

REPORT BY THE INDEPENDENT MONITOR  
(Immigration and Asylum Act 1999)

RABINDER SINGH QC

NOVEMBER 2002



## **Report of the Independent Monitor 2002 (Immigration and Asylum Act 1999)**

### **Introduction**

1. I was appointed the Independent Monitor of the entry clearance system in October 2000. The appointment was for two years and expires in November 2002. This is, therefore, my second and final report.
2. My appointment was made by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs under section 23 of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 (“the 1999 Act”), which, so far as material, provides:
  - “(1) The Secretary of State must appoint a person to monitor, in such manner as the Secretary of State may determine, refusals of entry clearance in cases where there is, as a result of section 60(5), no right of appeal.
  - (2) But the Secretary of State may not appoint a member of his staff.
  - (3) The monitor must make an annual report on the discharge of his functions to the Secretary of State.
  - (4) The Secretary of State must lay a copy of any report made to him under subsection (3) before each House of Parliament.”
3. For those who are not familiar with my role, I should explain in what sense I am the “Independent” Monitor. First, as section 23(2) of the 1999 Act requires, I am not a member of the Secretary of State’s staff. I am a barrister in private practice. Secondly, while I have been in post, I have not taken any immigration cases in my practice as a barrister, whether for or against the Government.
4. In order to understand the effect of section 60(5) of the 1999 Act, it is necessary to look at sections 59 and 60 as a whole. Section 59(2) normally entitles a person who, “on an application duly made”, is refused an entry clearance to appeal to an immigration adjudicator. Section 60, so far as material, provides:
  - “(4) Subsection (5) applies to a person who seeks to enter the United Kingdom –
    - (a) as a visitor;
    - (b) in order to follow a course of study of not more than six months’ duration for which he has been accepted;
    - (c) with the intention of studying but without having been accepted for any course of study; or
    - (d) as a dependant of a person within paragraph (a), (b) or (c).
  - (5) That person –
    - (a) is not entitled to appeal under section 59 against a refusal of an entry clearance *unless he is a family visitor*; and
    - (b) is not entitled to appeal against a refusal of leave to enter if he does not hold a current entry clearance at the time of the refusal.

...

(10) ‘Family visitor’ has such meaning as may be prescribed.”<sup>1</sup>

(Emphasis added)

5. In essence, therefore, since the above provisions came into force on 2 October 2000, the right of appeal in visitor cases has been restored to family visitors, as defined in the regulations, but there is still no right of appeal in the case of other visitors and short-term students. My statutory remit, therefore, is confined to monitoring the non-family visitor and short-term student cases. However, in practice, I am pleased to say that the Monitor’s role is a wider one: I have found that UKvisas, which is the new name for the former Joint Entry Clearance Unit (“JECU”), and overseas posts welcome any constructive criticism that can be offered by the Monitor generally as to their operations, even in relation to issues such as family visitor cases and settlement cases.

### **My role**

6. My remit is to monitor and to report. I can make recommendations but I cannot make binding decisions.
7. In particular, I cannot adjudicate on individual cases where entry clearance has been refused but where there is no right of appeal. As last year, I have found that the most common misunderstanding on the part of members of the public, including some lawyers, is to think that I can overturn a refusal of entry clearance in an individual case. I receive a lot of correspondence asking me to look at individual cases but, because I am unable to do so, I have to refer them to UKvisas or, sometimes, the Immigration and Nationality Department of the Home Office, when it is apparent that the query is in fact about leave to remain rather than entry clearance.
8. However, I hope that the Monitor can have a positive role. I have had useful discussions not only with officials at UKvisas and at the Home Office but also with ministers and Members of Parliament and lawyers working in the field. As I said last year, I hope that I have provided a bridge between the government and the communities which are affected by entry clearance decisions. Again, as I said last year, many people, including legal practitioners abroad, have given me their own thoughts about possible improvements to the entry clearance system, which I have tried to relay to UKvisas, both informally and through this report.

### **A year of consolidation**

9. My first year in post was, as I described it in my first report, a year of transition, especially because there were many big changes taking place, including the coming into force of the Human Rights Act 1998 (“HRA”) and the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 (“the 2000 Act”), which in general extends the scope of the Race Relations Act 1976 (“the RRA”) to immigration functions. Since my first report, the post of Monitor under the 2000 Act has been filled. I have had discussions with that Monitor, Mary Coussey, which I hope have been of mutual benefit.

---

<sup>1</sup> The relevant regulations are the Immigration Appeals (Family Visitor) (No. 2) Regulations 2000 (SI 2000 No. 2446).

10. As I have mentioned above, the 1999 Act restored the right of appeal in family visitor cases. When this restored right first came into effect in October 2000, appellants were required to pay either £500 for an oral appeal or £150 for a paper appeal. Although I am told that this was done to give priority service for such appeals, there was concern that the fees were high and would deter some potential appellants from exercising their right of appeal. On 12 January 2001, the then Home Secretary (Jack Straw MP) announced in the House of Commons that the appeal fees were being reduced to £125 and £50 respectively. The Home Secretary also announced that he was commissioning a review of family visitor appeals, to be completed by Spring 2002. The review team in turn commissioned independent research to seek the views of, among others, non-governmental organisations, entry clearance staff, sponsors and applicants. As a result of work on the Immigration, Nationality and Asylum Bill, the research team was unable to produce its final report by Spring 2002. It was expected by the end of October 2002 but, at the time of writing, I have not yet seen it. In the meantime, on 24 April 2002, the present Home Secretary (David Blunkett MP) announced in the House of Commons that the family visitor appeal fees would be abolished altogether with effect from 15 May 2002. This is a decision which I welcome because even the reduced fees may have been high enough to deter exercise of the right of appeal. When I visited overseas posts, anecdotal experience suggested that applicants might well prefer to make a fresh application rather than exercise the right of appeal.
11. As I reported last year, training on the HRA is now standard for entry clearance officers. When I visited UKvisas in September 2002, I was informed by the Training Manager that the training now includes emphasis on the concept of “positive obligations” to respect rights under the HRA as well as the obligation not to interfere with those rights in a way which is not justified. I was told about training about the RRA, which emphasises the need to treat applicants on their merits and not by reference to stereotypes. I was also told about training on the writing of refusal notices by entry clearance officers, which emphasises the need to tailor the notice to the circumstances of the individual case. This is important, especially since refusal notices in cases where there is no right of appeal (Form REF1) have this year been revised as part of the “streamlining process” to which I return to in paragraph 42.

### **The entry clearance system generally**

12. JECU was established jointly by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Home Office to manage the UK’s overseas entry clearance operation<sup>2</sup>. JECU began work in June 2000 and was this year re-styled “UKvisas”, a title which will perhaps make it easier for the public to understand what it does.
13. As is well-known, not everyone who wishes to visit the United Kingdom needs a visa (entry clearance) to do so. At **Annex 1** to this report is a list of countries whose nationals require a visa to visit the United Kingdom. The Annex also lists those countries whose nationals require a Direct Airside Transit Visa.
14. One of the most frequent complaints made about the system is that citizens of many countries in the world do not need visas for visits but that the countries where they are required tend to be those like the Indian sub-continent and Nigeria, where those who need visas will tend not to be white, but which have obvious connections with communities settled, sometimes for several generations, in the United Kingdom. This

---

<sup>2</sup> There are 164 entry clearance issuing posts around the world, based in British Embassies, High Commissions and Consulates. Sometimes one post administers visas for the whole of a country: for example, the consulate at Düsseldorf issues visas for all posts in Germany.

is a policy and legislative matter which is not for me but for the people's representatives. Nor is it for UKvisas or for individual entry clearance officers who have to do their best to apply the immigration rules and not to make policy decisions.

15. At **Annex 2** to this report is a set of tables setting out statistics (provided by UKvisas) for visa applications, including refusal rates, around the world in 2001-2002. Unlike last year's statistics, these cover the financial year rather than a calendar year.
16. There were approximately 1.78 million applications for visas in 2001-2002. The vast majority were for non-settlement purposes. The largest post in the world (in terms of numbers of applications) has become Lagos, which has overtaken Delhi and Mumbai (Bombay). The sharp increase in the number of applications at Lagos has led to severe problems, as I saw when I visited the two posts in Nigeria in April-May 2002 and to which I refer below.
17. The global refusal rate has gone up from 6.8% in 2000 to 10% in the year 2001-2002. Although this is still relatively low, it is not clear to me why there has been an increase of that order and it should be kept under review.
18. In any event, that global refusal rate is the mean average and needs to be seen in the context of a range of refusal rates in different parts of the world. It is noteworthy that, as Annex 2 shows, the two regions where the refusal rate is above the global average are Equatorial Africa (21%) and South Asia (19%).
19. In the financial year 2001/2002 10 posts offering a full entry clearance service had a refusal rate of nil (some other posts offered a more limited service and also had a nil refusal rate). The 11 posts with the next lowest refusal rates (expressed in percentages) in the same financial year were as follows:

Canberra	0.1
Chicago	0.2
Mexico City	0.2
Ashgabat	0.2
Los Angeles	0.3
Wellington	0.3
Madrid	0.3
Port Moresby	0.4
Paris	0.5
Prague	0.5
New York	0.5

20. The 10 posts with the highest refusal rates (again in percentages) in the financial year 2001/2002 were as follows:

Accra	45
Kathmandu	43
Nuku'alofa	35
Islamabad	32
Khartoum	31
Dhaka	28
Addis Ababa	28
Lahore	24
Karachi	22
Tallinn	20

21. One of these is in Equatorial Africa and four are in the Indian sub-continent.
22. As I mentioned in my first report, some Members of Parliament have expressed concern to me that, in their experience from talking to their constituents, it appeared that refusal rates are very high in the case of young men who wish to visit the United Kingdom from places like the Indian sub-continent. I was then told by JECU that statistics were not available which would allow the refusal rate to be ascertained by reference to gender and age group. I suggested that this should be done in the future, if possible, but such statistics are not yet available. However, I have been informed by UKvisas that a new Central Reference System is being devised, which will enable them to compile statistics according to nationality, age and gender. UKvisas envisages that this will come on-stream in 18 months time. This is a welcome indication and should be kept under review by Members of Parliament and others interested in the subject.
23. UKvisas continues to set itself high standards of performance. For example, it has a target time for decisions on straightforward non-settlement visa applications within 24 hours. The target time for less straightforward non-settlement applications is 10 working days. Even some very busy posts, like Delhi, offer a "same day" service for non-settlement visas. However, some have fallen badly behind. In particular, Lagos, which has experienced a large increase in applications in the last year, had a waiting time of over 70 days when I was there and I am told this has gone up to over 100 days. This is the longest queue for Tier 3 interviews at any post in the world. Queues of that length are, as everyone recognises, unacceptable and resources and management energies need to be targeted to posts where they build up.
24. The target for interviews for settlement visa applicants is generally 12 weeks. In the case of four posts, which have heavy settlement caseloads, the target time can range from 12 weeks to 36 weeks depending on the category of applicant: priority is given to those with the right of abode; dependent relatives over 65; spouses; and children under 18. I am informed that these latter target times have been agreed by ministers.
25. An important part of the work of UKvisas is the handling of communications, including telephone queries and correspondence from Members of Parliament. I am pleased to see that the backlog in the handling of that correspondence which had been cleared by December 2000 has not returned.
26. In my first report I noted the welcome development of "visa forums" at various places around the United Kingdom. I am informed by UKvisas that they operate in a different way now. UKvisas participates in the community outreach events organised by the appropriate department of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office: to date this has been only the South Asian department. These are all day events which usually include visits to temples and local radio stations; lunch and an open meeting, at which questions about the entry clearance system tend to dominate. In 2002 there have been such events in Bristol, Oldham, Southall, Birmingham and Leicester. There was a visa-specific event in Leicester when the Director of Entry Clearance in India took part. I hope that these events will continue and, if possible, be expanded to other communities in this country.

## Files

27. A core part of my work as Independent Monitor is to review files in those cases where a visa has been refused but there is no right of appeal.
28. My second review of files has been for the calendar year 2001. As suggested in my last report I have now been permitted to examine a sample of files where visas were issued as well as a larger sample of those where visas were refused. I suggest that this practice should continue in future so that my successor can have the same opportunity.
29. Since last year the Independent Monitor has been asked to look at about 800 -1,000 files, whereas my predecessor used to look at about 1, 800. The files are selected randomly by independent statistical experts. The numbers which are selected are then called for from all overseas posts. Some files were not sent by posts by the due date for which they were requested but most were.
30. I am pleased to report that most of the files I have reviewed set out reasons which were clear and complied with the immigration rules. This is consistent with what I observed when visiting posts overseas (see below).
31. I am troubled that it is still the case that sometimes reasons for refusal doubted the genuineness of documents because there were spelling or grammatical errors in them. Yet this is a common enough occurrence, even in British documents.
32. A factor which often counts against an applicant is that they have no previous history of travelling (and returning from) abroad. However, in some files this reason was mentioned even though it was accepted that there had been at least one trip abroad. I am doubtful that this reason should be relied upon when there is evidence that an applicant has in fact travelled abroad and returned to their home country.

## Overseas visits

33. An important part of my role is to familiarise myself with the work of posts by visiting them overseas. In 2002 I was able to fit in four posts, again chosen because of their varying sizes and their different sorts of clients: Lagos, Abuja, Paris and Kiev. Lagos, Abuja and Kiev have all had problems with the length of their Tier 3 queues in the last year or so but Abuja and Kiev have made real inroads into the problem. In Lagos the queue has got worse since I was there because of the large increase in the number of applications to which I have already referred. Paris is a very different kind of post. French citizens do not need a visa but it is one of the top ten busiest posts in the world because there are many third country nationals resident in France who often wish to visit the UK because of its proximity.
34. As before, I was impressed by the professionalism which I observed at each of the posts I visited. I was able to sit in on any interview that I wanted to. I was able to see files and to discuss local issues with the entry clearance officers and entry clearance managers at each post. I was also able to meet members of the local community to receive their views on the entry clearance system, in particular in Lagos and Abuja.
35. The physical conditions for applicants at each post varied. Abuja has recently expanded. Kiev is in cramped facilities shared with another embassy but, at the time of my visit in September 2002, new facilities were being prepared which would provide ample space. In Paris, at the time of my visit in June 2002, the constraints of

physical space led to a queue outside in the street and to some extent were felt to determine how many applicants could be seen in a day. I understand that, since my visit, the physical arrangements have been changed to allow for more people to come in. The biggest problems are clearly at Lagos. There are large numbers of interviewees; there are space constraints; the interview booths are relatively small and open at the back; the microphones do not work as well as some of those I have seen elsewhere in the world: all of these factors contribute to a tense atmosphere, where sometimes interviewers have to raise their voices to be heard above the ambient sound.

36. Entry clearance work is an important part of the work of posts overseas. It is valued at the highest levels of the FCO. Entry clearance officers do not always feel that this is true nearer the ground but they need to be given the right environment to work in if they are to provide the service to the public which they would like to give and which it is UKvisas policy to offer.

### **“Pre-sifts”**

37. In my first report I made reference to what are colloquially called “pre-sifts”, more officially “pre-assessment.” This is the practice by which, at many posts, an application is not formally accepted but looked at briefly to see if it is likely to meet the criteria for the grant of a visa.
38. As I said last year, there are arguments both for and against pre-assessment. An applicant who is likely to be refused a visa for some obvious reason, because they clearly do not have the paperwork which would show that they satisfy the immigration rules is saved the application fee, which may represent a large amount of money in the local currency. Pre-assessment may also help some applicants to improve the quality of their applications by obtaining the necessary documentation which will enable them to satisfy the immigration rules. On the other hand, since an application is not “duly made”, the right of appeal – even where it exists in law – is not triggered if a person withdraws an application they would otherwise have made as a result of pre-assessment. Also, the application does not appear in the statistics relating to refusals since there is no formal refusal. This has contributed to a perception on the part of some people who have spoken to me that the statistics are unreliable.
39. Last year, I suggested that a formal study should be done into the question of pre-assessment, preferably by an independent research team such as the one which has done the review of family visitor appeals. I also suggested that there should be a central policy as to the use of pre-sifts.
40. Unfortunately, I am informed by UKvisas that it proved impossible to get that research done in the time available. In any event, UKvisas has come to the view, as part of the “streamlining” process to which I refer below, that pre-assessment should be discouraged. I have been shown guidance which was sent to posts in August 2002 which states:

“Experience has shown that pre-assessment is not applied consistently in Posts, and that those who have elected not to proceed on one day will often return and reapply. By moving away from the pre-assessment of applications, we are discouraging frivolous applicants; ensuring that those who are serious about applying for visas are not prevented from doing so; providing a more transparent and fair service. It is essential that information is available to

potential applicants to ensure that they are adequately prepared so that their application receives a fair evaluation.”

41. On balance, I welcome the policy change away from pre-assessment. However, it will be important that the new policy is applied consistently on the ground at all posts. In the past there was a variation of practice at different posts and the position should be monitored so that informal “advice” or “information” does not again become pre-assessment.

### **Streamlining**

42. As Annex 2 shows, the number of applications for visas continues to increase around the world, despite the apparent downturn in air travel since 11 September 2001. Yet resources, whether in the shape of staff or buildings, are not necessarily going to continue to increase, at least not at the rate that would be needed to keep up. In response, UKvisas has piloted a variety of schemes, together known as “streamlining”, in the Indian sub-continent and in Africa. These are now being applied everywhere, although what is possible and appropriate will vary with local circumstances. Guidance to posts describes streamlining as follows:

“The core principle of streamlining is not to issue more visas, or refuse more applicants, but to provide a seamless, speedy and fair process which is more conducive to a same-day service. This means, in essence, taking decisions faster and more efficiently.”

43. Of most direct significance to my remit is the introduction of new refusal notice forms for cases where there is no right of appeal (REF1). Examples of this new form for non-family visitors, business visitors and short-term students are at **Annex 3**. The guidance sent to posts on these standardised forms states that:

“ECOs spend a significant amount of time composing comprehensive refusal notices which summarise the application. This is often unnecessary and old-style detailed refusals should only be necessary in exceptional cases (e.g. in highly complex cases). ... The phrases on these templates are to be accessed from a ‘drop-down menu’ and then personalised to each applicant’s individual circumstances. Tailoring them in this way is a quick process which saves a considerable amount of time. ECMs will continue to review these decisions within 24 hours and should closely monitor the use of these forms.”

44. I am grateful to UKvisas for giving me the opportunity to comment on the new REF1 while it was being drafted and for taking my comments on board. If used properly and consistently, the new form should save time without sacrificing fairness because the reasons given will have to be tailored to the individual circumstances of the applicant and cannot be simply a recitation of conclusions referring to one or more of the criteria in the immigration rules. However, since these forms are designed to be used in those cases where there is no right of appeal, there may be a risk that in practice, a busy Entry Clearance Officer will give priority to setting out reasons more fully in cases where there is the possibility of an appeal than in these cases. The only independent review of such reasons will be by the Monitor, who can only see a sample of the files from around the world and who cannot overturn any particular decision. My successor in this post will wish to make sure that the introduction of the new refusal notice has not compromised the standards of good decision-making which UKvisas sets itself.

## **The future**

45. Finally I would like to repeat a point made by my predecessor as Independent Monitor and by me last year. I suggest that the position of elderly relatives should be looked at again with sympathy. In practice, if an elderly relative comes to the United Kingdom on a visit visa and stays on, whether to help with looking after grandchildren or for other reasons, they are very unlikely to be deported. Yet visit visas are supposed to be refused to a person who does not satisfy the entry clearance officer of an intention to leave the UK after the visit. Many people doubt whether this needs to continue.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank the Heads of Mission and their staff at Lagos, Abuja, Paris and Kiev for their generosity with their time and their hospitality. I would also like to thank the staff at UKvisas, in particular Robin Barnett, its new head; Sarah Booker, head of policy; and Claudia Goti, who has assisted me again with administrative support this year. I wish my successor in this post well.

## **Annexes**

1. List of visa nationals
2. Statistics for 2001-2002
3. Examples of revised REF1

<b>List of countries whose nationals require a visa to enter the UK</b>		
Afghanistan	Georgia	Papua New Guinea
Albania	Ghana	Peru
Algeria	Guinea	Philippines
Angola	Guinea Bissau	Qatar
Armenia	Guyana	Romania
Azerbaijan	Haiti	Russia
Bahrain	India	Rwanda
Bangladesh	Indonesia	Sao Tome & Principe
Belarus	Iran	Saudi Arabia
Benin	Iraq	Senegal
Bhutan	Ivory Coast	Sierra Leone
Bosnia - Herzegovina	Jordan	Slovak Republic
Bulgaria	Kazakhstan	Somalia
Burkina Faso	Kenya	Sri Lanka
Burundi	Korea (Dem. People's Rep)	Sudan
Cambodia	Kuwait	Surinam
Cameroon	Kyrgyzstan	Syria
Cape Verde	Laos	Taiwan
Central African Rep.	Lebanon	Tajikistan
Chad	Liberia	Tanzania
China (People's Republic of)	Libya	Thailand
Colombia	Macedonia	Togo
Comoros	Madagascar	Tunisia
Congo, Democratic Republic of	Maldives	Turkey
Congo, Republic of	Mali	'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus'
Croatia	Mauritania	Turkmenistan
Cuba	Mauritius	Uganda
Djibouti	Moldova	Ukraine
Dominican Republic	Mongolia	United Arab Emirates
Ecuador	Morocco	Uzbekistan
Egypt	Mozambique	Vietnam
Equatorial Guinea	Myanmar	Yemen
Eritrea	Nepal	Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (including Documents issued by the Former Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia)
Ethiopia	Niger	Zambia
Fiji	Nigeria	Zimbabwe
Gabon	Oman	
Gambia	Pakistan	
	Palestinian Authority	

**Direct Airside Transit Visa (DATV) Nationals**

In addition to needing a visa to enter the United Kingdom, nationals of the following countries also require a visa to transit through the UK, known as Direct Airside Transit.

<b>(DATV).</b> Afghanistan People's Republic of China Colombia Croatia Democratic Republic of Congo Ecuador Eritrea Ethiopia Ghana Iran Iraq Libya	Nigeria Slovak Republic Somalia Sri Lanka Turkey 'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus' Uganda Yugoslavia (documents issued by the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, by present Yugoslav authorities, or by the United Nations Mission in Kosovo). Zimbabwe
--	---

## GLOBAL STATISTICS FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2001/2

Total Applications 2001-021.xls - Global Analysis

Global Summary Region	Settlement Applications			Non - Settlement Applications			Total UK Applications			Refusal Percentage %	C'wealth Recd Received	Dept. Terr Recd Received	Grand Total Recd
	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused				
Australia & South Pacific	6779	7284	6	43034	43976	136	49813	51260	142	0.3%	1603	3	51,419
Central Europe & FSU	3892	3658	136	238831	217747	15381	242723	221405	15517	6%	2669	563	245,955
Eq. Africa	7631	4810	2374	225477	164390	46335	233108	169200	48709	21%	1108	47	234,263
Far East	1415	1240	151	135873	120934	10885	137288	122174	11036	8%	866	66	138,220
Latin America	1007	929	37	28018	26563	1598	29025	27492	1635	6%	4765	2683	36,473
Middle East	1991	1860	345	163037	154182	4416	165028	156042	4761	3%	2891	86	168,005
JECU, London	0	0	0	1145	1145	0	1145	1145	0	0%	0	0	1,145
North America	3895	3835	12	90413	88066	381	94308	91901	393	0.4%	7	745	95,060
Near East & Northern Africa	2,070	1,693	343	91,458	81,221	6,133	93,528	82,914	6,476	7%	1,471	1,697	96,696
South Asia	22,738	22,057	7,044	366,081	294,012	66,622	388,819	316,069	73,666	19%	1,830	100	390,749
South East Asia	4,538	4,092	444	86,949	79,390	5,373	91,487	83,482	5,817	6%	916	131	92,534
Southern Africa	3,079	3,266	79	34,675	31,570	2,950	37,754	34,836	3,029	8%	77	2	37,833
Southern Europe	2,160	1,631	208	66,336	60,554	2,456	68,496	62,185	2,664	4%	834	43	69,373
West Indies & Atlantic	815	733	93	10,374	9,365	889	11,189	10,098	982	9%	475	1,348	13,012
Western Europe	633	563	29	107,967	98,343	1,361	108,600	98,906	1,390	1%	529	93	109,222
<b>Totals</b>	<b>62,643</b>	<b>57,651</b>	<b>11,301</b>	<b>1,689,668</b>	<b>1,471,458</b>	<b>164,916</b>	<b>1,752,311</b>	<b>1,529,109</b>	<b>176,217</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>20,041</b>	<b>7,607</b>	<b>1,779,959</b>

## WESTERN EUROPE

Total Applications 2001-021.xls

W Europe Post	Settlement Applications			Non - Settlement Applications			Total UK Applications			Refusal Percentage %	C'wealth Recd Received	Dept. Terr Recd Received	Grand Total Recd	
	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused					
Amsterdam	119	115	0	8650	8436	138	8769	8551	138	2%	116	1	8886	
Berlin	0	0	0	477	472	5	477	472	5	1%	0	1	478	
Berne	0	0	0	59	59	0	59	59	0	0%	0	0	59	
Brussels	30	28	0	4426	3558	38	4456	3586	38	1%	12	4	4472	
Copenhagen	9	7	2	3293	2717	99	3302	2724	101	3%	1	0	3303	
Dublin	90	76	20	8578	8060	206	8668	8136	226	3%	1	2	8671	
Dusseldorf	58	52	2	25941	23280	239	25999	23332	241	1%	68	40	26107	
Geneva	112	105	3	9284	7647	223	9396	7752	226	2%	76	12	9484	
Helsinki	1	1	0	959	897	25	960	898	25	3%	9	7	976	
Luxembourg	12	12	0	376	370	0	388	382	0	0%	0	0	388	
Oslo	7	8	0	3820	3693	27	3827	3701	27	1%	95	1	3923	
Paris	100	77	0	24046	23053	116	24146	23130	116	0.5%	102	0	24248	
Reykjavik	5	5	0	181	178	3	186	183	3	2%	0	0	186	
Rome	60	49	2	10573	9187	129	10633	9236	131	1%	44	12	10689	
Stockholm	7	6	0	4458	4009	81	4465	4015	81	2%	5	13	4483	
Vienna	23	22	0	2846	2727	32	2869	2749	32	1%	0	0	2869	
<b>Total</b>	<b>633</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>107967</b>	<b>98343</b>	<b>1361</b>	<b>108600</b>	<b>98906</b>	<b>1390</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>529</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>109222</b>

## WEST INDIES AND ATLANTIC

Total Applications 2001-021.xls

W Indies & Atlantic Post	Settlement Applications			Non - Settlement Applications			Total UK Applications			Refusal Percentage %	C'wealth Recd Received	Dept. Terr Recd Received	Grand Total Recd
	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused				
Ascencion Is	0	0	0	118	118	0	118	118	0	0%	0	99	217
Bridgetown	166	178	19	792	739	95	958	917	114	12%	1	62	1021
Georgetown	109	96	18	2026	1794	184	2135	1890	202	9%	0	609	2744
Hamilton	16	16	0	243	243	0	259	259	0	0%	0	0	259
Kingston	356	285	48	3701	3162	423	4057	3447	471	12%	38	65	4160
Nassau	21	21	0	331	325	0	352	346	0	0%	0	10	362
Port of Spain	95	96	4	1786	1675	128	1881	1771	132	7%	45	5	1931
Port Stanley	3	3	0	10	10	0	13	13	0	0%	0	0	13
Santo Domingo	49	38	4	1367	1299	59	1416	1337	63	4%	391	498	2305
<b>Totals</b>	<b>815</b>	<b>733</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>10374</b>	<b>9365</b>	<b>889</b>	<b>11189</b>	<b>10098</b>	<b>982</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>1348</b>	<b>13012</b>

## SOUTHERN EUROPE

Total Applications 2001-021.xls

S Europe Post	Settlement Applications			Non - Settlement Applications			Total UK Applications			Refusal Percentage %	C'wealth Recd Received	Dept. Terr Recd Received	Grand Total Recd
	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused				
Ankara	17	17	0	3784	3604	106	3801	3621	106	3%	5	2	3808
Athens	27	24	0	986	915	83	1013	939	83	8%	226	4	1243
Gibraltar	1	1	0	262	262	0	263	263	0	0%	1	0	264
Istanbul	1827	1330	203	48458	43218	2046	50285	44548	2249	4%	82	37	50404
Lisbon	22	22	0	1222	1147	34	1244	1169	34	3%	488	0	1732
Madrid	34	34	0	4951	4936	15	4985	4970	15	0.3%	28	0	5013
Nicosia	37	29	5	5882	5730	152	5919	5759	157	3%	0	0	5919
Valletta	195	174	0	791	742	20	986	916	20	2%	4	0	990
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2160</b>	<b>1631</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>66336</b>	<b>60554</b>	<b>2456</b>	<b>68496</b>	<b>62185</b>	<b>2664</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>834</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>69373</b>

## SOUTHERN AFRICA

Total Applications 2001-021.xls

Sth. Africa Post	Settlement Applications			Non - Settlement Applications			Total UK Applications			Refusal Percentage %	C'wealth Recd Received	Dept. Terr Recd Received	Grand Total Recd
	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused				
Gaborone	56	54	3	1210	1076	88	1266	1130	91	7%	0	0	1266
Harare	663	658	5	2609	2059	550	3272	2717	555	17%	0	1	3273
Lilongwe	67	53	0	379	285	11	446	338	11	2%	1	0	447
Luanda	5	4	1	2202	2066	95	2207	2070	96	4%	76	0	2283
Lusaka	102	96	6	5536	4807	751	5638	4903	757	13%	0	0	5638
Maputo	17	17	0	756	859	14	773	876	14	2%	0	0	773
Maseru	7	7	0	186	147	37	193	154	37	19%	0	1	194
Mbabane	9	9	0	207	194	4	216	203	4	2%	0	0	216
Pretoria	2119	2334	64	20812	19336	1363	22931	21670	1427	6%	0	0	22931
Windhoek	34	34	0	778	741	37	812	775	37	5%	0	0	812
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3079</b>	<b>3266</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>34675</b>	<b>31570</b>	<b>2950</b>	<b>37754</b>	<b>34836</b>	<b>3029</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>37833</b>

## SOUTH EAST ASIA

Total Applications 2001-021.xls

South East Asia Post	Settlement Applications			Non - Settlement Applications			Total UK Applications			Refusal Percentage %	C'wealth Recd Received	Dept. Terr Recd Received	Grand Total Recd
	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused				
Bandar S B	12	12	0	593	581	9	605	593	9	1%	0	0	605
Bangkok	2141	1900	277	27137	25219	2186	29278	27119	2463	8%	110	0	29388
Hanoi	137	115	29	2466	2225	157	2603	2340	186	7%	30	0	2633
Hong Kong	422	393	29	4884	4583	140	5306	4976	169	3%	209	16	5531
Jakarta	213	189	10	15716	14746	464	15929	14935	474	3%	219	0	16148
Kuala Lumpur	496	473	10	2393	1931	389	2889	2404	399	14%	0	0	2889
Manila	939	781	87	27351	24024	1674	28290	24805	1761	6%	263	110	28663
Rangoon	22	15	2	1564	1304	281	1586	1319	283	18%	85	0	1671
Singapore	156	214	0	4845	4777	73	5001	4991	73	1%	0	5	5006
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4538</b>	<b>4092</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>86949</b>	<b>79390</b>	<b>5373</b>	<b>91487</b>	<b>83482</b>	<b>5817</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>916</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>92534</b>

## SOUTH ASIA

Total Applications 2001-021.xls

South Asia Post	Settlement Applications			Non - Settlement Applications			Total UK Applications			Refusal Percentage %	C <sup>w</sup> wealth Recd Received	Dept. Terr Recd Received	Grand Total Recd
	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused				
Chennai (Madras)	469	554	43	49382	40092	3417	49851	40646	3460	7%	0	8	49859
Colombo	930	776	144	21002	18348	4051	21932	19124	4195	19%	18	44	21994
Dhaka	5362	4732	1429	22132	15164	6242	27494	19896	7671	28%	0	0	27494
Islamabad	10271	11238	4298	65149	44944	20122	75420	56182	24420	32%	54	0	75474
Karachi	541	422	119	35998	28212	7785	36539	28634	7904	22%	19	0	36558
Kathmandu	153	102	21	6394	2838	2770	6547	2940	2791	43%	1638	0	8185
Kolkata (Calcutta)	121	114	7	9936	9793	192	10057	9907	199	2%	0	0	10057
Lahore	1	1	0	10837	8288	2549	10838	8289	2549	24%	0	0	10838
Mumbia (Bombay)	2067	1673	334	71902	64435	7626	73969	66108	7960	11%	44	25	74038
New Delhi	2823	2445	649	73349	61898	11868	76172	64343	12517	16%	57	23	76252
<b>Totals</b>	<b>22738</b>	<b>22057</b>	<b>7044</b>	<b>366081</b>	<b>294012</b>	<b>66622</b>	<b>388819</b>	<b>316069</b>	<b>73666</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>1830</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>390749</b>

## NEAR EAST AND NORTH AFRICA

Total Applications 2001-021.xls

NE & N. Africa Post	Settlement Applications			Non - Settlement Applications			Total UK Applications			Refusal Percentage %	C'wealth Recd Received	Dept. Terr Recd Received	Grand Total Recd
	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused				
Algiers	0	0	0	5315	5315	0	5315	5315	0	0%	0	0	5315
Amman	311	226	28	9916	8249	151	10227	8475	179	2%	152	0	10379
Beirut	104	95	3	6810	6680	65	6914	6775	68	1%	44	0	6958
Cairo	217	155	50	26919	25002	1142	27136	25157	1192	4%	328	21	27485
Casablanca	434	336	57	6339	6002	251	6773	6338	308	5%	239	133	7145
Damascus	165	178	56	4786	4054	732	4951	4232	788	16%	144	0	5095
Jerusalem	19	18	1	1871	1753	89	1890	1771	90	5%	4	3	1897
Khartoum	158	91	67	4301	2970	1331	4459	3061	1398	31%	14	0	4473
Rabat	0	0	0	382	382	0	382	382	0	0%	15	179	576
Tangier	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	1352	1352
Tel Aviv	181	179	0	1019	922	85	1200	1101	85	7%	340	9	1549
Tripoli	117	122	10	17054	14945	1251	17171	15067	1261	7%	2	0	17173
Tunis	364	293	71	6746	4947	1036	7110	5240	1107	16%	189	0	7299
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2070</b>	<b>1693</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>91458</b>	<b>81221</b>	<b>6133</b>	<b>93528</b>	<b>82914</b>	<b>6476</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>1471</b>	<b>1697</b>	<b>96696</b>

## NORTH AMERICA

Total Applications 2001-021.xls

N America Post	Settlement Applications			Non - Settlement Applications			Total UK Applications			Refusal Percentage %	C'wealth Recd Received	Dept. Terr Recd Received	Grand Total Recd
	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused				
Chicago	462	545	1	10644	10751	26	11106	11296	27	0.2%	0	50	11156
Los Angeles	965	906	5	20566	19448	61	21531	20354	66	0.3%	7	99	21637
New York	1064	1052	1	31123	30727	144	32187	31779	145	0.5%	0	429	32616
Ottawa	1242	1170	5	16828	15888	150	18070	17058	155	1%	0	35	18105
Washington	162	162	0	11252	11252	0	11414	11414	0	0%	0	132	11546
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3895</b>	<b>3835</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>90413</b>	<b>88066</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>94308</b>	<b>91901</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>745</b>	<b>95060</b>

## MIDDLE EAST

Total Applications 2001-021.xls

Mid East Post	Settlement Applications			Non - Settlement Applications			Total UK Applications			Refusal Percentage	C'wealth Recd Received	Dept. Terr Recd Received	Grand Total Recd
	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	%	Received	Received	Received
Abu Dhabi	96	81	8	21369	19408	743	21465	19489	751	3%	145	0	21610
Bahrain	161	160	1	12791	12558	77	12952	12718	78	1%	0	0	12952
Doha	19	19	0	11660	11256	298	11679	11275	298	3%	26	0	11705
Dubai	126	102	77	897	845	52	1023	947	129	13%	1035	0	2058
Jedda	124	63	61	19578	19107	396	19702	19170	457	2%	338	0	20040
Kuwait	97	66	9	33901	31511	572	33998	31577	581	2%	170	3	34171
Muscat	53	53	0	11321	11013	308	11374	11066	308	3%	1047	0	12421
Riyadh	51	48	9	24458	24190	335	24509	24238	344	1%	88	81	24678
Sana'a	305	376	95	3662	3265	321	3967	3641	416	10%	36	0	4003
Tehran	959	892	85	23400	21029	1314	24359	21921	1399	6%	6	2	24367
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>1860</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>163037</b>	<b>154182</b>	<b>4416</b>	<b>165028</b>	<b>156042</b>	<b>4761</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2891</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>168005</b>

## LATIN AMERICA

Total Applications 2001-021.xls

Latin America Post	Settlement Applications			Non - Settlement Applications			Total UK Applications			Refusal Percentage	C'wealth Recd	Dept. Terr Recd	Grand Total Recd
	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	%	Received	Received	Recd
Belmopan	10	9	1	34	34	0	44	43	1	2%	6	5	55
Bogota	178	153	25	17082	15928	1150	17260	16081	1175	7%	1037	211	18508
Brasilia	0	0	0	92	92	0	92	92	0	0%	19	0	111
Buenos Aires	70	65	3	543	500	27	613	565	30	5%	684	7	1304
Caracas	53	50	1	720	678	22	773	728	23	3%	0	0	773
Guatemala City	23	23	0	47	45	2	70	68	2	3%	259	0	329
Havana	109	102	2	1634	1732	147	1743	1834	149	9%	626	219	2588
La Paz	13	13	0	70	64	1	83	77	1	1%	67	10	160
Lima	68	66	2	3685	3560	102	3753	3626	104	3%	230	39	4022
Managua	1	1	0	13	13	0	14	14	0	0%	35	211	260
Mexico City	117	117	0	456	455	1	573	572	1	0.2%	463	0	1036
Montevideo	3	3	0	35	33	2	38	36	2	5%	47	24	109
Panama City	12	12	0	111	103	8	123	115	8	7%	128	24	275
Quito	69	52	3	2440	2357	86	2509	2409	89	4%	178	5	2692
Rio de Janeiro	198	180	0	514	430	47	712	610	47	7%	386	0	1098
San Jose	22	22	0	55	53	2	77	75	2	3%	135	25	237
San Salvador	5	5	0	32	31	1	37	36	1	3%	112	0	149
Santiago	53	53	0	435	435	0	488	488	0	0%	215	5	708
Tegucigalpa	3	3	0	20	20	0	23	23	0	0%	138	1898	2059
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1,007</b>	<b>929</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>28018</b>	<b>26563</b>	<b>1598</b>	<b>29025</b>	<b>27492</b>	<b>1635</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>4765</b>	<b>2683</b>	<b>36473</b>

## FAR EAST

Total Applications 2001-021.xls

Far East Post	Settlement Applications			Non - Settlement Applications			Total UK Applications			Refusal Percentage %	C'wealth Recd Received	Dept. Terr Recd Received	Grand Total Recd
	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused				
Guangzhou	435	300	114	19222	17109	1454	19657	17409	1568	8%	43	24	19724
Beijing	309	284	14	55745	46077	7150	56054	46361	7164	13%	185	0	56239
Seoul	61	60	0	1090	965	59	1151	1025	59	5%	94	39	1284
Shanghai	80	66	3	18540	16234	1664	18620	16300	1667	9%	49	0	18669
Taipei	67	67	0	35192	35192	0	35259	35259	0	0%	0	0	35259
Tokyo	458	459	19	4903	4468	328	5361	4927	347	6%	495	3	5859
Ulaan Baatar	5	4	1	1181	889	230	1186	893	231	19%	0	0	1186
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1415</b>	<b>1240</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>135873</b>	<b>120934</b>	<b>10885</b>	<b>137288</b>	<b>122174</b>	<b>11036</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>866</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>138220</b>

## EQUATORIAL AFRICA

Total Applications 2001-021.xls

Equatorial Africa Post	Settlement Applications			Non - Settlement Applications			Total UK Applications			Refusal Percentage %	C'wealth Recd Received	Dept. Terr Recd Received	Grand Total Recd
	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused				
Abidjan	97	66	14	3510	2766	546	3607	2832	560	16%	845	0	4452
Abuja	210	139	85	22945	18704	3290	23155	18843	3375	15%	0	3	23158
Accra	1213	1030	484	45212	26824	20532	46425	27854	21016	45%	0	0	46425
Addis Ababa	656	0	781	3674	2667	412	4330	2667	1193	28%	18	0	4348
Antananarivo	9	6	2	314	273	25	323	279	27	8%	0	0	323
Bamako	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	0%	0	0	3
Banjul	595	291	71	7212	4020	1028	7807	4311	1099	14%	0	0	7807
Dakar	14	12	0	1898	1283	224	1912	1295	224	12%	245	0	2157
Dar Es Salaam	191	171	20	7753	6539	1190	7944	6710	1210	15%	0	0	7944
Freetown	267	175	77	4938	3555	743	5205	3730	820	16%	0	0	5205
Kampala	1121	363	120	13252	10436	1815	14373	10799	1935	13%	0	0	14373
Kigali	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0
Kinshasa	0	128	43	0	1169	426	0	1297	469		0	0	0
Lagos	1359	1155	356	83934	60797	12980	85293	61952	13336	16%	0	25	85318
Nairobi	1657	1081	270	18426	14286	2140	20083	15367	2410	12%	0	19	20102
Port Louis	182	140	21	9963	8965	681	10145	9105	702	7%	0	0	10145
Victoria	13	11	0	241	195	16	254	206	16	6%	0	0	254
Yaounde	47	42	30	2202	1908	287	2249	1950	317	14%	0	0	2249
<b>Totals</b>	<b>7631</b>	<b>4810</b>	<b>2374</b>	<b>225477</b>	<b>164390</b>	<b>46335</b>	<b>233108</b>	<b>169200</b>	<b>48709</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>1108</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>234263</b>

## CENTRAL EUROPE AND FORMER SOVIET UNION

Total Applications 2001-021.xls

C Europe & FSU Post	Settlement Applications			Non - Settlement Applications			Total UK Applications			Refusal	C'wealth	Dept. Terr	Grand
	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Percentage %	Recd Received	Received	Total Recd
Almaty	87	86	1	6554	6115	293	6641	6201	294	4%	5	2	6648
Ashgabat	5	5	0	1040	1038	2	1045	1043	2	0.2%	0	2	1047
Baku	29	24	2	2847	2680	128	2876	2704	130	5%	17	0	2893
Belgrade	78	70	4	11974	11953	182	12052	12023	186	2%	50	12	12114
Bratislava	201	189	1	19850	17701	335	20051	17890	336	2%	414	106	20571
Bucharest	310	274	23	24561	21913	2172	24871	22187	2195	9%	54	64	24989
Budapest	154	150	1	1333	1198	107	1487	1348	108	7%	372	34	1893
Ekaterinburg	107	101	4	3345	3144	118	3452	3245	122	4%	0	17	3469
Kiev	409	394	17	23303	18684	3777	23712	19078	3794	16%	40	38	23790
Minsk	74	72	0	8076	7834	220	8150	7906	220	3%	5	12	8167
Moscow	678	633	21	68278	63244	2531	68956	63877	2552	4%	202	111	69269
Prague	317	317	0	1963	1940	11	2280	2257	11	0.5%	0	0	2280
Riga	62	60	2	1624	1448	176	1686	1508	178	11%	55	8	1749
St Petersburg	198	194	1	12181	11452	541	12379	11646	542	4%	33	22	12434
Sarajevo	37	37	0	3065	3010	55	3102	3047	55	2%	4	7	3113
Skopje	96	62	15	3866	3169	500	3962	3231	515	13%	8	0	3970
Sofia	143	187	11	19157	17341	2814	19300	17528	2825	15%	116	9	19425
Tallinn	55	51	0	541	433	120	596	484	120	20%	83	7	686
Tashkent	35	32	3	2753	2318	370	2788	2350	373	13%	24	2	2814
Tbilisi	15	14	0	2617	2448	137	2632	2462	137	5%	8	9	2649
Tirana	304	218	21	2587	2205	243	2891	2423	264	9%	1	1	2893
Vilnius	71	71	0	810	661	55	881	732	55	6%	10	2	893
Warsaw	341	339	1	1369	1191	108	1710	1530	109	6%	874	11	2595
Yerevan	13	10	3	1222	1066	128	1235	1076	131	11%	0	0	1235
Zagreb	73	68	5	13915	13561	258	13988	13629	263	2%	294	87	14369
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3892</b>	<b>3658</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>238831</b>	<b>217747</b>	<b>15381</b>	<b>242723</b>	<b>221405</b>	<b>15517</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>2669</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>245955</b>

## AUSTRALIA AND SOUTH PACIFIC

Total Applications 2001-021.xls

Aust & S Pacific Post	Settlement Applications			Non - Settlement Applications			Total UK Applications			Refusal Percentage %	C'wealth Recd Received	Dept. Terr Recd Received	Grand Total Recd
	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused	Received	Issued	Refused				
Canberra	4810	5397	3	32163	32529	38	36973	37926	41	0.1%	2	0	36975
Honiara	6	6	0	25	24	1	31	30	1	3%	0	0	31
Nuku'alofa	1	1	0	19	11	7	20	12	7	35%	10	0	30
Pt Moresby	10	10	0	458	456	2	468	466	2	0.4%	0	0	468
Suva	19	18	1	1559	1482	55	1578	1500	56	4%	1575	3	3156
Vila	5	5	0	9	9	0	14	14	0	0%	0	0	14
Wellington	1928	1847	2	8801	9465	33	10729	11312	35	0.3%	16	0	10745
<b>Totals</b>	<b>6779</b>	<b>7284</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>43034</b>	<b>43976</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>49813</b>	<b>51260</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>1603</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>51419</b>

Reference:

**Annex 3**  
REF 1 / GV 51

**IMMIGRATION ACT 1971 AND IMMIGRATION & ASYLUM ACT 1999**  
**REFUSAL OF AN ENTRY CLEARANCE (NO RIGHT OF APPEAL)**

To:

--

<b>You have applied for an entry clearance to the United Kingdom as</b>	<b>a visitor</b>	<b>for 6 months</b>
---	------------------	---------------------

**BUT:**

- The financial outlay on your proposed visit, for the reasons you have given, is not commensurate with your current social and economic circumstances.
- I am not satisfied that you are in business/employment as you claim, which leads me to doubt that you intend to leave the United Kingdom.
- The reasons you have given and the preparations you have made with regard to your proposed visit, when balanced against your personal and economic circumstances, lead me to doubt that you are a genuine visitor for a limited period.
- You have not shown that you have, on the balance of probabilities, sufficiently strong family, social or economic ties to satisfy me that you intend to leave the United Kingdom on completion of your visit.
- I am not satisfied that all the documents you have presented are genuine which leads me to doubt that you are a genuine visitor for the period stated. Your arrangements for conducting business in the UK are at best vague.
- The cost of the trip is not commensurate with the benefits to be gained.
- I am not satisfied that documents submitted with your application are genuine. This seriously undermines the overall credibility of your application
- *Other*

**I am not satisfied that you are genuinely seeking entry for the purpose and for the period as stated by you. I therefore refuse your application.**

If you wish to make any comments on the reasons for refusal, I will note them here:

--

**You do not have a right of appeal against this decision (by virtue of Section 60 of the Immigration & Asylum Act 1999). This decision will not prejudice any application you make in the future.**

<b>Entry Clearance Officer:</b>	<b>Date: 16 December 2002</b>
<b>A notice (of which this is a copy) was handed to me at:</b>	
<b>The contents have been translated to me in:</b>	
<b>Applicant's signature:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Reviewed by Entry Clearance Manager</b>	<b>Date:</b>

Reference:

**IMMIGRATION ACT 1971 AND IMMIGRATION & ASYLUM ACT 1999**  
**REFUSAL OF AN ENTRY CLEARANCE (NO RIGHT OF APPEAL)**

To:

<b>You have applied for an entry clearance to the United Kingdom as</b>	<b>a student</b>	<b>for less than 6 months</b>
---	------------------	-------------------------------

I am not satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that you meet the requirements of paragraph 57 of HC395, and in particular that:

- You have been accepted on a course of full time course of study
- You are able and intend to follow such a course
- You intend to leave the United Kingdom at the end of your studies
- You are able to meet the costs of the course and maintain and accommodate yourself without recourse to employment or public funds

**BECAUSE**

- You have no letter giving you unconditional acceptance for your proposed course
- You are unable to tell me the basic content of your proposed course or the future benefits you might accrue from the course
- The financial outlay on tuition, accommodation and maintenance is not commensurate with your current financial circumstances or the benefits you might gain from this course
- The course of study you propose is unrealistic because it is inconsistent with your previous pattern of study and you have been unable to give me a satisfactory explanation for this
- You have taken no preparatory steps for your proposed course to ensure that these studies are appropriate and the cost is disproportionate to your present economic circumstances or the advantages you might acquire.
- Your account of your personal, economic and social circumstances and how these studies will be used does not satisfy me, on the balance of probabilities, that you intend to leave the United Kingdom on the completion of your course
- *Other*

**I am not satisfied that you are genuinely seeking entry for the purpose and for the period as stated by you. I therefore refuse your application.**

If you wish to make any comments on the reasons for refusal, I will note them here:

**You do not have a right of appeal against this decision (by virtue of Section 60 of the Immigration & Asylum Act 1999). This decision will not prejudice any application you make in the future.**

<b>Entry Clearance Officer:</b>	<b>Date: 16 December 2002</b>
<b>A notice (of which this is a copy) was handed to me at:</b>	
<b>The contents have been translated to me in:</b>	
<b>Applicant's signature:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Reviewed by Entry Clearance Manager</b>	<b>Date:</b>