

2022 01G 0709

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

IN BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY

IN THE MATTER OF an application of Grant Thornton Limited, as Court- Appointed Monitor of 92834 Newfoundland and Labrador Inc., (“92834” or the “Company”); and

AND IN THE MATTER OF the Companies Creditors Arrangement Act R.S.C., 1985 c. C-36 as Amended (the “CCAA”)

MEMORANDUM OF FACT AND LAW OF APPLICANT

SUMMARY OF CURRENT DOCUMENT

Court File Number(s):	2022 01G 0709
-----------------------	---------------

Date of Filing of Document:	June 6, 2024
-----------------------------	--------------

Name of Party Filing or Person:	Grant Thornton Limited, in its capacity as Court-Appointed Monitor (the “Applicant”) of the Company
---------------------------------	---

Application to which Document being filed relates:	Notice of Motion filed by the Applicant to extend the stay of proceedings,
--	--

Statement of Purpose in filing:	Memorandum in support of the Application
---------------------------------	--

Court Sub-File Number, if any	N/A
-------------------------------	-----

FACTS:

1. As of February 21, 2022, Canada Fluorspar Inc., and Canada Fluorspar (NL) (hereinafter referred to as the “**Original Entities**”) were insolvent and were unable to meet its debt obligations as they became due. As a result, PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc., in its capacity as court-appointed receiver and manager of Bridging Finance Inc., and Bridging Income Fund LP (“**PWC**”) applied for an interim receivership order pursuant to s.47(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985 c. B-3 (the “**BIA**”) over substantially all the assets and undertaking of the Original Entities, which order was issued by this Honourable Court on the 21st day of February, 2022 (the “**Interim Receivership Order**”). Pursuant to the Interim Receivership Order, Grant Thornton Limited (“**GTL**”) was appointed as Interim Receiver of all the assets and undertaking of the Original Entities, with the exception of those assets and undertakings that were carved out of the receivership (defined therein as the “**Excluded Property**”).
2. On the 8th day of March 2022, GTL as Interim Receiver made an application to this Honourable Court declaring that Canada Fluorspar Inc., Canada Fluorspar (NL) Inc., and Newspaper (hereinafter the “**New Entities**”) were a company to which the CCAA applied and requesting protection under the CCAA. As a result of that application, the Court granted an initial CCAA Order on the 11th day of March 2022 (the “**Initial CCAA Order**”) and the Court subsequently granted the ARIO on the 18th day of March 2022. In both orders, GTL was appointed and confirmed as CCAA Monitor.
3. In the Initial CCAA Order, this Honourable Court authorized the Monitor, on behalf of the New Entities, to enter into a DIP Financing Agreement with the DIP Lenders referenced in the Initial CCAA Order (the “**DIP Lenders**”).
4. Following the 18th day of March 2022, the Monitor conducted a Sales and Investment Solicitation Process (“**SISP**”) as contemplated in the order of this Honourable Court issued on the same day as the ARIO (the “**SISP Order**”). The activities of the Monitor in executing the SISP during this period are outlined generally in the Monitor’s Third, Fourth and Fifth Report.

5. On the 31st day of May 2022, the Monitor made an application to this Honourable Court seeking an extension of the stay period until the 2nd day of September 2022 and amending the SISP procedures to extend the dates of the Phase 2 Bid Deadline and each step thereafter in order to correspond with the CCAA stay period (the “**Amended SISP Order**”). The extension was requested to allow the Monitor to arrange the completion of a National Instruments 43-101 Technical Report with the expectation that it would assist in increasing the purchase price for the New Entities’ assets. The court granted these amendments by Order dated the 10th day of June 2022.
6. As outlined in the Monitor’s Fifth Report, the Monitor received multiple bids for the New Entities’ assets through the SISP process. The Monitor made a recommendation to the DIP Lenders as to its preferred choice with respect to the bids received. The DIP Lenders supported the Monitor’s recommendation, and the Monitor therefore notified the successful bidder (the “**Successful Bidder**”) on August 18, 2022.
7. On the 30th day of August 2022, this Honourable Court issued the 2nd Amended ARIO extending the CCAA stay period until the 17th day of October 2022 and amended the SISP procedures in order to allow time to (i) complete the SISP; (ii) enter into a definitive agreement with the Successful Bidder; and (iii) obtain court approval.
8. As outlined in the Monitor’s Fifth Report, the Monitor completed the SISP and awarded, with the consent and the agreement of the DIP Lenders, the sale of the New Entities’ assets to the Successful Bidder.
9. As outlined in the Monitor’s Sixth Report, the Monitor and the New Entities worked diligently to complete the definitive agreement. However, the Successful Bidder failed to top up the agreed upon deposit as required by the SISP, and therefore failed to complete a key deadline as outlined in the SISP. As a result of this material adverse change, the agreement with the Successful Bidder was then terminated and the Monitor filed with this Honourable Court a Material Adverse Change Report.
10. On the 12th day of October 2022, this court issued the 3rd Amended ARIO extending the CCAA stay period until the 26th day of February, 2023 to allow the senior secured creditors

and the DIP Lenders time to determine next steps as it related to the New Entities' assets, including the possibility of another SISP or a different type of sale or liquidation process.

11. Following the 12th day of October 2022, the Monitor and the Company worked diligently to solicit bids from parties that previously submitted proposals during the SISP. As of January 26, 2023, the Monitor selected, and the DIP Lenders approved a new successful bidder (the "**Purchaser**").
12. On the 13th day of February 2023, the Monitor entered into a Letter of Intent with the Purchaser.
13. On the 21st day of February 2023, this court issued the 4th Amended ARIO extending the CCAA stay period until the 31st day of May, 2023 to allow (i) the Purchaser to complete its due diligence (ii) enter into a definitive agreement; and (iii) obtain court approval.
14. On the 18th day of May, 2023, the court issued the 5th Amended ARIO extending the CCAA stay period until the 16th day of June, 2023 to allow the Purchaser (i) to complete the definitive agreement and (ii) obtain court approval and close the transaction. In addition, the court approved the addition of CFI Newspar Holdings Inc., to these proceedings (CFI Newspar Holdings Inc., the Original Entities and the New Entities are hereinafter referred to as "**CFI**").
15. On the 7th day of June, 2023, the court issued the Approval and Reverse Vesting Order ("**ARVO**") (i) approving the sale to the Purchaser and (ii) issuing the 6th Amended ARIO extending the CCAA stay period until the 31st day of October, 2023.
16. Pursuant to the ARVO, all the Excluded Liabilities, Claims and Encumbrances (except for the Permitted Encumbrances) as defined in the Share Purchase Agreement between CFI and the Purchaser were vested out to ResidualCo, being 92834, and 92834 was added as an applicant in these CCAA proceedings.
17. On the 13th day of June, 2023 the share transaction with the Purchaser closed and the sale proceeds were paid by the Purchaser to the Monitor.

18. On the 25th day of October, 2023, the court issued (i) the Claims Identification Order, (ii) the 7th amendment to the ARIO extending the stay of proceedings until the 31st day of March, 2024, (iii) the interim distribution of funds by the Monitor in an amount of \$14,100,000.00 as set out in the Monitor's Tenth Report; and (iv) approval of the activities, fees and disbursements of the Monitor and its Legal Counsel.
19. On the 26th day of October 2023, the Monitor remitted the amount of \$14,112,409.00 to Bridging, the amount included outstanding interest due and owing.
20. On the 25th day of January, 2024, this court issued an order (the "Distribution Order") providing for the following: (i) 8th amendment to the ARIO extending the stay of proceedings until the 30th day of June, 2024, (ii) a distribution of funds by the Monitor to the priority claimants in an amount of \$272,892.76 and to Bridging in an amount of \$500,878.46, and (iii) that upon final distribution of funds by the Monitor, the stay of proceedings be lifted to allow the Monitor to make an assignment in to bankruptcy with respect to 92384.
21. Pursuant to the Distribution Order, claimants were given until the 15th day of February 2024 to appeal any claim determinations or the Monitor's proposed distribution of the funds.
22. The Monitor receiver 6 notices of disputed claims, with a total claims value of \$1,813,643.01.
23. On the 15th day of May, 2024, this court issued an order providing the following; (i) that the Monitor remit \$1,230,700.00 into this Honourable Court, as funds representing the amount of the disputed claim of the Town of St. Lawrence, (ii) that the Monitor remit \$123,078.05 into this Honourable Court, as funds representing the amount of the disputed claim of Box L. Mining and Ranching LLC, and (iii) that any determinations subject to an unresolved dispute between the Monitor and the claimants shall be submitted for adjudication to this Honourable Court.
24. To date, the Town of St. Lawrence, Inaminka Marine Services Limited and Richard Spellacy have applied to this Honourable Court for determinations of their claims.

25. At a Case Management Meeting held on April 17, 2024, this court scheduled September 19, 2024 as the hearing date for the appeal filed by Inaminka Marine Services Limited and Richard Spellacy.
26. At this time, the Monitor has determined that it is appropriate to extend the stay of proceedings to allow for the court to make a determination with respect to the appeals of the Town of St. Lawrence, Inaminka Marine Services Limited and Richard Spellacy, and to allow the Monitor to make any further distributions that may be required and to apply to be discharged.

ISSUES:

27. The issues before this Honourable Court are as follows:
 - (a) Whether the requested extension to the stay of proceedings should be granted.

LAW AND ARGUMENT:

Whether the requested extension to the stay of proceedings should be granted.

28. The current stay period expires on the 30th day of June 2024. The Applicant is now requesting an extension of the stay until the 21st day of December 2024.
29. Section 11.02(2) of the CCAA provides that a court has discretion to grant a requested stay of proceedings, on any terms it may impose:

11.02 (2) A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

Reference: CCAA s., 11.02(2) [TAB 1]

30. The requested stay is necessary as it will allow the Monitor additional time (i) to deal with the claimants who applied to this Honourable Court for determination of their claims: (ii) to deal with any further distributions that may be required; and (iii) to make an application to be discharged.
31. Section 11.02 (3) of the CCAA outlines when a court should make an order to extend a stay:

(3) The court shall not make the order unless

(a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

Reference: CCAA s., 11.02(3) [TAB 2]

32. The Applicant submits that the request is appropriate in these circumstances, as it will allow for the necessary time needed to review and determine the outstanding appeals, distribute any remaining funds and for the Monitor to be discharged.
33. Further, the Applicant has acted in good faith and with due diligence throughout these CCAA proceedings.
34. In *Harte Gold Corp (Re)*, 2022 ONSC 653, the Ontario Supreme Court of Justice discussed the test for extending a stay of proceedings under s. 11.02 of the CCAA.

The current stay period expires on January 31, 2022. Under s. 11.02 of the CCAA, the court may grant an extension of a stay of proceedings where: (a) circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and (b) the debtor company satisfies the court that it has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

Harte Gold is seeking to extend the stay period to and including March 29, 2022 to allow it to proceed with the closing of the

Silver Lake transaction, while at the same time preserving the status quo and preventing creditors and others from taking any steps to try and better their positions in comparison to other creditors.

No creditors are expected to suffer material prejudice as a result of the extension of the stay of proceedings. Harte Gold is acting in good faith and will continue to pay its post-filing obligations in the ordinary course. As detailed in Harte Gold's cash flow forecast, it is expected to have sufficient liquidity to continue its operations during the contemplated extension of the stay.

For these reasons the stay is extended to March 29, 2022

Reference: *Harte Gold Corp (Re)*, 2022 ONSC 653 at paragraphs 87-90 [TAB 3]


35. As noted above, the Monitor requires additional time to deal with the claimants who applied to this Honourable Court for determination of their claims, distribute any remaining funds and apply to be discharged.
36. No creditors will suffer material prejudice as a result of the extension. The revised cashflow of the Monitor shows sufficient cash to allow for the extension without any additional borrowing.

CONCLUSION

37. The Applicant respectfully requests that this Honourable Court grant the Order attached to the within Application.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED.

DATED at the City of St. John's, in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, this 6 day of June, 2024.



Geoffrey Spencer
McInnes Cooper
Solicitors for the Applicant
Whose address for service is:
5th Floor, Baine Johnston Centre
10 Fort William Place

St. John's, NL A1C 5X4

**TO: Supreme Court of Newfoundland & Labrador
General Division (In Bankruptcy)
P.O. Box 937
313 Duckworth Street
St. John's, NL A1C 5M3**

AND TO: The Service List attached as Schedule "A" to the Application

List of Authorities:

1. *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, C. c-36, as amended, s. 11.02(2)
2. *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, C. c-36, as amended, s. 11.02(3)
3. *Harte Gold Corp (Re)*, 2022 ONSC 653

TAB 1

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
Part II — Jurisdiction of Courts (ss. 9-18.5)

Most Recently Cited in: Harte Gold Corp. (Re) , 2022 ONSC 653, 2022 CarswellOnt 1698 | (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List], Feb 4, 2022)

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.02

s 11.02

Currency

11.02

11.02(1) Stays, etc. — initial application

A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 10 days,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

11.02(2) Stays, etc. — other than initial application

A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

11.02(3) Burden of proof on application

The court shall not make the order unless

- (a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and
- (b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

11.02(4) Restriction

Orders doing anything referred to in subsection (1) or (2) may only be made under this section.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2019, c. 29, s. 137

Judicial Consideration (1)

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to February 15, 2022

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 156:3 (February 2, 2022)

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

TAB 2

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
Part II — Jurisdiction of Courts (ss. 9-18.5)

Most Recently Cited in: Harte Gold Corp. (Re) , 2022 ONSC 653, 2022 CarswellOnt 1698 | (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List], Feb 4, 2022)

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.02

s 11.02

Currency

11.02

11.02(1) Stays, etc. — initial application

A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 10 days,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

11.02(2) Stays, etc. — other than initial application

A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

11.02(3) Burden of proof on application

The court shall not make the order unless

- (a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and
- (b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

11.02(4) Restriction

Orders doing anything referred to in subsection (1) or (2) may only be made under this section.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2019, c. 29, s. 137

Judicial Consideration (1)

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to February 15, 2022

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 156:3 (February 2, 2022)

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

TAB 3

2022 ONSC 653
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Harte Gold Corp. (Re)

2022 CarswellOnt 1698, 2022 ONSC 653, 97 C.B.R. (6th) 202

**THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985,
c. C-36, AS AMENDED (Applicant) and A PLAN OF COMPROMISE
OR ARRANGEMENT OF HARTE GOLD CORP. (Applicant)**

Penny J.

Heard: January 28, 2022
Judgment: February 4, 2022
Docket: CV-21-00673304-00CL

Counsel: Guy P. Martel, Danny Duy Vu, Lee Nicholson, William Rodler Dumais, for Applicant
Joseph Pasquariello, Chris Armstrong, Andrew Harmes, for Court appointed Monitor
Leanne M. Williams, for Board of Directors of the Applicant
Marc Wasserman, Kathryn Esaw, Dave Rosenblat, Justin Kanji, for 1000025833 Ontario Inc.
Stuart Brotman, Daniel Richer, for BNP Paribas
Sean Collins, Walker W. MacLeod, Natasha Rambaran, for Appian Capital Advisory LLP, 2729992 Ontario Corp., ANR Investments B.V. and AHG (Jersey) Limited
David Bish, for OMF Fund II SO Ltd., Orion Resource Partners (USA) LP and their affiliates
Orlando M. Rosa, Gordon P. Acton, for Netmizaaggamig Nishnaabeg First Nation (Pic Mobert First Nation)
Timothy Jones, for Attorney General of Ontario

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.1 General principles](#)

[XIX.1.e Jurisdiction](#)

[XIX.1.e.i Court](#)

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.2 Initial application](#)

[XIX.2.b Grant of stay](#)

[XIX.2.b.vii Extension of order](#)

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.2 Initial application](#)

[XIX.2.g Monitor](#)

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — General principles — Jurisdiction — Court
Company operated gold mine — Company encountered growing liquidity problem — Company developed plan to attract new capital through potential sale — No binding offers were received — Further sale and investment solicitation process led to two competing proposals from its primary secured creditors — One of creditors had winning bid and proposed purchase was structured as reverse vesting order — Company brought motion for orders approving creditor transaction, including reverse vesting order structure, extending stay and expanding monitor's powers — Motion granted — [Section 11 of Companies Creditors](#)

Arrangement Act clearly provided court with jurisdiction to issue reverse vesting order, provided discretion available under s. 11 of Act was exercised in accordance with objects and purposes of Act — Reverse vesting order should continue to be regarded as unusual or extraordinary measure and approval of such structure should involve close scrutiny — Reverse vesting order sought in instant case was in creditors' and stakeholders' interests — Order was appropriate as it would provide for timely, efficient and impartial resolution of company's insolvency; preserve and maximize value of company's assets; ensure fair and equitable treatment of claims against company; protect public interest; and balance costs and benefits of company's restructuring or liquidation.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Grant of stay — Extension of order

Company operated gold mine — Company encountered growing liquidity problem — Company developed plan to attract new capital through potential sale — No binding offers were received — Further sale and investment solicitation process led to two competing proposals from its primary secured creditors — One of creditors had winning bid and proposed purchase was structured as reverse vesting order — Company brought motion for orders approving creditor transaction, including reverse vesting order structure, extending stay and expanding monitor's powers — Motion granted — Company was seeking to extend stay period to allow it to proceed with closing transaction, while at same time preserving status quo and preventing creditors and others from taking steps to try and better their positions — No creditors were expected to suffer material prejudice as result of extension of stay of proceedings.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Monitor

Company operated gold mine — Company encountered growing liquidity problem — Company developed plan to attract new capital through potential sale — No binding offers were received — Further sale and investment solicitation process led to two competing proposals from its primary secured creditors — One of creditors had winning bid and proposed purchase was structured as reverse vesting order — Company brought motion for orders approving creditor transaction, including reverse vesting order structure, extending stay and expanding monitor's powers — Motion granted — Order for monitor's expanded powers was intended to provide monitor with power to administer affairs of new companies, established to complete transaction, along with powers necessary to wind down proceedings and put new companies into bankruptcy following close of transaction.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by Penny J.:

Arrangement relatif à Nemaska Lithium inc. (2020), 2020 CarswellQue 10601, 2020 QCCS 3218 (Que. Bkcty.) — considered

Arrangement relatif à Nemaska Lithium inc. (2020), 2020 QCCA 1488, 2020 CarswellQue 11925 (C.A. Que.) — referred to
Lydian International Limited (Re) (2020), 2020 ONSC 4006, 2020 CarswellOnt 9768, 81 C.B.R. (6th) 218 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed

Plasco Energy, Re (July 17, 2015), Doc. Toronto CV-15-10869-00C (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Quest University Canada (Re) (2020), 2020 BCSC 1883, 2020 CarswellBC 3091, 85 C.B.R. (6th) 41 (B.C. S.C.) — considered

Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp. (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 83 D.L.R. (4th) 76, 46 O.A.C. 321, 4 O.R. (3d) 1, 1991 CarswellOnt 205 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Sino-Forest Corp., Re (2012), 2012 ONSC 4377, 2012 CarswellOnt 9430, 92 C.B.R. (5th) 99 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Southern Star Developments Ltd. v. Quest University Canada (2020), 2020 BCCA 364, 2020 CarswellBC 3252, 85 C.B.R. (6th) 96 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2006), 2006 CarswellOnt 863, 18 C.B.R. (5th) 173 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Target Canada Co., Re (2015), 2015 ONSC 1487, 2015 CarswellOnt 3261, 23 C.B.R. (6th) 314 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to
Victor Cantore v. Nemaska Lithium Inc. (Formerly Nemaska Lithium Inc., Nemaska Lithium Whabouchi Mine Inc., Nemaska Lithium Shawinigan Transformation Inc., Nemaska Lithium Pip Inc. and Nemaska Lithium Innovation Inc.), et al. (2021), 2021 CarswellQue 4589, 2021 CarswellQue 4590 (S.C.C.) — referred to

9354-9186 Québec inc. v. Callidus Capital Corp. (2020), 2020 SCC 10, 2020 CSC 10, 2020 CarswellQue 3772, 2020 CarswellQue 3773, 78 C.B.R. (6th) 1, 444 D.L.R. (4th) 373, 1 B.L.R. (6th) 1 (S.C.C.) — followed

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3

Generally — referred to

Business Corporations Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. B.16

Generally — referred to

s. 168 — referred to

s. 168(1)(g) — referred to

s. 186(1) "reorganization" — referred to

s. 186(2) — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 5.1(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 122] — referred to

s. 6(2) — referred to

s. 6(8) — referred to

s. 11 — pursuant to

s. 11.02 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 11.3 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to

s. 11.3(4) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 22(1) — referred to

s. 23(1)(k) — referred to

s. 36 — referred to

s. 36(1) — referred to

s. 36(3) — referred to

Penny J.:

1 This is a motion by Harte Gold for an approval and reverse vesting order involving the sale of Harte Gold's mining enterprise to a strategic purchaser (that is, an entity in the gold mining business) and for an order extending the stay and expanding the Monitor's powers to include new entities to be created for the purposes of implementing Harte Gold's proposed restructuring. There was no opposition to the relief sought. All those who appeared at the hearing supported approval of the transaction.

2 Following the conclusion of oral submissions on Friday, January 28, 2022, I issued the orders sought with written reasons to follow. These are the reasons.

Background

3 Harte Gold is a public company incorporated under the [Business Corporations Act \(Ontario\)](#). Prior to January 17, 2022, its shares publicly traded on the Toronto Stock Exchange, Frankfurt Stock Exchange and over-the-counter. Harte Gold operates a gold mine located in northern Ontario within the Sault Ste. Marie Mining Division and approximately 30 km north of the town

of White River. This mine, referred to as the Sugar Loaf Mine, produces gold bullion. Harte Gold has a total of 260 employees on payroll, as well as 19 employees retained through various agencies. Harte Gold's payroll obligations are current.

4 Of some importance to the form of transaction proposed in this case, involving an approval and reverse vesting order (RVO), is the fact that Harte Gold has 12 material permits and licenses that are required to maintain its mining operations, 24 active work permits and licenses that allow the performance of exploration work on various parts of the Sugar Loaf property and many other forest resource licenses, fire permits and the like, all necessary in one way or another to Harte Gold's continued operations. Harte Gold also has 513 mineral tenures, consisting of three freehold properties, seven leasehold properties, 468 mineral claims and 35 additional tenures. The transfer of these permits and licenses etc. would involve a complex transfer or new application process of indeterminate risk, delay and cost.

5 It is also important to note that Harte Gold is party to an Impact Benefits Agreement dated April 2018 between Harte Gold and Netmizaaggamig Nishnaabeg First Nation.

6 Harte Gold has two primary secured creditors. They are: a numbered company (833) owned by Silver Lake Resources Limited (an Australian gold mine company). 833 is a very recent assignee of significant secured debt from BNPP; and, AHG Jersey Limited (AHG is part of the Appian group). Appian entities are also counterparties to a number of offtake agreements under which Harte Gold sells gold in exchange for prices determined by a pricing formula tied to the London bullion market. Orion is, similarly, a counterparty to additional offtake agreements. BNPP, following the assignment of its secured debt, has retained additional obligations in respect of certain hedging arrangements provided to Harte Gold. Harte Gold also has a number of trade and other unsecured creditors who are owed an estimated \$7.5 million for pre-filing obligations and further amounts for services rendered post-filing.

7 At the time of its initial application to the court, Harte Gold's assets were valued at \$163.8 million. Its liabilities were valued at \$166.1 million. On a balance sheet basis, therefore, Harte Gold was insolvent.

8 Since about 2019, Harte Gold has been pursuing a number of measures to address a growing liquidity problem, a problem only exacerbated by the Covid-19 pandemic. Despite these efforts, in 2020 Harte Gold was obliged to seek agreement from its prime lender, BNPP, to defer debt payments and to seek a forbearance from enforcement of BNPP's security. In May 2021, Harte Gold initiated a strategic review of options to achieve the desired liquidity and to fund the acquisition of new capital. Harte Gold appointed a strategic committee of its board and, shortly thereafter, a special committee of independent directors. The special committee retained FTI as financial advisor (FTI was subsequently appointed Monitor by this Court) and developed a plan to attract new capital through a potential sale.

9 This pre-filing strategic process involved approaching over 250 potential buyers. 31 of these entities executed confidentiality agreements; 28 of those conducted due diligence through Harte Gold's virtual data room. Harte Gold received four nonbinding expressions of interest but, by the bid deadline in September 2021, no binding offers had been received.

10 In the aftermath of this unsuccessful process, Silver Lake through 833 acquired BNPP's debt and advanced a proposal to acquire Harte Gold's operations by way of a credit bid and to provide interim financing in connection with any proceedings under the CCAA. An initial order under the CCAA issued from this Court on December 7, 2021.

11 In the midst of this process, Harte Gold received a competing proposal to make a credit bid from Harte Gold's second secured creditor, Appian. As a result of these developments, Harte Gold resolved to conduct a further (albeit brief, given the extensive process that had just been completed) sale and investment solicitation process, this time with a stalking horse bid. Further competing proposals took place between Silver Lake and Appian over who would be the stalking horse bidder. As a result of this process, the stalking horse bid of Silver Lake was significantly improved. Appian was then content to let Silver Lake's credit bid form the basis of the SISP. I approved this process in an order dated December 20, 2021.

12 The Monitor provided a new solicitation notice to a total of 48 known and previously unknown potential bidders (other than Silver Lake and Appian). None of the potentially interested parties signed a confidentiality agreement or requested access to the data room.

13 Only one competing bid was received — a further credit bid from Appian with improved conditions over those proposed by Silver Lake. Ultimately, all parties agreed that the responding commitment from Silver Lake which was at least as favourable to stakeholders as the Appian bid would be, in effect, the prevailing and winning bid.

14 This took the form of a Second Amended and Restated Subscription Agreement (SARSA) with 833, the actual purchaser. The improved terms were: (a) the assumption by the purchaser of Harte Gold's office lease at 161 Bay Street in Toronto; (b)(i) the proviso that the \$10 million cap on payment of cure costs and pre-filing trade creditors does not apply to the assumption of post-filing trade creditor obligations; and (ii) all amounts owing by Harte Gold to any of the Appian parties are subject to a settlement agreement between 833 Ontario, Silver Lake and Appian and excluded from the pre-filing cure costs; and, (c) the undertaking to pay an additional cash deposit of US\$1,693,658.72, equivalent to approximately 5% of the Appian indebtedness.

15 In broad brush terms, the Silver Lake/833 purchase is structured as a reverse vesting order. The transaction will involve:

- the cancellation of all Harte Gold shares and the issue of new shares to the purchaser
- payment by the purchaser of all secured debt
- payment by the purchaser of virtually all pre-filing trade amounts (estimated at \$7.5 million but with a \$10 million cap) and post-filing trade amounts
- certain excluded contracts and liabilities being assigned to newly formed companies which will, ultimately, be put into bankruptcy. The excluded contracts and liabilities include a number of agreements involving ongoing or future services in respect of which there is little if any money currently owed. They also include a number of contracts with Appian entities and Orion, both of which support approval of the transaction. The employment contracts of four terminated executives will, however, be excluded liabilities, which will nullify the value of any termination claims. Notably, excluded liabilities does not include regulatory or environmental liabilities to any government authority
- retaining on the payroll all but four employees (the four members of the executive team whose employment contracts will be terminated), and
- releases, including of Harte Gold and its directors and officers, the Monitor and its legal counsel and Silver Lake and its directors and officers.

There is no provision for any break fee. Nor is there a request for any form of sealing order.

16 I should add that the value of what the purchaser is paying for Harte Gold's business, including the secured debt, the pre and post-filing trade amounts, interim financing and the like, totals well over \$160 million.

Issues

17 There are three principal issues:

- (1) Whether the proposed transaction should be approved, including the reverse vesting order transaction structure and the form of the proposed release;
- (2) Whether the stay should be extended; and,
- (3) Whether the Monitor's mandate should be extended to include additional companies (newcos) being incorporated for the purposes of executing the proposed transaction.

Analysis

18 Section 11 of the CCAA confers jurisdiction on the Court in the broadest of terms: "the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances".

19 Section 36(1) of the CCAA provides:

A debtor company in respect of which an order has been made under this Act may not sell or otherwise dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business unless authorized to do so by a court. Despite any requirement for shareholder approval, including one under federal or provincial law, the court may authorize the sale or disposition even if shareholder approval was not obtained.

20 Section 36(3) of the CCAA provides a non-exhaustive list of factors to be considered on a motion to approve a sale. These include:

- (a) whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances;
- (b) whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition;
- (c) whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in their opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;
- (d) the extent to which the creditors were consulted;
- (e) the effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties; and
- (f) whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.

21 The s. 36(3) criteria largely correspond to the principles articulated in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp* 1991 CanLII 2727(ONCA) for the approval of the sale of assets in an insolvency scenario:

- (a) whether sufficient effort has been made to obtain the best price and that the debtor has not acted improvidently;
- (b) the interests of all parties;
- (c) the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers have been obtained; and
- (d) whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process:

see *Target Canada Co. (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 1487, at paras. 14-17.

22 The purchase transaction for which approval is being sought in this case does not provide for a sale of assets but, rather, provides for a "reverse vesting order" under which the purchaser will become the sole shareholder of Harte Gold and certain excluded assets, excluded contracts and excluded liabilities will be vested out to new companies incorporated for that purpose.

23 In determining whether the transaction should be approved and the RVO granted, it is appropriate to consider:

- (a) the statutory basis for a reverse vesting order and whether a reverse vesting order is appropriate in the circumstances; and,
- (b) the factors outlined in s. 36(3) of the CCAA, making provision or adjustment, as appropriate, for the unique aspects of a reverse vesting transaction.

The Statutory Basis (Jurisdiction) for a Reverse Vesting Order

24 The first reverse vesting sale transaction appears to have been approved by this Court in *Plasco Energy (Re)*, (July 17, 2015), CV-15-10869-00CL in the handwritten endorsement of Justice Wilton-Siegel. The use of the reverse vesting order structure was not in dispute (indeed, in most of the cases, reported and otherwise, there has been no dispute). Wilton-Siegel J. found "the Court has authority under [section 11 of the CCAA](#) to authorize such transactions notwithstanding that the applicants are not proceeding under [s. 6\(2\) of the CCAA](#) insofar as it is not contemplated that the applicants will propose a plan of arrangement or compromise."

25 A few dozen of these orders have been made since that time, mostly in a context where there was no opposition and no obvious or identified unfairness arising from the use of the RVO structure. The frequency of applications based on court approval of an RVO structure has increased significantly in the past few years.

26 More recently, two reverse vesting orders have been approved in contested cases and been considered by appellate courts in Canada. I cite these two cases in particular because, being opposed and appealed, there tends to be a more in-depth analysis of the issues than is usually the case in the context of unopposed orders.

27 In *Arrangement relatif à Nemaska Lithium Inc.*, 2020 QCCS 3218, at paras. 52 and 71 (leave to appeal to QCCA refused, *Arrangement relatif à Nemaska Lithium Inc.*, 2020 QCCA 1488; leave to appeal to SCC refused, *Arrangement relatif à Nemaska Lithium Inc.*, 2021 CarswellQue 4589), Justice Gouin of the Quebec Superior Court approved a reverse vesting transaction in the face of opposition by a creditor. Following a nine day hearing, Gouin J. reviewed the context of the transaction in detail and carefully analyzed the purpose and efficiency of the RVO in maintaining the going concern operations of the debtor companies. He also found that the approval of the RVO should be considered under [s. 36 CCAA](#), subject to determining, for example:

- Whether sufficient efforts to get the best price have been made and whether the parties acted providently
- The efficacy and integrity of the process followed
- The interests of the parties, and
- Whether any unfairness resulted from the process.

Gouin J. considered that these criteria had been met and found the issuance of the RVO to be a valid exercise of his discretion, concluding that it would serve to maximize creditor recoveries while maintaining the debtor companies as a going concern and allowing an efficient transfer of the necessary permits, licences and authorizations to the purchaser.

28 In denying leave to appeal, the Quebec Court of Appeal noted that the [CCAA](#) judge found that "the terms 'sell or otherwise dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business' under [subsection 36\(1\) of the CCAA](#) should be broadly interpreted to allow a [CCAA](#) judge to grant innovative solutions such as RVOs on a case by case basis, in accordance with the wide discretionary powers afforded the supervising judge pursuant to [section 11 CCAA](#), as recognized by the Supreme Court in *Callidus*": *Nemaska* QCCA at para 19.

29 Similarly, in *Quest University Canada (Re)*, 2020 BCSC 1883, Justice Fitzpatrick of the British Columbia Supreme Court extensively reviewed the caselaw related to a [CCAA](#) court's authority to grant a reverse vesting order. Fitzpatrick J. found that the [CCAA](#) provided sufficient authority to grant the reverse vesting order being sought, which was consistent "with the remedial purposes of the [CCAA](#)" and consistent with the Supreme Court of Canada's ruling on [CCAA](#) jurisdiction in *9354-9186 Québec Inc. v. Callidus Capital Corp.*, 2020 SCC 10. She found, therefore, that the issue in each case is not whether the court has sufficient jurisdiction but whether the relief is "appropriate" in the circumstances and stakeholders are treated as fairly and reasonably as the circumstances permit.

30 In *Quest*, the debtor was in the process of putting forward a plan of compromise under the [CCAA](#). It encountered resistance from an unsecured creditor whose vote could potentially have prevented the necessary creditor approval of the plan. The debtor revised its approach, deleting all conditions precedent requiring creditor and court approval and proceeded with a motion for

the approval of an RVO to achieve what it was really after; that is, a sale of certain assets to a new owner with Quest continuing as a going concern academic institution.

31 Fitzpatrick J. relied on *Callidus* to the effect that:

- Courts have long recognized that s. 11 of the CCAA signals legislative endorsement of the "broad reading of CCAA authority developed by the jurisprudence". On the plain wording of the provision, the jurisdiction granted by s. 11 is constrained only by restrictions set out in the CCAA itself, and the requirement that the order made be "appropriate in the circumstances"
- the CCAA generally prioritizes "avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company"
- Where a party seeks an order relating to a matter that falls within the supervising judge's purview, and for which there is no CCAA provision conferring more specific jurisdiction, s. 11 necessarily is the provision of first resort in anchoring jurisdiction. As Blair J.A. put it in *Stelco*, s. 11 "for the most part supplants the need to resort to inherent jurisdiction" in the CCAA context
- The exercise of the discretion under s. 11 must further the remedial objectives of the CCAA and be guided by the baseline considerations of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence
- Whether this discretion ought to be exercised in a particular case is a circumstance-specific inquiry that must balance the various objectives of the CCAA. The supervising judge is best positioned to undertake this inquiry.

32 The SCC in *Callidus* made an important point in the context of the limits of broad discretion; all discretion has limits and its exercise under s. 11 must accord with the objectives of the CCAA and other insolvency legislation in Canada. These objectives include: providing for timely, efficient and impartial resolution of a debtor's insolvency; preserving and maximizing the value of a debtor's assets; ensuring fair and equitable treatment of the claims against a debtor; protecting the public interest; and, in the context of a commercial insolvency, balancing the costs and benefits of restructuring or liquidating the company. Further, the discretion under s. 11 must also be exercised in furtherance of three baseline considerations: (a) that the order sought is appropriate in the circumstances, and (b) that the applicant has been acting in good faith and (c) with due diligence.

33 Ultimately, Fitzpatrick J. held that, in the complex and unique circumstances of that case, it was appropriate to exercise her discretion to allow the RVO structure. Quest sought this relief in good faith and while acting with due diligence to promote the best outcome for all stakeholders. She considered the balance between the competing interests at play and concluded that the proposed transaction was unquestionably the fairest and most reasonable means by which the greatest benefit can be achieved for the overall stakeholder group.

34 The British Columbia Court of Appeal refused leave to appeal, concluding that the appeal was not "meritorious", also noting that reverse vesting orders had been granted in other contested proceedings, namely *Nemaska*. The BCCA also stated that the reverse vesting order granted by Fitzpatrick J. "reflect[ed] precisely the type of intricate, fact-specific, real-time decision making that inheres in judges supervising CCAA proceedings": *Southern Star Developments Ltd. v. Quest University Canada*, 2020 BCCA 364.

35 It is worthy of note that, in both *Nemaska* and *Quest*, the *bona fides* of the objectors were front and centre in the judicial analysis and, in both cases, the motivations and objectives of the objectors were found suspect and inadequate.

36 The jurisdiction of the court to issue an RVO is frequently said to arise from s. 11 and s. 36(1) of the CCAA. However, the structure of the transaction employing an RVO typically does not involve the debtor 'selling or otherwise disposing of assets outside the ordinary course of business', as provided in s. 36(1). This is because the RVO structure is really a purchase of shares of the debtor and "vesting out" from the debtor to a new company, of unwanted assets, obligations and liabilities.

37 I am, therefore, not sure I agree with the analysis which founds jurisdiction to issue an RVO in s. 36(1). But that can be left for another day because I am wholeheartedly in agreement that s. 11, as broadly interpreted in the jurisprudence including, most recently, *Callidus*, clearly provides the court with jurisdiction to issue such an order, provided the discretion available under s. 11 is exercised in accordance with the objects and purposes of the CCAA. And it is for this reason that I also wholeheartedly agree that the analytical framework of s. 36(3) for considering an asset sale transaction, even though s. 36 may not support a standalone basis for jurisdiction in an RVO situation, should be applied, with necessary modifications, to an RVO transaction.

38 Given this context, however, I think it would be wrong to regard employment of the RVO structure in an insolvency situation as the "norm" or something that is routine or ordinary course. Neither the BIA nor the CCAA deal specifically with the use or application of an RVO structure. The judicial authorities approving this approach, while there are now quite a few, do not generally provide much guidance on the positive and negative implications of this restructuring technique or what to look out for. Broader-based commentary and discussion is only now just now starting to emerge. This suggests to me that the RVO should continue to be regarded as an unusual or extraordinary measure; not an approach appropriate in any case merely because it may be more convenient or beneficial for the purchaser. Approval of the use of an RVO structure should, therefore, involve close scrutiny. The Monitor and the court must be diligent in ensuring that the restructuring is fair and reasonable to all parties having regard to the objectives and statutory constraints of the CCAA. This is particularly the case where there is no party with a significant stake in the outcome opposing the use of an RVO structure. The debtor, the purchaser and especially the Monitor, as the court appointed officer overseeing the process and answerable to the court (and in addition to all the usual enquiries and reporting obligations), must be prepared to answer questions such as:

- (a) Why is the RVO necessary in this case?
- (b) Does the RVO structure produce an economic result at least as favourable as any other viable alternative?
- (c) Is any stakeholder worse off under the RVO structure than they would have been under any other viable alternative? and
- (d) Does the consideration being paid for the debtor's business reflect the importance and value of the licences and permits (or other intangible assets) being preserved under the RVO structure?

39 With this in mind, I will turn to the enumerated s. 36(3) factors. To the extent there are RVO specific issues of concern apart from those enumerated in s. 36(3), I will also address those in the following section of my analysis.

The Section 36 Factors in the RVO Context

Reasonableness of the Process Leading to the Proposed Sale

40 Between the pre-filing strategic review process and the court approved SISP, the business and assets of Harte Gold have been extensively marketed on a global basis. While the SISP was subject to variation from the format contemplated in my earlier order, the ability of the applicant, in conjunction with the Monitor, to vary the process was already established in that order. I find, in any event, that the adjustments made were appropriate in the circumstances, given there were no new bidders and the only offers came from the two competing secured creditors who had already been extensively involved in the process and whose status, interests and objectives were well known to the applicant and the Monitor.

41 Prior to its appointment as Monitor, FTI was intimately involved at all stages of the strategic review process, including the implementation of the pre-filing marketing process and the negotiation of the original proposed subscription agreement that was executed prior to the commencement of the CCAA proceedings and subsequently replaced by the stalking horse bid and the SARSA.

42 Following the commencement of the CCAA proceedings, the Monitor was involved in the negotiations that resulted in the execution of the stalking horse bid and the SARSA. In addition, the Monitor has overseen the implementation of the SISP and is satisfied that it was carried out in accordance with the SISP procedures, including the Monitor's consent to the amendment of the SISP procedures to cancel the auction as unnecessary and accept the SARSA as the best option available.

43 The Monitor's opinion is that the process was reasonable, leading to the best outcome reasonably available in the circumstances.

44 I am satisfied that the sales process was reasonable. The transaction now before the Court was the culmination of approximately seven months of extensive solicitation efforts on the part of both Harte Gold and FTI as part of the prefiling strategic process and the SISP.

45 Harte Gold and FTI broadly canvassed the market by contacting 241 parties regarding their potential interest in acquiring Harte Gold's business and assets. This process ultimately culminated in initial competing bids from Silver Lake and Appian and, subsequently, additional competing bids from both entities as part of the SISP. The competitive tension in this process resulted in material improvements for stakeholders on both occasions.

Comparison with Sale in Bankruptcy

46 The Monitor has considered whether the completion of the transaction contemplated by the SARSA would be more beneficial to creditors of the applicant and stakeholders generally than a sale or disposition of the business and assets of Harte Gold under a bankruptcy. The Monitor is unambiguously of the view that the SARSA transaction is the vastly more beneficial option.

47 The SISP has shown that the SARSA represents the highest and best offer available for Harte Gold's business and assets. The Monitor is satisfied that the approval and completion of the transactions contemplated by the SARSA are in the best interests of the creditors of Harte Gold and its stakeholders generally.

48 In addition to anything else, a bankruptcy would jeopardize ongoing operations and the permits and licences necessary to maintain such operations. A sale in bankruptcy would delay and, again, jeopardize the approval and closing of the proposed transaction as it would be necessary to first assign Harte Gold into bankruptcy or obtain a bankruptcy order, convene a meeting of creditors, appoint inspectors and obtain the approval of the inspectors for the transaction prior to seeking a more traditional AVO or an RVO. Additional costs would also be incurred in undertaking those steps. Silver Lake would have to continue to advance additional funds to finance ongoing operations during this extended period. There is no indication it would be willing to do so. In any event, requiring such a process would fundamentally change the value proposition the purchaser has relied upon and is willing to accept.

49 Taking all this into account, a sale or disposition of the business and assets of the applicant in a bankruptcy would almost certainly result in a lower recovery for stakeholders and would not be more beneficial than closing the RVO transaction in the CCAA proceedings.

Consultation with Creditors

50 Harte Gold's major creditors are Silver Lake, the Appian parties and BNPP. BNPP still has potential claims of approximately \$28 million in respect of its hedge agreements. Silver Lake has claims of approximately \$95 million in respect of the DIP facility and the first lien credit facilities it acquired from BNPP. The Appian parties have claims of approximately US\$34 million in respect of amounts owing under the Appian facility and additional potential claims in respect of obligations under royalty and offtake agreements.

51 BNPP was consulted throughout the strategic review process and has executed a support agreement with the purchaser. In addition, as previously described, the purchaser and the Appian Parties have been extensively involved in the SISP.

52 While there is no evidence of consultations with unsecured creditors, I do not regard that as a material deficiency given that virtually all creditors, secured and unsecured alike, are going to be paid in full under the terms of the SARSA.

53 The Monitor is of the view that the degree of creditor consultation has been appropriate in the circumstances. The Monitor does not consider that any material change in the outcome of efforts to sell the business and assets of the Applicant would have resulted from additional creditor consultation.

54 I find, on the evidence, that the Monitor's assessment of this factor is well supported and correct.

The Effect of the Proposed Sale on Creditors and Other Interested Parties

55 The proposed transaction affords the following benefits to the creditors and to stakeholders generally:

- (a) the retention and payment in full of the claims of almost all creditors of Harte Gold;
- (b) continued employment for all except four of the Harte Gold's employees;
- (c) ongoing business opportunities for suppliers of goods and services to the Sugar Loaf Mine; and
- (d) the continuation of the benefits of the existing Impact Benefits Agreement with Netmizaaggamig Nishnaabeg First Nation.

56 The Monitor's opinion is that the effect of the proposed transaction is overwhelming positive for the vast majority of Harte Gold's creditors and other stakeholders apart (as discussed below) from the shareholders who have no reasonable economic interest at this point.

57 Unlike *Quest*, this is not a case in which the RVO is being used to thwart creditor opposition. Indeed, the evidence is that almost all creditors, secured and unsecured, will be paid in full. To the extent there might be concerns that an RVO structure could be used to thwart creditor democracy and voting rights, those concerns are not present here. This is not a traditional "compromise" situation. It is hard to see how anything would change under a creditor class vote scenario because almost all of the creditors are being paid in full.

58 The evidence is that there is no creditor being placed in a worse position, because of the use of an RVO transaction structure, than they would have been in under a more traditional asset sale and AVO structure (or, for that matter, under any plausible plan of compromise).

59 Because the transaction contemplates the cancellation of all existing shares and related rights in Harte Gold and the issue of new shares to the purchaser, the existing shareholders of Harte Gold will receive no recovery on their investment. Being a public company, Harte Gold has issued material change notices as the events described above were unfolding. By the time of the commencement of the CCAA proceedings, the shareholders had been advised in no uncertain terms that there was no prospect of shareholders realizing any value for their equity investment.

60 The evidence of Harte's financial problems and balance sheet insolvency, the unsuccessful pre-filing strategic review process, and the hard reality that the only parties willing to bid anything for Harte Gold were the holders of secured debt (and only for, effectively, the value of the secured debt plus carrying and process costs) only serves to emphasize that equity holders will not see, and on any other realistic scenario would not see, any recovery of their equity investment in Harte Gold.

61 Under s. 186(1) of the OBCA, "reorganization" includes a court order made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or an order made under the *Companies Creditors Arrangement Act* approving a proposal. While the term "proposal" is unfortunate (because there are no formal "proposals" under the CCAA), I view the use of this term in the non-technical sense of the word; that is, as encompassing any proposal such as the proposed transaction brought forward for the approval of the Court under the provisions of the CCAA in this case.

62 Section 186(2) of the OBCA provides that if a corporation is subject to a reorganization, its articles may be amended by the court order to effect any change that might lawfully be made by an amendment under s. 168. Section 168(1)(g) provides

that a corporation may from time to time amend its articles to add, change or remove any provision that is set out in its articles, including to change the designation of all or any of its shares, and add, change or remove any rights, privileges, restrictions and conditions, including rights to accrued dividends, in respect of all or any of its shares. This provides the jurisdiction of the court to approve the cancellation of all outstanding shares and the issuance of new shares to the purchaser.

63 Section 36(1) of the CCAA contemplates that despite any requirement for shareholder approval, the court may authorize a sale or disposition out of the ordinary course even if shareholder approval is not obtained. While, again, s. 36(1) is concerned with asset sales, the underlying logic of this provision applies to an assessment of cancellation of shares as well. In this case, there is no prospect of shareholder recovery on any realistic scenario.

64 Equity claims are subject to special treatment under the CCAA. Section 6(8) prohibits court approval of a plan of compromise if any equity is to be paid before payment in full of all claims that are not equity claims. Section 22(1) provides that equity claimants are prohibited from voting on a plan unless the court orders otherwise. In short, shareholders have no economic interest in an insolvent enterprise: *Sino-Forest Corporation (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 4377, paras. 23-29. In circumstances like Harte Gold's, where the shareholders have no economic interest, present or future, it would be unnecessary and, indeed, inappropriate to require a vote of the shareholders: *Stelco Inc. (Re)*, 2006 CanLII 4500 at para. 11. The order requested for the cancellation of existing shares is, for these reasons, justified in the circumstances.

65 Taking all this into account, I find that the effect of the transaction on creditors and stakeholders is overwhelmingly positive and the best outcome reasonably available in the circumstances.

Fairness of Consideration

66 Harte Gold's business and assets have been extensively marketed both prior to and during the CCAA proceedings. At the conclusion of the SISP, two bids were available, which were equivalent in all material respects and represented the highest and best offers received. As described earlier, all parties concurred that the Silver Lake-sponsored SARSA should be determined to be the successful bid. As also described above, the closing of the SARSA transaction will provide a vastly superior recovery for creditors than would a liquidation of Harte Gold's assets in bankruptcy. Based on the market, therefore, the consideration must be considered fair and reasonable.¹

67 A further concern with an RVO transaction structure such as this one could be whether, in effect, a purchaser making a credit bid might be getting something (i.e., the licences and permits) for nothing (i.e., the licences and permits were not subject to the creditor's security). It is possible that in a bankruptcy, for example, the licences and permits might have no value. The evidence here is that the purchaser is paying more than Harte Gold would be worth in a bankruptcy. The evidence is also that the purchaser is paying considerably more than just the value of the secured debt. This includes cure costs for third party trade creditors and DIP financing to keep the Mine operational — both payments being made to bring about the acquisition of the Mine as a going concern.

68 It is true that no attempt has been made to put an independent value on the transfer of the licences and permits. However, any strategic buyer (Silver Lake is a strategic buyer and acquired the BNPP debt for this purpose) would need the licences and permits. The results of the pre-filing strategic process and the SISP constitutes evidence that no one else among the universe of potential purchasers of an operating gold mine in Northern Ontario was willing to pay more than Silver Lake was willing to pay. In the circumstances, I do not think it could be seriously suggested that Silver Lake is getting "something" for "nothing".

69 The Monitor is satisfied that the consideration is fair in the circumstances. I agree with the Monitor's assessment for the reasons outlined above.

Other Considerations Re Appropriateness of RVO vs. AVO

70 As noted, Harte Gold has twelve material permits and licenses that are required to maintain its mining operations, as well as twenty-four active work permits and licenses that allow the performance of exploration work and many other forest resource licences and fire permits.

71 The principal objective and benefit of employing the RVO approach in this case is the preservation of Harte Gold's many permits and licences necessary to conduct operations at the Sugar Loaf Mine. Under a traditional asset sale and AVO structure, the purchaser would have to apply to the various agencies and regulatory authorities for transfers of existing licences and permits or, if transfers are not possible, for new licences and permits. This is a process that would necessarily involve risk, delay, and cost. The RVO sought in this case achieves the timely and efficient preservation of the necessary licences and permits necessary for the operations of the Mine.

72 It is no secret that time is not on the side of a debtor company faced with Harte Gold's financial challenges. It is also relevant that the purchaser has agreed to provide DIP financing up to \$10.8 million and substantial cure costs of pre and post filing trade obligations. This is all financing required to be able to continue operations as a going concern at the Mine post closing and to fund the CCAA process.

73 The position of the purchaser is, not unreasonably, that it will not *both* continue to fund ongoing operations and the CCAA process *and* undertake a process of application to relevant government agencies for transfers of the Harte Gold licenses and permits (or, if necessary, for new ones) with all of the risks and uncertainties of possible adverse outcomes and indeterminant delays and costs associated with such a process. The RVO structure will enable the transaction to be completed efficiently and expeditiously, without exposure to these material risks, delays and costs.

74 The Monitor supports the use of the RVO transaction structure. The Monitor has also pointed out that the applicant holds some 513 mineral tenures, consisting of three freehold properties, seven leasehold properties, 468 mineral claims and 35 additional tenures. The reverse vesting structure avoids the need to amend the various registrations to reflect a new owner, which would add more cost and delay if the proposed purchase transaction was to proceed through a traditional asset purchase and vesting order.

75 In addition, Harte Gold has a significant number of contracts that will be retained under the SARSA. Again, the RVO transaction structure will avoid potentially significant delays and costs associated with having to seek consent to assignment from contract counter-parties or, if consents could not be obtained, orders assigning such contracts under s. 11.3 of the CCAA. The Monitor has also pointed out that under the SARSA and the RVO, the purchaser will be required to pay applicable cure costs in respect of the retained contracts which has been structured in substantially the same manner as contemplated by s. 11.3(4) of the CCAA if a contract was assigned by court order.

76 For all these reasons, I accept that the proposed RVO transaction structure is necessary to achieve the clear benefits of the Silver Lake purchase and that it is appropriate to approve this transaction in the circumstances.

Conclusion on RVO/Section 36 Issues

77 In all the circumstances, I find that the RVO sought in the circumstances of this case is in the interests of the creditors and stakeholders in general. I consider the RVO to be appropriate in the circumstances. The RVO will: provide for timely, efficient and impartial resolution of Harte Gold's insolvency; preserve and maximize the value of Harte Gold's assets; ensure a fair and equitable treatment of the claims against Harte Gold; protect the public interest (in the sense of preserving employment for well over 250 employees as well as numerous third party suppliers and service providers and maintaining Harte Gold's commitments to the First Nations peoples of the area); and, balances the costs and benefits of Harte Gold's restructuring or liquidation.

Release

78 Harte Gold seeks a Release which includes the present and former directors and officers of Harte Gold and the newcos, the Monitor and its legal counsel, and the purchaser and its directors, and officers. The proposed Release covers all present and future claims against the released parties based upon any fact, matter of occurrence in respect of the SARSA transactions or Harte Gold and its assets, business or affairs, except any claim for fraud or willful misconduct or any claim that is not permitted to be released under s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA.

79 CCAA courts have frequently approved releases, both in the context of a plan and in the absence of a CCAA plan, both on consent and in contested matters. These releases have been in favour of the parties, directors, officers, monitors, counsel, employees, shareholders and advisors.

80 I find that the requested Release is reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances. I base my decision on an assessment of following factors taken from *Lydian International Limited (Re)*, 2020 ONSC 4006 at para. 54. As is often the case in the exercise of discretionary powers, it is not necessary for each of the factors to apply for the release to be approved.

81 *Whether the claims to be released are rationally connected to the purpose of the restructuring:* The claims released are rationally connected to Harte Gold's restructuring. The Release will have the effect of diminishing claims against the released parties, which in turn will diminish indemnification claims by the released parties against the Administration Charge and the Directors' Charge. The result is a larger pool of cash available to satisfy creditor claims. Given that a purpose of a CCAA proceeding is to maximize creditor recovery, a release that helps achieve this goal is rationally connected to the purpose of the Company's restructuring.

82 *Whether the releasees contributed to the restructuring:* The released parties made significant contributions to Harte Gold's restructuring, both prior to and throughout these CCAA Proceedings. Among other things, the extensive efforts of the directors and management of Harte Gold were instrumental in the conduct of the prefiling strategic process, the SISP and the continued operations of Harte Gold during the CCAA proceedings. With a proposed sale that will maintain Harte Gold as a going concern and permit most creditors to receive recovery in full, these CCAA proceedings have had what must be considered a "successful" outcome for the benefit of Harte Gold's stakeholders. The released parties have clearly contributed time, energy and resources to achieve this outcome and accordingly, are deserving of a release.

83 *Whether the Release is fair, reasonable and not overly broad:* The Release is fair and reasonable. Harte Gold is unaware of any outstanding director claims or liabilities against its directors and officers. Similarly, Harte Gold is unaware of any claims against the advisors related to their provision of services to Harte Gold or to the purchaser relating to Harte Gold or these CCAA proceedings. As such, the Release is not expected to materially prejudice any stakeholders. Further, the Release is sufficiently narrow. Regulatory or environmental liabilities owed to any government authority have not been disclaimed and the language of the Release was specifically negotiated with the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines to preserve those identified obligations. Further, the Release carves out and preserves claims that are not permitted to be released pursuant to s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA and claims arising from fraud or wilful misconduct. The scope of the Release is sufficiently balanced and will allow Harte Gold and the released parties to move forward with the transaction and to conclude these CCAA proceedings.

84 *Whether the restructuring could succeed without the Release:* The Release is being sought, with the support of Silver Lake and the Appian parties (the most significant stakeholders in these CCAA proceedings) as it will enhance the certainty and finality of the transaction. Additionally, Harte Gold and the purchaser both take the position that the Release is an essential component to the transaction.

85 *Whether the Release benefits Harte Gold as well as the creditors generally:* The Release benefits Harte Gold and its creditors and other stakeholders by reducing the potential for the released parties to seek indemnification, thus minimizing further claims against the Administration Charge and the Directors' Charge.

86 *Creditors' knowledge of the nature and effect of the Release:* All creditors on the service list were served with materials relating to this motion. Harte Gold also made additional efforts to serve all parties with excluded claims under the transaction. Additionally, the form of the Release was included in the draft approval and reverse vesting order that was included in the original Application Record in these CCAA proceedings. All of this provided stakeholders with ample notice and time to raise concerns with Harte Gold or the Monitor. No creditor (or any other stakeholder) has objected to the Release. A specific claims process for claims against the released parties in these circumstances would only result in additional costs and delay without any apparent corresponding benefit.

Extension of the Stay

87 The current stay period expires on January 31, 2022. Under s. 11.02 of the CCAA, the court may grant an extension of a stay of proceedings where: (a) circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and (b) the debtor company satisfies the court that it has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

88 Harte Gold is seeking to extend the stay period to and including March 29, 2022 to allow it to proceed with the closing of the Silver Lake transaction, while at the same time preserving the status quo and preventing creditors and others from taking any steps to try and better their positions in comparison to other creditors.

89 No creditors are expected to suffer material prejudice as a result of the extension of the stay of proceedings. Harte Gold is acting in good faith and will continue to pay its post-filing obligations in the ordinary course. As detailed in Harte Gold's cash flow forecast, it is expected to have sufficient liquidity to continue its operations during the contemplated extension of the stay.

90 For these reasons the stay is extended to March 29, 2022.

Expansion of Monitor's Powers

91 The CCAA provides the Court with broad discretion in respect of the Monitor's functions. Section 23(1)(k) of the CCAA provides that the Monitor can "carry out any other functions in relation to the [debtor] company that the court may direct". In addition, of course, s. 11 of the CCAA authorizes this Court to make any order that is necessary and appropriate in the circumstances.

92 The order for the Monitor's expanded powers is intended to provide the Monitor with the power, effective upon the issuance of the approval and reverse vesting order, to administer the affairs of the newcos (which is necessary to complete the transaction), along with powers necessary to wind down these CCAA proceedings and to put the newcos into bankruptcy following the close of the transaction. No creditor is prejudiced by the expansion of the Monitor's powers to facilitate the transaction and the wind-down of the CCAA proceedings. On the contrary, the granting of such powers is necessary to achieve the benefits of the transaction to stakeholders which have been described above.

93 I approve the grant of the requested powers to the Monitor.

Conclusion

94 For all these reasons, the motion for an order approving the Silver Lake transaction, including the RVO structure, is granted. The additional requests for orders extending the stay and expanding the Monitor's powers are also granted.

Motion granted.

Footnotes

- 1 The total value of the consideration is, perhaps coincidentally, also roughly equivalent to the value of Harte Gold's assets as shown in its audited financial statements in the last full year prior to the commencement of these proceedings.