SUPERIOR COURT
Commercial Division

CANADA
PROVINCE OF QUÉBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTRÉAL
N°: 500-11-042345-120

DATE : November 20, 2012

PRESIDING : THE HONOURABLE MARK SCHRAGER, J.S.C.

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

AVEOS FLEET PERFORMANCE INC. /
AVEOS FLEET PERFORMANCE AÉRONAUTIQUE INC.
Insolvent Debtor/Petitioner

and

AERO TECHNICAL US, INC.
Insolvent Debtor

and

FTI CONSULTING CANADA INC.
Monitor

and

NORTHGATEARINSO CANADA INC.
Petitioner

and

CREDIT SUISSE AG CAYMAN ISLANDS BRANCH
Secured creditor

JS 1319

JUDGMENT

INTRODUCTION

[1] Aveos Fleet Performance Inc. ("Aveos") is subject to an order under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("C.C.A.A.")[1] It has sold or seeks to sell all of its assets and is not operating its business. Can it invoke Section 32 C.C.A.A. to cancel an executory contract? This is the principal issue before this Court.

FACTS

[2] Aveos and its related entity, Aero Technical US, Inc. (collectively, the "debtors") applied for and this Court issued an initial order under the C.C.A.A. on March 19, 2012. A stay was issued until April 5, 2012, at that time and has subsequently been extended. F.T.I. Consulting Canada Inc. was named monitor. The record of the Court and particularly the orders and reasons of the undersigned indicate that in the hours following the initial order, the entire board of directors (but one) of Aveos resigned. Most of the remaining employees (i.e. those who had not been laid off prior to the C.C.A.A. filing) were laid off immediately following the initial order and the day-to-day operations of Aveos were shut down.

[3] The remaining director signed the affidavit in support of a Motion Seeking the Appointment of a Chief Restructuring Officer ("C.R.O."), in virtue of which Mr. Jonathan Solursh of the firm R.e.I. Consulting Group, an independent consultant, was named C.R.O. and has acted in such capacity since then. The remaining director resigned following such appointment.

[4] Much time and effort were spent in the month following the filing with the emergency situations of a company not having sufficient cash to operate in the normal course, being in possession of property claimed by third parties and having 2800 former or present employees owed millions of dollars in the aggregate. Nevertheless, the C.R.O. quickly concluded with the support of the Monitor that Aveos had to be sold.

---

[1] R.S.C. 1985, c. C-25

[5] On April 29, 2012, this Court issued an order approving the "Divestiture Process" put forward by the C.R.O. in virtue of which Aveos was offered for sale. The C.R.O. determined that Aveos' three (3) divisions (i.e. engines, components and air frames) should be marketed with a view to separate sales as it was unlikely that anyone would purchase all three (3) divisions. The C.R.O. believed that the value could be maximized by seeking to split Aveos into three (3) enterprises although there was no impediment to any one person acquiring all three (3) divisions. It was certainly hoped that all three (3) divisions would be sold on a going concern basis and would recommence operations and this in the interest of all stakeholders.

[6] As the Court record indicates, at no time did any party bring a motion to end the stay period with a view to petitioning Aveos into bankruptcy.

[7] The C.R.O. and Monitor have reported on an ongoing basis and also gave evidence in the present matter before the undersigned. The Divestiture Process has given rise to over 10 transactions. Unfortunately, only one sale (for the components division) has been made on a going concern basis where approximately 200 jobs should be conserved. However, and significantly, although the process of seeking bids has ended, the C.R.O. and the Monitor testified before the undersigned that a "latecomer" has appeared, and is performing a due diligence investigation with a view to making an offer to acquire the engine maintenance division of Aveos. The engine maintenance equipment remains in the hands of a liquidator but the scheduled auction has now been postponed. The interested party is in the same type of business, so that the tax losses of Aveos may have value as part of the transaction and this could potentially lead to the filing of a plan of arrangement with some benefit for unsecured creditors. Though the engine maintenance contract with Air Canada was sold as part of the Divestiture Process, it represented approximately 55 % of the engine maintenance business. Accordingly, there is a potential value in the business enterprise beyond the liquidation value of the tangible assets.

[8] Against this status update of the C.C.A.A. file is the dispute between Aveos and the present Petitioner, Northgatearinso Canada Inc. ("N.G.A.").

[9] Aveos was created as a result of the C.C.A.A. restructuring of Air Canada. It was the former maintenance department of Air Canada. Initially, it depended on Air Canada's support for payroll and human resources. As part of the process of separating Aveos from Air Canada, Aveos sought to outsource its human resources and payroll departments. To this end, a process to select a service provider was put in place. The goal of Aveos

was to have a completely outsourced human resources and payroll system that would include computer access for employees through a portal where they could access their files and view their status (e.g. benefit accruals) and even input information (e.g. change beneficiaries in insurance plans). The service would include a call center to handle employee questions.

[10] The establishment of the system had many challenges and complicating factors, such as the fact that some Aveos' personnel were Air Canada's employees that had been seconded to Aveos.

[11] Originally, an operating system completely independent from Air Canada and its services providers was targeted for autumn 2010. This date was extended due to extraneous considerations to July 14, 2011, which was fortunate given all of the developmental problems experienced as will be addressed below.

[12] The "Global Master Services Agreement" ("G.M.S.A.") with N.G.A. was signed between Aveos and N.G.A. in January 2011. By the time of the C.C.A.A. filing in March 2012 not all outstanding operational issues had been resolved. The relationship was fraught with frustration on both sides. Aveos felt that N.G.A. took too long to install systems and was unable to provide certain services altogether. Costs ran over those stipulated in the G.M.S.A. for services not covered under the agreement. All of this caused Aveos to lose confidence in N.G.A.

[13] N.G.A. was frustrated by the ongoing changes in Aveos management personnel charged with the implementation of the system, so that from N.G.A.'s point of view, once it finally "educated" one member of the Aveos team he\she was replaced so that Aveos throughout did not fully understand what the system was designed to do, and by extension, what the system could not do.

[14] Aveos felt that N.G.A. as the expert should tell it not merely what was needed, but what was missing in the system to address Aveos' needs. Instead, the Aveos' personnel in charge learned piecemeal that features that they wanted or needed were not available or at least not included in the contract price. This situation was severe enough to cause Aveos to engage the services of Deloitte at the beginning of 2012 as a consultant to help Aveos resolve the continuing issues arising during implementation of the services to be provided by N.G.A. under the G.M.S.A.

[15] N.G.A. felt not only did Aveos fail to understand the system, but it provided incomplete or incorrect data to N.G.A. for input and thus further complicated matters.

[16] The problems with N.G.A. were such that Aveos has sought cancellation of the G.M.S.A. not only under Section 32 C.C.A.A. but also Aveos seeks resiliation for cause pursuant to the law of contracts generally based on N.G.A.'s alleged faulty execution of its obligations.

[17] The level of frustration existing between N.G.A. and Aveos continued after the C.C.A.A. filing. The lay-offs and the shut down of day-to-day operations required services not contemplated by the G.M.S.A. Obtaining such services in a timely manner from N.G.A. was the subject of ongoing extensive and tense negotiations over a period of approximately one month. Aveos was now represented by the C.R.O. and his staff with the support of the Monitor.

[18] Before the undersigned, the representative of the Monitor diplomatically described the situation between N.G.A. and Aveos prior to the C.C.A.A. filing as a "failed business relationship". Unfortunately, the situation did not improve during the post-filing period.

[19] Upon learning of the initial filing under the C.C.A.A., N.G.A. communicated with Aveos. The thrust of N.G.A.'s written and verbal communications were either a refusal to continue services under the existing contract and seeking assurance of payment going forward (according to Aveos) or a request as to what would be required given the change of operations and personnel as described above (according to N.G.A). There followed a series of exchanges including numerous conference calls which gave rise, in succession, to three Memoranda of Understanding dated March 26, April 10 and April 13, 2012 which outlined the services to be provided by N.G.A. to Aveos and the pricing in respect thereof.

[20] Aveos had payroll needs because 120 employees had been recalled. Also payroll periods which fell on both sides of the C.C.A.A. filing date required special attention. Certain "claw-back" amounts previously set off against amounts due to employees had to be paid post-filing. Records of employment had to be issued in order for employees to be able to claim benefits from the government unemployment insurance program.

[21] Other ongoing services under the G.M.S.A. were obviously not required as Aveos' operations were not continuing as had been the case prior to the C.C.A.A. filing.

[22] From N.G.A.'s point of view, the demands being made by Aveos were exorbitant mainly because the time delays were extremely aggressive. Many of the services requested were not what the system was designed to do. For example, records of employment resulting from mass layoffs were

not designed into the system, nor were reversing deductions from past pay periods and ledgering these reversals in the former pay period already closed for purposes of data entry. The system had to be (re-)designed to accommodate these needs.

[23] From the C.R.O's point of view, N.G.A.'s performance failures experienced by Aveos pre-filing now continued into the post-filing period. N.G.A.'s difficulty to meet tight time deadlines imposed by the C.C.A.A. circumstances and the exorbitant pricing made it such that Aveos, through the C.R.O., sought and engaged an alternate payroll service provider as of May 1st, 2012. The price for a one-year contract albeit encompassing far less extensive services than those under the G.M.S.A., is one-half of N.G.A.'s monthly fee. Indeed, the representative of the C.R.O. testified that the exorbitant pricing under the three (3) Memoranda of Agreement was only accepted because there was no alternative at that time. As such, $240,000.00 was paid by Aveos to N.G.A. for the 4-week period between the end of March and the end of April 2012.

[24] In one instance, where the payroll included the reversal of amounts previously set off, N.G.A. could not produce the work product at all or at least on time such that the C.R.O. organized staff to produce 800 pay cheques manually. Moreover, the data in question was entered into the database by N.G.A. in the current as opposed to the old, pre-filing period in consideration of which the payments were being made. This caused Services Canada to question whether the employees were indeed eligible for Unemployment Insurance ("UIC") benefits. Apparently, much energy was expended in order to correct this situation and the results were additional delays for employees to receive their UIC benefits.

[25] Effective May 1st, 2012, Aveos gave notice to N.G.A. that it was cancelling the G.M.S.A. and the three (3) Memoranda of Agreement for faulty performances both pre and post-filing. Alternatively, Aveos took the position that it was cancelling and repudiating the agreements pursuant to its rights to do so under Section 32 C.C.A.A. N.G.A. claims $501,381.00 which is the indemnity provided by the G.M.S.A. where cancellation is for "convenience", i.e. without cause. N.G.A. also claims the sum of $91,377.00 for unpaid services rendered under the three (3) Memoranda of Agreement.

[26] Crédit Suisse, the secured creditor, has taken the position that whatever sums might be due to N.G.A., they fall within the definition of "claim" in Sections 2 and 19 C.C.A.A. and are not post-filing claims as postulated by N.G.A. Thus, any payment would be subordinate to the rights of Crédit Suisse.

ISSUES

[27] Is Section 32 C.C.A.A. available to Aveos as a means to resiliate or cancel the G.M.S.A.?

[28] Aside from Section 32 C.C.A.A., does Aveos have the right to resiliate the G.M.S.A. because of the alleged faulty execution by N.G.A. of its obligations there under?

[29] Does N.G.A. have the right to claim the cancellation indemnity of $501,381.00 foreseen by the G.M.S.A.? If so, is the amount due immediately by Aveos as a claim arising after the C.C.A.A. filing, and as such not subject to the stay of proceedings? In the alternative, is the amount due but subject to be treated as a (pre-filing) ordinary or unsecured claim to be dealt with under an arrangement, if any, or a bankruptcy?

[30] Is the sum of $91,377.00 due immediately for services rendered by N.G.A. to Aveos after the C.C.A.A. filing?

POSITION OF N.G.A.

[31] N.G.A. contends that Section 32 C.C.A.A. does not apply in the circumstances where Aveos ceased to carry on business, is being liquidated and as such will not propose an arrangement to its creditors. N.G.A. argues that Section 32(1)(b) C.C.A.A. does not apply to such a scenario. The purpose of Section 32 C.C.A.A. is to allow a debtor company to rid itself of contractual obligations which are an impediment to an arrangement. Where no arrangement will be filed, Section 32 C.C.A.A. should not apply according to N.G.A.

[32] Moreover, since the G.M.S.A. contains a provision allowing for cancellation without cause, such recourse must be used before reverting to a statutory mechanism to seek cancellation of the contract. In other words, according to N.G.A., Aveos must pay the stipulated cancellation penalty of $501,381.00 to achieve cancellation in such manner rather than having recourse to Section 32 C.C.A.A.

[33] The resiliation of the G.M.S.A. for faulty execution is not available to Aveos because on the facts of the case, N.G.A. is not at fault having fulfilled its contractual obligations at all relevant times.

[34] The $501,381.00 cancellation penalty is not a claim provable within the meaning of the C.C.A.A., but rather is a post-filing claim. This claim arises from the unilateral cancellation of the G.M.S.A. by Aveos after the

C.C.A.A. filing. N.G.A. continued to render services after the filing albeit in a modified manner, at Aveos' request and in order to respond to Aveos' needs in the situation as it unfolded after the C.C.A.A. filing. On or about May 1st, 2012, approximately five (5) weeks after the C.C.A.A. filing, Aveos cancelled the G.M.S.A. and as such the obligation of Aveos to pay the penalty of $501,381.00.00 arose after the filing. Consequently, it is not a provable claim, but rather an amount arising and payable after the C.C.A.A. filing.

[35] Similarly, the $91,377.00 representing charges for services rendered after the filing, and at the request of and as agreed with Aveos, are currently due. This is not a claim provable to be dealt with under an arrangement, according to N.G.A. As such, it should be paid by Aveos immediately, as were the other amounts for services rendered after the C.C.A.A. filing, the whole as pleaded by N.G.A.

DISCUSSION

[36] Section 32 C.C.A.A. provides a mechanism for a debtor company to "disclaim or resiliate" agreements to which it is a party at the time of the initial C.C.A.A. filing. This disclaimer is achieved by notice given by the debtor to the co-contracting party.

[37] The debtor company's notice to disclaim may be contested by the other party to the contract as N.G.A. has done in the present case. It then falls upon the Court to make (or not) an order of disclaimer :

[38] Section 32(4) C.C.A.A. provides as follows :

> "Factors to be considered
>
> In deciding whether to make the order, the court is to consider, among other things,
>
> 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."

[39] On the face of the drafting of Section 32(4) C.C.A.A., the matters listed are not an exhaustive enumeration of the matters that this Court may consider in deciding whether to approve the cancellation of a contract where the notice is contested.

[40] Section 37(4)(c) C.C.A.A. is not in issue in these proceedings because N.G.A. did not allege nor prove any financial hardship arising from the G.M.S.A. There is the obvious lack of revenue stream when the contract is cancelled (approximately $80,000.00 per month), but it was not contended that the loss of this, *per se* constituted, in this particular case, the "financial hardship" to which subparagraph (c) refers.

[41] Section 32(4)(b) C.C.A.A. addresses the issue of whether the cancellation of the contract would "enhance the prospects of a viable" arrangement being made.

[42] The Monitor filed a report and its representative, Ms. Toni Vanderlaan, testified before the undersigned.

[43] The Monitor confirmed that it had approved the proposed cancellation of the G.M.S.A. as foreseen by Section 32(4)(a) C.C.A.A. In so doing, the Monitor considered the cost of continuing the G.M.S.A., which as indicated above represents approximately $80,000.00 per month prior to the C.C.A.A. filing. The alternate provider engaged by Aveos after May 1st (Ceridian), was considerably cheaper at $40,000.00 per year albeit that the scope of the service under the G.M.S.A. provided by N.G.A. was much broader than those provided by Ceridian. In any event, the Monitor determined that the G.M.S.A. was far too expensive given the cash position of Aveos and its payroll and human resources needs in any scenario post C.C.A.A. filing.

[44] In addition to cost, the Monitor concluded that cancelling the G.M.S.A. would enhance the prospect of filing an arrangement. The Monitor underlined that not merely was the G.M.S.A. expensive, but it was undesirable. As stated above, Ms. Vanderlaan summarized the relations between N.G.A. and Aveos at the time of the C.C.A.A. filing as a "failed business relationship". It is clear to the Court that the systems provided by N.G.A. either did not do what they were supposed to do or if they did do what they were supposed to do, then there was a breakdown in communication between N.G.A. as service provider and Aveos as consumer as to what the requirements of Aveos were.

[45] The representative of N.G.A., Mr. Latulippe, referred on a number of occasions to the fact that the representatives of Aveos responsible for the negotiation and implementation of the G.M.S.A. with N.G.A. did not properly

understand what the system was designed to do. This may have been so, but it became evident during the hearing before the undersigned that N.G.A. was lacking in its ability both before and after the C.C.A.A. filing to understand its client's needs and to address them adequately or where that was not possible to explain such inability in a timely and comprehensible fashion. It was therefore not conceivable that Aveos could use the G.M.S.A. going forward because of all of the problems associated with it.

[46] Moreover, the system described in the G.M.S.A. was designed for a company with approximately 3,000 employees. After the C.C.A.A. filing, Aveos only had a fraction of that number on a descending basis. Since the Divestiture Process was based on the premise that no one acquirerer would seek to purchase all three (3) divisions of Aveos, then any possible purchasers would not want the contract based purely on the number of employees. Aside from such consideration, the system did not work very well and the likelihood was that any acquirerer would be an operator in the industry and already have its own payroll and human resources systems in place. The sale or assignment of the G.M.S.A. as part of a sale of assets was not an alternative in the view of the Monitor even absent all the problems experienced by Aveos with the system. Thus, in any possible scenario, the G.M.S.A. was of no use to Aveos and could not enhance, in any scenario, the making of an arrangement.

[47] However, and as stated above, N.G.A. contends that cancellation under Section 32 C.C.A.A. is not available because Section 32(4)(b) C.C.A.A. does not apply. According to N.G.A., there is no discussion to be had about the prospect of an arrangement since early on in the C.C.A.A. process, Aveos shut down its normal operations and went into liquidation mode. Thus, no plan of arrangement will be made, so that an essential element for the application of Section 32 C.C.A.A. is not met according to N.G.A.

[48] The text of Section 32(4)(b) C.C.A.A. does not impose as a condition for resiliation that there be a plan of arrangement or even the certainty that there will be a plan of arrangement filed. Rather 32(4)(b) C.C.A.A. requires that the cancellation of the G.M.S.A. enhance the prospects of a viable arrangement. It is clear from the Monitor's analysis referred to above that the cancellation would rid Aveos of an expensive contract for a system which never functioned in a completely satisfactory manner, and that under the best of circumstances was inappropriate for a company with less than 2,800 employees, and where the relationship with the service provider (both pre and post C.C.A.A. filing) had failed. Viewed in this way, the disclaimer could only enhance the possibility of an arrangement.

[49] It is accepted by the case law that the disclaimer need not be essential but merely advantageous to a plan [2]. There need not be any certainty that there will be a plan of arrangement but just that cancellation of the contract in question would be beneficial to the making of a plan.

[50] Section 32 C.C.A.A. applies even where there is a sales process in place as is the situation with Aveos [3]. Prior to Section 36 C.C.A.A. coming into force in 2009, it was broadly accepted that liquidating while under C.C.A.A. protection was not contrary to the Act.[4] Now, Section 36 C.C.A.A. explicitly provides for sales out of the ordinary course of business, with Court approval.

[51] A sales process, particularly when assets are offered on a going concern basis together with intangible property (e.g. customer contracts) can lead to a result where one or several operating business entities similar to those operated by the debtor pre C.C.A.A. filing, continues after the C.C.A.A. process is completed. The ability to file an arrangement can largely be a function of the sales proceeds received and the amounts available to different stakeholders, particularly secured creditors. The point is that the existence of a sales process or "liquidation" does not *per se* mean that an arrangement is not a possibility. The fact that Aveos ceased operations was a function of cash (or the lack thereof), but the sales process was specifically designed to enhance the possibility of going-concern sales. Indeed, the timetable was short, specifically so as to limit the deterioration of critical mass of such things as customer base and labour pool. Despite the fact that only one division (components) of Aveos was sold on a going concern basis through the process, the C.R.O. testified at the hearing that a new prospective purchaser had come forward to possibly purchase the engine maintenance center together with tax losses arising from Aveos' operations. This could result in a plan of arrangement being filed with benefit for unsecured creditors.

[52] Accordingly, in the view of this Court, the shutdown of Aveos' normal operations and the implementation of a sales process does not in itself, eliminate the application of Section 32 C.C.A.A. as argued by N.G.A.

---

[2] *Timminco Limited (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 4471 at par. 52 to 57; *Boutique Jacob inc. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2011 QCCS 276 at par. 38 to 41 and 46; *Homburg Invest inc. (Re)*, 2011 QCCS 6376 at par. 103-106; *9145-7978 Québec inc. (arrangement relatif à)*, 2007 QCCA 768 at par. 26 to 29.

[3] *Timminco Limited* (Re), op.cit, at par. 52-27

[4] *Sproule vs. Nortel Networks Corporation 2009 ONCA 833; First Leaside Wealth Management Inc. (Re),* 2012 ONSC 1299; *PCAS Patient Care Automation Services Inc. (Re),* 2012 ONSC 3367; *Brainhunter Inc. (Re),* (2009) 62 C.B.R. (5th) 41 (ONSC); *Anvil Range Mining Corp. (Re)*, (2002) 34 C.B.R. (4th) (ONCA)

[53] As indicated above, the undersigned has considered the evidence of the C.R.O. with respect to the late bidder. C.C.A.A. issues generally must be decided in "real time" if for no other reason so as to achieve the broad remedial purpose of the legislation[5] of providing a means for financially-strapped enterprises to correct problems and continue in business. This is all the more so in a process such as the Aveos Divestiture Process where the parties' business judgment dictates that the debtor be offered for sale but the parties do not know ahead of time what the outcome of such process will be. The situation evolves constantly and rapidly. The Court's decisions along the way cannot be frozen in time lest those decisions be unrealistic and unhelpful to the process. In any event, even if the undersigned only considered the facts as they were at the date of the notice to disclaim the G.M.S.A. as urged by N.G.A., the undersigned would still be of the opinion that Section 32 C.C.A.A. is available to Aveos for the reasons given above pertaining to the interpretation of Section 32 C.C.A.A.

[54] N.G.A. also submitted that since the G.M.S.A. contains a mechanism to cancel where cancellation for cause under the common law of contracts is not available, then Section 32 C.C.A.A. cannot apply. The argument put forward by N.G.A. is based on the decision in the matter of Hart Stores [6] where Mongeon, J.S.C. held that Section 32 C.C.A.A. did not apply to the cancellation or termination of verbal contracts of employment having no fixed term.

[55] The reasoning in that case was that the mechanism in Section 32 C.C.A.A. was inappropriate to cancel a verbal contract of indeterminate term where the law (Article 2091 of the Civil Code of Québec) provided a mechanism for unilateral cancellation. In this Court's opinion that reasoning does not apply to a written service agreement of determinate term such as the G.M.S.A.

[56] Moreover taken to its logical conclusion, the argument is not really of any help to N.G.A. for the following reason. If Aveos could not rely on Section 32 C.C.A.A. and was obliged to rely on the cancellation for convenience clause in the G.M.S.A., the penalty of $501,381.00 would nonetheless constitute a provable claim payable under an eventual plan of arrangement or bankruptcy.

[57] "Claim" is defined in Section 2 of the C.C.A.A. by reference to the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ("B.I.A.") [7]. Section 19 C.C.A.A. introduced

---

[5] *Century Services Inc. vs. Canada (Attorney General),* [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379
[6] Re *Hart Stores Inc.*, 2012 QCCS 1094
[7] R.S.C. *c.* B.-3

in the 2007 amendments which came into force in 2009, includes in claims that can be dealt with under a plan of arrangement the following:

> "19.(1)(*b*) claims that relate to debts or liabilities, present or future, to which the company may become subject before the compromise or arrangement is sanctioned by reason of any obligation incurred by the company before the earlier of the days referred to in subparagraphs (*a*)(i) and (ii)."

This is precisely the situation with the cancellation indemnity claimed by N.G.A. in this case. Though Aveos may have triggered the cancellation penalty after the C.C.A.A. filing, the obligation stems from a contract to which it was bound pre-C.C.A.A. filing.

[58] The claim for the cancellation penalty would also be a claim provable in a bankruptcy (see Section 2 and Section 121 of the *B.I.A.* which are substantially similar to Section 19 C.C.A.A.).

[59] Accordingly, in any and all scenarios, the $501,381.00 claimed by N.G.A. for the cancellation indemnity would be a claim provable and would not have the status of a "post-filing claim" payable immediately, i.e. prior to the claims of other creditors.

[60] The Courts have said on numerous occasions that pre-filing creditors cannot under the guise of making a post-filing claim, obtain a preference over other creditors. [8] This applies even to employees for severance claims arising from termination of employment after the C.C.A.A. filing [9]. The equitable treatment of creditors' demands that claims for contractual damages arising from the termination of contracts after filing under the C.C.A.A. be treated on a par with other provable claims [10].

[61] Consequently, N.G.A.'s argument based on the cancellation of the G.M.S.A. without cause after the C.C.A.A. filing date is not helpful to N.G.A., since even if correct, the argument would give rise to a claim provable only.

[62] Moreover, the parties cannot write out part of the C.C.A.A. from contracts. [11] This is against public policy. Parties to a contract cannot exclude in advance the application of the C.C.A.A. It would be offensive to the wording of Section 32 and the C.C.A.A. in general if Section 32 C.C.A.A. could not achieve its purpose as a result of the drafting of the contract which

---

[8] *Pine Valley Mining Corporation (Re)*, 2008 B.C.S.C. 368 para. 37-42; *Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)*, 2010 O.N.S.C. 1746, para. 29-31, 33-35

[9] *Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)*, op.cit.

[10] *Timminco Limited (Re)*, op.cit., para. 44

[11] Section 8 C.C.A.A.

the debtor sought to cancel. This would defeat the rehabilitative purpose of the C.C.A.A. and thus would be contrary to the public policy of the C.C.A.A.

[63] Consequently, Section 32 C.C.A.A. is available to Aveos in order to cancel the G.M.S.A. The appropriate order will issue.

[64] Because of the manner in which the Court has answered the first issue set forth hereinabove (i.e. the application of Section 32 C.C.A.A.) it is not necessary to analyse whether Aveos could cancel the G.M.S.A. for cause because of alleged faulty execution by N.G.A. in virtue of the law of contracts generally.

[65] Regarding the $501,381.00 cancellation indemnity, the following should be added. Section 32(7) C.C.A.A. provides that any loss suffered in relation to the disclaimer is a provable claim. The Court renders no judgment on whether the amount of any such claim is $501,381.00 or any other amount in the circumstances. That will have to be determined at a later date, if necessary.

[66] The final issue requiring determination is the matter of N.G.A.'s claim for $91,377.00 for system maintenance. This amount represents the fee of $10,153.00 per week stipulated in the memorandum of understanding of April 13th. Such an amount was paid for the period up to the end of April 2012. The $91,377.00 represents $10,153.00 per week for the 9-week period commencing April 30, 2012, i.e. the expiry of the term of the last memorandum of understanding.

[67] N.G.A. needed the data maintained in the system to complete the records of employment ("R.O.E.") for each of the employees. It had contracted to make "best efforts" to complete those R.O.E.s by April 28, 2012. Mr. Latulippe, N.G.A.'s representative, testified that N.G.A. completed all of the R.O.Es by April 28th, except for 50 which were problematic and could not be completed until the end of June. Accordingly, N.G.A. required the data to be maintained until that time. He conceded that there was no explicit agreement in place after April 30, 2012 for Aveos to pay such weekly system maintenance fee.

[68] Even though N.G.A. only contracted to make best efforts to complete the R.O.E.s before April 28th, if N.G.A. needed to maintain the data in the system after April 28th, it was not justified, without Aveos' consent, to charge the $10,153.00 per week to maintain the data in the system. The "best efforts" clause may have attenuated N.G.A.'S obligation to complete by April 28th but did not impose an obligation on Aveos after that date without its consent. It had been agreed after the C.C.A.A. filing that the services to be provided by N.G.A. and paid for by Aveos were set

forth in the memoranda of understanding. There was no obligation to pay for system maintenance after April 28th.

[69] The Court adds that the fact that the cancellation of the G.M.S.A. takes effect according to Section 32(5) C.C.A.A. on the 30th day following Aveos' notice of May 7, 2012 does not entitle N.G.A. to charge for services under the M.G.S.A. not provided nor for services not agreed to under the memoranda of understanding. Accordingly, the claim for $91,377.00 will be denied.

FOR ALL OF THE FOREGOING REASONS, THE COURT :

[70] **DISMISSES** Northgatearinso Canada Inc.'s "Amended Motion to Strike *De Bene Esse* Notice by Debtor Company to Disclaim or Resiliate an Agreement and for Payment of Post-filing Obligations", dated July 9, 2012;

[71] **DECLARES** and **ORDERS** resiliated as of June 6, 2012 the following agreement, namely: "Global Master Services Agreement" between Aveos Fleet Performance Inc. and Northgatearinso Canada Inc. dated June 30, 2010 as amended from time to time including, *inter alia*, by subsequent Memoranda of Agreement".

[72] THE WHOLE with costs against Northgatearinso Canada Inc.

Montreal, November 20, 2012

MARK SCHRAGER, J.S.C.

Mtre. Martin Poulin
Fraser Milner Casgrain LLP
Attorneys for Aveos Fleet Performance inc./
Aveos Fleet Performance Aéronautique Inc.
and Aéro Technical US, Inc.
Insolvent Debtor/Petitioner

Mtre. Geneviève Cloutier
Gowling Lafleur Henderson s.e.n.c.r.l
Attorneys for Northegatearinso Canada Inc.

Mtre. Bernard Bouchard and Mtre. Caroline Dion
Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP
Attorneys for Canadian Counsel for Credit
Suisse AG, Cayman Islands Branch

Mtre. Sylvain Rigaud
Norton Rose Canada LLP
Attorneys for FTI Consulting Canada Inc.
Monitor

Dates of Hearings: September 28, October 18, 19 and 30, 2012