

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

CITATION: R. v. Baig, 2026 ONCA 401

DATE: 20260608

DOCKET: COA-26-CR-0249 & M57126

George, Monahan and Pomerance JJ.A.

BETWEEN

His Majesty the King

Respondent (Respondent/
Responding Party)

and

Nicholas Baig

Applicant (Appellant/
Moving Party)

Nicholas Baig, acting in person

Kevin Rawluk, for the respondent Attorney General of Ontario

Eric Peterson, for the respondent Attorney General of Canada

Heard and rendered orally: June 4, 2026

On appeal from the order of Justice Lisa A. Wannamaker of the Superior Court of Justice, dated February 6, 2026.

REASONS FOR DECISION

[1] The appellant pleaded guilty to a charge of second-degree murder and was sentenced to life imprisonment with a 17-year period of parole ineligibility. This

court dismissed his motion to extend time to appeal his conviction (see 2022 ONCA 129) and dismissed his sentence appeal (see 2022 ONCA 692).

[2] On November 20, 2025, the appellant filed a *habeas corpus* application in the Superior Court of Justice seeking his immediate release from custody on the basis of alleged irregularities in relation to his guilty plea as well as complaints and objections regarding his conditions of confinement.

[3] The application judge dismissed the application summarily, finding it to be manifestly frivolous and doomed to fail. The appellant was in substance attempting to appeal his conviction long after his motion to extend time to appeal had been dismissed. He was also attempting to bypass the statutory review process available to deal with grievances and complaints about conditions of confinement in federal institutions.

[4] The appellant appeals the application judge's summary dismissal of his *habeas corpus* application. However, he has failed to identify any errors in the application judge's analysis or findings, simply repeating the same manifestly frivolous arguments that were correctly rejected by the application judge.

[5] We also note that the appellant filed additional material in the form of a motion for directions (M57126) addressed to the Chief Justice of Ontario. The Crown opposes admission of this material. We agree that it has no bearing on the issues before us and therefore it is not admitted as fresh evidence.

[6] Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

“J. George J.A.”
“P.J. Monahan J.A.”
“R. Pomerance J.A.”