

# Court of King's Bench of Alberta

**Citation: Leger v Ravinder Bagga Barrister, 2026 ABKB 219**

**Date:** 20260323  
**Docket:** 2601 00555  
**Registry:** Calgary

Between:

**Linda Leger**

Plaintiff

- and -

**Ravinder Bagga Barrister and Solicitor Managing Partner and Owner Bagga & Associates  
operating under Ravinder Bagga Professional Corporation**

Defendants

---

**Endorsement  
of the  
Honourable Associate Chief Justice  
D.B. Nixon**

---

[1] By way of email dated March 2, 2026, the Plaintiff, Ms. Leger, asks the Court to review and dismiss the Defendants' Statement of Defence filed January 29, 2026 under Civil Practice Note 7 ("CPN7").

[2] Amongst other things, Ms. Leger asks the Court to "STRIKE THIS EASILY PROVABLE DECEIVING PURJED STATEMENT OF DEFENCE" [*sic*] because it is "materially deficient and blatantly contrary to the evidence of fact". In support of her request, she submits a copy of her Statement of Claim, various versions of a "Timeline of Events" which appear to provide background on the events leading to this present Action and Ms. Leger's other

related, but separate, lawsuits before this Court, a Reply to Defence filed February 6, 2026, and an Affidavit she affirmed and filed February 10, 2026. Ms. Leger has also sent my Judicial Assistant several inappropriate emails and attachments such as transcripts and screenshots which were not helpful to her requests.

[3] CPN7 sets out summary procedures, using rule 3.68 of the *Alberta Rules of Court*, Alta Reg 124/2010, for an assessment of a “claim, defence, action, application, or proceeding that appears on its face to be frivolous, vexatious, or otherwise an abuse of process”. While CPN7 allows for the process to be used for reviewing Statements of Defence, it is more commonly used for reviewing commencement documents. This is because if there are defects in a Statement of Defence, other Court processes may be more appropriate, such as making a Request for Particulars (r 3.61), filing a Reply to a Statement of Defence (r 3.33)(as Ms. Leger has done), bringing an application to strike out all or parts of a pleading (r 3.68), or amending a pleading (r 3.62).

[4] In any event, the use of CPN7 is appropriate where two conditions are met: (a) the frivolous, vexatious, or abusive nature of the pleading is evident on its face; *and* (b) there is reason to prefer the CPN7 process to ordinary Court procedures: *Wilyman v Cole*, 2024 ABCA 41 at para 20 [emphasis in original].

[5] With these conditions in mind, I reviewed Ms. Leger’s submissions as well as the Statement of Defence. Based on my review of the facts and analysis of the law, I find the Statement of Defence is not, on its face, frivolous, vexatious, or an abuse of process. I make this determination because the Statement of Defence is framed in a manner that is consistent with what I would expect from Defence counsel in litigation of this nature.

[6] For context, I understand the Defendants were counsel for the defendants in Actions 2401 10052, 2401 16803 and 2501 02389 in which Ms. Leger was the plaintiff. In that capacity, the Defendants were adverse to her.

[7] Given the comments from Ms. Leger, I infer that she resents the fact that the Defendants denied the allegations against them, including her allegation that they owed her a duty of care during the prior legal proceedings. Although Ms. Leger asserts that her “Timeline of Events with evidence available ... will clearly and easily” prove her allegations against the Defendants to “have this matter settled” and her “claims be paid”, she needs to prove her points in a court of law. I infer from her comments that she fails to understand that the Defendants have the right and entitlement to challenge the allegations advanced in the Statement of Claim and her claim for monetary damages in the amount of twenty million dollars (amongst other relief sought). In that regard, the Defendants also have the right to present evidence in support of their defence. That evidence may contradict the narrative of events alleged by Ms. Leger in her commencement documents and proposed evidence.

[8] For clarification, evidence can comprise of oral testimony given in a court of competent jurisdiction or written affidavit. Ms. Leger may wish to use her various versions of a “Timeline of Events” and “Prologue” to assist her in the preparation of any additional affidavits of records, in compliance with rr 5.6-5.8 of the *Alberta Rules of Court*. However, as currently presented, the Court does not consider these documents to be evidence for the purposes of her litigation.

[9] I am hopeful that the parties will use ordinary Court procedures to raise arguments, respond to them, and present their relevant factual background and evidence in support of their respective positions.

[10] In conclusion, CPN7 does not apply to the Statement of Defence.

[11] This Endorsement does not prevent either party from applying under the *Alberta Rules of Court* for other remedies with respect to the Action, including under rr 3.68, 7.2, 7.3 or otherwise.

**Dated** at Calgary, Alberta this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of March 2026.

---

**D.B. Nixon**  
**A.C.J.C.K.B.A.**

**Appearances:**

Linda Leger – Written Submission  
Plaintiff

Taylor Campbell – No Appearance  
McLennan Ross LLP  
for the Defendants