

C

2012 CarswellOnt 10568, 2012 ONSC 4471, 93 C.B.R. (5th) 326, 222 A.C.W.S. (3d) 932

Timminco Ltd., Re

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

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Timminco Limited and Bécancour Silicon Inc.
(Applicants)

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Morawetz J.

Heard: June 4, 2012

Judgment: August 3, 2012

Docket: CV-12-9539-00CL

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

Counsel: Maria Konyukhova for Applicants

Robin B. Schwill for J. Thomas Timmins

Steven J. Weisz for Monitor

Debra McPhail for Superintendent of Financial Services

Thomas McRae for B51 Non-Union Employee Pension Committee and B51 Union Employee Pension Committee

Charles Sinclair for United Steelworkers

James Harnum for Mercer Canada

Subject: Insolvency

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Proceedings subject to stay — Miscellaneous

T resigned from his position as CEO of T Inc. in May 2001 but remained director until mid-2007, at which time he resigned from board and sold all of his remaining equity interests — Pursuant to 1996 consulting agreement, T Inc. was to provide T with monthly payment of \$29,166.66 less amount due to T under any pension or retire-

ment plan — At time of T's resignation as CEO, 1996 agreement was amended by letter agreement pursuant to which T was to receive monthly amount of \$20,833.33 — T brought motion for order requiring T Inc. to comply with 1996 agreement — T Inc. brought cross-motion for order that its obligations under 1996 agreement, as amended by letter agreement, were pre-filing obligations stayed by initial order granted in reorganization proceedings — Motion by T was dismissed; cross-motion by T Inc. was granted — Benefits conferred on T were, in substance, termination and/or retirement benefits, and as such were unsecured claims — T Inc. was insolvent and not able to honour its obligations to all creditors — If benefits conferred on T were not stayed, T would, in effect, receive enhanced priority over other unsecured creditors, contrary to scheme and purpose of Companies Creditors Arrangement Act — Overriding objective of CCAA was to ensure that creditors in same classification were treated equitably, which would enhance prospects of viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of debtor company — Disclaimer of agreement with T, if necessary, was fair, reasonable, advantageous, and beneficial to T Inc. restructuring process — Court could not conclude that disclaimer would likely cause significant financial hardship to T.

Cases considered by Morawetz J.:

Fraser Papers Inc., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4469, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 217, 2009 C.E.B. & P.G.R. 8350, 76 C.C.P.B. 254 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Homburg Invest Inc., Re (2011), 2011 QCCS 6376, 2011 CarswellQue 13411 (Que. Bkcty.) — considered

Indalex Ltd., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4465, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 64, 79 C.C.P.B. 104 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Nortel Networks Corp., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 3583, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 68, 75 C.C.P.B. 233 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Nortel Networks Corp., Re (2009), 256 O.A.C. 131, 2009 CarswellOnt 7383, 2009 ONCA 833, 59 C.B.R. (5th) 23, 77 C.C.P.B. 161, (sub nom. *Sproule v. Nortel Networks Corp.*) 2010 C.L.L.C. 210-005, (sub nom. *Sproule v. Nortel Networks Corp., Re*) 99 O.R. (3d) 708 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Statutes considered:

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

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 32 — considered

s. 32(2) — considered

s. 32(4) — considered

s. 32(4)(b) — considered

MOTION for order requiring company to comply with agreement providing retirement benefits towards former CEO; MOTION by company for order that its obligations under agreement were pre-filing obligations stayed by

initial order in reorganization proceedings.

Morawetz J.:

Overview

1 Mr. J. Thomas Timmins, a former Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") of Timminco Limited ("Timminco") moves for an order that Timminco be ordered to comply with its obligations under a consulting agreement between Timminco and Mr. Timmins dated September 19, 1996 (the "1996 Agreement") and to remit to Mr. Timmins the monthly amounts that he claims to be entitled to under the 1996 Agreement.

2 In response, Timminco brought a cross-motion for an order declaring that Timminco's obligations under the 1996 Agreement, as amended by letter agreement effective May 28, 2011 (the "Letter Agreement" and, together with the 1996 Agreement, the "Agreement"), constitute pre-filing obligations which are stayed by the Initial Order granted in these proceedings on January 3, 2012.

3 Alternative positions have also been presented by the parties.

4 Timminco puts forth the alternative that, if Mr. Timmins' motion is granted, Timminco seeks an order that the 1996 Agreement be disclaimed in accordance with section 32 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA") and that the effective date of the disclaimer of the Agreement (if such a disclaimer is held to be required) should be April 30, 2012.

5 In response to this alternative position, Mr. Timmins seeks an order that the court deny Timminco's request to have the 1996 Agreement disclaimed and, in any event, if the 1996 Agreement is disclaimed, Timminco should not be relieved of its obligation to pay the monthly fees that have and continue to accrue from the date Timminco commenced CCAA proceedings until the date that any such disclaimer is effective.

6 Mr. Timmins asks that the court deny Timminco's request to have the 1996 Agreement disclaimed in accordance with section 32 of the CCAA as the disclaimer would not necessarily enhance the prospects of a viable arrangement being made in respect of Timminco, and would objectively result in significant financial hardship to Mr. Timmins.

Facts

7 Mr. Timmins resigned from his position as CEO on May 28, 2001, but remained a director of Timminco until mid-2007, at which time he resigned from the board and sold all of his remaining equity interests.

8 The preamble to the 1996 Agreement provides:

The Consultant is an executive of the Corporation who has gained such a level of knowledge, experience and competence in the Corporation's business that it is in the Corporation's interest, following his retirement from employment, to ensure that the Corporation continues to have access to the Consultant for advice and consultation and the Corporation wishes to ensure that the Consultant shall not engage in activities which are competitive with the Corporation's business.

9 The 1996 Agreement provides that Timminco agreed to pay Mr. Timmins a monthly amount by which \$29,166.66 exceeds the monthly amount to which [Mr. Timmins] is entitled on [Mr. Timmins] retirement under

any pension or retirement plans of [Timminco].

10 The monthly payments were to commence on the first day of the month following Mr. Timmins retirement and terminate only on Mr. Timmins death (subject to earlier termination due to any breach of obligations by Mr. Timmins). There has been no alleged breach on the part of Mr. Timmins of any such obligations.

11 Under the 1996 Agreement, Mr. Timmins was to consult with Timminco "within the time limits from time to time of his physical and other abilities...; provided, however, that consultation and advice shall never occupy [Mr. Timmins] time to such an extent as shall prevent him from devoting the greater portion of his time to other activities".

12 At the time of his resignation as CEO, the 1996 Agreement was amended by the Letter Agreement.

13 Pursuant to the Letter Agreement, Timminco agreed to pay Mr. Timmins a monthly amount of \$20,833.33 without further deduction except as may be required by law, commencing on July 1, 2001.

14 The Letter Agreement also provided that Timminco would terminate various employment benefits of Mr. Timmins (such as car lease and parking) and would cease to provide Mr. Timmins with office space and secretarial assistance after September 30, 2001.

15 In connection with the Letter Agreement, Mr. Timmins executed a release and indemnity which provides, in part, as follows:

Whereas I have agreed to retire voluntarily as Chief Executive Officer and an employee of Timminco Limited and as a director and/or officer of any subsidiaries of Timminco Limited (hereinafter referred to collectively as "Timminco") effective immediately.

And whereas I have agreed to accept the consideration described in the attached letter to me from Timminco dated May 28, 2001 and in the agreement between Timminco and me dated as of September 19, 1996 (collectively, the "Retirement Agreement"), in full settlement of any and all claims I may have relating to my employment with Timminco or the termination thereof;...I understand and agree that the consideration described above satisfies all obligations of Timminco, arising from or out of my employment with Timminco or the termination of my employment with Timminco, including without limitation obligations pursuant to the *Employment Standards Act (Ontario)* and the *Human Rights Code (Ontario)*. For the said consideration, I covenant that I will not file any claims or complaints under the *Employment Standards Act (Ontario)* or the *Human Rights Code (Ontario)*.

16 Following his retirement in 2001, Mr. Timmins remained a member of Timminco's board of directors until October 2007 and served as a member of several board committees until that time, including the strategic committee of the board from June 2003 until October 2007. He received director fees and was reimbursed for his expenses in connection with his services as a member of the board of directors of Timminco and its various committees.

17 Mr. Timmins states that he has fulfilled all contractual obligations imposed on him by the 1996 Agreement and that he has always been prepared to provide his consulting services to Timminco, as required by the 1996 Agreement, whenever from time to time requested by Timminco.

18 The evidence of Mr. Kalins, President, General Counsel and Corporate Secretary of Timmins, is that

Timminco has not sought or received any consulting services from Mr. Timmins following his retirement.

19 Mr. Timmins has a different view. His evidence is that he provided consulting services during the early period of Dr. Schimmelbuch's term as CEO.

20 Since the execution of the Letter Agreement, Timminco has paid Mr. Timmins approximately \$2.625 million. Mr. Kalins states that the payments under the Letter Agreement constitute the entirety of Mr. Timmins' entitlements from Timminco following his retirement.

21 Timminco has filed statements of pension, retirement, annuity and other income ("T4A Forms") and/or statements of amounts paid or credited to non-residents of Canada ("NR4 Forms") with the Canada Revenue Agency in connection with payments made by Timminco to Mr. Timmins in each year from 2002 to 2011. The T4A Forms and NR4 Forms filed by Timminco with respect to Mr. Timmins in each of those years list amounts paid to Mr. Timmins under the category of "retiring allowances". Mr. Kalins deposed that Timminco is not aware of any requests from Mr. Timmins to amend or refile any of the T4A Forms or NR4 Forms filed by Timminco since 2002.

22 Timminco complied with its obligations to pay the monthly consulting fee to Mr. Timmins until December 2011.

23 Payment was due on January 1, 2012, which was not made. The Initial Order was granted on Tuesday, January 3, 2012.

24 On February 8, 2012, a debtor-in-possession financing agreement (the "DIP Agreement") between Timminco and QSI Partners Ltd. ("QSI" or the "DIP Lender") was approved. Mr. Timmins was not served with notice of the motion to approve the DIP Agreement.

25 On March 30, 2012, counsel for Timminco sent a letter to counsel for Mr. Timmins enclosing a formal notice of disclaimer of the 1996 Agreement pursuant to section 32 of the CCAA. According to the correspondence, the 1996 Agreement was to be disclaimed effective April 30, 2012.

Analysis

26 Counsel to Mr. Timmins set out four issues:

(a) Was Timminco entitled to stop paying the monthly consulting fee to Mr. Timmins, notwithstanding Mr. Timmins' position that these payments are post-filing obligations under the 1996 Agreement between the parties?

(b) Should Timminco be entitled to disclaim the 1996 Agreement notwithstanding that:

(i) the company's ongoing obligations under the 1996 Agreement have not impeded its ability to effect a successful sale of its assets; and

(ii) the disclaimer would result in significant financial hardship to Mr. Timmins.

(c) In the event that Timminco was not entitled to stop paying the monthly consulting fee, is Mr. Timmins entitled to payments for the period from January 1, 2012 up to the effective date (if any) of the

disclaimer?

(d) In the event that Timminco is entitled to disclaim the 1996 Agreement, what should the effective date of that disclaimer be?

27 Counsel to Timminco set forth the issue as being whether Timminco's obligations under the Agreement constitute pre-filing obligations which are stayed by the Initial Order.

28 In a supplementary factum, counsel to Timminco broadened the issue to read as follows:

(a) Should Mr. Timmins' motion for an order that the 1996 Agreement is not to be disclaimed or resiliated be granted; and

(b) If Mr. Timmins' motion referenced in (a) above be granted, should the effective date of the disclaimer of the 1996 Agreement be extended past April 30, 2012 (the day that was 30 days after the day on which Timminco gave notice of the disclaimer to Mr. Timmins).

29 Counsel to Mr. Timmins submits that the 1996 Agreement is clear and unambiguous and that Timminco's attempts to describe the unpaid monthly consulting fees as a pre-filing claim inappropriately mischaracterizes the nature of the 1996 Agreement. Counsel submits that the unpaid amounts can only be characterized as the pre-filing claim if Mr. Timmins earned the right to be paid an amount during his employment with Timminco (which amount was then to be paid out to him over time after the termination of his employment), without further obligations owing from Mr. Timmins to Timminco. Counsel to Mr. Timmins submits that clearly is not the case as the monthly consulting fees do not constitute compensation deferred from a prior employment agreement between the parties and the fees cannot be said to be owing for employment services previously performed by Mr. Timmins.

30 Mr. Timmins takes the position that, while the Letter Agreement dealt with a number of termination of employment issues, it specifically did not amend the 1996 Agreement other than to fix the monthly consulting fee and, in other respects, the 1996 Agreement was to remain in full force and effect.

31 Specifically, from Mr. Timmins standpoint, there were no pension or retirement benefits to forego at the time he entered into the Letter Agreement as the pension plan in which he had participated prior to his resignation was terminated and wound up in 1998 with a lump sum entitlement having been paid out.

32 Counsel for Mr. Timmins goes on to submit that the purpose and effect of the 1996 Agreement is clear and unambiguous on its face - (i) to ensure that Mr. Timmins advice remains available to Timminco; (ii) to ensure that he or his investment company do not engage in activities which are competitive to Timminco's business; and (iii) to ensure that Mr. Timmins does not disclose or otherwise use confidential information.

33 Counsel submits that Mr. Timmins' and Timminco's obligations under the 1996 Agreement are ongoing post-filing obligations, and as such cannot be stayed and suspended in the CCAA proceedings.

34 In my opinion, the arguments of Mr. Timmins are flawed.

35 It seems to me that the benefits conferred on Mr. Timmins under the 1996 Agreement, as amended by the Letter Agreement are, in substance, termination and/or retirement benefits. These are unsecured claims. Counsel to the Applicant has summarized the following attributes or characteristics of the Agreement in support of the

Applicant's position that the claim of Mr. Timmins is, in substance, for termination and/or retirement benefits:

- (a) the amount of Mr. Timmins' monthly fee under the 1996 Agreement was essentially a "top up" to any other retirement and pension benefit that Mr. Timmins would receive from Timminco;
- (b) the "consulting" term of the 1996 Agreement was to commence the first day of the month following Mr. Timmins' retirement;
- (c) under the Agreement, Mr. Timmins is not entitled to any retirement or pension benefits from Timminco following his retirement other than the payments;
- (d) neither the 1996 Agreement nor the Letter Agreement provide for any minimum amount of consulting to be provided by Mr. Timmins in order to be entitled to receive the monthly payments;
- (e) all other employment benefits and provision of services to enable Mr. Timmins to provide employment services to Timminco were terminated by the Letter Agreement; and
- (f) Mr. Timmins has not provided any consulting services to Timminco following his retirement as CEO.

36 From the standpoint of Timminco, for all intents and purposes, the Letter Agreement concluded whatever employment relationship remained between Mr. Timmins and Timminco.

37 In addition, in connection with the Letter Agreement and his retirement, Mr. Timmins also executed a release in indemnity wherein he released any and all claims he may have had relating to his employment with Timminco or the termination thereof and agreed that the consideration described in the Agreement satisfies all of the obligations of Timminco arising from or out of his employment with Timminco or the termination of his employment.

38 It is especially significant that the release and indemnity specifically references both the 1996 Agreement and the Letter Agreement.

39 Further, the filings made by Timminco with the Canada Revenue Agency constitute further evidence of the payments made to Mr. Timmins under the Agreement are, in substance, unsecured termination and/or retirement benefits. Mr. Timmins discounts this point indicating that it is the responsibility of Timminco to issue the tax forms. However, it is the responsibility of Mr. Timmins to file the return and to ensure its accuracy.

40 In my view, the inescapable conclusion is that when the 1996 Agreement is considered together with the amendments set out in the Letter Agreement, in substance, the parties entered into an arrangement that addressed termination and/or retirement benefits.

41 The law in this area is clear. The courts have repeatedly found that termination and/or retirement benefits are pre-filing unsecured obligations of debtor companies undergoing CCAA proceedings. See *Indalex Ltd., Re* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 64 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* [Recommendation of Benefit Motion] (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 68 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) [Nortel] and *Fraser Papers Inc., Re* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 217 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

42 Further, the debtor company's obligation to make retirement, termination, severance and other related

payments to unionized and non-unionized employees have been held to be pre-filing obligations. See Nortel, paras. 10, 12, 67. At para. 67, I stated:

...The exact time of when the payment obligation crystallized is not, in my view, the determining factor under section 11.3 [of the CCAA]. Rather, the key factor is whether the employee performed services after the date of the Initial Order. If so, he or she is entitled to compensation benefits for such current service.

43 It is clear in this case that Mr. Timmins did not provide any services after the date of the Initial Order.

44 The Timminco Entities are insolvent and are not able to honour their obligations to all creditors. If the benefits conferred on Mr. Timmins under the Agreement are not stayed, Mr. Timmins would, in effect, receive an enhanced priority over other unsecured creditors, which would be contrary to the scheme and purpose of the CCAA. In this respect, it is noted that the position of the Applicant on this motion was supported by counsel to FSCO, both the Non-Union and Union Employee Pension Committee, the United Steelworkers and Mercer Canada.

45 The Monitor expressed no view on whether the monthly payment obligations were a pre-filing or a post-filing obligation. The Monitor did, however, approve of the proposed disclaimer (see below).

46 In my view, it is necessary to briefly address the submission made by counsel to Mr. Timmins that the CCAA order does not preclude Mr. Timmins' claim for the unpaid monthly consulting fees and the related submission that the CCAA order does not stay pre-filing obligations. Paragraph 11 of the CCAA clearly provides that the Timminco Entities are directed to make no payments of principal, interest or otherwise on account of monies owing by the Timminco Entities to any of their creditors as of January 3, 2012. Having made the determination that the obligation of Timminco to Mr. Timmins under the Agreement constitutes a pre-filing claim, this provision is broad enough to cover any and all pre-filing obligations owing to Mr. Timmins.

47 The foregoing is sufficient to dispose of the issues raised in the motion and cross-motion. However, in the event that I am in error in my conclusion, the secondary issue has to be addressed; namely, whether Timminco should be entitled to disclaim the 1996 Agreement and, if so, what should be the effective date of the disclaimer.

48 Section 32 of the CCAA permits a counter-party to a contract disclaimed by the debtor company to apply to court for an order that the agreement is not to be disclaimed or resiliated.

49 Section 32(4) sets out factors to be considered by the court, among other things, in deciding whether to make the order:

- (a) whether the monitor approved the proposed disclaimer or resiliation;
- (b) whether the disclaimer or resiliation would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company; and
- (c) whether the disclaimer or resiliation would likely cause significant financial hardship to a party to the agreement.

50 In alternative submissions, counsel to Timminco takes the position that the motion of Mr. Timmins should be dismissed because:

- (a) the Monitor has approved the proposed disclaimer;
- (b) the disclaimer will enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of Timminco;
- (c) the disclaimer is expected to benefit the stakeholders of Timminco as a whole in that it will permit Timminco to maximize recoveries to its stakeholders;
- (d) the disclaimer will not cause any significant financial hardship to Mr. Timmins; and
- (e) prohibiting Timminco from disclaiming the Agreement will result in a windfall to Mr. Timmins at the expense of the other unsecured creditors of the Timminco Entities.

51 In analyzing this aspect of the motion, I accept the submission of counsel to Timminco that the scope of the CCAA and the various protections it affords debtor companies should not be interpreted so narrowly as to apply only in the context of a restructuring process leading to a plan arrangement for a newly restructured entity. The Court of Appeal for Ontario stated in *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, 2009 ONCA 833 (Ont. C.A.), there is "no reason...why the same analysis cannot apply during a sale process that requires the business to be carried as a going concern".

52 In my view, the section 32 (4)(b) requirement that a disclaimer of an agreement with a debtor company enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made should be interpreted with a view to the expanded scope of the statute.

53 In this particular case, the overriding objective of the CCAA must be to ensure that creditors in the same classification are treated equitably. Such treatment will enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the debtor company.

54 Similar views were expressed by the court in *Homburg Invest Inc., Re*, 2011 QCCS 6376 (Que. Bkcty.) where the Quebec Superior Court held, among other things, that it is not necessary to demonstrate that a proposed disclaimer is essential for the restructuring period. It merely has to be advantageous and beneficial.

55 It is also noted that counsel to the Applicants submitted that at the commencement of the CCAA proceedings, the Timminco Entities ceased making payments with respect to many of their pre-filing obligations in order to preserve their ability to continue operating and to implement a successful sale of their assets. The continued existence of the Agreement and of the requirement to make the payments thereunder would have further strained the Timminco Entities already severely constrained cash flows. Further, counsel contends that disclaimer of the Agreement and the cessation of payments to Mr. Timmins thereunder improved the Timminco Entities' cash flows and their ability to continue implementing a sales process with respect to their assets.

56 Counsel to Timminco also points out that under the DIP Agreement, approved on February 8, 2012, the Timminco Entities are restricted to use the proceeds of the DIP Facility for the purpose of funding operating costs, expenses and liabilities in accordance with the cash flow projections. Although the DIP Agreement does not prohibit the payment of amounts akin to the amounts owing under the Agreement, the cash flow projections approved by the DIP Lender do not provide for a payment of the monthly payments under the Agreement; making such payments would accordingly result in an event of default under the DIP Agreement. Further, counsel adds that without access to the DIP Facility, the Timminco Entities would have been unable to implement a sales

process designed to maximize the benefits to their stakeholders.

57 I am satisfied that, in the context of this alternative argument, the disclaimer of the Agreement, if necessary, is fair, reasonable, advantageous and beneficial to the Timminco Entities' restructuring process.

58 Counsel to Mr. Timmins also raised the issue that the disclaimer of the 1996 Agreement would objectively result in significant financial hardship to Mr. Timmins.

59 However, Mr. Timmins did acknowledge that, if the test of whether the disclaimer of an agreement that pays a party \$250,000 per year will cause "significant financial hardship to that party" depends on the individual characteristics and circumstances of that party, the disclaimer of the 1996 Agreement will not cause significant financial hardship to Mr. Timmins.

60 I am in agreement with the submission of the Timminco Entities that the test of whether a disclaimer of an agreement will cause significant financial hardship to the counter party depends and is centered on an examination of the individual characteristics and circumstances of such counter party. Further, an objective test for "significant financial hardship" would make it difficult to debtor companies to disclaim large contracts regardless of the financial ability of the counter parties to absorb the resultant losses. It seems to me that such a result would be contrary to the purpose of principles of the CCAA.

61 Based on the record, I am unable to conclude that the disclaimer would likely cause significant financial hardship to Mr. Timmins.

62 I have also taken into account that the effect of acceding to the argument put forth by counsel to Mr. Timmins would result in an improvement to his position relative to, and at the expense of, the unsecured creditors and other stakeholders of the Timminco Entities. If the Agreement is disclaimed, however, the monthly amounts that would otherwise be paid to Mr. Timmins would be available for distribution to all of Timminco's unsecured creditors, including Mr. Timmins. This equitable result is dictated by the guiding principles of the CCAA.

63 For the foregoing reasons, the alternative relief sought by Mr. Timmins, to the effect that the Agreement is not to be disclaimed, is denied.

64 The remaining outstanding issue is whether or not the disclaimer of the Agreement should be effective April 30, 2012. Counsel to Mr. Timmins takes the position that the effective date of the disclaimer should be no earlier than the date of the determination of this motion.

65 On March 30, 2012, counsel for Timminco sent a letter to Mr. Timmins' counsel enclosing a formal notice of disclaimer which was to be effective April 30, 2012. In accordance with section 32 (2) of the CCAA, on April 13, 2012, Mr. Timmins filed his motion objecting to the disclaimer. Counsel to Mr. Timmins sought to have the motion heard in advance of April 30, but on account of scheduling issues, the motion did not proceed until June 4, 2012. Counsel to Mr. Timmins takes the position that given that the CCAA Order prohibits Mr. Timmins from ceasing to comply with his obligations under the 1996 Agreement, it is only fair that payment for such obligations should be made up until the date that the court makes its determination on this motion.

66 The contrary position put forth by counsel to Timminco is that the Timminco Entities did not deliver a notice of disclaimer until March 30, 2012 because they were of the view that the obligations under the Agree-

ment constitute Timminco's unsecured pre-filing obligations which were stayed by Initial Order and that Timminco was authorized to stop making the payments under the Agreement without being required to disclaim the Agreement. Consequently, counsel submits that the Timminco Entities only delivered a notice of disclaimer in response to correspondence with Mr. Timmins' counsel and did so expressly without prejudice to their position that the obligations under the Agreement were pre-filing obligations.

67 Counsel to Timminco acknowledged that, if the court found that Timminco's obligations did not constitute pre-filing obligations and the Agreement needed to be disclaimed prior to Timminco being entitled to cease making payments, Timminco would be obligated to make the payments that became due prior to the effective day of the disclaimer, namely, April 30, 2012.

68 I am satisfied that the delay between the commencement of this motion by Mr. Timmins and its hearing was attributable to scheduling issues and the demands on Timminco's management and counsel's time placed by the Timminco Entities' CCAA Proceedings, including the sales process being undertaken by the Timminco Entities for the benefit of their stakeholders. Given these competing priorities, it seems to me that it would be unfair to extend the effective date of the disclaimer, if necessary, beyond April 30, 2012.

69 As noted, my comments with respect to the disclaimer issue are for the assistance of the parties, in the event that my determination of the pre-filing issue is found to be in error.

Disposition

70 In the result, the motion of Mr. Timmins is dismissed. The relief requested by Timminco in the cross-motion is granted.

Motion by former CEO dismissed; Motion by company granted.

END OF DOCUMENT