding after his escape and where he waited for about 20 months (between XXXX 2014 and XXXX 2016) is important to the assessment of his fear. I would then expect that when he signed his BOC form in 2017, accompanied by his legal counsel, he would not make a mistake with this person’s identity.
5. I do not see how the fact that his story took place three years before he signed his BOC Form (in 2014 and not in 2013, as he submits in his memorandum) explains why he would have made a mistake with the identity of the person who hid him for nearly two years, confusing his uncle with his aunt. This error regarding the person in the initial BOC Form undermines his credibility. It is not determinative, but it adds to the appellant’s other credibility issues.

**The behaviour of this appellant who did not seek asylum in the United States even though he had a visa for that country and had gone there in 2016 is not consistent with that of a person who fears for his life**

1. The RPD draws a negative inference regarding the appellant’s credibility based on the fact that he travelled to the U.S. without seeking asylum when he had no special status in XXXX and his status depended on his sister. It considers that if he feared for his safety in the DRC he would have applied for asylum in the U.S. in XXXX 2016. This conclusion is not determinative.
2. The appellant asserts that he had legal status in XXXX at that time.
3. The RPD correctly concluded that the appellant’s behaviour is inconsistent with that of a person who fears for their life and that this undermined his credibility.
4. The appellant did not have legal status in XXXX when he went to the U.S. in 2016. His status in XXXX was entirely dependent on the diplomatic duties of his stepsister, the latter being based on a lie since to the Congolese authorities he was his stepsister’s son. He was taking a risk that the Congolese authorities would find out that he was not his stepsister’s son, as the XXXX authorities discovered in 2017 when they asked him to leave the country.
5. The appellant had had a U.S. visa[[18]](#endnote-18) since XXXX XXXX, 2016, and could have applied to the U.S. for protection as of that date. He went there on vacation in XXXX 2016. He sought Canada’s protection because his life had been in danger in his country of origin since 2014. However, he returned to XXXX without seeking asylum, thereby taking the risk of having the XXXX authorities ask him to leave the country, as did occur in 2017.
6. The failure to apply for asylum in the U.S. when he had only temporary status in XXXX is inconsistent with the behaviour of a person who fears being persecuted or harmed. This behaviour in itself is not determinative, but it adds to the appellant’s other credibility issues.

**The appellant would not face a risk if he returned to the DRC**

1. The appellant is not challenging the conclusion of the RPD that it did not believe that the appellant was wanted in his country. It considered that if he had received three summonses from the police between XXXX and XXXX 2014, his sister, a lawyer whom the government trusted sufficiently to make her a diplomat, would have defended him by presenting him as a full‑time student and not a member of the kuluna armed criminal group rather than passing him off as her son.
2. The appellant is not credible. He obtained a diplomatic passport in 2015 when he alleges he was being sought. He did not apply for asylum in the U.S. even though he had no legal status in XXXX. He made a mistake with the identity of the person who hid him between 2014 and 2016 in his initial BOC Form. Even if he did have trouble with the police in XXXX and XXXX 2014, he did not establish that it was because he was suspected of being a kuluna, and Operation Likofi had ended in XXXX 2014. The notice to appear that he produced on the RPD record does not corroborate this allegation.
3. If the appellant were to return to the DRC, there is nothing in his profile that suggests that the police would suspect him of being a kuluna. The evidence also does not lead to the conclusion that in 2021 the kuluna are still being hunted down in a manner that violates their human rights, as was the case in 2013–2014.
4. The appellant would not face a serious possibility of persecution and, on a balance of probabilities, would not be subjected to a risk to his life, to a danger of torture or to a risk of cruel and unusual punishment if he were to return to the DRC.

**CONCLUSION**

1. I dismiss the appeal and confirm the RPD’s determination that the appellant is neither a Convention refugee nor a person in need of protection.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| (*signed*) | *Agnès CONNAT* |
|  | **Me Agnès Connat** |
|  | **March 11, 2021** |
|  | **Date** |
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