

Apr. 30/12.

Apr 30/12 Court File No. CV-12-9617-00CL

Having read the written Record
of heard from Counsel for the Applicants,
the number of representative Counsel:

the written in so far as the Beverages
Transaction is concerned is adjourned

can Consent to Thrus. May 3/12 ~~Cassels~~
the Greenstar Transaction is unopposed

subject to the position on behalf of
Representative Counsel & Counsel

1. Standalone Transaction: both as set out
in the attached additums to this

endorsements. The conduct of the ~~Monetary~~ CRP
is approved as set out in the 2nd report

including increase in Representative Counsel
Attendance - all as set out in 2 Orders

1) Approval & Disbursement of Greenstar/Manor ~~Orders~~
2 Sale Approval & Vesting Order - Greenstar.

Orders signed to issue

ALL confirmed

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(Commercial List)

Proceedings commenced at Toronto

MOTION RECORD
Initially returnable April 23, 2012

Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP
2100 Scotia Plaza
40 King Street West
Toronto, Ontario M5H 3C2

John Birch LSUC#338698U
Tel: 416-860-5225
Fax: 416-640-3057

David S. Ward LSUC#: 335441A
Tel: 416.869.5960
Fax: 416.360.3154

Lawyers for the Applicants



①

I was advised by
Representative Counsel for
the investors that a number
of investors raised concerns
regarding the Queenston
manor and Beverages transaction,
in part due to the limited
time the investors had
to review and assess same.

First Seaside, the CRO and the Monitor will work with Representative Counsel for the investors/ ^(the "Parties") to develop and implement a communication protocol regarding future proposed transactions in order to ensure that the investors have a reasonable opportunity to assess and respond to such transactions. The protocol shall include provisions to address confidentiality concerns which are acceptable to the Parties noted above.

The approval of the First Report of the Monitor, dated March 21, 2012, shall be without prejudice to any party opposing or making submissions in respect of the cost allocation ~~then~~ proposed herein, when such cost allocation is determined and brought before the Court for approval.