

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS
ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF INDEX ENERGY MILLS ROAD CORPORATION**

(the "Applicant")

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES

August 15, 2017

CASSELS BROCK & BLACKWELL LLP

2100 Scotia Plaza
40 King Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 3C2

Shayne Kukulowicz LSUC#30729S

Tel: 416.860.6463

Fax: 416.640.3176

skukulowicz@casselsbrock.com

Jane Dietrich LSUC# 49302U

Tel: 416.860.5223

Fax: 416.640.3144

jdietrich@casselsbrock.com

Lance Williams LSBC# 508874

Tel: 604.691.6112

Fax: 604.691.6120

lwilliams@casselsbrock.com

Lawyers for Index Energy Mills Road Corporation

INDEX

AUTHORITIES

Tab

- A. *Re Stelco Inc.*, 2004 CarswellOnt 1211 (Ont. SCJ [Comm List]) *Re Stelco Inc.*, 2004 CarswellOnt 1211 (SCJ), leave to appeal refused (2004), 48 CBR (4th) 299 (ONCA), leave to appeal refused 2005 CarswellOnt 5200 (SCC).
- B. *Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)*, [2009] OJ No 4286 (Ont SCJ [Comm List]).
- C. *Cinram International Inc.*, 2012 ONSC 3767 (Ont. SCJ [Comm List]).
- D. *Smurfit-Stone Container Canada Inc.*, 2009 CanLII 2493 (Ont SCJ [Comm List]).
- E. *Re Mobilicity Group*, 2013 ONSC 6167 (Ont. SCJ [Comm List]).
- F. *U.S. Steel Canada Inc. (Re)*, 2014 ONSC 6145 (Ont. SCJ).
- G. *Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services] Ltd., Re*, 2010 SCC 60 (SCC).
- H. *Re Performance Sports Group Ltd.*, 2016 ONSC 6800 (Ont. SCJ [Comm List]).
- I. *Re H.B. White Canada Corp.*, Initial Order of Justice Newbould dated July 7, 2016, in Court File No. CV16-11452-00CL (Ont. SCJ [Comm List]).
- J. *Re Sears Canada Inc. et al.*, Amended and Restated Initial Order of Justice Hainey dated June 22, 2017, in Court File No. CV-17-11846-00CL (Ont. SCJ [Comm List]).
- K. *Re Dondeb Inc. et al.*, dated January 15, 2013, in Court File No. CV-12-00009794-00CL (Ont. SCJ [Comm List]).
- L. *Re Jetsgo Corp*, JE 2005-881 (QCCS), 2005 CanLII 13012 (QCCS).

TAB A

2004 CarswellOnt 1211
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Stelco Inc., Re

2004 CarswellOnt 1211, [2004] O.J. No. 1257, [2004] O.T.C. 284, 129 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1065, 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT,
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED**

IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT WITH RESPECT TO
STELCO INC. AND THE OTHER APPLICANTS LISTED IN SCHEDULE "A"

APPLICATION UNDER THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS
AMENDED

Farley J.

Heard: March 5, 2004
Judgment: March 22, 2004
Docket: 04-CL-5306

Counsel: Michael E. Barrack, James D. Gage, Geoff R. Hall for Applicants
David Jacobs, Michael McCreary for Locals, 1005, 5328, 8782 of the United Steel Workers of America
Ken Rosenberg, Lily Harmer, Rob Centa for United Steelworkers of America
Bob Thornton, Kyla Mahar for Ernst & Young Inc., Monitor of the Applicants
Kevin J. Zych for Informal Committee of Stelco Bondholders
David R. Byers for CIT
Kevin McElcheran for GE
Murray Gold, Andrew Hatnay for Retired Salaried Beneficiaries
Lewis Gottheil for CAW Canada and its Local 523
Virginie Gauthier for Fleet
H. Whiteley for CIBC
Gail Rubenstein for FSCO
Kenneth D. Kraft for EDS Canada Inc.

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX](#) Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

[XIX.1](#) General principles

[XIX.1.b](#) Qualifying company

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Proposal — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Application of Act

Steel company S Inc. applied for protection under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA") on January 29, 2004 — Union locals moved to rescind initial order and dismiss initial application of S Inc. and its subsidiaries on ground S Inc. was not "debtor company" as defined in s. 2 of CCAA because S Inc. was not insolvent — Motion dismissed — Given time and steps involved in reorganization, condition of insolvency perforce required expanded meaning under CCAA — Union affiant stated that S Inc. will run out of funding by November 2004 — Given that November was ten months away from date of filing, S Inc. had liquidity problem — S Inc. realistically cannot expect any increase in its credit line with its lenders or access to further outside funding — S Inc. had negative equity of \$647 million — On balance of probabilities, S Inc. was insolvent and therefore was "debtor company" as at date of filing and entitled to apply for CCAA protection.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Farley J.*:

A Debtor (No. 64 of 1992), Re (1993), [1993] 1 W.L.R. 264 (Eng. Ch. Div.) — considered

Anvil Range Mining Corp., Re (2002), 2002 CarswellOnt 2254, 34 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Bank of Montreal v. I.M. Krisp Foods Ltd. (1996), [1997] 1 W.W.R. 209, 140 D.L.R. (4th) 33, 148 Sask. R. 135, 134 W.A.C. 135, 6 C.P.C. (4th) 90, 1996 CarswellSask 581 (Sask. C.A.) — considered

Barsi v. Farcas (1923), [1924] 1 W.W.R. 707, 2 C.B.R. 299, 18 Sask. L.R. 158, [1924] 1 D.L.R. 1154, 1923 CarswellSask 227 (Sask. C.A.) — referred to

Bell ExpressVu Ltd. Partnership v. Rex (2002), 2002 SCC 42, 2002 CarswellBC 851, 2002 CarswellBC 852, 100 B.C.L.R. (3d) 1, [2002] 5 W.W.R. 1, 212 D.L.R. (4th) 1, 287 N.R. 248, 18 C.P.R. (4th) 289, 166 B.C.A.C. 1, 271 W.A.C. 1, 93 C.R.R. (2d) 189, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 559 (S.C.C.) — considered

Challmie, Re (1976), 22 C.B.R. (N.S.) 78, 1976 CarswellBC 63 (B.C. S.C.) — considered

Clarkson v. Sterling (1887), 14 O.R. 460 (Ont. C.P.) — considered

Consolidated Seed Exports Ltd., Re (1986), 69 B.C.L.R. 273, 62 C.B.R. (N.S.) 156, 1986 CarswellBC 481 (B.C. S.C.) — considered

Cumberland Trading Inc., Re (1994), 23 C.B.R. (3d) 225, 1994 CarswellOnt 255 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered

Davidson v. Douglas (1868), 15 Gr. 347, 1868 CarswellOnt 167 (Ont. Ch.) — considered

Diemaster Tool Inc. v. Skvortsoff (Trustee of) (1991), 3 C.B.R. (3d) 133, 1991 CarswellOnt 168 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

Enterprise Capital Management Inc. v. Semi-Tech Corp. (1999), 1999 CarswellOnt 2213, 10 C.B.R. (4th) 133 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Gagnier, Re (1950), 30 C.B.R. 74, 1950 CarswellOnt 101 (Ont. S.C.) — considered

Gardner v. Newton (1916), 10 W.W.R. 51, 26 Man. R. 251, 29 D.L.R. 276, 1916 CarswellMan 83 (Man. K.B.) — considered

Inducon Development Corp., Re (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306, 1991 CarswellOnt 219 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

Kenwood Hills Development Inc., Re (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 44, 1995 CarswellOnt 38 (Ont. Bkcty.) — considered

King Petroleum Ltd., Re (1978), 29 C.B.R. (N.S.) 76, 1978 CarswellOnt 197 (Ont. S.C.) — considered

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered

Maybank Foods Inc. (Trustee of) v. Provisioners Maritimes Ltd. (1989), 92 N.S.R. (2d) 283, 75 C.B.R. (N.S.) 317, 45 B.L.R. 14, 237 A.P.R. 283, 1989 CarswellNS 27 (N.S. T.D.) — considered

Montreal Trust Co. of Canada v. Timber Lodge Ltd. (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 14, (sub nom. *Timber Lodge Ltd. v. Montreal Trust Co. of Canada (No. 1)*) 101 Nfld. & P.E.I.R. 73, (sub nom. *Timber Lodge Ltd. v. Montreal Trust Co. of Canada (No. 1)*) 321 A.P.R. 73, 1992 CarswellPEI 13 (P.E.I. C.A.) — referred to

MTM Electric Co., Re (1982), 42 C.B.R. (N.S.) 29, 1982 CarswellOnt 170 (Ont. Bkcty.) — considered

New Quebec Raglan Mines Ltd. v. Blok-Andersen (1993), 9 B.L.R. (2d) 93, 1993 CarswellOnt 173 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of) (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 1 O.R. (3d) 289, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 41 O.A.C. 282, 1990 CarswellOnt 139 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Trustee of) v. Olympia & York Realty Corp. (2001), 2001 CarswellOnt 2954, 16

[B.L.R. \(3d\) 74](#), [28 C.B.R. \(4th\) 294](#) (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Trustee of) v. Olympia & York Realty Corp. (2003), [2003 CarswellOnt 5210](#), [46 C.B.R. \(4th\) 313](#), (sub nom. *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Bankrupt) v. Olympia & York Realty Corp.*) [180 O.A.C. 158](#) (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Optical Recording Laboratories Inc., Re (1990), [2 C.B.R. \(3d\) 64](#), [75 D.L.R. \(4th\) 747](#), [42 O.A.C. 321](#), (sub nom. *Optical Recording Laboratories Inc. v. Digital Recording Corp.*) [1 O.R. \(3d\) 131](#), [1990 CarswellOnt 143](#) (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Pacific Mobile Corp., Re (1979), [32 C.B.R. \(N.S.\) 209](#), [1979 CarswellQue 76](#) (C.S. Que.) — referred to

PWA Corp. v. Gemini Group Automated Distribution Systems Inc. (1993), [103 D.L.R. \(4th\) 609](#), [49 C.P.R. \(3d\) 456](#), [64 O.A.C. 274](#), [15 O.R. \(3d\) 730](#), [10 B.L.R. \(2d\) 109](#), [1993 CarswellOnt 149](#) (Ont. C.A.) — considered

PWA Corp. v. Gemini Group Automated Distribution Systems Inc. (1993), [49 C.P.R. \(3d\) ix](#), [10 B.L.R. \(2d\) 244](#) (note), [104 D.L.R. \(4th\) vii](#), [68 O.A.C. 21](#) (note), [164 N.R. 78](#) (note), [16 O.R. \(3d\) xvi](#) (S.C.C.) — referred to

R. v. Proulx (2000), [\[2000\] 4 W.W.R. 21](#), [2000 SCC 5](#), [2000 CarswellMan 32](#), [2000 CarswellMan 33](#), [140 C.C.C. \(3d\) 449](#), [30 C.R. \(5th\) 1](#), [182 D.L.R. \(4th\) 1](#), [249 N.R. 201](#), [49 M.V.R. \(3d\) 163](#), [\[2000\] 1 S.C.R. 61](#), [142 Man. R. \(2d\) 161](#), [212 W.A.C. 161](#) (S.C.C.) — referred to

Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia (1991), [8 C.B.R. \(3d\) 312](#), [86 D.L.R. \(4th\) 621](#), [1991 CarswellOnt 220](#) (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

Standard Trustco Ltd. (Trustee of) v. Standard Trust Co. (1993), [13 O.R. \(3d\) 7](#), [21 C.B.R. \(3d\) 25](#), [1993 CarswellOnt 219](#) (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

TDM Software Systems Inc., Re (1986), [60 C.B.R. \(N.S.\) 92](#), [1986 CarswellOnt 203](#) (Ont. S.C.) — referred to

Viteway Natural Foods Ltd., Re (1986), [63 C.B.R. \(N.S.\) 157](#), [1986 CarswellBC 499](#) (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

Webb v. Stenton (1883), [11 Q.B.D. 518](#) (Eng. C.A.) — referred to

633746 Ontario Inc. (Trustee of) v. Salvati (1990), [79 C.B.R. \(N.S.\) 72](#), [73 O.R. \(2d\) 774](#), [1990 CarswellOnt 181](#) (Ont. S.C.) — considered

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. B-3

Generally — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

s. 2(1) “insolvent person” — referred to

s. 2(1) “insolvent person” (a) — considered

s. 2(1) “insolvent person” (b) — considered

s. 2(1) “insolvent person” (c) — considered

s. 43(7) — referred to

s. 121(1) — referred to

s. 121(2) — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

s. 2 “debtor company” — referred to

s. 2 “debtor company” (a) — considered

s. 2 “debtor company” (b) — considered

s. 2 “debtor company” (c) — considered

s. 2 “debtor company” (d) — considered

s. 12 — referred to

s. 12(1) “claim” — referred to

Winding-up and Restructuring Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11

Generally — referred to

Words and phrases considered:

debtor company

It seems to me that the [*Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36] test of insolvency . . . which I have determined is a proper interpretation is that the [*Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3] definition of [s. 2(1)] (a), (b) or (c) of insolvent person is acceptable with the caveat that as to (a), a financially troubled corporation is insolvent if it is reasonably expected to run out of liquidity within reasonable proximity of time as compared with the time reasonably required to implement a restructuring.

MOTION by union that steel company was not “debtor company” as defined in *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Farley J.:

1 As argued this motion by Locals 1005, 5328 and 8782 United Steel Workers of America (collectively “Union”) to rescind the initial order and dismiss the application of Stelco Inc. (“Stelco”) and various of its subsidiaries (collectively “Sub Applicants”) for access to the protection and process of the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (“CCAA”) was that this access should be denied on the basis that Stelco was not a “debtor company” as defined in s. 2 of the CCAA because it was not insolvent.

2 Allow me to observe that there was a great deal of debate in the materials and submissions as to the reason(s) that Stelco found itself in with respect to what Michael Locker (indicating he was “an expert in the area of corporate restructuring and a leading steel industry analyst”) swore to at paragraph 12 of his affidavit was the “current crisis”:

12. Contending with weak operating results and resulting tight cash flow, management has deliberately chosen not to fund its employee benefits. By contrast, Dofasco and certain other steel companies have consistently funded both their employee benefit obligations as well as debt service. If Stelco’s management had chosen to fund pension obligations, presumably with borrowed money, *the current crisis* and related restructuring plans would focus on debt restructuring as opposed to the reduction of employee benefits and related liabilities. [Emphasis added.]

3 For the purpose of determining whether Stelco is insolvent and therefore could be considered to be a debtor company, it matters not what the cause or who caused the financial difficulty that Stelco is in as admitted by Locker on behalf of the Union. The management of a corporation could be completely incompetent, inadvertently or advertently; the corporation could be in the grip of ruthless, hard hearted and hard nosed outside financiers; the corporation could be the innocent victim of uncaring policy of a level of government; the employees (unionized or non-unionized) could be completely incompetent, inadvertently or advertently; the relationship of labour and management could be absolutely poisonous; the corporation could be the victim of unforeseen events affecting its viability such as a fire destroying an essential area of its plant and equipment or of rampaging dumping. One or more or all of these factors (without being exhaustive), whether or not of varying degree and whether or not in combination of some may well have been the cause of a corporation’s difficulty. The point here is that Stelco’s difficulty exists; the only question is whether Stelco is insolvent within the meaning of that in the “debtor company” definition of the CCAA. However, I would point out, as I did in closing, that no matter how this motion turns out, Stelco does have a problem which has to be addressed - addressed within the CCAA process if Stelco is insolvent or addressed outside that process if Stelco is determined not to be insolvent. The status quo will lead to ruination of Stelco (and its Sub Applicants) and as a result will very badly affect its stakeholder, including pensioners, employees (unionized and non-unionized), management, creditors, suppliers, customers, local and other governments and the local communities. In such situations, time is a precious commodity; it cannot be wasted; no matter how much some would like to take time outs, the clock cannot be stopped. The watchwords of the Commercial List are equally applicable in such circumstances. They are communication, cooperation and common sense. I appreciate that these cases frequently invoke emotions running high and wild; that is understandable on a human basis but it is the considered, rational approach which will solve the problem.

4 The time to determine whether a corporation is insolvent for the purpose of it being a “debtor company” and thus able to make an application to proceed under the CCAA is the date of filing, in this case January 29, 2004.

5 The Monitor did not file a report as to this question of insolvency as it properly advised that it wished to take a neutral role. I understand however, that it did provide some assistance in the preparation of Exhibit C to Hap Steven’s affidavit.

6 If I determine in this motion that Stelco is not insolvent, then the initial order would be set aside. See *Montreal Trust Co. of Canada v. Timber Lodge Ltd.* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 14 (P.E.I. C.A.). The onus is on Stelco as I indicated in my January 29, 2004 endorsement.

7 S. 2 of the CCAA defines “debtor company” as:

"debtor company" means any company that:

(a) is bankrupt or insolvent;

(b) has committed an act of bankruptcy within the meaning of *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ["BIA"] or deemed insolvent within the meaning of the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act*, whether or not proceedings in respect of the company have been taken under either of those Acts;

(c) has made an authorized assignment against which a receiving order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*; or

(d) is in the course of being wound-up under the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act* because the company is insolvent.

8 Counsel for the Existing Stelco Lenders and the DIP Lenders posited that Stelco would be able to qualify under (b) in light of the fact that as of January 29, 2004 whether or not it was entitled to receive the CCAA protection under (a) as being insolvent, it had ceased to pay its pre-filing debts. I would merely observe as I did at the time of the hearing that I do not find this argument attractive in the least. The most that could be said for that is that such game playing would be ill advised and in my view would not be rewarded by the exercise of judicial discretion to allow such an applicant the benefit of a CCAA stay and other advantages of the procedure for if it were capriciously done where there is not reasonable need, then such ought not to be granted. However, I would point out that if a corporation did capriciously do so, then one might well expect a creditor-initiated application so as to take control of the process (including likely the ouster of management including directors who authorized such unnecessary stoppage); in such a case, while the corporation would not likely be successful in a corporation application, it is likely that a creditor application would find favour of judicial discretion.

9 This judicial discretion would be exercised in the same way generally as is the case where s. 43(7) of the BIA comes into play whereby a bankruptcy receiving order which otherwise meets the test may be refused. See *Kenwood Hills Development Inc., Re* (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 44 (Ont. Bkcty.) where at p. 45 I observed:

The discretion must be exercised judicially based on credible evidence; it should be used according to common sense and justice and in a manner which does not result in an injustice: See *Re Churchill Forest Industries (Manitoba) Ltd.* (1971), 16 C.B.R. (NS) 158 (Man. Q.B.).

10 Anderson J. in *MTM Electric Co., Re* (1982), 42 C.B.R. (N.S.) 29 (Ont. Bkcty.) at p. 30 declined to grant a bankruptcy receiving order for the eminently good sense reason that it would be counterproductive: "Having regard for the value of the enterprise and having regard to the evidence before me, I think it far from clear that a receiving order would confer a benefit on anyone." This common sense approach to the judicial exercise of discretion may be contrasted by the rather more puzzling approach in *TDM Software Systems Inc., Re* (1986), 60 C.B.R. (N.S.) 92 (Ont. S.C.).

11 The Union, supported by the International United Steel Workers of America ("International"), indicated that if certain of the obligations of Stelco were taken into account in the determination of insolvency, then a very good number of large Canadian corporations would be able to make an application under the CCAA. I am of the view that this concern can be addressed as follows. The test of insolvency is to be determined on its own merits, not on the basis that an otherwise technically insolvent corporation should not be allowed to apply. However, if a technically insolvent corporation were to apply and there was no material advantage to the corporation and its stakeholders (in other words, a pressing need to restructure), then one would expect that the court's discretion would be judicially exercised against granting CCAA protection and ancillary relief. In the case of Stelco, it is recognized, as discussed above, that it is in crisis and in need of restructuring - which restructuring, if it is insolvent, would be best accomplished within a CCAA proceeding. Further, I am of the view that the track record of CCAA proceedings in this country demonstrates a healthy respect for the fundamental concerns of interested parties and stakeholders. I have consistently observed that much more can be achieved by negotiations outside the courtroom where there is a reasonable exchange of information, views and the exploration of possible solutions

and negotiations held on a without prejudice basis than likely can be achieved by resorting to the legal combative atmosphere of the courtroom. A mutual problem requires a mutual solution. The basic interest of the CCAA is to rehabilitate insolvent corporations for the benefit of all stakeholders. To do this, the cause(s) of the insolvency must be fixed on a long term viable basis so that the corporation may be turned around. It is not achieved by positional bargaining in a tug of war between two parties, each trying for a larger slice of a defined size pie; it may be achieved by taking steps involving shorter term equitable sacrifices and implementing sensible approaches to improve productivity to ensure that the pie grows sufficiently for the long term to accommodate the reasonable needs of the parties.

12 It appears that it is a given that the Sub Applicants are in fact insolvent. The question then is whether Stelco is insolvent.

13 There was a question as to whether Stelco should be restricted to the material in its application as presented to the Court on January 29, 2004. I would observe that CCAA proceedings are not in the nature of the traditional adversarial lawsuit usually found in our courtrooms. It seems to me that it would be doing a disservice to the interest of the CCAA to artificially keep the Court in the dark on such a question. Presumably an otherwise deserving “debtor company” would not be allowed access to a continuing CCAA proceeding that it would be entitled to merely because some potential evidence were excluded for traditional adversarial technical reasons. I would point out that in such a case, there would be no prohibition against such a corporation reapplying (with the additional material) subsequently. In such a case, what would be the advantage for anyone of a “pause” before being able to proceed under the rehabilitative process under the CCAA. On a practical basis, I would note that all too often corporations will wait too long before applying, at least this was a significant problem in the early 1990s. In *Inducon Development Corp., Re* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306 (Ont. Gen. Div.), I observed:

Secondly, CCAA is designed to be remedial; it is not, however, designed to be preventative. CCAA should not be the last gasp of a dying company; it should be implemented, if it is to be implemented, at a stage prior to the death throe.

14 It seems to me that the phrase “death throe” could be reasonably replaced with “death spiral”. In *Cumberland Trading Inc., Re* (1994), 23 C.B.R. (3d) 225 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), I went on to expand on this at p. 228:

I would also observe that all too frequently debtors wait until virtually the last moment, the last moment, or in some cases, beyond the last moment before even beginning to think about reorganizational (and the attendant support that any successful reorganization requires from the creditors). I noted the lamentable tendency of debtors to deal with these situations as “last gasp” desperation moves in *Re Inducon Development Corp.* (1992), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 308 (Ont. Gen. Div.). To deal with matters on this basis minimizes the chances of success, even if “success” may have been available with earlier spade work.

15 I have not been able to find in the CCAA reported cases any instance where there has been an objection to a corporation availing itself of the facilities of the CCAA on the basis of whether the corporation was insolvent. Indeed, as indicated above, the major concern here has been that an applicant leaves it so late that the timetable of necessary steps may get impossibly compressed. That is not to say that there have not been objections by parties opposing the application on various other grounds. Prior to the 1992 amendments, there had to be debentures (plural) issued pursuant to a trust deed; I recall that in *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, 1 O.R. (3d) 289 (Ont. C.A.), the initial application was rejected in the morning because there had only been one debenture issued but another one was issued prior to the return to court that afternoon. This case stands for the general proposition that the CCAA should be given a large and liberal interpretation. I should note that there was in *Enterprise Capital Management Inc. v. Semi-Tech Corp.* (1999), 10 C.B.R. (4th) 133 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) a determination that in a creditor application, the corporation was found not to be insolvent, but see below as to BIA test (c) my views as to the correctness of this decision.

16 In *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) I observed at p. 32:

One of the purposes of the CCAA is to facilitate ongoing operations of a business where its assets have a greater value

as part of an integrated system than individually. The CCAA facilitates reorganization of a company where the alternative, sale of the property piecemeal, is likely to yield far less satisfaction to the creditors.

17 In *Anvil Range Mining Corp., Re* (2002), 34 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. C.A.), the court stated to the same effect:

The second submission is that the plan is contrary to the purposes of the CCAA. Courts have recognized that the purpose of the CCAA is to enable compromises to be made for the common benefit of the creditors and the company and to keep the company alive and out of the hands of liquidators.

18 Encompassed in this is the concept of saving employment if a restructuring will result in a viable enterprise. See *Diemaster Tool Inc. v. Skvortsoff (Trustee of)* (1991), 3 C.B.R. (3d) 133 (Ont. Gen. Div.). This concept has been a continuing thread in CCAA cases in this jurisdiction stretching back for at least the past 15 years, if not before.

19 I would also note that the jurisprudence and practical application of the bankruptcy and insolvency regime in place in Canada has been constantly evolving. The early jails of what became Canada were populated to the extent of almost half their capacity by bankrupts. Rehabilitation and a fresh start for the honest but unfortunate debtor came afterwards. Most recently, the *Bankruptcy Act* was revised to the BIA in 1992 to better facilitate the rehabilitative aspect of making a proposal to creditors. At the same time, the CCAA was amended to eliminate the threshold criterion of there having to be debentures issued under a trust deed (this concept was embodied in the CCAA upon its enactment in 1933 with a view that it would only be large companies with public issues of debt securities which could apply). The size restriction was continued as there was now a threshold criterion of at least \$5 million of claims against the applicant. While this restriction may appear discriminatory, it does have the practical advantage of taking into account that the costs (administrative costs including professional fees to the applicant, and indeed to the other parties who retain professionals) is a significant amount, even when viewed from the perspective of \$5 million. These costs would be prohibitive in a smaller situation. Parliament was mindful of the time horizons involved in proposals under BIA where the maximum length of a proceeding including a stay is six months (including all possible extensions) whereas under CCAA, the length is in the discretion of the court judicially exercised in accordance with the facts and the circumstances of the case. Certainly sooner is better than later. However, it is fair to observe that virtually all CCAA cases which proceed go on for over six months and those with complexity frequently exceed a year.

20 Restructurings are not now limited in practical terms to corporations merely compromising their debts with their creditors in a balance sheet exercise. Rather there has been quite an emphasis recently on operational restructuring as well so that the emerging company will have the benefit of a long term viable fix, all for the benefit of stakeholders. See *Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 312 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p. 314 where Borins J. states:

The proposed plan exemplifies the policy and objectives of the Act as it proposes a regime for the court-supervised re-organization for the Applicant company intended to avoid the devastating social and economic effects of a creditor-initiated termination of its ongoing business operations and enabling the company to carry on its business in a manner in which it is intended to cause the least possible harm to the company, its creditors, its employees and former employees and the communities in which it carries on and carried on its business operations.

21 The CCAA does not define “insolvent” or “insolvency”. Houlden & Morawetz, *The 2004 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (Toronto, Carswell; 2003) at p. 1107 (N5) states:

In interpreting “debtor company”, reference must be had to the definition of “insolvent person” in s. 2(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* . . .

To be able to use the Act, a company must be bankrupt or insolvent: *Reference re Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada)*, 16 C.B.R. 1, [1934] S.C.R. 659, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75. The company must, in its application, admit its

insolvency.

22 It appears to have become fairly common practice for applicants and others when reference is made to insolvency in the context of the CCAA to refer to the definition of “insolvent person” in the BIA. That definition is as follows:

s. 2(1) . . .

“insolvent person” means a person who is not bankrupt and who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada, and whose liability to creditors provable as claims under this Act amount to one thousand dollars, and

(a) who is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due,

(b) who has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due, or

(c) the aggregate of whose property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or, if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due.

23 Stelco acknowledges that it does not meet the test of (b); however, it does assert that it meets the test of both (a) and (c). In addition, however, Stelco also indicates that since the CCAA does not have a reference over to the BIA in relation to the (a) definition of “debtor company” as being a company that is “(a) bankrupt or insolvent”, then this term of “insolvent” should be given the meaning that the overall context of the CCAA requires. See the modern rule of statutory interpretation which directs the court to take a contextual and purposive approach to the language of the provision at issue as illustrated by *Bell ExpressVu Ltd. Partnership v. Rex*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 559 (S.C.C.) at p. 580:

Today there is only one principle or approach, namely the words of an Act are to be read in their entire context and in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament.

24 I note in particular that the (b), (c) and (d) aspects of the definition of “debtor company” all refer to other statutes, including the BIA; (a) does not. S. 12 of the CCAA defines “claims” with reference over to the BIA (and otherwise refers to the BIA and the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act*). It seems to me that there is merit in considering that the test for insolvency under the CCAA may differ somewhat from that under the BIA, so as to meet the special circumstances of the CCAA and those corporations which would apply under it. In that respect, I am mindful of the above discussion regarding the time that is usually and necessarily (in the circumstances) taken in a CCAA reorganization restructuring which is engaged in coming up with a plan of compromise and arrangement. The BIA definition would appear to have been historically focussed on the question of bankruptcy - and not reorganization of a corporation under a proposal since before 1992, secured creditors could not be forced to compromise their claims, so that in practice there were no reorganizations under the former *Bankruptcy Act* unless all secured creditors voluntarily agreed to have their secured claims compromised. The BIA definition then was essentially useful for being a pre-condition to the “end” situation of a bankruptcy petition or voluntary receiving order where the upshot would be a realization on the bankrupt’s assets (not likely involving the business carried on - and certainly not by the bankrupt). Insolvency under the BIA is also important as to the Paulian action events (eg., fraudulent preferences, settlements) as to the conduct of the debtor *prior* to the bankruptcy; similarly as to the question of provincial preference legislation. Reorganization under a plan or proposal, on the contrary, is with a general objective of the applicant continuing to exist, albeit that the CCAA may also be used to have an orderly disposition of the assets and undertaking in whole or in part.

25 It seems to me that given the time and steps involved in a reorganization, and the condition of insolvency performance requires an expanded meaning under the CCAA. Query whether the definition under the BIA is now sufficient in that light for the allowance of sufficient time to carry through with a realistically viable proposal within the maximum of six months allowed under the BIA? I think it sufficient to note that there would not be much sense in providing for a rehabilitation program of restructuring/reorganization under either statute if the entry test was that the applicant could not apply until a rather late stage of its financial difficulties with the rather automatic result that in situations of complexity of any material degree, the applicant would not have the financial resources sufficient to carry through to hopefully a successful end. This would indeed be contrary to the renewed emphasis of Parliament on “rescues” as exhibited by the 1992 and 1997 amendments to the CCAA and the BIA.

26 Allow me now to examine whether Stelco has been successful in meeting the onus of demonstrating with credible evidence on a common sense basis that it is insolvent within the meaning required by the CCAA in regard to the interpretation of “debtor company” in the context and within the purpose of that legislation. To a similar effect, see *PWA Corp. v. Gemini Group Automated Distribution Systems Inc.* (1993), 103 D.L.R. (4th) 609 (Ont. C.A.), leave to appeal to S.C.C. dismissed [(1993), 49 C.P.R. (3d) ix (S.C.C.)] wherein it was determined that the trial judge was correct in holding that a party was not insolvent and that the statutory definition of insolvency pursuant to the BIA definition was irrelevant to determine that issue, since the agreement in question effectively provided its own definition by implication. It seems to me that the CCAA test of insolvency advocated by Stelco and which I have determined is a proper interpretation is that the BIA definition of (a), (b) or (c) of insolvent person is acceptable with the caveat that as to (a), a financially troubled corporation is insolvent if it is reasonably expected to run out of liquidity within reasonable proximity of time as compared with the time reasonably required to implement a restructuring. That is, there should be a reasonable cushion, which cushion may be adjusted and indeed become in effect an encroachment depending upon reasonable access to DIP between financing. In the present case, Stelco accepts the view of the Union’s affiant, Michael Mackey of Deloitte and Touche that it will otherwise run out of funding by November 2004.

27 On that basis, allow me to determine whether Stelco is insolvent on the basis of (i) what I would refer to as the CCAA test as described immediately above, (ii) BIA test (a) or (iii) BIA test (c). In doing so, I will have to take into account the fact that Stephen, albeit a very experienced and skilled person in the field of restructurings under the CCAA, unfortunately did not appreciate that the material which was given to him in Exhibit E to his affidavit was modified by the caveats in the source material that in effect indicated that based on appraisals, the fair value of the real assets acquired was in excess of the purchase price for two of the U.S. comparators. Therefore the evidence as to these comparators is significantly weakened. In addition at Q. 175-177 in his cross examination, Stephen acknowledged that it was reasonable to assume that a purchaser would “take over some liabilities, some pension liabilities and OPEB liabilities, for workers who remain with the plant.” The extent of that assumption was not explored; however, I do note that there was acknowledgement on the part of the Union that such an assumption would also have a reciprocal negative effect on the purchase price.

28 The BIA tests are disjunctive so that anyone meeting any of these tests is determined to be insolvent: see *Optical Recording Laboratories Inc., Re* (1990), 75 D.L.R. (4th) 747 (Ont. C.A.) at p. 756; *Viteway Natural Foods Ltd., Re* (1986), 63 C.B.R. (N.S.) 157 (B.C. S.C.) at p. 161. Thus, if I determine that Stelco is insolvent on *any one* of these tests, then it would be a “debtor company” entitled to apply for protection under the CCAA.

29 In my view, the Union’s position that Stelco is not insolvent under BIA (a) because it has not entirely used up its cash and cash facilities (including its credit line), that is, it is not yet as of January 29, 2004 run out of liquidity conflates inappropriately the (a) test with the (b) test. The Union’s view would render the (a) test necessarily as being redundant. See *R. v. Proulx*, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 61 (S.C.C.) at p. 85 for the principle that no legislative provision ought to be interpreted in a manner which would “render it mere surplusage.” Indeed the plain meaning of the phrase “unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due” requires a construction of test (a) which permits the court to take a purposive assessment of a debtor’s ability to meet his future obligations. See *King Petroleum Ltd., Re* (1978), 29 C.B.R. (N.S.) 76 (Ont. S.C.) where Steele J. stated at p. 80:

With respect to cl. (a), it was argued that at the time the disputed payments were made the company was able to meet its obligations as they generally became due because no major debts were in fact due at that time. This was premised on the fact that the moneys owed to Imperial Oil were not due until 10 days after the receipt of the statements and that the

statements had not then been received. I am of the opinion that this is not a proper interpretation of cl. (a). *Clause (a) speaks in the present and future tenses and not in the past.* I am of the opinion that the company was an “insolvent person” within the meaning of cl. (a) because by the very payment-out of the money in question it placed itself in a position that it was unable to meet its obligations as they would generally become due. In other words, it had placed itself in a position that it would not be able to pay the obligations that it knew it had incurred and which it knew would become due in the immediate future. [Emphasis added.]

30 *King Petroleum Ltd.* was a case involving the question in a bankruptcy scenario of whether there was a fraudulent preference during a period when the corporation was insolvent. Under those circumstances, the “immediate future” does not have the same expansive meaning that one would attribute to a time period in a restructuring forward looking situation.

31 Stephen at paragraphs 40-49 addressed the restructuring question in general and its applicability to the Stelco situation. At paragraph 41, he outlined the significant stages as follows:

The process of restructuring under the CCAA entails a number of different stages, the most significant of which are as follows:

- (a) identification of the debtor’s stakeholders and their interests;
- (b) arranging for a process of meaningful communication;
- (c) dealing with immediate relationship issues arising from a CCAA filing;
- (d) sharing information about the issues giving rise to the debtor’s need to restructure;
- (e) developing restructuring alternatives; and
- (f) building a consensus around a plan of restructuring.

32 I note that January 29, 2004 is just 9-10 months away from November 2004. I accept as correct his conclusion based on his experience (and this is in accord with my own objective experience in large and complicated CCAA proceedings) that Stelco would have the liquidity problem within the time horizon indicated. In that regard, I also think it fair to observe that Stelco realistically cannot expect any increase in its credit line with its lenders or access further outside funding. To bridge the gap it must rely upon the stay to give it the uplift as to pre-filing liabilities (which the Union misinterpreted as a general turnaround in its cash position without taking into account this uplift). As well, the Union was of the view that recent price increases would relieve Stelco’s liquidity problems; however, the answers to undertaking in this respect indicated:

With respect to the Business Plan, the average spot market sales price per ton was \$514, and the average contract business sales price per ton was \$599. The Forecast reflects an average spot market sales price per ton of \$575, and average contract business sales price per ton of \$611. The average spot price used in the forecast considers further announced price increases, recognizing, among other things, the timing and the extent such increases are expected to become effective. The benefit of the increase in sales prices from the Business Plan is essentially offset by the substantial increase in production costs, and in particular in raw material costs, primarily scrap and coke, as well as higher working capital levels and a higher loan balance outstanding on the CIT credit facility as of January 2004.

I accept that this is generally a cancel out or wash in all material respects.

33 I note that \$145 million of cash resources had been used from January 1, 2003 to the date of filing. Use of the credit facility of \$350 million had increased from \$241 million on November 30, 2003 to \$293 million on the date of filing. There must be a reasonable reserve of liquidity to take into account day to day, week to week or month to month variances and also

provide for unforeseen circumstances such as the breakdown of a piece of vital equipment which would significantly affect production until remedied. Trade credit had been contracting as a result of appreciation by suppliers of Stelco's financial difficulties. The DIP financing of \$75 million is only available if Stelco is under CCAA protection. I also note that a shut down as a result of running out of liquidity would be complicated in the case of Stelco and that even if conditions turned around more than reasonably expected, start-up costs would be heavy and quite importantly, there would be a significant erosion of the customer base (reference should be had to the Slater Hamilton plant in this regard). One does not liquidate assets which one would not sell in the ordinary course of business to thereby artificially salvage some liquidity for the purpose of the test: see *Pacific Mobile Corp., Re* (1979), 32 C.B.R. (N.S.) 209 (C.S. Que.) at p. 220. As a rough test, I note that Stelco (albeit on a consolidated basis with all subsidiaries) running significantly behind plan in 2003 from its budget of a profit of \$80 million now to a projected loss of \$192 million and cash has gone from a positive \$209 million to a negative \$114 million.

34 Locker made the observation at paragraph 8 of his affidavit that:

8. Stelco has performed poorly for the past few years primarily due to an inadequate business strategy, poor utilization of assets, inefficient operations and generally weak management leadership and decision-making. This point is best supported by the fact that Stelco's local competitor, Dofasco, has generated outstanding results in the same period.

Table 1 to his affidavit would demonstrate that Dofasco has had superior profitability and cashflow performance than its "neighbour" Stelco. He went on to observe at paragraphs 36-37:

36. Stelco can achieve significant cost reductions through means other than cutting wages, pensions and benefits for employees and retirees. Stelco could bring its cost levels down to those of restructured U.S. mills, with the potential for lowering them below those of many U.S. mills.

37. Stelco could achieve substantial savings through productivity improvements within the mechanisms of the current collective agreements. More importantly, a major portion of this cost reduction could be achieved through constructive negotiations with the USWA in an out-of-court restructuring that does not require intervention of the courts through the vehicle of CCAA protection.

I accept his constructive comments that there is room for cost reductions and that there are substantial savings to be achieved through productivity improvements. However, I do not see anything detrimental to these discussions and negotiations by having them conducted within the umbrella of a CCAA proceeding. See my comments above regarding the CCAA in practice.

35 But I would observe and I am mystified by Locker's observations at paragraph 12 (quoted above), that Stelco should have borrowed to fund pension obligations to avoid its current financial crisis. This presumes that the borrowed funds would not constitute an obligation to be paid back as to principal and interest, but rather that it would assume the character of a cost-free "gift".

36 I note that Mackey, without the "laundry list" he indicates at paragraph 17 of his second affidavit, is unable to determine at paragraph 19 (for himself) whether Stelco was insolvent. Mackey was unable to avail himself of all available information in light of the Union's refusal to enter into a confidentiality agreement. He does not closely adhere to the BIA tests as they are defined. In the face of positive evidence about an applicant's financial position by an experienced person with expertise, it is not sufficient to displace this evidence by filing evidence which goes no further than raising questions: see *Anvil Range Mining Corp., supra* at p. 162.

37 The Union referred me to one of my decisions *Standard Trustco Ltd. (Trustee of) v. Standard Trust Co.* (1993), 13 O.R. (3d) 7 (Ont. Gen. Div.) where I stated as to the MacGirr affidavit:

The Trustee's cause of action is premised on MacGirr's opinion that STC was insolvent as at August 3, 1990 and

therefore the STC common shares and promissory note received by Trustco in return for the Injection had no value at the time the Injection was made. Further, MacGirr ascribed no value to the opportunity which the Injection gave to Trustco to restore STC and salvage its thought to be existing \$74 million investment. In stating his opinion MacGirr defined solvency as:

(a) the ability to meet liabilities as they fall due; and

(b) that assets exceed liabilities.

On cross-examination MacGirr testified that in his opinion on either test STC was insolvent as at August 3, 1990 since as to (a) STC was experiencing then a negative cash flow and as to (b) the STC financial statements incorrectly reflected values. As far as (a) is concerned, I would comment that while I concur with MacGirr that at some time in the long run a company that is experiencing a negative cash flow will eventually not be able to meet liabilities as they fall due but that is not the test (which is a “present exercise”). On that current basis STC was meeting its liabilities on a timely basis.

38 As will be seen from that expanded quote, MacGirr gave his own definitions of insolvency which are not the same as the s. 2 BIA tests (a), (b) and (c) but only a very loose paraphrase of (a) and (c) and an omission of (b). Nor was I referred to the *King Petroleum Ltd.* or *Proulx* cases *supra*. Further, it is obvious from the context that “*sometime in the long run . . . eventually*” is not a finite time in the foreseeable future.

39 I have not given any benefit to the \$313 - \$363 million of improvements referred to in the affidavit of William Vaughan at paragraph 115 as those appear to be capital expenditures which will have to be accommodated within a plan of arrangement or after emergence.

40 It seems to me that if the BIA (a) test is restrictively dealt with (as per my question to Union counsel as to how far in the future should one look on a prospective basis being answered “24 hours”) then Stelco would not be insolvent under that test. However, I am of the view that that would be unduly restrictive and a proper contextual and purposive interpretation to be given when it is being used for a restructuring purpose even under BIA would be to see whether there is a reasonably foreseeable (at the time of filing) expectation that there is a looming liquidity condition or crisis which will result in the applicant running out of “cash” to pay its debts as they generally become due in the future without the benefit of the say and ancillary protection and procedure by court authorization pursuant to an order. I think this is the more appropriate interpretation of BIA (a) test in the context of a reorganization or “rescue” as opposed to a threshold to bankruptcy consideration or a fraudulent preferences proceeding. On that basis, I would find Stelco insolvent from the date of filing. Even if one were not to give the latter interpretation to the BIA (a) test, clearly for the above reasons and analysis, if one looks at the meaning of “insolvent” within the context of a CCAA reorganization or rescue solely, then of necessity, the time horizon must be such that the liquidity crisis would occur in the sense of running out of “cash” but for the grant of the CCAA order. On that basis Stelco is certainly insolvent given its limited cash resources unused, its need for a cushion, its rate of cash burn recently experienced and anticipated.

41 What about the BIA (c) test which may be roughly referred to as an assets compared with obligations test. See *New Quebec Raglan Mines Ltd. v. Blok-Andersen*, [1993] O.J. No. 727 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) as to fair value and fair market valuation. The Union observed that there was no intention by Stelco to wind itself up or proceed with a sale of some or all of its assets and undertaking and therefore some of the liabilities which Stelco and Stephen took into account would not crystallize. However, as I discussed at the time of the hearing, the (c) test is what one might reasonably call or describe as an “artificial” or notional/hypothetical test. It presumes certain things which are in fact not necessarily contemplated to take place or to be involved. In that respect, I appreciate that it may be difficult to get one’s mind around that concept and down the right avenue of that (c) test. See my views at trial in *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Trustee of) v. Olympia & York Realty Corp.*, [2001] O.J. No. 3394 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paragraphs 13, 21 and 33; affirmed [2003] O.J. No. 5242 (Ont. C.A.). At paragraph 33, I observed in closing:

33 . . . They (and their expert witnesses) all had to contend with dealing with rambling and complicated facts and, in Section 100 BIA, a section which is difficult to administer when fmv [fair market value] in a notational or hypothetical

market involves ignoring what would often be regarded as self evidence truths but at the same time appreciating that this notational or hypothetical market requires that the objects being sold have to have realistic true to life attributes recognized.

42 The Court of Appeal stated at paragraphs 24-25 as follows:

24. Nor are the appellants correct to argue that the trial judge also assumed an imprudent vendor in arriving at his conclusion about the fair market value of the OYSF note would have to know that in order to realize value from the note any purchaser would immediately put OYSF and thus OYDL itself into bankruptcy to pre-empt a subsequent triggering event in favour of EIB. While this was so, and the trial judge clearly understood it, the error in this submission is that it seeks to inject into the analysis factors subjected to the circumstances of OYDL as vendor and not intrinsic to the value of the OYSF note. The calculation of fair market value does not permit this but rather must assume an unconstrained vendor.

25. The Applicants further argue that the trial judge eroded in determining the fair market value of the OYSF note by reference to a transaction which was entirely speculative because it was never considered by OYDL nor would have it been since it would have resulted in OYDL's own bankruptcy. I disagree. The transaction hypothesized by the trial judge was one between a notational, willing, prudent and informed vendor and purchaser based on factors relevant to the OYSF note itself rather than the particular circumstances of OYDL as the seller of the note. This is an entirely appropriate way to determine the fair market value of the OYSF note.

43 Test (c) deems a person to be insolvent if "the aggregate of [its] property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or of disposed at a fairly conducted sale under legal process would not be sufficient to enable payment of all [its] obligations, due and accruing due." The origins of this legislative test appear to be the decision of Spragge V-C in *Davidson v. Douglas* (1868), 15 Gr. 347 (Ont. Ch.) at p. 351 where he stated with respect to the solvency or insolvency of a debtor, the proper course is:

to see and examine whether all his property, real and personal, be sufficient if presently realized for the payment of his debts, and in this view we must estimate his land, as well as his chattel property, not at what his neighbours or others may consider to be its value, but at what it would bring in the market at a forced sale, or a sale where the seller cannot await his opportunities, but must sell.

44 In *Clarkson v. Sterling* (1887), 14 O.R. 460 (Ont. C.P.) at p. 463, Rose J. indicted that the sale must be fair and reasonable, but that the determination of fairness and reasonableness would depend on the facts of each case.

45 The Union essentially relied on garnishment cases. Because of the provisions relating as to which debts may or may not be garnished, these authorities are of somewhat limited value when dealing with the test (c) question. However I would refer to one of the Union's cases *Bank of Montreal v. I.M. Krisp Foods Ltd.*, [1996] S.J. No. 655 (Sask. C.A.) where it is stated at paragraph 11:

11. Few phrases have been as problematic to define as "debt due or accruing due". The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, 3rd ed. defines "accruing" as "arising in due course", but an examination of English and Canadian authority reveals that not all debts "arising in due course" are permitted to be garnisheed. (See Professor Dunlop's extensive research for his British Columbia Law Reform Commission's Report on Attachment of Debts Act, 1978 at 17 to 29 and is text Creditor-Debtor Law in Canada, 2nd ed. at 374 to 385.)

46 In *Barsi v. Farcas* (1923), [1924] 1 D.L.R. 1154 (Sask. C.A.), Lamont J.A. was cited for his statement at p. 522 of

Webb v. Stenton (1883), 11 Q.B.D. 518 (Eng. C.A.) that: “an accruing debt, therefore, is a debt not yet actually payable, but a debt which is represented by an existing obligation.”

47 Saunders J. noted in 633746 *Ontario Inc. (Trustee of) v. Salvati* (1990), 79 C.B.R. (N.S.) 72 (Ont. S.C.) at p. 81 that a sale out of the ordinary course of business would have an adverse effect on that actually realized.

48 There was no suggestion by any of the parties that any of the assets and undertaking would have any enhanced value from that shown on the financial statements prepared according to GAAP.

49 In *King Petroleum Ltd.*, *supra* at p. 81 Steele J. observed:

To consider the question of insolvency under cl. (c) I must look to the aggregate property of the company and come to a conclusion as to whether or not it would be sufficient to enable payment of all obligations due and accruing due. There are two tests to be applied: First, its fair value and, secondly, its value if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process. The balance sheet is a starting point, but the evidence relating to the fair value of the assets and what they might realize if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process must be reviewed in interpreting it. In this case, I find no difficulty in accepting the obligations shown as liabilities because they are known. I have more difficulty with respect to the assets.

50 To my view the preferable interpretation to be given to “sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due” is to be determined in the context of this test as a whole. What is being put up to satisfy those obligations is the debtor’s assets and undertaking *in total*; in other words, the debtor in essence is taken as having sold everything. There would be no residual assets and undertaking to pay off any obligations which would not be encompassed by the phrase “all of his obligations, due and accruing due”. Surely, there cannot be “orphan” obligations which are left hanging unsatisfied. It seems to me that the intention of “due and accruing due” was to cover off all obligations of whatever nature or kind and leave nothing in limbo.

51 S. 121(1) and (2) of the BIA, which are incorporated by reference in s. 12 of the CCAA, provide in respect to provable claims:

S. 121(1) All debts and liabilities, present or future, to which the bankrupt is subject on the day on which the bankrupt becomes bankrupt or to which bankrupt may become subject before the bankrupt’s discharge by reason of any obligation incurred before the day on which the bankrupt becomes bankrupt shall be deemed to be claims provable in proceedings under this Act.

(2) The determination whether a contingent or unliquidated claim is a provable claim and the valuation of such claim shall be made in accordance with s. 135.

52 *Houlden and Morawetz 2004 Annotated supra* at p. 537 (G28(3)) indicates:

The word “liability” is a very broad one. It includes all obligations to which the bankrupt is subject on the day on which he becomes bankrupt except for contingent and unliquidated claims which are dealt with in s. 121(2).

However contingent and unliquidated claims would be encompassed by the term “obligations”.

53 In *Gardner v. Newton* (1916), 29 D.L.R. 276 (Man. K.B.), Mathers C.J.K.B. observed at p. 281 that “contingent claim, that is, a claim which may or may not ripen into a debt, according as some future event does or does not happen.” See *A Debtor (No. 64 of 1992), Re*, [1993] 1 W.L.R. 264 (Eng. Ch. Div.) at p. 268 for the definition of a “liquidated sum” which is an amount which can be readily ascertained and hence by corollary an “unliquidated claim” would be one which is not easily

ascertained, but will have to be valued. In *Gagnier, Re* (1950), 30 C.B.R. 74 (Ont. S.C.), there appears to be a conflation of not only the (a) test with the (c) test, but also the invocation of the judicial discretion not to grant the receiving order pursuant to a bankruptcy petition, notwithstanding that “[the judge was] unable to find the debtor is bankrupt”. The debtor was able to survive the (a) test as he had the practice (accepted by all his suppliers) of providing them with post dated cheques. The (c) test was not a problem since the judge found that his assets should be valued at considerably more than his obligations. However, this case does illustrate that the application of the tests present some difficulties. These difficulties are magnified when one is dealing with something more significantly complex and a great deal larger than a haberdashery store - in the case before us, a giant corporation in which, amongst other things, is engaged in a very competitive history including competition from foreign sources which have recently restructured into more cost efficient structures, having shed certain of their obligations. As well, that is without taking into account that a sale would entail significant transaction costs. Even of greater significance would be the severance and termination payments to employees not continued by the new purchaser. Lastly, it was recognized by everyone at the hearing that Stelco’s plants, especially the Hamilton-Hilton works, have extremely high environmental liabilities lurking in the woodwork. Stephen observed that these obligations would be substantial, although not quantified.

54 It is true that there are no appraisals of the plant and equipment nor of the assets and undertaking of Stelco. Given the circumstances of this case and the complexities of the market, one may realistically question whether or not the appraisals would be all that helpful or accurate.

55 I would further observe that in the notional or hypothetical exercise of a sale, then all the obligations which would be triggered by such sale would have to be taken into account.

56 All liabilities, contingent or unliquidated would have to be taken into account. See *King Petroleum Ltd.*, *supra* p. 81; *Salvati*, *supra* pp. 80-1; *Maybank Foods Inc. (Trustee of) v. Provisioners Maritimes Ltd.* (1989), 45 B.L.R. 14 (N.S. T.D.) at p. 29; *Challmie, Re* (1976), 22 C.B.R. (N.S.) 78 (B.C. S.C.), at pp. 81-2. In *Challmie* the debtor ought to have known that his guarantee was very much exposed given the perilous state of his company whose liabilities he had guaranteed. It is interesting to note what was stated in *Maybank Foods Inc. (Trustee of)*, even if it is rather patently obvious. Tidman J. said in respect of the branch of the company at p. 29:

Mr. MacAdam argues also that the \$4.8 million employees’ severance obligation was not a liability on January 20, 1986. The *Bankruptcy Act* includes as obligations both those due and accruing due. Although the employees’ severance obligation was not due and payable on January 20, 1986 it was an obligation “accruing due”. The Toronto facility had experienced severe financial difficulties for some time; in fact, it was the major, if not the sole cause, of Maybank’s financial difficulties. I believe it is reasonable to conclude that a reasonably astute perspective buyer of the company has a going concern would have considered that obligation on January 20, 1986 and that it would have substantially reduced the price offered by that perspective buyer. Therefore that obligation must be considered as an obligation of the company on January 20, 1986.

57 With the greatest of respect for my colleague, I disagree with the conclusion of Ground J. in *Enterprise Capital Management Inc.*, *supra* as to the approach to be taken to “due and accruing due” when he observed at pp. 139-140:

It therefore becomes necessary to determine whether the principle amount of the Notes constitutes an obligation “due or accruing due” as of the date of this application.

There is a paucity of helpful authority on the meaning of “accruing due” for purposes of a definition of insolvency. Historically, in 1933, in *P. Lyall & Sons Construction Co. v. Baker*, [1933] O.R. 286 (Ont. C.A.), the Ontario Court of Appeal, in determining a question of set-off under the *Dominion Winding-Up Act* had to determine whether the amount claimed as set-off was a debt due or accruing due to the company in liquidation for purposes of that Act. Marsten J. at pp. 292-293 quoted from Moss J.A. in *Mail Printing Co. v. Clarkson* (1898), 25 O.R. 1 (Ont. C.A.) at p. 8:

A debt is defined to be a sum of money which is certainly, and at all event, payable without regard to the fact whether it be payable now or at a future time. And an accruing debt is a debt not yet actually payable, but a debt

which is represented by an existing obligation: Per Lindley L.J. in *Webb v. Stenton* (1883), 11 Q.D.D. at p. 529.

Whatever relevance such definition may have had for purposes of dealing with claims by and against companies in liquidation under the old winding-up legislation, it is apparent to me that it should not be applied to definitions of insolvency. To include every debt payable at some future date in “accruing due” for the purposes of insolvency tests would render numerous corporations, with long term debt due over a period of years in the future and anticipated to be paid out of future income, “insolvent” for the purposes of the BIA and therefore the CCAA. For the same reason, I do not accept the statement quoted in the *Enterprise factum* from the decision of the Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York in *Centennial Textiles Inc., Re*, 220 B.R. 165 (U.S.N.Y.D.C. 1998) that “if the present saleable value of assets are less than the amount required to pay existing debt as they mature, the debtor is insolvent”. In my view, the obligations, which are to be measured against the fair valuation of a company’s property as being obligations due and accruing due, must be limited to obligations currently payable or properly chargeable to the accounting period during which the test is being applied as, for example, a sinking fund payment due within the current year. Black’s Law Dictionary defines “accrued liability” as “an obligation or debt which is properly chargeable in a given accounting period, but which is not yet paid or payable”. The principal amount of the Notes is neither due nor accruing due in this sense.

58 There appears to be some confusion in this analysis as to “debts” and “obligations”, the latter being much broader than debts. Please see above as to my views concerning the floodgates argument under the BIA and CCAA being addressed by judicially exercised discretion even if “otherwise warranted” applications were made. I pause to note that an insolvency test under general corporate litigation need not be and likely is not identical, or indeed similar to that under these insolvency statutes. As well, it is curious to note that the cut off date is the end of the current fiscal period which could have radically different results if there were a calendar fiscal year and the application was variously made in the first week of January, mid-summer or the last day of December. Lastly, see above and below as to my views concerning the proper interpretation of this question of “accruing due”.

59 It seems to me that the phrase “accruing due” has been interpreted by the courts as broadly identifying obligations that will “become due”. See *Viteway Natural Foods Ltd.* below at pp. 163-4 - at least at some point in the future. Again, I would refer to my conclusion above that every obligation of the corporation in the hypothetical or notional sale must be treated as “accruing due” to avoid orphan obligations. In that context, it matters not that a wind-up pension liability may be discharged over 15 years; in a test (c) situation, it is crystallized on the date of the test. See *Optical Recording Laboratories Inc. supra* at pp. 756-7; *Viteway Natural Foods Ltd., Re* (1986), 63 C.B.R. (N.S.) 157 (B.C. S.C.) at pp. 164-63-4; *Consolidated Seed Exports Ltd., Re* (1986), 62 C.B.R. (N.S.) 156 (B.C. S.C.) at p. 163. In *Consolidated Seed Exports Ltd.*, Spencer J. at pp. 162-3 stated:

In my opinion, a futures broker is not in that special position. The third definition of “insolvency” may apply to a futures trader at any time even though he has open long positions in the market. Even though Consolidated’s long positions were not required to be closed on 10th December, the chance that they might show a profit by March 1981 or even on the following day and thus wipe out Consolidated’s cash deficit cannot save it from a condition of insolvency on that day. The circumstances fit precisely within the third definition; if all Consolidated’s assets had been sold on that day at a fair value, the proceeds would not have covered its obligations due and accruing due, including its obligations to pay in March 1981 for its long positions in rapeseed. The market prices from day to day establish a fair valuation. . . .

The contract to buy grain at a fixed price at a future time imposes a present obligation upon a trader taking a long position in the futures market to take delivery in exchange for payment at that future time. It is true that in the practice of the market, that obligation is nearly always washed out by buying an offsetting short contract, but until that is done the obligation stands. The trader does not know who will eventually be on the opposite side of his transaction if it is not offset but all transactions are treated as if the clearing house is on the other side. It is a present obligation due at a future time. It is therefore an obligation accruing due within the meaning of the third definition of “insolvency”.

60 The possibility of an expectancy of future profits or a change in the market is not sufficient; *Consolidated Seed*

Exports Ltd. at p. 162 emphasizes that the test is to be done on that day, the day of filing in the case of an application for reorganization.

61 I see no objection to using Exhibit C to Stephen's affidavit as an aid to review the balance sheet approach to test (c). While Stephen may not have known who prepared Exhibit C, he addressed each of its components in the text of his affidavit and as such he could have mechanically prepared the exhibit himself. He was comfortable with and agreed with each of its components. Stelco's factum at paragraphs 70-1 submits as follows:

70. In Exhibit C to his Affidavit, Mr. Stephen addresses a variety of adjustments to the Shareholder's Equity of Stelco necessary to reflect the values of assets and liabilities as would be required to determine whether Stelco met the test of insolvency under Clause C. In cross examination of both Mr. Vaughan and Mr. Stephen only one of these adjustments was challenged - the "Possible Reductions in Capital Assets."

71. The basis of the challenge was that the comparative sales analysis was flawed. In the submission of Stelco, none of these challenges has any merit. Even if the entire adjustment relating to the value in capital assets is ignored, the remaining adjustments leave Stelco with assets worth over \$600 million less than the value of its obligations due and accruing due. This fundamental fact is not challenged.

62 Stelco went on at paragraphs 74-5 of its factum to submit:

74. The values relied upon by Mr. Stephen if anything, understate the extent of Stelco's insolvency. As Mr. Stephen has stated, and no one has challenged by affidavit evidence or on cross examination, in a fairly conducted sale under legal process, the value of Stelco's working capital and other assets would be further impaired by: (i) increased environmental liabilities not reflected on the financial statements, (ii) increased pension deficiencies that would be generated on a wind up of the pension plans, (iii) severance and termination claims and (iv) substantial liquidation costs that would be incurred in connection with such a sale.

75. No one on behalf of the USWA has presented any evidence that the capital assets of Stelco are in excess of book value on a stand alone basis. Certainly no one has suggested that these assets would be in excess of book value if the related environmental legacy costs and collective agreements could not be separated from the assets.

63 Before turning to that exercise, I would also observe that test (c) is also disjunctive. There is an insolvency condition if the total obligation of the debtor exceed either (i) a fair valuation of its assets or (ii) the proceeds of a sale fairly conducted under legal process of its assets.

64 As discussed above and confirmed by Stephen, if there were a sale under legal process, then it would be unlikely, especially in this circumstance that values would be enhanced; in all probability they would be depressed from book value. Stephen took the balance sheet GAAP calculated figure of equity at November 30, 2003 as \$804.2 million. From that, he deducted the loss for December 2003 - January 2004 of \$17 million to arrive at an equity position of \$787.2 million as at the date of filing.

65 From that, he deducted, reasonably in my view, those "booked" assets that would have no value in a test (c) sale namely: (a) \$294 million of future income tax recourse which would need taxable income in the future to realize; (b) \$57 million for a write-off of the Platemill which is presently hot idled (while Locker observed that it would not be prohibitive in cost to restart production, I note that neither Stephen nor Vaughn were cross examined as to the decision not to do so); and (c) the capitalized deferred debt issue expense of \$3.2 million which is being written off over time and therefore, truly is a "nothing". This totals \$354.2 million so that the excess of value over liabilities before reflecting obligations not included in the financials directly, but which are, substantiated as to category in the notes would be \$433 million.

66 On a windup basis, there would be a pension deficiency of \$1252 million; however, Stephen conservatively in my view looked at the Mercer actuary calculations on the basis of a going concern finding deficiency of \$656 million. If the \$1252 million windup figure had been taken, then the picture would have been even bleaker than it is as Stephen has calculated it for test (c) purposes. In addition, there are deferred pension costs of \$198.7 million which under GAAP accounting calculations is allowed so as to defer recognition of past bad investment experience, but this has no realizable value. Then there is the question of Employee Future Benefits. These have been calculated as at December 31, 2003 by the Mercer actuary as \$909.3 million but only \$684 million has been accrued and booked on the financial statements so that there has to be an increased provision of \$225.3 million. These off balance sheet adjustments total \$1080 million.

67 Taking that last adjustment into account would result in a *negative* equity of (\$433 million minus \$1080 million) or *negative* \$647 million. On that basis without taking into account possible reductions in capital assets as dealt with in the somewhat flawed Exhibit E nor environmental and other costs discussed above, Stelco is insolvent according to the test (c). With respect to Exhibit E, I have not relied on it in any way, but it is entirely likely that a properly calculated Exhibit E would provide comparators (also being sold in the U.S. under legal process in a fairly conducted process) which tend to require a further downward adjustment. Based on test (c), Stelco is significantly, not marginally, under water.

68 In reaching my conclusion as to the negative equity (and I find that Stephen approached that exercise fairly and constructively), please note my comments above regarding the possible assumption of pension obligations by the purchaser being offset by a reduction of the purchase price. The 35% adjustment advocated as to pension and employee benefits in this regard is speculation by the Union. Secondly, the Union emphasized cash flow as being important in evaluation, but it must be remembered that Stelco has been negative cash flow for some time which would make that analysis unreliable and to the detriment of the Union's position. The Union treated the \$773 million estimated contribution to the shortfall in the pension deficiency by the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund as eliminating that as a Stelco obligation. That is not the case however as that Fund would be subrogated to the claims of the employees in that respect with a result that Stelco would remain liable for that \$773 million. Lastly, the Union indicated that there should be a \$155 million adjustment as to the negative equity in Sub Applicants when calculating Stelco's equity. While Stephen at Q. 181-2 acknowledged that there was no adjustment for that, I agree with him that there ought not to be since Stelco was being examined (and the calculations were based) on an unconsolidated basis, not on a consolidated basis.

69 In the end result, I have concluded on the balance of probabilities that Stelco is insolvent and therefore it is a "debtor company" as at the date of filing and entitled to apply for the CCAA initial order. My conclusion is that (i) BIA test (c) strongly shows Stelco is insolvent; (ii) BIA test (a) demonstrates, to a less certain but sufficient basis, an insolvency and (iii) the "new" CCAA test again strongly supports the conclusion of insolvency. I am further of the opinion that I properly exercised my discretion in granting Stelco and the Sub Applicants the initial order on January 29, 2004 and I would confirm that as of the present date with effect on the date of filing. The Union's motion is therefore dismissed.

70 I appreciate that all the employees (union and non-union alike) and the Union and the International have a justifiable pride in their work and their workplace - and a human concern about what the future holds for them. The pensioners are in the same position. Their respective positions can only be improved by engaging in discussion, an exchange of views and information reasonably advanced and conscientiously listened to and digested, leading to mutual problem solving, ideas and negotiations. Negative attitudes can only lead to the detriment to all stakeholders. Unfortunately there has been some finger pointing on various sides; that should be put behind everyone so that participants in this process can concentrate on the future and not inappropriately dwell on the past. I understand that there have been some discussions and interchange over the past two weeks since the hearing and that is a positive start.

Motion dismissed.

APPENDIX

2004 CarswellOnt 2936
Ontario Court of Appeal

Stelco Inc., Re

2004 CarswellOnt 2936, [2004] O.J. No. 1903

**In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36,
As Amended**

In the Matter of a Proposed Plan of Compromise or Arrangement with Respect to Stelco Inc. and the other
Applicants Listed on Schedule "A" Application under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c.
C-36, As Amended

Doherty J.A., Laskin J.A., Moldaver J.A.

Judgment: May 5, 2004
Docket: CA M31129

Counsel: David P. Jacobs, for Moving Party
Michael E. Barrack, for Responding Party

Subject: Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

Related Abridgment Classifications

For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX](#) Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

[XIX.1](#) General principles

[XIX.1.b](#) Qualifying company

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency

Per Curiam:

1 Leave to appeal refused. Costs to the respondents Stelco in the amount by \$2,000 and to the "primary lender" in the amount of \$1000.

End of Document

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

2004 CarswellOnt 5200
Supreme Court of Canada

Stelco Inc., Re

2004 CarswellOnt 5200, 2004 CarswellOnt 5201, [2004] S.C.C.A. No. 336, 338 N.R. 196 (note)

Local Union No. 1005 United Steelworkers of America, Local Union No. 5328 United Steelworkers of America, Local Union No. 8782 United Steelworkers of America v. Stelco Inc., CHT Steel Company Inc., Stelpipe Ltd., Stelwire Ltd., and Welland Pipe Ltd. (collectively “STELCO”), CIT Business Credit Canada Inc., GE Commercial Finance, Fleet Capital Canada (collectively the “Senior Lenders”)

Binnie J., Charron J., McLachlin C.J.C.

Judgment: December 9, 2004
Docket: 30447

Proceedings: Leave to appeal refused, 2004 CarswellOnt 2936 (Ont. C.A.); Leave to appeal refused, 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299, 2004 CarswellOnt 1211 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])

Counsel: None given

Subject: Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

Related Abridgment Classifications

For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.1 General principles](#)

[XIX.1.b Qualifying company](#)

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency

Per Curiam:

1 The application for leave to appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal for Ontario, Number M31129, dated May 5, 2004, is dismissed with costs.

TAB B

2009 CarswellOnt 6184
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 6184, [2009] O.J. No. 4286, 181 A.C.W.S. (3d) 853, 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT,
R.S.C. 1985, C-36. AS AMENDED**

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF CANWEST
GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS CORP. AND THE OTHER APPLICANTS LISTED ON SCHEDULE "A"

Pepall J.

Judgment: October 13, 2009
Docket: CV-09-8241-OOCL

Counsel: Lyndon Barnes, Edward Sellers, Jeremy Dacks for Applicants
Alan Merskey for Special Committee of the Board of Directors
David Byers, Maria Konyukhova for Proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.
Benjamin Zarnett, Robert Chadwick for Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders
Edmond Lamek for Asper Family
Peter H. Griffin, Peter J. Osborne for Management Directors, Royal Bank of Canada
Hilary Clarke for Bank of Nova Scotia
Steve Weisz for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.3 Arrangements](#)

[XIX.3.e Miscellaneous](#)

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Miscellaneous

Debtor companies experienced financial problems due to deteriorating economic environment in Canada — Debtor companies took steps to improve cash flow and to strengthen their balance sheets — Economic conditions did not improve nor did financial circumstances of debtor companies — They experienced significant tightening of credit from critical suppliers and trade creditors, reduction of advertising commitments, demands for reduced credit terms by newsprint and printing suppliers, and restrictions on or cancellation of credit cards for certain employees — Application was brought for relief pursuant to Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Application granted — Proposed monitor was appointed —

Companies qualified as debtor companies under Act — Debtor companies were in default of their obligations — Required statement of projected cash-flow and other financial documents required under s. 11(2) were filed — Stay of proceedings was granted to create stability and allow debtor companies to pursue their restructuring — Partnerships in application carried on operations that were integral and closely interrelated to business of debtor companies — It was just and convenient to grant relief requested with respect to partnerships — Debtor-in-possession financing was approved — Administration charge was granted — Debtor companies' request for authorization to pay pre-filing amounts owed to critical suppliers was granted — Directors' and officers' charge was granted — Key employee retention plans were approved — Extension of time for calling of annual general meeting was granted.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Pepall J.*:

Cadillac Fairview Inc., Re (1995), 1995 CarswellOnt 36, 30 C.B.R. (3d) 29 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re (2006), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187, 2006 ABQB 153, 2006 CarswellAlta 446 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

General Publishing Co., Re (2003), 39 C.B.R. (4th) 216, 2003 CarswellOnt 275 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Global Light Telecommunications Inc., Re (2004), 2004 BCSC 745, 2004 CarswellBC 1249, 2 C.B.R. (5th) 210, 33 B.C.L.R. (4th) 155 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

Grant Forest Products Inc., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4699, 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance) (2002), 287 N.R. 203, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 18 C.P.R. (4th) 1, 44 C.E.L.R. (N.S.) 161, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 211 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 223 F.T.R. 137 (note), 20 C.P.C. (5th) 1, 40 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, 2002 SCC 41, 2002 CarswellNat 822, 2002 CarswellNat 823, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 93 C.R.R. (2d) 219, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.) — followed

Smurfit-Stone Container Canada Inc., Re (2009), 50 C.B.R. (5th) 71, 2009 CarswellOnt 391 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299, 2004 CarswellOnt 1211 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 2936 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

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

Generally — referred to

Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C.

Chapter 15 — referred to

Canada Business Corporations Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44

Generally — referred to

s. 106(6) — referred to

s. 133(1) — referred to

s. 133(1)(b) — referred to

s. 133(3) — referred to

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

Generally — considered

s. 2 “debtor company” — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 11(2) — referred to

s. 11.2 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.2(1) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 11.2(4) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.4 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.4(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to

s. 11.4(3) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.51 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.52 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 23 — considered

Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43

s. 137(2) — considered

Rules considered:

Rules of Civil Procedure, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194
R. 38.09 — referred to

APPLICATION for relief pursuant to *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Pepall J.:

1 Canwest Global Communications Corp. ("Canwest Global"), its principal operating subsidiary, Canwest Media Inc. ("CMI"), and the other applicants listed on Schedule "A" of the Notice of Application apply for relief pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.¹ The applicants also seek to have the stay of proceedings and other provisions extend to the following partnerships: Canwest Television Limited Partnership ("CTLTP"), Fox Sports World Canada Partnership and The National Post Company/La Publication National Post ("The National Post Company"). The businesses operated by the applicants and the aforementioned partnerships include (i) Canwest's free-to-air television broadcast business (ie. the Global Television Network stations); (ii) certain subscription-based specialty television channels that are wholly owned and operated by CTLTP; and (iii) the National Post.

2 The Canwest Global enterprise as a whole includes the applicants, the partnerships and Canwest Global's other subsidiaries that are not applicants. The term Canwest will be used to refer to the entire enterprise. The term CMI Entities will be used to refer to the applicants and the three aforementioned partnerships. The following entities are not applicants nor is a stay sought in respect of any of them: the entities in Canwest's newspaper publishing and digital media business in Canada (other than the National Post Company) namely the Canwest Limited Partnership, Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Canwest Books Inc., and Canwest (Canada) Inc.; the Canadian subscription based specialty television channels acquired from Alliance Atlantis Communications Inc. in August, 2007 which are held jointly with Goldman Sachs Capital Partners and operated by CW Investments Co. and its subsidiaries; and subscription-based specialty television channels which are not wholly owned by CTLTP.

3 No one appearing opposed the relief requested.

Background Facts

4 Canwest is a leading Canadian media company with interests in twelve free-to-air television stations comprising the Global Television Network, subscription-based specialty television channels and newspaper publishing and digital media operations.

5 As of October 1, 2009, Canwest employed the full time equivalent of approximately 7,400 employees around the world. Of that number, the full time equivalent of approximately 1,700 are employed by the CMI Entities, the vast majority of whom work in Canada and 850 of whom work in Ontario.

6 Canwest Global owns 100% of CMI. CMI has direct or indirect ownership interests in all of the other CMI Entities. Ontario is the chief place of business of the CMI Entities.

7 Canwest Global is a public company continued under the *Canada Business Corporations Act*.² It has authorized capital consisting of an unlimited number of preference shares, multiple voting shares, subordinate voting shares, and non-voting shares. It is a "constrained-share company" which means that at least 66 2/3% of its voting shares must be beneficially owned by Canadians. The Asper family built the Canwest enterprise and family members hold various classes of shares. In April and May, 2009, corporate decision making was consolidated and streamlined.

8 The CMI Entities generate the majority of their revenue from the sale of advertising (approximately 77% on a consolidated basis). Fuelled by a deteriorating economic environment in Canada and elsewhere, in 2008 and 2009, they experienced a decline in their advertising revenues. This caused problems with cash flow and circumstances were exacerbated by their high fixed operating costs. In response to these conditions, the CMI Entities took steps to improve cash flow and to strengthen their balance sheets. They commenced workforce reductions and cost saving measures, sold certain interests and assets, and engaged in discussions with the CRTC and the Federal government on issues of concern.

9 Economic conditions did not improve nor did the financial circumstances of the CMI Entities. They experienced significant tightening of credit from critical suppliers and trade creditors, a further reduction of advertising commitments, demands for reduced credit terms by newsprint and printing suppliers, and restrictions on or cancellation of credit cards for certain employees.

10 In February, 2009, CMI breached certain of the financial covenants in its secured credit facility. It subsequently received waivers of the borrowing conditions on six occasions. On March 15, 2009, it failed to make an interest payment of US\$30.4 million due on 8% senior subordinated notes. CMI entered into negotiations with an ad hoc committee of the 8% senior subordinated noteholders holding approximately 72% of the notes (the "Ad Hoc Committee"). An agreement was reached wherein CMI and its subsidiary CTLP agreed to issue US\$105 million in 12% secured notes to members of the Ad Hoc Committee. At the same time, CMI entered into an agreement with CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. ("CIT") in which CIT agreed to provide a senior secured revolving asset based loan facility of up to \$75 million. CMI used the funds generated for operations and to repay amounts owing on the senior credit facility with a syndicate of lenders of which the Bank of Nova Scotia was the administrative agent. These funds were also used to settle related swap obligations.

11 Canwest Global reports its financial results on a consolidated basis. As at May 31, 2009, it had total consolidated assets with a net book value of \$4.855 billion and total consolidated liabilities of \$5.846 billion. The subsidiaries of Canwest Global that are not applicants or partnerships in this proceeding had short and long term debt totalling \$2.742 billion as at May 31, 2009 and the CMI Entities had indebtedness of approximately \$954 million. For the 9 months ended May 31, 2009, Canwest Global's consolidated revenues decreased by \$272 million or 11% compared to the same period in 2008. In addition, operating income before amortization decreased by \$253 million or 47%. It reported a consolidated net loss of \$1.578 billion compared to \$22 million for the same period in 2008. CMI reported that revenues for the Canadian television operations decreased by \$8 million or 4% in the third quarter of 2009 and operating profit was \$21 million compared to \$39 million in the same period in 2008.

12 The board of directors of Canwest Global struck a special committee of the board ("the Special Committee") with a mandate to explore and consider strategic alternatives in order to maximize value. That committee appointed Thomas Strike, who is the President, Corporate Development and Strategy Implementation of Canwest Global, as Recapitalization Officer and retained Hap Stephen, who is the Chairman and CEO of Stonecrest Capital Inc., as a Restructuring Advisor ("CRA").

13 On September 15, 2009, CMI failed to pay US\$30.4 million in interest payments due on the 8% senior subordinated notes.

14 On September 22, 2009, the board of directors of Canwest Global authorized the sale of all of the shares of Ten Network Holdings Limited (Australia) ("Ten Holdings") held by its subsidiary, Canwest Mediaworks Ireland Holdings ("CMIH"). Prior to the sale, the CMI Entities had consolidated indebtedness totalling US\$939.9 million pursuant to three facilities. CMI had issued 8% unsecured notes in an aggregate principal amount of US\$761,054,211. They were guaranteed by all of the CMI Entities except Canwest Global, and 30109, LLC. CMI had also issued 12% secured notes in an aggregate principal amount of US\$94 million. They were guaranteed by the CMI Entities. Amongst others, Canwest's subsidiary, CMIH, was a guarantor of both of these facilities. The 12% notes were secured by first ranking charges against all of the property of CMI, CTLP and the guarantors. In addition, pursuant to a credit agreement dated May 22, 2009 and subsequently amended, CMI has a senior secured revolving asset-based loan facility in the maximum amount of \$75 million with CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. ("CIT"). Prior to the sale, the debt amounted to \$23.4 million not including certain letters of credit. The facility is guaranteed by CTLP, CMIH and others and secured by first ranking charges against all of the property of CMI, CTLP, CMIH and other guarantors. Significant terms of the credit agreement are described in paragraph 37 of the proposed Monitor's report. Upon a CCAA filing by CMI and commencement of proceedings under Chapter 15 of the

Bankruptcy Code, the CIT facility converts into a DIP financing arrangement and increases to a maximum of \$100 million.

15 Consents from a majority of the 8% senior subordinated noteholders were necessary to allow the sale of the Ten Holdings shares. A Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement was entered into by CMI, CMIH, certain consenting noteholders and others wherein CMIH was allowed to lend the proceeds of sale to CMI.

16 The sale of CMIH's interest in Ten Holdings was settled on October 1, 2009. Gross proceeds of approximately \$634 million were realized. The proceeds were applied to fund general liquidity and operating costs of CMI, pay all amounts owing under the 12% secured notes and all amounts outstanding under the CIT facility except for certain letters of credit in an aggregate face amount of \$10.7 million. In addition, a portion of the proceeds was used to reduce the amount outstanding with respect to the 8% senior subordinated notes leaving an outstanding indebtedness thereunder of US\$393.25 million.

17 In consideration for the loan provided by CMIH to CMI, CMI issued a secured intercompany note in favour of CMIH in the principal amount of \$187.3 million and an unsecured promissory note in the principal amount of \$430.6 million. The secured note is subordinated to the CIT facility and is secured by a first ranking charge on the property of CMI and the guarantors. The payment of all amounts owing under the unsecured promissory note are subordinated and postponed in favour of amounts owing under the CIT facility. Canwest Global, CTLP and others have guaranteed the notes. It is contemplated that the debt that is the subject matter of the unsecured note will be compromised.

18 Without the funds advanced under the intercompany notes, the CMI Entities would be unable to meet their liabilities as they come due. The consent of the noteholders to the use of the Ten Holdings proceeds was predicated on the CMI Entities making this application for an Initial Order under the CCAA. Failure to do so and to take certain other steps constitute an event of default under the Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement, the CIT facility and other agreements. The CMI Entities have insufficient funds to satisfy their obligations including those under the intercompany notes and the 8% senior subordinated notes.

19 The stay of proceedings under the CCAA is sought so as to allow the CMI Entities to proceed to develop a plan of arrangement or compromise to implement a consensual "pre-packaged" recapitalization transaction. The CMI Entities and the Ad Hoc Committee of noteholders have agreed on the terms of a going concern recapitalization transaction which is intended to form the basis of the plan. The terms are reflected in a support agreement and term sheet. The recapitalization transaction contemplates amongst other things, a significant reduction of debt and a debt for equity restructuring. The applicants anticipate that a substantial number of the businesses operated by the CMI Entities will continue as going concerns thereby preserving enterprise value for stakeholders and maintaining employment for as many as possible. As mentioned, certain steps designed to implement the recapitalization transaction have already been taken prior to the commencement of these proceedings.

20 CMI has agreed to maintain not more than \$2.5 million as cash collateral in a deposit account with the Bank of Nova Scotia to secure cash management obligations owed to BNS. BNS holds first ranking security against those funds and no court ordered charge attaches to the funds in the account.

21 The CMI Entities maintain eleven defined benefit pension plans and four defined contribution pension plans. There is an aggregate solvency deficiency of \$13.3 million as at the last valuation date and a wind up deficiency of \$32.8 million. There are twelve television collective agreements eleven of which are negotiated with the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada. The Canadian Union of Public Employees negotiated the twelfth television collective agreement. It expires on December 31, 2010. The other collective agreements are in expired status. None of the approximately 250 employees of the National Post Company are unionized. The CMI Entities propose to honour their payroll obligations to their employees, including all pre-filing wages and employee benefits outstanding as at the date of the commencement of the CCAA proceedings and payments in connection with their pension obligations.

Proposed Monitor

22 The applicants propose that FTI Consulting Canada Inc. serve as the Monitor in these proceedings. It is clearly qualified to act and has provided the Court with its consent to act. Neither FTI nor any of its representatives have served in any of the capacities prohibited by section of the amendments to the CCAA.

Proposed Order

23 I have reviewed in some detail the history that preceded this application. It culminated in the presentation of the within application and proposed order. Having reviewed the materials and heard submissions, I was satisfied that the relief requested should be granted.

24 This case involves a consideration of the amendments to the CCAA that were proclaimed in force on September 18, 2009. While these were long awaited, in many instances they reflect practices and principles that have been adopted by insolvency practitioners and developed in the jurisprudence and academic writings on the subject of the CCAA. In no way do the amendments change or detract from the underlying purpose of the CCAA, namely to provide debtor companies with the opportunity to extract themselves from financial difficulties notwithstanding insolvency and to reorganize their affairs for the benefit of stakeholders. In my view, the amendments should be interpreted and applied with that objective in mind.

(a) Threshold Issues

25 Firstly, the applicants qualify as debtor companies under the CCAA. Their chief place of business is in Ontario. The applicants are affiliated debtor companies with total claims against them exceeding \$5 million. The CMI Entities are in default of their obligations. CMI does not have the necessary liquidity to make an interest payment in the amount of US\$30.4 million that was due on September 15, 2009 and none of the other CMI Entities who are all guarantors are able to make such a payment either. The assets of the CMI Entities are insufficient to discharge all of the liabilities. The CMI Entities are unable to satisfy their debts as they come due and they are insolvent. They are insolvent both under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*³ definition and under the more expansive definition of insolvency used in *Stelco Inc., Re*⁴. Absent these CCAA proceedings, the applicants would lack liquidity and would be unable to continue as going concerns. The CMI Entities have acknowledged their insolvency in the affidavit filed in support of the application.

26 Secondly, the required statement of projected cash-flow and other financial documents required under section 11(2) of the CCAA have been filed.

(b) Stay of Proceedings

27 Under section 11 of the CCAA, the Court has broad jurisdiction to grant a stay of proceedings and to give a debtor company a chance to develop a plan of compromise or arrangement. In my view, given the facts outlined, a stay is necessary to create stability and to allow the CMI Entities to pursue their restructuring.

(b) Partnerships and Foreign Subsidiaries

28 The applicants seek to extend the stay of proceedings and other relief to the aforementioned partnerships. The partnerships are intertwined with the applicants' ongoing operations. They own the National Post daily newspaper and Canadian free-to-air television assets and certain of its specialty television channels and some other television assets. These businesses constitute a significant portion of the overall enterprise value of the CMI Entities. The partnerships are also guarantors of the 8% senior subordinated notes.

29 While the CCAA definition of a company does not include a partnership or limited partnership, courts have repeatedly exercised their inherent jurisdiction to extend the scope of CCAA proceedings to encompass them. See for example *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re*⁵; *Smurfit-Stone Container Canada Inc., Re*⁶; and *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re*⁷. In this case, the partnerships carry on operations that are integral and closely interrelated to the business of the applicants. The operations and obligations of the partnerships are so intertwined with those of the applicants that irreparable harm would ensue if the requested stay were not granted. In my view, it is just and convenient to grant the relief requested with respect to the partnerships.

30 Certain applicants are foreign subsidiaries of CMI. Each is a guarantor under the 8% senior subordinated notes, the CIT credit agreement (and therefore the DIP facility), the intercompany notes and is party to the support agreement and the Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement. If the stay of proceedings was not extended to these entities, creditors could seek to enforce their guarantees. I am persuaded that the foreign subsidiary applicants as that term is defined in the affidavit filed are debtor companies within the meaning of section 2 of the CCAA and that I have jurisdiction and ought to grant the order requested as it relates to them. In this regard, I note that they are insolvent and each holds assets in Ontario in that they each maintain funds on deposit at the Bank of Nova Scotia in Toronto. See in this regard *Cadillac Fairview Inc., Re*⁸ and *Global Light Telecommunications Inc., Re*⁹

(C) DIP Financing

31 Turning to the DIP financing, the premise underlying approval of DIP financing is that it is a benefit to all stakeholders as it allows the debtors to protect going-concern value while they attempt to devise a plan acceptable to creditors. While in the past, courts relied on inherent jurisdiction to approve the terms of a DIP financing charge, the September 18, 2009 amendments to the CCAA now expressly provide jurisdiction to grant a DIP financing charge. Section 11.2 of the Act states:

(1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

(3) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.

(4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

(a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;

(b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;

(c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;

(d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;

(e) the nature and value of the company's property;

(f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and

(g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

32 In light of the language of section 11.2(1), the first issue to consider is whether notice has been given to secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge. Paragraph 57 of the proposed order affords priority to the DIP charge, the administration charge, the Directors' and Officers' charge and the KERP charge with the following exception: "any validly perfected purchase money security interest in favour of a secured creditor or any statutory encumbrance existing on the date of this order in favour of any person which is a "secured creditor" as defined in the CCAA in respect of any of source deductions from wages, employer health tax, workers compensation, GST/QST, PST payables, vacation pay and banked overtime for employees, and amounts under the Wage Earners' Protection Program that are subject

to a super priority claim under the BIA". This provision coupled with the notice that was provided satisfied me that secured creditors either were served or are unaffected by the DIP charge. This approach is both consistent with the legislation and practical.

33 Secondly, the Court must determine that the amount of the DIP is appropriate and required having regard to the debtors' cash-flow statement. The DIP charge is for up to \$100 million. Prior to entering into the CIT facility, the CMI Entities sought proposals from other third party lenders for a credit facility that would convert to a DIP facility should the CMI Entities be required to file for protection under the CCAA. The CIT facility was the best proposal submitted. In this case, it is contemplated that implementation of the plan will occur no later than April 15, 2010. The total amount of cash on hand is expected to be down to approximately \$10 million by late December, 2009 based on the cash flow forecast. The applicants state that this is an insufficient cushion for an enterprise of this magnitude. The cash-flow statements project the need for the liquidity provided by the DIP facility for the recapitalization transaction to be finalized. The facility is to accommodate additional liquidity requirements during the CCAA proceedings. It will enable the CMI Entities to operate as going concerns while pursuing the implementation and completion of a viable plan and will provide creditors with assurances of same. I also note that the proposed facility is simply a conversion of the pre-existing CIT facility and as such, it is expected that there would be no material prejudice to any of the creditors of the CMI Entities that arises from the granting of the DIP charge. I am persuaded that the amount is appropriate and required.

34 Thirdly, the DIP charge must not and does not secure an obligation that existed before the order was made. The only amount outstanding on the CIT facility is \$10.7 in outstanding letters of credit. These letters of credit are secured by existing security and it is proposed that that security rank ahead of the DIP charge.

35 Lastly, I must consider amongst others, the enumerated factors in paragraph 11.2(4) of the Act. I have already addressed some of them. The Management Directors of the applicants as that term is used in the materials filed will continue to manage the CMI Entities during the CCAA proceedings. It would appear that management has the confidence of its major creditors. The CMI Entities have appointed a CRA and a Restructuring Officer to negotiate and implement the recapitalization transaction and the aforementioned directors will continue to manage the CMI Entities during the CCAA proceedings. The DIP facility will enhance the prospects of a completed restructuring. CIT has stated that it will not convert the CIT facility into a DIP facility if the DIP charge is not approved. In its report, the proposed Monitor observes that the ability to borrow funds from a court approved DIP facility secured by the DIP charge is crucial to retain the confidence of the CMI Entities' creditors, employees and suppliers and would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made. The proposed Monitor is supportive of the DIP facility and charge.

36 For all of these reasons, I was prepared to approve the DIP facility and charge.

(d) Administration Charge

37 While an administration charge was customarily granted by courts to secure the fees and disbursements of the professional advisors who guided a debtor company through the CCAA process, as a result of the amendments to the CCAA, there is now statutory authority to grant such a charge. Section 11.52 of the CCAA states:

(1) On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in respect of the fees and expenses of

(a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;

(b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and

(c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

38 I must therefore be convinced that (1) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; (2) the amount is appropriate; and (3) the charge should extend to all of the proposed beneficiaries.

39 As with the DIP charge, the issue relating to notice to affected secured creditors has been addressed appropriately by the applicants. The amount requested is up to \$15 million. The beneficiaries of the charge are: the Monitor and its counsel; counsel to the CMI Entities; the financial advisor to the Special Committee and its counsel; counsel to the Management Directors; the CRA; the financial advisor to the Ad Hoc Committee; and RBC Capital Markets and its counsel. The proposed Monitor supports the aforementioned charge and considers it to be required and reasonable in the circumstances in order to preserve the going concern operations of the CMI Entities. The applicants submit that the above-note professionals who have played a necessary and integral role in the restructuring activities to date are necessary to implement the recapitalization transaction.

40 Estimating quantum is an inexact exercise but I am prepared to accept the amount as being appropriate. There has obviously been extensive negotiation by stakeholders and the restructuring is of considerable magnitude and complexity. I was prepared to accept the submissions relating to the administration charge. I have not included any requirement that all of these professionals be required to have their accounts scrutinized and approved by the Court but they should not preclude this possibility.

(e) Critical Suppliers

41 The next issue to consider is the applicants' request for authorization to pay pre-filing amounts owed to critical suppliers. In recognition that one of the purposes of the CCAA is to permit an insolvent corporation to remain in business, typically courts exercised their inherent jurisdiction to grant such authorization and a charge with respect to the provision of essential goods and services. In the recent amendments, Parliament codified the practice of permitting the payment of pre-filing amounts to critical suppliers and the provision of a charge. Specifically, section 11.4 provides:

(1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is satisfied that the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.

(2) If the court declares a person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.

(3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied under the terms of the order.

(4) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

42 Under these provisions, the Court must be satisfied that there has been notice to creditors likely to be affected by the charge, the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company, and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation. While one might interpret section 11.4 (3) as requiring a charge any time a person is declared to be a critical supplier, in my view, this provision only applies when a court is compelling a person to supply. The charge then provides protection to the unwilling supplier.

43 In this case, no charge is requested and no additional notice is therefore required. Indeed, there is an issue as to

whether in the absence of a request for a charge, section 11.4 is even applicable and the Court is left to rely on inherent jurisdiction. The section seems to be primarily directed to the conditions surrounding the granting of a charge to secure critical suppliers. That said, even if it is applicable, I am satisfied that the applicants have met the requirements. The CMI Entities seek authorization to make certain payments to third parties that provide goods and services integral to their business. These include television programming suppliers given the need for continuous and undisturbed flow of programming, newsprint suppliers given the dependency of the National Post on a continuous and uninterrupted supply of newsprint to enable it to publish and on newspaper distributors, and the American Express Corporate Card Program and Central Billed Accounts that are required for CMI Entity employees to perform their job functions. No payment would be made without the consent of the Monitor. I accept that these suppliers are critical in nature. The CMI Entities also seek more general authorization allowing them to pay other suppliers if in the opinion of the CMI Entities, the supplier is critical. Again, no payment would be made without the consent of the Monitor. In addition, again no charge securing any payments is sought. This is not contrary to the language of section 11.4 (1) or to its purpose. The CMI Entities seek the ability to pay other suppliers if in their opinion the supplier is critical to their business and ongoing operations. The order requested is facilitative and practical in nature. The proposed Monitor supports the applicants' request and states that it will work to ensure that payments to suppliers in respect of pre-filing liabilities are minimized. The Monitor is of course an officer of the Court and is always able to seek direction from the Court if necessary. In addition, it will report on any such additional payments when it files its reports for Court approval. In the circumstances outlined, I am prepared to grant the relief requested in this regard.

(f) Directors' and Officers' Charge

44 The applicants also seek a directors' and officers' ("D &O") charge in the amount of \$20 million. The proposed charge would rank after the administration charge, the existing CIT security, and the DIP charge. It would rank *pari passu* with the KERP charge discussed subsequently in this endorsement but postponed in right of payment to the extent of the first \$85 million payable under the secured intercompany note.

45 Again, the recent amendments to the CCAA allow for such a charge. Section 11.51 provides that:

- (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company
- (2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.
- (3) The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.
- (4) The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

46 I have already addressed the issue of notice to affected secured creditors. I must also be satisfied with the amount and that the charge is for obligations and liabilities the directors and officers may incur after the commencement of proceedings. It is not to extend to coverage of wilful misconduct or gross negligence and no order should be granted if adequate insurance at a reasonable cost could be obtained.

47 The proposed Monitor reports that the amount of \$20 million was estimated taking into consideration the existing D&O insurance and the potential liabilities which may attach including certain employee related and tax related obligations. The amount was negotiated with the DIP lender and the Ad Hoc Committee. The order proposed speaks of indemnification

relating to the failure of any of the CMI Entities, after the date of the order, to make certain payments. It also excludes gross negligence and wilful misconduct. The D&O insurance provides for \$30 million in coverage and \$10 million in excess coverage for a total of \$40 million. It will expire in a matter of weeks and Canwest Global has been unable to obtain additional or replacement coverage. I am advised that it also extends to others in the Canwest enterprise and not just to the CMI Entities. The directors and senior management are described as highly experienced, fully functional and qualified. The directors have indicated that they cannot continue in the restructuring effort unless the order includes the requested directors' charge.

48 The purpose of such a charge is to keep the directors and officers in place during the restructuring by providing them with protection against liabilities they could incur during the restructuring: *General Publishing Co., Re*¹⁰ Retaining the current directors and officers of the applicants would avoid destabilization and would assist in the restructuring. The proposed charge would enable the applicants to keep the experienced board of directors supported by experienced senior management. The proposed Monitor believes that the charge is required and is reasonable in the circumstances and also observes that it will not cover all of the directors' and officers' liabilities in the worst case scenario. In all of these circumstances, I approved the request.

(g) Key Employee Retention Plans

49 Approval of a KERP and a KERP charge are matters of discretion. In this case, the CMI Entities have developed KERPs that are designed to facilitate and encourage the continued participation of certain of the CMI Entities' senior executives and other key employees who are required to guide the CMI Entities through a successful restructuring with a view to preserving enterprise value. There are 20 KERP participants all of whom are described by the applicants as being critical to the successful restructuring of the CMI Entities. Details of the KERPs are outlined in the materials and the proposed Monitor's report. A charge of \$5.9 million is requested. The three Management Directors are seasoned executives with extensive experience in the broadcasting and publishing industries. They have played critical roles in the restructuring initiatives taken to date. The applicants state that it is probable that they would consider other employment opportunities if the KERPs were not secured by a KERP charge. The other proposed participants are also described as being crucial to the restructuring and it would be extremely difficult to find replacements for them

50 Significantly in my view, the Monitor who has scrutinized the proposed KERPs and charge is supportive. Furthermore, they have been approved by the Board, the Special Committee, the Human Resources Committee of Canwest Global and the Ad Hoc Committee. The factors enumerated in *Grant Forest Products Inc., Re*¹¹ have all been met and I am persuaded that the relief in this regard should be granted.

51 The applicants ask that the Confidential Supplement containing unredacted copies of the KERPs that reveal individually identifiable information and compensation information be sealed. Generally speaking, judges are most reluctant to grant sealing orders. An open court and public access are fundamental to our system of justice. Section 137(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act* provides authority to grant a sealing order and the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*¹² provides guidance on the appropriate legal principles to be applied. Firstly, the Court must be satisfied that the order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk. Secondly, the salutary effects of the order should outweigh its deleterious effects including the effects on the right to free expression which includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

52 In this case, the unredacted KERPs reveal individually identifiable information including compensation information. Protection of sensitive personal and compensation information the disclosure of which could cause harm to the individuals and to the CMI Entities is an important commercial interest that should be protected. The KERP participants have a reasonable expectation that their personal information would be kept confidential. As to the second branch of the test, the aggregate amount of the KERPs has been disclosed and the individual personal information adds nothing. It seems to me that this second branch of the test has been met. The relief requested is granted.

Annual Meeting

53 The CMI Entities seek an order postponing the annual general meeting of shareholders of Canwest Global. Pursuant to section 133 (1)(b) of the CBCA, a corporation is required to call an annual meeting by no later than February 28, 2010, being six months after the end of its preceding financial year which ended on August 31, 2009. Pursuant to section 133 (3), despite subsection (1), the corporation may apply to the court for an order extending the time for calling an annual meeting.

54 CCAA courts have commonly granted extensions of time for the calling of an annual general meeting. In this case, the CMI Entities including Canwest Global are devoting their time to stabilizing business and implementing a plan. Time and resources would be diverted if the time was not extended as requested and the preparation for and the holding of the annual meeting would likely impede the timely and desirable restructuring of the CMI Entities. Under section 106(6) of the CBCA, if directors of a corporation are not elected, the incumbent directors continue. Financial and other information will be available on the proposed Monitor's website. An extension is properly granted.

Other

55 The applicants request authorization to commence Chapter 15 proceedings in the U.S. Continued timely supply of U.S. network and other programming is necessary to preserve going concern value. Commencement of Chapter 15 proceedings to have the CCAA proceedings recognized as "foreign main proceedings" is a prerequisite to the conversion of the CIT facility into the DIP facility. Authorization is granted.

56 Canwest's various corporate and other entities share certain business services. They are seeking to continue to provide and receive inter-company services in the ordinary course during the CCAA proceedings. This is supported by the proposed Monitor and FTI will monitor and report to the Court on matters pertaining to the provision of inter-company services.

57 Section 23 of the amended CCAA now addresses certain duties and functions of the Monitor including the provision of notice of an Initial Order although the Court may order otherwise. Here the financial threshold for notice to creditors has been increased from \$1000 to \$5000 so as to reduce the burden and cost of such a process. The proceedings will be widely published in the media and the Initial Order is to be posted on the Monitor's website. Other meritorious adjustments were also made to the notice provisions.

58 This is a "pre-packaged" restructuring and as such, stakeholders have negotiated and agreed on the terms of the requested order. That said, not every stakeholder was before me. For this reason, interested parties are reminded that the order includes the usual come back provision. The return date of any motion to vary, rescind or affect the provisions relating to the CIT credit agreement or the CMI DIP must be no later than November 5, 2009.

59 I have obviously not addressed every provision in the order but have attempted to address some key provisions. In support of the requested relief, the applicants filed a factum and the proposed Monitor filed a report. These were most helpful. A factum is required under Rule 38.09 of the Rules of Civil Procedure. Both a factum and a proposed Monitor's report should customarily be filed with a request for an Initial Order under the CCAA.

Conclusion

60 Weak economic conditions and a high debt load do not a happy couple make but clearly many of the stakeholders have been working hard to produce as desirable an outcome as possible in the circumstances. Hopefully the cooperation will persist.

Application granted.

Footnotes

¹ R.S.C. 1985, c. C. 36, as amended

² R.S.C. 1985, c.C.44.

³ R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, as amended.

⁴ (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); leave to appeal refused 2004 CarswellOnt 2936 (Ont. C.A.).

⁵ (1993), 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

⁶ [2009] O.J. No. 349 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

⁷ (2006), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187 (Alta. Q.B.).

⁸ (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 29 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

⁹ (2004), 33 B.C.L.R. (4th) 155 (B.C. S.C.).

¹⁰ (2003), 39 C.B.R. (4th) 216 (Ont. S.C.J.).

¹¹ [2009] O.J. No. 3344 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]). That said, given the nature of the relationship between a board of directors and senior management, it may not always be appropriate to give undue consideration to the principle of business judgment.

¹² [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.).

TAB C

2012 ONSC 3767
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Cinram International Inc., Re

2012 CarswellOnt 8413, 2012 ONSC 3767, 217 A.C.W.S. (3d) 11, 91 C.B.R. (5th) 46

**In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors
Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as Amended**

And In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Cinram International Inc., Cinram
International Income Fund, CII Trust and The Companies Listed in Schedule "A" (Applicants)

Morawetz J.

Heard: June 25, 2012

Judgment: June 26, 2012

Docket: CV-12-9767-00CL

Counsel: Robert J. Chadwick, Melaney Wagner, Caroline Descours for Applicants

Steven Golick for Warner Electra-Atlantic Corp.

Steven Weisz for Pre-Petition First Lien Agent, Pre-Petition Second Lien Agent and DIP Agent

Tracy Sandler for Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation

David Byers for Proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Inc.

Subject: Insolvency

Headnote

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

C group of companies was replicator and distributor of CDs and DVDs with operational footprint across North America and Europe — C group experienced significant declines in revenue and EBITDA, and had insufficient funds to meet their immediate cash requirements as result of liquidity challenges — C group sought protection of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — C group brought application seeking initial order under Act, and relief including stay of proceedings against third party non-applicant; authorization to make pre-filing payments; and approval of certain Court-ordered charges over their assets relating to their DIP Financing, administrative costs, indemnification of their trustees, directors and officers, Key Employee Retention Plan, and consent consideration — Application granted — Applicants met all qualifications established for relief under Act — Charges referenced in initial order were approved — Relief requested in initial order was extensive and went beyond what court usually considers on initial hearing; however, in circumstances, requested relief was appropriate — Applicants spent considerable time reviewing their alternatives and did so in consultative manner with their senior secured lenders — Senior secured lenders supported application, notwithstanding that it was clear that they would suffer significant shortfall on their positions.

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

C group of companies was replicator and distributor of CDs and DVDs with operational footprint across North America and Europe — C group experienced significant declines in revenue and EBITDA, and had insufficient funds to meet their immediate cash requirements as result of liquidity challenges — C group brought application seeking initial order under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and other relief, including authorization for C International to act as foreign representative in within proceedings to seek recognition order under Chapter 15 of U.S. Bankruptcy Code on basis that Ontario, Canada was Centre of Main Interest (COMI) of applicants — Application granted on other grounds — It is

function of receiving court, in this case, U.S. Bankruptcy Court for District of Delaware, to make determination on location of COMI and to determine whether present proceeding is foreign main proceeding for purposes of Chapter 15.

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

Stay against third party non-applicant — C group of companies was replicator and distributor of CDs and DVDs with operational footprint across North America and Europe — C group experienced significant declines in revenue and EBITDA, and had insufficient funds to meet their immediate cash requirements as result of liquidity challenges — C group sought protection of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — C LP was not applicant in proceedings; however, C LP formed part of C group's income trust structure with C Fund, ultimate parent of C group — C group brought application seeking initial order under Act, including stay of proceedings against C LP — Application granted — Applicants met all qualifications established for relief under Act — Charges referenced in initial order were approved — Relief requested in initial order was extensive and went beyond what court usually considers on initial hearing; however, in circumstances, requested relief was appropriate.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by Morawetz J.:

Brainhunter Inc., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 7627 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Cadillac Fairview Inc., Re (1995), 1995 CarswellOnt 36, 30 C.B.R. (3d) 29 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 6184, 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re (2010), 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115, 2010 CarswellOnt 212, 2010 ONSC 222 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Fraser Papers Inc., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 3658, 56 C.B.R. (5th) 194 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Global Light Telecommunications Inc., Re (2004), 2004 BCSC 745, 2004 CarswellBC 1249, 2 C.B.R. (5th) 210, 33 B.C.L.R. (4th) 155 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

Grant Forest Products Inc., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4699, 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd. (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, 1990 CarswellBC 394, 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, (sub nom. *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada*) [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of) (1990), 1990 CarswellOnt 139, 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 1 O.R. (3d) 289, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 41 O.A.C. 282 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Prizm Income Fund, Re (2011), 2011 ONSC 2061, 2011 CarswellOnt 2258, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 213 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance) (2002), 287 N.R. 203, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 18 C.P.R. (4th) 1, 44 C.E.L.R. (N.S.) 161, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 211 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 223 F.T.R. 137 (note), 20 C.P.C. (5th) 1, 40 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, 2002 SCC 41, 2002 CarswellNat 822, 2002 CarswellNat 823, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 93 C.R.R. (2d) 219, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.) — considered

Sino-Forest Corp., Re (2012), 2012 CarswellOnt 4117, 2012 ONSC 2063 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299, 2004 CarswellOnt 1211 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 2936 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 338 N.R. 196 (note), 2004 CarswellOnt 5200, 2004 CarswellOnt 5201 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Sulphur Corp. of Canada Ltd., Re (2002), 2002 CarswellAlta 896, 2002 ABQB 682, [2002] 10 W.W.R. 491, 5 Alta. L.R. (4th) 251, 319 A.R. 152, 35 C.B.R. (4th) 304 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

T. Eaton Co., Re (1997), 1997 CarswellOnt 1914, 46 C.B.R. (3d) 293 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

Timminco Ltd., Re (2012), 2012 CarswellOnt 1466, 2012 ONSC 948, 95 C.C.P.B. 222, 86 C.B.R. (5th) 171 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Timminco Ltd., Re (2012), 2012 ONSC 106, 2012 CarswellOnt 1059, 89 C.B.R. (5th) 127 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Timminco Ltd., Re (2012), 2012 ONSC 506, 95 C.C.P.B. 48, 2012 CarswellOnt 1263, 85 C.B.R. (5th) 169 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Woodward's Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 236, 79 B.C.L.R. (2d) 257, 1993 CarswellBC 530 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

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

Generally — referred to

s. 2 "insolvent person" — considered

Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. 1982

Chapter 15 — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

- s. 2(1) "company" — considered
- s. 2(1) "debtor company" — considered
- s. 3(1) — considered
- s. 3(2) — considered
- s. 11 — considered
- s. 11.2 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered
- s. 11.2(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered
- s. 11.2(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered
- s. 11.2(4) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered
- s. 11.4 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered
- s. 11.51 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered
- s. 11.52 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

APPLICATION by group of debtor companies for initial order and other relief under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Morawetz J.:

- 1 Cinram International Inc. ("CII"), Cinram International Income Fund ("Cinram Fund"), CII Trust and the Companies listed in Schedule "A" (collectively, the "Applicants") brought this application seeking an initial order (the "Initial Order") pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA"). The Applicants also request that the court exercise its jurisdiction to extend a stay of proceedings and other benefits under the Initial Order to Cinram International Limited Partnership ("Cinram LP", collectively with the Applicants, the "CCAA Parties").
- 2 Cinram Fund, together with its direct and indirect subsidiaries (collectively, "Cinram" or the "Cinram Group") is a replicator and distributor of CDs and DVDs. Cinram has a diversified operational footprint across North America and Europe that enables it to meet the replication and logistics demands of its customers.
- 3 The evidentiary record establishes that Cinram has experienced significant declines in revenue and EBITDA, which, according to Cinram, are a result of the economic downturn in Cinram's primary markets of North America and Europe, which impacted consumers' discretionary spending and adversely affected the entire industry.
- 4 Cinram advises that over the past several years it has continued to evaluate its strategic alternatives and rationalize its operating footprint in order to attempt to balance its ongoing operations and financial challenges with its existing debt levels. However, despite cost reductions and recapitalized initiatives and the implementation of a variety of restructuring alternatives, the Cinram Group has experienced a number of challenges that has led to it seeking protection under the CCAA.
- 5 Counsel to Cinram outlined the principal objectives of these CCAA proceedings as:
 - (i) to ensure the ongoing operations of the Cinram Group;
 - (ii) to ensure the CCAA Parties have the necessary availability of working capital funds to maximize the ongoing business of the Cinram Group for the benefit of its stakeholders; and

(iii) to complete the sale and transfer of substantially all of the Cinram Group's business as a going concern (the "Proposed Transaction").

6 Cinram contemplates that these CCAA proceedings will be the primary court supervised restructuring of the CCAA Parties. Cinram has operations in the United States and certain of the Applicants are incorporated under the laws of the United States. Cinram, however, takes the position that Canada is the nerve centre of the Cinram Group.

7 The Applicants also seek authorization for Cinram International ULC ("Cinram ULC") to act as "foreign representative" in the within proceedings to seek a recognition order under Chapter 15 of the United States Bankruptcy Code ("Chapter 15"). Cinram advises that the proceedings under Chapter 15 are intended to ensure that the CCAA Parties are protected from creditor actions in the United States and to assist with the global implementation of the Proposed Transaction to be undertaken pursuant to these CCAA proceedings.

8 Counsel to the Applicants submits that the CCAA Parties are part of a consolidated business in Canada, the United States and Europe that is headquartered in Canada and operationally and functionally integrated in many significant respects. Cinram is one of the world's largest providers of pre-recorded multi-media products and related logistics services. It has facilities in North America and Europe, and it:

(i) manufactures DVDs, blue ray disks and CDs, and provides distribution services for motion picture studios, music labels, video game publishers, computer software companies, telecommunication companies and retailers around the world;

(ii) provides various digital media services through One K Studios, LLC; and

(iii) provides retail inventory control and forecasting services through Cinram Retail Services LLC (collectively, the "Cinram Business").

9 Cinram contemplates that the Proposed Transaction could allow it to restore itself as a market leader in the industry. Cinram takes the position that it requires CCAA protection to provide stability to its operations and to complete the Proposed Transaction.

10 The Proposed Transaction has the support of the lenders forming the steering committee with respect to Cinram's First Lien Credit Facilities (the "Steering Committee"), the members of which have been subject to confidentiality agreements and represent 40% of the loans under Cinram's First Lien Credit Facilities (the "Initial Consenting Lenders"). Cinram also anticipates further support of the Proposed Transaction from additional lenders under its credit facilities following the public announcement of the Proposed Transaction.

11 Cinram Fund is the direct or indirect parent and sole shareholder of all of the subsidiaries in Cinram's corporate structure. A simplified corporate structure of the Cinram Group showing all of the CCAA Parties, including the designation of the CCAA Parties' business segments and certain non-filing entities, is set out in the Pre-Filing Report of FTI Consulting Inc. (the "Monitor") at paragraph 13. A copy is attached as Schedule "B".

12 Cinram Fund, CII, Cinram International General Partner Inc. ("Cinram GP"), CII Trust, Cinram ULC and 1362806 Ontario Limited are the Canadian entities in the Cinram Group that are Applicants in these proceedings (collectively, the "Canadian Applicants"). Cinram Fund and CII Trust are both open-ended limited purpose trusts, established under the laws of Ontario, and each of the remaining Canadian Applicants is incorporated pursuant to Federal or Provincial legislation.

13 Cinram (US) Holdings Inc. ("CUSH"), Cinram Inc., IHC Corporation ("IHC"), Cinram Manufacturing, LLC ("Cinram Manufacturing"), Cinram Distribution, LLC ("Cinram Distribution"), Cinram Wireless, LLC ("Cinram Wireless"), Cinram Retail Services, LLC ("Cinram Retail") and One K Studios, LLC ("One K") are the U.S. entities in the Cinram Group that are Applicants in these proceedings (collectively, the "U.S. Applicants"). Each of the U.S. Applicants is incorporated under the

laws of Delaware, with the exception of One K, which is incorporated under the laws of California. On May 25, 2012, each of the U.S. Applicants opened a new Canadian-based bank account with J.P. Morgan.

14 Cinram LP is not an Applicant in these proceedings. However, the Applicants seek to have a stay of proceedings and other relief under the CCAA extended to Cinram LP as it forms part of Cinram's income trust structure with Cinram Fund, the ultimate parent of the Cinram Group.

15 Cinram's European entities are not part of these proceedings and it is not intended that any insolvency proceedings will be commenced with respect to Cinram's European entities, except for Cinram Optical Discs SAC, which has commenced insolvency proceedings in France.

16 The Cinram Group's principal source of long-term debt is the senior secured credit facilities provided under credit agreements known as the "First-Lien Credit Agreement" and the "Second-Lien Credit Agreement" (together with the First-Lien Credit Agreement, the "Credit Agreements").

17 All of the CCAA Parties, with the exception of Cinram Fund, Cinram GP, CII Trust and Cinram LP (collectively, the "Fund Entities"), are borrowers and/or guarantors under the Credit Agreements. The obligations under the Credit Agreements are secured by substantially all of the assets of the Applicants and certain of their European subsidiaries.

18 As at March 31, 2012, there was approximately \$233 million outstanding under the First-Lien Term Loan Facility; \$19 million outstanding under the First-Lien Revolving Credit Facilities; approximately \$12 million of letter of credit exposure under the First-Lien Credit Agreement; and approximately \$12 million outstanding under the Second-Lien Credit Agreement.

19 Cinram advises that in light of the financial circumstances of the Cinram Group, it is not possible to obtain additional financing that could be used to repay the amounts owing under the Credit Agreements.

20 Mr. John Bell, Chief Financial Officer of CII, stated in his affidavit that in connection with certain defaults under the Credit Agreements, a series of waivers was extended from December 2011 to June 30, 2012 and that upon expiry of the waivers, the lenders have the ability to demand immediate repayment of the outstanding amounts under the Credit Agreements and the borrowers and the other Applicants that are guarantors under the Credit Agreements would be unable to meet their debt obligations. Mr. Bell further stated that there is no reasonable expectation that Cinram would be able to service its debt load in the short to medium term given forecasted net revenues and EBITDA for the remainder of fiscal 2012, fiscal 2013, and fiscal 2014. The cash flow forecast attached to his affidavit indicates that, without additional funding, the Applicants will exhaust their available cash resources and will thus be unable to meet their obligations as they become due.

21 The Applicants request a stay of proceedings. They take the position that in light of their financial circumstances, there could be a vast and significant erosion of value to the detriment of all stakeholders. In particular, the Applicants are concerned about the following risks, which, because of the integration of the Cinram business, also apply to the Applicants' subsidiaries, including Cinram LP:

- (a) the lenders demanding payment in full for money owing under the Credit Agreements;
- (b) potential termination of contracts by key suppliers; and
- (c) potential termination of contracts by customers.

22 As indicated in the cash flow forecast, the Applicants do not have sufficient funds available to meet their immediate cash requirements as a result of their current liquidity challenges. Mr. Bell states in his affidavit that the Applicants require access to Debtor-In-Possession ("DIP") Financing in the amount of \$15 millions to continue operations while they implement their restructuring, including the Proposed Transaction. Cinram has negotiated a DIP Credit Agreement with the lenders forming the Steering Committee (the "DIP Lenders") through J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, NA as Administrative Agent (the "DIP Agent") whereby the DIP Lenders agree to provide the DIP Financing in the form of a term loan in the amount of \$15 million.

23 The Applicants also indicate that during the course of the CCAA proceedings, the CCAA Parties intend to generally make payments to ensure their ongoing business operations for the benefit of their stakeholders, including obligations incurred prior to, on, or after the commencement of these proceedings relating to:

- (a) the active employment of employees in the ordinary course;
- (b) suppliers and service providers the CCAA Parties and the Monitor have determined to be critical to the continued operation of the Cinram business;
- (c) certain customer programs in place pursuant to existing contracts or arrangements with customers; and
- (d) inter-company payments among the CCAA Parties in respect of, among other things, shared services.

24 Mr. Bell states that the ability to make these payments relating to critical suppliers and customer programs is subject to a consultation and approval process agreed to among the Monitor, the DIP Agent and the CCAA Parties.

25 The Applicants also request an Administration Charge for the benefit of the Monitor and Moelis and Company, LLC ("Moelis"), an investment bank engaged to assist Cinram in a comprehensive and thorough review of its strategic alternatives.

26 In addition, the directors (and in the case of Cinram Fund and CII Trust, the Trustees, referred to collectively with the directors as the "Directors/Trustees") requested a Director's Charge to provide certainty with respect to potential personal liability if they continue in their current capacities. Mr. Bell states that in order to complete a successful restructuring, including the Proposed Transaction, the Applicants require the active and committed involvement of their Directors/Trustees and officers. Further, Cinram's insurers have advised that if Cinram was to file for CCAA protection, and the insurers agreed to renew the existing D&O policies, there would be a significant increase in the premium for that insurance.

27 Cinram has also developed a key employee retention program (the "KERP") with the principal purpose of providing an incentive for eligible employees, including eligible officers, to remain with the Cinram Group despite its financial difficulties. The KERP has been reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees of the Cinram Fund. The KERP includes retention payments (the "KERP Retention Payments") to certain existing employees, including certain officers employed at Canadian and U.S. Entities, who are critical to the preservation of Cinram's enterprise value.

28 Cinram also advises that on June 22, 2012, Cinram Fund, the borrowers under the Credit Agreements, and the Initial Consenting Lenders entered into a support agreement pursuant to which the Initial Consenting Lenders agreed to support the Proposed Transaction to be pursued through these CCAA proceedings (the "Support Agreement").

29 Pursuant to the Support Agreement, lenders under the First-Lien Credit Agreement who execute the Support Agreement or Consent Agreement prior to July 10, 2012 (the "Consent Date") are entitled to receive consent consideration (the "Early Consent Consideration") equal to 4% of the principal amount of loans under the First-Lien Credit Agreement held by such consenting lenders as of the Consent Date, payable in cash from the net sale proceeds of the Proposed Transaction upon distribution of such proceeds in the CCAA proceedings.

30 Mr. Bell states that it is contemplated that the CCAA proceedings will be the primary court-supervised restructuring of the CCAA Parties. He states that the CCAA Parties are part of a consolidated business in Canada, the United States and Europe that is headquartered in Canada and operationally and functionally integrated in many significant respects. Mr. Bell further states that although Cinram has operations in the United States, and certain of the Applicants are incorporated under the laws of the United States, it is Ontario that is Cinram's home jurisdiction and the nerve centre of the CCAA Parties' management, business and operations.

31 The CCAA Parties have advised that they will be seeking a recognition order under Chapter 15 to ensure that they are protected from creditor actions in the United States and to assist with the global implementation of the Proposed Transaction. Thus, the Applicants seek authorization in the Proposed Initial Order for:

Cinram ULC to seek recognition of these proceedings as "foreign main proceedings" and to seek such additional relief required in connection with the prosecution of any sale transaction, including the Proposed Transaction, as well as authorization for the Monitor, as a court-appointed officer, to assist the CCAA Parties with any matters relating to any of the CCAA Parties' subsidiaries and any foreign proceedings commenced in relation thereto.

32 Mr. Bell further states that the Monitor will be actively involved in assisting Cinram ULC as the foreign representative of the Applicants in the Chapter 15 proceedings and will assist in keeping this court informed of developments in the Chapter 15 proceedings.

33 The facts relating to the CCAA Parties, the Cinram business, and the requested relief are fully set out in Mr. Bell's affidavit.

34 Counsel to the Applicants filed a comprehensive factum in support of the requested relief in the Initial Order. Part III of the factum sets out the issues and the law.

35 The relief requested in the form of the Initial Order is extensive. It goes beyond what this court usually considers on an initial hearing. However, in the circumstances of this case, I have been persuaded that the requested relief is appropriate.

36 In making this determination, I have taken into account that the Applicants have spent a considerable period of time reviewing their alternatives and have done so in a consultative manner with their senior secured lenders. The senior secured lenders support this application, notwithstanding that it is clear that they will suffer a significant shortfall on their positions. It is also noted that the Early Consent Consideration will be available to lenders under the First-Lien Credit Agreement who execute the Support Agreement prior to July 10, 2012. Thus, all of these lenders will have the opportunity to participate in this arrangement.

37 As previously indicated, the Applicants' factum is comprehensive. The submissions on the law are extensive and cover all of the outstanding issues. It provides a fulsome review of the jurisprudence in the area, which for purposes of this application, I accept. For this reason, paragraphs 41-96 of the factum are attached as Schedule "C" for reference purposes.

38 The Applicants have also requested that the confidential supplement — which contains the KERP summary listing the individual KERP Payments and certain DIP Schedules — be sealed. I am satisfied that the KERP summary contains individually identifiable information and compensation information, including sensitive salary information, about the individuals who are covered by the KERP and that the DIP schedules contain sensitive competitive information of the CCAA Parties which should also be treated as being confidential. Having considered the principals of *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.), I accept the Applicants' submission on this issue and grant the requested sealing order in respect of the confidential supplement.

39 Finally, the Applicants have advised that they intend to proceed with a Chapter 15 application on June 26, 2012 before the United States Bankruptcy Court in the District of Delaware. I am given to understand that Cinram ULC, as proposed foreign representative, will be seeking recognition of the CCAA proceedings as "foreign main proceedings" on the basis that Ontario, Canada is the Centre of Main Interest or "COMI" of the CCAA Applicants.

40 In his affidavit at paragraph 195, Mr. Bell states that the CCAA Parties are part of a consolidated business that is headquartered in Canada and operationally and functionally integrated in many significant respects and that, as a result of the following factors, the Applicants submit the COMI of the CCAA Parties is Ontario, Canada:

- (a) the Cinram Group is managed on a consolidated basis out of the corporate headquarters in Toronto, Ontario, where corporate-level decision-making and corporate administrative functions are centralized;
- (b) key contracts, including, among others, major customer service agreements, are negotiated at the corporate level and created in Canada;

(c) the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer of CII, who are also directors, trustees and/or officers of other entities in the Cinram Group, are based in Canada;

(d) meetings of the board of trustees and board of directors typically take place in Canada;

(e) pricing decisions for entities in the Cinram Group are ultimately made by the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer in Toronto, Ontario;

(f) cash management functions for Cinram's North American entities, including the administration of Cinram's accounts receivable and accounts payable, are managed from Cinram's head office in Toronto, Ontario;

(g) although certain bookkeeping, invoicing and accounting functions are performed locally, corporate accounting, treasury, financial reporting, financial planning, tax planning and compliance, insurance procurement services and internal audits are managed at a consolidated level in Toronto, Ontario;

(h) information technology, marketing, and real estate services are provided by CII at the head office in Toronto, Ontario;

(i) with the exception of routine maintenance expenditures, all capital expenditure decisions affecting the Cinram Group are managed in Toronto, Ontario;

(j) new business development initiatives are centralized and managed from Toronto, Ontario; and

(k) research and development functions for the Cinram Group are corporate-level activities centralized at Toronto, Ontario, including the Cinram Group's corporate-level research and development budget and strategy.

41 Counsel submits that the CCAA Parties are highly dependent upon the critical business functions performed on their behalf from Cinram's head office in Toronto and would not be able to function independently without significant disruptions to their operations.

42 The above comments with respect to the COMI are provided for informational purposes only. This court clearly recognizes that it is the function of the receiving court — in this case, the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware — to make the determination on the location of the COMI and to determine whether this CCAA proceeding is a "foreign main proceeding" for the purposes of Chapter 15.

43 In the result, I am satisfied that the Applicants meet all of the qualifications established for relief under the CCAA and I have signed the Initial Order in the form submitted, which includes approvals of the Charges referenced in the Initial Order.

Schedule "A"

Additional Applicants

Cinram International General Partner Inc.

Cinram International ULC

1362806 Ontario Limited

Cinram (U.S.) Holdings Inc.

Cinram, Inc.

IHC Corporation


Cinram Manufacturing LLC

Cinram Distribution LLC

Cinram Wireless LLC

Cinram Retail Services, LLC

One K Studios, LLC

Schedule "B"**Graphic 1****Schedule "C"****A. The Applicants Are "Debtor Companies" to Which the CCAA Applies**

41. The CCAA applies in respect of a "debtor company" (including a foreign company having assets or doing business in Canada) or "affiliated debtor companies" where the total of claims against such company or companies exceeds \$5 million.

CCAA, Section 3(1).

42. The Applicants are eligible for protection under the CCAA because each is a "debtor company" and the total of the claims against the Applicants exceeds \$5 million.

(1) The Applicants are Debtor Companies

43. The terms "company" and "debtor company" are defined in Section 2 of the CCAA as follows:

"company" means any company, corporation or legal person incorporated by or under an Act of Parliament or of the legislature of a province and any incorporated company having assets or doing business in Canada, wherever incorporated, and any income trust, but does not include banks, authorized foreign banks within the meaning of section 2 of the *Bank Act*, railway or telegraph companies, insurance companies and companies to which the *Trust and Loan Companies Act* applies.

"debtor company" means any company that:

(a) is bankrupt or insolvent;

(b) has committed an act of bankruptcy within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or is deemed insolvent within the meaning of the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act*, whether or not proceedings in respect of the company have been taken under either of those Acts;

(c) has made an authorized assignment or against which a receiving order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*; or

(d) is in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act* because the company is insolvent.

CCAA, Section 2 ("company" and "debtor company").

44. The Applicants are debtor companies within the meaning of these definitions.

(2) The Applicants are "companies"

45. The Applicants are "companies" because:

a. with respect to the Canadian Applicants, each is incorporated pursuant to federal or provincial legislation or, in the case of Cinram Fund and CII Trust, is an income trust; and

b. with respect to the U.S. Applicants, each is an incorporated company with certain funds in bank accounts in Canada opened in May 2012 and therefore each is a company having assets or doing business in Canada.

Bell Affidavit at paras. 4, 80, 84, 86, 91, 94, 98, 102, 105, 108, 111, 114, 117, 120, 123, 212; Application Record, Tab 2.

46. The test for "having assets or doing business in Canada" is disjunctive, such that either "having assets" in Canada or "doing business in Canada" is sufficient to qualify an incorporated company as a "company" within the meaning of the CCAA.

47. Having only nominal assets in Canada, such as funds on deposit in a Canadian bank account, brings a foreign corporation within the definition of "company". In order to meet the threshold statutory requirements of the CCAA, an applicant need only be in technical compliance with the plain words of the CCAA.

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re (2009), 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 30 [*Canwest Global*]; Book of Authorities of the Applicants ("*Book of Authorities*"), Tab 1.

Global Light Telecommunications Inc., Re (2004), 2 C.B.R. (5th) 210 (B.C. S.C.) at para. 17 [*Global Light*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 2.

48. The Courts do not engage in a quantitative or qualitative analysis of the assets or the circumstances in which the assets were created. Accordingly, the use of "instant" transactions immediately preceding a CCAA application, such as the creation of "instant debts" or "instant assets" for the purposes of bringing an entity within the scope of the CCAA, has received judicial approval as a legitimate device to bring a debtor within technical requirements of the CCAA.

Global Light Telecommunications Inc., Re, supra at para. 17; Book of Authorities, Tab 2.

Cadillac Fairview Inc., Re (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 29 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at paras. 5-6; Book of Authorities, Tab 3.

Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of) (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289 (Ont. C.A.) at paras. 74, 83; Book of Authorities, Tab 4.

(3) *The Applicants are insolvent*

49. The Applicants are "debtor companies" as defined in the CCAA because they are companies (as set out above) and they are insolvent.

50. The insolvency of the debtor is assessed as of the time of filing the CCAA application. The CCAA does not define insolvency. Accordingly, in interpreting the meaning of "insolvent", courts have taken guidance from the definition of "insolvent person" in Section 2(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (the "BIA"), which defines an "insolvent person" as a person (i) who is not bankrupt; and (ii) who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada; (iii) whose liabilities to creditors provable as claims under the BIA amount to one thousand dollars; and (iv) who is "insolvent" under one of the following tests:

- a. is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due;
- b. has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due; or
- c. the aggregate of his property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due.

BIA, Section 2 ("insolvent person").

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); leave to appeal to C.A. refused [2004] O.J. No. 1903 (Ont. C.A.); leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused [2004] S.C.C.A. No. 336 (S.C.C.), at para.4 [*Stelco*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 5.

51. These tests for insolvency are disjunctive. A company satisfying any one of these tests is considered insolvent for the purposes of the CCAA.

Stelco Inc., Re, supra at paras. 26 and 28; Book of Authorities, Tab 5.

52. A company is also insolvent for the purposes of the CCAA if, at the time of filing, there is a reasonably foreseeable expectation that there is a looming liquidity condition or crisis that would result in the company being unable to pay its debts as they generally become due if a stay of proceedings and ancillary protection are not granted by the court.

Stelco Inc., Re, supra at para. 40; Book of Authorities, Tab 5.

53. The Applicants meet both the traditional test for insolvency under the BIA and the expanded test for insolvency based on a looming liquidity condition as a result of the following:

- a. The Applicants are unable to comply with certain financial covenants under the Credit Agreements and have entered into a series of waivers with their lenders from December 2011 to June 30, 2012.
- b. Were the Lenders to accelerate the amounts owing under the Credit Agreements, the Borrowers and the other Applicants that are Guarantors under the Credit Agreements would be unable to meet their debt obligations. Cinram Fund would be the ultimate parent of an insolvent business.

d. The Applicants have been unable to repay or refinance the amounts owing under the Credit Agreements or find an out-of-court transaction for the sale of the Cinram Business with proceeds that equal or exceed the amounts owing under the Credit Agreements.

e. Reduced revenues and EBITDA and increased borrowing costs have significantly impaired Cinram's ability to service its debt obligations. There is no reasonable expectation that Cinram will be able to service its debt load in the short to medium term given forecasted net revenues and EBITDA for the remainder of fiscal 2012 and for fiscal 2013 and 2014.

f. The decline in revenues and EBITDA generated by the Cinram Business has caused the value of the Cinram Business to decline. As a result, the aggregate value of the Property, taken at fair value, is not sufficient to allow for payment of all of the Applicants' obligations due and accruing due.

g. The Cash Flow Forecast indicates that without additional funding the Applicants will exhaust their available cash resources and will thus be unable to meet their obligations as they become due.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 23, 179-181, 183, 197-199; Application Record, Tab 2.

(4) The Applicants are affiliated companies with claims outstanding in excess of \$5 million

54. The Applicants are affiliated debtor companies with total claims exceeding 5 million dollars. Therefore, the CCAA applies to the Applicants in accordance with Section 3(1).

55. Affiliated companies are defined in Section 3(2) of the CCAA as follows:

- a. companies are affiliated companies if one of them is the subsidiary of the other or both are subsidiaries of the same company or each is controlled by the same person; and
- b. two companies are affiliated with the same company at the same time are deemed to be affiliated with each other.

CCAA, Section 3(2).

56. CII, CII Trust and all of the entities listed in Schedule "A" hereto are indirect, wholly owned subsidiaries of Cinram Fund; thus, the Applicants are "affiliated companies" for the purpose of the CCAA.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 3, 71; Application Record, Tab 2.

57. All of the CCAA Parties (except for the Fund Entities) are each a Borrower and/or Guarantor under the Credit Agreements. As at March 31, 2012 there was approximately \$252 million of aggregate principal amount outstanding under the First Lien Credit Agreement (plus approximately \$12 million in letter of credit exposure) and approximately \$12 million of aggregate principal amount outstanding under the Second Lien Credit Agreement. The total claims against the Applicants far exceed \$5 million.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 75; Application Record, Tab 2.

B. The Relief is Available under The CCAA and Consistent with the Purpose and Policy of the CCAA

(1) The CCAA is Flexible, Remedial Legislation

58. The CCAA is remedial legislation, intended to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors as an alternative to bankruptcy. In particular during periods of financial hardship, debtors turn to the Court so that the Court may apply the CCAA in a flexible manner in order to accomplish the statute's goals. The Court should give the CCAA a broad and liberal interpretation so as to encourage and facilitate successful restructurings whenever possible.

Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of), *supra* at paras. 22 and 56-60; Book of Authorities, Tab 4. *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at para. 5; Book of Authorities, Tab 6.

Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd. (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 (B.C. C.A.), at pp. 4 and 7; Book of Authorities, Tab 7.

59. On numerous occasions, courts have held that Section 11 of the CCAA provides the courts with a broad and liberal power, which is at their disposal in order to achieve the overall objective of the CCAA. Accordingly, an interpretation of the CCAA that facilitates restructurings accords with its purpose.

Sulphur Corp. of Canada Ltd., Re (2002), 35 C.B.R. (4th) 304 (Alta. Q.B.) ("*Sulphur*") at para. 26; Book of Authorities, Tab 8.

60. Given the nature and purpose of the CCAA, this Honourable Court has the authority and jurisdiction to depart from the Model Order as is reasonable and necessary in order to achieve a successful restructuring.

(2) The Stay of Proceedings Against Non-Applicants is Appropriate

61. The relief sought in this application includes a stay of proceedings in favour of Cinram LP and the Applicants' direct and indirect subsidiaries that are also party to an agreement with an Applicant (whether as surety, guarantor or otherwise) (each, a "Subsidiary Counterparty"), including any contract or credit agreement. It is just and reasonable to grant the requested stay of proceedings because:

- a. the Cinram Business is integrated among the Applicants, Cinram LP and the Subsidiary Counterparties;
- b. if any proceedings were commenced against Cinram LP, or if any of the third parties to such agreements were to commence proceedings or exercise rights and remedies against the Subsidiary Counterparties, this would have a detrimental effect on the Applicants' ability to restructure and implement the Proposed Transaction and would lead to an erosion of value of the Cinram Business; and
- c. a stay of proceedings that extends to Cinram LP and the Subsidiary Counterparties is necessary in order to maintain stability with respect to the Cinram Business and maintain value for the benefit of the Applicants' stakeholders.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 185-186; Application Record, Tab 2.

62. The purpose of the CCAA is to preserve the *status quo* to enable a plan of compromise to be prepared, filed and considered by the creditors:

In the interim, a judge has great discretion under the CCAA to make order so as to effectively maintain the status quo in respect of an insolvent company while it attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for the proposed compromise or arrangement which will be to the benefit of both the company and its creditors.

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re, *supra* at para. 5; Book of Authorities, Tab 6. *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*, *supra* at para. 27; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

CCAA, Section 11.

63. The Court has broad inherent jurisdiction to impose stays of proceedings that supplement the statutory provisions of Section 11 of the CCAA, providing the Court with the power to grant a stay of proceedings where it is just and reasonable to do so, including with respect to non-applicant parties.

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re, *supra* at paras. 5 and 16; Book of Authorities, Tab 6.

T. Eaton Co., Re (1997), 46 C.B.R. (3d) 293 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 6; Book of Authorities, Tab 9.

64. The Courts have found it just and reasonable to grant a stay of proceedings against third party non-applicants in a number of circumstances, including:

- a. where it is important to the reorganization process;
- b. where the business operations of the Applicants and the third party non-applicants are intertwined and the third parties are not subject to the jurisdiction of the CCAA, such as partnerships that do not qualify as "companies" within the meaning of the CCAA;
- c. against non-applicant subsidiaries of a debtor company where such subsidiaries were guarantors under the note indentures issued by the debtor company; and
- d. against non-applicant subsidiaries relating to any guarantee, contribution or indemnity obligation, liability or claim in respect of obligations and claims against the debtor companies.

Woodward's Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 236 (B.C. S.C.) at para. 31; Book of Authorities, Tab 10. *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re*, *supra* at para. 21; Book of Authorities, Tab 6.

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re, *supra* at paras. 28 and 29; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Sino-Forest Corp., Re, 2012 ONSC 2063 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 5, 18, and 31; Book of Authorities, Tab 11.

Re MAAX Corp, Initial Order granted June 12, 2008, Montreal 500-11-033561-081, (Que. Sup. Ct. [Commercial Division]) at para. 7; Book of Authorities, Tab 12.

65. The Applicants submit the balance of convenience favours extending the relief in the proposed Initial Order to Cinram LP and the Subsidiary Counterparties. The business operations of the Applicants, Cinram LP and the Subsidiary Counterparties are intertwined and the stay of proceedings is necessary to maintain stability and value for the benefit of the Applicants' stakeholders, as well as allow an orderly, going-concern sale of the Cinram Business as an important component of its reorganization process.

(3) Entitlement to Make Pre-Filing Payments

66. To ensure the continued operation of the CCAA Parties' business and maximization of value in the interests of Cinram's stakeholders, the Applicants seek authorization (but not a requirement) for the CCAA Parties to make certain pre-filing payments, including: (a) payments to employees in respect of wages, benefits, and related amounts; (b) payments to suppliers and service providers critical to the ongoing operation of the business; (c) payments and the application of credits in connection with certain existing customer programs; and (d) intercompany payments among the Applicants related to intercompany loans and shared services. Payments will be made with the consent of the Monitor and, in certain circumstances, with the consent of the Agent.

67. There is ample authority supporting the Court's general jurisdiction to permit payment of pre-filing obligations to persons whose services are critical to the ongoing operations of the debtor companies. This jurisdiction of the Court is not ousted by Section 11.4 of the CCAA, which became effective as part of the 2009 amendments to the CCAA and codified the Court's practice of declaring a person to be a critical supplier and granting a charge on the debtor's property in favour of such critical supplier. As noted by Pepall J. in *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*, the recent amendments, including Section 11.4, do not detract from the inherently flexible nature of the CCAA or the Court's broad and inherent jurisdiction to make such orders that will facilitate the debtor's restructuring of its business as a going concern.

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re *supra*, at paras. 41 and 43; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

68. There are many cases since the 2009 amendments where the Courts have authorized the applicants to pay certain pre-filing amounts where the applicants were not seeking a charge in respect of critical suppliers. In granting this authority, the Courts considered a number of factors, including:

- a. whether the goods and services were integral to the business of the applicants;
- b. the applicants' dependency on the uninterrupted supply of the goods or services;
- c. the fact that no payments would be made without the consent of the Monitor;
- d. the Monitor's support and willingness to work with the applicants to ensure that payments to suppliers in respect of pre-filing liabilities are minimized;
- e. whether the applicants had sufficient inventory of the goods on hand to meet their needs; and
- f. the effect on the debtors' ongoing operations and ability to restructure if they were unable to make pre-filing payments to their critical suppliers.

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re supra, at para. 43; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Brainhunter Inc., Re, [2009] O.J. No. 5207 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 21 [*Brainhunter*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 13.

Prizm Income Fund, Re (2011), 75 C.B.R. (5th) 213 (Ont. S.C.J.) at paras. 29-34; Book of Authorities, Tab 14.

69. The CCAA Parties rely on the efficient and expedited supply of products and services from their suppliers and service providers in order to ensure that their operations continue in an efficient manner so that they can satisfy customer requirements. The CCAA Parties operate in a highly competitive environment where the timely provision of their products and services is essential in order for the company to remain a successful player in the industry and to ensure the continuance of the Cinram Business. The CCAA Parties require flexibility to ensure adequate and timely supply of required products and to attempt to obtain and negotiate credit terms with its suppliers and service providers. In order to accomplish this, the CCAA Parties require the ability to pay certain pre-filing amounts and post-filing payables to those suppliers they consider essential to the Cinram Business, as approved by the Monitor. The Monitor, in determining whether to approve pre-filing payments as critical to the ongoing business operations, will consider various factors, including the above factors derived from the caselaw.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 226, 228, 230; Application Record, Tab 2.

70. In addition, the CCAA Parties' continued compliance with their existing customer programs, as described in the Bell Affidavit, including the payment of certain pre-filing amounts owing under certain customer programs and the application of certain credits granted to customers pre-filing to post-filing receivables, is essential in order for the CCAA Parties to maintain their customer relationships as part of the CCAA Parties' going concern business.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 234; Application Record, Tab 2.

71. Further, due to the operational integration of the businesses of the CCAA Parties, as described above, there is a significant volume of financial transactions between and among the Applicants, including, among others, charges by an Applicant providing shared services to another Applicant of intercompany accounts due from the recipients of those services, and charges by a Applicant that manufactures and furnishes products to another Applicant of inter-company accounts due from the receiving entity.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 225; Application Record, Tab 2.

72. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that it is appropriate in the present circumstances for this Honourable Court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the CCAA Parties the authority to make the pre-filing payments described in the proposed Initial Order subject to the terms therein.

(4) The Charges Are Appropriate

73. The Applicants seek approval of certain Court-ordered charges over their assets relating to their DIP Financing (defined below), administrative costs, indemnification of their trustees, directors and officers, KERP and Support Agreement. The Lenders and the Administrative Agent under the Credit Agreements, the senior secured facilities that will be primed by the charges, have been provided with notice of the within Application. The proposed Initial Order does not purport to give the Court-ordered charges priority over any other validly perfected security interests.

(A) DIP Lenders' Charge

74. In the proposed Initial Order, the Applicants seek approval of the DIP Credit Agreement providing a debtor-in-possession term facility in the principal amount of \$15 million (the "DIP Financing"), to be secured by a charge over all of the assets and property of the Applicants that are Borrowers and/or Guarantors under the Credit Agreements (the "Charged Property") ranking ahead of all other charges except the Administration Charge.

75. Section 11.2 of the CCAA expressly provides the Court the statutory jurisdiction to grant a debtor-in-possession ("DIP") financing charge:

11.2(1) *Interim financing* - On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

11.2(2) *Priority* — secured creditors — The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

Timminco Ltd., Re, 211 A.C.W.S. (3d) 881 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) [2012 CarswellOnt 1466] at para. 31; Book of Authorities, Tab 15. CCAA, Section 11.2(1) and (2).

76. Section 11.2 of the CCAA sets out the following factors to be considered by the Court in deciding whether to grant a DIP financing charge:

11.2(4) Factors to be considered — In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
- (b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
- (c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
- (d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;
- (e) the nature and value of the company's property;
- (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
- (g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

CCAA, Section 11.2(4).

77. The above list of factors is not exhaustive, and it may be appropriate for the Court to consider additional factors in determining whether to grant a DIP financing charge. For example, in circumstances where funds to be borrowed pursuant to a DIP facility were not expected to be immediately necessary, but applicants' cash flow statements projected the need for additional liquidity, the Court in granting the requested DIP charge considered the fact that the applicants' ability to borrow funds that would be secured by a charge would help retain the confidence of their trade creditors, employees and suppliers.

Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re (2010), 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 42-43 [*Canwest Publishing*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 16.

78. Courts in recent cross-border cases have exercised their broad power to grant charges to DIP lenders over the assets of foreign applicants. In many of these cases, the debtors have commenced recognition proceedings under Chapter 15.

Re Catalyst Paper Corporation, Initial Order granted on January 31, 2012, Court File No. S-120712 (B.C.S.C.) [*Catalyst Paper*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 17.

Angiotech, supra, Initial Order granted on January 28, 2011, Court File No. S-110587; Book of Authorities, Tab 18

Fraser Papers Inc., Re [2009 CarswellOnt 3658 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])], Initial Order granted on June 18, 2009, Court File No. CV-09-8241-00CL; Book of Authorities, Tab 19.

79. As noted above, pursuant to Section 11.2(1) of the CCAA, a DIP financing charge may not secure an obligation that existed before the order was made. The requested DIP Lenders' Charge will not secure any pre-filing obligations.

80. The following factors support the granting of the DIP Lenders' Charge, many of which incorporate the considerations enumerated in Section 11.2(4) listed above:

- a. the Cash Flow Forecast indicates the Applicants will need additional liquidity afforded by the DIP Financing in order to continue operations through the duration of these proposed CCAA Proceedings;
- b. the Cinram Business is intended to continue to operate on a going concern basis during these CCAA Proceedings under the direction of the current management with the assistance of the Applicants' advisors and the Monitor;
- c. the DIP Financing is expected to provide the Applicants with sufficient liquidity to implement the Proposed Transaction through these CCAA Proceedings and implement certain operational restructuring initiatives, which will materially enhance the likelihood of a going concern outcome for the Cinram Business;
- d. the nature and the value of the Applicants' assets as set out in their consolidated financial statements can support the requested DIP Lenders' Charge;
- e. members of the Steering Committee under the First Lien Credit Agreement, who are senior secured creditors of the Applicants, have agreed to provide the DIP Financing;
- f. the proposed DIP Lenders have indicated that they will not provide the DIP Financing if the DIP Lenders' Charge is not approved;
- g. the DIP Lenders' Charge will not secure any pre-filing obligations;
- h. the senior secured lenders under the Credit Agreements affected by the charge have been provided with notice of these CCAA Proceedings; and
- i. the proposed Monitor is supportive of the DIP Facility, including the DIP Lenders' Charge.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 199-202, 205-208; Application Record, Tab 2.

(B) Administration Charge

81. The Applicants seek a charge over the Charged Property in the amount of CAD\$3.5 million to secure the fees of the Monitor and its counsel, the Applicants' Canadian and U.S. counsel, the Applicants' Investment Banker, the Canadian and U.S. Counsel to the DIP Agent, the DIP Lenders, the Administrative Agent and the Lenders under the Credit Agreements, and the financial advisor to the DIP Lenders and the Lenders under the Credit Agreements (the "Administration Charge"). This charge is to rank in priority to all of the other charges set out in the proposed Initial Order.

82. Prior to the 2009 amendments, administration charges were granted pursuant to the inherent jurisdiction of the Court. Section 11.52 of the CCAA now expressly provides the court with the jurisdiction to grant an administration charge:

11.52(1) Court may order security or charge to cover certain costs

On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in respect of the fees and expenses of

(a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;

(b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and

(c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

11.52(2) Priority

The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

CCAA, Section 11.52(1) and (2).

82. Administration charges were granted pursuant to Section 11.52 in, among other cases, *Timminco Ltd., Re*, *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re* and *Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re*.

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re, *supra*; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Canwest Publishing, *supra*; Book of Authorities, Tab 16.

Timminco Ltd., Re, 2012 ONSC 106 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) [*Timminco*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 20.

84. In *Canwest Publishing*, the Court noted Section 11.52 does not contain any specific criteria for a court to consider in granting an administration charge and provided a list of non-exhaustive factors to consider in making such an assessment. These factors were also considered by the Court in *Timminco*. The list of factors to consider in approving an administration charge include:

- a. the size and complexity of the business being restructured;
- b. the proposed role of the beneficiaries of the charge;
- c. whether there is unwarranted duplication of roles;
- d. whether the quantum of the proposed charge appears to be fair and reasonable;

- e. the position of the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; and
- f. the position of the Monitor.

Canwest Publishing supra, at para. 54; Book of Authorities, Tab 16.

Timminco, supra, at paras. 26-29; Book of Authorities, Tab 20.

85. The Applicants submit that the Administration Charge is warranted and necessary, and that it is appropriate in the present circumstances for this Honourable Court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the Administration Charge, given:

- a. the proposed restructuring of the Cinram Business is large and complex, spanning several jurisdictions across North America and Europe, and will require the extensive involvement of professional advisors;
- b. the professionals that are to be beneficiaries of the Administration Charge have each played a critical role in the CCAA Parties' restructuring efforts to date and will continue to be pivotal to the CCAA Parties' ability to pursue a successful restructuring going forward, including the Investment Banker's involvement in the completion of the Proposed Transaction;
- c. there is no unwarranted duplication of roles;
- d. the senior secured creditors affected by the charge have been provided with notice of these CCAA Proceedings; and
- e. the Monitor is in support of the proposed Administration Charge.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 188, 190; Application Record, Tab 2.

(C) Directors' Charge

86. The Applicants seek a Directors' Charge in an amount of CAD\$13 over the Charged Property to secure their respective indemnification obligations for liabilities imposed on the Applicants' trustees, directors and officers (the "Directors and Officers"). The Directors' Charge is to be subordinate to the Administration Charge and the DIP Lenders' Charge but in priority to the KERP Charge and the Consent Consideration Charge.

87. Section 11.51 of the CCAA affords the Court the jurisdiction to grant a charge relating to directors' and officers' indemnification on a priority basis:

11.51(1) Security or charge relating to director's indemnification

On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company after the commencement of proceedings under this Act.

11.51(2) Priority

The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditors of the company

11.51(3) Restriction — indemnification insurance

The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.

11.51(4) Negligence, misconduct or fault

The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

CCAA, Section 11.51.

88. The Court has granted director and officer charges pursuant to Section 11.51 in a number of cases. In *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*, the Court outlined the test for granting such a charge:

I have already addressed the issue of notice to affected secured creditors. I must also be satisfied with the amount and that the charge is for obligations and liabilities the directors and officers may incur after the commencement of proceedings. It is not to extend to coverage of wilful misconduct or gross negligence and no order should be granted if adequate insurance at a reasonable cost could be obtained.

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re, *supra* at paras 46-48; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Canwest Publishing, *supra* at paras. 56-57; Book of Authorities, Tab 16.

Timminco, *supra* at paras. 30-36; Book of Authorities, Tab 20.

89. The Applicants submit that the D&O Charge is warranted and necessary, and that it is appropriate in the present circumstances for this Honourable Court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the D&O Charge in the amount of CAD\$13 million, given:

- a. the Directors and Officers of the Applicants may be subject to potential liabilities in connection with these CCAA proceedings with respect to which the Directors and Officers have expressed their desire for certainty with respect to potential personal liability if they continue in their current capacities;
- b. renewal of coverage to protect the Directors and Officers is at a significantly increased cost due to the imminent commencement of these CCAA proceedings;
- c. the Directors' Charge would cover obligations and liabilities that the Directors and Officers, as applicable, may incur after the commencement of these CCAA Proceedings and is not intended to cover wilful misconduct or gross negligence;
- d. the Applicants require the continued support and involvement of their Directors and Officers who have been instrumental in the restructuring efforts of the CCAA Parties to date;
- e. the senior secured creditors affected by the charge have been provided with notice of these CCAA proceedings; and
- f. the Monitor is in support of the proposed Directors' Charge.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 249, 250, 254-257; Application Record, Tab 2.

(D) KERP Charge

90. The Applicants seek a KERP Charge in an amount of CAD\$3 million over the Charged Property to secure the KERP Retention Payments, KERP Transaction Payments and Aurora KERP Payments payable to certain key employees of the CCAA Parties crucial for the CCAA Parties' successful restructuring.

91. The CCAA is silent with respect to the granting of KERP charges. Approval of a KERP and a KERP charge are matters within the discretion of the Court. The Court in *Grant Forest Products Inc., Re* [2009 CarswellOnt 4699 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])] considered a number of factors in determining whether to grant a KERP and a KERP charge, including:

- a. whether the Monitor supports the KERP agreement and charge (to which great weight was attributed);
- b. whether the employees to which the KERP applies would consider other employment options if the KERP agreement were not secured by the KERP charge;
- c. whether the continued employment of the employees to which the KERP applies is important for the stability of the business and to enhance the effectiveness of the marketing process;
- d. the employees' history with and knowledge of the debtor;
- e. the difficulty in finding a replacement to fulfill the responsibilities of the employees to which the KERP applies;
- f. whether the KERP agreement and charge were approved by the board of directors, including the independent directors, as the business judgment of the board should not be ignored;
- g. whether the KERP agreement and charge are supported or consented to by secured creditors of the debtor; and
- h. whether the payments under the KERP are payable upon the completion of the restructuring process.

Grant Forest Products Inc., Re, 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 8-24 [*Grant Forest*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 21.

Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re supra, at paras 59; Book of Authorities, Tab 16.

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re supra, at para. 49; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Timminco Ltd., Re (2012), 95 C.C.P.B. 48 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 72-75; Book of Authorities, Tab 22.

92. The purpose of a KERP arrangement is to retain key personnel for the duration of the debtor's restructuring process and it is logical for compensation under a KERP arrangement to be deferred until after the restructuring process has been completed, with "staged bonuses" being acceptable. KERP arrangements that do not defer retention payments to completion of the restructuring may also be just and fair in the circumstances.

Grant Forest Products Inc., Re supra at para. 22-23; Book of Authorities, Tab 21.

93. The Applicants submit that the KERP Charge is warranted and necessary, and that it is appropriate in the present circumstances for this Honourable Court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the KERP Charge in the amount of CAD\$3 million, given:

- a. the KERP was developed by Cinram with the principal purpose of providing an incentive to the Eligible Employees, the Eligible Officers, and the Aurora Employees to remain with the Cinram Group while the company pursued its restructuring efforts;
- b. the Eligible Employees and the Eligible Officers are essential for a restructuring of the Cinram Group and the preservation of Cinram's value during the restructuring process;
- c. the Aurora Employees are essential for an orderly transition of Cinram Distribution's business operations from the Aurora facility to its Nashville facility;
- d. it would be detrimental to the restructuring process if Cinram were required to find replacements for the Eligible Employees, the Eligible Officers and/or the Aurora Employees during this critical period;
- e. the KERP, including the KERP Retention Payments, the KERP Transaction Payments and the Aurora KERP Payments payable thereunder, not only provides appropriate incentives for the Eligible Employees, the Eligible Officers and the

Aurora Employees to remain in their current positions, but also ensures that they are properly compensated for their assistance in Cinram's restructuring process;

f. the senior secured creditors affected by the charge have been provided with notice of these CCAA proceedings; and

g. the KERP has been reviewed and approved by the board of trustees of Cinram Fund and is supported by the Monitor.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 236-239, 245-247; Application Record, Tab 2.

(E) Consent Consideration Charge

94. The Applicants request the Consent Consideration Charge over the Charged Property to secure the Early Consent Consideration. The Consent Consideration Charge is to be subordinate in priority to the Administration Charge, the DIP Lenders' Charge, the Directors' Charge and the KERP Charge.

95. The Courts have permitted the opportunity to receive consideration for early consent to a restructuring transaction in the context of CCAA proceedings payable upon implementation of such restructuring transaction. In *Sino-Forest Corp., Re*, the Court ordered that any noteholder wishing to become a consenting noteholder under the support agreement and entitled to early consent consideration was required to execute a joinder agreement to the support agreement prior to the applicable consent deadline. Similarly, in these proceedings, lenders under the First Lien Credit Agreement who execute the Support Agreement (or a joinder thereto) and thereby agree to support the Proposed Transaction on or before July 10, 2012, are entitled to Early Consent Consideration earned on consummation of the Proposed Transaction to be paid from the net sale proceeds.

Sino-Forest Corp., Re, *supra*, Initial Order granted on March 30, 2012, Court File No. CV-12-9667-00CL at para. 15; Book of Authorities, Tab 23. Bell Affidavit, para. 176; Application Record, Tab 2.

96. The Applicants submit it is appropriate in the present circumstances for this Honourable Court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the Consent Consideration Charge, given:

a. the Proposed Transaction will enable the Cinram Business to continue as a going concern and return to a market leader in the industry;

b. Consenting Lenders are only entitled to the Early Consent Consideration if the Proposed Transaction is consummated; and

c. the Early Consent Consideration is to be paid from the net sale proceeds upon distribution of same in these proceedings.

Bell Affidavit, para. 176; Application Record, Tab 2.

Application granted.

TAB D

2009 CarswellOnt 391
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Smurfit-Stone Container Canada Inc., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 391, [2009] O.J. No. 349, 174 A.C.W.S. (3d) 933, 50 C.B.R. (5th) 71

**In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement
of Smurfit-Stone Container Canada Inc. and others**

Pepall J.

Judgment: January 27, 2009

Docket: CV-09-7966-00CL

Counsel: Sean F. Dunphy, Alexander D. Rose for Applicants
Robert J. Chadwick, Christopher G. Armstrong for Proposed Monitor
Susan Grundy for DIP Lenders

Subject: Insolvency

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Proposal — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Miscellaneous issues

American parent entities of debtor companies commenced Chapter 11 proceedings — Debtor companies were principal Canadian operating entities of American parent companies — Debtor companies brought application for relief under CCAA and requested that terms of initial CCAA order apply to two Canadian partnerships ("CCAA entities") affiliated with applicants — Application granted — Applicants were insolvent, had indebtedness in excess of \$5 million and qualified pursuant to CCAA — Proposed outline for plan included continuing process of selling and realizing value in respect of closed and discontinued operations and coordinating with US entities to achieve balance sheet restructuring — Due to Chapter 11 filing, pre-filing secured credit facility was not available and as such, absent some additional facility CCAA entities would be required to repay amounts owing under pre-filing credit agreement — CCAA entities would also no longer have access to operating credits, would not longer be able to benefit from accounts receivable securitization program, would be unable to operate in ordinary course or satisfy ongoing obligations — Extensive process was undertaken to obtain new debt financing — Proposed monitor was of view that restructuring and continuation of debtor companies and CCAA entities as going concern was best option available — Successful restructuring of CCAA entities appeared to be intertwined with successful restructuring of American entities in Chapter 11 proceeding — In order to continue day-to-day operations and facilitate restructuring, debtor companies required access to significant funding.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Pepall J.*:

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. 1982
Chapter 11 — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

APPLICATION by debtor companies for relief under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* and order for extension of terms of initial CCAA order to two affiliated partnerships.

Pepall J.:

1 Smurfit-Stone Container Canada Inc. ("SSC Canada"), Stone Container Finance Company of Canada II, MBI Limited, 3083527 Nova Scotia Company, BC Shipper Supplies Ltd., Specialty Containers Inc., 639647 British Columbia Limited, 605681 N.B. Inc. Canada, and Francobec Company (the "Applicants") seek relief under the CCAA. They also request that the terms of the Initial CCAA order apply to two Canadian partnerships affiliated with the Applicants, namely Smurfit-MBI and SLP Finance General Partnership (the "CCAA Entities"). Each of these CCAA Entities has filed for Chapter 11 protection in the U.S. Deloitte and Touche Inc. has consented to act as Monitor in the CCAA proceedings.

2 On January 26, 2009, Smurfit-Stone Container Corporation ("Smurfit-Stone") and certain of its affiliates including SSC Canada commenced Chapter 11 proceedings in the U.S. Smurfit-Stone is based in St. Louis, Missouri and in Chicago, Illinois. It is a leading North American producer of paperboard products, market pulp, corrugated containers and other specialty packaging products. It is also one of the world's biggest recyclers of paper. It currently holds approximately 18% of the North American container board market. Its operations have been negatively affected by the global economic downturn, the decrease in consumer spending, the manufacturing exodus from North America, a rise in costs, and a general market shift away from paper-based packaging. It has numerous direct and indirect subsidiaries.

3 SSC Canada and Smurfit-MBI, an Ontario limited partnership, are its principal Canadian operating entities. SSC Canada operates mills and plants producing liner board, corrugating medium and food board. Smurfit-MBI is a converting operation that produces corrugated containers using liner board from the mills. Its general partner is MBI Limited which carries on no business other than acting as Smurfit-MBI's general partner and has no assets other than its interest in Smurfit-MBI.

4 3083527 Nova Scotia Company is wholly-owned by SSC Canada. It does not carry on business except that it is one of the two Smurfit-MBI limited partners (the other being SSC Canada). BC Shipper Supplies Ltd. is no longer active. Specialty Containers Inc.'s assets were all sold in 2008. 639647 British Columbia Limited has no operations and holds the shares of BC Shippers Supplies Ltd. and Specialty Containers Inc.

5 SLP Finance General Partnership is owned by two Delaware companies. It does not carry on operations but owns the shares of 605681 N. B. Inc. which was liquidated in 2005 and of Francobec Company, a Nova Scotia company which previously operated a hardwood chipping facility which is now inactive. It has US\$574 million in investment assets.

6 Stone Container Finance Company of Canada II does not carry on business except that it issued notes, the proceeds of which were remitted to SSC Canada. It has assets of US\$62 million and liabilities of US\$207 million. Collectively all of these companies and partnerships are referred to as the CCAA Entities.

7 The CCAA Entities employ approximately 2,600 people across Canada many of whom are unionized.

8 Smurfit-Stone operates as a North American company rather than as a collection of individual business units. The U.S. and Canadian operations are fully integrated. In this regard, they have a centralized cash management system. All high level management decisions are made by a U.S. management team and it will have responsibility for the restructuring plan for the CCAA entities.

9 A secured credit facility covers both the Canadian and American operations. The amount outstanding on this pre-filing secured credit facility as of January 23, 2009 was approximately US\$1 billion of which approximately US\$367 million is attributable to SSC Canada. Security over all material Canadian assets had been provided as part of this facility.

10 The debt of the CCAA Entities also includes Canadian notes of US\$200 million and trade creditor payables of US\$53.4 million. In addition, there is a Canadian accounts receivable securitization programme, the outstanding balance of which is US\$38 million as of January 23, 2009. There are six defined benefit registered pension plans in Canada for which there is an aggregate solvency deficiency of approximately \$132 million as at December 31, 2007.

11 The Applicants are insolvent, have indebtedness in excess of \$5 million and qualify pursuant to the CCAA. The proposed outline for a plan includes continuing the process of selling and realizing value in respect of closed and discontinued operations and coordinating with the US entities to achieve a balance sheet restructuring.

12 As a result of the Chapter 11 filing, the pre-filing secured credit facility is no longer available. In addition, the Chapter 11 filing constitutes an event of termination under the receivables agreement that governs the accounts receivable securitization programme. As such, absent some additional facility, the CCAA Entities would be required to repay amounts owing under the pre-filing credit agreement. In addition, they would no longer be able to benefit from the accounts receivable securitization programme, would have no access to operating credits, would be unable to operate in the ordinary course, and would be unable to satisfy ongoing obligations.

13 Under the DIP facility that is proposed, both SSC Canada and the U.S. company, Smurfit-Stone Container Enterprises, Inc. ("SSCUS") are borrowers; the total commitment is US\$750 million comprised of US\$315 million in revolving facilities available to both SSCUS and SSC Canada, a US\$400 million term loan available to SSCUS; and a US\$35 million term loan available to SSC Canada. The term loan facilities are being used to take out the accounts receivable securitization programme. The loans to SSCUS are guaranteed by SSCC and most of the U.S. debtors and by SSC Canada and the latter provides a charge over its assets for all advances made to SSCUS. There would be rights of subrogation. The loans to SSC Canada are guaranteed by SSCUS and most of its U.S. subsidiaries and secured by a charge over substantially all of the assets of Smurfit-Stone's U.S. entities. The borrowings of SSC Canada are guaranteed by the other CCAA entities.

14 While some of the DIP lenders also participated in the pre-filing secured credit facility, the DIP financing involves new money and is not a refinancing. New lenders are also participating in the DIP facility. The lenders of the pre-filing secured credit facility are unopposed to the order sought.

15 The DIP lenders are unwilling to extend the DIP facility to SSC Canada absent its guarantee of the obligations of SSCUS under the DIP facility. In addition, the business is fully integrated making it impracticable particularly in the current credit environment to secure alternate financing on a stand-alone basis. To continue operations, the DIP facility is required. Estimated cash on hand for the Canadian operating entities at January 23, 2009 was \$704,517 and the accounts payable balance is estimated to be in excess of US\$53 million.

16 The amount borrowed is to be secured by a charge on the Applicants' property following an Administration charge of \$1 million and a Directors' charge of \$8.6 million. Until a final order has been granted by the U.S. court approving continued lending under the DIP facility and until approved by this court, and prior to February 18, 2009, no more than \$100,000 million of the U.S. revolving commitment and \$15 million of the SSC Canada revolving commitment will be available for borrowing. During the initial 30-day stay period, the CCAA Entities anticipate they will require US\$50 million of which US\$31 million of the term loan is to be used to refinance the account receivables securitization programme. This will result in an increase in cash receipts.

17 The proposed Monitor filed a report. It described the extensive process undertaken to obtain new debt financing. It further understands that Smurfit-Stone, having thoroughly canvassed the market, does not have any satisfactory alternative financing arrangements available. The proposed Monitor is of the view that the restructuring and continuation of Smurfit-Stone and the CCAA Entities as a going concern is the best option available given that a going concern restructuring would preserve the value

of Smurfit-Stone and the CCAA Entities whereas a liquidation and wind-down would likely result in a substantial diminution in value that could ultimately reduce creditors' recoveries. Significantly, the liquidation and wind-down of the CCAA Entities could eliminate a significant number of jobs, many of which would be preserved if the CCAA Entities are able to continue as a going concern. The proposed Monitor has also been advised that the CCAA Entities have recently been "net debtors", relying on advances from SSCUS to fund working capital requirements. Based on the information available to it, it is supportive of the DIP facility including SSC Canada's guarantee. In this regard, however, it is unable to provide views of the value of the guarantee or the probability that it will be called upon. Smurfit-Stone has advised the Monitor that SSC Canada's guarantee of SSCUS' obligations is contingent and that the DIP facility was negotiated with a third-party lender on the basis that there would be full recovery of all loans advanced to SSCUS under the DIP facility from the U.S. assets of Smurfit-Stone.

18 The successful restructuring of the CCAA Entities appears to be inextricably intertwined with the successful restructuring of the Smurfit-Stone enterprise in the Chapter 11 proceeding. In order to continue day-to-day operations and to facilitate the company's restructuring, the U.S. debtors and the CCAA Entities require access to significant funding. Given all of these facts, I am prepared to grant the relief requested.

19 As mentioned, the requested order extends the benefits of the protections provided by the order to Smurfit-MBI and SLP Finance General Partnership, both of which are partnerships but not Applicants. The operations of the partnerships are integral and closely interrelated with that of the Applicants and in my view the request is appropriate in the circumstances outlined. See also *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

20 As to the centralized cash management system, the proposed Monitor has reviewed it and will be able to adequately monitor the transfers of cash, including transfers within the system so that transactions applicable to SSC Canada and Smurfit-MBI can be ascertained, traced and properly recorded. The Monitor will review and monitor the system and report to the court from time to time. As of January 23, 2009, SSC Canada was estimated to have US\$121,000 and CDN\$185,000 in cash and Smurfit-MBI was estimated to have US\$97,000 and CDN\$414,000 in cash.

21 The CCAA Entities seek to pay certain pre-filing amounts owed to critical suppliers. The proposed Monitor has been advised that SSC Canada's operations depend on a ready supply of key materials such as wood, chemicals, fuel and energy from third party suppliers and, in addition, SSC Canada's and Smurfit-MBI's operations are reliant on rail and trucking services, custom brokers and third party warehouses. I am satisfied that the request to pay these pre-filing amounts is appropriate.

22 According to Smurfit-Stone, it is very difficult to separate the creditors of the U.S. debtors from the creditors of the CCAA Entities. Smurfit-Stone intends to engage Epiq Bankruptcy Solutions LLC to send notice of the Chapter 11 proceedings to all creditors owed more than \$1,000. The proposed Monitor has suggested that such notice include notice of the CCAA proceedings to the creditors of the CCAA Entities. I am in agreement with this proposed course of action but request that the Monitor report to the court when service has been effected.

23 I also note and rely upon the comeback provision found in paragraph 57 of the order which allows any interested party to apply to the court to vary or amend this order on not less than seven days' notice.

24 There are obviously numerous other provisions in the order that I have not addressed specifically as I believe they are all self-evident. In all of the circumstances I am prepared to grant the order requested. Counsel will re-attend on Wednesday at 10:00 a.m. to address a further recognition order.

Application granted.

TAB E

CITATION: Re: Mobilicity Group 2013 ONSC 6167
COURT FILE NO.: 13-CV-16274-OOCL
DATE: 20131004

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO
COMMERCIAL LIST**

IN MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, 1985, c.C-36
AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF
8440522 CANADA INC., DATA & AUDIO-VISUAL ENTERPRISES WIRELESS
INC., AND DATA & AUDIO-VISUAL ENTERPRISES HOLDINGS
INCORPORATION

BEFORE: Newbould J.

COUNSEL: Robert Frank, Virginie Gauthier and Evan Cobb, for applicants
David C. Moore for The Catalyst Capital Group Inc.
John Porter and Leanne M. Williams, for Ernst & Young Inc, the proposed
Monitor
Robert J. Chadwick and Brendan O'Neill, for the proposed DIP lender and the ad
hoc Committee of Noteholders
Kevin P. McElcheran and James D. Gage, for Quadrangle, a shareholder and for
subordinated note holders
Janice Wright, for Equity Financial Trust Company, as Trustee and Collateral
Agent under the First Lien Notes, Trustee under the Unsecured Senior Notes, and
Collateral Agent under the Bridge Notes

DATE HEARD: September 30, 2013

[1] On September 30, the applicants ("Mobilicity Group") applied for protection under the CCAA. At the conclusion of the hearing I ordered that the application should be granted for reasons to follow, and an Initial Order was signed. These are my reasons.

Background facts

[2] The Mobilicity Group consists of Data & Audio-Visual Enterprises Wireless Inc., the operating company ("Wireless" or "Mobilicity"), its holding company Data & Audio-Visual

Enterprises Holdings Inc. (“Holdings”) and 8440522 Canada Inc., wholly owned by Wireless and which has no material assets or liabilities.

[3] Mobilicity carries on business as a Canadian wireless telecommunications carrier. It provides cellular service to Canadians in five urban markets: Ottawa, Toronto, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver and has roaming agreements with third party service providers to provide continuity of service outside of these markets. Mobilicity also offers hardware (handsets and accessories) to its customers.

[4] Mobilicity was founded on the concept of offering low cost cellular services to value-conscious consumers seeking less expensive cellular services than those offered by the established players in the market, being Bell Canada Inc., TELUS Corporation and Rogers Communications Inc.

[5] In addition to four corporately-owned stores, the Mobilicity dealer network consists of approximately 314 points of distribution which include approximately 94 “platinum-level” stores that exclusively sell Mobilicity-branded services and only offer wireless-related products at their stores, and approximately 150 “gold” and “silver” level stores that sell Mobilicity-branded services, but also sell non-wireless related products. With the exception of the four corporately owned stores, these points of distribution are operated independently from the Mobilicity Group and are compensated for sales on a commission basis 45 days after the end of the month in which a subscriber is signed on, subject to certain customer retention requirements. These dealers often operate with very low liquidity and any disruption to the stream of revenue derived from commissions would cause many of them to cease operations due to a lack of funding

[6] Mobilicity operates on a “pay in advance” billing system which provides set monthly plans for its subscribers. Mobilicity has approximately 194,000 subscribers who together generate gross revenues of approximately \$6.3 million per month.

[7] Mobilicity's business model provides for outsourcing of certain business functions: network building and maintenance, real-time billing and rating, provisioning systems, handset logistics and distribution and call centre operations. Suppliers of such business functions include: Ericsson Canada Inc., Amdocs Canadian Managed Services Inc. and Ingram Micro Inc.

[8] The single most significant capital expenditure made by Mobilicity was the acquisition of its 10 spectrum licenses from the Government of Canada effective in 2009. Mobilicity acquired the spectrum licenses for \$243 million using funds contributed by Holdings.

[9] After purchasing the spectrum licences, Mobilicity incurred significant costs by establishing an office, hiring a management team to develop the wireless carrier business, and contracting with Ericsson Canada Inc. to build a network system.

Outstanding indebtedness

[10] In aggregate, the Mobilicity Group has raised in excess of \$400 million in debt financing to fund capital expenditures and operations since 2008. A description of that indebtedness is below:

- a. Wireless is the borrower under certain first lien notes issued in a principal amount of \$195,000,000 due April 29, 2018. Holdings is a guarantor of the first lien notes and each of Wireless and Holdings has entered into a general security agreement in connection with the first lien notes. The Catalyst Capital Group Inc. ("Catalyst") holds approximately 32% of the first lien notes.
- b. Wireless is the borrower of \$43.25 million in second lien notes (the "Bridge Notes") due September 30, 2013. These Bridge Notes are also guaranteed by Holdings and the obligations thereunder are secured by the assets of Wireless and

Holdings. The Bridge Notes rank behind the first lien notes in right of payment and the security on the Bridge Notes is subordinate to the first lien notes security.

- c. Holdings has issued 15% Senior Unsecured Debentures in the total principal amount of \$95 million due September 25, 2018. As of July 31, 2013, the amount outstanding on the Unsecured Senior Notes (including payment in kind interest) was approximately \$154.4 million.
- d. Holdings has also issued 12% Convertible Unsecured Notes due September 25, 2018. Initially, convertible notes in the principal amount of \$59,741,000 were issued (the “Unsecured Pari Passu Notes”). Subsequently, additional convertible notes in the principal amount of \$35,000,000 were issued (the “Unsecured Subordinated Notes”). The Unsecured Subordinated Notes rank subordinate in right of payment to the Unsecured Pari Passu Notes and the Unsecured Senior Notes and the Unsecured Pari Passu Notes rank pari passu in right of payment with the Unsecured Senior Notes. As of July 31, 2013, the amount outstanding on the Unsecured Pari Passu Notes and the Unsecured Subordinated Notes (including payment in kind interest) respectively, was approximately \$88.4 million and approximately \$38.6 million.

[11] The cash interest payment under the above described indebtedness is a payment of over \$9 million on the first lien notes which became due on September 30, 2013, the date of the Initial Order.

Mobilicity Group’s financial difficulties

[12] Wireless telecom start-ups are highly capital-intensive. As indicated by the substantial indebtedness incurred by the Mobilicity Group to date, significant fixed costs must be incurred before revenue can be generated. During the period where a wireless carrier is building its

customer base, revenue is typically insufficient to cover previously incurred investments and ongoing operating costs. It can take several years for a customer base to be adequately built to provide profitability. The applicants submit that Mobilicity ran out of “financial runway” before profitability was achieved and it now faces an imminent liquidity crisis.

[13] For the seven months ended July 31, 2013, the Mobilicity Group recognized revenue of \$46,864,490. During that period, the Mobilicity Group recorded a net loss of \$71,958,543. As of July 31, 2013, the Mobilicity Group had on a consolidated basis accumulated a net deficit of \$431,807,958.

[14] In July 2012, the Mobilicity Group engaged National Bank and Canaccord Genuity (together, the “financial advisors”) as their financial advisors in an effort to raise additional financing.

[15] With the assistance of the financial advisors, the Mobilicity Group solicited more than 30 potential investors in an attempt to raise financing. In this regard, an investor roadshow was completed in August and September of 2012 without success.

[16] The Bridge Notes facility was entered into on February 6, 2013 to allow Mobilicity to continue operations while it pursued strategic alternatives. The Bridge note lenders are the first lien note holders other than Catalyst, and certain existing holders of Unsecured Senior Notes. Catalyst has started oppression proceedings attacking the Bridge Notes facility.

[17] Mr. William Aziz was retained in late April of 2013 through BlueTree Advisors II Inc. as Chief Restructuring Officer to provide assistance in dealing with restructuring matters. Mr. Aziz has extensive experience in the area of corporate restructuring.

[18] The Mobilicity Group proposed alternative plans of arrangement earlier this year. During the course of those proceedings, a transaction was agreed to sell the Mobilicity Group to TELUS

Corporation for \$380 million pursuant to a plan of arrangement under the *Canada Business Corporations Act*. The plan of arrangement was approved on May 28, 2013. However, On June 4, 2013, the Minister of Industry announced that TELUS Corporation's application to transfer the spectrum licenses would not be approved at that time. Accordingly, the TELUS transaction was not completed.

[19] The Mobilicity Group has continued to engage with potential acquirers. As part of those efforts, the Mobilicity Group solicited and received an expression of interest and engaged in detailed discussions with a significant U.S.-based wireless service provider. However, after significant due diligence these discussions did not ultimately result in a binding offer due to uncertainty surrounding the Government's upcoming spectrum auction.

[20] In the two weeks preceding this application the Mobilicity Group developed a transaction structure for a proposed transaction with a prospective purchaser, which is currently being considered by Industry Canada. The government's assent to the proposed transaction was not obtained prior to this application being made.

Analysis

[21] It is clear from the affidavit of Mr. Aziz that the Mobilicity Group is insolvent and that without the protection of the CCAA, a shutdown of operations would be inevitable as the Mobilicity Group will cease to be able to pay its trade creditors in the ordinary course and will cease to be able to make interest payments on its outstanding debt securities. Thus the applicants are entitled to relief under the CCAA.

[22] The Initial Order contained provisions permitting a charge for directors and an administration charge. These were not opposed except as to part of the administrative charge discussed below. The applicants also sought authorization to continue the engagement of the financial advisors who had initially been retained in 2012, which was not opposed, and approval

of KERP agreements for a small number of employees, also not opposed. The Monitor supported these provisions and they appeared to be reasonable, and were approved.

[23] I will deal with issues that were raised by Catalyst, not in opposition to the Initial Order, but in opposition to certain parts of it.

DIP financing

[24] The Mobilicity Group has obtained a \$30 million DIP facility available in five tranches, to be used only in accordance with the cash flow forecasts of the applicants. They seek approval of this facility and a charge to secure the facility. The facility was obtained after a solicitation process undertaken by the Mobilicity Group and its financial advisors, described in some particularity in Mr. Aziz's affidavit. The lenders are the holders of the second lien notes under the Bridge Loan and other unsecured lenders of the Mobilicity Group.

[25] The DIP financing ranks *pari passu* with the Bridge Notes, and subordinate to the first lien notes, with the exception of cash interest payments under the DIP Financing. Since the DIP financing ranks subordinate to the first lien notes, the holders of the first lien notes, including Catalyst, will not be adversely affected by the DIP Financing.

[26] In the solicitation process, the Mobilicity Group received DIP financing proposals from not less than four parties, including existing creditors as well as third parties with no prior financial involvement with the Mobilicity Group. One such proposal was provided by the holders of the Bridge Notes and another was provided by Catalyst. The Mobilicity Group engaged its financial advisors and legal counsel to assist in the evaluation of the DIP Financing options that were presented.

[27] Upon review, the Mobilicity Group determined, with advice from its advisors, that the proposals provided by the non-creditor third parties likely could not be implemented. Therefore,

the financial advisors held discussions with the holders of the Bridge Notes and Catalyst to obtain what the Mobilicity Group believed to be the best available offer from each party either in the form of a final definitive term sheet or definitive agreements. These discussions occurred over the course of several weeks.

[28] The financial advisors and counsel to the Mobilicity Group evaluated these DIP financing options, including the Catalyst DIP term sheet, based upon, among other things, quantum, conditions, price, ranking and execution risk and provided their expert views to the board of directors of the Mobilicity Group. After consideration of the DIP financing options, and after considering the advice of its legal and financial advisors, the board of directors of the Mobilicity Group concluded that the DIP financing option presented by the holders of the Bridge Notes was the best available option.

[29] Catalyst contends that the DIP lending should not be approved at this time. It points to the cash flow forecast of the applicants that indicates that no DIP borrowing will be required until the week ending November 8, 2013 and says that there is time to give consideration to other DIP facilities that might be available. Mr. Moore said that he expects to obtain instructions from Catalyst to propose DIP financing that will rank equally as the DIP lending proposed by the applicants but provide more money and on better terms than that provided for in the proposal before the court.

[30] Mr. Moore relies on the statement of Blair, J. (as he then was) in *Re Royal Oak Mines Inc.* (1999), 6 C.B.R. (4th) 314 that extraordinary relief such as DIP financing with super priority status should be kept in the Initial Order to what is reasonably necessary to meet the debtor's urgent needs during the sorting out period. Each case, of course, depends on its particular facts. Unlike *Royal Oak*, the proposed DIP financing does not give the DIP lender super priority of the kind in *Royal Oak*. It will rank behind the first lien notes held by Mr. Moore's client. The issue is whether approval of DIP financing is necessary at this time.

[31] As to that question, I accept the position of Mobilicity that it is important that now that the CCAA proceedings have commenced, approving a DIP facility will provide some assurance of stability to the market place, including the customers of Mobilicity and its suppliers and dealers. If no DIP financing were approved, there is a serious risk that customers of Mobilicity, who do not have long term contracts, will go elsewhere. That would negatively affect the cash flow of Mobilicity and the assumption that advances under the DIP loan would not be required until November.

[32] Should this DIP facility be approved with its proposed security? In my view it should. On the record before me, the facility was approved by the board of directors of the Mobilicity Group with the benefit of expert advice after a process undertaken to obtain bids for the loan. I recognize that board approval is a factor that may be taken into account but it is not determinative. See *Re Crystallex* (2012), 91 C.B.R. (5th) 207 (C.A.) at para. 85.

[33] The factors in s.11.2 (4) of the CCAA must be considered. I will deal with each of them.

- (a) The period during which the company is expected to be subject to the CCAA proceedings.

[34] Mobilicity hopes to be able to enter into a transaction with a proposed purchaser within a relatively short period of time. The applicants submit that it is reasonable to estimate that the proceedings could last to February, 2014 and that subject to its conditions, the DIP facility can provide funding until that time.

- (b) How the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings.

[35] The Mobilicity Group retained Mr. Aziz in April, 2013 as its CRO, and he will continue in that capacity. He is a person of known ability. The business will continue to be run on a day to day basis by management who are looking for stability to enable it to keep its customer base.

(c) Whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors.

[36] Catalyst, as the holder of approximately 34% of the first lien notes, says it has no confidence in Mr. Aziz or the way that it alleges the Mobilicity Group has ignored the different interests of Mobilicity and its holding company. That is the subject of its claim for oppression. However, the balance of first lien note holders, all of the Bridge Note holders, approximately 92% of the unsecured debenture holders and all of the holders of the pari passu notes support the company's management and the approval of the DIP facility. That is, holders of \$444 million of the Mobilicity Group's debt, or 88% of that debt, support management and the DIP facility.

(d) Whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement.

[37] The Mobilicity Group's preferred course is to achieve a going concern transaction that will be of benefit to all stakeholders, including the first lien note holders. The DIP facility permits some stability and breathing room to enable this to happen.

(e) The nature and value of the company's property.

[38] The earlier TELUS deal was for \$380 plus assumption of obligations of the company. If the value of the Mobilicity Group is anywhere near that size, the \$30 million DIP facility appears reasonable, particularly as it is to be drawn down in tranches when needed.

(f) Whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security.

[39] No creditors will be materially prejudiced as a result of the DIP facility charge. The secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge have consented to it. The charge is junior to the security granted to the holders of first lien notes and is subordinate to any encumbrances that may have priority over the first lien notes either by contract or by operation of law.

(g) The position of the Monitor as set out in its report.

[40] In its pre-filing report, E & Y, the proposed Monitor, has reviewed the process leading to the DIP facility and its terms. It states that it is of the view that the DIP facility charge is required and is reasonable in the circumstances in view of the applicants' liquidity needs.

[41] In all of the circumstances, I approved the DIP facility and its charge. There is a come-back clause in the Initial Order, which Catalyst may or may not wish to utilize. I would observe that if Catalyst seeks to have a DIP facility proposed by it to replace the approved DIP facility, some consideration of the *Soundair* and *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg* principles may be appropriate.

Stay of oppression action

[42] The Initial Order sought by the applicants contained a usual stay order preventing the commencement or continuance of proceedings against or in respect of the applicants and the Monitor. Included in the protection were the DIP lenders, the holders of Bridge Notes and the Collateral Agent under the Bridge notes. The applicants submitted, and I agree with them, that this expanded group was appropriate in the circumstances as the holders of Bridge Notes and the Trustee have each been named in the oppression application brought by Catalyst. The holders of the Bridge Notes and the Trustee are parties to the oppression application by Catalyst solely due to their lending arrangements with the applicants and, as a result, the applicants are central parties to that litigation and would need to participate actively in any steps taken in that litigation. Further, any continuation of the oppression application against the holders of the

Bridge Notes and the Trustee would distract from the goals of these proceedings and also result in unwarranted expenditure of resources by the holders of the Bridge Notes and the Trustee, each of which are indemnified in a customary manner by the applicants for these types of expenditures. As the DIP lenders are also Bridge Note holders and as such parties are stepping into a similar financial position as the Bridge Note holders, the extension of the stay to those parties is appropriate and reasonable. See *Sino- Forest Corp. (Re)*, (May 8, 2012), Toronto CV-12-9667-00CL (Ont. S.C.J.); *Timminco Ltd. Re.*, 2012 ONSC 2515 at paras. 23 and 24.

[43] Catalyst contended, however, that the stay provisions should exclude its oppression application. Why this is so is not clear. Mr. Moore said there had been no steps taken in the application since the August cross-examination of Mr. Aziz, and that Catalyst would undertake not to take further steps until the come-back date. I see no reason why the oppression application should be excluded from the stay contained in the Initial Order. It may be that Catalyst will be paid out in the near future if the transaction now on the table can be concluded. In any event, it is open to any party to apply to lift a stay on proper grounds. Catalyst is no different.

Ad hoc committee charge

[44] The Initial Order contains an administration charge to cover fees and disbursements to be paid out to the Monitor and its counsel, counsel to the applicants, counsel to the DIP lenders and counsel to the ad hoc committee of Noteholders. Catalyst contends that there is no basis for counsel for the ad hoc committee of Noteholders to be included in this charge or to be paid by the applicant.

[45] In this case, counsel to the DIP lenders is also counsel to the ad hoc committee of noteholders. That committee includes the balance of the first lien noteholders other than Catalyst who are the Bridge Note holders. It was the Bridge Notes that permitted the Mobilicity Group to continue since February of this year. Those noteholders making up the ad hoc committee have been working in a supportive capacity in an attempt to have the Mobilicity Group re-organized in

a constructive way. I am satisfied that the ad hoc committee has been of assistance to the process and that the charge is appropriate and necessary. I would also note that the administrative charge is junior to the first lien notes and thus the security position of Catalyst is not affected by the charge. As well the administrative charge is supported by the proposed Monitor.

Appointment of chief restructuring officer

[46] The Initial Order authorizes the applicants to continue the engagement of William Aziz as the chief restructuring officer of the Mobilicity Group on the terms set out in the CRO engagement letter. This letter has been sealed as confidential. Catalyst said it should see the letter and until then no order should be made. On the day before this application was heard, counsel for the Mobilicity Group offered to send the complete record to counsel for Catalyst if an undertaking was given that the material would be kept confidential prior to the hearing. Mr. Moore objected to such a pre-condition and was served shortly before the hearing with the application record without the confidential documents.

[47] Catalyst contends that no order should be made until it has had a chance to see the terms of the engagement letter. I do not think this wise. To proceed with the CCAA process without the continuation of Mr. Aziz as the chief restructuring officer would send the entirely wrong signal to all stakeholders, let alone the Government of Canada with whom Mr. Aziz has been dealing regarding a proposed transaction.

[48] Mr. Aziz has a thorough knowledge of the affairs of the Mobilicity Group, having been its chief restructuring officer since April of this year. He has been central to the efforts of the applicants to restructure. He is very knowledgeable and experienced. It is appropriate that his engagement now be continued. The proposed Monitor has reviewed the engagement letter and is of the view that the fee arrangement is reasonable and consistent with the fee arrangements in other engagements of similar size, scope and complexity.

[49] Counsel for the applicants and Catalyst were agreeable to working out an appropriate confidentiality arrangement. Once Catalyst has seen the engagement letter for Mr. Aziz, it will be entitled if so advised to bring whatever come-back motion it thinks appropriate.

[50] The Initial Order as signed contains provisions as discussed in this endorsement.

Newbould J.

Released: October 4, 2013

CITATION: Re: Mobilicity 2013 ONSC 6167
COURT FILE NO.: 13-CV-16274-OOCL
DATE: 20131004

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO
COMMERCIAL LIST**

BETWEEN:

IN MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES'*
CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, 1985, c.C-
36 AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF
COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF
8440522 CANADA INC., DATA & AUDIO-
VISUAL ENTERPRISES WIRELESS INC.,
AND DATA & AUDIO-VISUAL
ENTERPRISES HOLDINGS
INCORPORATION

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT

Newbould J.

Released: October 4, 2013

TAB F

CITATION: U.S. Steel Canada Inc. (Re), 2014 ONSC 6145
COURT FILE NO.: CV-14-10695-00CL
DATE: 20141022

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO

IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985,
c. C-36 AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT
WITH RESPECT TO U.S. STEEL CANADA INC.

BEFORE: Mr. Justice H. Wilton-Siegel

COUNSEL: *R. Paul Steep, Jamey Gage and Heather Meredith*, for the Applicant

Kevin Zych, for the Monitor

Michael Barrack, Robert Thornton and Grant Moffat, for United States Steel Corporation and the proposed DIP Lender

Gale Rubenstein, Robert J. Chadwick and Logan Willis, for Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario and the Superintendent of Financial Services (Ontario)

Ken Rosenberg and Lily Harmer, for the United Steelworkers International Union and the United Steelworkers Union, Local 8782

Sharon L.C. White, for the United Steelworkers Union, Local 1005

Shayne Kukulowicz and Larry Ellis, for the City of Hamilton

Steve Weisz and Arjo Shalviri, for Caterpillar Financial Services Limited

S. Michael Citak, for various trade creditors

Kathryn Esaw and Patrick Corney, for the Independent Electricity System Operator

Andrew Hatnay, for certain retirees and for the proposed representative counsel

HEARD AND ENDORSED: October 8, 2014
RELEASED: October 22, 2014

ENDORSEMENT

[1] U.S. Steel Canada Inc. (the "Applicant") brought an application for protection under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the "CCAA") on September 16, 2014, and was granted the requested relief pursuant to an initial order of Morawetz R.S.J. dated

September 16, 2014 (the “Initial Order”). The Initial Order contemplated that any interested party, including the Applicant and the Monitor, could apply to this court to vary or amend the Initial Order at a comeback motion scheduled for October 6, 2014 (the “Comeback Motion”).

[2] The Comeback Motion was adjourned from October 6, 2014 to October 7, 2014, and further adjourned on that date to October 8, 2014. On October 8, 2014, the Court heard various motions of the Applicant and addressed certain other additional scheduling matters, indicating that written reasons would follow with respect to the substantive matters addressed at the hearing. This endorsement constitutes the Court’s reasons with respect to the five substantive matters addressed in two orders issued at the hearing.

[3] In this endorsement, capitalized terms that are not defined herein have the meanings ascribed to them in the Initial Order.

DIP Loan

[4] The Applicant seeks approval of a debtor-in-possession loan facility (the “DIP Loan”), the terms of which are set out in an amended and restated DIP facility term sheet dated as of September 16, 2014 (the “Term Sheet”) between the Applicant and a subsidiary of USS (the “DIP Lender”).

[5] The Term Sheet contemplates a DIP Loan in the maximum amount of \$185 million, to be guaranteed by each of the present and future, direct or indirect, wholly-owned subsidiaries of the Applicant. The Term Sheet provides for a maximum availability under the DIP Loan that varies on a monthly basis to reflect the Applicant’s cash flow requirements as contemplated in the cash flow projections attached thereto. Advances bear interest at 5% per annum, 7% upon an event of default, and are prepayable at any time upon payment of an exit fee of \$5.5 million together with the lender’s fees and costs described below. The Term Sheet provides for a commitment fee in the amount of \$3.7 million payable out of the first advance. The Applicant is also obligated to pay the lender’s legal fees and any costs of realization or disbursement pertaining to the DIP Loan and these CCAA proceedings.

[6] The Term Sheet contains a number of affirmative covenants, including compliance with a timetable for the CCAA proceedings. The DIP Loan terminates on the earliest to occur of certain events, including: (1) the implementation of a compromise or plan of arrangement; (2) the sale of all or substantially all of the Applicant’s assets; (3) the conversion of the CCAA proceedings into a proceeding under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*; (4) December 31, 2015, being the end of the proposed restructuring period according to the timetable; and (5) the occurrence of an event of default, at the discretion of the DIP lender.

[7] A condition precedent to funding under the DIP Loan is an order of this Court granting a charge in favour of the DIP lender (the “DIP Lender’s Charge”) having priority over all security interests, trusts, liens, charges and encumbrances, claims of secured creditors, statutory or otherwise (herein, collectively “Encumbrances”) other than the Administration Charge (Part I), the Director’s Charge and certain permitted liens set out in the Term Sheet, which include existing and future purchase money security interests and certain equipment financing security registrations listed in a schedule to the Term Sheet (the “Permitted Priority Liens”).

[8] The terms and conditions of the DIP Loan, as set out in the Term Sheet, have been the subject of extensive negotiation in the period prior to the hearing of this motion. The DIP Loan is supported by the monitor and USS, and is not opposed by any of the other major stakeholders of the Applicant, including the Province of Ontario and the United Steelworkers International Union and the United Steelworkers Union, Locals 1005 and 8782 (collectively, the “USW”).

[9] The existence of a financing facility is of critical importance to the Applicant at this time in order to ensure stable continuing operations during the CCAA proceedings and thereby to provide reassurance to the Applicant’s various stakeholders that the Applicant will continue to have the financial resources to pay its suppliers and employees, and to carry on its business in the ordinary course. As such, debtor-in-possession financing is a pre-condition to a successful restructuring of the Applicant. In particular, the Applicant requires additional financing to build up its raw materials inventories prior to the Seaway freeze to avoid the risk of operating disruptions and/or sizeable cost increases during the winter months.

[10] The Monitor, who was present during the negotiations regarding the terms of the DIP Loan, the Chief Restructuring Officer (the “CRO”) and the Financial Advisor to the Applicant have each advised the Court that in their opinion the terms of the DIP Loan are reasonable, are consistent with the terms of other debtor-in-possession financing facilities in respect of comparable borrowers, and meet the financial requirements of the Applicant. The Monitor has advised in its First Report that it does not believe it likely that a superior DIP proposal would have been forthcoming.

[11] The Court has the authority to approve the DIP Loan under s. 11 of the CCAA. I am satisfied that, for the foregoing reasons, it is appropriate to do so in the present circumstances.

[12] The Court also has the authority under s. 11.2 of the CCAA to grant the requested priority of the DIP Lender’s Charge to secure the DIP Loan. In this regard, s. 11.2(4) of the CCAA sets out a non-exhaustive list of factors to be considered by a court in addressing such a motion. In addition, Pepall J. (as she then was) stressed the importance of three particular criteria in *Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)*, 2009 CarswellOnt 6184 at paras. 32-34 (S.C.), [2009] O.J. No. 4286 [*Canwest*]. In my view, the DIP Lender’s Charge sought by the Applicant is appropriate based on those factors for the reasons that follow.

[13] First, notice has been given to all of the secured parties likely to be affected, including USS as the only secured creditor having a general security interest over all the assets of the Applicant. Notice has also been given broadly to all PPSA registrants, various governmental agencies, including environmental agencies and taxing authorities, and to all pension and retirement plan beneficiaries pursuant to the process contemplated by the Notice Procedure Order.

[14] Second, the maximum amount of the DIP Loan is appropriate based on the anticipated cash flow requirements of the Applicant, as reflected in its cash flow projections for the entire restructuring period, in order to continue to carry on its business during the restructuring period. The cash flows to January 30, 2015 are the subject of a favourable report of the Monitor in its First Report.

[15] Third, the Applicant's business will continue to be managed by the Applicant's management with the assistance of the CRO during the restructuring period. The Applicant's board of directors will continue in place, a majority of whom are independent individuals with significant restructuring and steel-industry experience. The Applicant's parent and largest creditor, USS, is providing support to the Applicant by providing the DIP Loan through a subsidiary. Equally important, the existing operational relationships between the Applicant and USS will continue.

[16] Fourth, for the reasons set out above, the DIP Loan will assist in, and enhance, the restructuring process.

[17] Fifth, the DIP Lender's Charge does not secure any unsecured pre-filing obligations owed to the DIP lender or its affiliates. It will not prejudice any of the other parties having security interests in property of the Applicant. In particular, the DIP Charge will rank behind the Permitted Priority Liens. Although it will rank ahead of any deemed trust contemplated by the *Pension Benefits Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.8, the DIP Loan contemplates continued payment of the pension contributions required under the Pension Agreement dated as of March 31, 2006, as amended by the Amendment to Pension Agreement dated October 31, 2007 (collectively, the "Stelco Pension Agreement") and Ontario Regulation 99/06 under the *Pension Benefits Act* (the "Stelco Regulation").

[18] Based on the foregoing, it is appropriate to grant the DIP Charge having the priority contemplated above. As was the case in *Timminco Ltd. (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 948 at paras. 46-47, [2012] O.J. No. 596 [*Timminco*], it is not realistic to conceive of the DIP Loan proceeding in the absence of the DIP Lender's Charge receiving the priority being requested on this motion, nor is it realistic to investigate the possibility of third-party debtor-in-possession financing without a similar priority. The proposed DIP Loan, subject to the benefit of the proposed DIP Lender's Charge, is a necessary pre-condition to continuation of these restructuring proceedings under the CCAA and avoidance of a bankruptcy proceeding. I am satisfied that, in order to further these objectives, it is both necessary and appropriate to invoke the doctrine of paramountcy, as contemplated in *Sun Indalex Finance, LLC v. United Steel Workers*, 2013 SCC 6, [2013] 1 S.C.R. 271 [*Sun Indalex*] such that the provisions of the CCAA will override the provisions of the *Pension Benefits Act* in respect of the priority of the DIP Lender's Charge.

Administration Charge and Director's Charge

[19] The Initial Order provides for an Administration Charge (Part I) to the maximum amount of \$6.5 million, a Director's Charge to a maximum amount of \$39 million, and an Administration Charge (Part II) to a maximum amount of \$5.5 million plus \$1 million. On this motion, the Applicant seeks to amend the Initial Order, which was granted on an *ex parte* basis, to provide that the Administration Charge (Part I) and the Director's Charge rank ahead of all other Encumbrances in that order, and the Administration Charge (Part II) ranks ahead of all Encumbrances except the prior-ranking court-ordered charges and the Permitted Priority Liens.

[20] The Court's authority to grant a super-priority in respect of the fees and expenses to be covered by the Administration Charge (Part I) and the Administration Charge (Part II) is found in s. 11.52 of the CCAA. Similarly, s. 11.51 of the CCAA provides the authority to grant a

similar charge in respect of the fees and expenses of the directors to be secured by the Director's Charge.

[21] As discussed above, the Applicant has fulfilled the notice requirements in respect of those provisions by serving the motion materials for this Comeback Motion to the parties on the service list and by complying with the requirements of the Notice Procedure Order.

[22] It is both commonplace and essential to order a super-priority in respect of charges securing professional fees and disbursements and directors' fees and disbursements in restructurings under the CCAA. I concur in the expression of the necessity of such security as a pre-condition to the success of any possible restructuring, as articulated by Morawetz R.S.J. in *Timminco* at para. 66.

[23] In *Canwest*, at para. 54, Pepall J. (as she then was) set out a non-exhaustive list of factors to be considered in approving an administration charge. Morawetz R.S.J. addressed those factors in his endorsement respecting the granting of the Initial Order approving the Administration Charge (Part I) and the Administration Charge (Part II). Similarly, Morawetz R.S.J. also addressed the necessity for, and appropriateness of, approving the Director's Charge in such endorsement.

[24] In my opinion, the same factors support the super-priority sought by the Applicant for the Administration Charge (Part I), the Director's Charge and the Administration Charge (Part II). Further, I am satisfied that the requested priority of these charges is necessary to further the objectives of these CCAA proceedings and that it is also necessary and appropriate to invoke the doctrine of paramountcy, as contemplated in *Sun Indalex*, such that the provisions of the CCAA will override the provisions of the *Pension Benefits Act* in respect of the priority of these Charges. I am satisfied that the beneficiaries of the Administration Charge (Part I) and the Administration Charge (Part II) will not likely provide services to the Applicant in these CCAA proceedings without the proposed security for their fees and disbursements. I am also satisfied that their participation in the CCAA proceedings is critical to the Applicant's ability to restructure. Similarly, I accept that the Applicant requires the continued involvement of its directors to pursue its restructuring and that such persons, particularly its independent directors, would not likely continue in this role without the benefit of the proposed security due to the personal exposure associated with the Applicant's financial position.

The KERP

[25] The Applicant has identified 28 employees in management and operational roles who it considers critical to the success of its restructuring efforts and continued operations as a going concern. It has developed a key employee retention programme (the "KERP") to retain such employees. The KERP provides for a cash retention payment equal to a percentage of each such employee's annual salary, to be paid upon implementation of a plan of arrangement or completion of a sale, upon an outside date, or upon earlier termination of employment without cause.

[26] The maximum amount payable under the KERP is \$2,570,378. The Applicant proposes to pay such amount to the Monitor to be held in trust pending payment.

[27] The Court's jurisdiction to authorize the KERP is found in its general power under s. 11 of the CCAA to make such order as it sees fit in a proceeding under the CCAA. The following factors identified in case law support approval of the KERP in the present circumstances.

[28] First, the evidence supports the conclusion that the continued employment of the employees to whom the KERP applies is important for the stability of the business and to assist in the marketing process. The evidence is that these employees perform important roles in the business and cannot easily be replaced. In addition, certain of the employees have performed a central role in the proceedings under the CCAA and the restructuring process to date.

[29] Second, the Applicant advises that the employees identified for the KERP have lengthy histories of employment with the Applicant and specialized knowledge that cannot be replaced by the Applicant given the degree of integration between the Applicant and USS. The evidence strongly suggests that, if the employees were to depart the Applicant, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to have adequate replacements in view of the Applicant's current circumstances.

[30] Third, there is little doubt that, in the present circumstances and, in particular, given the uncertainty surrounding a significant portion of the Applicant's operations, the employees to be covered by the KERP would likely consider other employment options if the KERP were not approved.

[31] Fourth, the KERP was developed through a consultative process involving the Applicant's management, the Applicant's board of directors, USS, the Monitor and the CRO. The Applicant's board of directors, including the independent directors, supports the KERP. The business judgment of the board of directors is an important consideration in approving a proposed KERP: see *Timminco Ltd. (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 506 at para.73, [2012] O.J. No. 472. In addition, USS, the only secured creditor of the Applicant, supports the KERP.

[32] Fifth, both the Monitor and the CRO support the KERP. In particular, the Monitor's judgment in this matter is an important consideration. The Monitor has advised in its First Report that it is satisfied that each of the employees covered by the KERP is critical to the Applicant's strategic direction and day-to-day operations and management. It has also advised that the amount and terms of the proposed KERP are reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances and in the Monitor's experience in other CCAA proceedings.

[33] Sixth, the terms of the KERP, as described above, are effectively payable upon completion of the restructuring process.

Appointment of Representative Counsel for the Non-USW Active and Retiree Beneficiaries

[34] The beneficiaries entitled to benefits under the Hamilton Salaried Pension Plan, the LEW Salaried Pension Plan, the LEW Pickling Facility Plan who are not represented by the USW, the Legacy Pension Plan, the Steinman Plan, the Opportunity GRRSP, RBC's and RA's who are not represented by the USW and beneficiaries entitled to OEPB's who are not represented by the USW (collectively, the "Non-USW Active and Retiree Beneficiaries") do not currently have representation in these proceedings. The defined terms in this section have the meanings ascribed thereto in the affidavit of Michael A. McQuade referred to in the Initial Order.

[35] The Applicant proposes the appointment of six representatives and representative counsel to represent the interests of the Non-USW Active and Retiree Beneficiaries. The Court has authority to make such an order under the general authority in section 11 of the CCAA and pursuant to Rules 10.01 and 12.07 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*. I am satisfied that such an order should be granted in the circumstances.

[36] In reaching this conclusion, I have considered the factors addressed in *Canwest Publishing (Re)*, 2010 ONSC 1328, [2010] O.J. No. 943. In this regard, the following considerations are relevant.

[37] The Non-USW Active and Retiree Beneficiaries are an important stakeholder group in these proceedings under the CCAA and deserve meaningful representation relating to matters of recovery, compromise of rights and entitlement to benefits under the plans of which they are beneficiaries or changes to other compensation. Current and former employees of a company in proceedings under the CCAA are vulnerable generally on their own. In the present case, there is added concern due to the existence of a solvency deficiency in the Applicant's pension plans and the unfunded nature of the OPEB's.

[38] Second, the contemplated representation will enhance the efficiency of the proceedings under the CCAA in a number of ways. It will assist in the communication of the rights of this stakeholder group on an on-going basis during the restructuring process. It will also provide an efficient and cost-effective means of ensuring that the interests of this stakeholder group are brought to the attention of the Court. In addition, it will establish a leadership group who will be able to organize a process for obtaining the advice and directions of this group on specific issues in the restructuring as required.

[39] Third, the contemplated representation will avoid a multiplicity of retainers to the extent separate representation is not required. In this regard, I note that at the present time, there is a commonality of interest among all the non-USW Active and Retiree Beneficiaries in accordance with the principles referred to in *Nortel Networks Corp. (Re)*, 2009 CarswellOnt 3028 at para. 62 (S.C.), [2009] O.J. No. 3280 [*Nortel*]. In particular, at the present time, none of the CRO, the proposed representative counsel and the proposed representatives see any material conflict of interest between the current and former employees. In these circumstances, as in *Nortel*, I am satisfied that representation of the employees' interests can be accomplished by the appointment of a single representative counsel, knowledgeable and experienced in all facets of employee claims. If the interests of such parties do in fact diverge in the future, the Court will be able to address the need for separate counsel at such time. In this regard, the proposed representative counsel has advised the Court that it and the proposed representatives are alert to the possibility of such conflicts potentially arising and will bring any issues of this nature to the Court's attention.

[40] Fourth, the balance of convenience favours the proposed order insofar as it provides for notice and an opt-out process. The proposed representation order thereby provides the flexibility to members of this stakeholder group who do not wish to be represented by the proposed representatives or the proposed representative counsel to opt-out in favour of their own choice of representative and of counsel.

[41] Fifth, the proposed representative counsel, Koskie Minsky LLP, have considerable experience representing employee groups in other restructurings under the CCAA. Similarly, the proposed representatives have considerable experience in respect of the matters likely to be addressed in the proceedings, either in connection with the earlier restructuring of the Applicant or in former roles as employees of the Applicant.

[42] Sixth, the proposed order is supported by the Monitor and a number of the principal stakeholders of the Applicant and is not opposed by any of the other stakeholders appearing on this motion.

Extension of the Stay

[43] Lastly, the Applicant seeks an order extending the provisions of the Initial Order, including the stay provisions thereof, until January 23, 2015. Section 11.02(2) of the CCAA gives the Court the discretionary authority to extend a stay of proceedings subject to satisfaction of the conditions set out in s. 11.02(3). I am satisfied that these requirements have been met in the present case, and that the requested relief should be granted, for the following reasons.


[44] First, the stay is necessary to provide the stability required to allow the Applicant an opportunity to work towards a plan of arrangement. Since the Initial Order, the Applicant has continued its operations without major disruption. In the absence of a stay, however, the evidence indicates the Applicant will have a cash flow deficiency that will render the objective of a successful restructuring unattainable. As mentioned, the Monitor has advised that, based on its review, the Applicant should have adequate financial resources to continue to operate in the ordinary course and in accordance with the terms of the Initial Order during the stay period.

[45] Second, I am satisfied that the Applicant is acting in good faith and with due diligence to facilitate the restructuring process. In this regard, the Applicant has had extensive discussions with its principal stakeholders to address significant objections to the initial draft of the Term Sheet that were raised by such stakeholders.

[46] Third, the Monitor and the CRO support the extension.

[47] Lastly, while it is not anticipated that the restructuring will have proceeded to the point of identification of a plan of arrangement by the end of the proposed stay period, the Applicant should be able to make significant steps toward that goal during this period. In particular, the Applicant intends to commence a process of discussions with its stakeholders as well as to explore restructuring options through a sales or restructuring recapitalization process (the "SARP") contemplated by the Term Sheet. An extension of the stay will ensure stability and continuity of the applicant's operations while these discussions are conducted, without which the Applicant's restructuring options will be seriously limited if not excluded altogether. In addition, the Applicant should be able to take steps to provide continuing assurance to its stakeholders that it will be able to continue to operate in the ordinary course during the anticipated restructuring period, without interruption, notwithstanding the current proceedings under the CCAA.

[48] Accordingly, I am satisfied that an extension of the Initial Order will further the purposes of the Act and the requested extension should be granted.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "W. Ben-L. J.", written over a horizontal line.

Wilton-Siegel J.

Date: October 22, 2014

TAB G

2010 SCC 60
Supreme Court of Canada

Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services] Ltd., Re

2010 CarswellBC 3419, 2010 CarswellBC 3420, 2010 SCC 60, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, [2010] G.S.T.C. 186, [2010] S.C.J. No. 60, [2011] 2 W.W.R. 383, [2011] B.C.W.L.D. 533, [2011] B.C.W.L.D. 534, 12 B.C.L.R. (5th) 1, 196 A.C.W.S. (3d) 27, 2011 D.T.C. 5006 (Eng.), 2011 G.T.C. 2006 (Eng.), 296 B.C.A.C. 1, 326 D.L.R. (4th) 577, 409 N.R. 201, 503 W.A.C. 1, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 170, J.E. 2011-5

Century Services Inc. (Appellant) and Attorney General of Canada on behalf of Her Majesty The Queen in Right of Canada (Respondent)

Deschamps J., McLachlin C.J.C., Binnie, LeBel, Fish, Abella, Charron, Rothstein, Cromwell JJ.

Heard: May 11, 2010
Judgment: December 16, 2010
Docket: 33239

Proceedings: reversing *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re* (2009), 2009 CarswellBC 1195, 2009 G.T.C. 2020 (Eng.), 2009 BCCA 205, 270 B.C.A.C. 167, 454 W.A.C. 167, [2009] 12 W.W.R. 684, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79 (B.C. C.A.); reversing *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re* (2008), 2008 CarswellBC 2895, 2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221, 2009 G.T.C. 2011 (Eng.) (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers])

Counsel: Mary I.A. Buttery, Owen J. James, Matthew J.G. Curtis for Appellant
Gordon Bourgard, David Jacyk, Michael J. Lema for Respondent

Subject: Estates and Trusts; Goods and Services Tax (GST); Tax — Miscellaneous; Insolvency

APPEAL by creditor from judgment reported at 2009 CarswellBC 1195, 2009 BCCA 205, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, [2009] 12 W.W.R. 684, 270 B.C.A.C. 167, 454 W.A.C. 167, 2009 G.T.C. 2020 (Eng.) (B.C. C.A.), allowing Crown's appeal from dismissal of application for immediate payment of tax debt.

Deschamps J.:

1 For the first time this Court is called upon to directly interpret the provisions of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA"). In that respect, two questions are raised. The first requires reconciliation of provisions of the CCAA and the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("ETA"), which lower courts have held to be in conflict with one another. The second concerns the scope of a court's discretion when supervising reorganization. The relevant statutory provisions are reproduced in the Appendix. On the first question, having considered the evolution of Crown priorities in the context of insolvency and the wording of the various statutes creating Crown priorities, I conclude that it is the CCAA and not the ETA that provides the rule. On the second question, I conclude that the broad discretionary jurisdiction conferred on the supervising judge must be interpreted having regard to the remedial nature of the CCAA and insolvency legislation generally. Consequently, the court had the discretion to partially lift a stay of proceedings to allow the debtor to make an assignment under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("BIA"). I would allow the appeal.

1. Facts and Decisions of the Courts Below

2 Ted LeRoy Trucking Ltd. ("LeRoy Trucking") commenced proceedings under the *CCAA* in the Supreme Court of British Columbia on December 13, 2007, obtaining a stay of proceedings with a view to reorganizing its financial affairs. LeRoy Trucking sold certain redundant assets as authorized by the order.

3 Amongst the debts owed by LeRoy Trucking was an amount for Goods and Services Tax ("GST") collected but unremitted to the Crown. The *ETA* creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown for amounts collected in respect of GST. The deemed trust extends to any property or proceeds held by the person collecting GST and any property of that person held by a secured creditor, requiring that property to be paid to the Crown in priority to all security interests. The *ETA* provides that the deemed trust operates despite any other enactment of Canada except the *BIA*. However, the *CCAA* also provides that subject to certain exceptions, none of which mentions GST, deemed trusts in favour of the Crown do not operate under the *CCAA*. Accordingly, under the *CCAA* the Crown ranks as an unsecured creditor in respect of GST. Nonetheless, at the time LeRoy Trucking commenced *CCAA* proceedings the leading line of jurisprudence held that the *ETA* took precedence over the *CCAA* such that the Crown enjoyed priority for GST claims under the *CCAA*, even though it would have lost that same priority under the *BIA*. The *CCAA* underwent substantial amendments in 2005 in which some of the provisions at issue in this appeal were renumbered and reformulated (S.C. 2005, c. 47). However, these amendments only came into force on September 18, 2009. I will refer to the amended provisions only where relevant.

4 On April 29, 2008, Brenner C.J.S.C., in the context of the *CCAA* proceedings, approved a payment not exceeding \$5 million, the proceeds of redundant asset sales, to Century Services, the debtor's major secured creditor. LeRoy Trucking proposed to hold back an amount equal to the GST monies collected but unremitted to the Crown and place it in the Monitor's trust account until the outcome of the reorganization was known. In order to maintain the *status quo* while the success of the reorganization was uncertain, Brenner C.J.S.C. agreed to the proposal and ordered that an amount of \$305,202.30 be held by the Monitor in its trust account.

5 On September 3, 2008, having concluded that reorganization was not possible, LeRoy Trucking sought leave to make an assignment in bankruptcy under the *BIA*. The Crown sought an order that the GST monies held by the Monitor be paid to the Receiver General of Canada. Brenner C.J.S.C. dismissed the latter application. Reasoning that the purpose of segregating the funds with the Monitor was "to facilitate an ultimate payment of the GST monies which were owed pre-filing, but only if a viable plan emerged", the failure of such a reorganization, followed by an assignment in bankruptcy, meant the Crown would lose priority under the *BIA* (2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers])).

6 The Crown's appeal was allowed by the British Columbia Court of Appeal (2009 BCCA 205, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79, 270 B.C.A.C. 167 (B.C. C.A.)). Tysoe J.A. for a unanimous court found two independent bases for allowing the Crown's appeal.

7 First, the court's authority under s. 11 of the *CCAA* was held not to extend to staying the Crown's application for immediate payment of the GST funds subject to the deemed trust after it was clear that reorganization efforts had failed and that bankruptcy was inevitable. As restructuring was no longer a possibility, staying the Crown's claim to the GST funds no longer served a purpose under the *CCAA* and the court was bound under the priority scheme provided by the *ETA* to allow payment to the Crown. In so holding, Tysoe J.A. adopted the reasoning in *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)*, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1, 73 O.R. (3d) 737 (Ont. C.A.), which found that the *ETA* deemed trust for GST established Crown priority over secured creditors under the *CCAA*.

8 Second, Tysoe J.A. concluded that by ordering the GST funds segregated in the Monitor's trust account on April 29, 2008, the judge had created an express trust in favour of the Crown from which the monies in question could not be diverted for any other purposes. The Court of Appeal therefore ordered that the money held by the Monitor in trust be paid to the Receiver General.

2. Issues

9 This appeal raises three broad issues which are addressed in turn:

(1) Did s. 222(3) of the *ETA* displace s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* and give priority to the Crown's *ETA* deemed trust during *CCAA* proceedings as held in *Ottawa Senators*?

(2) Did the court exceed its *CCAA* authority by lifting the stay to allow the debtor to make an assignment in bankruptcy?

(3) Did the court's order of April 29, 2008 requiring segregation of the Crown's GST claim in the Monitor's trust account create an express trust in favour of the Crown in respect of those funds?

3. Analysis

10 The first issue concerns Crown priorities in the context of insolvency. As will be seen, the *ETA* provides for a deemed trust in favour of the Crown in respect of GST owed by a debtor "[d]espite ... any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*)" (s. 222(3)), while the *CCAA* stated at the relevant time that "notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be [so] regarded" (s. 18.3(1)). It is difficult to imagine two statutory provisions more apparently in conflict. However, as is often the case, the apparent conflict can be resolved through interpretation.

11 In order to properly interpret the provisions, it is necessary to examine the history of the *CCAA*, its function amidst the body of insolvency legislation enacted by Parliament, and the principles that have been recognized in the jurisprudence. It will be seen that Crown priorities in the insolvency context have been significantly pared down. The resolution of the second issue is also rooted in the context of the *CCAA*, but its purpose and the manner in which it has been interpreted in the case law are also key. After examining the first two issues in this case, I will address Tysoe J.A.'s conclusion that an express trust in favour of the Crown was created by the court's order of April 29, 2008.

3.1 Purpose and Scope of Insolvency Law

12 Insolvency is the factual situation that arises when a debtor is unable to pay creditors (see generally, R. J. Wood, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law* (2009), at p. 16). Certain legal proceedings become available upon insolvency, which typically allow a debtor to obtain a court order staying its creditors' enforcement actions and attempt to obtain a binding compromise with creditors to adjust the payment conditions to something more realistic. Alternatively, the debtor's assets may be liquidated and debts paid from the proceeds according to statutory priority rules. The former is usually referred to as reorganization or restructuring while the latter is termed liquidation.

13 Canadian commercial insolvency law is not codified in one exhaustive statute. Instead, Parliament has enacted multiple insolvency statutes, the main one being the *BIA*. The *BIA* offers a self-contained legal regime providing for both reorganization and liquidation. Although bankruptcy legislation has a long history, the *BIA* itself is a fairly recent statute — it was enacted in 1992. It is characterized by a rules-based approach to proceedings. The *BIA* is available to insolvent debtors owing \$1000 or more, regardless of whether they are natural or legal persons. It contains mechanisms for debtors to make proposals to their creditors for the adjustment of debts. If a proposal fails, the *BIA* contains a bridge to bankruptcy whereby the debtor's assets are liquidated and the proceeds paid to creditors in accordance with the statutory scheme of distribution.

14 Access to the *CCAA* is more restrictive. A debtor must be a company with liabilities in excess of \$5 million. Unlike the *BIA*, the *CCAA* contains no provisions for liquidation of a debtor's assets if reorganization fails. There are three ways of exiting *CCAA* proceedings. The best outcome is achieved when the stay of proceedings provides the debtor with some breathing space during which solvency is restored and the *CCAA* process terminates without reorganization being needed. The second most desirable outcome occurs when the debtor's compromise or arrangement is accepted by its creditors and the reorganized company emerges from the *CCAA* proceedings as a going concern. Lastly, if the compromise or arrangement fails, either the company or its creditors usually seek to have the debtor's assets liquidated under the applicable provisions of the *BIA* or to place the debtor into receivership. As discussed in greater detail below,

the key difference between the reorganization regimes under the *BIA* and the *CCAA* is that the latter offers a more flexible mechanism with greater judicial discretion, making it more responsive to complex reorganizations.

15 As I will discuss at greater length below, the purpose of the *CCAA* — Canada's first reorganization statute — is to permit the debtor to continue to carry on business and, where possible, avoid the social and economic costs of liquidating its assets. Proposals to creditors under the *BIA* serve the same remedial purpose, though this is achieved through a rules-based mechanism that offers less flexibility. Where reorganization is impossible, the *BIA* may be employed to provide an orderly mechanism for the distribution of a debtor's assets to satisfy creditor claims according to predetermined priority rules.

16 Prior to the enactment of the *CCAA* in 1933 (S.C. 1932-33, c. 36), practice under existing commercial insolvency legislation tended heavily towards the liquidation of a debtor company (J. Sarra, *Creditor Rights and the Public Interest: Restructuring Insolvent Corporations* (2003), at p. 12). The battering visited upon Canadian businesses by the Great Depression and the absence of an effective mechanism for reaching a compromise between debtors and creditors to avoid liquidation required a legislative response. The *CCAA* was innovative as it allowed the insolvent debtor to attempt reorganization under judicial supervision outside the existing insolvency legislation which, once engaged, almost invariably resulted in liquidation (*Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada)*, [1934] S.C.R. 659 (S.C.C.), at pp. 660-61; Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 12-13).

17 Parliament understood when adopting the *CCAA* that liquidation of an insolvent company was harmful for most of those it affected — notably creditors and employees — and that a workout which allowed the company to survive was optimal (Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 13-15).

18 Early commentary and jurisprudence also endorsed the *CCAA*'s remedial objectives. It recognized that companies retain more value as going concerns while underscoring that intangible losses, such as the evaporation of the companies' goodwill, result from liquidation (S. E. Edwards, "Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1947), 25 *Can. Bar Rev.* 587, at p. 592). Reorganization serves the public interest by facilitating the survival of companies supplying goods or services crucial to the health of the economy or saving large numbers of jobs (*ibid.*, at p. 593). Insolvency could be so widely felt as to impact stakeholders other than creditors and employees. Variants of these views resonate today, with reorganization justified in terms of rehabilitating companies that are key elements in a complex web of interdependent economic relationships in order to avoid the negative consequences of liquidation.

19 The *CCAA* fell into disuse during the next several decades, likely because amendments to the Act in 1953 restricted its use to companies issuing bonds (S.C. 1952-53, c. 3). During the economic downturn of the early 1980s, insolvency lawyers and courts adapting to the resulting wave of insolvencies resurrected the statute and deployed it in response to new economic challenges. Participants in insolvency proceedings grew to recognize and appreciate the statute's distinguishing feature: a grant of broad and flexible authority to the supervising court to make the orders necessary to facilitate the reorganization of the debtor and achieve the *CCAA*'s objectives. The manner in which courts have used *CCAA* jurisdiction in increasingly creative and flexible ways is explored in greater detail below.

20 Efforts to evolve insolvency law were not restricted to the courts during this period. In 1970, a government-commissioned panel produced an extensive study recommending sweeping reform but Parliament failed to act (see *Bankruptcy and Insolvency: Report of the Study Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency Legislation* (1970)). Another panel of experts produced more limited recommendations in 1986 which eventually resulted in enactment of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* of 1992 (S.C. 1992, c. 27) (see *Proposed Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency* (1986)). Broader provisions for reorganizing insolvent debtors were then included in Canada's bankruptcy statute. Although the 1970 and 1986 reports made no specific recommendations with respect to the *CCAA*, the House of Commons committee studying the *BIA*'s predecessor bill, C-22, seemed to accept expert testimony that the *BIA*'s new reorganization scheme would shortly supplant the *CCAA*, which could then be repealed, with commercial insolvency and bankruptcy being governed by a single statute (*Minutes of Proceedings*

and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations, Issue No. 15, October 3, 1991, at pp. 15:15-15:16).

21 In retrospect, this conclusion by the House of Commons committee was out of step with reality. It overlooked the renewed vitality the *CCAA* enjoyed in contemporary practice and the advantage that a flexible judicially supervised reorganization process presented in the face of increasingly complex reorganizations, when compared to the stricter rules-based scheme contained in the *BIA*. The "flexibility of the *CCAA* [was seen as] a great benefit, allowing for creative and effective decisions" (Industry Canada, Marketplace Framework Policy Branch, *Report on the Operation and Administration of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (2002), at p. 41). Over the past three decades, resurrection of the *CCAA* has thus been the mainspring of a process through which, one author concludes, "the legal setting for Canadian insolvency restructuring has evolved from a rather blunt instrument to one of the most sophisticated systems in the developed world" (R. B. Jones, "The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring: Challenges for the Rule of Law", in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005* (2006), 481, at p. 481).

22 While insolvency proceedings may be governed by different statutory schemes, they share some commonalities. The most prominent of these is the single proceeding model. The nature and purpose of the single proceeding model are described by Professor Wood in *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law*:

They all provide a collective proceeding that supersedes the usual civil process available to creditors to enforce their claims. The creditors' remedies are collectivized in order to prevent the free-for-all that would otherwise prevail if creditors were permitted to exercise their remedies. In the absence of a collective process, each creditor is armed with the knowledge that if they do not strike hard and swift to seize the debtor's assets, they will be beat out by other creditors. [pp. 2-3]

The single proceeding model avoids the inefficiency and chaos that would attend insolvency if each creditor initiated proceedings to recover its debt. Grouping all possible actions against the debtor into a single proceeding controlled in a single forum facilitates negotiation with creditors because it places them all on an equal footing, rather than exposing them to the risk that a more aggressive creditor will realize its claims against the debtor's limited assets while the other creditors attempt a compromise. With a view to achieving that purpose, both the *CCAA* and the *BIA* allow a court to order all actions against a debtor to be stayed while a compromise is sought.

23 Another point of convergence of the *CCAA* and the *BIA* relates to priorities. Because the *CCAA* is silent about what happens if reorganization fails, the *BIA* scheme of liquidation and distribution necessarily supplies the backdrop for what will happen if a *CCAA* reorganization is ultimately unsuccessful. In addition, one of the important features of legislative reform of both statutes since the enactment of the *BIA* in 1992 has been a cutback in Crown priorities (S.C. 1992, c. 27, s. 39; S.C. 1997, c. 12, ss. 73 and 125; S.C. 2000, c. 30, s. 148; S.C. 2005, c. 47, ss. 69 and 131; S.C. 2009, c. 33, ss. 25 and 29; see also *Alternative granite & marbre inc., Re*, 2009 SCC 49, [2009] 3 S.C.R. 286, [2009] G.S.T.C. 154 (S.C.C.); *Quebec (Deputy Minister of Revenue) c. Rainville* (1979), [1980] 1 S.C.R. 35 (S.C.C.); *Proposed Bankruptcy Act Amendments: Report of the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency* (1986)).

24 With parallel *CCAA* and *BIA* restructuring schemes now an accepted feature of the insolvency law landscape, the contemporary thrust of legislative reform has been towards harmonizing aspects of insolvency law common to the two statutory schemes to the extent possible and encouraging reorganization over liquidation (see *An Act to establish the Wage Earner Protection Program Act, to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts*, S.C. 2005, c. 47; *Gauntlet Energy Corp., Re*, 2003 ABQB 894, [2003] G.S.T.C. 193, 30 Alta. L.R. (4th) 192 (Alta. Q.B.), at para. 19).

25 Mindful of the historical background of the *CCAA* and *BIA*, I now turn to the first question at issue.

3.2 GST Deemed Trust Under the CCAA

26 The Court of Appeal proceeded on the basis that the *ETA* precluded the court from staying the Crown's enforcement of the GST deemed trust when partially lifting the stay to allow the debtor to enter bankruptcy. In so doing, it adopted the reasoning in a line of cases culminating in *Ottawa Senators*, which held that an *ETA* deemed trust remains enforceable during *CCAA* reorganization despite language in the *CCAA* that suggests otherwise.

27 The Crown relies heavily on the decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal in *Ottawa Senators* and argues that the later in time provision of the *ETA* creating the GST deemed trust trumps the provision of the *CCAA* purporting to nullify most statutory deemed trusts. The Court of Appeal in this case accepted this reasoning but not all provincial courts follow it (see, e.g., *Komunik Corp., Re*, 2009 QCCS 6332 (C.S. Que.), leave to appeal granted, 2010 QCCA 183 (C.A. Que.)). Century Services relied, in its written submissions to this Court, on the argument that the court had authority under the *CCAA* to continue the stay against the Crown's claim for unremitted GST. In oral argument, the question of whether *Ottawa Senators* was correctly decided nonetheless arose. After the hearing, the parties were asked to make further written submissions on this point. As appears evident from the reasons of my colleague Abella J., this issue has become prominent before this Court. In those circumstances, this Court needs to determine the correctness of the reasoning in *Ottawa Senators*.

28 The policy backdrop to this question involves the Crown's priority as a creditor in insolvency situations which, as I mentioned above, has evolved considerably. Prior to the 1990s, Crown claims largely enjoyed priority in insolvency. This was widely seen as unsatisfactory as shown by both the 1970 and 1986 insolvency reform proposals, which recommended that Crown claims receive no preferential treatment. A closely related matter was whether the *CCAA* was binding at all upon the Crown. Amendments to the *CCAA* in 1997 confirmed that it did indeed bind the Crown (see *CCAA*, s. 21, as am. by S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 126).

29 Claims of priority by the state in insolvency situations receive different treatment across jurisdictions worldwide. For example, in Germany and Australia, the state is given no priority at all, while the state enjoys wide priority in the United States and France (see B. K. Morgan, "Should the Sovereign be Paid First? A Comparative International Analysis of the Priority for Tax Claims in Bankruptcy" (2000), 74 *Am. Bank. L.J.* 461, at p. 500). Canada adopted a middle course through legislative reform of Crown priority initiated in 1992. The Crown retained priority for source deductions of income tax, Employment Insurance ("EI") and Canada Pension Plan ("CPP") premiums, but ranks as an ordinary unsecured creditor for most other claims.

30 Parliament has frequently enacted statutory mechanisms to secure Crown claims and permit their enforcement. The two most common are statutory deemed trusts and powers to garnish funds third parties owe the debtor (see F. L. Lamer, *Priority of Crown Claims in Insolvency* (loose-leaf), at § 2).

31 With respect to GST collected, Parliament has enacted a deemed trust. The *ETA* states that every person who collects an amount on account of GST is deemed to hold that amount in trust for the Crown (s. 222(1)). The deemed trust extends to other property of the person collecting the tax equal in value to the amount deemed to be in trust if that amount has not been remitted in accordance with the *ETA*. The deemed trust also extends to property held by a secured creditor that, but for the security interest, would be property of the person collecting the tax (s. 222(3)).

32 Parliament has created similar deemed trusts using almost identical language in respect of source deductions of income tax, EI premiums and CPP premiums (see s. 227(4) of the *Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.) ("*ITA*"), ss. 86(2) and (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 23, and ss. 23(3) and (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8). I will refer to income tax, EI and CPP deductions as "source deductions".

33 In *Royal Bank v. Sparrow Electric Corp.*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 411 (S.C.C.), this Court addressed a priority dispute between a deemed trust for source deductions under the *ITA* and security interests taken under both the *Bank Act*, S.C. 1991, c. 46, and the *Alberta Personal Property Security Act*, S.A. 1988, c. P-4.05 ("*PPSA*"). As then worded, an *ITA* deemed trust over the debtor's property equivalent to the amount owing in respect of income tax became effective at the

time of liquidation, receivership, or assignment in bankruptcy. *Sparrow Electric* held that the *ITA* deemed trust could not prevail over the security interests because, being fixed charges, the latter attached as soon as the debtor acquired rights in the property such that the *ITA* deemed trust had no property on which to attach when it subsequently arose. Later, in *First Vancouver Finance v. Minister of National Revenue*, 2002 SCC 49, [2002] G.S.T.C. 23, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 720 (S.C.C.), this Court observed that Parliament had legislated to strengthen the statutory deemed trust in the *ITA* by deeming it to operate from the moment the deductions were not paid to the Crown as required by the *ITA*, and by granting the Crown priority over all security interests (paras. 27-29) (the "*Sparrow Electric* amendment").

34 The amended text of s. 227(4.1) of the *ITA* and concordant source deductions deemed trusts in the *Canada Pension Plan* and the *Employment Insurance Act* state that the deemed trust operates notwithstanding any other enactment of Canada, except ss. 81.1 and 81.2 of the *BIA*. The *ETA* deemed trust at issue in this case is similarly worded, but it excepts the *BIA* in its entirety. The provision reads as follows:

222. (3) Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

35 The Crown submits that the *Sparrow Electric* amendment, added by Parliament to the *ETA* in 2000, was intended to preserve the Crown's priority over collected GST under the *CCAA* while subordinating the Crown to the status of an unsecured creditor in respect of GST only under the *BIA*. This is because the *ETA* provides that the GST deemed trust is effective "despite" any other enactment except the *BIA*.

36 The language used in the *ETA* for the GST deemed trust creates an apparent conflict with the *CCAA*, which provides that subject to certain exceptions, property deemed by statute to be held in trust for the Crown shall not be so regarded.

37 Through a 1997 amendment to the *CCAA* (S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 125), Parliament appears to have, subject to specific exceptions, nullified deemed trusts in favour of the Crown once reorganization proceedings are commenced under the Act. The relevant provision reads:

18.3 (1) Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

This nullification of deemed trusts was continued in further amendments to the *CCAA* (S.C. 2005, c. 47), where s. 18.3(1) was renumbered and reformulated as s. 37(1):

37. (1) Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

38 An analogous provision exists in the *BIA*, which, subject to the same specific exceptions, nullifies statutory deemed trusts and makes property of the bankrupt that would otherwise be subject to a deemed trust part of the debtor's estate and available to creditors (S.C. 1992, c. 27, s. 39; S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 73; *BIA*, s. 67(2)). It is noteworthy that in both the *CCAA* and the *BIA*, the exceptions concern source deductions (*CCAA*, s. 18.3(2); *BIA*, s. 67(3)). The relevant provision of the *CCAA* reads:

18.3 (2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*....

Thus, the Crown's deemed trust and corresponding priority in source deductions remain effective both in reorganization and in bankruptcy.

39 Meanwhile, in both s. 18.4(1) of the *CCAA* and s. 86(1) of the *BIA*, other Crown claims are treated as unsecured. These provisions, establishing the Crown's status as an unsecured creditor, explicitly exempt statutory deemed trusts in source deductions (*CCAA*, s. 18.4(3); *BIA*, s. 86(3)). The *CCAA* provision reads as follows:

18.4 (3) Subsection (1) [Crown ranking as unsecured creditor] does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution

Therefore, not only does the *CCAA* provide that Crown claims do not enjoy priority over the claims of other creditors (s. 18.3(1)), but the exceptions to this rule (i.e., that Crown priority is maintained for source deductions) are repeatedly stated in the statute.

40 The apparent conflict in this case is whether the rule in the *CCAA* first enacted as s. 18.3 in 1997, which provides that subject to certain explicit exceptions, statutory deemed trusts are ineffective under the *CCAA*, is overridden by the one in the *ETA* enacted in 2000 stating that GST deemed trusts operate despite any enactment of Canada except the *BIA*. With respect for my colleague Fish J., I do not think the apparent conflict can be resolved by denying it and creating a rule requiring both a statutory provision enacting the deemed trust, and a second statutory provision confirming it. Such a rule is unknown to the law. Courts must recognize conflicts, apparent or real, and resolve them when possible.

41 A line of jurisprudence across Canada has resolved the apparent conflict in favour of the *ETA*, thereby maintaining GST deemed trusts under the *CCAA*. *Ottawa Senators*, the leading case, decided the matter by invoking the doctrine of implied repeal to hold that the later in time provision of the *ETA* should take precedence over the *CCAA* (see also *Solid Resources Ltd., Re* (2002), 40 C.B.R. (4th) 219, [2003] G.S.T.C. 21 (Alta. Q.B.); *Gauntlet*

42 The Ontario Court of Appeal in *Ottawa Senators* rested its conclusion on two considerations. First, it was persuaded that by explicitly mentioning the *BIA* in *ETA* s. 222(3), but not the *CCAA*, Parliament made a deliberate choice. In the words of MacPherson J.A.:

The *BIA* and the *CCAA* are closely related federal statutes. I cannot conceive that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception, but accidentally fail to consider the *CCAA* as a possible second exception. In my view, the omission of the *CCAA* from s. 222(3) of the *ETA* was almost certainly a considered omission. [para. 43]

43 Second, the Ontario Court of Appeal compared the conflict between the *ETA* and the *CCAA* to that before this Court in *Doré c. Verdun (Municipalité)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862 (S.C.C.), and found them to be "identical" (para. 46). It therefore considered *Doré* binding (para. 49). In *Doré*, a limitations provision in the more general and recently enacted *Civil Code of Québec*, S.Q. 1991, c. 64 ("C.C.Q."), was held to have repealed a more specific provision of the earlier *Quebec Cities and Towns Act*, R.S.Q., c. C-19, with which it conflicted. By analogy, the Ontario Court of Appeal held that the later in time and more general provision, s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, impliedly repealed the more specific and earlier in time provision, s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* (paras. 47-49).

44 Viewing this issue in its entire context, several considerations lead me to conclude that neither the reasoning nor the result in *Ottawa Senators* can stand. While a conflict may exist at the level of the statutes' wording, a purposive and contextual analysis to determine Parliament's true intent yields the conclusion that Parliament could not have intended to restore the Crown's deemed trust priority in GST claims under the *CCAA* when it amended the *ETA* in 2000 with the *Sparrow Electric* amendment.

45 I begin by recalling that Parliament has shown its willingness to move away from asserting priority for Crown claims in insolvency law. Section 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* (subject to the s. 18.3(2) exceptions) provides that the Crown's deemed trusts have no effect under the *CCAA*. Where Parliament has sought to protect certain Crown claims through statutory deemed trusts and intended that these deemed trusts continue in insolvency, it has legislated so explicitly and elaborately. For example, s. 18.3(2) of the *CCAA* and s. 67(3) of the *BIA* expressly provide that deemed trusts for source deductions remain effective in insolvency. Parliament has, therefore, clearly carved out exceptions from the general rule that deemed trusts are ineffective in insolvency. The *CCAA* and *BIA* are in harmony, preserving deemed trusts and asserting Crown priority only in respect of source deductions. Meanwhile, there is no express statutory basis for concluding that GST claims enjoy a preferred treatment under the *CCAA* or the *BIA*. Unlike source deductions, which are clearly and expressly dealt with under both these insolvency statutes, no such clear and express language exists in those Acts carving out an exception for GST claims.

46 The internal logic of the *CCAA* also militates against upholding the *ETA* deemed trust for GST. The *CCAA* imposes limits on a suspension by the court of the Crown's rights in respect of source deductions but does not mention the *ETA* (s. 11.4). Since source deductions deemed trusts are granted explicit protection under the *CCAA*, it would be inconsistent to afford a better protection to the *ETA* deemed trust absent explicit language in the *CCAA*. Thus, the logic of the *CCAA* appears to subject the *ETA* deemed trust to the waiver by Parliament of its priority (s. 18.4).

47 Moreover, a strange asymmetry would arise if the interpretation giving the *ETA* priority over the *CCAA* urged by the Crown is adopted here: the Crown would retain priority over GST claims during *CCAA* proceedings but not in bankruptcy. As courts have reflected, this can only encourage statute shopping by secured creditors in cases such as this one where the debtor's assets cannot satisfy both the secured creditors' and the Crown's claims (*Gauntlet*, at para. 21). If creditors' claims were better protected by liquidation under the *BIA*, creditors' incentives would lie overwhelmingly with avoiding proceedings under the *CCAA* and not risking a failed reorganization. Giving a key player in any insolvency such skewed incentives against reorganizing under the *CCAA* can only undermine that statute's remedial objectives and risk inviting the very social ills that it was enacted to avert.

48 Arguably, the effect of *Ottawa Senators* is mitigated if restructuring is attempted under the *BIA* instead of the *CCAA*, but it is not cured. If *Ottawa Senators* were to be followed, Crown priority over GST would differ depending on whether restructuring took place under the *CCAA* or the *BIA*. The anomaly of this result is made manifest by the fact that it would deprive companies of the option to restructure under the more flexible and responsive *CCAA* regime, which has been the statute of choice for complex reorganizations.

49 Evidence that Parliament intended different treatments for GST claims in reorganization and bankruptcy is scant, if it exists at all. Section 222(3) of the *ETA* was enacted as part of a wide-ranging budget implementation bill in 2000. The summary accompanying that bill does not indicate that Parliament intended to elevate Crown priority over GST claims under the *CCAA* to the same or a higher level than source deductions claims. Indeed, the summary for deemed trusts states only that amendments to existing provisions are aimed at "ensuring that employment insurance premiums and Canada Pension Plan contributions that are required to be remitted by an employer are fully recoverable by the Crown in the case of the bankruptcy of the employer" (Summary to S.C. 2000, c. 30, at p. 4a). The wording of GST deemed trusts resembles that of statutory deemed trusts for source deductions and incorporates the same overriding language and reference to the *BIA*. However, as noted above, Parliament's express intent is that only source deductions deemed trusts remain operative. An exception for the *BIA* in the statutory language establishing the source deductions deemed trusts accomplishes very little, because the explicit language of the *BIA* itself (and the *CCAA*) carves out these source deductions deemed trusts and maintains their effect. It is however noteworthy that no equivalent language maintaining GST deemed trusts exists under either the *BIA* or the *CCAA*.

50 It seems more likely that by adopting the same language for creating GST deemed trusts in the *ETA* as it did for deemed trusts for source deductions, and by overlooking the inclusion of an exception for the *CCAA* alongside the *BIA* in s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, Parliament may have inadvertently succumbed to a drafting anomaly. Because of a statutory lacuna

in the *ETA*, the GST deemed trust could be seen as remaining effective in the *CCAA*, while ceasing to have any effect under the *BIA*, thus creating an apparent conflict with the wording of the *CCAA*. However, it should be seen for what it is: a facial conflict only, capable of resolution by looking at the broader approach taken to Crown priorities and by giving precedence to the statutory language of s. 18.3 of the *CCAA* in a manner that does not produce an anomalous outcome.

51 Section 222(3) of the *ETA* evinces no explicit intention of Parliament to repeal *CCAA* s. 18.3. It merely creates an apparent conflict that must be resolved by statutory interpretation. Parliament's intent when it enacted *ETA* s. 222(3) was therefore far from unambiguous. Had it sought to give the Crown a priority for GST claims, it could have done so explicitly as it did for source deductions. Instead, one is left to infer from the language of *ETA* s. 222(3) that the GST deemed trust was intended to be effective under the *CCAA*.

52 I am not persuaded that the reasoning in *Doré* requires the application of the doctrine of implied repeal in the circumstances of this case. The main issue in *Doré* concerned the impact of the adoption of the *C.C.Q.* on the administrative law rules with respect to municipalities. While Gonthier J. concluded in that case that the limitation provision in art. 2930 *C.C.Q.* had repealed by implication a limitation provision in the *Cities and Towns Act*, he did so on the basis of more than a textual analysis. The conclusion in *Doré* was reached after thorough contextual analysis of both pieces of legislation, including an extensive review of the relevant legislative history (paras. 31-41). Consequently, the circumstances before this Court in *Doré* are far from "identical" to those in the present case, in terms of text, context and legislative history. Accordingly, *Doré* cannot be said to require the automatic application of the rule of repeal by implication.

53 A noteworthy indicator of Parliament's overall intent is the fact that in subsequent amendments it has not displaced the rule set out in the *CCAA*. Indeed, as indicated above, the recent amendments to the *CCAA* in 2005 resulted in the rule previously found in s. 18.3 being renumbered and reformulated as s. 37. Thus, to the extent the interpretation allowing the GST deemed trust to remain effective under the *CCAA* depends on *ETA* s. 222(3) having impliedly repealed *CCAA* s. 18.3(1) because it is later in time, we have come full circle. Parliament has renumbered and reformulated the provision of the *CCAA* stating that, subject to exceptions for source deductions, deemed trusts do not survive the *CCAA* proceedings and thus the *CCAA* is now the later in time statute. This confirms that Parliament's intent with respect to GST deemed trusts is to be found in the *CCAA*.

54 I do not agree with my colleague Abella J. that s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, can be used to interpret the 2005 amendments as having no effect. The new statute can hardly be said to be a mere re-enactment of the former statute. Indeed, the *CCAA* underwent a substantial review in 2005. Notably, acting consistently with its goal of treating both the *BIA* and the *CCAA* as sharing the same approach to insolvency, Parliament made parallel amendments to both statutes with respect to corporate proposals. In addition, new provisions were introduced regarding the treatment of contracts, collective agreements, interim financing and governance agreements. The appointment and role of the Monitor was also clarified. Noteworthy are the limits imposed by *CCAA* s. 11.09 on the court's discretion to make an order staying the Crown's source deductions deemed trusts, which were formerly found in s. 11.4. No mention whatsoever is made of GST deemed trusts (see Summary to S.C. 2005, c. 47). The review went as far as looking at the very expression used to describe the statutory override of deemed trusts. The comments cited by my colleague only emphasize the clear intent of Parliament to maintain its policy that only source deductions deemed trusts survive in *CCAA* proceedings.

55 In the case at bar, the legislative context informs the determination of Parliament's legislative intent and supports the conclusion that *ETA* s. 222(3) was not intended to narrow the scope of the *CCAA*'s override provision. Viewed in its entire context, the conflict between the *ETA* and the *CCAA* is more apparent than real. I would therefore not follow the reasoning in *Ottawa Senators* and affirm that *CCAA* s. 18.3 remained effective.

56 My conclusion is reinforced by the purpose of the *CCAA* as part of Canadian remedial insolvency legislation. As this aspect is particularly relevant to the second issue, I will now discuss how courts have interpreted the scope of their discretionary powers in supervising a *CCAA* reorganization and how Parliament has largely endorsed this interpretation.

Indeed, the interpretation courts have given to the *CCAA* helps in understanding how the *CCAA* grew to occupy such a prominent role in Canadian insolvency law.

3.3 Discretionary Power of a Court Supervising a *CCAA* Reorganization

57 Courts frequently observe that "[t]he *CCAA* is skeletal in nature" and does not "contain a comprehensive code that lays out all that is permitted or barred" (*ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*, 2008 ONCA 587, 92 O.R. (3d) 513 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 44, *per* Blair J.A.). Accordingly, "[t]he history of *CCAA* law has been an evolution of judicial interpretation" (*Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List])), at para. 10, *per* Farley J.).

58 *CCAA* decisions are often based on discretionary grants of jurisdiction. The incremental exercise of judicial discretion in commercial courts under conditions one practitioner aptly describes as "the hothouse of real-time litigation" has been the primary method by which the *CCAA* has been adapted and has evolved to meet contemporary business and social needs (see Jones, at p. 484).

59 Judicial discretion must of course be exercised in furtherance of the *CCAA*'s purposes. The remedial purpose I referred to in the historical overview of the Act is recognized over and over again in the jurisprudence. To cite one early example:

The legislation is remedial in the purest sense in that it provides a means whereby the devastating social and economic effects of bankruptcy or creditor initiated termination of ongoing business operations can be avoided while a court-supervised attempt to reorganize the financial affairs of the debtor company is made.

(*Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 57, *per* Doherty J.A., dissenting)

60 Judicial decision making under the *CCAA* takes many forms. A court must first of all provide the conditions under which the debtor can attempt to reorganize. This can be achieved by staying enforcement actions by creditors to allow the debtor's business to continue, preserving the *status quo* while the debtor plans the compromise or arrangement to be presented to creditors, and supervising the process and advancing it to the point where it can be determined whether it will succeed (see, e.g., *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84 (B.C. C.A.), at pp. 88-89; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 19 B.C.A.C. 134 (B.C. C.A. [In Chambers]), at para. 27). In doing so, the court must often be cognizant of the various interests at stake in the reorganization, which can extend beyond those of the debtor and creditors to include employees, directors, shareholders, and even other parties doing business with the insolvent company (see, e.g., *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 2000 ABQB 442, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9 (Alta. Q.B.), at para. 144, *per* Paperny J. (as she then was); *Air Canada, Re* (2003), 42 C.B.R. (4th) 173 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), at para. 3; *Air Canada, Re* [2003 CarswellOnt 4967 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])], 2003 CanLII 49366, at para. 13, *per* Farley J.; Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 181-92 and 217-26). In addition, courts must recognize that on occasion the broader public interest will be engaged by aspects of the reorganization and may be a factor against which the decision of whether to allow a particular action will be weighed (see, e.g., *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix Rouge, Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 158 (Ont. S.C.J.), at para. 2, *per* Blair J. (as he then was); Sarra, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 195-214).

61 When large companies encounter difficulty, reorganizations become increasingly complex. *CCAA* courts have been called upon to innovate accordingly in exercising their jurisdiction beyond merely staying proceedings against the debtor to allow breathing room for reorganization. They have been asked to sanction measures for which there is no explicit authority in the *CCAA*. Without exhaustively cataloguing the various measures taken under the authority of the *CCAA*, it is useful to refer briefly to a few examples to illustrate the flexibility the statute affords supervising courts.

62 Perhaps the most creative use of *CCAA* authority has been the increasing willingness of courts to authorize post-filing security for debtor in possession financing or super-priority charges on the debtor's assets when necessary

for the continuation of the debtor's business during the reorganization (see, e.g., *Skydome Corp., Re* (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]); *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re*, 2000 BCCA 146, 135 B.C.A.C. 96 (B.C. C.A.), aff'g (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 144 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]); and generally, J. P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (2007), at pp. 93-115). The *CCAA* has also been used to release claims against third parties as part of approving a comprehensive plan of arrangement and compromise, even over the objections of some dissenting creditors (see *Metcalf & Mansfield*). As well, the appointment of a Monitor to oversee the reorganization was originally a measure taken pursuant to the *CCAA*'s supervisory authority; Parliament responded, making the mechanism mandatory by legislative amendment.

63 Judicial innovation during *CCAA* proceedings has not been without controversy. At least two questions it raises are directly relevant to the case at bar: (1) what are the sources of a court's authority during *CCAA* proceedings? (2) what are the limits of this authority?

64 The first question concerns the boundary between a court's statutory authority under the *CCAA* and a court's residual authority under its inherent and equitable jurisdiction when supervising a reorganization. In authorizing measures during *CCAA* proceedings, courts have on occasion purported to rely upon their equitable jurisdiction to advance the purposes of the Act or their inherent jurisdiction to fill gaps in the statute. Recent appellate decisions have counselled against purporting to rely on inherent jurisdiction, holding that the better view is that courts are in most cases simply construing the authority supplied by the *CCAA* itself (see, e.g., *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re*, 2003 BCCA 344, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236 (B.C. C.A.), at paras. 45-47, per Newbury J.A.; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (Ont. C.A.), paras. 31-33, per Blair J.A.).

65 I agree with Justice Georgina R. Jackson and Professor Janis Sarra that the most appropriate approach is a hierarchical one in which courts rely first on an interpretation of the provisions of the *CCAA* text before turning to inherent or equitable jurisdiction to anchor measures taken in a *CCAA* proceeding (see G. R. Jackson and J. Sarra, "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters", in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007* (2008), 41, at p. 42). The authors conclude that when given an appropriately purposive and liberal interpretation, the *CCAA* will be sufficient in most instances to ground measures necessary to achieve its objectives (p. 94).

66 Having examined the pertinent parts of the *CCAA* and the recent history of the legislation, I accept that in most instances the issuance of an order during *CCAA* proceedings should be considered an exercise in statutory interpretation. Particularly noteworthy in this regard is the expansive interpretation the language of the statute at issue is capable of supporting.

67 The initial grant of authority under the *CCAA* empowered a court "where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company ... on the application of any person interested in the matter ..., subject to this Act, [to] make an order under this section" (*CCAA*, s. 11(1)). The plain language of the statute was very broad.

68 In this regard, though not strictly applicable to the case at bar, I note that Parliament has in recent amendments changed the wording contained in s. 11(1), making explicit the discretionary authority of the court under the *CCAA*. Thus in s. 11 of the *CCAA* as currently enacted, a court may, "subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, ... make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances" (S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 128). Parliament appears to have endorsed the broad reading of *CCAA* authority developed by the jurisprudence.

69 The *CCAA* also explicitly provides for certain orders. Both an order made on an initial application and an order on subsequent applications may stay, restrain, or prohibit existing or new proceedings against the debtor. The burden is on the applicant to satisfy the court that the order is appropriate in the circumstances and that the applicant has been acting in good faith and with due diligence (*CCAA*, ss. 11(3), (4) and (6)).

70 The general language of the *CCAA* should not be read as being restricted by the availability of more specific orders. However, the requirements of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising *CCAA* authority. Appropriateness under the *CCAA* is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the *CCAA*. The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to achieve the remedial purpose of the *CCAA* — avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company. I would add that appropriateness extends not only to the purpose of the order, but also to the means it employs. Courts should be mindful that chances for successful reorganizations are enhanced where participants achieve common ground and all stakeholders are treated as advantageously and fairly as the circumstances permit.

71 It is well-established that efforts to reorganize under the *CCAA* can be terminated and the stay of proceedings against the debtor lifted if the reorganization is "doomed to failure" (see *Chef Ready*, at p. 88; *Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25 (B.C. C.A.), at paras. 6-7). However, when an order is sought that does realistically advance the *CCAA*'s purposes, the ability to make it is within the discretion of a *CCAA* court.

72 The preceding discussion assists in determining whether the court had authority under the *CCAA* to continue the stay of proceedings against the Crown once it was apparent that reorganization would fail and bankruptcy was the inevitable next step.

73 In the Court of Appeal, Tysoe J.A. held that no authority existed under the *CCAA* to continue staying the Crown's enforcement of the GST deemed trust once efforts at reorganization had come to an end. The appellant submits that in so holding, Tysoe J.A. failed to consider the underlying purpose of the *CCAA* and give the statute an appropriately purposive and liberal interpretation under which the order was permissible. The Crown submits that Tysoe J.A. correctly held that the mandatory language of the *ETA* gave the court no option but to permit enforcement of the GST deemed trust when lifting the *CCAA* stay to permit the debtor to make an assignment under the *BIA*. Whether the *ETA* has a mandatory effect in the context of a *CCAA* proceeding has already been discussed. I will now address the question of whether the order was authorized by the *CCAA*.

74 It is beyond dispute that the *CCAA* imposes no explicit temporal limitations upon proceedings commenced under the Act that would prohibit ordering a continuation of the stay of the Crown's GST claims while lifting the general stay of proceedings temporarily to allow the debtor to make an assignment in bankruptcy.

75 The question remains whether the order advanced the underlying purpose of the *CCAA*. The Court of Appeal held that it did not because the reorganization efforts had come to an end and the *CCAA* was accordingly spent. I disagree.

76 There is no doubt that had reorganization been commenced under the *BIA* instead of the *CCAA*, the Crown's deemed trust priority for the GST funds would have been lost. Similarly, the Crown does not dispute that under the scheme of distribution in bankruptcy under the *BIA*, the deemed trust for GST ceases to have effect. Thus, after reorganization under the *CCAA* failed, creditors would have had a strong incentive to seek immediate bankruptcy and distribution of the debtor's assets under the *BIA*. In order to conclude that the discretion does not extend to partially lifting the stay in order to allow for an assignment in bankruptcy, one would have to assume a gap between the *CCAA* and the *BIA* proceedings. Brenner C.J.S.C.'s order staying Crown enforcement of the GST claim ensured that creditors would not be disadvantaged by the attempted reorganization under the *CCAA*. The effect of his order was to blunt any impulse of creditors to interfere in an orderly liquidation. His order was thus in furtherance of the *CCAA*'s objectives to the extent that it allowed a bridge between the *CCAA* and *BIA* proceedings. This interpretation of the tribunal's discretionary power is buttressed by s. 20 of the *CCAA*. That section provides that the *CCAA* "may be applied together with the provisions of any Act of Parliament... that authorizes or makes provision for the sanction of compromises or arrangements between a company and its shareholders or any class of them", such as the *BIA*. Section 20 clearly indicates the intention of Parliament for the *CCAA* to operate *in tandem* with other insolvency legislation, such as the *BIA*.

77 The *CCAA* creates conditions for preserving the *status quo* while attempts are made to find common ground amongst stakeholders for a reorganization that is fair to all. Because the alternative to reorganization is often bankruptcy, participants will measure the impact of a reorganization against the position they would enjoy in liquidation. In the case at bar, the order fostered a harmonious transition between reorganization and liquidation while meeting the objective of a single collective proceeding that is common to both statutes.

78 Tysoe J.A. therefore erred in my view by treating the *CCAA* and the *BIA* as distinct regimes subject to a temporal gap between the two, rather than as forming part of an integrated body of insolvency law. Parliament's decision to maintain two statutory schemes for reorganization, the *BIA* and the *CCAA*, reflects the reality that reorganizations of differing complexity require different legal mechanisms. By contrast, only one statutory scheme has been found to be needed to liquidate a bankrupt debtor's estate. The transition from the *CCAA* to the *BIA* may require the partial lifting of a stay of proceedings under the *CCAA* to allow commencement of the *BIA* proceedings. However, as Laskin J.A. for the Ontario Court of Appeal noted in a similar competition between secured creditors and the Ontario Superintendent of Financial Services seeking to enforce a deemed trust, "[t]he two statutes are related" and no "gap" exists between the two statutes which would allow the enforcement of property interests at the conclusion of *CCAA* proceedings that would be lost in bankruptcy *Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108 (Ont. C.A.), at paras. 62-63).

79 The Crown's priority in claims pursuant to source deductions deemed trusts does not undermine this conclusion. Source deductions deemed trusts survive under both the *CCAA* and the *BIA*. Accordingly, creditors' incentives to prefer one Act over another will not be affected. While a court has a broad discretion to stay source deductions deemed trusts in the *CCAA* context, this discretion is nevertheless subject to specific limitations applicable only to source deductions deemed trusts (*CCAA*, s. 11.4). Thus, if *CCAA* reorganization fails (e.g., either the creditors or the court refuse a proposed reorganization), the Crown can immediately assert its claim in unremitted source deductions. But this should not be understood to affect a seamless transition into bankruptcy or create any "gap" between the *CCAA* and the *BIA* for the simple reason that, regardless of what statute the reorganization had been commenced under, creditors' claims in both instances would have been subject to the priority of the Crown's source deductions deemed trust.

80 Source deductions deemed trusts aside, the comprehensive and exhaustive mechanism under the *BIA* must control the distribution of the debtor's assets once liquidation is inevitable. Indeed, an orderly transition to liquidation is mandatory under the *BIA* where a proposal is rejected by creditors. The *CCAA* is silent on the transition into liquidation but the breadth of the court's discretion under the Act is sufficient to construct a bridge to liquidation under the *BIA*. The court must do so in a manner that does not subvert the scheme of distribution under the *BIA*. Transition to liquidation requires partially lifting the *CCAA* stay to commence proceedings under the *BIA*. This necessary partial lifting of the stay should not trigger a race to the courthouse in an effort to obtain priority unavailable under the *BIA*.

81 I therefore conclude that Brenner C.J.S.C. had the authority under the *CCAA* to lift the stay to allow entry into liquidation.

3.4 Express Trust

82 The last issue in this case is whether Brenner C.J.S.C. created an express trust in favour of the Crown when he ordered on April 29, 2008, that proceeds from the sale of LeRoy Trucking's assets equal to the amount of unremitted GST be held back in the Monitor's trust account until the results of the reorganization were known. Tysoe J.A. in the Court of Appeal concluded as an alternative ground for allowing the Crown's appeal that it was the beneficiary of an express trust. I disagree.

83 Creation of an express trust requires the presence of three certainties: intention, subject matter, and object. Express or "true trusts" arise from the acts and intentions of the settlor and are distinguishable from other trusts arising by operation of law (see D. W. M. Waters, M. R. Gillen and L. D. Smith, eds., *Waters' Law of Trusts in Canada* (3rd ed. 2005), at pp. 28-29 especially fn. 42).

84 Here, there is no certainty to the object (i.e. the beneficiary) inferrable from the court's order of April 29, 2008, sufficient to support an express trust.

85 At the time of the order, there was a dispute between Century Services and the Crown over part of the proceeds from the sale of the debtor's assets. The court's solution was to accept LeRoy Trucking's proposal to segregate those monies until that dispute could be resolved. Thus there was no certainty that the Crown would actually be the beneficiary, or object, of the trust.

86 The fact that the location chosen to segregate those monies was the Monitor's trust account has no independent effect such that it would overcome the lack of a clear beneficiary. In any event, under the interpretation of *CCAA* s. 18.3(1) established above, no such priority dispute would even arise because the Crown's deemed trust priority over GST claims would be lost under the *CCAA* and the Crown would rank as an unsecured creditor for this amount. However, Brenner C.J.S.C. may well have been proceeding on the basis that, in accordance with *Ottawa Senators*, the Crown's GST claim would remain effective if reorganization was successful, which would not be the case if transition to the liquidation process of the *BIA* was allowed. An amount equivalent to that claim would accordingly be set aside pending the outcome of reorganization.

87 Thus, uncertainty surrounding the outcome of the *CCAA* restructuring eliminates the existence of any certainty to permanently vest in the Crown a beneficial interest in the funds. That much is clear from the oral reasons of Brenner C.J.S.C. on April 29, 2008, when he said: "Given the fact that [*CCAA* proceedings] are known to fail and filings in bankruptcy result, it seems to me that maintaining the status quo in the case at bar supports the proposal to have the monitor hold these funds in trust." Exactly who might take the money in the final result was therefore evidently in doubt. Brenner C.J.S.C.'s subsequent order of September 3, 2008, denying the Crown's application to enforce the trust once it was clear that bankruptcy was inevitable, confirms the absence of a clear beneficiary required to ground an express trust.

4. Conclusion

88 I conclude that Brenner C.J.S.C. had the discretion under the *CCAA* to continue the stay of the Crown's claim for enforcement of the GST deemed trust while otherwise lifting it to permit LeRoy Trucking to make an assignment in bankruptcy. My conclusion that s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* nullified the GST deemed trust while proceedings under that Act were pending confirms that the discretionary jurisdiction under s. 11 utilized by the court was not limited by the Crown's asserted GST priority, because there is no such priority under the *CCAA*.

89 For these reasons, I would allow the appeal and declare that the \$305,202.30 collected by LeRoy Trucking in respect of GST but not yet remitted to the Receiver General of Canada is not subject to deemed trust or priority in favour of the Crown. Nor is this amount subject to an express trust. Costs are awarded for this appeal and the appeal in the court below.

Fish J. (concurring):

I

90 I am in general agreement with the reasons of Justice Deschamps and would dispose of the appeal as she suggests.

91 More particularly, I share my colleague's interpretation of the scope of the judge's discretion under s. 11 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("*CCAA*"). And I share my colleague's conclusion that Brenner C.J.S.C. did not create an express trust in favour of the Crown when he segregated GST funds into the Monitor's trust account (2008 BCSC 1805, [2008] G.S.T.C. 221 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers])).

92 I nonetheless feel bound to add brief reasons of my own regarding the interaction between the *CCAA* and the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("*ETA*").

93 In upholding deemed trusts created by the *ETA* notwithstanding insolvency proceedings, *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1 (Ont. C.A.), and its progeny have been unduly protective of Crown interests which Parliament itself has chosen to subordinate to competing prioritized claims. In my respectful view, a clearly marked departure from that jurisprudential approach is warranted in this case.

94 Justice Deschamps develops important historical and policy reasons in support of this position and I have nothing to add in that regard. I do wish, however, to explain why a comparative analysis of related statutory provisions adds support to our shared conclusion.

95 Parliament has in recent years given detailed consideration to the Canadian insolvency scheme. It has declined to amend the provisions at issue in this case. Ours is not to wonder why, but rather to treat Parliament's preservation of the relevant provisions as a deliberate exercise of the legislative discretion that is Parliament's alone. With respect, I reject any suggestion that we should instead characterize the apparent conflict between s. 18.3(1) (now s. 37(1)) of the *CCAA* and s. 222 of the *ETA* as a drafting anomaly or statutory lacuna properly subject to judicial correction or repair.

II

96 In the context of the Canadian insolvency regime, a deemed trust will be found to exist only where two complementary elements co-exist: first, a statutory provision *creating* the trust; and second, a *CCAA* or *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("*BIA*") provision *confirming* — or explicitly preserving — its effective operation.

97 This interpretation is reflected in three federal statutes. Each contains a deemed trust provision framed in terms strikingly similar to the wording of s. 222 of the *ETA*.

98 The first is the *Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.) ("*ITA*") where s. 227(4) *creates* a deemed trust:

227 (4) Trust for moneys deducted — Every person who deducts or withholds an amount under this Act is deemed, notwithstanding any security interest (as defined in subsection 224(1.3)) in the amount so deducted or withheld, to hold the amount separate and apart from the property of the person and from property held by any secured creditor (as defined in subsection 224(1.3)) of that person that but for the security interest would be property of the person, in trust for Her Majesty and for payment to Her Majesty in the manner and at the time provided under this Act. [Here and below, the emphasis is of course my own.]

99 In the next subsection, Parliament has taken care to make clear that this trust is unaffected by federal or provincial legislation to the contrary:

(4.1) Extension of trust — Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (except sections 81.1 and 81.2 of that Act), any other enactment of Canada, any enactment of a province or any other law, where at any time an amount deemed by subsection 227(4) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not paid to Her Majesty in the manner and at the time provided under this Act, property of the person ... equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was deducted or withheld by the person, separate and apart from the property of the person, in trust for Her Majesty whether or not the property is subject to such a security interest, ...

...

... and the proceeds of such property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all such security interests.

100 The continued operation of this deemed trust is expressly *confirmed* in s. 18.3 of the *CCAA*:

18.3 (1) Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*...

101 The operation of the *ITA* deemed trust is also confirmed in s. 67 of the *BIA*:

67 (2) Subject to subsection (3), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a bankrupt shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty for the purpose of paragraph (1)(a) unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(3) Subsection (2) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act*...

102 Thus, Parliament has first *created* and then *confirmed the continued operation of* the Crown's *ITA* deemed trust under *both* the *CCAA* and the *BIA* regimes.

103 The second federal statute for which this scheme holds true is the *Canada Pension Plan*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-8 ("*CPP*"). At s. 23, Parliament creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown and specifies that it exists despite all contrary provisions in any other Canadian statute. Finally, and in almost identical terms, the *Employment Insurance Act*, S.C. 1996, c. 23 ("*EIA*"), creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown: see ss. 86(2) and (2.1).

104 As we have seen, the survival of the deemed trusts created under these provisions of the *ITA*, the *CPP* and the *EIA* is confirmed in s. 18.3(2) the *CCAA* and in s. 67(3) the *BIA*. In all three cases, Parliament's intent to enforce the Crown's deemed trust through insolvency proceedings is expressed in clear and unmistakable terms.

105 The same is not true with regard to the deemed trust created under the *ETA*. Although Parliament creates a deemed trust in favour of the Crown to hold unremitted GST monies, and although it purports to maintain this trust notwithstanding any contrary federal or provincial legislation, it does not *confirm* the trust — or expressly provide for its continued operation — in either the *BIA* or the *CCAA*. The second of the two mandatory elements I have mentioned is thus absent reflecting Parliament's intention to allow the deemed trust to lapse with the commencement of insolvency proceedings.

106 The language of the relevant *ETA* provisions is identical in substance to that of the *ITA*, *CPP*, and *EIA* provisions:

222. (1) [Deemed] Trust for amounts collected — Subject to subsection (1.1), every person who collects an amount as or on account of tax under Division II is deemed, for all purposes and despite any security interest in the amount, to hold the amount in trust for Her Majesty in right of Canada, separate and apart from the property of the person and from property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, until the amount is remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn under subsection (2).

...

(3) Extension of trust — Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property

held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was collected by the person, in trust for Her Majesty, separate and apart from the property of the person, whether or not the property is subject to a security interest, ...

...

... and the proceeds of the property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all security interests.

107 Yet no provision of the *CCAA* provides for the continuation of this deemed trust after the *CCAA* is brought into play.

108 In short, Parliament has imposed *two* explicit conditions, or "building blocks", for survival under the *CCAA* of deemed trusts created by the *ITA*, *CPP*, and *EIA*. Had Parliament intended to likewise preserve under the *CCAA* deemed trusts created by the *ETA*, it would have included in the *CCAA* the sort of confirmatory provision that explicitly preserves other deemed trusts.

109 With respect, unlike Tysoe J.A., I do not find it "inconceivable that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception when enacting the current version of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* without considering the *CCAA* as a possible second exception" (2009 BCCA 205, 98 B.C.L.R. (4th) 242, [2009] G.S.T.C. 79 (B.C. C.A.), at para. 37). *All* of the deemed trust provisions excerpted above make explicit reference to the *BIA*. Section 222 of the *ETA* does not break the pattern. Given the near-identical wording of the four deemed trust provisions, it would have been surprising indeed had Parliament not addressed the *BIA* at all in the *ETA*.

110 Parliament's evident intent was to render GST deemed trusts inoperative upon the institution of insolvency proceedings. Accordingly, s. 222 mentions the *BIA* so as to *exclude* it from its ambit — rather than to *include* it, as do the *ITA*, the *CPP*, and the *EIA*.

111 Conversely, I note that *none* of these statutes mentions the *CCAA* expressly. Their specific reference to the *BIA* has no bearing on their interaction with the *CCAA*. Again, it is the confirmatory provisions *in the insolvency statutes* that determine whether a given deemed trust will subsist during insolvency proceedings.

112 Finally, I believe that chambers judges should not segregate GST monies into the Monitor's trust account during *CCAA* proceedings, as was done in this case. The result of Justice Deschamps's reasoning is that GST claims become unsecured under the *CCAA*. Parliament has deliberately chosen to nullify certain Crown super-priorities during insolvency; this is one such instance.

III

113 For these reasons, like Justice Deschamps, I would allow the appeal with costs in this Court and in the courts below and order that the \$305,202.30 collected by LeRoy Trucking in respect of GST but not yet remitted to the Receiver General of Canada be subject to no deemed trust or priority in favour of the Crown.

Abella J. (dissenting):

114 The central issue in this appeal is whether s. 222 of the *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("*EIA*"), and specifically s. 222(3), gives priority during *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("*CCAA*"), proceedings to the Crown's deemed trust in unremitted GST. I agree with Tysoe J.A. that it does. It follows, in my respectful view, that a court's discretion under s. 11 of the *CCAA* is circumscribed accordingly.

115 Section 11¹ of the *CCAA* stated:

11. (1) Notwithstanding anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up Act*, where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make an order under this section.

To decide the scope of the court's discretion under s. 11, it is necessary to first determine the priority issue. Section 222(3), the provision of the *ETA* at issue in this case, states:

222 (3) Extension of trust — Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was collected by the person, in trust for Her Majesty, separate and apart from the property of the person, whether or not the property is subject to a security interest, and

(b) to form no part of the estate or property of the person from the time the amount was collected, whether or not the property has in fact been kept separate and apart from the estate or property of the person and whether or not the property is subject to a security interest

and is property beneficially owned by Her Majesty in right of Canada despite any security interest in the property or in the proceeds thereof and the proceeds of the property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all security interests.

116 Century Services argued that the *CCAA*'s general override provision, s. 18.3(1), prevailed, and that the deeming provisions in s. 222 of the *ETA* were, accordingly, inapplicable during *CCAA* proceedings. Section 18.3(1) states:

18.3 (1) ... [N]otwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

117 As MacPherson J.A. correctly observed in *Ottawa Senators Hockey Club Corp. (Re)* (2005), 73 O.R. (3d) 737, [2005] G.S.T.C. 1 (Ont. C.A.), s. 222(3) of the *ETA* is in "clear conflict" with s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* (para. 31). Resolving the conflict between the two provisions is, essentially, what seems to me to be a relatively uncomplicated exercise in statutory interpretation: does the language reflect a clear legislative intention? In my view it does. The deemed trust provision, s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, has unambiguous language stating that it operates notwithstanding any law except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("*BIA*").

118 By expressly excluding only one statute from its legislative grasp, and by unequivocally stating that it applies despite any other law anywhere in Canada *except* the *BIA*, s. 222(3) has defined its boundaries in the clearest possible terms. I am in complete agreement with the following comments of MacPherson J.A. in *Ottawa Senators*:

The legislative intent of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* is clear. If there is a conflict with "any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*)", s. 222(3) prevails. In these words Parliament did two things: it decided that s. 222(3) should trump all other federal laws and, importantly, it addressed the topic of exceptions to its trumping decision and identified a single exception, the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* The *BIA* and the *CCAA* are closely related federal statutes. I cannot conceive that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception, but accidentally fail to consider the *CCAA* as a possible second exception. In my view, the omission of the *CCAA* from s. 222(3) of the *ETA* was almost certainly a considered omission. [para. 43]

119 MacPherson J.A.'s view that the failure to exempt the *CCAA* from the operation of the *ETA* is a reflection of a clear legislative intention, is borne out by how the *CCAA* was subsequently changed after s. 18.3(1) was enacted in 1997. In 2000, when s. 222(3) of the *ETA* came into force, amendments were also introduced to the *CCAA*. Section 18.3(1) was not amended.

120 The failure to amend s. 18.3(1) is notable because its effect was to protect the legislative *status quo*, notwithstanding repeated requests from various constituencies that s. 18.3(1) be amended to make the priorities in the *CCAA* consistent with those in the *BIA*. In 2002, for example, when Industry Canada conducted a review of the *BIA* and the *CCAA*, the Insolvency Institute of Canada and the Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals recommended that the priority regime under the *BIA* be extended to the *CCAA* (Joint Task Force on Business Insolvency Law Reform, *Report* (March 15, 2002), Sch. B, proposal 71, at pp. 37-38). The same recommendations were made by the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce in its 2003 report, *Debtors and Creditors Sharing the Burden: A Review of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*; by the Legislative Review Task Force (Commercial) of the Insolvency Institute of Canada and the Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals in its 2005 *Report on the Commercial Provisions of Bill C-55*; and in 2007 by the Insolvency Institute of Canada in a submission to the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce commenting on reforms then under consideration.

121 Yet the *BIA* remains the only exempted statute under s. 222(3) of the *ETA*. Even after the 2005 decision in *Ottawa Senators* which confirmed that the *ETA* took precedence over the *CCAA*, there was no responsive legislative revision. I see this lack of response as relevant in this case, as it was in *R. v. Tele-Mobile Co.*, 2008 SCC 12, [2008] 1 S.C.R. 305 (S.C.C.), where this Court stated:

While it cannot be said that legislative silence is necessarily determinative of legislative intention, in this case the silence is Parliament's answer to the consistent urging of Telus and other affected businesses and organizations that there be express language in the legislation to ensure that businesses can be reimbursed for the reasonable costs of complying with evidence-gathering orders. I see the legislative history as reflecting Parliament's intention that compensation not be paid for compliance with production orders. [para. 42]

122 All this leads to a clear inference of a deliberate legislative choice to protect the deemed trust in s. 222(3) from the reach of s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA*.

123 Nor do I see any "policy" justification for interfering, through interpretation, with this clarity of legislative intention. I can do no better by way of explaining why I think the policy argument cannot succeed in this case, than to repeat the words of Tysoe J.A. who said:

I do not dispute that there are valid policy reasons for encouraging insolvent companies to attempt to restructure their affairs so that their business can continue with as little disruption to employees and other stakeholders as possible. It is appropriate for the courts to take such policy considerations into account, but only if it is in connection with a matter that has not been considered by Parliament. Here, Parliament must be taken to have weighed policy considerations when it enacted the amendments to the *CCAA* and *ETA* described above. As Mr. Justice MacPherson observed at para. 43 of *Ottawa Senators*, it is inconceivable that Parliament would specifically identify the *BIA* as an exception when enacting the current version of s. 222(3) of the *ETA* without considering the *CCAA* as a possible second exception. I also make the observation that the 1992 set of amendments to the *BIA* enabled proposals to be binding on secured creditors and, while there is more flexibility under the *CCAA*, it is possible for an insolvent company to attempt to restructure under the auspices of the *BIA*. [para. 37]

124 Despite my view that the clarity of the language in s. 222(3) is dispositive, it is also my view that even the application of other principles of interpretation reinforces this conclusion. In their submissions, the parties raised the following as being particularly relevant: the Crown relied on the principle that the statute which is "later in time" prevails;

and Century Services based its argument on the principle that the general provision gives way to the specific (*generalia specialibus non derogant*).

125 The "later in time" principle gives priority to a more recent statute, based on the theory that the legislature is presumed to be aware of the content of existing legislation. If a new enactment is inconsistent with a prior one, therefore, the legislature is presumed to have intended to derogate from the earlier provisions (Ruth Sullivan, *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes* (5th ed. 2008), at pp. 346-47; Pierre-André Côté, *The Interpretation of Legislation in Canada* (3rd ed. 2000), at p. 358).

126 The exception to this presumptive displacement of pre-existing inconsistent legislation, is the *generalia specialibus non derogant* principle that "[a] more recent, general provision will not be construed as affecting an earlier, special provision" (Côté, at p. 359). Like a Russian Doll, there is also an exception within this exception, namely, that an earlier, specific provision may in fact be "overruled" by a subsequent general statute if the legislature indicates, through its language, an intention that the general provision prevails (*Doré c. Verdun (Municipalité)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 862 (S.C.C.)).

127 The primary purpose of these interpretive principles is to assist in the performance of the task of determining the intention of the legislature. This was confirmed by MacPherson J.A. in *Ottawa Senators*, at para. 42:

[T]he overarching rule of statutory interpretation is that statutory provisions should be interpreted to give effect to the intention of the legislature in enacting the law. This primary rule takes precedence over all maxims or canons or aids relating to statutory interpretation, including the maxim that the specific prevails over the general (*generalia specialibus non derogant*). As expressed by Hudson J. in *Canada v. Williams*, [1944] S.C.R. 226, ... at p. 239 ...:

The maxim *generalia specialibus non derogant* is relied on as a rule which should dispose of the question, but the maxim is not a rule of law but a rule of construction and bows to the intention of the legislature, if such intention can reasonably be gathered from all of the relevant legislation.

(See also Côté, at p. 358, and Pierre-Andre Côté, with the collaboration of S. Beaulac and M. Devinat, *Interprétation des lois* (4th ed. 2009), at para. 1335.)

128 I accept the Crown's argument that the "later in time" principle is conclusive in this case. Since s. 222(3) of the *ETA* was enacted in 2000 and s. 18.3(1) of the *CCAA* was introduced in 1997, s. 222(3) is, on its face, the later provision. This chronological victory can be displaced, as Century Services argues, if it is shown that the more recent provision, s. 222(3) of the *ETA*, is a general one, in which case the earlier, specific provision, s. 18.3(1), prevails (*generalia specialibus non derogant*). But, as previously explained, the prior specific provision does not take precedence if the subsequent general provision appears to "overrule" it. This, it seems to me, is precisely what s. 222(3) achieves through the use of language stating that it prevails despite any law of Canada, of a province, or "any other law" *other than the BIA*. Section 18.3(1) of the *CCAA*, is thereby rendered inoperative for purposes of s. 222(3).

129 It is true that when the *CCAA* was amended in 2005,² s. 18.3(1) was re-enacted as s. 37(1) (S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 131). Deschamps J. suggests that this makes s. 37(1) the new, "later in time" provision. With respect, her observation is refuted by the operation of s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, which expressly deals with the (non) effect of re-enacting, without significant substantive changes, a repealed provision (see *Canada (Attorney General) v. Canada (Public Service Staff Relations Board)*, [1977] 2 F.C. 663 (Fed. C.A.), dealing with the predecessor provision to s. 44(f)). It directs that new enactments not be construed as "new law" unless they differ in substance from the repealed provision:

44. Where an enactment, in this section called the "former enactment", is repealed and another enactment, in this section called the "new enactment", is substituted therefor,

...

(f) except to the extent that the provisions of the new enactment are not in substance the same as those of the former enactment, the new enactment shall not be held to operate as new law, but shall be construed and have effect as a consolidation and as declaratory of the law as contained in the former enactment;

Section 2 of the *Interpretation Act* defines an enactment as "an Act or regulation or *any portion of an Act or regulation*".

130 Section 37(1) of the current *CCAA* is almost identical to s. 18.3(1). These provisions are set out for ease of comparison, with the differences between them underlined:

37.(1) Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

18.3 (1) Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

131 The application of s. 44(f) of the *Interpretation Act* simply confirms the government's clearly expressed intent, found in Industry Canada's clause-by-clause review of Bill C-55, where s. 37(1) was identified as "a technical amendment to reorder the provisions of this Act". During second reading, the Hon. Bill Rompkey, then the Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate, confirmed that s. 37(1) represented only a technical change:

On a technical note relating to the treatment of deemed trusts for taxes, the bill [*sic*] makes no changes to the underlying policy intent, despite the fact that in the case of a restructuring under the *CCAA*, sections of the act [*sic*] were repealed and substituted with renumbered versions due to the extensive reworking of the *CCAA*.

(*Debates of the Senate*, vol. 142, 1st Sess., 38th Parl., November 23, 2005, at p. 2147)

132 Had the substance of s. 18.3(1) altered in any material way when it was replaced by s. 37(1), I would share Deschamps J.'s view that it should be considered a new provision. But since s. 18.3(1) and s. 37(1) are the same in substance, the transformation of s. 18.3(1) into s. 37(1) has no effect on the interpretive queue, and s. 222(3) of the *ETA* remains the "later in time" provision (Sullivan, at p. 347).

133 This means that the deemed trust provision in s. 222(3) of the *ETA* takes precedence over s. 18.3(1) during *CCAA* proceedings. The question then is how that priority affects the discretion of a court under s. 11 of the *CCAA*.

134 While s. 11 gives a court discretion to make orders notwithstanding the *BIA* and the *Winding-up Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11, that discretion is not liberated from the operation of any other federal statute. Any exercise of discretion is therefore circumscribed by whatever limits are imposed by statutes *other* than the *BIA* and the *Winding-up Act*. That includes the *ETA*. The chambers judge in this case was, therefore, required to respect the priority regime set out in s. 222(3) of the *ETA*. Neither s. 18.3(1) nor s. 11 of the *CCAA* gave him the authority to ignore it. He could not, as a result, deny the Crown's request for payment of the GST funds during the *CCAA* proceedings.

135 Given this conclusion, it is unnecessary to consider whether there was an express trust.

136 I would dismiss the appeal.

Appeal allowed.

Pourvoi accueilli.

Appendix

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (as at December 13, 2007)

11. (1) Powers of court — Notwithstanding anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up Act*, where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make an order under this section.

...

(3) Initial application court orders — A court may, on an initial application in respect of a company, make an order on such terms as it may impose, effective for such period as the court deems necessary not exceeding thirty days,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection (i);

(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 or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company.

(4) Other than initial application court orders — A court may, on an application in respect of a company other than an initial application, make an order on such terms as it may impose,

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

(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 or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company.

...

(6) Burden of proof on application — The court shall not make an order under subsection (3) or (4) unless

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

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (4), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

11.4 (1) Her Majesty affected — An order made under section 11 may provide that

(a) Her Majesty in right of Canada may not exercise rights under subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* or any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, in respect of the company if the company is a tax debtor under that subsection or provision, for such period as the court considers appropriate but ending not later than

(i) the expiration of the order,

(ii) the refusal of a proposed compromise by the creditors or the court,

- (iii) six months following the court sanction of a compromise or arrangement,
- (iv) the default by the company on any term of a compromise or arrangement, or
- (v) the performance of a compromise or arrangement in respect of the company; and\

(b) Her Majesty in right of a province may not exercise rights under any provision of provincial legislation in respect of the company where the company is a debtor under that legislation and the provision has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

for such period as the court considers appropriate but ending not later than the occurrence or time referred to in whichever of subparagraphs (a)(i) to (v) may apply.

(2) When order ceases to be in effect — An order referred to in subsection (1) ceases to be in effect if

(a) the company defaults on payment of any amount that becomes due to Her Majesty after the order is made and could be subject to a demand under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) under any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection; or

(b) any other creditor is or becomes entitled to realize a security on any property that could be claimed by Her Majesty in exercising rights under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection.

(3) Operation of similar legislation — An order made under section 11, other than an order referred to in subsection (1) of this section, does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

18.3 (1) Deemed trusts — Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(2) Exceptions — Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a "federal provision") nor in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province where

(a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or

(b) the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, notwithstanding any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

18.4 (1) Status of Crown claims — In relation to a proceeding under this Act, all claims, including secured claims, of Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province or any body under an enactment respecting workers' compensation, in this section and in section 18.5 called a "workers' compensation body", rank as unsecured claims.

...

(3) Operation of similar legislation — Subsection (1) does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

...

20. [Act to be applied conjointly with other Acts] — The provisions of this Act may be applied together with the provisions of any Act of Parliament or of the legislature of any province, that authorizes or makes provision for the sanction of compromises or arrangements between a company and its shareholders or any class of them.

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (as at September 18, 2009)

11. General power of court — Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, 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.

...

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 30 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.

(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.

(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.

...

11.09 (1) Stay — Her Majesty — An order made under section 11.02 may provide that

(a) Her Majesty in right of Canada may not exercise rights under subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* or any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, in respect of the company if the company is a tax debtor under that subsection or provision, for the period that the court considers appropriate but ending not later than

(i) the expiry of the order,

(ii) the refusal of a proposed compromise by the creditors or the court,

(iii) six months following the court sanction of a compromise or an arrangement,

(iv) the default by the company on any term of a compromise or an arrangement, or

(v) the performance of a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company; and

(b) Her Majesty in right of a province may not exercise rights under any provision of provincial legislation in respect of the company if the company is a debtor under that legislation and the provision has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

for the period that the court considers appropriate but ending not later than the occurrence or time referred to in whichever of subparagraphs (a)(i) to (v) that may apply.

(2) When order ceases to be in effect — The portions of an order made under section 11.02 that affect the exercise of rights of Her Majesty referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b) cease to be in effect if

(a) the company defaults on the payment of any amount that becomes due to Her Majesty after the order is made and could be subject to a demand under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection; or

(b) any other creditor is or becomes entitled to realize a security on any property that could be claimed by Her Majesty in exercising rights under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection.

(3) Operation of similar legislation — An order made under section 11.02, other than the portions of that order that affect the exercise of rights of Her Majesty referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b), does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

37. (1) Deemed trusts — Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(2) Exceptions — Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a "federal provision"), nor does it apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province if

(a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or

(b) the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that

subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 (as at December 13, 2007)

222. (1) [Deemed] Trust for amounts collected — Subject to subsection (1.1), every person who collects an amount as or on account of tax under Division II is deemed, for all purposes and despite any security interest in the amount, to hold the amount in trust for Her Majesty in right of Canada, separate and apart from the property of the person and from property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, until the amount is remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn under subsection (2).

(1.1) Amounts collected before bankruptcy — Subsection (1) does not apply, at or after the time a person becomes a bankrupt (within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), to any amounts that, before that time, were collected or became collectible by the person as or on account of tax under Division II.

...

(3) Extension of trust — Despite any other provision of this Act (except subsection (4)), any other enactment of Canada (except the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*), any enactment of a province or any other law, if at any time an amount deemed by subsection (1) to be held by a person in trust for Her Majesty is not remitted to the Receiver General or withdrawn in the manner and at the time provided under this Part, property of the person and property held by any secured creditor of the person that, but for a security interest, would be property of the person, equal in value to the amount so deemed to be held in trust, is deemed

(a) to be held, from the time the amount was collected by the person, in trust for Her Majesty, separate and apart from the property of the person, whether or not the property is subject to a security interest, and

(b) to form no part of the estate or property of the person from the time the amount was collected, whether or not the property has in fact been kept separate and apart from the estate or property of the person and whether or not the property is subject to a security interest

and is property beneficially owned by Her Majesty in right of Canada despite any security interest in the property or in the proceeds thereof and the proceeds of the property shall be paid to the Receiver General in priority to all security interests.

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (as at December 13, 2007)

67. (1) Property of bankrupt — The property of a bankrupt divisible among his creditors shall not comprise

(a) property held by the bankrupt in trust for any other person,

(b) any property that as against the bankrupt is exempt from execution or seizure under any laws applicable in the province within which the property is situated and within which the bankrupt resides, or

(b.1) such goods and services tax credit payments and prescribed payments relating to the essential needs of an individual as are made in prescribed circumstances and are not property referred to in paragraph (a) or (b),

but it shall comprise

(c) all property wherever situated of the bankrupt at the date of his bankruptcy or that may be acquired by or devolve on him before his discharge, and

(d) such powers in or over or in respect of the property as might have been exercised by the bankrupt for his own benefit.

(2) Deemed trusts — Subject to subsection (3), notwithstanding any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a bankrupt shall not be regarded as held in trust for Her Majesty for the purpose of paragraph (1)(a) unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

(3) Exceptions — Subsection (2) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a "federal provision") nor in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province where

(a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or

(b) the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, notwithstanding any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

86. (1) Status of Crown claims — In relation to a bankruptcy or proposal, all provable claims, including secured claims, of Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province or of any body under an Act respecting workers' compensation, in this section and in section 87 called a "workers' compensation body", rank as unsecured claims.

...

(3) Exceptions — Subsection (1) does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*;

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, or an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts; or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a similar purpose to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, where the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a "province providing a comprehensive pension plan" as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a "provincial pension plan" as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

Footnotes

- 1 Section 11 was amended, effective September 18, 2009, and now states:
11. Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, 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.
- 2 The amendments did not come into force until September 18, 2009.

TAB H

CITATION: Re: Performance Sports Group Ltd., 2016 ONSC 6800
COURT FILE NO.: CV-16-11582-00CL
DATE: 20161101

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
COMMERCIAL LIST**

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT,
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT
OF PERFORMANCE SPORTS GROUP LTD., BAUER HOCKEY CORP., BAUER HOCKEY
RETAIL CORP., BAUER PERFORMANCE SPORTS UNIFORMS CORP., BPS CANADA
INTERMEDIATE CORP., BPS DIAMOND SPORTS CORP., EASTON BASEBALL/SOFTBALL
CORP., KBAU HOLDINGS CANADA, INC., PERFORMANCE LACROSSE GROUP CORP.,
PSG INNOVATION CORP., BAUER HOCKEY RETAIL INC., BAUER HOCKEY, INC., BAUER
PERFORMANCE SPORTS UNIFORMS INC., BPS DIAMOND SPORTS INC., BPS US
HOLDINGS INC., EASTON BASEBALL/SOFTBALL INC., PERFORMANCE LACROSSE
GROUP INC., PSG INNOVATION INC.

(Applicants)

BEFORE: Newbould J.

COUNSEL: *Peter Howard and Kathryn Esaw* , for the Applicants

Robert I. Thornton and Rachel Bengino, for the Proposed Monitor Ernst & Young
Inc.

Bernard D. Boucher and John Tuzyk, for Sagard Capital Partners, L.P

David Bish and Adam Slavens, for Fairfax Financial Holdings Limited

Robert Staley, for the board of directors of Performance Sports Group Ltd.

Joseph Latham and Ryan Baulke, for the Ad Hoc Committee of certain term
lenders

Tony Reyes and Evan Cobb, for Bank of America, the ABL DIP lender

HEARD: October 31, 2016

ENDORSEMENT

[1] On October 31, 2016 Performance Sports Group Ltd. (“PSG”) and the other Applicants (collectively, the “Applicants” or the “PSG Entities”) applied for and were granted protection under the CCAA and an Initial Order was signed, for reasons to follow. These are my reasons.

[2] PSG, a public company incorporated under British Columbia law and traded publicly on the Toronto and New York stock exchanges, is the ultimate parent of the other PSG Entities, as well as certain entities in Europe which are not applicants in the this proceeding.

[3] The PSG Entities are leading designers, developers and manufacturers of high performance sports equipment and related apparel. Historically focused on hockey, the PSG Entities expanded their business to include equipment and apparel in the baseball/softball and lacrosse markets. The hockey business operates under the BAUER, MISSION and EASTON brands; the baseball/softball business operates under the EASTON and COMBAT brands, and the lacrosse business operates under the MAVERIK and CASCADE brands.

[4] The hockey and baseball/softball markets are the PSG Entities’ largest business focus, generating approximately 60% and 30% of the Applicants’ sales in fiscal 2015, respectively, with remaining sales derived from the lacrosse and apparel businesses. The PSG Entities have a diverse customer base, including over 4,000 retailers across the globe and more than 60 distributors. In fiscal 2015, approximately 58% of the PSG Entities’ total sales were in the U.S., approximately 24% were in Canada, and approximately 18% were in the rest of the world.

[5] The PSG Entities are generally structured so that there is a Canadian and U.S. subsidiary for each major business line. Some of the entities also perform specific functions such as risk management, accounting etc. for the benefit of the other PSG Entities. The Applicants have commenced parallel proceedings in the U.S. under Chapter 11 of the US Bankruptcy Code in the Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware.

Employees and benefits

[6] As of September 30, 2016, the Applicants had 728 employees globally, with 224 employees in Canada, 430 in the U.S., 23 in Asia and 51 in Europe.

[7] The majority of the PSG Entities' workforce is non-unionized. Canada is the only location with unionized employees, who are employed by Bauer Canada in Blainville, Quebec. 33 of 119 full-time Blainville situated employees are members of the United Steelworkers' Union of America Local 967 and are subject to a five-year collective bargaining agreement expiring on November 30, 2017.

[8] Under the collective bargaining agreement with the unionized employees in Blainville, Quebec, Bauer Canada maintains a simplified defined contribution pension plan registered with Retraite Quebec. Under the plan, Bauer Canada matches employee contributions up to C\$0.35/per hour worked by the employee up to a maximum of 80 hours bi-weekly.

[9] Bauer Canada provides a supplemental pension plan (the "Canadian SERP") for nine former executives which is not a registered pension plan and does not accept new participants. There is no funding obligation under these plans. As at May 31, 2016, the Canadian SERP had an accrued benefit obligation of approximately C\$4.53 million. The PSG Entities do not intend to continue paying the Canadian SERP obligations during the CCAA proceedings.

[10] The PSG Entities provide a post-retirement life insurance plan to most Canadian employees. The life insurance plan is not funded and as at May 31, 2016 had an accrued benefit obligation of C\$614,000. In February, 2016, the PSG Entities closed a distribution facility in Mississauga, Ontario. Approximately 51 employees belonging to the Glass, Molders, Pottery, Plastics and Allied Workers International Union were terminated in January and February 2016 because of the closure.

[11] Due to the consolidation of the COMBAT operations with the EASTON operations, the PSG Entities terminated the employment of an additional 85 individuals between July and October, 2016, of whom approximately 77% were employees located in Canada and 23% were

employees located in the U.S. The workforce reductions, primarily related to consolidation of the COMBAT operations, have resulted in the number of the PSG Entities' employees falling by approximately 15% since the end of fiscal 2016 and approximately 19% since the end of calendar 2015.

Assets and liabilities

[12] As at September 30, 2016, the Applicants had assets with a book value of approximately \$594 million and liabilities with a book value of approximately \$608 million.

[13] The majority of the Applicants' assets are comprised of accounts receivable, inventory and intangible assets. The Applicants' intellectual property and brand assets are a significant part of their businesses. The PSG Entities' patent portfolio includes hundreds of issued and pending patent applications covering a number of essential business lines. In addition to their patent portfolio, the PSG Entities have a number of registered trademarks to protect their brands.

[14] The major liabilities of the PSG Entities are obligations under:

(a) a term loan facility (the "Term Loan Facility"): PSG is the borrower with a syndicate of lenders (the "Term Lenders") participating in the Term Loan Facility. The Term Loan Facility is governed by the term loan credit agreement dated as of April 15, 2014 (the "Term Loan Agreement"). As at October 28, 2016, approximately \$330.5 million plus \$1.4 million accrued interest was outstanding under the Term Loan Facility.

(b) an Asset-based revolving facility (the "ABL Facility" and together with the Term Loan Facility, the "Facilities"): a number of the PSG Entities are borrowers and BOA is the agent for a syndicate of lenders (the "ABL Lenders" and, together with the Term Lenders, the "Secured Lenders") participating in the ABL Facility. The ABL Facility is governed by the revolving ABL credit agreement dated as of April 15, 2014 (the "ABL Agreement"). As at October 28, 2016, approximately \$159 million was outstanding under the ABL Facility.

Problems leading to the CCAA filing

[15] A number of industry-wide and company-specific events have caused significant financial difficulties for the Applicants in the past 18 months:

- a. Several key customers, retailers of sports equipment and apparel and sporting goods stores, abruptly filed for bankruptcy in late 2015 and 2016, resulting in substantial write-offs of accounts receivable and reduced purchase orders.
- b. A marked and unexpected underperformance in the two most significant of the PSG Entities' business lines, being the Bauer Business and the Easton Business, has had an extremely negative effect on the PSG Entities' overall profitability.
- c. The PSG Entities' financial results have been negatively affected by currency fluctuations.
- d. The PSG Entities reduced their earnings guidance for FY2016 in response to their recent financial difficulties, which triggered a sharp decline in their common share price. Due that fall in share prices, the PSG Entities incurred considerable professional fees defending a recent class action and responding to inquiries by U.S. and Canadian regulators as to their continuous disclosure record.
- e. The PSG Entities have triggered an event of default under their Facilities as a result of their failure to file certain reporting materials required under U.S. and Canadian securities law. The PSG Entities have been operating under the forbearance of their secured lenders since August 29, 2016, but that forbearance expired on October 28, 2016, leaving the PSG Entities in default under their Facilities.

Anticipated stalking horse bid sales process

[16] The Applicants, in response to the myriad of issues leading to the current liquidity crisis and in particular in response to their failure to timely file the reporting materials, engaged in a thorough review of the PSG Entities' strategic alternatives. The PSG Entities concluded that

negotiating a going-concern sale of their businesses was the optimal course to maximize value, and structured a process by which do so.

[17] As part of that process, the PSG Entities have entered into an asset purchase agreement (the “Stalking Horse Agreement”) for the sale of substantially all of their assets to a group of investors led by Sagard Capital Partners, L.P., the holder of approximately 17% of the shares of PSG, and Fairfax Financial Holdings Limited for a purchase price of \$575 million. The Stalking Horse Agreement contemplates that the Applicants will continue as a going concern under new ownership, their secured debt will be fully repaid and payment of trade creditors. It further contemplates the preservation of a significant number of jobs in Canada and the U.S. The bid contemplated under the Stalking Horse Agreement will, subject to Court approval, serve as the stalking horse bid in a CCAA/Chapter 11 sales process to take place over the next 60 days of the proceedings and which is expected to conclude early in 2017. Approval of the sales process will be sought on the come-back motion later in November.

Analysis

[18] I am quite satisfied that each of the PSG Entities are debtor companies within the meaning of the CCAA and that they are insolvent with liabilities individually and as a whole over the threshold of \$5 million.

[19] There are two DIP loans for which approval is sought, being an ABL DIP and a Term Loan DIP, as follows:

(a) A group comprised of members of the ABL Lenders (“ABL DIP Lenders”), will provide an operating loan facility of \$200 million (the “ABL DIP Facility”) pursuant to an ABL DIP Credit Agreement (the “ABL DIP Credit Agreement”). The advances are expected to be made progressively and on an as-needed basis. All receipts of the Applicants will be applied to progressively replace the existing indebtedness under the ABL Credit Agreement, which is in the amount of \$160 million. Accordingly, the facility provided by the ABL DIP Lenders is estimated provide up an additional \$25 million of liquidity as compared to what is currently provided under the ABL Facility.

(b) The Sagard Group (the “Term Loan DIP Lenders” and together with the ABL DIP Lenders, the “DIP Lenders”), will provide a term loan facility (the “Term Loan DIP Facility” and together with the ABL DIP Facility, the “DIP Facilities”) in the amount of \$361.3 million pursuant to a Term Loan DIP Credit Agreement (the “Term Loan DIP Credit Agreement” and together with the ABL DIP Credit Agreement, the “DIP Agreements”). The advances are expected to be made progressively as the funds are needed. The Term Loan DIP Facility will be applied to refinance the existing indebtedness under the Term Loan Credit Agreement, in the amount of approximately \$331.3 million, to finance operations and to pay expenditures pertaining to the restructuring process. Accordingly, the Term Loan DIP Facility will provide approximately \$30 million in new liquidity to fund ongoing operating and capital expenses during the restructuring proceedings.

[20] The DIP Facilities were negotiated after the Applicants retained Centerview Partners LLC to assist in putting the required interim financing in place. The Applicants, with the assistance of Centerview, determined that obtaining interim financing from a third party would be extremely challenging, unless such facility was provided either junior to the ABL Facility and Term Loan Facility, on an unsecured basis, or paired with a refinancing of the existing indebtedness. The time was tight and in view of the existing charges against the assets and the very limited availability of unencumbered assets, it was thought that there would be little or no interest for third parties to act as interim financing providers. Accordingly, the Applicants decided to focus their efforts on negotiating DIP financing with its current lenders and stakeholders.

[21] I am satisfied that the DIP Facilities should be approved, taking into account the factors in section 11.2(4) of the CCAA. Without DIP financing, the PSG Entities do not have sufficient cash on hand or generate sufficient receipts to continue operating their business and pursue a post-filing sales process. The management of the PSG Entities’ business throughout the CCAA process will be overseen by the Monitor, who will supervise spending under the ABL DIP

Facility. The Monitor¹ is supportive of the DIP Facilities in light of the fact that the Applicants are facing a looming liquidity crisis in the very short term and the Applicants, Centerview and the CRO have determined that there is little alternative other than to enter into the proposed DIP Agreements.

[22] Section 11.2(1) of the CCAA provides that security for a DIP facility may not secure an obligation that existed before the order authorizing the security was made. The effect of this provision is that advances under a DIP facility may not be used to repay pre-filing obligations. In this case, the ABL DIP Facility is a revolving facility. Under its terms, receipts from operations of the PSG Entities post-filing may be used to pay down the existing ABL Facility. The applicants submit that in this case, the ABL DIP Facility preserves the pre-filing status quo by upholding the relative pre-stay priority position of each secured creditor. By requiring that the PSG Entities only use post-filing cash receipts to pay down the accrued balance under the revolving credit facility, the ABL DIP Lenders are in no better position with respect to the priority of their pre-filing debt relative to other creditors. I accept that no advances under the ABL DIP Facility will be used to pay pre-filing obligations and there has been inserted in the Initial Order a provision that expressly prevents that. The provision that receipts from operations of the PSG Entities post-filing may be used to pay down the existing ABL Facility is approved.

[23] The PSG Entities seek authorization to pay pre-filing amounts owing to the following suppliers, so long as these payments are approved by the Monitor:

- (a) Foreign suppliers located throughout Asia to which the PSG Entities predominantly source their manufacturing operations;
- (b) Domestic suppliers located in the U.S. and Canada which supply critical goods and services;

¹ Ernst & Young has filed a Report as the Proposed Monitor. For ease of reference I refer to Ernst & Young in this decision as the Monitor.

- (c) Suppliers in the Applicants' extensive global shipping, warehousing and distribution network, which move raw materials to and from the Applicants' global manufacturing centers and to move finished products to the Applicants' customers;
- (d) Those suppliers who delivered goods to the PSG Entities in the twenty days before October 31, 2016 – all of whom are entitled to be paid for their services under U.S. bankruptcy law; and
- (e) Third parties such as contractors, builders and repairs, who may potentially assert liens under applicable law against the PSG Entities.

[24] There is ample authority supporting the Court's general jurisdiction to permit payment of pre-filing obligations to persons whose services are critical to the ongoing operations of the debtor companies. This jurisdiction of the Court is not ousted by Section 11.4 of the CCAA, which became effective as part of the 2009 amendments to the CCAA and codified the Court's practice of declaring a person to be a critical supplier and granting a charge on the debtor's property in favour of such critical supplier. The recent amendments, including Section 11.4, do not detract from the inherently flexible nature of the CCAA or the Court's broad and inherent jurisdiction to make such orders that will facilitate the debtor's restructuring of its business as a going concern. See *Re Canwest Global Communications Corp.* (2009), 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72 at para. 43.

[25] I am satisfied that an order should be made permitting the payments as requested. Any interruption of supply or service by the critical suppliers could have an immediate materially adverse impact on the PSG Entities' business, operations and cash flow, and could thereby seriously jeopardize their ability to restructure and continue as a going concern. Certain of the critical suppliers may not be able to continue to operate if not paid for pre-filing goods and services. The PSG Entities do not have any readily available means to replace these suppliers or, alternatively, to compel them to supply goods and services. There is a substantial risk that certain of the critical suppliers, including foreign suppliers, will interrupt supply if the pre-filing arrears that they are owed are not paid, all of which would risk unanticipated delays, interruptions and shutdowns. Payment of amounts in excess of \$10,000 will require Monitor approval.

[26] The PSG Entities seek approval to continue the use of their current Transfer Pricing Model to operate their business in the ordinary course. The Transfer Pricing Model is intended to ensure that each individual PSG Entity is compensated for the value of their contribution to the PSG Entities' overall business. The Applicants say that to ensure that the PSG Entities' intercompany transfers are not inhibited and stakeholder value is not eroded with regard to any particular entity, the Court should approve use of the Transfer Pricing Model. No doubt section 11 of the CCAA gives the Court jurisdiction to make the order sought and to continue the business as it has been operated prior to the CCAA and in this case it is desirable in light of the intention to sell the business as a going concern. I approve the continued use of the Transfer Pricing Model. In doing so, I am not to be taken as making any judgment as to the validity of the Transfer Pricing Model, i.e. whether it would pass muster with the relevant taxing authorities.

[27] The PSG Entities seek an administrative charge in the amount of \$7.5 million, and it is supported by the Monitor. The charge is to cover the fees and disbursements of the Monitor, U.S. and Canadian counsel to the Monitor, U.S. and Canadian counsel to the Applicants and counsel to the directors of the Applicants, and as defined in the APL DIP Agreement, and is to cover the fees and disbursements incurred both before and after the making of the Initial Order.

[28] I realize that the model order provides for an administration charge to protect fees and disbursements incurred both before and after the order is made by of the Monitor, counsel to the Monitor and the Applicant's counsel. In this case, I raised a concern that past fees for a broad number of lawyers, including defence class action counsel in the U.S., could be paid from cash whereas it appeared from the material that there may be unpaid severance or other payments owing to employees in Canada that would not be paid.

[29] Normally it is not an issue what an administration charge covers, with professionals taking care when advising companies in financial trouble and contemplating CCAA proceedings that they remain current with their billings. The CCAA does not expressly state whether an administration charge can or cannot cover past outstanding fees or disbursements, but the language would appear to imply that it is to cover only current fees and disbursement. Section 11.52(1) provides:

11.52 (1) On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in respect of the fees and expenses of

(a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;

(b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and

(c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

[30] Regarding (a), a Monitor is appointed in the Initial Order and its duties are performed during the CCAA proceeding, not before. Regarding (b), the language “for the purpose of proceedings under this Act” would appear to relate to proceedings, and not some other work such as a lawyer for the debtor defending litigation against the debtor. The same can be said regarding the language in (c) “effective participation in proceedings under this Act”.

[31] In response to my concerns about the Canadian employees being protected against past unpaid obligations, I was advised that it is the intention of the applicants to bring a motion on the come-back hearing to permit all past outstanding amounts to be paid to the Canadian employees. No counsel appearing for any of the other parties voiced any concern with that. In the circumstances I permitted the administration charge to be granted. If no such motion is brought on the come-back hearing or it is not granted, the administration charge should be revisited.

[32] It appears clear, however, that an administration charge under section 52.11(1) can only be granted to cover work done in connection with a CCAA proceeding. Thus it is not possible for such a charge to protect fees of lawyers in other jurisdictions who may be engaged by the debtor either in foreign insolvency proceedings or other litigation. In the circumstances, the administration charge in this case shall not be used to cover the fees and disbursements of any of the applicants' lawyers in the U.S. chapter 11 proceedings or in any class action or other suit brought against any of the applicants. It may be that in the future, thought should be given as to


whether it is appropriate at all to provide for an administration charge to cover pre-filing expenses.

[33] The Canadian PSG Entities are expected to have positive net cash flows during the CCAA proceeding. Part of that money will be used to fund the deficit expected to be experienced by the US PSG Entities during the same period. At this time of year, due to hockey sales, the Canadian PSG Entities fund the US PSG Entities. The Applicants seek authorization to effect intercompany advances, secured by an intercompany charge. It is said that as PSG Entities' business is highly integrated and depends on intercompany transfers, the intercompany charge will preserve the status quo between PSG Entities.

[34] Intercompany charges to protect intercompany advances have been approved before in CCAA proceedings under the general power in section 11 to make such order as the court considers appropriate. See *Walter Energy Canada Holdings, Inc. (Re)*, 2016 BCSC 107 and *Fraser Papers Inc. (Re)*, 2009 CanLII 32698.

[35] In this case, I also raised the issue about cash leaving Canada during the CCAA process while unpaid amounts owing to employees in Canada were outstanding. Apart from the comfort of the anticipated motion on the come-back hearing to pay these unpaid amounts, the Monitor is of the view that the intercompany charge is the best way to protect the Canadian creditors. The Monitor states that while it is difficult at this juncture to ascertain whether the intercompany charge is sufficient to protect the interest of each individual estate, considering that the Stalking Horse bid contemplates that there should be substantial funds available after the payment of the secured creditors' claims, the intercompany charge appears to offer some measure of protection to the individual estates. In view of the foregoing, the Proposed Monitor considers that the intercompany charge is reasonable in the circumstances. I approve the intercompany charge.

[36] A standard directors' charge for \$7.5 million is supported by the Monitor and it is approved, as is the request that Brian J. Fox of Alvarez & Marsal North America, LLC be appointed as the Chief Restructuring Officer of the PSG Entities. Given the anticipated complexity of their insolvency proceedings, which include plenary proceedings in Canada and the United States, the PSG Entities will benefit from a CRO.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David J.", written over a horizontal line.

Newbould J.

Date: November 1, 2016

TAB I

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

THE HONOURABLE

)

THURSDAY, THE 7TH

)

MR. JUSTICE NEWBOULD

)

DAY OF JULY, 2016



IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS*
ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF H.B. WHITE CANADA CORP.

(the "**Applicant**")

INITIAL ORDER

THIS APPLICATION, made by the Applicant, pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the "**CCAA**") was heard this day at 330 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.

ON READING the affidavit of Philip J. Gund sworn July 6, 2016 (the "**Gund Affidavit**") and the Exhibits thereto, and the pre-filing report dated July 6, 2016 of Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc. ("**A&M**") in its capacity as the proposed Monitor of the Applicant, and on being advised that the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the charges created herein were given notice, and on hearing the submissions of counsel for the Applicant, A&M, Northland Power Inc., Wells Fargo Bank, National Association ("**Wells Fargo**") and Oaktree Power Opportunities Fund III, L.P. and Oaktree Power Opportunities Fund III (Parallel), L.P. (collectively, "**Oaktree**"), no one appearing for any other person although duly served as appears from the affidavit of service of Leonard Loewith sworn July 6, 2016 and on reading the consent of A&M to act as the Monitor,

SERVICE

1. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the time for service of the Notice of Application and the Application Record is hereby abridged and validated so that this Application is properly returnable today and hereby dispenses with further service thereof.

APPLICATION

2. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that the Applicant is a company to which the CCAA applies.

PLAN OF ARRANGEMENT

3. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicant shall have the authority to file and may, subject to further order of this Court, file with this Court a plan of compromise or arrangement (hereinafter referred to as the "**Plan**").

POSSESSION OF PROPERTY AND OPERATIONS

4. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicant shall remain in possession and control of its current and future assets, undertakings and properties of every nature and kind whatsoever, and wherever situate including all proceeds thereof (the "**Property**"). Subject to further Order of this Court, the Applicant shall continue to carry on business in a manner consistent with the preservation of its business (the "**Business**") and Property. The Applicant is authorized and empowered to continue to retain and employ the employees, consultants, agents, experts, accountants, counsel and such other persons (collectively "**Assistants**") currently retained or employed by it, with liberty to retain such further Assistants as it deems reasonably necessary or desirable in the ordinary course of business or for the carrying out of the terms of this Order.

5. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicant shall be entitled to continue to utilize the central cash management system currently in place as described in the Gund Affidavit or replace it with another substantially similar central cash management system (the "**Cash Management System**") and that any present or future bank providing the Cash Management System shall not be under any obligation whatsoever to inquire into the propriety, validity or legality of any transfer, payment, collection or other action taken under the Cash Management System, or as to the use or application by the Applicant of funds transferred, paid, collected or otherwise dealt with in the Cash Management System, shall be entitled to provide the Cash Management System without any liability in respect thereof to any Person (as defined below)

other than the Applicant, pursuant to the terms of the documentation applicable to the Cash Management System, and shall be, in its capacity as provider of the Cash Management System, an unaffected creditor under the Plan with regard to any claims or expenses it may suffer or incur in connection with the provision of the Cash Management System.

6. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicant shall be entitled but not required to pay the following expenses whether incurred prior to or after this Order:

- (a) all outstanding and future wages, salaries, employee and pension benefits, vacation pay and expenses payable on or after the date of this Order, in each case incurred in the ordinary course of business and consistent with existing compensation policies and arrangements; and
- (b) the fees and disbursements of any Assistants retained or employed by the Applicant in respect of these proceedings, at their standard rates and charges.

7. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, except as otherwise provided to the contrary herein, the Applicant shall be entitled but not required to pay all reasonable expenses incurred by the Applicant in carrying on the Business in the ordinary course prior to, on or after this Order, and in carrying out the provisions of this Order, which expenses shall include, without limitation:

- (a) all expenses and capital expenditures reasonably necessary for the preservation of the Property or the Business including, without limitation, payments on account of insurance (including directors and officers insurance), premiums for surety bonds, maintenance and security services; and
- (b) payment for goods or services actually supplied to the Applicant following the date of this Order,

provided that, to the extent such expenses were incurred prior to the date of this Order, the Applicant shall only be entitled to pay such amounts up to a maximum aggregate amount of \$800,000 if they are determined by the Applicant, in consultation with the Monitor, to be necessary to the continued operation of the Business or preservation of the Property and such payments are approved in advance by the Monitor or by further Order of the Court.

8. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicant shall remit, in accordance with legal requirements, or pay:

- (a) any statutory deemed trust amounts in favour of the Crown in right of Canada or of any Province thereof or any other taxation authority which are required to be deducted from employees' wages, including, without limitation, amounts in respect of (i) employment insurance, (ii) Canada Pension Plan, and (iii) income taxes;
- (b) all goods and services or other applicable sales taxes (collectively, "**Sales Taxes**") required to be remitted by the Applicant in connection with the sale of goods and services by the Applicant, but only where such Sales Taxes are accrued or collected after the date of this Order, or where such Sales Taxes were accrued or collected prior to the date of this Order but not required to be remitted until on or after the date of this Order; and
- (c) any amount payable to the Crown in right of Canada or of any Province thereof or any political subdivision thereof or any other taxation authority in respect of municipal realty, municipal business or other taxes, assessments or levies of any nature or kind which are entitled at law to be paid in priority to claims of secured creditors and which are attributable to or in respect of the carrying on of the Business by the Applicant.

9. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that until a real property lease is disclaimed in accordance with the CCAA, the Applicant shall pay all amounts constituting rent or payable as rent under real property leases (including, for greater certainty, common area maintenance charges, utilities and realty taxes and any other amounts payable to the landlord under the lease) or as otherwise may be negotiated between the Applicant and the landlord from time to time ("**Rent**"), for the period commencing from and including the date of this Order, twice-monthly in equal payments on the first and fifteenth day of each month, in advance (but not in arrears). On the date of the first of such payments, any Rent relating to the period commencing from and including the date of this Order shall also be paid.

10. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, except as specifically permitted herein or in the Definitive Documents (as defined below), the Applicant is hereby directed, until further Order of this Court: (a) to make no payments of principal, interest thereon or otherwise on account of amounts owing by the Applicant to any of its creditors as of this date; (b) to grant no security interests,

trust, liens, charges or encumbrances upon or in respect of any of its Property; and (c) to not grant credit or incur liabilities except in the ordinary course of the Business.

RESTRUCTURING

11. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicant shall, subject to such requirements as are imposed by the CCAA and such covenants as may be contained in the Definitive Documents (as defined below), have the right to:

- (a) permanently or temporarily cease, downsize or shut down any of its business or operations, and to dispose of redundant or non-material assets not exceeding \$100,000 in any one transaction or \$500,000 in the aggregate; and
- (b) terminate the employment of such of its employees or temporarily lay off such of its employees as it deems appropriate,

all of the foregoing to permit the Applicant to proceed with an orderly restructuring of the Business (the "**Restructuring**").

12. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicant shall provide each of the relevant landlords with notice of the Applicant's intention to remove any fixtures from any leased premises at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the intended removal. The relevant landlord shall be entitled to have a representative present in the leased premises to observe such removal and, if the landlord disputes the Applicant's entitlement to remove any such fixture under the provisions of the lease, such fixture shall remain on the premises and shall be dealt with as agreed between any applicable secured creditors, such landlord and the Applicant, or by further Order of this Court upon application by the Applicant on at least two (2) days notice to such landlord and any such secured creditors. If the Applicant disclaims the lease governing such leased premises in accordance with Section 32 of the CCAA, it shall not be required to pay Rent under such lease pending resolution of any such dispute (other than Rent payable for the notice period provided for in Section 32(5) of the CCAA), and the disclaimer of the lease shall be without prejudice to the Applicant's claim to the fixtures in dispute.

13. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that if a notice of disclaimer is delivered pursuant to Section 32 of the CCAA, then (a) during the notice period prior to the effective time of the disclaimer, the landlord may show the affected leased premises to prospective tenants during normal business hours, on giving the Applicant and the Monitor 24 hours' prior written notice, and (b) at the effective time of the disclaimer, the relevant landlord shall be entitled to take possession of any

such leased premises without waiver of or prejudice to any claims or rights such landlord may have against the Applicant in respect of such lease or leased premises, provided that nothing herein shall relieve such landlord of its obligation to mitigate any damages claimed in connection therewith.

NO PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE APPLICANT, PROJECT OWNERS OR THE PROPERTY

14. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that until and including August 6, 2016, or such later date as this Court may order (the “**Stay Period**”), no proceeding or enforcement process in any court or tribunal (each, a “**Proceeding**”) shall be commenced or continued against or in respect of: (i) the Applicant, (ii) the Monitor, (iii) any owner or tenant of the land relating to a HBW Project (as defined below), (iv) any “owner” (as that term is defined in the *Construction Lien Act*, R.S.O. 1990, C.30, as amended (the “**Ontario CLA**”)) relating to a HBW Project, or (v) any Person that contracted with the Applicant or its affiliates for the Engineering, Procurement and Construction of a HBW Project (each of (iii), (iv) or (v), a “**Project Owner**”), or affecting the Business or the Property, except with the written consent of the Applicant and the Monitor, or with leave of this Court, and any and all Proceedings currently under way against or in respect of the Applicant or affecting the Business or the Property are hereby stayed and suspended pending further Order of this Court.

NO EXERCISE OF RIGHTS OR REMEDIES

15. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that during the Stay Period, no Proceeding shall be commenced or continued against or in respect of the surety companies (the “**Bonding Companies**” and each a “**Bonding Company**”) providing performance bonds, labour and materials bonds and/or warranty bonds (collectively, the “**Bonds**”) with respect to the HBW Projects (as defined below) including any right, remedy or claim of any Person against the Bonding Companies in connection with any indebtedness, indemnity, liability or obligation of any kind whatsoever of the Bonding Companies under contract, statute or otherwise, whether or not such right or claim is reduced to judgment, liquidated, unliquidated, fixed, contingent, matured, unmatured, disputed, undisputed, legal, equitable, secured, unsecured, perfected, unperfected, present, future, known, or unknown, by indemnity, guarantee, surety or otherwise, and whether or not such right is executory or anticipatory in nature, including the right or ability of any Person to advance a claim for contribution, indemnity or otherwise, with respect to any matter, action, cause or chose in action, whether existing at present or commenced in future, which indebtedness, indemnity, liability or obligation is derivative of the primary liability of the Applicant except with the written

consent of the Applicant or the Bonding Companies as applicable, and the Monitor, or with leave of this Court.

16. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that without limiting the provisions of paragraphs 14 through 15 of this Order, until further order of this Court, during the Stay Period, no Person shall take any steps or action to interfere with the Applicant completing work on any project on which HBW is a contracting party (an “**HBW Project**”) or exercise any rights or remedies, or commence any Proceeding, in connection with any Bonds relating to the HBW Projects.

17. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that nothing in this Order shall affect the ability of a Bonding Company under a Bond to attend on or investigate the applicable HBW Project subject to such Bond, including discussing such projects with the applicable Project Owner or claimant.

18. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that any Project Owner or claimant under any Bond is entitled to provide notice to the Bonding Companies of any claim that it intends to advance and the applicable Bonding Company shall be entitled to make such investigations as it deems appropriate in the ordinary course under the relevant Bond.

19. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that notwithstanding the terms of paragraphs 17 and 18 of this Order, the Applicant, the Bonding Companies, any Project Owner and/or any Person are directed not to settle, admit, set-off, or pay any Bond claims or other claims relating to any HBW Project without the consent of the Monitor or further Order of this Court.

20. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that during the Stay Period, all rights and remedies of any individual, firm, corporation, partnership, governmental body or agency, or any other entities (all of the foregoing, collectively being “**Persons**” and each being a “**Person**”) against or in respect of the Applicant, the Monitor, any Project Owner relating to a HBW Project, or affecting the Business or the Property, are hereby stayed and suspended except with the written consent of the Applicant and the Monitor, or leave of this Court, provided that nothing in this Order shall (i) empower the Applicant to carry on any business which the Applicant is not lawfully entitled to carry on or (ii) affect such investigations, actions, suits or proceedings by a regulatory body as are permitted by Section 11.1 of the CCAA.

CONSTRUCTION LIENS

21. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, without limiting the generality of this Order, any party asserting a lien right under the Ontario CLA or any similar applicable legislation in any Province of Canada (the “**Provincial Lien Legislation**”) in respect of an HBW Project be and hereby is

stayed and any Person seeking to enforce such a claim shall be required to seek the rights and remedies set out in this Order.

22. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that no Person shall be permitted to preserve or perfect a lien under Provincial Lien Legislation on account of materials or services provided to the Applicant, including, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, (a) registering a Claim for Lien under s. 34(1)(a) of the Ontario CLA with respect to any lands to which the Applicants have supplied services or materials; (b) registering a Certificate of Action under s. 36 of the Ontario CLA with respect to any lands to which the Applicants have supplied services or materials; and (c) serving a Claim for Lien under s. 34(1)(b) of the Ontario CLA or delivering a Notice of Lien under s. 24(2) of the Ontario CLA, with respect to any HBW Projects except as permitted under this Order.

23. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that any Person who wishes to assert a claim pursuant to the Provincial Lien Legislation after July 7, 2016 (the “**Filing Date**”) in respect of an HBW Project, whether in respect of materials and/or services supplied before or after the Filing Date, shall serve a notice on the Monitor, attention Al Hutchens (ahutchens@alvarezandmarsal.com) with a copy to L. Joseph Latham, counsel to the Monitor (jlatham@goodmans.ca) and with a copy to HBW, c/o Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP, attention Jane Dietrich (jdietrich@casselsbrock.com), within the timeframes proscribed by the applicable construction lien legislation in order to preserve and perfect their lien claim for that project.

NO INTERFERENCE WITH RIGHTS

24. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that during the Stay Period, no Person shall discontinue, fail to honour, alter, interfere with, repudiate, terminate or cease to perform any right, renewal right, contract, agreement, licence or permit in favour of or held by the Applicant, except with the written consent of the Applicant and the Monitor, or leave of this Court.

CONTINUATION OF SERVICES

25. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that during the Stay Period, all Persons having oral or written agreements with the Applicant or statutory or regulatory mandates for the supply of goods and/or services, including without limitation all computer software, communication and other data services, centralized banking services, payroll services, insurance, transportation services, utility or other services to the Business or the Applicant, are hereby restrained until further Order of this Court from discontinuing, altering, interfering with or terminating the supply of such goods

or services as may be required by the Applicant, and that the Applicant shall be entitled to the continued use of its current premises, telephone numbers, facsimile numbers, internet addresses and domain names, provided in each case that the normal prices or charges for all such goods or services received after the date of this Order are paid by the Applicant in accordance with normal payment practices of the Applicant or such other practices as may be agreed upon by the supplier or service provider and each of the Applicant and the Monitor, or as may be ordered by this Court.

26. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, with respect to any policy of insurance and corresponding reinsurance policy applicable to the Applicant or directors and officers of the Applicant to which another member of the IEA Group (being Infrastructure and Energy Alternatives, LLC and its subsidiaries) is a party, the non-Applicant members of the IEA Group shall take all steps necessary to comply with the provisions of such policy, including with respect to providing written notice of any claim involving the Applicant (including the Business or the Property) or directors or officers of the Applicant, as applicable (an “**IEA Occurrence**”) and any other provision of such policies to enable the Applicant or the directors or officers of the Applicant, as applicable, to make claims and receive payment in respect of such claims; and the Applicant or directors or officers of the Applicant, as applicable, shall be entitled to receive any payments made pursuant to any such policy arising from an IEA Occurrence.

NON-DEROGATION OF RIGHTS

27. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, notwithstanding anything else in this Order, no Person shall be prohibited from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of lease or licensed property or other valuable consideration provided on or after the date of this Order, nor shall any Person be under any obligation on or after the date of this Order to advance or re-advance any monies or otherwise extend any credit to the Applicant. Nothing in this Order shall derogate from the rights conferred and obligations imposed by the CCAA.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

28. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that during the Stay Period, and except as permitted by subsection 11.03(2) of the CCAA, no Proceeding may be commenced or continued against any of the former, current or future directors or officers of the Applicant, including any person, employee or agent of the Applicant (collectively, the “**Directors or Officers**”) with respect to any claim against the Directors or Officers that arose before the date hereof and that relates to any obligations of the Applicant whereby the Directors or Officers are alleged under any law to be

liable in their capacity as Directors or Officers for the payment or performance of such obligations, until a compromise or arrangement in respect of the Applicant, if one is filed, is sanctioned by this Court or is refused by the creditors of the Applicant or this Court.

DIRECTORS' AND OFFICERS' INDEMNIFICATION AND CHARGE

29. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicant shall indemnify its directors and officers against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as directors and officers of the Applicant after the commencement of the within proceedings, except to the extent that, with respect to any officer or director, the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct.

30. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the directors and officers of the Applicant shall be entitled to the benefit of and are hereby granted a charge (the "**Directors' Charge**") on the Property, which charge shall not exceed an aggregate amount of \$500,000, as security for the indemnity provided in paragraph 29 of this Order. The Directors' Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 56 and 58 herein.

31. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, notwithstanding any language in any applicable insurance policy to the contrary, (a) no insurer shall be entitled to be subrogated to or claim the benefit of the Directors' Charge, and (b) the Applicant's directors and officers shall only be entitled to the benefit of the Directors' Charge to the extent that they do not have coverage under any directors' and officers' insurance policy, or to the extent that such coverage is insufficient to pay amounts indemnified in accordance with paragraph 29 of this Order.

APPROVAL OF CRO ENGAGEMENT

32. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the agreement dated as of June 1, 2016 pursuant to which the Applicant has engaged Ankura Consulting Group, LLC to act as Chief Restructuring Organization (the "**CRO**") through the services of Philip J. Gund and B. Lee Fletcher, a copy of which is attached as **Exhibit "L"** to the Gund Affidavit (the "**CRO Engagement Letter**"), and the appointment of the CRO pursuant to the terms thereof is hereby approved, including, without limitation, the payment of the fees and expenses contemplated thereby.

33. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, subject to the provisions of the CCAA, this Order and any subsequent Orders of this Court, the CRO is authorized to exercise and perform the powers, responsibilities and duties as described in the CRO Engagement Letter, together with such

other powers, responsibilities and duties as may be agreed upon by the CRO and approved by this Court (collectively, the “**CRO Powers**”), including, without limitation, the power to:

- (a) take such actions and steps, and execute such documents and writings as required to cause or permit the Applicant to do all things authorized, directed and permitted pursuant to the CCAA, the terms of this Order, and any subsequent Orders of this Court, subject to the terms of those Orders;
- (b) subject the terms of this Order, realize and dispose of the Property of the Applicant on behalf of the Applicant, including, without limitation, to negotiate and enter into agreements on behalf of the Applicant with respect to the sale or other disposition of all or any part of the Property;
- (c) execute such documents as may be necessary, for and on behalf of the Applicant;
- (d) apply for and obtain any vesting or other orders which may be necessary or appropriate, in the opinion of the CRO, in consultation with the Monitor, in order to convey any Property to a purchaser or purchasers thereof, or to comply with any agreement entered into by the Applicant in relation to the conveyance of any such Property;
- (e) take such steps as in the opinion of the CRO are necessary or appropriate to maintain control over all receipts and disbursements of the Applicant, including, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, taking such steps as are necessary or desirable to control and use all bank accounts of the Applicant;
- (f) represent the Applicant in any negotiations with any other party;
- (g) communicate with and provide information to the Monitor, and the DIP Lender (as defined below), and their advisors, regarding the Business and affairs of the Applicant;
- (h) assist the Monitor as requested by the Monitor in connection with the powers given to the Monitor; and
- (i) take all such steps and actions, enter into and execute all such agreements and documents and incur such expenses and obligations necessary or incidental to the exercise of the CRO Powers on behalf of the Applicant, as are reasonably required

to carry out the provisions of this Order, including in the name of and on behalf of the Applicant, as applicable,

provided that, in each case such actions, agreements, expenses and obligations shall be construed to be those of the Applicant and not of the CRO personally.

34. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the CRO shall not be or be deemed to be a director, officer or employee of the Applicant.

35. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the CRO shall not, as a result of the performance of its obligations and duties in accordance with the terms of the CRO Engagement Letter, be deemed to be in Possession (as defined below) of any of the Property within the meaning of any Environmental Legislation (as defined below); provided, however, if the CRO is nevertheless later found to be in Possession of any Property, then the CRO, as the case may be, shall be deemed to be a Person who has been lawfully appointed to take, or has lawfully taken, possession or control of such Property for the purposes of section 14.06(1.1)(c) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* of Canada (the “BIA”) and shall be entitled to the benefits and protections in relation to the Applicant and such Property as provided by section 14.06(2) of the BIA to a “trustee” in relation to an insolvent Person and its property.

36. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that nothing in this order shall be construed as resulting in the CRO being an employer, successor employer, responsible person or operator within the meaning of any statute, regulation or rule of law, or equity for any purpose whatsoever.

37. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the CRO shall not have any liability with respect to any losses, claims, damages or liabilities, of any nature or kind, to any Person from and after the date of this Order except to the extent such losses, claims, damages or liabilities result from the gross negligence or wilful misconduct on the part of the CRO, provided further that in no event shall the liability of the CRO exceed the quantum of the fees paid to the CRO.

38. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that no action or other proceeding shall be commenced directly, or by way of counterclaim, third party claim or otherwise, against or in respect of the CRO, and all rights and remedies of any Person against or in respect of the CRO are hereby stayed and suspended, except with the written consent of the CRO or with leave of this Court on notice to the Applicant, the Monitor, and the CRO. Notice of any such motion seeking leave of this Court shall be served upon the Applicant, the Monitor, and the CRO at least ten (10) days prior to the return date of any such motion for leave.

39. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the obligations of the Applicant to the CRO pursuant to the CRO Engagement Letter shall be treated as unaffected and may not be compromised in any Plan or proposal filed under the BIA in respect of the Applicant.

40. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that (i) any indemnification obligations of the Applicant in favour of the CRO and (ii) payment obligations of the Applicant to the CRO shall be entitled to the benefit of and shall form part of the Administration Charge (as defined below) set out herein.

APPOINTMENT OF MONITOR

41. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that A&M is hereby appointed pursuant to the CCAA as the Monitor, an officer of this Court, to monitor the Business and financial affairs of the Applicant with the powers and obligations set out in the CCAA and as set forth herein and that the Applicant and its shareholders, officers, directors, and Assistants shall advise the Monitor of all material steps taken by the Applicant pursuant to this Order and all subsequent Orders, and shall co-operate fully with the Monitor in the exercise of its powers and discharge of its obligations and provide the Monitor with the assistance that is necessary to enable the Monitor to adequately carry out the Monitor's functions.

42. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor, in addition to its prescribed rights and obligations under the CCAA, is hereby directed and empowered to:

- (a) monitor the Applicant's receipts and disbursements;
- (b) report to this Court at such times and intervals as the Monitor may deem appropriate with respect to matters relating to the Property, the Business, and such other matters as may be relevant to the proceedings herein;
- (c) assist the Applicant, to the extent required by the Applicant, in its dissemination, to the DIP Lender and its counsel on a periodic basis of financial and other information as agreed to between the Applicant and the DIP Lender which may be used in these proceedings including reporting on a basis to be agreed with the DIP Lender;
- (d) advise the Applicant in its preparation of the Applicant's cash flow statements and reporting required by the DIP Lender, which information shall be reviewed with the Monitor and delivered to the DIP Lender and its counsel on a periodic basis;
- (e) advise the Applicant in its development of the Plan and any amendments to the Plan;

- (f) assist the Applicant, to the extent required by the Applicant, with the holding and administering of creditors' or shareholders' meetings for voting on the Plan;
- (g) have full and complete access to the Property, including the premises, books, records, data, including data in electronic form, and other financial documents of the Applicant, to the extent that is necessary to adequately assess the Applicant's Business and financial affairs or to perform its duties arising under this Order;
- (h) be at liberty to engage independent legal counsel or such other Persons as the Monitor deems necessary or advisable respecting the exercise of its powers and performance of its obligations under this Order; and
- (i) perform such other duties as are required by this Order or by this Court from time to time.

43. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor shall not take possession of the Property and shall take no part whatsoever in the management or supervision of the management of the Business and shall not, by fulfilling its obligations hereunder, be deemed to have taken or maintained possession or control of the Business or Property, or any part thereof.

44. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that nothing herein contained shall require the Monitor to occupy or to take control, care, charge, possession or management (separately and/or collectively, "**Possession**") of any of the Property that might be environmentally contaminated, might be a pollutant or a contaminant, or might cause or contribute to a spill, discharge, release or deposit of a substance contrary to any federal, provincial or other law respecting the protection, conservation, enhancement, remediation or rehabilitation of the environment or relating to the disposal of waste or other contamination including, without limitation, the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act*, the *Ontario Environmental Protection Act*, the *Ontario Water Resources Act*, or the *Ontario Occupational Health and Safety Act* and regulations thereunder (the "**Environmental Legislation**"), provided however that nothing herein shall exempt the Monitor from any duty to report or make disclosure imposed by applicable Environmental Legislation. The Monitor shall not, as a result of this Order or anything done in pursuance of the Monitor's duties and powers under this Order, be deemed to be in Possession of any of the Property within the meaning of any Environmental Legislation, unless it is actually in possession.

45. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that that the Monitor shall provide any creditor of the Applicant and the DIP Lender with information provided by the Applicant in response to reasonable requests for information made in writing by such creditor addressed to the Monitor. The Monitor shall not have any responsibility or liability with respect to the information disseminated by it pursuant to this paragraph. In the case of information that the Monitor has been advised by the Applicant is confidential, the Monitor shall not provide such information to creditors unless otherwise directed by this Court or on such terms as the Monitor and the Applicant may agree.

46. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, in addition to the rights and protections afforded to the Monitor under the CCAA and as an officer of this Court, the Monitor shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of its appointment or the carrying out of the provisions of this Order, save and except for any gross negligence or wilful misconduct on its part. Nothing in this Order shall derogate from the protections afforded the Monitor by the CCAA or any applicable legislation.

47. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor, counsel to the Monitor, and counsel to the Applicant shall be paid their reasonable fees and disbursements, in each case at their standard rates and charges by the Applicant as part of the costs of these proceedings, subject to any assessments of the Court. The Applicant is hereby authorized and directed to pay the accounts of the Monitor, counsel for the Monitor and counsel for the Applicant on a monthly basis and, in addition, the retainers paid to the Monitor, the Monitor's counsel and the Applicant's counsel are hereby approved.

48. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor and its legal counsel shall pass their accounts from time to time, and for this purpose the accounts of the Monitor and its legal counsel are hereby referred to a judge of the Commercial List of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice.

49. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor, counsel to the Monitor, the CRO and the Applicant's counsel shall be entitled to the benefit of and are hereby granted a charge (the "**Administration Charge**") on the Property, which charge shall not exceed an aggregate amount of \$1,000,000, as security for their professional fees and disbursements incurred at the standard rates and charges of the Monitor and such counsel, both before and after the making of this Order in respect of these proceedings. The Administration Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 56 and 58 of this Order.

DIP FINANCING

50. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicant is hereby authorized and empowered to obtain and borrow under a credit facility from Infrastructure and Energy Alternatives, LLC (the “**DIP Lender**”) in order to finance the Applicant’s working capital requirements, restructuring costs and other general corporate purposes and capital expenditures, provided that borrowings under such credit facility shall not exceed US\$5,000,000 unless permitted by further Order of this Court.

51. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that such credit facility shall be on the terms and subject to the conditions set forth in the commitment letter between the Applicant and the DIP Lender dated as of June 29, 2016 (the “**Commitment Letter**”), filed.

52. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicant or the CRO on behalf of the Applicant, as the case may be, is hereby authorized and empowered to execute and deliver such amended and restated commitment letters, loan or credit agreements, mortgages, charges, hypothecs and security documents, guarantees, and other definitive documents (collectively, the “**Definitive Documents**”), as are contemplated by the Commitment Letter or as may be reasonably required by the DIP Lender pursuant to the terms thereof, and the Applicant is hereby authorized and directed to pay and perform all of its indebtedness, interest, fees, liabilities and obligations to the DIP Lender under and pursuant to the Commitment Letter and the Definitive Documents as and when the same become due and are to be performed, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order.

53. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the DIP Lender shall be entitled to the benefit of and is hereby granted a charge (the “**DIP Lender’s Charge**”) on the Property, which DIP Lender’s Charge shall not secure an obligation that exists before this Order is made. The DIP Lender’s Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 56 and 58 of this Order.

54. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order:

- (a) the DIP Lender may take such steps from time to time as it may deem necessary or appropriate to file, register, record or perfect the DIP Lender’s Charge or any of the Definitive Documents;
- (b) upon the occurrence of an event of default under the Commitment Letter or the Definitive Documents, as applicable, or the DIP Lender’s Charge, the DIP Lender may cease making advances to the Applicant and set off and/or consolidate any

amounts owing by the DIP Lender to the Applicant against the obligations of the Applicant to the DIP Lender, and the DIP Lender, upon seven (7) days notice to the Applicant and the Monitor, may exercise any and all of its other rights and remedies against the Applicant or the Property under or pursuant to the Commitment Letter, Definitive Documents and the DIP Lender's Charge, including without limitation, to make demand, accelerate payment and give other notices, or to apply to this Court for the appointment of a receiver, receiver and manager or interim receiver, or for a bankruptcy order against the Applicant and for the appointment of a trustee in bankruptcy of the Applicant; and

- (c) the foregoing rights and remedies of the DIP Lender shall be enforceable against any trustee in bankruptcy, interim receiver, receiver or receiver and manager of the Applicant or the Property.

55. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that the DIP Lender shall be treated as unaffected in any plan of arrangement or compromise filed by the Applicant under the CCAA, or any proposal filed by the Applicant under the BIA, with respect to any advances made under the Commitment Letter or the Definitive Documents.

VALIDITY AND PRIORITY OF CHARGES CREATED BY THIS ORDER

56. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the priorities of the Directors' Charge, the Administration Charge and the DIP Lender's Charge, as among them, shall be as follows:

First – Administration Charge (to the maximum amount of \$1,000,000);

Second – DIP Lender's Charge; and

Third – Directors' Charge (to the maximum amount of \$500,000).

57. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the filing, registration or perfection of the Administration Charge, the DIP Lender's Charge, or Directors' Charge (collectively, the "**Charges**") shall not be required, and that the Charges shall be valid and enforceable for all purposes, including as against any right, title or interest filed, registered, recorded or perfected subsequent to the Charges coming into existence, notwithstanding any such failure to file, register, record, or perfect.

58. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Administration Charge (as constituted and defined herein) shall constitute a charge on the Property and such Administration Charge shall rank in priority to all other security interests, trusts, liens, charges and encumbrances, claims of secured creditors, statutory or otherwise (collectively, "**Encumbrances**"), having notice of this application, including the existing Encumbrances of Wells Fargo and Oaktree. Each of the Directors' Charge and the DIP Lender's Charge (each as constituted and defined herein) shall constitute a charge on the Property and such Charges shall rank in priority to all other Encumbrances, in favour of any Person, other than the Administration Charge, the existing security interests of Wells Fargo and Oaktree, any existing Encumbrances that have been perfected by registrations pursuant to the applicable provincial *Personal Property Security Act* prior to the date of this Order, and any Person with a valid and, if applicable, perfected construction lien claims pursuant to the applicable Provincial Lien Legislation to the extent of any holdback amounts.

59. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that except as otherwise expressly provided for herein, or as may be approved by this Court, the Applicant shall not grant any Encumbrances over any Property that rank in priority to, or *pari passu* with, any of the Administration Charge, the DIP Lender's Charge or the Directors' Charge, unless the Applicant also obtains the prior written consent of the Monitor, the DIP Lender, Wells Fargo, Oaktree and the beneficiaries of the Administration Charge and the Directors' Charge, or further Order of this Court.

60. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Directors' Charge, the Administration Charge, the Commitment Letter, the Definitive Documents and the DIP Lender's Charge shall not be rendered invalid or unenforceable and the rights and remedies of the chargees entitled to the benefit of the Charges (collectively, the "**Chargees**") and/or the DIP Lender thereunder shall not otherwise be limited or impaired in any way by (a) the pendency of these proceedings and the declarations of insolvency made herein; (b) any application(s) for bankruptcy order(s) issued pursuant to BIA, or any bankruptcy order made pursuant to such applications; (c) the filing of any assignments for the general benefit of creditors made pursuant to the BIA; (d) the provisions of any federal or provincial statutes; or (e) any negative covenants, prohibitions or other similar provisions with respect to borrowings, incurring debt or the creation of Encumbrances, contained in any existing loan documents, lease, sublease, offer to lease or other agreement (collectively, an "**Agreement**") which binds the Applicant, and notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in any Agreement:

- (a) neither the creation of the Charges nor the execution, delivery, perfection, registration or performance of the Commitment Letter or the Definitive Documents shall create or be deemed to constitute a breach by the Applicant of any Agreement to which it is a party;
- (b) none of the Chargees shall have any liability to any Person whatsoever as a result of any breach of any Agreement caused by or resulting from the Applicant entering into the Commitment Letter, the creation of the Charges, or the execution, delivery or performance of the Definitive Documents; and
- (c) the payments made by the Applicant pursuant to this Order, the Commitment Letter or the Definitive Documents, and the granting of the Charges, do not and will not constitute preferences, fraudulent conveyances, transfers at undervalue, oppressive conduct, or other challengeable or voidable transactions under any applicable law.

61. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that any Charge created by this Order over leases of real property in Canada shall only be a Charge in the Applicant's interest in such real property leases.

SERVICE AND NOTICE

62. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor shall (i) without delay, publish in the *Daily Commercial News* and *The Globe and Mail* (National Edition), a notice containing the information prescribed under the CCAA and (ii) within five days after the date of this Order: (A) make this Order publicly available in the manner prescribed under the CCAA, (B) send, in the prescribed manner, a notice to every known creditor who has a claim against the Applicant of more than \$1,000 (other than individual employees or former employees), and (C) prepare a list showing the names and addresses of those creditors and the estimated amounts of those claims, and make it publicly available in the prescribed manner, all in accordance with Section 23(1)(a) of the CCAA and the regulations made thereunder.

63. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the E-Service Protocol of the Commercial List (the "**E-Service Protocol**") is approved and adopted by reference herein and, in this proceeding, the service of documents made in accordance with the E-Service Protocol (which can be found on the Commercial List website at <http://www.ontariocourts.ca/scj/practice/practice-directions/toronto/e-service-protocol/>) shall be valid and effective service. Subject to Rule 17.05 this Order shall constitute an order for substituted service pursuant to Rule 16.04 of the Rules of

Civil Procedure. Subject to Rule 3.01(d) of the Rules of Civil Procedure and paragraph 21 of the E-Service Protocol, service of documents in accordance with the E-Service Protocol will be effective on transmission. This Court further orders that a Case Website shall be established in accordance with the E-Service Protocol with the following URL '<www.alvarezandmarsal.com/hbwhite>' (the "**Case Website**").

64. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that if the service or distribution of documents in accordance with the E-Service Protocol is not practicable, the Applicant and the Monitor are at liberty to serve or distribute this Order, any other materials and orders in these proceedings, any notices or other correspondence, by forwarding true copies thereof by prepaid ordinary mail, courier, personal delivery or facsimile transmission to the Applicant's creditors or other interested parties at their respective addresses as last shown on the records of the Applicant and that any such service or distribution by courier, personal delivery or facsimile transmission shall be deemed to be received on the next business day following the date of forwarding thereof, or if sent by ordinary mail, on the third business day after mailing.

65. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicant, the Monitor and their counsel are at liberty to serve or distribute this Order, any other materials and orders as may be reasonably required in these proceedings, including any notices, or other correspondence, by forwarding true copies thereof by electronic message to the Applicant's creditors or other interested parties and their advisors. For greater certainty, any such distribution or service shall be deemed to be in satisfaction of a legal or juridical obligation, and notice requirements within the meaning of clause 3(c) of the Electronic Commerce Protection Regulation, Reg. 81000-2-175 (SOR/DORS).

66. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor shall create, maintain and update as necessary a list of all Persons appearing in person or by counsel in this proceeding (the "**Service List**"). The Monitor shall post the Service List, as may be updated from time to time, on the Case Website as part of the public materials to be recorded thereon in relation to this proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Monitor shall have no liability in respect of the accuracy of or the timeliness of making any changes to the Service List.

GENERAL

67. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicant or the Monitor may from time to time apply to this Court for advice and directions in the discharge of its powers and duties hereunder.

68. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that nothing in this Order shall prevent the Monitor from acting as an interim receiver, a receiver, a receiver, and manager, or a trustee in bankruptcy of the Applicant, the Business or the Property.


69. **THIS COURT HEREBY REQUESTS** the aid and recognition of any court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body having jurisdiction in Canada or in the United States, to give effect to this Order and to assist the Applicant, the Monitor and their respective agents in carrying out the terms of this Order. All courts, tribunals, regulatory, and administrative bodies are hereby respectfully requested to make such orders and to provide such assistance to the Applicant and to the Monitor, as an officer of this Court, as may be necessary or desirable to give effect to this Order, to grant representative status to the Monitor in any foreign proceeding, or to assist the Applicant and the Monitor and their respective agents in carrying out the terms of this Order.

70. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that each of the Applicant and the Monitor be at liberty and is hereby authorized and empowered to apply to any court, tribunal, regulatory, or administrative body, wherever located, for the recognition of this Order and for assistance in carrying out the terms of this Order, and that the Applicant is authorized and empowered to act as a representative in respect of the within proceedings for the purpose of having these proceedings recognized in a jurisdiction outside Canada, including, with the consent of the Applicant, acting as the foreign representative of the Applicant to apply to the United States Bankruptcy Court for relief pursuant to Chapter 15 of the *United States Bankruptcy Code*, 11 U.S.C. §§ 101-1330, as amended, and to act as foreign representative in respect of any such proceedings and any ancillary relief in respect thereto.

71. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that any interested party (including the Applicant and the Monitor) may apply to this Court to vary or amend this Order on not less than seven (7) days' notice to any other party or parties likely to be affected by the order sought or upon such other notice, if any, as this Court may order.

72. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that this Order and all of its provisions are effective as of 12:01 a.m. Eastern Standard/Daylight Time on the date of this Order.

ENTERED AT / INSCRIT À TORONTO
ON / BOOK NO:
LE / DANS LE REGISTRE NO:



JUL 07 2016

Court File No. **CV16-11452-00CL**

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED
AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF H.B. WHITE CANADA CORP.

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)**

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

INITIAL ORDER

Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP

2100 Scotia Plaza, 40 King Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 3C2

R. Shayne Kukulowicz LSUC #:30729S

Tel: 416.860.6463

Fax: 416.640.3176

skukulowicz@casselsbrock.com

Jane O. Dietrich LSUC #:49302U

Tel: 416.860.5223

Fax: 416.640.3144

jdietrich@casselsbrock.com

Natalie E. Levine LSUC#: 64908K

Tel: 416.860.6568

Fax: 416.640.3207

nlevine@casselsbrock.com

Lawyers for H. B. White Canada Corp.

TAB J

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST



THE HONOURABLE MR.

JUSTICE HAINEY

)
)
)

THURSDAY, THE 22ND

DAY OF JUNE, 2017

IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS*
ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF SEARS CANADA INC., CORBEIL
ÉLECTRIQUE INC., S.L.H. TRANSPORT INC., THE CUT INC.,
SEARS CONTACT SERVICES INC., INITIUM LOGISTICS
SERVICES INC., INITIUM COMMERCE LABS INC., INITIUM
TRADING AND SOURCING CORP., SEARS FLOOR
COVERING CENTRES INC., 173470 CANADA INC., 2497089
ONTARIO INC., 6988741 CANADA INC., 10011711 CANADA
INC., 1592580 ONTARIO LIMITED, 955041 ALBERTA LTD.,
4201531 CANADA INC., 168886 CANADA INC., AND 3339611
CANADA INC.

(each, an "**Applicant**", and collectively, the "**Applicants**")

AMENDED AND RESTATED INITIAL ORDER

THIS APPLICATION, made by the Applicants, pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the "**CCAA**"), was heard this day at 330 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.

ON READING the affidavit of Billy Wong sworn June 22, 2017, and the Exhibits thereto (collectively, the "**Wong Affidavit**"), and the pre-filing report dated June 22, 2017 of FTI Consulting Canada Inc. ("**FTI**"), in its capacity as the proposed Monitor of the Applicants (the "**Pre-Filing Report**"), and on hearing the submissions of counsel to the Applicants and SearsConnect (the "**Partnership**", and collectively with the Applicants, the "**Sears Canada**

Entities”), counsel to the Board of Directors (the “**Board of Directors**”) of Sears Canada Inc. (“**SCI**”) and the Special Committee of the Board of Directors (the “**Special Committee**”) of SCI, counsel to FTI, counsel to Wells Fargo Capital Finance Corporation Canada (the “**DIP ABL Agent**”), as administrative agent under the DIP ABL Credit Agreement (as defined herein), and counsel to GACP Finance Co., LLC (the “**DIP Term Agent**”), as administrative agent under the DIP Term Credit Agreement (as defined herein), Koskie Minsky LLP as counsel for Store Catalogue Retiree Group, counsel for the Financial Services Commission of Ontario, and on reading the consent of FTI to act as the Monitor.

SERVICE

1. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the time for service of the Notice of Application and the Application Record is hereby abridged and validated so that this Application is properly returnable today and hereby dispenses with further service thereof.

APPLICATION

2. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that the Applicants are companies to which the CCAA applies. Although not an Applicant, the Partnership shall enjoy the benefits of the protections and authorizations provided by this Order.

PLAN OF ARRANGEMENT

3. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicants, individually or collectively, shall have the authority to file and may, subject to further Order of this Court, file with this Court a plan of compromise or arrangement (hereinafter referred to as the “**Plan**”).

POSSESSION OF PROPERTY AND OPERATIONS

4. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Sears Canada Entities shall remain in possession and control of their respective current and future assets, undertakings and properties of every nature and kind whatsoever, and wherever situate including all proceeds thereof (the “**Property**”). For greater certainty, the “**Property**” includes all inventory, assets, undertakings and property of the Sears Canada Entities in the possession or control of the Hometown Dealers (as defined in the Wong Affidavit) and all inventory, assets, undertakings and property of the Sears Canada

Entities in the possession or control of the Corbeil Franchisees (as defined in the Wong Affidavit). Subject to further Order of this Court, the Sears Canada Entities shall continue to carry on business in a manner consistent with the preservation of the value of their business (the “**Business**”) and Property. The Sears Canada Entities shall each be authorized and empowered to continue to retain and employ the employees, independent contractors, advisors, consultants, agents, experts, accountants, counsel and such other persons (collectively, “**Assistants**”) currently retained or employed by them, with liberty, subject to the terms of the Definitive Documents (as defined herein) to retain such further Assistants, as they deem reasonably necessary or desirable in the ordinary course of business or for the carrying out of the terms of this Order.

5. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Sears Canada Entities shall be entitled to continue to utilize the central cash management services currently in place as described in the Wong Affidavit, or, with the consent of the Monitor, the DIP ABL Agent on behalf of the DIP ABL Lenders (as defined herein) and the DIP Term Agent on behalf of the DIP Term Lenders (as defined herein), replace it with another substantially similar central cash management services (the “**Cash Management System**”) and that any present or future bank or other institution providing the Cash Management System shall not be under any obligation whatsoever to inquire into the propriety, validity or legality of any transfer, payment, collection or other action taken under the Cash Management System, or as to the use or application by the Sears Canada Entities of funds transferred, paid, collected or otherwise dealt with in the Cash Management System, shall be entitled to provide the Cash Management System without any liability in respect thereof to any Person (as hereinafter defined) other than the Sears Canada Entities, pursuant to the terms of the documentation applicable to the Cash Management System, and shall be, in its capacity as provider of the Cash Management System, an unaffected creditor under the Plan with regard to any claims or expenses it may suffer or incur in connection with the provision of the Cash Management System; provided, however, that no bank or other institution providing such Cash Management System shall be obliged to extend any overdraft credit, on an aggregate net basis, directly or indirectly in connection therewith and further provided that, to the extent any overdraft occurs, on an aggregate net basis, the Sears Canada Entities shall make arrangements to repay such overdraft forthwith.

6. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Sears Canada Entities, subject to availability under, and in accordance with the terms of the DIP Facilities (as defined herein) and the Definitive Documents, and subject to further Order of this Court, shall be entitled but not required to pay the following expenses whether incurred prior to, on or after this Order to the extent that such expenses are incurred and payable by the Sears Canada Entities:

- (a) all outstanding and future wages, salaries, commissions, employee and retiree benefits (including, without limitation, medical, dental, life insurance and similar benefit plans or arrangements), pension benefits or contributions, vacation pay, expenses, and director fees and expenses, payable on or after the date of this Order, in each case incurred in the ordinary course of business and consistent with existing compensation policies and arrangements (but not including termination or severance payments), and all other payroll, pension and benefits processing and servicing expenses;
- (b) all outstanding and future amounts owing to or in respect of Persons working as independent contractors in connection with the Business;
- (c) all outstanding or future amounts owing in respect of customer rebates, refunds, discounts or other amounts on account of similar customer programs or obligations;
- (d) all outstanding or future amounts related to honouring customer obligations, whether existing before or after the date of this Order, including customer financing, product warranties, pre-payments, deposits, gift cards, Sears Club programs (including redemptions of Sears Club points) and other customer loyalty programs, offers and benefits, in each case incurred in the ordinary course of business and consistent with existing policies and procedures;
- (e) the fees and disbursements of any Assistants retained or employed by the Sears Canada Entities at their standard rates and charges; and
- (f) with the consent of the Monitor, amounts owing for goods or services actually supplied to the Sears Canada Entities prior to the date of this Order by:

- (i) logistics or supply chain providers, including customs brokers and freight forwarders, fuel providers, repair, maintenance and parts providers, and security and armoured truck carriers, and including amounts payable in respect of customs and duties for goods;
- (ii) providers of information, internet, and other technology, including e-commerce providers and related services;
- (iii) providers of credit, debit and gift card processing related services; and
- (iv) other third party suppliers up to a maximum aggregate amount of \$25 million, if, in the opinion of the Sears Canada Entities, the supplier is critical to the business and ongoing operations of the Sears Canada Entities.

7. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, except as otherwise provided to the contrary herein and subject to the terms of the Definitive Documents, the Sears Canada Entities shall be entitled but not required to pay all reasonable expenses incurred by them in carrying on the Business in the ordinary course after this Order, and in carrying out the provisions of this Order and any other Order of this Court, which expenses shall include, without limitation:

- (a) all expenses and capital expenditures reasonably necessary for the preservation of the Property or the Business including, without limitation, payments on account of insurance (including directors' and officers' insurance), maintenance (including environmental remediation) and security services; and
- (b) payment for goods or services actually supplied to the Sears Canada Entities following the date of this Order.

8. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Sears Canada Entities shall remit, in accordance with legal requirements, or pay:

- (a) any statutory deemed trust amounts in favour of the Crown in right of Canada or of any Province thereof or any other taxation authority which are required to be deducted from the Sears Canada Entities' employees' wages, including, without limitation, amounts in respect of (i) employment insurance, (ii) Canada Pension Plan, (iii) Quebec Pension Plan, and (iv) income taxes;

- (b) all goods and services taxes, harmonized sales taxes or other applicable sales taxes (collectively, "**Sales Taxes**") required to be remitted by the Sears Canada Entities in connection with the sale of goods and services by the Sears Canada Entities, but only where such Sales Taxes are accrued or collected after the date of this Order, or where such Sales Taxes were accrued or collected prior to the date of this Order but not required to be remitted until on or after the date of this Order;
- (c) any amount payable to the Crown in right of Canada or of any Province thereof or any political subdivision thereof or any other taxation authority in respect of municipal realty, municipal business, workers' compensation or other taxes, assessments or levies of any nature or kind which are entitled at law to be paid in priority to claims of secured creditors and which are attributable to or in respect of the carrying on of the Business by the Sears Canada Entities; and
- (d) taxes under the *Income Tax Act* (Canada) or other relevant taxing statutes to the extent that such taxing statutes give rise to statutory deemed trust amounts in favour of the Crown in right of Canada or any Province thereof or any political subdivision thereof or any other taxation authority.

9. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, except as specifically permitted herein, the Sears Canada Entities are hereby directed, until further Order of this Court: (a) to make no payments of principal, interest thereon or otherwise on account of amounts owing by any one of the Sears Canada Entities to any of their creditors as of this date; (b) to grant no security interests, trust, liens, charges or encumbrances upon or in respect of any of the Property; and (c) to not grant credit or incur liabilities except in the ordinary course of the Business or pursuant to this Order or any further Order of this Court.

RESTRUCTURING

10. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Sears Canada Entities shall, subject to such requirements as are imposed by the CCAA, and subject to the terms of the Definitive Documents, have the right to:

- (a) permanently or temporarily cease, downsize or shut down any of their Business or operations, and to dispose of redundant or non-material assets not exceeding \$2 million in any one transaction or \$5 million in the aggregate in any series of related transactions, provided that, with respect to leased premises, the Sears Canada Entities may, subject to the requirements of the CCAA and paragraphs 11 to 13 herein, vacate, abandon or quit the whole (but not part of) and may permanently (but not temporarily) cease, downsize or shut down any of their Business or operations in respect of any leased premises;
- (b) terminate the employment of such of its employees or temporarily lay off such of its employees as the relevant Sears Canada Entity deems appropriate; and
- (c) pursue all avenues of refinancing, restructuring, selling and reorganizing the Business or Property, in whole or part, subject to prior approval of this Court being obtained before any material refinancing, restructuring, sale or reorganization,

all of the foregoing to permit the Sears Canada Entities to proceed with an orderly restructuring of the Sears Canada Entities and/or the Business (the “**Restructuring**”).

REAL PROPERTY LEASES

11. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that until a real property lease is disclaimed or resiliated in accordance with the CCAA, the Sears Canada Entities shall pay, without duplication, all amounts constituting rent or payable as rent under real property leases (including, for greater certainty, common area maintenance charges, utilities and realty taxes and any other amounts payable to the landlord under its lease, but for greater certainty, excluding accelerated rent or penalties, fees or other charges arising as a result of the insolvency of any or all of the Sears Canada Entities or the making of this Order) or as otherwise may be negotiated between the applicable Sears Canada Entity and the landlord from time to time (“**Rent**”), for the period commencing from and including the date of this Order, twice-monthly in equal payments on the first and fifteenth day of each month, in advance (but not in arrears). On the date of the first of such payments, any Rent relating to the period commencing from and including the date of this Order shall also be paid.

12. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Sears Canada Entities shall provide each of the relevant landlords with notice of the relevant Sears Canada Entity's intention to remove any fixtures from any leased premises at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the intended removal. The relevant landlord shall be entitled to have a representative present in the leased premises to observe such removal and, if the landlord disputes the entitlement of a Sears Canada Entity to remove any such fixture under the provisions of the lease, such fixture shall remain on the premises and shall be dealt with as agreed between any applicable secured creditors, such landlord and the relevant Sears Canada Entity, or by further Order of this Court upon application by the Sears Canada Entities on at least two (2) days' notice to such landlord and any such secured creditors. If any of the Sears Canada Entities disclaims or resiliates the lease governing such leased premises in accordance with Section 32 of the CCAA, it shall not be required to pay Rent under such lease pending resolution of any such dispute (other than Rent payable for the notice period provided for in Section 32(5) of the CCAA), and the disclaimer or resiliation of the lease shall be without prejudice to the relevant Sears Canada Entity's claim to the fixtures in dispute.

13. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that if a notice of disclaimer or resiliation is delivered pursuant to Section 32 of the CCAA by any of the Sears Canada Entities, then: (a) during the notice period prior to the effective time of the disclaimer or resiliation, the landlord may show the affected leased premises to prospective tenants during normal business hours, on giving the relevant Sears Canada Entity and the Monitor 24 hours' prior written notice; and (b) at the effective time of the disclaimer or resiliation, the relevant landlord shall be entitled to take possession of any such leased premises without waiver of or prejudice to any claims or rights such landlord may have against the relevant Sears Canada Entity in respect of such lease or leased premises, provided that nothing herein shall relieve such landlord of its obligation to mitigate any damages claimed in connection therewith.

NO PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE SEARS CANADA ENTITIES, THE BUSINESS OR THE PROPERTY

14. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that until and including July 22, 2017, or such later date as this Court may order (the "**Stay Period**"), no proceeding or enforcement process in any court or tribunal (each, a "**Proceeding**") shall be commenced or continued against or in respect of the

Sears Canada Entities or the Monitor or their respective employees and representatives acting in such capacities, or affecting the Business or the Property, except with the written consent of the Sears Canada Entities and the Monitor, or with leave of this Court, and any and all Proceedings currently under way against or in respect of the Sears Canada Entities or affecting the Business or the Property are hereby stayed and suspended pending further Order of this Court.

NO EXERCISE OF RIGHTS OR REMEDIES

15. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that during the Stay Period, no Person having any agreements or arrangements with the owners, operators, managers or landlords of commercial shopping centres or other commercial properties (including retail, office and industrial (warehouse) properties) in which there is located a store, office or warehouse owned or operated by the Sears Canada Entities shall take any Proceedings or exercise any rights or remedies under such agreements or arrangements that may arise upon and/or as a result of the making of this Order, the insolvency of, or declarations of insolvency by, any or all of the Sears Canada Entities, or as a result of any steps taken by the Sears Canada Entities pursuant to this Order and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, no Person shall terminate, accelerate, suspend, modify, determine or cancel any such arrangement or agreement or be entitled to exercise any rights or remedies in connection therewith.

16. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that during the Stay Period, no Person having any agreements or arrangements with the Hometown Dealers or the Corbeil Franchisees shall take any Proceedings or exercise any rights or remedies under such agreements or arrangements that may arise upon and/or as a result of the making of this Order, the insolvency of, or declarations of insolvency by, any or all of the Sears Canada Entities, or as a result of any steps taken by the Sears Canada Entities pursuant to this Order and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, no Person shall terminate, accelerate, suspend, modify, determine or cancel any such arrangement or agreement or be entitled to exercise any rights or remedies in connection therewith.

17. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that during the Stay Period all rights and remedies, of any individual, firm, corporation, governmental body or agency, or any other entities (all of the foregoing, collectively being “**Persons**” and each being a “**Person**”) against or in respect of the Sears Canada Entities or the Monitor or their respective employees and representatives acting in

such capacities, or affecting the Business or the Property, are hereby stayed and suspended, except with the written consent of the Sears Canada Entities and the Monitor, or leave of this Court, provided that nothing in this Order shall: (a) empower the Sears Canada Entities to carry on any business that the Sears Canada Entities are not lawfully entitled to carry on; (b) affect such investigations, actions, suits or proceedings by a regulatory body as are permitted by Section 11.1 of the CCAA; (c) prevent the filing of any registration to preserve or perfect a security interest; (d) prevent the registration of a claim for lien; (e) prevent any holder of a valid and enforceable right of first refusal, option to purchase or other similar right in respect of any real property from being entitled to exercise all such rights; or (f) empower the Sears Canada Entities to fail to comply with their obligations under leases (other than the payment of rent on a twice-monthly basis, in accordance with paragraph 11 herein), operating agreements or similar agreements for the period from and after the commencement of this proceeding.

NO INTERFERENCE WITH RIGHTS

18. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that during the Stay Period, no Person shall discontinue, fail to honour, alter, interfere with, repudiate, terminate or cease to perform any right, renewal right, contract, agreement, lease, sublease, licence or permit in favour of or held by the Sears Canada Entities, except with the written consent of the Sears Canada Entities and the Monitor, or leave of this Court. Without limiting the foregoing, no right, option, remedy, and/or exemption in favour of the relevant Sears Canada Entity shall be or shall be deemed to be negated, suspended, waived and/or terminated as a result of this Order.

CONTINUATION OF SERVICES

19. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that during the Stay Period, all Persons having oral or written agreements with the Sears Canada Entities or statutory or regulatory mandates for the supply of goods and/or services, including without limitation all trademark license and other intellectual property, computer software, communication and other data services, centralized banking services, payroll and benefit services, insurance, warranty services, transportation services, freight services, security and armoured truck carrier services, utility, customs clearing, warehouse and logistics services or other services to the Business or the Sears Canada Entities are hereby restrained until further Order of this Court from discontinuing, altering, interfering with or terminating the supply or license of such goods, services, trademarks and other

intellectual property as may be required by the Sears Canada Entities, and that the Sears Canada Entities shall be entitled to the continued use of the trademarks and other intellectual property currently licensed to, used or owned by the Sears Canada Entities, premises, telephone numbers, facsimile numbers, internet addresses and domain names, provided in each case that the normal prices or charges for all such goods or services received after the date of this Order are paid by the Sears Canada Entities in accordance with normal payment practices of the Sears Canada Entities or such other practices as may be agreed upon by the supplier or service provider and each of the Sears Canada Entities and the Monitor, or as may be ordered by this Court.

NON-DEROGATION OF RIGHTS

20. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, notwithstanding anything else in this Order, no Person shall be prohibited from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration provided on or after the date of this Order, nor shall any Person be under any obligation on or after the date of this Order to advance or re-advance any monies or otherwise extend any credit to the Sears Canada Entities. Nothing in this Order shall derogate from the rights conferred and obligations imposed by the CCAA.

KEY EMPLOYEE RETENTION PLAN

21. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Key Employee Retention Plan (the “**KERP**”), as described in the Wong Affidavit, is hereby approved and the Sears Canada Entities are authorized to make payments contemplated thereunder in accordance with the terms and conditions of the KERP.

22. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the key employees referred to in the KERP (the “**Key Employees**”) shall be entitled to the benefit of and are hereby granted the following charges on the Property, which charges shall not exceed: (a) an aggregate amount of \$4.6 million (the “**KERP Priority Charge**”) to secure the first \$4.6 million payable to the Key Employees under the KERP; and (b) an aggregate amount of \$4.6 million (the “**KERP Subordinated Charge**”) to secure any other payments to the Key Employees under the KERP. The KERP Priority Charge and the KERP Subordinated Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 47, 48 and 50 hereof.

APPROVAL OF FINANCIAL ADVISOR AGREEMENT

23. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the agreement dated May 15, 2017 engaging BMO Nesbitt Burns Inc. (the “**Financial Advisor**”) as financial advisor to SCI and attached as Confidential Appendix C to the Pre-Filing Report (the “**Financial Advisor Agreement**”), and the retention of the Financial Advisor under the terms thereof, is hereby ratified and approved and SCI is authorized and directed *nunc pro tunc* to make the payments contemplated thereunder in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Financial Advisor Agreement.

24. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Financial Advisor shall be entitled to the benefit of and is hereby granted a charge (the “**FA Charge**”) on the Property, which charge shall not exceed an aggregate amount of \$3.3 million, as security for the fees and disbursements payable under the Financial Advisor Agreement, both before and after the making of this Order in respect of these proceedings. The FA Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 47, 48 and 50 hereof.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

25. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that during the Stay Period, and except as permitted by subsection 11.03(2) of the CCAA, no Proceeding may be commenced or continued against any of the former, current or future directors or officers of the Sears Canada Entities with respect to any claim against the directors or officers that arose before the date hereof and that relates to any obligations of the Sears Canada Entities whereby the directors or officers are alleged under any law to be liable in their capacity as directors or officers for the payment or performance of such obligations, until a compromise or arrangement in respect of the Sears Canada Entities, if one is filed, is sanctioned by this Court or is refused by the creditors of the Sears Canada Entities or this Court.

DIRECTORS' AND OFFICERS' INDEMNIFICATION AND CHARGE

26. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Sears Canada Entities shall jointly and severally indemnify their directors and officers against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as directors or officers of the Sears Canada Entities after the commencement of the within proceedings, except to the extent that, with respect to any officer or director, the obligation or

liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct.

27. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the directors and officers of the Sears Canada Entities shall be entitled to the benefit of and are hereby granted the following charges on the Property, which charges shall not exceed: (a) an aggregate amount of \$44 million (the "**Directors' Priority Charge**"); and (b) an aggregate amount of \$19.5 million (the "**Directors' Subordinated Charge**"), respectively, and in each case, as security for the indemnity provided in paragraph 26 of this Order. The Directors' Priority Charge and the Directors' Subordinated Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 47, 48 and 50 hereof.

28. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, notwithstanding any language in any applicable insurance policy to the contrary: (a) no insurer shall be entitled to be subrogated to or claim the benefit of the Directors' Priority Charge and the Directors' Subordinated Charge; and (b) the Sears Canada Entities' directors and officers shall only be entitled to the benefit of the Directors' Priority Charge and the Directors' Subordinated Charge to the extent that they do not have coverage under any directors' and officers' insurance policy, or to the extent that such coverage is insufficient to pay amounts indemnified in accordance with paragraph 26 of this Order.

APPOINTMENT OF MONITOR

29. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that FTI is hereby appointed pursuant to the CCAA as the Monitor, an officer of this Court, to monitor the Business and financial affairs of the Sears Canada Entities with the powers and obligations set out in the CCAA or set forth herein and that the Sears Canada Entities and their shareholders, officers, directors, and Assistants shall advise the Monitor of all material steps taken by the Sears Canada Entities pursuant to this Order, and shall co-operate fully with the Monitor in the exercise of its powers and discharge of its obligations and provide the Monitor with the assistance that is necessary to enable the Monitor to adequately carry out the Monitor's functions.

30. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor, in addition to its prescribed rights and obligations under the CCAA, is hereby directed and empowered to:

- (a) monitor the Sears Canada Entities' receipts and disbursements;

- (b) liaise with the Sears Canada Entities and the Assistants and, if determined by the Monitor to be necessary, the Hometown Dealers and Corbeil Franchisees, with respect to all matters relating to the Property, the Business, the Restructuring and such other matters as may be relevant to the proceedings herein;
- (c) report to this Court at such times and intervals as the Monitor may deem appropriate with respect to matters relating to the Property, the Business, the Restructuring and such other matters as may be relevant to the proceedings herein;
- (d) assist the Sears Canada Entities, to the extent required by the Sears Canada Entities, in their dissemination of financial and other information to the DIP ABL Agent, the DIP ABL Lenders, the DIP Term Agent, the DIP Term Lenders and each of their respective counsel and financial advisors, pursuant to and in accordance with the Definitive Documents;
- (e) advise the Sears Canada Entities in their preparation of the Sears Canada Entities' cash flow statements and any reporting required by the Definitive Documents, which information shall be reviewed with the Monitor and delivered to the DIP ABL Agent, the DIP ABL Lenders, the DIP Term Agent, the DIP Term Lenders and each of their respective counsel and financial advisors, pursuant to and in accordance with the Definitive Documents;
- (f) advise the Sears Canada Entities in their development of the Plan and any amendments to the Plan;
- (g) assist the Sears Canada Entities, to the extent required by the Sears Canada Entities, with the holding and administering of creditors' or shareholders' meetings for voting on the Plan;
- (h) have full and complete access to the Property (including any Property in the possession of the Hometown Dealers and the Corbeil Franchisees), including the premises, books, records, data, including data in electronic form, and other financial documents of the Sears Canada Entities, to the extent that is necessary to adequately

assess the Business and the Sears Canada Entities' financial affairs or to perform its duties arising under this Order;

- (i) be at liberty to engage independent legal counsel or such other persons as the Monitor deems necessary or advisable respecting the exercise of its powers and performance of its obligations under this Order;
- (j) assist the Sears Canada Entities, to the extent required by the Sears Canada Entities, with any matters relating to any foreign proceeding commenced in relation to any of the Sears Canada Entities, including retaining independent legal counsel, agents, experts, accountants, or such other persons as the Monitor deems necessary or desirable respecting the exercise of this power; and
- (k) perform such other duties as are required by this Order or by this Court from time to time.

31. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor shall not take possession of the Property and shall take no part whatsoever in the management or supervision of the management of the Business and shall not, by fulfilling its obligations hereunder, be deemed to have taken or maintained possession or control of the Business or Property, or any part thereof.

32. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that nothing herein contained shall require the Monitor to occupy or to take control, care, charge, possession or management (separately and/or collectively, "**Possession**") of any of the Property that might be environmentally contaminated, might be a pollutant or a contaminant, or might cause or contribute to a spill, discharge, release or deposit of a substance contrary to any federal, provincial or other law respecting the protection, conservation, enhancement, remediation or rehabilitation of the environment or relating to the disposal of waste or other contamination including, without limitation, the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act*, the *Ontario Environmental Protection Act*, the *Ontario Water Resources Act*, or the *Ontario Occupational Health and Safety Act* and regulations thereunder (the "**Environmental Legislation**"), provided however that nothing herein shall exempt the Monitor from any duty to report or make disclosure imposed by applicable Environmental Legislation. The Monitor shall not, as a result of this Order or anything done in pursuance of the Monitor's duties and powers under this Order, be deemed to be in Possession of

any of the Property within the meaning of any Environmental Legislation, unless it is actually in possession.

33. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor shall provide any creditor of the Sears Canada Entities, the DIP ABL Agent, the DIP ABL Lenders, the DIP Term Agent and the DIP Term Lenders with information provided by the Sears Canada Entities in response to reasonable requests for information made in writing by such creditor addressed to the Monitor. The Monitor shall not have any responsibility or liability with respect to the information disseminated by it pursuant to this paragraph. In the case of information that the Monitor has been advised by the Sears Canada Entities is confidential, the Monitor shall not provide such information to creditors unless otherwise directed by this Court or on such terms as the Monitor and the Sears Canada Entities may agree.

34. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, in addition to the rights and protections afforded the Monitor under the CCAA or as an officer of this Court, the Monitor shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of its appointment or the carrying out of the provisions of this Order, save and except for any gross negligence or wilful misconduct on its part. Nothing in this Order shall derogate from the protections afforded the Monitor by the CCAA or any applicable legislation.

35. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor, counsel to the Monitor, counsel to the Sears Canada Entities and counsel to the Board of Directors and the Special Committee shall be paid their reasonable fees and disbursements, in each case at their standard rates and charges, whether incurred prior to or subsequent to the date of this Order, by the Sears Canada Entities as part of the costs of these proceedings. The Sears Canada Entities are hereby authorized and directed to pay the accounts of the Monitor, counsel to the Monitor, counsel to the Sears Canada Entities and counsel to the Board of Directors and the Special Committee on a weekly basis and, in addition, the Sears Canada Entities are hereby authorized to pay to the Monitor, counsel to the Monitor, counsel to the Sears Canada Entities and counsel to the Board of Directors and the Special Committee, retainers in the aggregate amount of \$700,000, to be held by them as security for payment of their respective fees and disbursements outstanding from time to time.

36. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor and its legal counsel shall pass their accounts from time to time, and for this purpose the accounts of the Monitor and its legal counsel are hereby referred to a judge of the Commercial List of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice.

37. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor, counsel to the Monitor, counsel to the Sears Canada Entities and counsel to the Board of Directors and the Special Committee shall be entitled to the benefit of and are hereby granted a charge (the “**Administration Charge**”) on the Property, which charge shall not exceed an aggregate amount of \$5 million, as security for their professional fees and disbursements incurred at their respective standard rates and charges, both before and after the making of this Order in respect of these proceedings. The Administration Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 47, 48 and 50 hereof.

DIP FINANCING

38. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Sears Canada Entities are hereby authorized and empowered to obtain and borrow or guarantee, as applicable, on a joint and several basis, under:

- (a) the Senior Secured Superpriority Debtor-in-Possession Amended and Restated Credit Agreement dated as of June 22, 2017 and attached to the Wong Affidavit as Exhibit K, among the Sears Canada Entities, the DIP ABL Agent and the lenders from time to time party thereto (the “**DIP ABL Lenders**”) (as may be amended, restated, supplemented and/or modified, subject to approval of this Court in respect of any amendment that the Monitor determines to be material, the “**DIP ABL Credit Agreement**”), in order to finance the Sears Canada Entities’ working capital requirements and other general corporate purposes and capital expenditures, all in accordance with the Definitive Documents, provided that borrowings under DIP ABL Credit Agreement shall not exceed \$300 million unless permitted by further Order of this Court (the “**DIP ABL Credit Facility**”); and
- (b) the Senior Secured Superpriority Credit Agreement dated as of June 22, 2017 and attached to the Wong Affidavit as Exhibit K, among the Sears Canada Entities, the DIP Term Agent and the lenders from time to time party thereto (the “**DIP Term Lenders**”) (as may be amended, restated, supplemented and/or modified, subject to approval of this Court in respect of any amendment that the Monitor determines to be material, the “**DIP Term Credit Agreement**”), in order to finance the Sears Canada Entities’ working capital requirements and other general corporate purposes and capital expenditures, all in accordance with the Definitive Documents, provided that borrowings under the DIP Term Credit Agreement shall not exceed \$150 million

unless permitted by further Order of this Court (the “**DIP Term Credit Facility**”, and together with the DIP ABL Credit Facility, the “**DIP Facilities**”).

39. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the DIP Facilities shall be on the terms and subject to the conditions set forth in the DIP ABL Credit Agreement, the DIP Term Credit Agreement and the other Definitive Documents.

40. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Sears Canada Entities are hereby authorized and empowered to execute and deliver the DIP ABL Credit Agreement, the DIP Term Credit Agreement and such mortgages, charges, hypothecs and security documents, guarantees and other definitive documents (collectively, and including any schedules (as amended and updated from time to time) thereto, the “**Definitive Documents**”), as are contemplated by the DIP ABL Credit Agreement and the DIP Term Credit Agreement or as may be reasonably required by the DIP ABL Agent on behalf of the DIP ABL Lenders and the DIP Term Agent on behalf of the DIP Term Lenders pursuant to the terms thereof, as applicable, and the Sears Canada Entities are hereby authorized and directed to pay and perform all of its indebtedness, interest, fees, liabilities and obligations to the DIP ABL Agent, the DIP ABL Lenders, the DIP Term Agent and the DIP Term Lenders under and pursuant to the Definitive Documents as and when the same become due and are to be performed, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order.

41. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the DIP ABL Agent and the DIP ABL Lenders shall be entitled to the benefit of and are hereby granted a charge (the “**DIP ABL Lenders’ Charge**”) on the Property as security for any and all Obligations (as defined in the DIP ABL Credit Agreement) other than the Prepetition Obligations (as defined in the DIP ABL Credit Agreement) (including on account of principal, interest, fees, expenses and other liabilities, and the aggregate of all such obligations, the “**DIP ABL Obligations**”), which DIP ABL Lenders’ Charge shall be in the aggregate amount of the DIP ABL Obligations outstanding at any given time under the DIP ABL Credit Agreement. The DIP ABL Lenders’ Charge shall not secure an obligation that exists before this Order is made. The DIP ABL Lenders’ Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 47, 48 and 50 hereof.

42. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the DIP Term Agent and the DIP Term Lenders shall be entitled to the benefit of and are hereby granted a charge (the “**DIP Term Lenders’ Charge**”) on the Property as security for any and all Obligations (as defined in DIP Term Credit Agreement)

(including on account of principal, interest, fees, expenses and other liabilities, and the aggregate of all such obligations, the “**DIP Term Obligations**”), which DIP Term Lenders’ Charge shall be in the aggregate amount of the DIP Term Obligations outstanding at any given time under the DIP Term Credit Agreement. The DIP Term Lenders’ Charge shall not secure an obligation that exists before this Order is made. The DIP Term Lenders’ Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 47, 48 and 50 hereof.

43. [Intentionally deleted.]

44. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order:

- (a) the DIP ABL Agent on behalf of the DIP ABL Lenders, as applicable, may take such steps from time to time as they may deem necessary or appropriate to file, register, record or perfect the DIP ABL Lenders’ Charge, the DIP ABL Credit Agreement or any of the other Definitive Documents;
- (b) the DIP Term Agent on behalf of the DIP Term Lenders, as applicable, may take such steps from time to time as they may deem necessary or appropriate to file, register, record or perfect the DIP Term Lenders’ Charge, the DIP Term Credit Agreement or any of the other Definitive Documents;
- (c) upon the occurrence of an event of default under the DIP ABL Credit Agreement, the other related Definitive Documents or the DIP ABL Lenders’ Charge, the DIP ABL Agent and the DIP ABL Lenders, as applicable, may, subject to the provisions of the DIP ABL Credit Agreement with respect to the giving of notice or otherwise, and in accordance with the DIP ABL Credit Agreement, the other related Definitive Documents and the DIP ABL Lenders’ Charge, as applicable, cease making advances to the Sears Canada Entities, make demand, accelerate payment and give other notices; provided that, the DIP ABL Agent and the DIP ABL Lenders must apply to this Court on seven (7) days’ prior written notice (which may include the service of materials in connection with such an application to this Court) to the Sears Canada Entities, the DIP Term Agent, the DIP Term Lenders and the Monitor, to enforce against or exercise any other rights and remedies with respect to the Sears Canada Entities or any of the Property (including to set off and/or consolidate any amounts

owing by the DIP ABL Agent and the DIP ABL Lenders to the Sears Canada Entities against the obligations of the Sears Canada Entities to the DIP ABL Agent and the DIP ABL Lenders under the DIP ABL Credit Agreement, the other related Definitive Documents or the DIP ABL Lenders' Charge), to appoint a receiver, receiver and manager or interim receiver, or to seek a bankruptcy order against the Sears Canada Entities and to appoint a trustee in bankruptcy of the Sears Canada Entities;

- (d) upon the occurrence of an event of default under the DIP Term Credit Agreement, the other related Definitive Documents or the DIP Term Lenders' Charge, the DIP Term Agent and the DIP Term Lenders, as applicable, may, subject to the provisions of the DIP Term Credit Agreement with respect to the giving of notice or otherwise, and in accordance with the DIP Term Credit Agreement, the other related Definitive Documents and the DIP Term Lenders' Charge, as applicable, cease making advances to the Sears Canada Entities, make demand, accelerate payment and give other notices; provided that, the DIP Term Agent and the DIP Term Lenders must apply to this Court on seven (7) days' prior written notice (which may include the service of materials in connection with such an application to this Court) to the Sears Canada Entities, the DIP ABL Agent, the DIP ABL Lenders and the Monitor, to enforce against or exercise any other rights and remedies with respect to the Sears Canada Entities or any of the Property (including to set off and/or consolidate any amounts owing by the DIP Term Agent and the DIP Term Lenders to the Sears Canada Entities against the obligations of the Sears Canada Entities to the DIP Term Agent and the DIP Term Lenders under the DIP Term Credit Agreement, the other related Definitive Documents or the DIP Term Lenders' Charge), to appoint a receiver, receiver and manager or interim receiver, or to seek a bankruptcy order against the Sears Canada Entities and to appoint a trustee in bankruptcy of the Sears Canada Entities; and
- (e) the foregoing rights and remedies of the DIP ABL Agent, the DIP ABL Lenders, the DIP Term Agent and the DIP Term Lenders shall be enforceable against any trustee in bankruptcy, interim receiver, receiver or receiver and manager of the Sears Canada Entities or the Property.

45. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that the DIP ABL Agent, the DIP ABL Lenders, the DIP Term Agent and the DIP Term Lenders shall be treated as unaffected in any plan of arrangement or compromise filed by the Sears Canada Entities or any of them under the CCAA, or any proposal filed by the Sears Canada Entities or any of them under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* of Canada (the “**BIA**”), with respect to any advances made under the DIP ABL Credit Agreement, the DIP Term Credit Agreement and the other Definitive Documents.

46. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that this Order is subject to provisional execution and that if any of the provisions of this Order in connection with the DIP ABL Credit Agreement, the DIP Term Credit Agreement, the other Definitive Documents, the DIP ABL Lenders’ Charge or the DIP Term Lenders’ Charge shall subsequently be stayed, modified, varied, amended, reversed or vacated in whole or in part (collectively, a “**Variation**”) whether by subsequent order of this Court on or pending an appeal from this Order, such Variation shall not in any way impair, limit or lessen the priority, protections, rights or remedies of the DIP ABL Agent, the DIP ABL Lenders, the DIP Term Agent and the DIP Term Lenders whether under this Order (as made prior to the Variation), under the DIP ABL Credit Agreement, the DIP Term Credit Agreement and the other Definitive Documents, with respect to any advances made prior to the DIP ABL Agent, the DIP ABL Lenders, the DIP Term Agent or the DIP Term Lenders being given notice of the Variation and the DIP ABL Agent, the DIP ABL Lenders, the DIP Term Agent and the DIP Term Lenders shall be entitled to rely on this Order as issued (including, without limitation, the DIP ABL Lenders’ Charge and the DIP Term Lenders’ Charge) for all advances so made.

VALIDITY AND PRIORITY OF CHARGES CREATED BY THIS ORDER

47. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the priorities of the Administration Charge, the FA Charge, the DIP ABL Lenders’ Charge, the DIP Term Lenders’ Charge, the Directors’ Priority Charge, the Directors’ Subordinated Charge, the KERP Priority Charge and the KERP Subordinated Charge (collectively, the “**Charges**”), as among them, with respect to ABL Priority Collateral (as defined in the Intercreditor Agreement dated March 20, 2017 and attached as Exhibit J to the Wong Affidavit) shall be as follows:

First – Administration Charge, to the maximum amount of \$5 million, and the FA Charge, to the maximum amount of \$3.3 million, on a *pari passu* basis;

Second – KERP Priority Charge, to the maximum amount of \$4.6 million;

Third – Directors' Priority Charge, to the maximum amount of \$44 million;

Fourth – DIP ABL Lenders' Charge, to the maximum amount of the quantum of the DIP ABL Obligations at the relevant time;

Fifth – the DIP Term Lenders' Charge, to the maximum amount of the quantum of the DIP Term Obligations at the relevant time;

Sixth – KERP Subordinated Charge, to the maximum amount of \$4.6 million; and

Seventh – the Directors' Subordinated Charge, to the maximum amount of \$19.5 million.

48. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the priorities of the Charges as among them, with respect to all Property other than the ABL Priority Collateral shall be as follows:

First – Administration Charge, to the maximum amount of \$5 million, and the FA Charge, to the maximum amount of \$3.3 million, on a *pari passu* basis;

Second – KERP Priority Charge, to the maximum amount of \$4.6 million;

Third – Directors' Priority Charge, to the maximum amount of \$44 million;

Fourth – DIP Term Lenders' Charge, to the maximum amount of the quantum of the DIP Term Obligations at the relevant time;

Fifth – DIP ABL Lenders' Charge, to the maximum amount of the quantum of the DIP ABL Obligations at the relevant time;

Sixth – KERP Subordinated Charge, to the maximum amount of \$4.6 million; and

Seventh – the Directors' Subordinated Charge, to the maximum amount of \$19.5 million.

49. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the filing, registration or perfection of the Charges shall not be required, and that the Charges shall be valid and enforceable for all purposes, including as

against any right, title or interest filed, registered, recorded or perfected subsequent to the Charges coming into existence, notwithstanding any such failure to file, register, record or perfect.

50. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that each of the Charges shall constitute a charge on the Property, and such Charges shall rank in priority to all other security interests, trusts (including constructive trusts), liens, charges and encumbrances, claims of secured creditors, statutory or otherwise (including without limitation any deemed trust that may be created under the Ontario *Pension Benefits Act*) (collectively, “**Encumbrances**”) other than (a) any Person with a properly perfected purchase money security interest under the *Personal Property Security Act* (Ontario) or such other applicable provincial legislation that has not been served with notice of this Order; and (b) statutory super-priority deemed trusts and liens for unpaid employee source deductions.

51. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that except as otherwise expressly provided for herein, or as may be approved by this Court, the Sears Canada Entities shall not grant any Encumbrances over any of the Property that rank in priority to, or *pari passu* with, any of the Charges, unless the Sears Canada Entities also obtain the prior written consent of the Monitor, the DIP ABL Agent on behalf of the DIP ABL Lenders, the DIP Term Agent on behalf of the DIP Term Lenders and the other beneficiaries of affected Charges, or further Order of this Court.

52. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Charges, the DIP ABL Credit Agreement, the DIP Term Credit Agreement, and the other Definitive Documents shall not be rendered invalid or unenforceable and the rights and remedies of the chargees entitled to the benefit of the Charges (collectively, the “**Chargees**”) thereunder shall not otherwise be limited or impaired in any way by: (a) the pendency of these proceedings and the declarations of insolvency made herein; (b) any application(s) for bankruptcy order(s) issued pursuant to BIA, or any bankruptcy order made pursuant to such applications; (c) the filing of any assignments for the general benefit of creditors made pursuant to the BIA; (d) the provisions of any federal or provincial statutes; or (e) any negative covenants, prohibitions or other similar provisions with respect to borrowings, incurring debt or the creation of Encumbrances, contained in any existing loan documents, lease, sublease, offer to lease or other agreement (collectively, an “**Agreement**”) that binds the Sears Canada Entities, and notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in any Agreement:

- (i) neither the creation of the Charges nor the execution, delivery, perfection, registration or performance of the DIP ABL Credit Agreement, the DIP Term Credit Agreement or the other Definitive Documents shall create or be deemed to constitute a breach by the Sears Canada Entities of any Agreement to which it is a party;
- (ii) none of the Chargees shall have any liability to any Person whatsoever as a result of any breach of any Agreement caused by or resulting from the Sears Canada Entities entering into the DIP ABL Credit Agreement and the DIP Term Credit Agreement, the creation of the Charges, or the execution, delivery or performance of the other Definitive Documents; and
- (iii) the payments made by the Sears Canada Entities pursuant to this Order, the DIP ABL Credit Agreement, the DIP Term Credit Agreement or the other Definitive Documents, and the granting of the Charges, do not and will not constitute preferences, fraudulent conveyances, transfers at undervalue, oppressive conduct, or other challengeable or voidable transactions under any applicable law.

53. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that any Charge created by this Order over leases of real property in Canada shall only be a Charge in the relevant Sears Canada Entity's interest in such real property leases.

54. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order, the L/C Collateral Account (as defined in the DIP ABL Credit Agreement) shall be deemed to be subject to a lien, security, charge and security interest in favour of the DIP ABL Agent solely for the reimbursement obligation of SCI related to the letters of credit issued under the Wells Fargo Credit Agreement which remain undrawn from and after the Comeback Motion (as defined herein). The Charges as they may attach to the L/C Collateral Account, including by operation of law or otherwise: (a) shall rank junior in priority to the lien, security, charge and security interest in favour of the DIP ABL Agent in respect of the L/C Collateral Account; and (b) shall attach to the L/C Collateral Account only to the extent of the rights, if any, of any Sears Canada Entity to the return of any cash from the L/C Collateral Account in accordance with the DIP ABL Credit Agreement.

CORPORATE MATTERS

55. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that SCI be and is hereby relieved of any obligation to call and hold an annual meeting of its shareholders until further Order of this Court.

56. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that SCI be and is hereby relieved of any obligation to appoint any new directors until further Order of this Court.

SERVICE AND NOTICE

57. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor shall: (a) without delay, publish in The Globe and Mail (National Edition) and La Presse a notice containing the information prescribed under the CCAA; and (b) within five days after the date of this Order, (i) make this Order publicly available in the manner prescribed under the CCAA, (ii) send or cause to be sent, in the prescribed manner, a notice to every known creditor who has a claim against the Sears Canada Entities of more than \$1,000 (excluding individual employees, former employees with pension and/or retirement savings plan entitlements, and retirees and other beneficiaries who have entitlements under any pension or retirement savings plans), and (iii) prepare a list showing the names and addresses of those creditors and the estimated amounts of those claims, and make it publicly available in the prescribed manner, all in accordance with Section 23(1)(a) of the CCAA and the regulations made thereunder, provided that the Monitor shall not make the claims, names and addresses of the individuals who are creditors publicly available.

58. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor shall create, maintain and update as necessary a list of all Persons appearing in person or by counsel in this proceeding (the “**Service List**”). The Monitor shall post the Service List, as may be updated from time to time, on the Monitor’s Website (as defined herein) as part of the public materials to be made available thereon in relation to this proceeding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Monitor shall have no liability in respect of the accuracy of or the timeliness of making any changes to the Service List.

59. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that any employee of any of the Sears Canada Entities that receives a notice of termination from any of the Sears Canada Entities shall be deemed to have received such notice of termination by no more than the seventh day following the date such notice of termination is delivered, if such notice of termination is sent by ordinary mail, courier or registered mail.

60. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the E-Service Protocol of the Commercial List (the “**Protocol**”) is approved and adopted by reference herein and, in this proceeding, the service of documents made in accordance with the Protocol (which can be found on the Commercial List

website at <http://www.ontariocourts.ca/scj/practice/practice-directions/toronto/eservice-commercial/>) shall be valid and effective service. Subject to Rule 17.05, this Order shall constitute an order for substituted service pursuant to Rule 16.04 of the Rules of Civil Procedure. Subject to Rule 3.01(d) of the Rules of Civil Procedure and paragraph 21 of the Protocol, service of documents in accordance with the Protocol will be effective on transmission. This Court further orders that a Case Website shall be established in accordance with the Protocol with the following URL: cfcanada.fticonsulting.com/searscanada (the “**Monitor’s Website**”).

61. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that if the service or distribution of documents in accordance with the Protocol is not practicable, the Sears Canada Entities and the Monitor are at liberty to serve or distribute this Order, any other materials and orders in these proceedings, any notices or other correspondence, by forwarding true copies thereof by prepaid ordinary mail, courier, personal delivery or electronic transmission to the Sears Canada Entities’ creditors or other interested parties at their respective addresses as last shown on the records of the Sears Canada Entities and that any such service or distribution by courier, personal delivery or electronic transmission shall be deemed to be received on the next business day following the date of forwarding thereof, or if sent by ordinary mail, on the third business day after mailing.

62. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicants, the Monitor, the Financial Advisor, the DIP Term Agent on behalf of the DIP Term Lenders and the DIP ABL Agent on behalf of the DIP ABL Lenders, and their respective counsel are at liberty to serve or distribute this Order, any other materials and orders as may be reasonably required in these proceedings, including any notices, or other correspondence, by forwarding true copies thereof by electronic message to the Applicants’ creditors or other interested parties and their advisors. For greater certainty, any such distribution or service shall be deemed to be in satisfaction of a legal or juridical obligation, and notice requirements within the meaning of clause 3(c) of the Electronic Commerce Protection Regulations, Reg. 81000-2-175 (SOR/DORS).

COMEBACK MOTION

63. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the comeback motion shall be heard on July 13, 2017 (the “**Comeback Motion**”).

GENERAL

64. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Sears Canada Entities or the Monitor may from time to time apply to this Court for advice and directions in the discharge of its powers and duties hereunder.

65. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that nothing in this Order shall prevent the Monitor from acting as an interim receiver, a receiver, a receiver and manager, or a trustee in bankruptcy of the Sears Canada Entities, the Business or the Property.

66. **THIS COURT HEREBY REQUESTS** the aid and recognition of any court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body having jurisdiction in Canada or in the United States, to give effect to this Order and to assist the Sears Canada Entities, the Monitor and their respective agents in carrying out the terms of this Order. All courts, tribunals, regulatory and administrative bodies are hereby respectfully requested to make such orders and to provide such assistance to the Sears Canada Entities and to the Monitor, as an officer of this Court, as may be necessary or desirable to give effect to this Order, to grant representative status to the Monitor in any foreign proceeding, or to assist the Sears Canada Entities and the Monitor and their respective agents in carrying out the terms of this Order.

67. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that each of the Applicants and the Monitor be at liberty and are hereby authorized and empowered to apply to any court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body, wherever located, for the recognition of this Order and for assistance in carrying out the terms of this Order, and that the Monitor is authorized and empowered to act as a representative in respect of the within proceedings for the purpose of having these proceedings recognized in a jurisdiction outside Canada, including acting as the foreign representative of the Applicants to apply to the United States Bankruptcy Court for relief pursuant to Chapter 15 of the *United States Bankruptcy Code*, 11 U.S.C. §§ 101-1515, as amended, and to act as foreign representative in respect of any such proceedings and any ancillary relief in respect thereto, and to take such other steps as may be authorized by the Court.

68. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that any interested party (including the Sears Canada Entities and the Monitor) may apply to this Court to vary or amend this Order at the Comeback Motion

on not less than seven (7) calendar days' notice to any other party or parties likely to be affected by the order sought or upon such other notice, if any, as this Court may order.

69. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that Confidential Appendix B and Confidential Appendix C to the Pre-Filing Report shall be and are hereby sealed, kept confidential and shall not form part of the public record pending further Order of this Court.

70. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that this Order and all of its provisions are effective as of 12:01 a.m. Eastern Standard/Daylight Time on the date of this Order.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Haines J.", written over a horizontal line.

ENTERED AT / INSCRIT À TORONTO
ON / BOOK NO:
LE / DANS LE REGISTRE NO:

JUL 13 2017

PER / PAR:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "pl", written below the text "PER / PAR:".

IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT*
ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

Court File No. CV-17-11846-00CL

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF
SEARS CANADA INC., CORBEIL ÉLECTRIQUE INC., S.L.H. TRANSPORT INC., THE
CUT INC., SEARS CONTACT SERVICES INC., INITIUM LOGISTICS SERVICES INC.,
INITIUM COMMERCE LABS INC., INITIUM TRADING AND SOURCING CORP.,
SEARS FLOOR COVERING CENTRES INC., 173470 CANADA INC., 2497089
ONTARIO INC., 6988741 CANADA INC., 10011711 CANADA INC., 1592580
ONTARIO LIMITED, 955041 ALBERTA LTD., 4201531 CANADA INC., 168886
CANADA INC., AND 3339611 CANADA INC. (collectively, the “Applicants”)

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(Commercial List)

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

AMENDED AND RESTATED INITIAL ORDER

OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP

Box 50, 1 First Canadian Place
Toronto, Canada M5X 1B8

Marc Wasserman (LSUC #: 44066M)
Tel: 416.862.4908

Jeremy Dacks (LSUC #: 41851R)
Tel: 416.862.4923

Michael De Lellis (LSUC #: 48038U)
Tel: 416.862.5997

Lawyers for the Applicants

TAB K

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION PURSUANT TO SECTION 243(1) OF THE
BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, AS AMENDED
AND

IN THE MATTER OF SECTION 101 OF THE COURTS OF JUSTICE ACT, R.S.O.
1990 c. C.43, AS AMENDE WITH RESPECT TO DONDEB INC. AND ALL THE
DEBTORS

ENDORSEMENT

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE G. B. MORAWETZ on January 15th,
2013, at TORONTO, Ontario

APPEARANCES:

A. Apps	Counsel for the Defendant
J. Dietrich	Counsel for the Receiver A Farber and Partners Inc
N. Rabinovitch	
K. Stigler	

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of
the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 January 15, 2013

-2- UPON COMMENCING...

3

4

E N D O R S E M E N T

5

6 G. B. Morawetz, J. (Orally)

7

8

THE COURT: A Farber and Partners Inc., ("Farber"

9

or "the Receiver"), in its capacity as court

10

appointed receiver of Dondeb Inc. and related

11

debtors, ("Dondeb" or the "Debtor"), brought this

12

motion for approval of its Second Report and the

13

activities of the receiver set out therein, and

14

for an order approving four transactions: The Tim

15

Horton's Transaction, the Preston Springs

16

Transaction, the Devonshire Transaction, and the

17

Dorset Place Transaction.

18

19

The motion was originally returned on January 14,

20

2013. On the return of the motion, counsel of

21

record to Dondeb advised that Mr. Apps was now

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 acting on behalf of Dondeb. An adjournment was
2 requested.

3
4 The adjournment was objected to by the Receiver
5 and by the mortgagees in attendance. The reason
6 for the objection was primarily that the
7 transactions in question had certain time limits
8 that form part of the contractual agreements that
9 required court approval and the issuance of an
10 approval and vesting order on a timely basis.

11
12 The motion for approval of the Devonshire
13 Transaction did proceed on January 14, 2013. The
14 transaction was approved and the approval and
15 vesting order was issued.

16
17 Counsel for the Receiver advised there was a
18 condition in the Tim Horton's Transaction and the
19 Preston Springs Transaction that vesting orders be
20 granted no later than January 15, 2013 and the
21 Dorset Place Transaction had an approval deadline
22 of January 21, 2013.

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

Under the circumstances I determined that it was appropriated to adjourn the motion for a period of twenty-four hours to today, namely, January 15th, so as to provide Mr. Apps with the opportunity to put forth argument on behalf of Dondeb. Mr. Apps filed an affidavit of Mr. Dancy sworn January 14, 2013.

A considerable portion of the affidavit does not, in my view, address the matters at issue on this motion. Rather the affidavit focuses to a large extent on historical aspects of the file, including the CCAA proceedings initiated by Dondeb which resulted in C. Campbell J., declining to issue an initial order under the CCAA and instead pronounce a global receivership order. Extensive reasons were provided by C. Campbell J. To the extent that Mr. Dancy is challenging past events, it is noted that no appeal was filed from the order of C. Campbell J. appointing Farber as

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 Receiver, nor has any request been made to extend
2 the time for appeal.
3

4 In my view these issues are not before the court.
5 To the extent that Mr. Dancy wishes to challenge
6 the adequacy of the legal representation that he
7 received during these proceedings, it appears to
8 me that his remedy, if any, does not lie in the
9 proceedings before the court today. In that
10 respect, it is noted that the former solicitor has
11 contacted the Law Society Practice Advisory
12 Department to advise them of the concerns raised
13 by Mr. Dancy and Mr. Apps has confirmed that the
14 former solicitor has fully cooperated with him in
15 the preparation for today's motion.
16

17 To the extent that Mr. Dancy in his affidavit
18 challenges the role of the receiver, including any
19 potential conflict issues, it seems to me that if
20 this challenge, is to go forward, Mr. Dancy will
21 first have to obtain leave pursuant to section 215
22 of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act ("BIA") and

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 pursuant to the provisions of the order appointing
2 the Receiver.

3
4 In the circumstances, however, I do feel that it
5 is prudent to defer the request of the Receiver to
6 receive approval of its Report until such time as
7 Mr. Apps has had an opportunity to fully consider
8 the issue.

9
10 The focus of the hearing today then shifted to the
11 Motion to approve the three transactions.

12
13 Section 247(b) of the BIA provides that a receiver
14 shall deal with the property of the insolvent
15 person in a commercially reasonable manner. The
16 receiver's duty is not to obtain the best price
17 but to do everything reasonably possible in the
18 circumstances to obtain the best price.

19 *Skyepharma PLC v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp.*, 12
20 C.B.R. (4th) 87. The duties of the court in
21 reviewing a proposed sale of assets by a receiver

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 that is opposed by other interested parties are as
2 follows:

3
4 1) It should consider whether the receiver has
5 made a sufficient effort to obtain the best
6 price and has not acted improvidently,

7
8 2) It should consider the interests of all
9 parties,

10
11 3) It should consider the efficacy and
12 integrity of the process of which offers have
13 been obtained, and

14
15 4) It should consider whether there has been
16 unfairness in the working out of the process.

17
18 *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.*, 7 C.B.R. (3rd) 1,
19 (Ont C. A.) *National Bank of Canada v. Global*
20 *Fasteners and Clamps, Ltd.*, 24 C.B.R. (4th) 228.

21 The court must not, however, enter into the
22 marketplace. It must not sit as if it were

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 hearing an appeal from the decision of the
2 receiver, reviewing in detail every element of the
3 process by which the receiver has arrived at its
4 recommendation. *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg* 67
5 *C.B.R. (N.S.)* 320. If the receiver has acted
6 fairly and reasonably and not arbitrarily, the
7 court will ordinarily approve the recommendation
8 of the receiver. *Integrated Building Corp. v.*
9 *Bank of Nova Scotia*, 75 *C.B.R. (N.S.)* 158.

10
11 It is only in exceptional circumstances that the
12 court will intervene and proceed contrary to the
13 recommendation of the receiver. *Crown Trust*
14 *supra*.

15
16 In this case the receiver has filed its Second
17 Report and two supplements to the Second Report.
18 I am not going to take the time in this
19 endorsement to set out all of the facts that the
20 receiver has relied on in arriving at its
21 recommendation to proceed with the court

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 application for the approval of the three
2 transactions in question today.

3
4 In addition, certain documentation is the subject
5 of a request for sealing order. It seems to me
6 that the confidential appendices do contain
7 confidential information, the disclosure of which
8 might be detrimental to stakeholders. In this
9 respect I am satisfied, based on the Sierra Club
10 principles, that the sealing order ought to be
11 granted.

12
13 I am given to understand that certain information
14 has been provided to Mr. Apps that relates to the
15 proposed purchase price of the transactions in
16 question. I have also taken into account all the
17 marketing efforts that receiver has referenced in
18 its second report.

19
20 The receiver is of the view that the market was
21 extensively canvassed and a competitive process
22 undertaken. The evidentiary background to the

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 sale of the property with respect to the Tim
2 Horton's Agreement, the Preston Springs
3 Agreements, and the Dorset Place Agreement
4 indicates that the Receiver has made substantial
5 efforts in obtaining an adequate purchase price
6 based on the multiple offers received and the
7 negotiations entered into after showing the
8 property to a variety of interested parties.

9
10 With the respect to the Tim Horton's Agreement
11 specifically, the Receiver is of the view that the
12 highest and best purchase price has been received
13 and the proposed purchaser has provided a
14 substantial deposit and the relevant mortgagees
15 have approved the Receiver entering into the
16 agreement.

17
18 With respect to the Preston Springs Agreement, the
19 Receiver is of the view that the Preston Springs
20 Agreement contains the highest and best purchase
21 price of the offers received and that a
22 substantial deposit has been provided and that the

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 prompt sale will curtail the ongoing need to fund
2 holding costs of this vacant property and the
3 mortgagee has approved the entering into of the
4 agreement.

5
6 With the respect to Dorset Place, the Receiver is
7 of the view that the Dorset Place Agreement
8 contains the highest and best purchase price of
9 the offers received and that a substantial deposit
10 has been provided and the relevant mortgagees have
11 provided their approval to the entering into the
12 transaction.

13
14 I have also taken into account certain financial
15 information that Mr. Dancy provided on the return
16 of the CCAA Application which detailed a value
17 that he himself had ascribed to certain
18 properties. I am satisfied that the purchase
19 price for the Tim Horton's Agreement and the
20 Dorset Place Agent are reasonably consistent with
21 the values put on the properties by Mr. Dancy.
22 With respect to Preston Springs agreement, it does

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 appear that the purchase price is somewhat less
2 that the value ascribed by Mr. Dancy. However, I
3 am satisfied based on the reasons provided by the
4 Receiver that it cannot be said to be an
5 unreasonable amount.

6
7 With respect to the Preston Springs Property the
8 position put forth by Mr. Dancy is that there are
9 alternatives available. Mr. Dancy's Affidavit
10 references a commitment from Pacific Financial
11 Group and a commitment of up to \$650, 000. Mr.
12 Apps indicated that other arrangements could be
13 put in place to satisfy obligations owing to the
14 second mortgagee and there were some suggestion
15 that there had been some discussion with the
16 second mortgagee, but the fact remains that
17 counsel to the second mortgagee supports the sale.

18
19 Further, there are also some practical
20 difficulties with the proposal put forth by Mr.
21 Apps with respect to Preston Springs as it would
22 require that property to be extracted from the

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 receivership proceedings. The receivership
2 proceedings involve a number of properties and
3 although there may very well be a transaction that
4 could produce a higher monetary result that the
5 one put forth by the receiver, I must take into
6 account that there would be considerable risks in
7 not approving the transaction.

8
9 For example, there is the "drop dead" purchase
10 date and also an indication that it does not
11 appear that the conditions in the PNC financing
12 commitments with respect to free and clear title
13 or insurance, among other things, could be
14 fulfilled. This has to be contrasted with the
15 high degree of certainty that the transaction as
16 recommended by the Receiver will proceed and
17 produce the expected results to the secured
18 creditors on this property.

19
20 On balance, I am satisfied that the Receiver has
21 conducted a proper sales prospect with respect to
22 all the properties involved and has considered the

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 interests of all parties. I am also satisfied
2 that the process has been fairly worked out. I
3 have not been persuaded that Mr. Dancy has
4 demonstrated that the transactions should not be
5 approved. It cannot be overlooked that the
6 negotiations involved with respect to these
7 properties have been ongoing for a considerable
8 period of time and Mr. Dancy and Dondeb elected to
9 wait until "one minute before midnight" before
10 objecting to the transactions involved.

11
12 Accordingly, the three transactions are approved.

13
14 The Receiver has also requested that the court
15 grant an order and declaration that the relief
16 granted is subject to provisional execution. The
17 Receiver expresses concern that if a notice of
18 appeal is filed, it will have the effect of
19 rendering this order moot, as the requirement of
20 two of the agreement is that the vesting order be
21 obtained today and not be subject to appeal.
22

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 In support of the argument that the declaration
2 should be made, the Receiver references
3 *Computershare Trust Company of Canada and*
4 *Beachfront Developments, Inc.*, 70 C.B.R. (5th) 284,
5 a decision of Newbould J. Newbould J. adopted
6 what appears to be a variation of the test for
7 injunctive relief that is set out in *RJR*
8 *MacDonald, Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*
9 (1994) 1 S.C.R. 311.

10
11 The three part test being that,

- 12
13 1) A serious issue has been identified,
14 2) Irreparable harm,
15 3) Balance of convenience.

16
17 This test has been adopted in cases not unlike the
18 one before me. In *BDC Venture Capital, Inc. v.*
19 *Natural Convergence Inc.* 2009 ONCA 637. Lang J.A.
20 referenced *After Eight Interiors Inc. v. Glenwood*
21 *Homes, Inc.* (2006) 391 AR 202. Lang J.A. stated
22 that the criteria included whether there was a

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 serious issue to be appealed, whether the moving
2 party would suffer irreparable harm if the stay
3 was not lifted, and whether the moving party would
4 suffer greater harm than the responding party if
5 the stay was not lifted.

6
7 In the *After Eight* decision, Fruman J.A. stated
8 that courts generally in applications under
9 section 195 of the BIA focus on the relative
10 prejudice to the parties and the interests of
11 justice generally. In my view it is appropriate
12 to consider this test, in these circumstances, to
13 be a variation of the RJR test.

14
15 As Newbould J. indicated in the *Computershare*
16 decision, (and I agree) I would not presume to
17 consider whether an appeal in this case on my
18 decision is or is not without serious merit. If
19 that is a factor to be considered, I will assume
20 there is some merit to the appeal. Focusing on
21 the issue of irreparable harm in this case, the
22 Receiver has put forth the argument that the

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 transactions may not be consummated if there is a
2 delay caused by an appeal. This would obviously
3 cause harm to the mortgagees in question. Whether
4 it is irreparable is another question.

5 Irreparable in the context of an injunction
6 usually that means that it cannot be calculated in
7 damages.

8
9 It is at this point that it is necessary to
10 consider the relative prejudice to the parties.
11 The Dondeb proceedings were commenced by way of an
12 application for CCAA relief. This requires that
13 the applicant Dondeb be insolvent. In these
14 circumstances, it is questionable as to whether or
15 not a damage award could be paid or honoured by
16 Dondeb and one has to consider the position of the
17 mortgagees in question for whose benefit the
18 receivership order was granted.

19
20 In these circumstances it appears to me that that
21 there would be serious and irreparable harm to the
22 mortgagees in question if the transactions could

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1 not be consummated and as a result, there is
2 substantial risk that the Receiver would then have
3 to remarket the properties.
4

5 The balance of convenience aspect also favours, in
6 my view, the secured creditors. Again, I have to
7 emphasize the lateness with which these objections
8 were raised by Dondeb. It is clear from the
9 record that the negotiations resulting in the
10 agreements being put forth for approval today were
11 entered into some time ago. There is also some
12 evidence that Mr. Dancy's son has been actively
13 involved and following along in the marketing
14 process and has some knowledge of matters.
15

16 In these circumstances I find that the balance of
17 convenience favours the position of the secured
18 creditors and I do give effect to the submission
19 of Mr. Rabinovitch that the entire declaration
20 could be moot if it is not subject to provisional
21 execution, which is therefore granted. Subject to
22 any questions counsel, that concludes my reasons.

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of
the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

1

2

3

Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.

FORM 2

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT (SUBSECTION 5 (2))

Evidence Act

I, Santiago Orbe, certify that this document is a true and accurate transcript of the recording of *Application Pursuant to Section 243(1) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act with respect to Dondeb Inc.* in the Superior Court of Justice of Ontario held at 330 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario, taken from recording No. 4899_8-1_20130115_161934-10, which has been certified in Form 1.

(Date)

(Signature of Authorized Person)

Photo static copies of this transcript are not certified and have not been paid for unless they bear the signature of SANTIAGO ORBE in blue ink, and accordingly are in direct violation of Ontario Regulation 587/91, Courts of Justice Act, January 1, 1990.

TAB L

SUPERIOR COURT (Commercial Division)

CANADA
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTREAL

No: 500-11-025198-058

DATE: APRIL 21, 2005

IN THE PRESENCE OF: THE HONOURABLE FRANÇOIS ROLLAND, Chief Justice

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, AS
AMENDED:**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF THE PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF:
JETSGO CORPORATION**

DEBTOR
and
RSM RICHTER INC.

MONITOR
and
GREATER TORONTO AIRPORT AUTHORITY (GTAA)
and
AÉROPORTS DE MONTRÉAL
and
VANCOUVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY
and
OTTAWA MACDONALD-CARTIER INTER-NATIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY
and
WINNIPEG AIRPORTS AUTHORITY INC.
and
AÉROPORT DE QUÉBEC INC.
and

EDMONTON REGIONAL AIRPORTS AUTHORITY
and
THE CALGARY AIRPORT AUTHORITY
and
HALIFAX INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY

[AIRPORT AUTHORITIES]
and
NAV CANADA

[NAV]

PETITIONERS

JUDGMENT

[1] GTAA and Airport Authorities are asking the lift of the stay of proceedings and the authorization to seize and detain aircraft of Jetsgo because of its failure to pay the Airport Charges and other fees.

[2] Furthermore, Petitioners ask that the proceeds of sale of any aircraft be segregated and held for the benefit of Petitioners.

[3] GTAA and Airport Authorities request the seizure in accordance with section 9 of the Airport Transfer Act (ATA) which reads as follows :

« Seizure and detention for fees and charges

9. (1) Where the amount of any landing fees, general terminal fees or other charges related to the use of an airport, and interest thereon, set by a designated airport authority in respect of an airport operated by the authority has not been paid, the authority may, in addition to any other remedy available for the collection of the amount and whether or not a judgment for the collection of the amount has been obtained, on application to the superior court of the province in which any aircraft owned or operated by the person liable to pay the amount is situated, obtain an order of the court, issued on such terms as the court considers necessary, authorizing the authority to seize and detain aircraft.

Idem

(2) Where the amount of any fees, charges and interest referred to in subsection (1) has not been paid and the designated airport authority has reason to believe that the person liable to pay the amount is about to leave Canada or take from Canada any aircraft owned or operated by the person, the authority may, in addition to any other remedy available for the collection of the amount and whether or not a judgment for the collection of the amount has been obtained, on ex parte application to the superior court of the province in which any aircraft owned or operated by the person is situated, obtain an order of the court, issued on such terms as the court considers necessary, authorizing the authority to seize and detain aircraft.

Release on payment

(3) Subject to subsection (4), except where otherwise directed by an order of a court, a designated airport authority is not required to release from detention an aircraft seized under subsection (1) or (2) unless the amount in respect of which the seizure was made is paid.

Release on security

(4) A designated airport authority shall release from detention an aircraft seized under subsection (1) or (2) if a bond or other security in a form satisfactory to the authority for the amount in respect of which the aircraft was seized is deposited with the authority.

Same meaning

(5) Words and expressions used in this section and section 10 have the same meaning as in the Aeronautics Act. »

[4] GTAA and Airport Authorities claim that they are entitled to exercise their seizure and detention rights under section 9 of the ATA with respect to all landing fees, general terminal fees or other charges related to the use of their respective airports, and interest thereon, owing by Jetsgo to the Airport Authorities, including without limitation the Airport Charges, Ongoing Charges, and estimated Airport Improvement Fee(AIF), as same may be adjusted from time to time.

[5] For its part, NAV is asking for the same authorization for non payment of various fees and charges for services rendered.

[6] NAV is basing its request on section 56 of the Civil Air and Navigation Services Commercialization (the NAV Canada Act) :

«Seizure and Detention of Aircraft

56. (1) In addition to any other remedy available for the collection of an unpaid and overdue charge imposed by the Corporation for air navigation services, and whether or not a judgment for the collection of the charge has been obtained, the Corporation may apply to the superior court of the province in which any aircraft owned or operated by the person liable to pay the charge is situated for an order, issued on such terms as the court considers appropriate, authorizing the Corporation to seize and detain any such aircraft until the charge is paid or a bond or other security for the unpaid and overdue amount in a form satisfactory to the Corporation is deposited with the Corporation.

(2) An application for an order referred to in subsection (1) may be made ex parte if the Corporation has reason to believe that the person liable to pay the charge is about to leave Canada or take from Canada any aircraft owned or operated by the person.

(3) The Corporation shall release from detention an aircraft seized under this section if

- (a) the amount in respect of which the seizure was made is paid;
- (b) a bond or other security in a form satisfactory to the Corporation for the amount in respect of which the seizure was made is deposited with the Corporation; or
- (c) an order of a court directs the Corporation to do so.

57. (1) An order under section 56 does not apply if the aircraft is exempt from seizure under the laws of the province in which the court that issued the order is situated.

(2) State aircraft are exempt from seizure and detention under an order issued under section 56. »

[7] The Motions raise the issue of the characterization of the rights granted to the Petitioners pursuant to the relevant legislation and whether such rights could be recognized by the Court when an Initial Order has been rendered pursuant to the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) ordering the stay of proceedings and appointing a Monitor.

[8] The facts may be summarized as follows.

[9] On March 11, 2005, the Court issued an initial order (the "Initial Order") pursuant to the CCAA, inter alia declaring that Jetsgo Corporation ("Jetsgo") was a company to which the CCAA applies, granting a stay of proceedings in respect of Jetsgo and its assets and property up until and including April 11, 2005, and appointing RSM Richter as Monitor (« Monitor »).

[10] On April 8, 2005, the Court extended the Initial Order until May 13, 2005.

[11] The GTAA is a lessee, operator and manager of Lester B. Pearson International Airport.

[12] Jetsgo ceased its operations on Friday, March 11, 2005, which coincided with the beginning of Ontario public school March break. Pearson International Airport was the main hub for Jetsgo operations.

[13] GTAA is alleging that on or after March 11, 2005, it incurred costs in the amount of \$36,361.00 because of Jetsgo's interruption of business and alleges that it is owed by Jetsgo the AIF in the amount of 2.5 million dollars and other fees consisting of landing fees, General Terminal charges, Central De-icing facility, Aircraft Parking, Exclusive Use Space, Employee Parking, Interest accrued to March 11, 2005 and GST, for a total of \$2,977,397.93.

[14] For their part, Airport Authorities allege that Jetsgo owes them for Landing fees and other fees an amount of \$1,687,363.33 plus an amount of \$1,117,842.47 which is an estimate of the Airport Improvement Fee.

[15] NAV alleges that Jetsgo owes it an amount of \$1,603,602.56 \$ representing various costs for services rendered to Jetsgo.

[16] On March 7, 2005, NAV made an application before the Ontario Superior Court to obtain an authorization to seize and detain an aircraft. However, it desisted from its proceedings because an Agreement intervened with Jetsgo as to the payment of the arrears.

[17] At the time of the issuance of the Initial Order, no legal proceedings had been undertaken by GTAA, the Airport Authorities, or NAV with regards to the payment of the arrears.

[18] For the purpose of this judgment, the parties have agreed to the following :

« In order to simplify and reduce the length of the hearing all parties agree to the facts enumerated therein.

Furthermore, the parties understand that the following issues will not be debated before the Court next week but rather deferred to a later date for proof and hearing, the

whole in light of the judgment to be rendered in connection with the specific matters to be debated, namely:

1. the quantum of the claims owed to Petitioners by the Debtor;
2. the subordination of the Administration Charge and other charges granted under the Initial Order to the rights of Petitioners to seize and detain the aircraft; and
3. the subordination of Petitioners' seizure and detention rights to the retention rights asserted by NordTech et al.

Accordingly, the only issues to be debated before the Court are the following.

1. the cancellation of the D & O Charge, and
2. the authorization to seize and detain the Fokker Aircraft, and for these purposes the lifting of the stay of proceedings granted under the CCAA proceedings.

[19] All the parties have made the following admissions :

« **Joint statement of facts** »

1. Each of the Petitioners constitutes a "designated airport authority" under the Airport Transfer (Miscellaneous Matters) Act, R.S.C., c. A-10.4 (the "ATA");
2. There are "landing fees, general terminal fees or other charges related to the use of an airport", as those terms are defined in the ATA (the "Fees"), owing to each of the Petitioners by the Debtor. The parties do not agree as to whether airport improvement fees shall constitute "Fees" for the purposes of Section 9.
3. The Fees owing by the Debtor to each of the Petitioners were set by each of the Petitioners in their respective capacities as designated airport authorities in respect of the airport operated by each of them. The quantum of the Fees is not admitted by Respondent Jetsgo Corporation.
4. The aircraft sought to be seized and detained by Petitioners are located in the Province of Quebec and are owned and operated by the Debtor;

5. The aircraft sought to be seized and detained by Petitioners are not exempt from seizure under a writ of execution issued by the Superior Court of the province of Quebec.

[20] NAV, Jetsgo and the other parties have also agreed to the following joint statement of facts :

« 1. Nav Canada has a statutory mandate to provide all aircraft operators in Canadian sovereign or controlled airspace with civil air navigation services, as set forth in the Civil Air Navigation Services Commercialization Act, S.C. 1996, Chapter 20.

2. Nav Canada has provided civil air navigation services to the Debtor for which the Debtor owes to Nav Canada civil air navigation charges ("Nav Charges").

3. The Nav Charges owing by the Debtor to Nav Canada were levied by the latter in accordance with its mandate under the Act.

4. On March 7th, 2005 Nav Canada issued an application in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice (the "Ontario Application") seeking an order authorizing the seizure and detention of the aircraft;

5. On the same date, an agreement was reached with the Debtor as to payment of amounts outstanding for Nav Charges and Nav Canada agreed to withdraw the Ontario Application without prejudice.

6. The Debtor failed to complete the payments under the Letter Agreement and filed proceedings under the CCAA;

7. The aircraft sought to be seized and detained by Nav Canada are located in the Province of Quebec and are owned and operated by the Debtor.

8. The aircraft sought to be seized and detained by Nav Canada are not exempt from seizure under a writ of execution issued by the Superior Court of the province of Quebec. »

[21] Also, GTAA, Airport Authorities and Nav are seeking the cancellation of the Directors and Officers' charge.

[22] GTAA, Airport Authorities and Nav are finally requesting the cancellation of paragraph 16.1 of the Initial Order which reads as follows :

« 16.1 AUTHORIZES Petitioner to pay, with the consent of the Monitor, and if deemed necessary by the Monitor, obtain Court approval concerning same, to its employees all wages owing in consideration of services rendered up until the date of this Order, and all wages and other amounts to which an employee is entitled under Part III of the Canada Labour Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. L-2, for which Directors may be held personally liable; »

ISSUES

A) Authorization to seize and detain :

[23] There are presently two judgments relating to similar issues : one from the Court of Appeal of Quebec and the other from the Court of Appeal of Ontario. They address the interpretation of section 9 of the ATA and section 56 of the NAV Canada Act.

[24] The Court has been informed that an application for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada has been filed from these two decisions, one on March 18, 2004 and the other on January 14, 2005. No decision has been rendered yet.

[25] In the case of Wilmington Trust Co. vs. Nav Canada¹, Mr. Justice Morissette writing for the majority of the Court of Appeal states :

«[106] De l'ensemble de cette analyse, il se dégage que, en l'absence d'un texte spécifique et clair, les ordonnances de saisie-rétention prévues aux articles 9 (1) L.C.A. et 56 (1) L.C.S.N.A.C. ne peuvent avoir l'effet de conférer aux autorités aéroportuaires et à Nav Canada un droit de suite sur les aéronefs des appelantes non plus qu'un droit de préférence sur le produit de leur vente en justice ou sous contrôle de justice. Autrement dit, ces aéronefs ne sont tenus d'aucune façon aux dettes d'Inter-Canadien pour la simple et bonne raison qu'ils n'appartiennent pas à cette débitrice.

[107] On peut dès lors s'interroger sur la nature véritable des droits que prévoient les dispositions à l'étude. Avec égards, contrairement à ce qu'affirme le premier juge, celles-ci n'accordent pas un droit de rétention à Nav Canada et aux autorités aéroportuaires; ce qu'elles leur confèrent, c'est plutôt le droit d'obtenir une ordonnance qui, aux conditions que l'autorité judiciaire estimera appropriées, leur confèrera alors, et seulement alors, le droit de saisir et retenir.

¹ [2004] R.J.Q. (C.A.) p. 2988

[108] De plus, à notre avis, il est erroné de dissocier les termes «saisir et retenir», en anglais «seize and detain», que l'on retrouve aux articles 9 (1) L.C.A. et 56 (1) L.C.S.N.A.C. Ces termes forment un tout et servent en réalité à qualifier la nature de l'ordonnance que Nav Canada ou les autorités aéroportuaires peuvent obtenir. En l'occurrence, il s'agit d'une ordonnance d'immobilisation des aéronefs. Sa finalité consiste à empêcher l'utilisateur de se servir du bien jusqu'au paiement des redevances dues.

[109] Pour l'obtenir, Nav Canada et les autorités aéroportuaires n'ont pas à établir de lien spécifique entre l'aéronef qu'elles cherchent à immobiliser et les dettes qui ont été créées par l'utilisateur parce qu'aucun droit réel ne naît du prononcé d'une semblable ordonnance. Se révèle donc bien fondé l'argument proposé par les appelantes selon lequel les deux lois dont il s'agit ne confèrent aux autorités aéroportuaires et à Nav Canada qu'un simple moyen de pression. »

[26] Mr. Justice Morissette adds :

« [110] Celui-ci est puissant mais d'un maniement délicat, car il peut précipiter la déconfiture de l'utilisateur. Son dosage dépend à la fois de l'initiative du créancier, que ce soit Nav Canada ou les autorités aéroportuaires, et du pouvoir d'appréciation et de pondération dont est investi le juge saisi de la demande. »

(underlining added)

[27] In the case of Greater Toronto Airport Authority et al vs. International Lease Finance², Mrs. Justice Cronk, writing for the majority, comes to the conclusion that the seizure and detention provided for in section 9 of the ATA and section 56 to the Nav Canada Act do not create any priority or preference and constitute a measure of pressure when and if granted by the Court.

[28] The Court is of the view that the rulings of the Courts of Appeal apply in the present case notwithstanding the fact that Jestgo is the owner of the 15 Fokker Aircraft and not the lessee as in the cases before the Courts of Appeal.

[29] The remedy provided for in section 9 of the ATA and 56 of the Nav Canada is to be authorized in the discretion of the Court.

² Dominion Law Reports 235 D.L.R. (4th) 618

[30] Even if the seizure had been authorized prior to the Initial Order, that seizure would have been superseded by the effect of the Initial Order and the sale of the aircraft must then be made through the Monitor with the authorization of the Court and not as a consequence of the seizure.

[31] In the case at bar, the Initial Order was issued on March 11th, 2005 by this Court and the aircraft of Jetsgo were grounded and are presently located at the Quebec City Airport.

[32] The Petitioners have not been in possession of these aircraft, which are under the control of the Monitor appointed by the Court. Jetsgo is trying to sell these 15 Fokker but they may not be sold without the authorization of this Court.

[33] Considering the decisions of the Courts of Appeal cited above, the Court comes to the conclusion that there is no reason at this stage to lift the stay of proceedings to allow Petitioners to seize and detain the aircraft.

[34] Allowing the seizure and setting money aside for Petitioners in these circumstances could jeopardize the restructuring and reorganization of Jetsgo since, in all probabilities, the creditors would not agree to put aside almost half of the net proceeds of the sale of the assets for the benefit of the Petitioners who would have to wait for an extended period of time until the Supreme Court determines the rights contained in section 9 of ATA and section 56 of Nav Canada Act.

[35] In an often quoted judgment on that subject, Mr. Justice Tysoe of the British Columbia Supreme Court summarized well what is meant by maintaining the status quo when a debtor company seeks the protection of the CCAA³ :

« It is my view that the maintenance of the status quo is intended to attempt to accomplish the following three objectives:

1. To suspend or freeze the rights of all creditors as they existed as at the date of the stay order (which, in British Columbia, is normally the day on which the C.C.A.C. proceedings are commenced). This objective is intended to allow the insolvent company an opportunity to reorganize itself without any creditor having an advantage over the company or any other creditor.

2. To postpone litigation in which the insolvent company is involved so that the human and monetary resources of the company can be devoted to the reorganization process. The litigation may be resolved by way of the reorganization.

³ Woodward's Ltd (Re), (1993) 100 D.L.R. (4th) 133 (B.C.S.C.) p. 140

3. To permit the insolvent company to take certain action that is beneficial to its continuation during the period of reorganization or its attempt to reorganize or, conversely, to restrain a non-creditor or a creditor with rights arising after the stay from exercising rights that are detrimental to the continuation of the company during the period of reorganization or its attempt to reorganize. This is the objective recognized by *Quintette and Alberta-Pacific Terminals*. The first case to recognize that the maintenance of the status quo could affect the rights of non-creditors was *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleum Ltd.* (1989), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 20, [1989] 2 W.W.R. 566, 64 Alta. L.R. (2d) 139 (Q.B.). This is the objective that takes into account the broad constituency of interests served by the C.C.A.A. As the overriding intent of the C.C.A.A. is to facilitate reorganizations, this is the overriding objective of maintaining the status quo and it may produce results that are not entirely consistent with the other objectives. The most common example of an inconsistency is a situation where the giving of effect to this objective results in an unequal treatment of creditors. »

[36] Indeed, maintaining the status quo will involve balancing the interests of all the parties and avoiding advantages to some over the others. Under the CCAA, the restructuring process and the general interest of all the creditors is to be preferred over the particular interests of a class of creditors.

[37] The Court concludes that the authorization to seize and detain the aircraft could cause a prejudice such that any reorganization process might fail.

[38] Therefore, the Court dismisses Petitioners' Motions for seizure and detention of the Aircraft.

B) The Directors and officers' charge :

[39] Paragraphs 21 and 22 of the Initial Order read as follows :

« Directors Indemnification and Charge

21. Orders that, in addition to any existing indemnities, Petitioner shall indemnify each of the Directors from and against the following (collectively, "**D&O Claims**");

(a) all costs (including, without limitation, full defence costs), charges, expenses, claims, liabilities and obligations, of any nature whatsoever, which may arise on or after the date of the Order or as a result of the cessation of operations (including, without limitation, an amount paid to settle an action or a judgment in a civil, criminal, administrative or investigative action or proceeding to which a Director may be made a party), provided that any such liability relates to such Director in that capacity, and, provided that such Director (i) acted honestly and in good faith in the best interests of Petitioner and (ii) in the case of a criminal or administrative action or proceeding in which such Director would be liable to a monetary penalty, such Director had reasonable grounds for believing his or her conduct was lawful, except if such Director has actively breached any fiduciary duties or has been grossly negligent or guilty of wilful misconduct; and

(b) all costs, charges, expenses, claims, liabilities and obligations relating to the failure of Petitioner to make any payments or to pay amounts in respect of employee or former employee entitlements to wages, vacation pay, termination pay, severance pay, pension or other benefits, or any other amount for services performed on or after the date of the Order and that such Directors sustain, by reason of their association with Petitioner as a Director, except to the extent that they have actively breached any fiduciary duties or have been grossly negligent or guilty of wilful misconduct.

The foregoing shall not constitute a contract of insurance or other valid and collectible insurance, as such term may be used in any existing policy of insurance issued in favour of Petitioner or any of the Directors. »

22. DECLARES that, as a security for the obligation of Petitioner to indemnify the Directors pursuant to paragraph 21 hereof, the Directors are hereby granted a hypothec on, mortgage of, lien on and security interest in the Property to the extent of the aggregate amount of \$5,000,00.00 (the "D&O Charge"), having the priority established by paragraphs 30 and 31 hereof. Such D&O Charge, shall not constitute or form a trust. Such D&O Charge, notwithstanding any language in any applicable policy of insurance to the contrary, shall only apply to the extent that the Directors do not have coverage under any directors' and officers' insurance, which shall not be excess insurance to the D&O Charge. In respect of any D&O

Claim against any of the Directors (collectively, the "Respondent Directors"), if such Respondent Directors do not receive confirmation from the applicable insurer within 21 days of delivery of notice of the D&O Claim to the applicable insurer, confirming that the applicable insurer will provide coverage for and indemnify the Respondent Directors, then, without prejudice to the subrogation rights hereinafter referred to, Petitioner shall pay the amount of the D&O Claim upon expiry. Failing such payment, the Respondent Directors may enforce the D&O Charge provided that the Respondent Directors shall reimburse Petitioner to the extent that they subsequently receive insurance benefits for the D&O Claim paid by Petitioner, and provided further that Petitioner shall, upon payment, be subrogated to the rights of the Respondent Directors to recover payment from the applicable insurer as if no such payment had been made. »

[40] Petitioners are asking the Court to cancel the D&O Charge since there is an insurance policy covering the Directors and Officers' liability for \$10,000,000.00 and said policy will be in force until July 9th, 2005. The second Monitor's report states that the Director, Michel Leblanc, may be liable for statutory severance pay pursuant to the *Canadian Labour Code* in the approximate amount of \$2.5 million, for amounts advanced by the company's pilots, aggregating \$2,900,000.00, for unpaid deduction at source \$430,000.00 and for an amount of approximately \$3,050,000.00 claimed pursuant to the Canadian Air Transport Security.

[41] The Monitor states that it is important that the D&O Charge be maintained in order to secure the cooperation of Michel Leblanc in the restructuring efforts and in the orderly disposal of the assets.

[42] The purpose of creating the D&O Charge is to protect the Directors and Officers against liabilities that they could incur during the restructuring and reorganization of the company. As Pamela L.J. Huff and Line A. Rogers write in the Commercial Insolvency Reporter ⁴:

« Thus, against the backdrop of a potential business failure, a CCAA restructuring creates new risks and potential liabilities for another group of critical participants in an insolvency: the directors and officers of a debtor corporation. It has become standard to include in an initial order a charge securing the indemnity granted by the debtor to directors and senior corporate officers (including a Chief Restructuring Officer, who may be court-

⁴ Commercial Insolvency Reporter, Volume 16, Number 6, August 2004, p.66

appointed) against liabilities that emerge during and, sometimes, prior to, a CCAA filing. »

[43] However, the Court takes into account that there is a D&O liability insurance policy in force for an amount of \$10,000,000.00.

[44] Maintaining the D&O Charge for pre-filing liability would create a preference in favour of otherwise unsecured creditors.

[45] The purpose of the D&O Charge is not to overprotect the Directors and Officers and the Court finds appropriate to limit the D&O Charge to post-filing liabilities in the present case.

C) Payment of employees wages:

[46] Petitioners ask for the cancellation of paragraph 16.1 of the Initial Order which reads as follows:

AUTHORIZES Petitioner to pay, with the consent of the Monitor, and if deemed necessary by the Monitor, obtain Court approval concerning same, to its employees all wages owing in consideration of services rendered up until the date of this Order, and all wages and other amounts to which an employee is entitled under Part III of the *Canada Labour Code*, R.S.C. 1985, c. L-2, for which Directors may be held personally liable; »

[47] In accordance with paragraph 16.1 of the Initial Order, Jetsgo, with the consent of the Monitor (and possibly the Court approval), could pay its employees all wages owing up until the date of the Order and all wages and other amounts to which they would be entitled under Part III of the *Canada Labour Code*.

[48] The Court is of the view, that this issue can be resolved by modifying paragraph 16.1 of the Initial Order by subjecting the payment to the Court's prior approval:

[49] The modified paragraph 16.1 will read as follows :

« AUTHORIZES Petitioner to pay, with the consent of the Monitor if deemed necessary by the Monitor and with the Court's prior approval, to its employees all wages owing in consideration of services rendered up until the date of this Order, and all wages and other amounts to which an employee is entitled under Part III of the *Canada Labour Code*, R.S.C. 1985, c. L-2, for which Directors may be held personally liable; »

[50] **WHEREFORE, THE COURT:**

[51] **GRANTS** in part Petitioners' Motions.

[52] **DISMISSES** Petitioners' Motions for the issuance of a seizure and detention.

[53] **ORDERS** that the D&O Charge in the Initial Order, as extended on April 8, 2005, be limited to liabilities arising after filing on Mach 11, 2005.

[54] **ORDERS** that paragraph 16.1 of the Initial Order extended on April 8, 2005 be replaced by the following :

« AUTHORIZES Petitioner to pay, with the consent of the Monitor if deemed necessary by the Monitor and with the Court's prior approval, to its employees all wages owing in consideration of services rendered up until the date of this Order, and all wages and other amounts to which an employee is entitled under Part III of the *Canada Labour Code*, R.S.C. 1985, c. L-2, for which Directors may be held personally liable; »

[55] Without costs.

FRANÇOIS ROLLAND, Chief Justice

Me Louis Gouin
Me Sylvain Rigaud
Ogilvy, Renault
Attorneys for Debtor

Me Bernard Boucher
Blake Cassels & Graydon
Attorneys for Aeroturbine Inc.

Me Mark E. Meland
Goldstein, Flanz & Fishman
and
Me Robert I. Thornton and Me Gregory Azeff
Thornton Grout Finnigan
And
Me Donald G. Gray
Cassels Brock & Blackwell
Attorneys for AeroUSA, Airplanes IAL Finance, Airplanes Holding Limited, GE Capital
Aviation Services Inc., Jets MD Lease Limited, Calyon Aviation Group

Me Gerry Apostolatos
Me Dimitri Maniatis
Me François Valin
Langlois Kronström Desjardins
Attorneys for Montreal Airports, Vancouver International Airport Authority, Ottawa
MacDonald-Cartier International Airport Authority, Winnipeg Airports Authority Inc.,
Québec City Airport Inc., Edmonton Regional Airports Authority, Calgary Airport Authority
and Halifax International Airport

Me Sandra Abitan
Me David Tardif-Latourelle
Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt
Attorneys for Greater Toronto Airport Authority

Me Kirk M. Baert
Koskie Minsky
Attorneys for Jetsgo Pilots' Association

Me Sylvain Vauclair
McCarthy Tétrault
Attorneys for the Monitor, RSM Richter Inc.

Me Alain Riendeau

Fasken Martineau Dumoulin
Attorneys for Moneris Solutions Corporation

Me Edmond F.B. Lamek
Me Donald E. Milner
Fasken Martineau DuMoulin
Attorneys for Moneris Solutions Corporation

Me Patrice Benoît
Gowling Lafleur Henderson
Attorneys for National Bank of Canada

Me Clifton Prophet
Gowling Lafleur Henderson
and

Me Denis St-Onge

Me Louise Lalonde

Gowling Lafleur Henderson
Attorneys for NAV Canada

Me Pierre Lecavalier
Côté, Marcoux & Joyal
Attorneys for Procureur général du Canada

Me Seth Mandell
Chaitons LLP
Attorneys for Red Seal Tours Inc.

Me Claude Paquet
Heenan Blaikie
Attorneys for Rolls-Royce

Me François Parizeau

Desjardins Ducharme Stein Monast
Med-Air Inc.

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED
AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF INDEX ENERGY MILLS ROAD CORPORATION**

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT TORONTO

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES

Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP

2100 Scotia Plaza
40 King Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 3C2

Shayne Kukulowicz LSUC#30729S

Tel: 416.860.6463

Fax: 416.640.3176

skukulowicz@casselsbrock.com

Jane Dietrich LSUC# 49302U

Tel: 416.860.5223

Fax: 416.640.3144

jdietrich@casselsbrock.com

Lance Williams LSBC# 508874

Tel: 604.691.6112

Fax: 604.691.6120

lwilliams@casselsbrock.com

Lawyers for Index Energy Mills Road Corporation