

COURT FILE NUMBER 2301-16114

COURT COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

JUDICIAL CENTRE CALGARY

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF MANTLE MATERIALS GROUP, LTD.

DOCUMENT BOOK OF AUTHORITIES

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE
AND CONTACT
INFORMATION OF
PARTY FILING THIS
DOCUMENT

GOWLING WLG (CANADA) LLP

Suite 1600, 421 – 7th Avenue SW
Calgary, AB T2P 4K9

Telephone: 403-298-1938 / 403-298-1018

Fax: 403-263-9193

Email: tom.cumming@gowlingwlg.com /
stephen.kroeger@gowlingwlg.com

File No.: A171561

Attention: Tom Cumming / Stephen Kroeger

**APPLICATION BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE MICHELE H. HOLLINS
FEBRUARY 23 AT 11:00 AM ON THE CALGARY COMMERCIAL LIST
VIA WEBEX**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Tab	Authority
1.	<i>Companies Creditors Arrangement Act</i> , R.S.C., 1985, c. C-36.
2.	<i>Re Nortel Networks Corporation</i> , 2009 CarswellOnt 4467 (SC).
3.	<i>Re Nelson Education Ltd.</i> , 2015 ONSC 5557.
4.	<i>Royal Bank v Soundair Corp.</i> , 1991 CarswellOnt 205 (ONCA).
5.	<i>Pricewaterhousecoopers Inc. v 1905393 Alberta Ltd.</i> , 2019 ABCA 433.
6.	<i>Re Bloom Lake</i> , 2015 QCCS 1920.
7.	<i>Orphan Well Association v. Grant Thornton Ltd.</i> , 2019 SCC 5.
8.	<i>Mantle Materials Group, Ltd (Re)</i> , 2024 ABKB 19.
9.	<i>Sierra Club of Canada v Canada (Minister of Finance)</i> , 2002 SCC 41.
10.	<i>Sherman Estate v Donovan</i> , 2021 SCC 25.

TAB 1

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

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11

s 11. General power of court

Currency

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.

Amendment History

1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1996, c. 6, s. 167(1)(d); 1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to November 22, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:21 (October 11, 2023)

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

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

s 11.02

Currency

11.02

11.02(1) Stays, etc. — initial application

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

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

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

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

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

11.02(3) Burden of proof on application

The court shall not make the order unless

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

11.02(4) Restriction

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

Amendment History

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

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to November 22, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:21 (October 11, 2023)

End of Document

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

Canada Federal Statutes

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Part III — General (ss. 18.6-43) [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

Obligations and Prohibitions [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

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

s 36.

Currency

36.

36(1) Restriction on disposition of business assets

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

36(2) Notice to creditors

A company that applies to the court for an authorization is to give notice of the application to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the proposed sale or disposition.

36(3) Factors to be considered

In deciding whether to grant the authorization, the court is to consider, among other things,

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

36(4) Additional factors — related persons

If the proposed sale or disposition is to a person who is related to the company, the court may, after considering the factors referred to in subsection (3), grant the authorization only if it is satisfied that

- (a) good faith efforts were made to sell or otherwise dispose of the assets to persons who are not related to the company; and
- (b) the consideration to be received is superior to the consideration that would be received under any other offer made in accordance with the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition.

36(5) Related persons

For the purpose of subsection (4), a person who is related to the company includes

- (a) a director or officer of the company;
- (b) a person who has or has had, directly or indirectly, control in fact of the company; and
- (c) a person who is related to a person described in paragraph (a) or (b).

36(6) Assets may be disposed of free and clear

The court may authorize a sale or disposition free and clear of any security, charge or other restriction and, if it does, it shall also order that other assets of the company or the proceeds of the sale or disposition be subject to a security, charge or other restriction in favour of the creditor whose security, charge or other restriction is to be affected by the order.

36(7) Restriction — employers

The court may grant the authorization only if the court is satisfied that the company can and will make the payments that would have been required under paragraphs 6(5)(a) and (6)(a) if the court had sanctioned the compromise or arrangement.

36(8) Restriction — intellectual property

If, on the day on which an order is made under this Act in respect of the company, the company is a party to an agreement that grants to another party a right to use intellectual property that is included in a sale or disposition authorized under subsection (6), that sale or disposition does not affect that other party's right to use the intellectual property — including the other party's right to enforce an exclusive use — during the term of the agreement, including any period for which the other party extends the agreement as of right, as long as the other party continues to perform its obligations under the agreement in relation to the use of the intellectual property.

Amendment History

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 78; 2017, c. 26, s. 14; 2018, c. 27, s. 269

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to November 22, 2023

Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:21 (October 11, 2023)

TAB 2

2009 CarswellOnt 4467
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Nortel Networks Corp., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 4467, [2009] O.J. No. 3169, 179 A.C.W.S. (3d) 265, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 229

**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
NORTEL NETWORKS CORPORATION, NORTEL NETWORKS LIMITED, NORTEL
NETWORKS GLOBAL CORPORATION, NORTEL NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL
CORPORATION AND NORTEL NETWORKS TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION (Applicants)

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

Morawetz J.

Heard: June 29, 2009

Written reasons: July 23, 2009

Docket: 09-CL-7950

Counsel: Derrick Tay, Jennifer Stam for Nortel Networks Corporation, et al
Lyndon Barnes, Adam Hirsh for Board of Directors of Nortel Networks Corporation, Nortel Networks Limited
J. Carfagnini, J. Pasquariello for Monitor, Ernst & Young Inc.
M. Starnino for Superintendent of Financial Services, Administrator of PBGF
S. Philpott for Former Employees
K. Zych for Noteholders
Pamela Huff, Craig Thorburn for MatlinPatterson Global Advisors LLC, MatlinPatterson Global Opportunities Partners III L.P.,
Matlin Patterson Opportunities Partners (Cayman) III L.P.
David Ward for UK Pension Protection Fund
Leanne Williams for Flextronics Inc.
Alex MacFarlane for Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors
Arthur O. Jacques, Tom McRae for Felske & Sylvain (de facto Continuing Employees' Committee)
Robin B. Schwill, Matthew P. Gottlieb for Nortel Networks UK Limited
A. Kauffman for Export Development Canada
D. Ullman for Verizon Communications Inc.
G. Benchetrit for IBM

Subject: Insolvency; Estates and Trusts

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIV Administration of estate](#)

[XIV.4 Sale of assets](#)

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.4 Liquidation or sale of assets](#)

Headnote

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

Telecommunication company entered protection under [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \("Act"\)](#) — Company decided to pursue "going concern" sales for various business units — Company entered into sale agreement with respect to assets in Code Division Multiple Access business and Long-Term Evolution Access assets — Company was pursuing sale of its other business units — Company brought motion for approval of bidding procedures and asset sale agreement — Motion granted — Court has jurisdiction to authorize sales process under Act in absence of formal plan of compromise or arrangement and creditor vote — Sale by company which preserved its business as going concern was consistent with objectives of Act — Unless sale was undertaken at this time, long-term viability of business would be in jeopardy.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Administration of estate — Sale of assets — Jurisdiction of court to approve sale

Telecommunication company entered protection under [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \("Act"\)](#) — Company decided to pursue "going concern" sales for various business units — Company entered into sale agreement with respect to assets in Code Division Multiple Access business and Long-Term Evolution Access assets — Company was pursuing sale of its other business units — Company brought motion for approval of bidding procedures and asset sale agreement — Motion granted — Court has jurisdiction to authorize sales process under Act in absence of formal plan of compromise or arrangement and creditor vote — Sale by company which preserved its business as going concern was consistent with objectives of Act — Unless sale was undertaken at this time, long-term viability of business would be in jeopardy.

Table of Authorities**Cases considered by *Morawetz J.*:**

Asset Engineering LP v. Forest & Marine Financial Ltd. Partnership (2009), 2009 BCCA 319, 2009 CarswellBC 1738 (B.C. C.A.) — followed

ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (2008), 2008 ONCA 587, 2008 CarswellOnt 4811, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 240 O.A.C. 245, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 296 D.L.R. (4th) 135, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 92 O.R. (3d) 513, 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163, 47 B.L.R. (4th) 123 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (2008), 2008 CarswellOnt 5432, 2008 CarswellOnt 5433 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Boutiques San Francisco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellQue 10918, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 189 (C.S. Que.) — referred to

Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re (2007), 2007 CarswellAlta 1050, 2007 ABQB 504, 35 C.B.R. (5th) 1, 415 A.R. 196, 33 B.L.R. (4th) 68 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re (1998), 1998 CarswellOnt 3346, 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299, 72 O.T.C. 99 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered

Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. v. Hard-Rock Paving Co. (2008), 2008 CarswellOnt 4046, 45 C.B.R. (5th) 87 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp. (2008), 2008 BCCA 327, 2008 CarswellBC 1758, 83 B.C.L.R. (4th) 214, 296 D.L.R. (4th) 577, 434 W.A.C. 187, 258 B.C.A.C. 187, 46 C.B.R. (5th) 7, [2008] 10 W.W.R. 575 (B.C. C.A.) — distinguished

Consumers Packaging Inc., Re (2001), 150 O.A.C. 384, 27 C.B.R. (4th) 197, 2001 CarswellOnt 3482, 12 C.P.C. (5th) 208 (Ont. C.A.) — 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]) — referred to

PSINET Ltd., Re (2001), 28 C.B.R. (4th) 95, 2001 CarswellOnt 3405 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Residential Warranty Co. of Canada Inc., Re (2006), 2006 ABQB 236, 2006 CarswellAlta 383, (sub nom. *Residential Warranty Co. of Canada Inc. (Bankrupt), Re*) 393 A.R. 340, 62 Alta. L.R. (4th) 168, 21 C.B.R. (5th) 57 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

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

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 4084, 6 C.B.R. (5th) 316 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Tiger Brand Knitting Co., Re (2005), 2005 CarswellOnt 1240, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 315 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

32 In support of the court's jurisdiction to grant the order sought in this case, counsel to the Applicants submits that Nortel seeks to invoke the "overarching policy" of the CCAA, namely, to preserve the going concern. *Residential Warranty Co. of Canada Inc., Re* (2006), 21 C.B.R. (5th) 57 (Alta. Q.B.) at para. 78.

33 Counsel to the Applicants further submits that CCAA courts have repeatedly noted that the purpose of the CCAA is to preserve the benefit of a going concern business for all stakeholders, or "the whole economic community":

The purpose of the CCAA is to facilitate arrangements that might avoid liquidation of the company and allow it to continue in business to the benefit of the whole economic community, including the shareholders, the creditors (both secured and unsecured) and the employees. *Citibank Canada v. Chase Manhattan Bank of Canada* (1991), 5 C.B.R. (3rd) 167 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 29. *Re Consumers Packaging Inc.* (2001) 27 C.B.R. (4th) 197 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 5.

34 Counsel to the Applicants further submits that the CCAA should be given a broad and liberal interpretation to facilitate its underlying purpose, including the preservation of the going concern for the benefit of all stakeholders and further that it should not matter whether the business continues as a going concern under the debtor's stewardship or under new ownership, for as long as the business continues as a going concern, a primary goal of the CCAA will be met.

35 Counsel to the Applicants makes reference to a number of cases where courts in Ontario, in appropriate cases, have exercised their jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets, even in the absence of a plan of arrangement being tendered to stakeholders for a vote. In doing so, counsel to the Applicants submits that the courts have repeatedly recognized that they have jurisdiction under the CCAA to approve asset sales in the absence of a plan of arrangement, where such sale is in the best interests of stakeholders generally. *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re, supra, Re PSINet, supra, Consumers Packaging Inc., Re* [2001 CarswellOnt 3482 (Ont. C.A.)], *supra, Stelco Inc., Re* (2004), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 316 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 1, *Tiger Brand Knitting Co., Re* (2005), 9 C.B.R. (5th) 315 (Ont. S.C.J.), *Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. v. Hard-Rock Paving Co.* (2008), 45 C.B.R. (5th) 87 (Ont. S.C.J.) and *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

36 In *Re Consumers Packaging, supra*, the Court of Appeal for Ontario specifically held that a sale of a business as a going concern during a CCAA proceeding is consistent with the purposes of the CCAA:

The sale of Consumers' Canadian glass operations as a going concern pursuant to the Owens-Illinois bid allows the preservation of Consumers' business (albeit under new ownership), and is therefore consistent with the purposes of the CCAA.

...we cannot refrain from commenting that Farley J.'s decision to approve the Owens-Illinois bid is consistent with previous decisions in Ontario and elsewhere that have emphasized the broad remedial purpose of flexibility of the CCAA and have approved the sale and disposition of assets during CCAA proceedings prior to a formal plan being tendered. *Re Consumers Packaging, supra, at paras. 5, 9.*

37 Similarly, in *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re, supra*, Blair J. (as he then was) expressly affirmed the court's jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets in the course of a CCAA proceeding before a plan of arrangement had been approved by creditors. *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re, supra*, at paras. 43, 45.

38 Similarly, in *PSINet Limited, supra*, the court approved a going concern sale in a CCAA proceeding where no plan was presented to creditors and a substantial portion of the debtor's Canadian assets were to be sold. Farley J. noted as follows:

[If the sale was not approved,] there would be a liquidation scenario ensuing which would realize far less than this going concern sale (which appears to me to have involved a transparent process with appropriate exposure designed to maximize the proceeds), thus impacting upon the rest of the creditors, especially as to the unsecured, together with the material enlarging of the unsecured claims by the disruption claims of approximately 8,600 customers (who will be materially

disadvantaged by an interrupted transition) plus the job losses for approximately 200 employees. *Re PSINet Limited, supra*, at para. 3.

39 In *Re Stelco Inc., supra*, in 2004, Farley J. again addressed the issue of the feasibility of selling the operations as a going concern:

I would observe that usually it is the creditor side which wishes to terminate CCAA proceedings and that when the creditors threaten to take action, there is a realization that a liquidation scenario will not only have a negative effect upon a CCAA applicant, but also upon its workforce. Hence, the CCAA may be employed to provide stability during a period of necessary financial and operational restructuring - and if a restructuring of the "old company" is not feasible, then there is the exploration of the feasibility of the sale of the operations/enterprise as a going concern (with continued employment) in whole or in part. *Re Stelco Inc, supra*, at para. 1.

40 I accept these submissions as being general statements of the law in Ontario. The value of equity in an insolvent debtor is dubious, at best, and, in my view, it follows that the determining factor should not be whether the business continues under the debtor's stewardship or under a structure that recognizes a new equity structure. An equally important factor to consider is whether the case can be made to continue the business as a going concern.

41 Counsel to the Applicants also referred to decisions from the courts in Quebec, Manitoba and Alberta which have similarly recognized the court's jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets during the course of a CCAA proceeding. *Boutiques San Francisco Inc., Re* (2004), 7 C.B.R. (5th) 189 (C.S. Que.), *Winnipeg Motor Express Inc., Re* (2008), 49 C.B.R. (5th) 302 (Man. Q.B.) at paras. 41, 44, and *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re* (2007), 35 C.B.R. (5th) 1 (Alta. Q.B.) at para. 75.

42 Counsel to the Applicants also directed the court's attention to a recent decision of the British Columbia Court of Appeal which questioned whether the court should authorize the sale of substantially all of the debtor's assets where the debtor's plan "will simply propose that the net proceeds from the sale...be distributed to its creditors". In *Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp.* (2008), 46 C.B.R. (5th) 7 (B.C. C.A.) ("*Cliffs Over Maple Bay*"), the court was faced with a debtor who had no active business but who nonetheless sought to stave off its secured creditor indefinitely. The case did not involve any type of sale transaction but the Court of Appeal questioned whether a court should authorize the sale under the CCAA without requiring the matter to be voted upon by creditors.

43 In addressing this matter, it appears to me that the British Columbia Court of Appeal focussed on whether the court should grant the requested relief and not on the question of whether a CCAA court has the jurisdiction to grant the requested relief.

44 I do not disagree with the decision in *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*. However, it involved a situation where the debtor had no active business and did not have the support of its stakeholders. That is not the case with these Applicants.

45 The *Cliffs Over Maple Bay* decision has recently been the subject of further comment by the British Columbia Court of Appeal in *Asset Engineering LP v. Forest & Marine Financial Ltd. Partnership*, 2009 BCCA 319 (B.C. C.A.).

46 At paragraphs 24 - 26 of the *Forest and Marine* decision, Newbury J.A. stated:

24. In *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*, the debtor company was a real estate developer whose one project had failed. The company had been dormant for some time. It applied for CCAA protection but described its proposal for restructuring in vague terms that amounted essentially to a plan to "secure sufficient funds" to complete the stalled project (Para. 34). This court, per Tysoe J.A., ruled that although the Act can apply to single-project companies, its purposes are unlikely to be engaged in such instances, since mortgage priorities are fully straight forward and there will be little incentive for senior secured creditors to compromise their interests (Para. 36). Further, the Court stated, the granting of a stay under s. 11 is "not a free standing remedy that the court may grant whenever an insolvent company wishes to undertake a "restructuring"...Rather, s. 11 is ancillary to the fundamental purpose of the CCAA, and a stay of proceedings freezing the rights of creditors should only be granted in furtherance of the CCAA's fundamental purpose". That purpose has been described in *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank* (1984) 11 D.L.R. (4th) 576 (Alta. Q.B.):

The legislation is intended to have wide scope and allow a judge to make orders which will effectively maintain the status quo for a period while the insolvent company attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for a proposed arrangement which will enable the company to remain in operation for what is, hopefully, the future benefit of both the company and its creditors. [at 580]

25. The Court was not satisfied in *Cliffs Over Maple Bay* that the "restructuring" contemplated by the debtor would do anything other than distribute the net proceeds from the sale, winding up or liquidation of its business. The debtor had no intention of proposing a plan of arrangement, and its business would not continue following the execution of its proposal - thus it could not be said the purposes of the statute would be engaged...

26. In my view, however, the case at bar is quite different from *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*. Here, the main debtor, the Partnership, is at the centre of a complicated corporate group and carries on an active financing business that it hopes to save notwithstanding the current economic cycle. (The business itself which fills a "niche" in the market, has been carried on in one form or another since 1983.) The CCAA is appropriate for situations such as this where it is unknown whether the "restructuring" will ultimately take the form of a refinancing or will involve a reorganization of the corporate entity or entities and a true compromise of the rights of one or more parties. The "fundamental purpose" of the Act - to preserve the *status quo* while the debtor prepares a plan that will enable it to remain in business to the benefit of all concerned - will be furthered by granting a stay so that the means contemplated by the Act - a compromise or arrangement - can be developed, negotiated and voted on if necessary...

47 It seems to me that the foregoing views expressed in *Forest and Marine* are not inconsistent with the views previously expressed by the courts in Ontario. The CCAA is intended to be flexible and must be given a broad and liberal interpretation to achieve its objectives and a sale by the debtor which preserves its business as a going concern is, in my view, consistent with those objectives.

48 I therefore conclude that the court does have the jurisdiction to authorize a sale under the CCAA in the absence of a plan.

49 I now turn to a consideration of whether it is appropriate, in this case, to approve this sales process. Counsel to the Applicants submits that the court should consider the following factors in determining whether to authorize a sale under the CCAA in the absence of a plan:

- (a) is a sale transaction warranted at this time?
- (b) will the sale benefit the whole "economic community"?
- (c) do any of the debtors' creditors have a *bona fide* reason to object to a sale of the business?
- (d) is there a better viable alternative?

I accept this submission.

50 It is the position of the Applicants that Nortel's proposed sale of the Business should be approved as this decision is to the benefit of stakeholders and no creditor is prejudiced. Further, counsel submits that in the absence of a sale, the prospects for the Business are a loss of competitiveness, a loss of value and a loss of jobs.

51 Counsel to the Applicants summarized the facts in support of the argument that the Sale Transaction should be approved, namely:

- (a) Nortel has been working diligently for many months on a plan to reorganize its business;
- (b) in the exercise of its business judgment, Nortel has concluded that it cannot continue to operate the Business successfully within the CCAA framework;

TAB 3

2015 ONSC 5557

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Nelson Education Ltd., Re

2015 CarswellOnt 13576, 2015 ONSC 5557, 258 A.C.W.S. (3d) 465, 29 C.B.R. (6th) 140

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

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Nelson
Education Ltd. and Nelson Education Holdings Ltd., Applicants

Newbould J.

Heard: August 13, 27, 2015

Judgment: September 8, 2015

Docket: CV15-10961-00CL

Counsel: Benjamin Zarnett, Jessica Kimmel, Caroline Descours for Applicants
Robert W. Staley, Kevin J. Zych, Sean Zweig for First Lien Agent and the First Lien Steering Committee
John L. Finnigan, D.J. Miller, Kyla E.M. Mahar for Royal Bank of Canada
Orestes Pasparaskis for Monitor

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.4 Liquidation or sale of assets](#)

Headnote

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

Education publishing company obtained protection under [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \("CCAA"\)](#) — Bank was one of 22 first lien lenders, second lien lender and agent for second lien lenders — Credit bid for sale of substantially all assets to newly incorporated entity owned by first ranked secured lenders, if approved, would result in second lien lenders receiving nothing on outstanding loans — Company brought motion for approval of sale; bank brought motion for order that amounts owing to it and portion of consent fee be paid by company prior to sale — Company's motion granted; bank's motion dismissed — Normally, sale process is undertaken after court approves proposed sale methodology with monitor participating in process and reporting to court — While none of this occurred, sale or investment sales process ("SISP") and credit bid sale transaction met requirements of [CCAA](#) — SISP was typical and consistent with processes that had been approved by court in many [CCAA](#) proceedings — Results of SISP showed that no interested parties could offer price sufficient to repay amounts owing to first lien lenders — Intercreditor agreement governed, and led to conclusion that order in favour of bank as second lien agent was not appropriate as payment would reduce collateral subject to rights of first lien lenders in that collateral.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by Newbould J.:

ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (2008), 2008 ONCA 587, 2008 CarswellOnt 4811, 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163, 47 B.L.R. (4th) 123, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 296 D.L.R. (4th) 135, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 240 O.A.C. 245, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 92 O.R. (3d) 513 (Ont. C.A.) — followed
Brainhunter Inc., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 7627 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to
Cruden v. Bank of New York (1992), 957 F.2d 961 (U.S. C.A. 2nd Cir.) — referred to

- (c) The activities undertaken by A&M were consistent with the activities that any investment banker or sale advisor engaged to assist in the sale of a business would be expected to undertake;
- (d) The selection of A&M as investment banker would not have had a detrimental effect on the SISP or the value of offers;
- (e) Both key senior management and A&M were incentivised to achieve the best value available and there was no impediment to doing so;
- (f) The SISP was undertaken in a thorough and professional manner;
- (g) The results of the SISP clearly demonstrate that none of the interested parties would, or would be likely to, offer a price for the Nelson business that would be sufficient to repay the amounts owing to the first lien lenders under the first lien credit agreement
- (h) The SISP was a thorough market test and can be relied on to establish that there is no value beyond the first lien debt.

36 The Monitor expressed the further view that:

- (a) There is no realistic prospect that Nelson could obtain a new source of financing sufficient to repay the first lien debt;
- (b) An alternative debt restructuring that might create value for the second lien lenders is not a viable alternative at this time;
- (c) There is no reasonable prospect of a new sale process generating a transaction at a value in excess of the first lien debt;
- (d) It does not appear that there are significant operational improvements reasonably available that would materially improve profitability in the short-term such that the value of the Nelson business would increase to the extent necessary to repay the first lien debt and, accordingly, there is no apparent benefit from delaying the sale of the business.

37 *Soundair* established factors to be considered in an application to approve a sale in a receivership. These factors have widely been considered in such applications in a CCAA proceeding. They are:

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

38 These factors are now largely mirrored in section 36(3) of the CCAA that requires a court to consider a number of factors, among other things, in deciding to authorize a sale of a debtor's assets. It is necessary to deal briefly with them.

- (a) Whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances. In this case, despite the fact that there was no prior court approval to the SISP, I accept the Monitor's view that the process was reasonable.

(b) Whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition. In this case there was no monitor at the time of the SISP. This factor is thus not strictly applicable as it assumes a sale process undertaken in a CCAA proceeding. However, the report of FTI blessing the SISP that took place is an important factor to consider.

(c) Whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in its opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy. The Monitor did not make such a statement in its report. However, there is no reason to think that a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy would be more beneficial to the creditors. The creditors negatively affected could not expect to fare better in a bankruptcy.

(d) The extent to which the creditors were consulted. The first lien steering committee was obviously consulted. Before the SISP, RBC, the second lien lenders' agent, was consulted and actively participated in the reconstruction discussions. I take it from the evidence that RBC did not actively participate in the SISP, a decision of its choosing, but was provided some updates.

(e) The effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties. The positive effect is that all ordinary course creditors, employees, suppliers and customers will be protected. The effect on the second lien lenders is to wipe out their security and any chance of their loans being repaid. However, apart from their being deemed to have consented to the sale, it is clear that the second lien lenders have no economic interest in the Nelson assets except as might be the case some years away if Nelson were able to improve its profitability to the point that the second lien lenders could be paid something towards the debt owed to them. RBC puts this time line as perhaps five years and it is clearly conjecture. The first lien lenders however are not obliged to wait in the hopes of some future result. As the senior secured creditor, they have priority over the interests of the second lien lenders.

There are some excluded liabilities and a small amount owing to former terminated employees that will not be paid. As to these the Monitor points out that there is no reasonable prospect of any alternative solution that would provide a recovery for those creditors, all of whom rank subordinate to the first lien lenders.

(f) Whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value. The Monitor is of the view that the results of the SISP indicate that the consideration is fair and reasonable in the circumstances and that the SISP can, and should, be relied on for the purposes of such a determination. There is no evidence to the contrary and I accept the view of the Monitor.

39 In the circumstances, taking into account the *Soundair* factors and the matters to be considered in section 36(3) of the CCAA, I am satisfied that the sale transaction should be approved. Whether the ancillary relief should be granted is a separate issue, to which I now turn.

(ii) Ancillary claimed relief

(a) Vesting order

40 The applicants seek a vesting order vesting all of Nelson's right, title and interest in and to the purchased assets in the purchaser, free and clear of all interests, liens, charges and encumbrances, other than the permitted encumbrances and assumed liabilities contemplated in the Asset Purchase Agreement. It is normal relief given in an asset sale under the CCAA and it is appropriate in this case.

(b) Payment of amounts to first lien lenders

41 As a condition to the completion of the transaction, Nelson is to pay all accrued and unpaid interest owing to the first lien lenders and all unpaid professional fees of the first lien agent and the first lien lenders outstanding under the first lien credit agreement. RBC does not oppose this relief.

TAB 4

1991 CarswellOnt 205
Ontario Court of Appeal

Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.

1991 CarswellOnt 205, [1991] O.J. No. 1137, 27 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1178,
46 O.A.C. 321, 4 O.R. (3d) 1, 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 83 D.L.R. (4th) 76

**ROYAL BANK OF CANADA (plaintiff/respondent) v. SOUNDAIR CORPORATION
(respondent), CANADIAN PENSION CAPITAL LIMITED (appellant)
and CANADIAN INSURERS' CAPITAL CORPORATION (appellant)**

Goodman, McKinlay and Galligan JJ.A.

Heard: June 11, 12, 13 and 14, 1991

Judgment: July 3, 1991

Docket: Doc. CA 318/91

Counsel: *J. B. Berkow* and *S. H. Goldman* , for appellants Canadian Pension Capital Limited and Canadian Insurers' Capital Corporation.

J. T. Morin, Q.C. , for Air Canada.

L.A.J. Barnes and *L.E. Ritchie* , for plaintiff/respondent Royal Bank of Canada.

S.F. Dunphy and *G.K. Ketcheson* , for Ernst & Young Inc., receiver of respondent Soundair Corporation.

W.G. Horton , for Ontario Express Limited.

N.J. Spies , for Frontier Air Limited.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Debtors and creditors

VII Receivers

VII.6 Conduct and liability of receiver

VII.6.a General conduct of receiver

Headnote

Receivers --- Conduct and liability of receiver — General conduct of receiver

Court considering its position when approving sale recommended by receiver.

S Corp., which engaged in the air transport business, had a division known as AT. When S Corp. experienced financial difficulties, one of the secured creditors, who had an interest in the assets of AT, brought a motion for the appointment of a receiver. The receiver was ordered to operate AT and to sell it as a going concern. The receiver had two offers. It accepted the offer made by OEL and rejected an offer by 922 which contained an unacceptable condition. Subsequently, 922 obtained an order allowing it to make a second offer removing the condition. The secured creditors supported acceptance of the 922 offer. The court approved the sale to OEL and dismissed the motion to approve the 922 offer. An appeal was brought from this order.

Held:

The appeal was dismissed.

Per Galligan J.A.: When a court appoints a receiver to use its commercial expertise to sell an airline, it is inescapable that it intends to rely upon the receiver's expertise and not upon its own. The court should be reluctant to second-guess, with the benefit of hindsight, the considered business decisions made by its receiver.

The conduct of the receiver should be reviewed in the light of the specific mandate given to him by the court. The order appointing the receiver did not say how the receiver was to negotiate the sale. The order obviously intended, because of the unusual nature of the asset being sold, to leave the method of sale substantially to the discretion of the receiver.

To determine whether a receiver has acted providently, the conduct of the receiver should be examined in light of the information the receiver had when it agreed to accept an offer. On the date the receiver accepted the OEL offer, it had only two offers: that of OEL, which was acceptable, and that of 922, which contained an unacceptable condition. The decision made was a sound one in the circumstances. The receiver made a sufficient effort to obtain the best price, and did not act improvidently.

The court must exercise extreme caution before it interferes with the process adopted by a receiver to sell an unusual asset. It is important that prospective purchasers know that, if they are acting in good faith, bargain seriously with a receiver and enter into an agreement with it, a court will not lightly interfere with the commercial judgment of the receiver to sell the assets to them. Per McKinlay J.A. (concurring in the result): It is most important that the integrity of procedures followed by court-appointed receivers be protected in the interests of both commercial morality and the future confidence of business persons in their dealings with receivers. In all cases, the court should carefully scrutinize the procedure followed by the receiver. While the procedure carried out by the receiver in this case was appropriate, given the unfolding of events and the unique nature of the asset involved, it may not be a procedure that is likely to be appropriate in many receivership sales.

Per Goodman J.A. (dissenting): It was imprudent and unfair on the part of the receiver to ignore an offer from an interested party which offered approximately triple the cash down payment without giving a chance to the offeror to remove the conditions or other terms which made the offer unacceptable to the receiver. The offer accepted by the receiver was improvident and unfair insofar as two creditors were concerned.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered:

- Beauty Counsellors of Canada Ltd., Re* (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 (Ont. S.C.) — referred to
- British Columbia Development Corp. v. Spun Cast Industries Ltd.* (1977), 26 C.B.R. (N.S.) 28, 5 B.C.L.R. 94 (S.C.) — referred to
- Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303, 86 A.P.R. 303 (C.A.) — referred to
- Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenburg* (1986), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 320n, 60 O.R. (2d) 87, 22 C.P.C. (2d) 131, 39 D.L.R. (4th) 526 (H.C.) — applied
- Salima Investments Ltd. v. Bank of Montreal* (1985), 59 C.B.R. (N.S.) 242, 41 Alta. L.R. (2d) 58, 65 A.R. 372, 21 D.L.R. (4th) (C.A.) — referred to
- Selkirk, Re* (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 245 (Ont. S.C.) — referred to
- Selkirk, Re* (1987), 64 C.B.R. (N.S.) 140 (Ont. S.C.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

- Employment Standards Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 137.
- Environmental Protection Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 141.

Appeal from order approving sale of assets by receiver.

Galligan J.A. :

1 This is an appeal from the order of Rosenberg J. made on May 1, 1991. By that order, he approved the sale of Air Toronto to Ontario Express Limited and Frontier Air Limited, and he dismissed a motion to approve an offer to purchase Air Toronto by 922246 Ontario Limited.

2 It is necessary at the outset to give some background to the dispute. Soundair Corporation ("Soundair") is a corporation engaged in the air transport business. It has three divisions. One of them is Air Toronto. Air Toronto operates a scheduled airline from Toronto to a number of mid-sized cities in the United States of America. Its routes serve as feeders to several of Air Canada's routes. Pursuant to a connector agreement, Air Canada provides some services to Air Toronto and benefits from the feeder traffic provided by it. The operational relationship between Air Canada and Air Toronto is a close one.

3 In the latter part of 1989 and the early part of 1990, Soundair was in financial difficulty. Soundair has two secured creditors who have an interest in the assets of Air Toronto. The Royal Bank of Canada (the "Royal Bank") is owed at least \$65 million dollars. The appellants Canadian Pension Capital Limited and Canadian Insurers' Capital Corporation (collectively

11 The proceedings before Rosenberg J. then followed. He approved the sale to OEL and dismissed a motion for the acceptance of the 922 offer. Before Rosenberg J., and in this court, both CCFL and the Royal Bank supported the acceptance of the second 922 offer.

12 There are only two issues which must be resolved in this appeal. They are:

- (1) Did the receiver act properly when it entered into an agreement to sell Air Toronto to OEL?
- (2) What effect does the support of the 922 offer by the secured creditors have on the result?

13 I will deal with the two issues separately.

1. Did the Receiver Act Properly in Agreeing to Sell to OEL?

14 Before dealing with that issue, there are three general observations which I think I should make. The first is that the sale of an airline as a going concern is a very complex process. The best method of selling an airline at the best price is something far removed from the expertise of a court. When a court appoints a receiver to use its commercial expertise to sell an airline, it is inescapable that it intends to rely upon the receiver's expertise and not upon its own. Therefore, the court must place a great deal of confidence in the actions taken and in the opinions formed by the receiver. It should also assume that the receiver is acting properly unless the contrary is clearly shown. The second observation is that the court should be reluctant to second-guess, with the benefit of hindsight, the considered business decisions made by its receiver. The third observation which I wish to make is that the conduct of the receiver should be reviewed in the light of the specific mandate given to him by the court.

15 The order of O'Brien J. provided that if the receiver could not complete the sale to Air Canada that it was "to negotiate and sell Air Toronto to another person." The court did not say how the receiver was to negotiate the sale. It did not say it was to call for bids or conduct an auction. It told the receiver to negotiate and sell. It obviously intended, because of the unusual nature of the asset being sold, to leave the method of sale substantially in the discretion of the receiver. I think, therefore, that the court should not review minutely the process of the sale when, broadly speaking, it appears to the court to be a just process.

16 As did Rosenberg J., I adopt as correct the statement made by Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg* (1986), 60 O.R. (2d) 87, 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 320n, 22 C.P.C. (2d) 131, 39 D.L.R. (4th) 526 (H.C.), at pp. 92-94 [O.R.], of the duties which a court must perform when deciding whether a receiver who has sold a property acted properly. When he set out the court's duties, he did not put them in any order of priority, nor do I. I summarize those duties as follows:

1. It should consider whether the receiver has made a sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently.
2. It should consider the interests of all parties.
3. It should consider the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers are obtained.
4. It should consider whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process.

17 I intend to discuss the performance of those duties separately.

1. Did the Receiver make a sufficient effort to get the best price and did it act providently?

18 Having regard to the fact that it was highly unlikely that a commercially viable sale could be made to anyone but the two national airlines, or to someone supported by either of them, it is my view that the receiver acted wisely and reasonably when it negotiated only with Air Canada and Canadian Airlines International. Furthermore, when Air Canada said that it would submit no further offers and gave the impression that it would not participate further in the receiver's efforts to sell, the only course reasonably open to the receiver was to negotiate with Canadian Airlines International. Realistically, there was nowhere else to go but to Canadian Airlines International. In doing so, it is my opinion that the receiver made sufficient efforts to sell the airline.

TAB 5

2019 ABCA 433
Alberta Court of Appeal

Pricewaterhousecoopers Inc v. 1905393 Alberta Ltd

2019 CarswellAlta 2418, 2019 ABCA 433, [2019] A.W.L.D. 4519,
312 A.C.W.S. (3d) 237, 74 C.B.R. (6th) 14, 98 Alta. L.R. (6th) 1

**Pricewaterhousecoopers Inc. in its capacity as Receiver of 1905393 Alberta Ltd.
(Respondent / Cross-Appellants / Applicant) and 1905393 Alberta Ltd., David
Podollan and Steller One Holdings Ltd. (Appellants / Cross-Respondents /
Respondents) and Servus Credit Union Ltd., Ducor Properties Ltd., Northern
Electric Ltd. and Fancy Doors & Mouldings Ltd. (Respondents / Interested Parties)**

Thomas W. Wakeling, Dawn Pentelechuk, Jolaine Antonio JJ.A.

Heard: September 3, 2019

Judgment: November 14, 2019

Docket: Edmonton Appeal 1903-0134-AC

Counsel: D.M. Nowak, J.M. Lee, Q.C., for Respondent, Pricewaterhousecoopers Inc. in its capacity as receiver of 1905393 Alberta Ltd.

D.R. Peskett, C.M. Young, for Appellants

C.P. Russell, Q.C., R.T. Trainer, for Respondent, Servus Credit Union Ltd.

S.A. Wanke, for Respondent, Ducor Properties Ltd.

S.T. Fitzgerald, for Respondent, Northern Electric Ltd.

H.S. Kandola, for Respondent, Fancy Doors & Mouldings Ltd.

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

XVII Practice and procedure in courts

[XVII.4 Appeals](#)

[XVII.4.b Miscellaneous](#)

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Practice and procedure in courts — Appeals — Miscellaneous

Appellants appeal Approval and Vesting Order which approved sale proposed in Asset Purchase Agreement between Receiver, PWC, and respondent, D Ltd. — Appeal dismissed — Chambers judge was keenly alive to abbreviated marketing period and appraised values of hotels — Nevertheless, having regard to unique nature of property, incomplete construction of development hotel, difficulties with prospective purchasers in branding hotels in area outside of major centre and area which was in midst of economic downturn, she concluded that receiver acted in commercially reasonable manner and obtained best price possible in circumstances — Even with abbreviated period for submission of offers, chambers judge reasonably concluded that receiver undertook extensive marketing campaign, engaged commercial realtor and construction consultant, and consulted and dialogued with owner throughout process, which process appellants took no issue with, until offers were received.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered:

Bank of Montreal v. River Rentals Group Ltd. (2010), 2010 ABCA 16, 2010 CarswellAlta 57, 18 Alta. L.R. (5th) 201, 470 W.A.C. 333, 469 A.R. 333, 63 C.B.R. (5th) 26 (Alta. C.A.) — considered

Northstone Power Corp. v. R.J.K. Power Systems Ltd. (2002), 2002 ABCA 201, 2002 CarswellAlta 1111, 36 C.B.R. (4th) 272, 317 A.R. 192, 284 W.A.C. 192 (Alta. C.A.) — referred to

conducted site visits and answered inquiries posed by prospective buyers. Prospective purchasers provided feedback to Colliers but that included concerns about the quality of construction on the Development Hotel.

5 The Receiver also engaged the services of an independent construction consultant, Entuitive Corporation, to provide an estimate of the cost to complete construction on the Development Hotel and to assist in decision-making on whether to complete the Development Hotel. In addition, the Receiver contacted a major international hotel franchise brand to obtain input on prospective franchisees' views of the design and fixturing of the Development Hotel. The ability to brand the Hotels is a significant factor affecting their marketability. Moreover, some of the feedback confirmed that energy exploration and development in Grande Prairie is down, resulting in downward pressure on hotel-room demand.

6 Parties that requested further information in response to the listing were asked to execute a confidentiality agreement whereupon they were granted access to a "data-room" containing information on the Hotels and offering related documents and photos. Colliers provided confidential information regarding 190's assets to 27 interested parties.

7 The deadline for offer submission yielded only four offers, each of which was far below the appraised value of the Hotels. Three of the four offers were extremely close in respect of their stated price; the fourth offer was significantly lower than the others. As a result, the Receiver went back to the three prospective purchasers that had similar offers and asked them to re-submit better offers. None, however, varied their respective purchase prices in a meaningful manner when invited to do so. The Receiver ultimately accepted and obtained approval for Ducor's offer to purchase which, as the appellants correctly point out, is substantially less than the appraised value of the Hotels.

8 The primary thrust of the appellants' argument is that an abbreviated sale process resulted in an offer which is unreasonably low having regard to the appraisals. They argue that the Receiver was improvident in accepting such an offer and the chambers judge erred by approving it. Approving the sale, they argue, would eliminate the substantial equity in the property evidenced by the appraised value and that the "massive prejudice" caused to them as a result materially outweighs any further time and cost associated with requiring the Receiver to re-market the Hotels with a longer exposure time. Mr. Podollan joins in this argument as he is potentially liable for any shortfall under personal guarantees to Servus for all amounts owed to Servus by 190. The other respondents, Fancy Doors & Mouldings Ltd and Northern Electric Ltd, similarly echo the appellants' arguments as the shortfall may deprive them both from collecting on their builders' liens which, collectively, total approximately \$340,000.

9 The appellants obtained both a stay of the Approval and Vesting Order and leave to appeal pursuant to s 193 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985, c B-3: *1905393 Alberta Ltd v. Servus Credit Union Ltd*, [2019] A.J. No. 895, 2019 ABCA 269 (Alta. C.A.). The issues around which leave was granted generally coalesce around two questions. First, whether the chambers judge applied the correct test in deciding whether to approve of the Receiver recommended sale; and second, whether the chambers judge erred in her application of the legal test to the facts in deciding whether to approve the sale and, in particular, erred in her exercise of discretion by failing to consider or provide sufficient weight to a relevant factor. The standard of review is correctness on the first question and palpable and overriding error on the second: *Northstone Power Corp. v. R.J.K. Power Systems Ltd.*, 2002 ABCA 201 (Alta. C.A.) at para 4, (2002), 317 A.R. 192 (Alta. C.A.).

10 As regards the first question, the parties agree that Court approval requires the Receiver to satisfy the well-known test in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.*, [1991] O.J. No. 1137 (Ont. C.A.) at para 16, (1991), 46 O.A.C. 321 (Ont. C.A.) ("*Soundair*"). That test requires the Court to consider four factors: (i) whether the receiver has made a sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently; (ii) whether the interests of all parties have been considered, not just the interests of the creditors of the debtor; (iii) the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers are obtained; and (iv) whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process.

11 The appellants suggest that *Soundair* has been modified by our Court in *Bank of Montreal v. River Rentals Group Ltd.*, 2010 ABCA 16 (Alta. C.A.) at para 13, (2010), 469 A.R. 333 (Alta. C.A.), to require an additional four factors in assessing whether a receiver has complied with its duties: (a) whether the offer accepted is so low in relation to the appraised value as to be unrealistic; (b) whether the circumstances indicate that insufficient time was allowed for the making of bids; (c) whether inadequate notice of sale by bid was given; and (d) whether it can be said that the proposed sale is not in the best interests of

either the creditor or the owner. The appellants argue that, although the chambers judge considered the *Soundair* factors, she erred by failing to consider the additional *River Rentals* factors and, in so doing, in effect applied the "wrong law".

12 We disagree. The chambers judge expressly referred to the *River Rentals* case. *River Rentals*, it must be recalled, simply identified a subset of factors that a Court might also consider when considering the first prong of the *Soundair* test as to whether a receiver failed to get the best price and has not acted providently. Moreover, the type of factors that might be considered is by no means a closed category and there may be other relevant factors that might lead a court to refuse to approve a sale: *Salima Investments Ltd. v. Bank of Montreal* (1985), 65 A.R. 372 (Alta. C.A.) at paras 12-13. At its core, *River Rentals* highlights the need for a Court to balance several factors in determining whether a receiver complied with its duties and to confirm a sale. It did not purport to modify the *Soundair* test, establish a hierarchy of factors, nor limit the types of things that a Court might consider. The chambers judge applied the correct test. This ground of appeal is dismissed.

13 At its core, then, the appellants challenge how the chambers judge applied and weighed the relevant factors in this case. The appellants suggest that the failure to obtain a price at or close to the appraised value of the Hotels is an overriding factor that trumps all the others in assessing whether the Receiver acted improvidently. That is not the test. A reviewing Court's function is not to consider whether a Receiver has failed to get the best price. Rather, a Receiver's duty is to act in a commercially reasonable manner in the circumstances with a view to obtaining the best price having regard to the competing interests of the interested parties: *Skyepharm PLC v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp.* (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 87 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para 4, [1999] O.J. No. 4300 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), aff'd on appeal (2000), 15 C.B.R. (4th) 298 (Ont. C.A.).

14 Nor is it the Court's function to substitute its view of how a marketing process should proceed. The appellants suggest that if the Hotels were re-marketed with an exposure period closer to that which the appraisals were based on, then a better offer might be obtained. Again, that is not the test. The Receiver's decision to enter into an agreement for sale must be assessed under the circumstances then existing. The chambers judge was aware that the Receiver considered the risk of not accepting the approved offer to be significant. There was no assurance that a longer marketing period would generate a better offer and, in the interim, the Receiver was incurring significant carrying costs. To ignore these circumstances would improperly call into question a receiver's expertise and authority in the receivership process and thereby compromise the integrity of a sales process and would undermine the commercial certainty upon which court-supervised insolvency sales are based: *Soundair* at para 43. In such a case, chaos in the commercial world would result and "receivers and purchasers would never be sure they had a binding agreement": *Soundair* at para 22.

15 The fact that three of the four offers came in so close together in terms of amount, with the fourth one being even lower, is significant. Absent evidence of impropriety or collusion in the preparation of those confidential offers — of which there is absolutely none — the fact that those offers were all substantially lower than the appraised value speaks loudly to the existing hotel market in Grande Prairie. Moreover, the appellants have not brought any fresh evidence application to admit cogent evidence that a better offer might materialize if the Hotels were re-marketed. Indeed, the appellants have indicated that they do not rely on what the leave judge described as a "fairly continuous flow of material", the scent of which was to suggest that there were better offers waiting in the wings but were prevented from bidding because of the Receiver's abbreviated marketing process. Clearly the impression meant to be created by that late flow of material was an important factor in the leave judge's decision to grant a stay and leave to appeal: 2019 ABCA 269 (Alta. C.A.) at para 13.

16 Nor, as stated previously, have the appellants been able to re-finance the Hotels notwithstanding their assessment that there is still substantial equity in the Hotels based on the appraisals. At a certain point, however, it is the market that sets the value of property and appraisals simply become "relegated to not much more than well-meant but inaccurate predictions": *Romspen Mortgage Corp. v. Lantzville Foothills Estates Inc.*, 2013 BCSC 2222 (B.C. S.C.) at para 20.

17 The chambers judge was keenly alive to the abbreviated marketing period and the appraised values of the Hotels. Nevertheless, having regard to the unique nature of the property, the incomplete construction of the Development Hotel, the difficulties with prospective purchasers in branding the Hotels in an area outside of a major centre and an area which is in the midst of an economic downturn, she concluded that the Receiver acted in a commercially reasonable manner and obtained the best price possible in the circumstances. Even with an abbreviated period for submission of offers, the chambers

TAB 6

2015 QCCS 1920
Cour supérieure du Québec

Bloom Lake, g.p.l., Re

2015 CarswellQue 4072, 2015 QCCS 1920, 27 C.B.R. (6th) 1, J.E. 2015-830, EYB 2015-251727

**In the matter of the companies' creditors arrangement act, r.s.c. 1985, c. C-36, as amended:
Bloom lake General Partner Limited, Quinto Mining Corporation, 8568391 Canada
Limited and Cliffs Québec Iron mining ULC, Petitioners, and The bloom lake iron ore
mine limited partnership and Bloom lake railway company limited, Mises en cause, and
FTI Consulting Canada Inc., Monitor, and 9201955 Canada inc., Mise en cause, and
Eabametoong first nation, Ginoogaming first nation, Constance Lake first nation and Long
Lake # 58 first nation, Aroland first nation and Marten Falls first nation, Objectors, and
8901341 Canada inc. and Canadian Development And Marketing Corporation, Interveners**

Hamilton J.C.S.

Heard: 24 april 2015

Judgment: 27 april 2015

Docket: C.S. Qué. Montréal 500-11-048114-157

Counsel: Me Bernard Boucher, Me Sébastien Guy, Me Steven J. Weisz for Bloom Lake General Partner Limited, Quinto Mining Corporation, 8568391 Canada Limited, Cliffs Quebec Iron Mining ULC, The Bloom Lake Iron Ore Mine Limited Partnership, Bloom Lake Railway Company Limited

Me Sylvain Rigaud, Me Chrystal Ashby for FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Me Jean-Yves Simard, Me Sean Zweig for 9201955 Canada Inc.

Me Stéphane Hébert, Me Maurice Fleming for Eabametoong First Nation Ginoogaming First Nation, Constance Lake First Nation and Long Lake # 58 First Nation, Aroland First Nation, Marten Falls First Nation

Me Sandra Abitan, Me Éric Préfontaine, Me Julien Morissette for 8901341 Canada inc. Canadian Development and Marketing Corporation

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency; Public

Related Abridgment Classifications

Aboriginal and Indigenous law

[XII Miscellaneous](#)

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.3 Arrangements](#)

[XIX.3.c Miscellaneous](#)

Civil practice and procedure

[III Parties](#)

[III.4 Standing](#)

Headnote

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

Sellers, who were parent company and affiliates of petitioners, sought to sell interests in chromite mining projects in Ring of Fire mining district — Sellers executed initial Share Purchase Agreement (SPA) with N, which made provision for "superior proposal" mechanism allowing sellers to accept unsolicited, superior offer from third party — Petitioners commenced motion for issuance of approval and vesting order with respect to initial SPA — C made unsolicited, superior offer — Sellers developed supplemental bid process giving C and N chance to submit their best and final offers — Sellers ultimately accepted N's higher

bidding offer and entered into revised SPA with N — Petitioners amended their motion to seek issuance of approval and vesting order with respect to revised SPA — Ruling was made on petitioners' amended motion — Motion was granted — Sale process was fair, reasonable and efficient within s. 36(3)(a) of *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* — There was no legal requirement that sale process be approved in advance — Sellers had no obligation to accept C's unsolicited and superior offer and to terminate initial SPA — Initial SPA permitted sellers to terminate it, but did not require them to do so — Sellers' supplemental bid process was very reasonable and fair, and in best interests of creditors — N submitted its offer in compliance with rules, and there was no fundamental flaw in process such as parties having unequal access to information or one party seeking to amend its offer after it had knowledge of other offers.

Aboriginal and indigenous law --- Miscellaneous

Sellers, who were parent company and affiliates of petitioners, sought to sell interests in chromite mining projects in Ring of Fire mining district — Sellers executed initial Share Purchase Agreement (SPA) with N, which made provision for "superior proposal" mechanism allowing sellers to accept unsolicited, superior offer from third party — Petitioners commenced motion for issuance of approval and vesting order with respect to initial SPA — First Nations bands filed objection to motion — Following C's unsolicited superior offer and supplemental bidding process, sellers accepted N's highest bidding offer and entered into revised SPA with N — Petitioners amended their motion to seek issuance of approval and vesting order with respect to revised SPA, but First Nations bands maintained their objection — Ruling was made on petitioners' amended motion — Motion was granted — It was not clear to what extent First Nations bands had knowledge of sale process and could have participated — There was no evidence to suggest that bands on their own could have made serious offer, or that they would have partnered with party that was not already identified and included in process — It was pure speculation whether First Nations would have presented offer in excess of N's offer — Sale of shares from one private party to another did not trigger duty to consult First Nations — It was difficult to see how granting of two or three percent royalty impacted rights of First Nations bands.

Civil practice and procedure --- Parties — Standing

Parties had standing and their objections were not dismissed due to lack of interest or standing.

Faillite et insolvabilité --- Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies — Arrangements — Divers

Vendeurs, qui représentaient la société mère et les filiales des pétitionnaires, voulaient vendre leurs intérêts dans les projets miniers de chromite dans le district minier du Cercle de Feu — Vendeurs ont signé avec N une convention d'achat d'actions prévoyant un mécanisme de [TRADUCTION] « propositions supérieures » qui permettait aux vendeurs d'accepter des offres supérieures non-sollicitées — Pétitionnaires ont déposé une requête en vue d'obtenir une ordonnance d'approbation et d'acquisition portant sur la convention — C a fait une offre supérieure non-sollicitée — Vendeurs ont élaboré un processus de soumissions supplémentaire permettant à C et N de présenter leurs meilleures offres finales — Vendeurs ont accepté l'offre supérieure de N et ont signé une convention d'achat d'actions révisée avec N — Pétitionnaires ont déposé une requête modifiée en vue de l'émission d'une ordonnance d'approbation et d'acquisition portant sur la convention révisée — Décision a été rendue à la suite du dépôt de la requête modifiée par les pétitionnaires — Requête a été accordée — Processus de vente a été équitable, raisonnable et efficace au regard de l'art. 36(3)a) de la Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies — Il n'existait aucune obligation juridique de faire approuver la vente à l'avance — Vendeurs n'avaient pas l'obligation d'accepter l'offre supérieure non-sollicitée de C et de mettre fin à la convention initiale — Convention initiale autorisait les vendeurs à y mettre fin, mais ne l'exigeait pas — Processus de soumissions supplémentaire des vendeurs était très raisonnable et équitable, et dans le meilleur intérêt des créanciers — N a présenté son offre en conformité avec les règles, donc il n'y avait pas d'erreur fondamentale dans le processus qui aurait eu pour effet de rendre inégal l'accès des parties à l'information ou qui aurait fait en sorte qu'une partie modifie son offre après avoir eu connaissance d'autres offres.

Droit autochtone --- Divers

Vendeurs, qui représentaient la société mère et les filiales des pétitionnaires, voulaient vendre leurs intérêts dans les projets miniers de chromite dans le district minier du Cercle de Feu — Vendeurs ont signé avec N une convention d'achat d'actions prévoyant un mécanisme de [TRADUCTION] « propositions supérieures » qui permettait aux vendeurs d'accepter des offres supérieures non-sollicitées — Pétitionnaires ont déposé une requête en vue d'obtenir une ordonnance d'approbation et d'acquisition portant sur la convention — Bandes de Premières Nations ont soulevé une objection à l'encontre de la requête — Suite à l'offre supérieure et non-sollicitée de C et au processus de soumissions supplémentaire, vendeurs ont accepté l'offre supérieure de N et ont signé une convention d'achat d'actions révisée avec N — Vendeurs ont accepté l'offre supérieure de N et ont signé une convention d'achat d'actions révisée avec N — Pétitionnaires ont déposé une requête modifiée en vue de l'émission

d'une ordonnance d'approbation et d'acquisition portant sur la convention révisée, mais les bandes de Premières Nations ont maintenu leur objection — Décision a été rendue à la suite du dépôt de la requête modifiée par les pétitionnaires — Requête a été accordée — On ignorait ce que les bandes de Premières Nations savaient du processus de vente et dans quelle mesure elles auraient pu y participer — Il n'existait aucun élément de preuve laissant croire que les bandes auraient pu, d'elles-mêmes, faire une offre sérieuse ou qu'elles auraient pu s'entendre avec une partie au processus qui n'était pas déjà identifiée — Hypothèse selon laquelle les Premières Nations auraient pu présenter une offre supérieure à l'offre de N relevait de la pure spéculation — Vente d'actions d'une partie privée à une autre partie privée n'a pas déclenché l'obligation de consulter les Premières Nations — Il était difficile d'imaginer comment l'octroi de deux ou trois points de pourcentage en termes de redevances pouvait avoir un impact sur les droits des bandes de Premières Nations.

Procédure civile --- Parties — Intérêt pour agir

Objections des parties n'ont pas été rejetées en raison de leur manque d'intérêt ou d'intérêt pour agir.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Hamilton J.C.S.*:

- AbitibiBowater Inc., Re* (2009), 2009 QCCS 6460, 2009 CarswellQue 14189 (C.S. Que.) — followed
- AbitibiBowater Inc., Re* (2010), 2010 QCCS 1742, 2010 CarswellQue 4082, 71 C.B.R. (5th) 220 (C.S. Que.) — considered
- Anvil Range Mining Corp., Re* (1998), 1998 CarswellOnt 5319, 7 C.B.R. (4th) 51 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered
- Aveos Fleet Performance Inc./Aveos performance aéronautique inc., Re* (2012), 2012 QCCS 4074, 2012 CarswellQue 8620 (C.S. Que.) — considered
- BDC Venture Capital Inc. v. Natural Convergence Inc.* (2009), 2009 ONCA 665, 2009 CarswellOnt 5535, 57 C.B.R. (5th) 186 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to
- Boutiques San Francisco Inc., Re* (2004), 2004 CarswellQue 753, [2004] R.J.Q. 965, 5 C.B.R. (5th) 197 (C.S. Que.) — referred to
- Canadian Airlines Corp., Re* (2000), 2000 ABQB 442, 2000 CarswellAlta 662, [2000] 10 W.W.R. 269, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 1, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 41, 265 A.R. 201 (Alta. Q.B.) — considered
- Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re* (1998), 1998 CarswellOnt 3346, 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299, 72 O.T.C. 99 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered
- Carrier Sekani Tribal Council v. British Columbia (Utilities Commission)* (2010), 2010 SCC 43, 2010 CarswellBC 2867, 2010 CarswellBC 2868, 96 R.P.R. (4th) 1, [2010] 11 W.W.R. 577, 54 C.E.L.R. (3d) 1, 9 B.C.L.R. (5th) 205, (sub nom. *Rio Tinto Alcon Inc. v. Carrier Sekani Tribal Council*) [2010] 4 C.N.L.R. 250, 406 N.R. 333, 325 D.L.R. (4th) 1, 11 Admin. L.R. (5th) 246, 293 B.C.A.C. 175, 496 W.A.C. 175, (sub nom. *Rio Tinto Alcon Inc. v. Carrier Sekani Tribal Council*) [2010] 2 S.C.R. 650, (sub nom. *Rio Tinto Alcon Inc. v. Carrier Sekani Tribal Council*) 225 C.R.R. (2d) 75 (S.C.C.) — followed
- Consumers Packaging Inc., Re* (2001), 2001 CarswellOnt 3482, 27 C.B.R. (4th) 197, 150 O.A.C. 384, 12 C.P.C. (5th) 208, [2001] O.T.C. 459 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to
- Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg* (1986), 60 O.R. (2d) 87, 22 C.P.C. (2d) 131, 39 D.L.R. (4th) 526, 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 320 (note), 1986 CarswellOnt 235 (Ont. H.C.) — considered
- Haida Nation v. British Columbia (Minister of Forests)* (2004), 2004 SCC 73, 2004 CarswellBC 2656, 2004 CarswellBC 2657, 245 D.L.R. (4th) 33, 19 Admin. L.R. (4th) 195, 11 C.E.L.R. (3d) 1, [2005] 1 C.N.L.R. 72, 26 R.P.R. (4th) 1, [2005] 3 W.W.R. 419, [2004] 3 S.C.R. 511, 36 B.C.L.R. (4th) 282, 327 N.R. 53, 206 B.C.A.C. 52, 338 W.A.C. 52, 2004 CSC 73 (S.C.C.) — followed
- Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re* (2002), 2002 BCSC 597, 2002 CarswellBC 1021, 34 C.B.R. (4th) 298 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) — considered
- Skydome Corp., Re* (1998), 1998 CarswellOnt 5922, 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered
- Skyepharma PLC v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp.* (2000), 2000 CarswellOnt 466, 47 O.R. (3d) 234, 130 O.A.C. 273, 15 C.B.R. (4th) 298 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to
- Terrace Bay Pulp Inc., Re* (2012), 2012 ONSC 4247, 2012 CarswellOnt 9470, 92 C.B.R. (5th) 40 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered
- White Birch Paper Holding Co., Re* (2010), 2010 QCCS 4915, 2010 CarswellQue 10954, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 49 (C.S. Que.) — followed

- the interests of the parties; and
- whether any unfairness resulted from the working out process.

[38] These principles were enunciated in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* They are equally applicable in a CCAA sale situation.¹⁷

28 The Court must give due consideration to two further elements in assessing whether the sale should be approved under Section 36 CCAA:

1. the business judgment rule:

[70] That being so, it is not for this Court to second-guess the commercial and business judgment properly exercised by the Petitioners and the Monitor.

[71] A court will not lightly interfere with the exercise of this commercial and business judgment in the context of an asset sale where the marketing and sale process was fair, reasonable, transparent and efficient. This is certainly not a case where it should.¹⁸

2. the weight to be given to the recommendation of the Monitor:

The recommendation of the Monitor, a court-appointed officer experienced in the insolvency field, carries great weight with the Court in any approval process. Absent some compelling, exceptional factor to the contrary, a Court should accept an applicant's proposed sale process where it is recommended by the Monitor and supported by the stakeholders.¹⁹

29 Debtors often ask the Court to authorize the sale process in advance. This has the advantage of ensuring that the process is clear and of reducing the likelihood of a subsequent challenge. In the present matter, the Petitioners did seek the Court's authorization with respect to a sale process for their other assets, but they did not seek the Court's authorization with respect to the sale process for the Ring of Fire interests because that sale process was already well under way before the CCAA filing. There is no legal requirement that the sale process be approved in advance, but it creates the potential for the process being challenged after the fact, as in this case.

30 The Court will therefore review the sale process in light of these factors.

(1) *From October 2014 to the execution of the Noront letter of intent on February 13, 2015*

31 The sale process began in earnest in October 2014 when Cliffs engaged Moelis.

32 Moelis identified a group of eighteen potential buyers and strategic partners, with the assistance of CQIM and Cliffs. The group included traders, resource buyers, financial sector participants, local strategic partners, and market participants, as well as parties who had previously expressed an interest in the Ring of Fire.

33 Moelis began contacting the potential interested parties to solicit interest in purchasing the Ring of Fire project. It sent a form of non-disclosure agreement to fifteen parties. Fourteen executed the agreement and were given access to certain confidential information.

34 Negotiations ensued with seven of the interested parties, and six were given access to the data room that was established in November 2014.

35 By January 21, 2015, non-binding letters of intent were received from Noront and from a third party. There were also two verbal expressions of interest, but neither resulted in a letter of intent.

TAB 7

2019 SCC 5, 2019 CSC 5
Supreme Court of Canada

Orphan Well Association v. Grant Thornton Ltd.

2019 CarswellAlta 141, 2019 CarswellAlta 142, 2019 SCC 5, 2019 CSC 5, [2019] 1 S.C.R. 150, [2019] 1 R.C.S. 150, [2019] 3 W.W.R. 1, [2019] A.W.L.D. 879, [2019] A.W.L.D. 880, [2019] A.W.L.D. 881, [2019] A.W.L.D. 941, [2019] A.W.L.D. 942, [2019] S.C.J. No. 5, 22 C.E.L.R. (4th) 121, 301 A.C.W.S. (3d) 183, 430 D.L.R. (4th) 1, 66 C.B.R. (6th) 1, 81 Alta. L.R. (6th) 1, 9 P.P.S.A.C. (4th) 293

Orphan Well Association and Alberta Energy Regulator (Appellants) and Grant Thornton Limited and ATB Financial (formerly known as Alberta Treasury Branches) (Respondents) and Attorney General of Ontario, Attorney General of British Columbia, Attorney General of Saskatchewan, Attorney General of Alberta, Ecojustice Canada Society, Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, Greenpeace Canada, Action Surface Rights Association, Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals and Canadian Bankers' Association (Interveners)

Wagner C.J.C., Abella, Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Gascon, Côté, Brown JJ.

Heard: February 15, 2018

Judgment: January 31, 2019

Docket: 37627

Proceedings: reversing *Orphan Well Assn. v. Grant Thornton Ltd.* (2017), 8 C.E.L.R. (4th) 1, [2017] 6 W.W.R. 301, 50 Alta. L.R. (6th) 1, 47 C.B.R. (6th) 171, 2017 CarswellAlta 695, 2017 ABCA 124, Frans Slatter J.A., Frederica Schutz J.A., Sheilah Martin J.A. (Alta. C.A.); affirming *Grant Thornton Ltd. v. Alberta Energy Regulator* (2016), 33 Alta. L.R. (6th) 221, 37 C.B.R. (6th) 88, [2016] 11 W.W.R. 716, 2016 CarswellAlta 994, 2016 ABQB 278, Neil Wittmann C.J.Q.B. (Alta. Q.B.)

Counsel: Ken Lenz, Q.C., Patricia Johnston, Q.C., Keely R. Cameron, Brad Gilmour, Michael W. Selnes, for Appellants
Kelly J. Bourassa, Jeffrey Oliver, Tom Cumming, Ryan Zahara, Danielle Maréchal, Brendan MacArthur-Stevens, Chris Nyberg, for Respondents

Josh Hunter, Hayley Pitcher, for Intervener the Attorney General of Ontario

Gareth Morley, Aaron Welch, Barbara Thomson, for Intervener, Attorney General of British Columbia

Richard James Fyfe, for Intervener, Attorney General of Saskatchewan

Robert Normey, Vivienne Ball, for Intervener, Attorney General of Alberta

Adrian Scotchmer, for Intervener, Ecojustice Canada Society

Lewis Manning, Toby Kruger, for Intervener, Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers

Nader R. Hasan, Lindsay Board, for Intervener, Greenpeace Canada

Christine Laing, Shaun Fluker, for Intervener, Action Surface Rights Association

Caireen E. Hanert, Adam Maerov, for Intervener, Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals

Howard A. Gorman, Q.C., D. Aaron Stephenson, for Intervener, Canadian Bankers' Association

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Environmental; Estates and Trusts; Insolvency; Natural Resources

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

X Priorities of claims

X.7 Unsecured claims

Bankruptcy and insolvency

XIV Administration of estate

XIV.2 Trustees

XIV.2.e Miscellaneous

Bankruptcy and insolvency

XIV Administration of estate

XIV.3 Trustee's possession of assets

Natural resources

III Oil and gas

III.3 Constitutional issues

III.3.c Miscellaneous

Natural resources

III Oil and gas

III.8 Statutory regulation

III.8.a General principles

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Priorities of claims — Unsecured claims — Priority with respect to secured creditors

Provincial legislation imposed environmental obligations with respect to abandonment and remediation of "end of life" oil wells — Trustee-in-bankruptcy G Ltd. sought to disclaim R Corp.'s interest in wells where costs of remediation exceeded wells' value (disclaimed wells), but sought to keep and sell valuable wells to maximize recovery of secured creditor — Orphan Wells Association (OWA) and Regulator applied for declaration that G Ltd.'s disclaimer of licensed wells was void and G Ltd. cross-applied for approval of sales process that excluded renounced wells — Chambers judge dismissed main application and granted cross-application — Appeals by OWA and Regulator were dismissed — [Section 14.06 of Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act \(BIA\)](#) did not exempt environmental claims from general bankruptcy regime, other than super priority in [s. 14.06\(7\)](#) — Role of G Ltd. as "licensee" under Oil and Gas Conservation Act and Pipeline Act was in operational conflict with provisions of [BIA](#) — OWA and Regulator appealed — Appeal allowed — There was no conflict between Alberta's regulatory regime and [BIA](#) requiring portions of former to be rendered inoperative in context of bankruptcy — "Disclaimer" did not empower trustee to simply walk away from "disclaimed" assets when bankrupt estate had been ordered to remedy any environmental condition or damage — No operational conflict was caused by fact that G Ltd., as licensee, remained responsible for abandoning renounced assets — End-of-life obligations binding on G Ltd. were not claims provable in R Corp. bankruptcy, so they did not conflict with general priority scheme in [BIA Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, s 14.06](#).

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Administration of estate — Trustees — Miscellaneous

Provincial legislation imposed environmental obligations with respect to abandonment and remediation of "end of life" oil wells — Trustee-in-bankruptcy G Ltd. sought to disclaim R Corp.'s interest in wells where costs of remediation exceeded wells' value (disclaimed wells), but sought to keep and sell valuable wells to maximize recovery of secured creditor — Orphan Wells Association (OWA) and Regulator applied for declaration that G Ltd.'s disclaimer of licensed wells was void and G Ltd. cross-applied for approval of sales process that excluded renounced wells — Chambers judge dismissed main application and granted cross-application — Appeals by OWA and Regulator were dismissed — [Section 14.06 of Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act \(BIA\)](#) did not exempt environmental claims from general bankruptcy regime, other than super priority in [s. 14.06\(7\)](#) — Role of G Ltd. as "licensee" under Oil and Gas Conservation Act and Pipeline Act was in operational conflict with provisions of [BIA](#) — OWA and Regulator appealed — Appeal allowed — There was no conflict between Alberta's regulatory regime and [BIA](#) requiring portions of former to be rendered inoperative in context of bankruptcy — No operational conflict was caused by fact that G Ltd., as licensee, remained responsible for abandoning renounced assets — Bankruptcy is not licence to ignore rules, and insolvency professionals are bound by and must comply with valid provincial laws during bankruptcy.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Administration of estate — Trustee's possession of assets — Miscellaneous

Provincial legislation imposed environmental obligations with respect to abandonment and remediation of "end of life" oil wells — Trustee-in-bankruptcy G Ltd. sought to disclaim R Corp.'s interest in wells where costs of remediation exceeded wells' value (disclaimed wells), but sought to keep and sell valuable wells to maximize recovery of secured creditor — Orphan Wells Association (OWA) and Regulator applied for declaration that G Ltd.'s disclaimer of licensed wells was void and G Ltd. cross-applied for approval of sales process that excluded renounced wells — Chambers judge dismissed main application and granted cross-application — Appeals by OWA and Regulator were dismissed — [Section 14.06 of Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act \(BIA\)](#)

did not exempt environmental claims from general bankruptcy regime, other than super priority in s. 14.06(7) — Role of G Ltd. as "licensee" under Oil and Gas Conservation Act and Pipeline Act was in operational conflict with provisions of BIA — OWA and Regulator appealed — Appeal allowed — There was no conflict between Alberta's regulatory regime and BIA requiring portions of former to be rendered inoperative in context of bankruptcy — No operational conflict was caused by fact that G Ltd., as licensee, remained responsible for abandoning renounced assets — Bankruptcy is not licence to ignore rules, and insolvency professionals are bound by and must comply with valid provincial laws during bankruptcy — End-of-life obligations binding on G Ltd. were not claims provable in R Corp. bankruptcy, so they did not conflict with general priority scheme in BIA.

Natural resources --- Oil and gas — Constitutional issues — Miscellaneous

Provincial legislation imposed environmental obligations with respect to abandonment and remediation of "end of life" oil wells — Trustee-in-bankruptcy G Ltd. sought to disclaim R Corp.'s interest in wells where costs of remediation exceeded wells' value (disclaimed wells), but sought to keep and sell valuable wells to maximize recovery of secured creditor — Orphan Wells Association (OWA) and Regulator applied for declaration that G Ltd.'s disclaimer of licensed wells was void and G Ltd. cross-applied for approval of sales process that excluded renounced wells — Chambers judge dismissed main application and granted cross-application — Appeals by OWA and Regulator were dismissed — Section 14.06 of Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA) did not exempt environmental claims from general bankruptcy regime, other than super priority in s. 14.06(7) — Role of G Ltd. as "licensee" under Oil and Gas Conservation Act (OGCA) and Pipeline Act (PA) was in operational conflict with provisions of BIA — OWA and Regulator appealed — Appeal allowed — There was no conflict between Alberta's regulatory regime and BIA requiring portions of former to be rendered inoperative in context of bankruptcy by inclusion of trustees in definition of "licensee" in OGCA and PA — Under either branch of paramountcy analysis, Alberta legislation authorizing Regulator's use of its disputed powers would be inoperative to extent that use of those powers during bankruptcy altered or reordered priorities established by BIA — In test set out in 2012 Supreme Court case, court clearly stated that not all environmental obligations enforced by regulator would be claims provable in bankruptcy — On proper understanding of "creditor" step, it was clear that Regulator acted in public interest and for public good and that it was not creditor of R Corp.

Natural resources --- Oil and gas — Statutory regulation — General principles

Provincial legislation imposed environmental obligations with respect to abandonment and remediation of "end of life" oil wells — Trustee-in-bankruptcy G Ltd. sought to disclaim R Corp.'s interest in wells where costs of remediation exceeded wells' value (disclaimed wells), but sought to keep and sell valuable wells to maximize recovery of secured creditor — Orphan Wells Association (OWA) and Regulator applied for declaration that G Ltd.'s disclaimer of licensed wells was void and G Ltd. cross-applied for approval of sales process that excluded renounced wells — Chambers judge dismissed main application and granted cross-application — Appeals by OWA and Regulator were dismissed — Section 14.06 of Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA) did not exempt environmental claims from general bankruptcy regime, other than super priority in s. 14.06(7) — Role of G Ltd. as "licensee" under Oil and Gas Conservation Act (OGCA) and Pipeline Act (PA) was in operational conflict with provisions of BIA — OWA and Regulator appealed — Appeal allowed — There was no conflict between Alberta's regulatory regime and BIA requiring portions of former to be rendered inoperative in context of bankruptcy by inclusion of trustees in definition of "licensee" in OGCA and PA — In test set out in 2012 Supreme Court case, court clearly stated that not all environmental obligations enforced by regulator would be claims provable in bankruptcy — On proper understanding of "creditor" step, it was clear that Regulator acted in public interest and for public good and that it was not creditor of R Corp.

Faillite et insolvabilité --- Priorité des créances — Réclamations non garanties — Priorité par rapport aux créanciers garantis
Législation provinciale imposait des obligations de fin de vie en matière environnementale relativement à l'abandon et la remise en état de puits de pétrole — Syndic de faillite G Ltd. a voulu renoncer aux intérêts de R Corp. dans des puits lorsque les coûts de remise en état outrepassaient la valeur des puits (les puits ayant fait l'objet d'une renonciation), mais a cherché à conserver et à vendre des puits ayant une valeur afin de maximiser le recouvrement d'un créancier garanti — Association de puits orphelins et un organisme de réglementation ont déposé une requête visant à faire déclarer que la renonciation de G Ltd. à l'égard de puits autorisés était nulle et G Ltd. a déposé une demande reconventionnelle en vue de faire approuver le processus de vente qui excluait les puits ayant fait l'objet d'une renonciation — Juge siégeant en son cabinet a rejeté la requête principale et a accueilli la demande reconventionnelle — Appels interjetés par l'association et l'organisme de réglementation ont été rejetés — Article 14.06 de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité (LFI) n'a pas soustrait les réclamations environnementales au régime général de faillite, à l'exception de la superpriorité prévue à l'art. 14.06(7) — Rôle de G Ltd. en tant que « titulaire de permis » en vertu de l'Oil and Gas Conservation Act et de la Pipeline Act engendrait un conflit d'application avec les dispositions de la LFI —

Association et l'organisme de réglementation ont formé un pourvoi — Pourvoi accueilli — Il n'y a aucun conflit entre le régime de réglementation de l'Alberta et la LFI en raison duquel des parties du premier doivent être inopérantes dans le contexte de la faillite — « Renonciation » n'habilitait pas le syndic à tout simplement délaissier les biens « faisant l'objet de la renonciation » quand on l'enjoignait à réparer un fait ou dommage lié à l'environnement — Aucun conflit d'application n'était imputable au fait que G Ltd. demeurait, en qualité de titulaire de permis, tenu d'abandonner les biens faisant l'objet de la renonciation — Obligations de fin de vie incombant à G Ltd. n'étaient pas des réclamations prouvables dans la faillite de R Corp. et n'entraient donc pas en conflit avec le régime de priorité général instauré dans la LFI.

Faillite et insolvabilité --- Administration de l'actif — Syndics — Divers

Législation provinciale imposait des obligations de fin de vie en matière environnementale relativement à l'abandon et la remise en état de puits de pétrole — Syndic de faillite G Ltd. a voulu renoncer aux intérêts de R Corp. dans des puits lorsque les coûts de remise en état outrepassaient la valeur des puits (les puits ayant fait l'objet d'une renonciation), mais a cherché à conserver et à vendre des puits ayant une valeur afin de maximiser le recouvrement d'un créancier garanti — Association de puits orphelins et un organisme de réglementation ont déposé une requête visant à faire déclarer que la renonciation de G Ltd. à l'égard de puits autorisés était nulle et G Ltd. a déposé une demande reconventionnelle en vue de faire approuver le processus de vente qui excluait les puits ayant fait l'objet d'une renonciation — Juge siégeant en son cabinet a rejeté la requête principale et a accueilli la demande reconventionnelle — Appels interjetés par l'association et l'organisme de réglementation ont été rejetés — Article 14.06 de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité (LFI) n'a pas soustrait les réclamations environnementales au régime général de faillite, à l'exception de la superpriorité prévue à l'art. 14.06(7) — Rôle de G Ltd. en tant que « titulaire de permis » en vertu de l'Oil and Gas Conservation Act et de la Pipeline Act engendrait un conflit d'application avec les dispositions de la LFI — Association et l'organisme de réglementation ont formé un pourvoi — Pourvoi accueilli — Il n'y a aucun conflit entre le régime de réglementation de l'Alberta et la LFI en raison duquel des parties du premier doivent être inopérantes dans le contexte de la faillite — « Renonciation » n'habilitait pas le syndic à tout simplement délaissier les biens « faisant l'objet de la renonciation » quand on l'enjoignait à réparer un fait ou dommage lié à l'environnement — Aucun conflit d'application n'était imputable au fait que G Ltd. demeurait, en qualité de titulaire de permis, tenu d'abandonner les biens faisant l'objet de la renonciation — Faillite n'est pas un permis de faire abstraction des règles, et les professionnels de l'insolvabilité sont liés par les lois provinciales valides au cours de la faillite.

Faillite et insolvabilité --- Administration de l'actif — Possession de l'actif par le syndic — Divers

Législation provinciale imposait des obligations de fin de vie en matière environnementale relativement à l'abandon et la remise en état de puits de pétrole — Syndic de faillite G Ltd. a voulu renoncer aux intérêts de R Corp. dans des puits lorsque les coûts de remise en état outrepassaient la valeur des puits (les puits ayant fait l'objet d'une renonciation), mais a cherché à conserver et à vendre des puits ayant une valeur afin de maximiser le recouvrement d'un créancier garanti — Association de puits orphelins et un organisme de réglementation ont déposé une requête visant à faire déclarer que la renonciation de G Ltd. à l'égard de puits autorisés était nulle et G Ltd. a déposé une demande reconventionnelle en vue de faire approuver le processus de vente qui excluait les puits ayant fait l'objet d'une renonciation — Juge siégeant en son cabinet a rejeté la requête principale et a accueilli la demande reconventionnelle — Appels interjetés par l'association et l'organisme de réglementation ont été rejetés — Article 14.06 de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité (LFI) n'a pas soustrait les réclamations environnementales au régime général de faillite, à l'exception de la superpriorité prévue à l'art. 14.06(7) — Rôle de G Ltd. en tant que « titulaire de permis » en vertu de l'Oil and Gas Conservation Act et de la Pipeline Act engendrait un conflit d'application avec les dispositions de la LFI — Association et l'organisme de réglementation ont formé un pourvoi — Pourvoi accueilli — Il n'y a aucun conflit entre le régime de réglementation de l'Alberta et la LFI en raison duquel des parties du premier doivent être inopérantes dans le contexte de la faillite — Aucun conflit d'application n'était imputable au fait que G Ltd. demeurait, en qualité de titulaire de permis, tenu d'abandonner les biens faisant l'objet de la renonciation — Faillite n'est pas un permis de faire abstraction des règles, et les professionnels de l'insolvabilité sont liés par les lois provinciales valides au cours de la faillite — Obligations de fin de vie incombant à G Ltd. n'étaient pas des réclamations prouvables dans la faillite de R Corp. et n'entraient donc pas en conflit avec le régime de priorité général instauré dans la LFI.

Ressources naturelles --- Pétrole et gaz — Questions d'ordre constitutionnel — Divers

Législation provinciale imposait des obligations de fin de vie en matière environnementale relativement à l'abandon et la remise en état de puits de pétrole — Syndic de faillite G Ltd. a voulu renoncer aux intérêts de R Corp. dans des puits lorsque les coûts de remise en état outrepassaient la valeur des puits (les puits ayant fait l'objet d'une renonciation), mais a cherché à conserver et

à vendre des puits ayant une valeur afin de maximiser le recouvrement d'un créancier garanti — Association de puits orphelins et un organisme de réglementation ont déposé une requête visant à faire déclarer que la renonciation de G Ltd. à l'égard de puits autorisés était nulle et G Ltd. a déposé une demande reconventionnelle en vue de faire approuver le processus de vente qui excluait les puits ayant fait l'objet d'une renonciation — Juge siégeant en son cabinet a rejeté la requête principale et a accueilli la demande reconventionnelle — Appels interjetés par l'association et l'organisme de réglementation ont été rejetés — Article 14.06 de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité (LFI) n'a pas soustrait les réclamations environnementales au régime général de faillite, à l'exception de la superpriorité prévue à l'art. 14.06(7) — Rôle de G Ltd. en tant que « titulaire de permis » en vertu de l'Oil and Gas Conservation Act (OGCA) et de la Pipeline Act (PA) engendrait un conflit d'application avec les dispositions de la LFI — Association et l'organisme de réglementation ont formé un pourvoi — Pourvoi accueilli — Il n'y a aucun conflit entre le régime de réglementation de l'Alberta et la LFI en raison duquel des parties du premier doivent être inopérantes dans le contexte de la faillite par l'ajout des syndic à la définition légale de « titulaire de permis » dans l'OGCA et la PA — Dans l'un ou l'autre volet de l'analyse relative à la prépondérance, la loi albertaine autorisant l'organisme de réglementation à exercer ses pouvoirs contestés sera inopérante, dans la mesure où l'exercice de ces pouvoirs pendant la faillite modifie ou réarrange les priorités établies par la LFI — Dans une décision de la Cour suprême rendue en 2012 dans laquelle elle a établi le test applicable, la Cour a clairement déclaré que les obligations environnementales appliquées par un organisme de réglementation ne sont pas toutes des réclamations prouvables en matière de faillite — D'après le sens qu'il convient de donner à l'étape « créancier », il était clair que l'organisme de réglementation a agi dans l'intérêt public et pour le bien public et qu'il n'était pas un créancier de R Corp.

Ressources naturelles --- Pétrole et gaz — Réglementation statutaire — Principes généraux

Législation provinciale imposait des obligations de fin de vie en matière environnementale relativement à l'abandon et la remise en état de puits de pétrole — Syndic de faillite G Ltd. a voulu renoncer aux intérêts de R Corp. dans des puits lorsque les coûts de remise en état outrepassaient la valeur des puits (les puits ayant fait l'objet d'une renonciation), mais a cherché à conserver et à vendre des puits ayant une valeur afin de maximiser le recouvrement d'un créancier garanti — Association de puits orphelins et un organisme de réglementation ont déposé une requête visant à faire déclarer que la renonciation de G Ltd. à l'égard de puits autorisés était nulle et G Ltd. a déposé une demande reconventionnelle en vue de faire approuver le processus de vente qui excluait les puits ayant fait l'objet d'une renonciation — Juge siégeant en son cabinet a rejeté la requête principale et a accueilli la demande reconventionnelle — Appels interjetés par l'association et l'organisme de réglementation ont été rejetés — Article 14.06 de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité (LFI) n'a pas soustrait les réclamations environnementales au régime général de faillite, à l'exception de la superpriorité prévue à l'art. 14.06(7) — Rôle de G Ltd. en tant que « titulaire de permis » en vertu de l'Oil and Gas Conservation Act (OGCA) et de la Pipeline Act (PA) engendrait un conflit d'application avec les dispositions de la LFI — Association et l'organisme de réglementation ont formé un pourvoi — Pourvoi accueilli — Il n'y a aucun conflit entre le régime de réglementation de l'Alberta et la LFI en raison duquel des parties du premier doivent être inopérantes dans le contexte de la faillite par l'ajout des syndic à la définition légale de « titulaire de permis » dans l'OGCA et la PA — Dans une décision de la Cour suprême rendue en 2012 dans laquelle elle a établi le test applicable, la Cour a clairement déclaré que les obligations environnementales appliquées par un organisme de réglementation ne sont pas toutes des réclamations prouvables en matière de faillite — D'après le sens qu'il convient de donner à l'étape « créancier », il était clair que l'organisme de réglementation a agi dans l'intérêt public et pour le bien public et qu'il n'était pas un créancier de R Corp.

In order to exploit oil and gas resources in Alberta, a company needs a property interest in the oil or gas, surface rights and a licence issued by the Alberta Energy Regulator. The Regulator administers the licensing scheme and enforces the abandonment and reclamation obligations of the licensees. The Regulator has delegated to the Orphan Wells Association (OWA) the authority to abandon and reclaim "orphans". On application by a creditor, G Ltd. was appointed receiver for R Corp. G Ltd. informed the Regulator that it was taking possession and control only of R Corp.'s 17 most productive wells, three associated facilities and 12 associated pipelines, and that it was not taking possession or control of any of R Corp.'s other licensed assets. The Regulator issued an order under the Oil and Gas Conservation Act (OGCA) and the Pipeline Act (PA) requiring R Corp. to suspend and abandon the renounced assets. The Regulator and the OWA filed an application for a declaration that G Ltd.'s renunciation of the renounced assets was void, an order requiring G Ltd. to comply with the abandonment orders and an order requiring G Ltd. to fulfill the statutory obligations as licensee in relation to the abandonment, reclamation and remediation of all of R Corp.'s licensed properties. G Ltd. brought a cross-application seeking approval to pursue a sales process excluding the renounced assets. A bankruptcy order was issued for R Corp. and G Ltd. was appointed as trustee. G Ltd. sent another letter to the Regulator invoking s. 14.06(4)(a)(ii) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA) in relation to the renounced assets.

The chambers judge found an operational conflict between s. 14.06 of the BIA and the definition of "licensee" in the OGCA and the PA, and approved the proposed sale procedure. Appeals by the Regulator and the OWA were dismissed. The majority of the court stated that the constitutional issues in the appeals were complementary to the primary issue, which was the interpretation of the BIA. Section 14.06 of the BIA did not exempt environmental claims from the general bankruptcy regime, other than the super priority in s. 14.06(7). Section 14.06(4) of the BIA did not limit the power of the trustee to renounce properties to those circumstances where it might be exposed to personal liability. In terms of constitutional analysis, the majority concluded that the role of G Ltd. as a "licensee" under the OGCA and the PA was in operational conflict with the provisions of the BIA that exempted trustees from personal liability, allowed them to disclaim assets and established the priority of environmental claims. The dissenting judge would have allowed the appeal on the basis that there was no conflict between Alberta's environmental legislation and the BIA. The dissenting judge was of the view that s. 14.06 of the BIA did not operate to relieve G Ltd. of R Corp.'s obligations with respect to its licensed assets and that the Regulator was not asserting any provable claims, so the priority scheme in the BIA was not upended. The Regulator and the OWA appealed.

Held: The appeal was allowed.

Per Wagner C.J.C. (Abella, Karakatsanis, Gascon, Brown JJ. concurring): There is no conflict between Alberta's regulatory regime and the BIA requiring portions of the former to be rendered inoperative in the context of bankruptcy. Although G Ltd. remained fully protected from personal liability by federal law, it could not walk away from the environmental liabilities of the bankrupt estate by invoking s. 14.06(4) of the BIA. Section 14.06(4) of the BIA was clear and unambiguous when read on its own. There was no basis on which to read the words "the trustee is not personally liable" in s. 14.06(4) of the BIA as encompassing the liability of the bankrupt estate. "Disclaimer" did not empower a trustee to simply walk away from the "disclaimed" assets when the bankrupt estate had been ordered to remedy any environmental condition or damage. The operational conflicts between the BIA and the Alberta legislation alleged by G Ltd. arose from its status as a "licensee" under the OGCA and the PA. In light of the proper interpretation of s. 14.06(4) of the BIA, no operational conflict was caused by the fact that, under Alberta law, G Ltd. as "licensee" remained responsible for abandoning the renounced assets utilizing the remaining assets of the estate. The burden was on G Ltd. to establish the specific purposes of ss. 14.06(2) and 14.06(4) of the BIA if it wished to demonstrate a conflict. Based on the plain wording of the sections and the Hansard evidence, it was evident that the purpose of these provisions was to protect trustees from personal liability in respect of environmental matters affecting the estates they were administering. This purpose was not frustrated by the inclusion of trustees in the definition of "licensee" in the OGCA and the PA.

Under either branch of the paramountcy analysis, the Alberta legislation authorizing the Regulator's use of its disputed powers would be inoperative to the extent that the use of those powers during bankruptcy altered or reordered the priorities established by the BIA. Only claims provable in bankruptcy must be asserted within the single proceeding. Other claims are not stayed upon bankruptcy and continue to be binding on the estate. In the test set out in a 2012 Supreme Court case, the court clearly stated that not all environmental obligations enforced by a regulator would be claims provable in bankruptcy. On a proper understanding of the "creditor" step, it was clear that the Regulator acted in the public interest and for the public good and that it was not a creditor of R Corp. No fairness concerns were raised by disregarding the Regulator's concession. The end-of-life obligations binding on G Ltd. were not claims provable in the R Corp. bankruptcy, so they did not conflict with the general priority scheme in the BIA. Requiring R Corp. to pay for abandonment before distributing value to creditors did not disrupt the priority scheme of the BIA. In crafting the priority scheme set out in the BIA, Parliament intended to permit regulators to place a first charge on real property of a bankrupt affected by an environmental condition or damage in order to fund remediation. Bankruptcy is not a licence to ignore rules, and insolvency professionals are bound by and must comply with valid provincial laws during bankruptcy.

Per Côté J. (dissenting) (Moldaver J. concurring): The appeal should be dismissed. Two aspects of Alberta's regulatory regime conflict with the BIA. First, Alberta's statutes regulating the oil and gas industry define the term "licensee" as including receivers and trustees in bankruptcy. The effect of this definition was that insolvency professionals were subject to the same obligations and liabilities as R Corp. itself, including the obligation to comply with the abandonment orders and the risk of personal liability for failing to do so. G Ltd. validly disclaimed the non-producing assets and the result was that it was no longer subject to the environmental liabilities associated with those assets. Because Alberta's statutory regime did not recognize these disclaimers as lawful, there was an unavoidable operational conflict between federal and provincial law. Alberta's legislation governing the oil and gas sector should be held inoperative to the extent that it did not recognize the legal effect of G Ltd.'s disclaimers. Section 14.06 of the BIA, when read as a whole, indicated that s. 14.06(4) did more than merely protect trustees from personal

liability. Parliament did not make the disclaimer power in s. 14.06(4) of the BIA conditional on the availability of the Crown's super priority. There was an operational conflict to the extent that Alberta's statutory regime held receivers and trustees liable as "licensees" in relation to disclaimed assets.

Second, the Regulator has required that G Ltd. satisfy R Corp.'s environmental liabilities ahead of the estate's other debts, which contravened the BIA's priority scheme. Because the abandonment orders were "claims provable in bankruptcy" under the three-part test outlined in the 2012 Supreme Court of Canada case, the Regulator could not assert those claims outside of the bankruptcy process. To do so would frustrate an essential purpose of the BIA of distributing the estate's value in accordance with the statutory priority scheme. Nor could the Regulator achieve the same result indirectly by imposing conditions on the sale of R Corp.'s valuable assets. The province's licensing scheme effectively operated as a debt collection mechanism in relation to a bankrupt company. It should be held inoperative as applied to R Corp. under the second prong of the paramountcy test, frustration of purpose. G Ltd. and the creditor had satisfied their burden of demonstrating a genuine inconsistency between federal and provincial law under both branches of the paramountcy test. The Court should continue to apply the "creditor" prong of the test as it was clearly articulated in the 2012 Supreme Court of Canada decision. Under that standard, the Regulator plainly acted as a creditor with respect to the R Corp. estate. It was sufficiently certain that either the Regulator or the OWA would ultimately perform the abandonment and reclamation work and assert a monetary claim for reimbursement.

Pour exploiter des ressources pétrolières et gazières en Alberta, une société a besoin d'un intérêt de propriété sur le pétrole ou le gaz, des droits de surface et d'un permis délivré par un organisme de réglementation, l'Alberta Energy Regulator. Cet organisme administre le régime de délivrance de permis et s'assure du respect des engagements d'abandon et de remise en état des titulaires de permis. L'organisme a délégué une association de puits orphelins, l'Orphan Wells Association, le pouvoir d'abandonner et de remettre en état les « orphelins ». À la demande d'un créancier, G Ltd. a été nommé séquestre de R Corp. G Ltd. a informé l'organisme de réglementation qu'il prenait possession et contrôle seulement des 17 puits les plus productifs de R Corp., ainsi que de trois installations et de 12 pipelines connexes, et qu'il ne prenait pas possession ou contrôle de tous les autres éléments d'actif de R Corp. visés par des permis. L'organisme de réglementation a rendu une ordonnance en vertu de l'Oil and Gas Conservation Act (OGCA) et de la Pipeline Act (PA) enjoignant à R Corp. de suspendre l'exploitation des biens faisant l'objet de la renonciation et de les abandonner. L'organisme de réglementation et l'association ont déposé une demande en vue d'obtenir un jugement déclaratoire portant que l'abandon par G Ltd. des biens faisant l'objet de la renonciation était nul, une ordonnance obligeant G Ltd. à se conformer aux ordonnances d'abandon, de même qu'une ordonnance enjoignant à G Ltd. de remplir les obligations légales en tant que titulaire de permis concernant l'abandon, la remise en état et la décontamination de tous les biens de R Corp. visés par des permis. G Ltd. a présenté une demande reconventionnelle visant à obtenir l'autorisation de poursuivre un processus de vente excluant les biens faisant l'objet de la renonciation. Une ordonnance de faillite a été rendue à l'égard de R Corp., et G Ltd. a été nommé syndic. G Ltd. a envoyé une autre lettre à l'organisme de réglementation dans laquelle il invoquait l'art. 14.06(4a)(ii) de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité (LFI) à l'égard des biens faisant l'objet de la renonciation.

Le juge siégeant en son cabinet a conclu à un conflit d'application entre l'art. 14.06 de la LFI et la définition de « titulaire de permis » que l'on trouve dans l'OGCA et la PA et a approuvé la procédure de vente proposée. Les appels interjetés par l'organisme de réglementation et l'association ont été rejetés. Les juges majoritaires de la cour ont déclaré que les questions constitutionnelles soulevées dans les appels étaient complémentaires à la question principale, soit l'interprétation de la LFI. L'article 14.06 de la LFI n'a pas soustrait les réclamations environnementales au régime général de faillite, à l'exception de la superpriorité prévue à l'art. 14.06(7). L'article 14.06(4) de la LFI n'a pas limité le pouvoir du syndic de renoncer aux biens dans des circonstances où il pourrait s'exposer à une responsabilité personnelle. Sur le plan de l'analyse constitutionnelle, les juges majoritaires ont conclu que le rôle de G Ltd. en tant que « titulaire de permis » au sens de l'OGCA et de la PA était en conflit d'application avec les dispositions de la LFI qui dégageaient les syndics de toute responsabilité personnelle, qui leur permettaient de renoncer à des biens et qui établissaient la priorité des réclamations environnementales. La juge dissidente aurait accueilli l'appel au motif qu'il n'y avait aucun conflit entre la législation albertaine sur l'environnement et la LFI. La juge dissidente était d'avis que l'art. 14.06 de la LFI n'a pas eu pour effet de libérer G Ltd. des obligations de R Corp. à l'égard de ses biens visés par des permis et que l'organisme de réglementation ne faisait valoir aucune réclamation prouvable, de sorte que le régime de priorité de la LFI n'était pas renversé. L'organisme de réglementation et l'association ont formé un pourvoi.

Arrêt: Le pourvoi a été accueilli.

Wagner, J.C.C. (Abella, Karakatsanis, Gascon, Brown, JJ., souscrivant à son opinion) : Il n'y a aucun conflit entre le régime de réglementation de l'Alberta et la LFI en raison duquel des parties du premier doivent être inopérantes dans le contexte de

la faillite. Bien que G Ltd. demeurait entièrement dégagé de toute responsabilité personnelle par le droit fédéral, il ne peut se soustraire aux engagements environnementaux qui lient l'actif du failli en invoquant l'art. 14.06(4) de la LFI. À la simple lecture de ses termes, l'art. 14.06(4) était clair et sans équivoque. Il n'y avait aucune raison de considérer que les mots « le syndic est [. . .] dégagé de toute responsabilité personnelle » figurant à l'art. 14.06(4) de la LFI visaient la responsabilité de l'actif du failli. La « renonciation » n'habilitait pas le syndic à tout simplement délaissier les biens « faisant l'objet de la renonciation » quand on l'enjoignait à réparer un fait ou dommage lié à l'environnement. Les conflits d'application entre la LFI et la législation albertaine allégués par G Ltd. résultaient de sa qualité de « titulaire de permis » au sens de l'OGCA et de la PA. Vu l'interprétation qu'il convenait de donner à l'art. 14.06(4) de la LFI, aucun conflit d'application n'était imputable au fait que, suivant le droit albertain, G Ltd. demeurait, en qualité de « titulaire de permis », tenu d'abandonner les biens faisant l'objet de la renonciation et d'utiliser les autres éléments de l'actif. Il incombait à G Ltd. d'établir les objectifs précis des art. 14.06(2) et (4) s'il souhaitait démontrer qu'il y avait conflit. Compte tenu du libellé clair des art. 14.06(2) et (4) et des débats parlementaires, l'objectif de ces dispositions était manifestement de dégager les syndics de toute responsabilité personnelle à l'égard de questions environnementales touchant l'actif qu'ils administrent. Cet objectif n'a pas été entravé par l'ajout des syndics à la définition de « titulaire de permis » dans l'OGCA et la PA.

Dans l'un ou l'autre volet de l'analyse relative à la prépondérance, la loi albertaine autorisant l'organisme de réglementation à exercer ses pouvoirs contestés sera inopérante, dans la mesure où l'exercice de ces pouvoirs pendant la faillite modifie ou réarrange les priorités établies par la LFI. On doit faire valoir uniquement les réclamations prouvables en matière de faillite dans le cadre de la procédure unique. Les réclamations non prouvables ne sont pas suspendues à la faillite et elles lient toujours l'actif. Dans une décision de la Cour suprême rendue en 2012 dans laquelle elle a établi le test applicable, la Cour a clairement déclaré que les obligations environnementales appliquées par un organisme de réglementation ne sont pas toutes des réclamations prouvables en matière de faillite. D'après le sens qu'il convient de donner à l'étape « créancier », il était clair que l'organisme de réglementation a agi dans l'intérêt public et pour le bien public et qu'il n'était pas un créancier de R Corp. Aucune préoccupation n'a été soulevée en matière d'équité en ne tenant pas compte de la concession faite par l'organisme de réglementation. Les obligations de fin de vie incombant à G Ltd. n'étaient pas des réclamations prouvables dans la faillite de R Corp. et n'entraient donc pas en conflit avec le régime de priorité général instauré dans la LFI. Obliger R Corp. à payer l'abandon avant de répartir la valeur entre les créanciers ne perturbait pas le régime de priorité établi dans la LFI. Au moment d'élaborer ce régime, le Parlement voulait permettre aux organismes de réglementation d'imposer une charge prioritaire sur le bien réel du failli touché par un fait ou dommage lié à l'environnement en vue de financer la décontamination. La faillite n'est pas un permis de faire abstraction des règles, et les professionnels de l'insolvabilité sont liés par les lois provinciales valides au cours de la faillite.

Côté, J. (dissidente) (Moldaver, J., souscrivant à son opinion) : Le pourvoi devrait être rejeté. Deux aspects du régime de réglementation albertain entraînent en conflit avec la LFI. D'abord, les lois albertaines qui réglementent l'industrie pétrolière et gazière précisent que le terme « titulaire de permis » vise les séquestres et syndics de faillite. Cette définition avait pour effet d'assujettir les professionnels de l'insolvabilité aux mêmes obligations et responsabilités que R Corp. elle-même, notamment l'obligation de se conformer aux ordonnances d'abandon et le risque d'engager sa responsabilité personnelle pour ne pas l'avoir fait. G Ltd. ayant valablement renoncé aux biens inexploités, il n'était donc plus assujéti aux engagements environnementaux liés à ces biens. Étant donné que le régime législatif albertain ne reconnaissait pas la légalité de ces renonciations, il y avait un conflit d'application inévitable entre la loi fédérale et la loi provinciale. La loi albertaine régissant l'industrie pétrolière et gazière devrait donc être déclarée inopérante dans la mesure où elle ne reconnaissait pas l'effet juridique des renonciations de G Ltd. Lu dans son ensemble, l'art. 14.06 indiquait que l'art. 14.06(4) ne se bornait pas à dégager les syndics de toute responsabilité personnelle. Le Parlement n'a pas rendu le pouvoir de renonciation prévu à l'art. 14.06(4) conditionnel à la possibilité pour la Couronne de se prévaloir de sa superpriorité. Il y avait un conflit d'application dans la mesure où le régime législatif albertain tenait les séquestres et les syndics responsables en tant que « titulaires de permis » relativement aux biens faisant l'objet d'une renonciation.

Ensuite, l'organisme de réglementation a exigé que G Ltd. acquitte les engagements environnementaux de R Corp. avant les autres dettes de l'actif, ce qui contrevenait au régime de priorité établi par la LFI. Comme les ordonnances d'abandon sont des « réclamations prouvables en matière de faillite » selon le test à trois volets énoncé par la Cour suprême du Canada dans une décision rendue en 2012, l'organisme de réglementation ne pouvait faire valoir ces réclamations en dehors du processus de faillite. Agir ainsi entraverait la réalisation d'un objet essentiel de la LFI : le partage de la valeur de l'actif conformément au régime de priorités établi par la loi. L'organisme de réglementation ne pouvait pas non plus atteindre indirectement le même

résultat en imposant des conditions à la vente des biens de valeur de R Corp. Le régime provincial de délivrance de permis servait en fait de mécanisme de recouvrement de créances à l'endroit d'une société en faillite. Il devrait être déclaré inopérant en ce qui concernait R Corp., suivant le second volet du critère de la prépondérance, l'entrave à la réalisation d'un objet fédéral. G Ltd. et le créancier se sont acquittés de leur fardeau de démontrer qu'il existait une incompatibilité véritable entre la loi fédérale et la loi provinciale selon les deux volets du test de la prépondérance. La Cour devrait continuer d'appliquer l'analyse relative au « créancier » telle qu'elle a été clairement formulée dans la décision rendue en 2012 par la Cour suprême du Canada. Suivant ce critère, l'organisme de réglementation a clairement agi comme créancier relativement à l'actif de R Corp. Il était suffisamment certain que l'organisme de réglementation ou l'association effectuerait ultimement les travaux d'abandon et de remise en état et ferait valoir une réclamation pécuniaire afin d'obtenir un remboursement.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Wagner C.J.C.*:

AbitibiBowater Inc., Re (2012), 2012 SCC 67, 2012 CarswellQue 12490, 2012 CarswellQue 12491, 352 D.L.R. (4th) 399, 71 C.E.L.R. (3d) 1, 95 C.B.R. (5th) 200, (sub nom. *Newfoundland and Labrador v. AbitibiBowater Inc.*) 438 N.R. 134, (sub nom. *Newfoundland and Labrador v. AbitibiBowater Inc.*) [2012] 3 S.C.R. 443 (S.C.C.) — followed

AbitibiBowater inc., Re (2010), 2010 QCCS 1261, 2010 CarswellQue 2812, 52 C.E.L.R. (3d) 17, 68 C.B.R. (5th) 1 (C.S. Que.) — considered

Alberta (Attorney General) v. Moloney (2015), 2015 SCC 51, 2015 CSC 51, 2015 CarswellAlta 2091, 2015 CarswellAlta 2092, [2015] 12 W.W.R. 1, 29 C.B.R. (6th) 173, (sub nom. *Moloney v. Administrator, Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act (Alta.)*) 476 N.R. 318, 85 M.V.R. (6th) 37, 22 Alta. L.R. (6th) 287, 391 D.L.R. (4th) 189, [2015] 3 S.C.R. 327, (sub nom. *Moloney v. Administrator, Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act (Alta.)*) 606 A.R. 123, (sub nom. *Moloney v. Administrator, Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act (Alta.)*) 652 W.A.C. 123 (S.C.C.) — distinguished

Alberta Energy Regulator v. Grant Thornton Limited (2017), 2017 ABCA 278, 2017 CarswellAlta 1568, 57 Alta. L.R. (6th) 37, 52 C.B.R. (6th) 1, 9 C.P.C. (8th) 238, [2018] 2 W.W.R. 639 (Alta. C.A.) — considered

Berkheiser v. Berkheiser (1957), [1957] S.C.R. 387, 7 D.L.R. (2d) 721, 1957 CarswellSask 60 (S.C.C.) — referred to
Canada (Attorney General) v. Law Society (British Columbia) (1982), [1982] 2 S.C.R. 307, 37 B.C.L.R. 145, [1982] 5 W.W.R. 289, 19 B.L.R. 234, 43 N.R. 451, 137 D.L.R. (3d) 1, 66 C.P.R. (2d) 1, 1982 CarswellBC 133, 1982 CarswellBC 743 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Canada Trustco Mortgage Co. v. R. (2005), 2005 SCC 54, 2005 CarswellNat 3212, 2005 CarswellNat 3213, (sub nom. *Canada Trustco Mortgage Co. v. Canada*) 2005 D.T.C. 5523 (Eng.), (sub nom. *Hypothèques Trustco Canada v. Canada*) 2005 D.T.C. 5547 (Fr.), [2005] 5 C.T.C. 215, (sub nom. *Minister of National Revenue v. Canada Trustco Mortgage Co.*) 340 N.R. 1, 259 D.L.R. (4th) 193, [2005] 2 S.C.R. 601 (S.C.C.) — considered

Canadian Western Bank v. Alberta (2007), 2007 SCC 22, 2007 CarswellAlta 702, 2007 CarswellAlta 703, 49 C.C.L.I. (4th) 1, [2007] 8 W.W.R. 1, 362 N.R. 111, 75 Alta. L.R. (4th) 1, 281 D.L.R. (4th) 125, [2007] I.L.R. I-4622, 409 A.R. 207, 402 W.A.C. 207, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 3 (S.C.C.) — considered

Daishowa-Marubeni International Ltd. v. R. (2013), 2013 SCC 29, 2013 CarswellNat 1469, 2013 CarswellNat 1470, [2013] 4 C.T.C. 97, 357 D.L.R. (4th) 617, 2013 D.T.C. 5085 (Eng.), 2013 D.T.C. 5086 (Fr.), (sub nom. *Daishowa-Marubeni International Ltd. v. Minister of National Revenue*) 445 N.R. 73, (sub nom. *Daishowa-Marubeni International Ltd. v. Canada*) [2013] 2 S.C.R. 336 (S.C.C.) — considered

GMAC Commercial Credit Corp. - Canada v. TCT Logistics Inc. (2006), 2006 SCC 35, 2006 CarswellOnt 4621, 2006 CarswellOnt 4622, (sub nom. *Industrial Wood & Allied Workers of Canada, Local 700 v. GMAC Commercial Credit Corporation*) 2006 C.L.L.C. 220-045, 51 C.C.E.L. (3d) 1, 22 C.B.R. (5th) 163, 53 C.C.P.B. 167, 351 N.R. 326, (sub nom. *GMAC Commercial Credit Corp. v. TCT Logistics Inc.*) 271 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 215 O.A.C. 313, [2006] 2 S.C.R. 123 (S.C.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
Husky Oil Operations Ltd. v. Minister of National Revenue (1995), [1995] 10 W.W.R. 161, 188 N.R. 1, 24 C.L.R. (2d) 131, 35 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 128 D.L.R. (4th) 1, 137 Sask. R. 81, 107 W.A.C. 81, [1995] 3 S.C.R. 453, 1995 CarswellSask 739, 1995 CarswellSask 740 (S.C.C.) — considered

received by it subject to the end-of-life obligations that would one day arise. These end-of-life obligations form a fundamental part of the value of the licensed assets, the same as if the associated costs had been paid up front. Having received the benefit of the Renounced Assets during the productive period of their life cycles, Redwater cannot now avoid the associated liabilities. This understanding is consistent with *Daishowa-Marubeni International Ltd. v. R.*, 2013 SCC 29, [2013] 2 S.C.R. 336 (S.C.C.), which dealt with the statutory reforestation obligations of holders of forest tenures in Alberta. This Court unanimously held that the reforestation obligations were "a future cost embedded in the forest tenure that serves to depress the tenure's value at the time of sale" (para. 29).

158 The fact that regulatory requirements may cost money does not transform them into debt collection schemes. As noted by Martin J.A., licensing requirements predate bankruptcy and apply to all licensees regardless of solvency. GTL does not dispute the fact that Redwater's licences can be transferred only to other licensees nor that the Regulator retains the authority in appropriate situations to reject proposed transfers due to safety or compliance concerns. There is no difference between such conditions and the condition that the Regulator will not approve transfers where they would leave the requirement to satisfy end-of-life obligations unaddressed. All these regulatory conditions depress the value of the licensed assets. None of them creates a monetary claim in the Regulator's favour. Licensing requirements continue to exist during bankruptcy, and there is no reason why GTL cannot comply with them.

(3) Conclusion on the Abitibi test

159 Accordingly, the end-of-life obligations binding on GTL are not claims provable in the Redwater bankruptcy, so they do not conflict with the general priority scheme in the *BIA*. This is not a mere matter of form, but of substance. Requiring Redwater to pay for abandonment before distributing value to creditors does not disrupt the priority scheme of the *BIA*. In crafting the priority scheme set out in the *BIA*, Parliament intended to permit regulators to place a first charge on real property of a bankrupt affected by an environmental condition or damage in order to fund remediation (see s. 14.06(7)). Thus, the *BIA* explicitly contemplates that environmental regulators will extract value from the bankrupt's real property if that property is affected by an environmental condition or damage. Although the nature of property ownership in the Alberta oil and gas industry meant that s. 14.06(7) was unavailable to the Regulator, the Abandonment Orders and the LMR replicate s. 14.06(7)'s effect in this case. Furthermore, it is important to note that Redwater's only substantial assets were affected by an environmental condition or damage. Accordingly, the Abandonment Orders and LMR requirements did not seek to force Redwater to fulfill end-of-life obligations with assets unrelated to the environmental condition or damage. In other words, recognizing that the Abandonment Orders and LMR requirements are not provable claims in this case does not interfere with the aims of the *BIA* — rather, it facilitates them.

160 Bankruptcy is not a licence to ignore rules, and insolvency professionals are bound by and must comply with valid provincial laws during bankruptcy. They must, for example, comply with non-monetary obligations that are binding on the bankrupt estate, that cannot be reduced to provable claims, and the effects of which do not conflict with the *BIA*, notwithstanding the consequences this may have for the bankrupt's secured creditors. The Abandonment Orders and the LMR requirements are based on valid provincial laws of general application — exactly the kind of valid provincial laws upon which the *BIA* is built. As noted in *Moloney*, the *BIA* is clear that "[t]he ownership of certain assets and the existence of particular liabilities depend upon provincial law" (para. 40). End-of-life obligations are imposed by valid provincial laws which define the contours of the bankrupt estate available for distribution.

161 Finally, as noted earlier, the *BIA*'s general purpose of facilitating financial rehabilitation is not relevant for a corporation such as Redwater. Corporations with insufficient assets to satisfy their creditors will never be discharged from bankruptcy because they cannot satisfy all their creditors' claims in full (*BIA*, s. 169(4)). Thus, no conflict with this purpose is caused by the conclusion that the end-of-life obligations binding Redwater are not provable claims.

IV. Conclusion

162 There is no conflict between Alberta's regulatory regime and the *BIA* requiring portions of the former to be rendered inoperative in the context of bankruptcy. Although GTL remains fully protected from personal liability by federal law, it cannot

TAB 8

2024 ABKB 19
Alberta Court of King's Bench

Mantle Materials Group, Ltd (Re)

2024 CarswellAlta 138, 2024 ABKB 19

In the Matter of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, RSC 1985 c B-3, as Amended

And In the Matter of the Bankruptcy of Mantle Materials Group Ltd

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

And In the Matter of the Compromise or Arrangement of Mantle Materials Group, Ltd and RLF Canada Holdings Ltd

D.B. Nixon A.C.J.K.B.

Heard: December 18, 2023

Judgment: January 10, 2024

Docket: Calgary B201-965622, 2301-16114

Counsel: T.S Cumming, S.A. Gabor, C.E. Hanert, S. Kroeger, for Mantle Materials Group Ltd

R. Zahara, M. McIntosh, for Travelers Capital Corp

P. Kyriakakis, for FTI Consulting Canada Inc

D.R. Bieganek, K.C., for 945441 Alberta Ltd and J. Shankowski

D.S. Nishimura, for Alberta Environment

R. Trainer, for Canadian Western Bank

N. Williams, for Pathward, National Association

P. Corney, for Fiera

T. Gusa, for ATB Financial

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.7 Miscellaneous](#)

Civil practice and procedure

[XII Discovery](#)

[XII.1 Introductory](#)

[XII.1.e Undertakings](#)

Headnote

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

Debtor's business involved extraction and selling of gravel from aggregate pits — Debtor was wholly owned subsidiary of R Ltd. — Debtor was responsible for environment protection orders on aggregate pits that addressed end-of-life reclamation — Debtor filed notice of intention to make proposal under [Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act \(BIA\)](#) naming F Inc. as proposal trustee — Remedial objective of debtor was to address its reclamation obligations and member of debtor's management team was critical to efficient progression of reclamation efforts — [BIA](#) statutory time periods were not flexible enough to address debtor's reclamation liabilities and parties did not contest continuation under [Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act \(CCAA\)](#) — Debtor brought application to convert [BIA](#) proposal proceedings into [CCAA](#) proceeding — T Corp. brought applications to enhance powers of monitor and to compel responses to undertakings and questions — Application to convert granted; application to enhance powers dismissed; application to compel responses granted in part — Continuation was consistent with purposes of

CCAA, and liquidation was not necessarily inconsistent with remedial objectives of CCAA — Monitor proceeding under CCAA was only available means by which reclamation obligations and sale of active pits could be completed — Debtor filed evidence that served as reasonable surrogate for information that CCAA required accompany initial application — Stay of proceedings was extended for debtor and R Ltd. — Restructuring charges were to be continued by debtor in context of CCAA proceedings — F Inc. was appointed monitor — Current management of debtor was best suited to deal with reclamation liabilities and to continue under CCAA proceedings.

Civil practice and procedure --- Discovery — Introductory — Undertakings

Debtor's business involved extraction and selling of gravel from aggregate pits — Debtor was wholly owned subsidiary of R Ltd. — Debtor was responsible for environment protection orders (EPOs) on aggregate pits that addressed end-of-life reclamation — Debtor filed notice of intention to make proposal under *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA)* naming F Inc. as proposal trustee — Remedial objective of debtor was to address its reclamation obligations and member of debtor's management team was critical to efficient progression of reclamation efforts — BIA statutory time periods were not flexible enough to address debtor's reclamation liabilities and parties did not contest continuation under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA)* — Debtor brought application to convert BIA proposal proceedings into CCAA proceeding — T Corp. brought applications to enhance powers of monitor and to compel responses to undertakings and questions — Application to convert granted; Application to enhance powers dismissed; Application to compel responses granted in part — Debtor was compelled to answer questions that were material and relevant and questions insofar as they related to its ability to indemnify individuals for personal liabilities under EPOs — Debtor was not required to answer remaining questions — Debtor was compelled to answer undertaking insofar as it was not already answered by draft document circulated.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *D.B. Nixon A.C.J.K.B.*:

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

Clothing for Modern Times Ltd., Re (2011), 2011 ONSC 7522, 2011 CarswellOnt 14402, 88 C.B.R. (5th) 329 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed

Jaguar Mining Inc., Re (2013), 2014 ONSC 494, 2013 CarswellOnt 18630, 12 C.B.R. (6th) 290 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Manitok Energy Inc (Re) (2022), 2022 ABCA 117, 2022 CarswellAlta 806, [2022] 6 W.W.R. 1, 98 C.B.R. (6th) 1, 468 D.L.R. (4th) 434 (Alta. C.A.) — referred to

Mantle Materials Group, Ltd v. Travelers Capital Corp (2023), 2023 ABCA 302, 2023 CarswellAlta 2671 (Alta. C.A.) — referred to

Mantle Materials Group, Ltd v. Travelers Capital Corp (2023), 2023 ABCA 339, 2023 CarswellAlta 2930 (Alta. C.A.) — referred to

Orphan Well Association v. Grant Thornton Ltd. (2019), 2019 SCC 5, 2019 CSC 5, 2019 CarswellAlta 141, 2019 CarswellAlta 142, 66 C.B.R. (6th) 1, 81 Alta. L.R. (6th) 1, [2019] 3 W.W.R. 1, 430 D.L.R. (4th) 1, 22 C.E.L.R. (4th) 121, 9 P.P.S.A.C. (4th) 293, [2019] 1 S.C.R. 150, [2019] 1 R.C.S. 150 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Orphan Well Association v. Trident Exploration Corp (2022), 2022 ABKB 839, 2022 CarswellAlta 3672, 4 C.B.R. (7th) 258 (Alta. K.B.) — considered

Re Mantle Materials Group, Ltd (2023), 2023 ABKB 488, 2023 CarswellAlta 2276, [2023] 10 W.W.R. 453, 61 Alta. L.R. (7th) 406, 9 C.B.R. (7th) 86 (Alta. K.B.) — considered

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 1211, 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299, [2004] O.T.C. 284 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

9354-9186 Québec inc. v. Callidus Capital Corp. (2020), 2020 SCC 10, 2020 CSC 10, 2020 CarswellQue 3772, 2020 CarswellQue 3773, 78 C.B.R. (6th) 1, 444 D.L.R. (4th) 373, 1 B.L.R. (6th) 1, [2020] 1 S.C.R. 521 (S.C.C.) — considered

Statutes considered:

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

Generally — considered

s. 2(1) "insolvent person" — considered

assume the Reclamation Liabilities associated therewith, and if such sales are not

- (e) complete the sale of the remaining assets of Mantle; and
- (f) once reasonable reserves are provided for, make distributions to Mantle's creditors.

possible, provide for such Reclamation Liabilities to be addressed;

26 It bears repeating here that the continuation under the *CCAA* is not contested by any of the parties. Further, no other options for what to do with Mantle and its assets have been proposed.

27 As noted by the proposed monitor (being FTI), proceeding under the *CCAA* would be the only available means by which the reclamation obligations and the sale of the active pits could be completed. I also note that FTI supports the continuation of the *BIA* proceedings under the *CCAA*.

28 As noted above, one of the motivations underlying the conversion of the Mantle proceedings from the *BIA* to the *CCAA* concerns the inflexible timing issues legislated in the *BIA*. Under the current timelines stipulated in the *BIA*, Mantle would be adjudged bankrupt by the expiration of the period within which it may file a proposal, the ultimate deadline being January 13, 2024. As discussed in *Callidus*, the appropriateness of the *CCAA* for liquidation depends on the facts of each individual case, and these factors are particularly pertinent.

29 Based on the evidence and my analysis of the law, I find that Mantle has satisfied the Second Factor. I make this determination because liquidation is not necessarily inconsistent with the remedial objectives of the *CCAA*: *Callidus* at para 45. This is particularly the case in these circumstances because the ultimate remedial objective of Mantle is to address its reclamation obligations.

c. Has Mantle filed evidence which serves as a reasonable surrogate for the information which section 10(2) of the CCAA requires accompany any initial application under the Act (the "Third Factor")?

30 Finally, under section 10(2) of the *CCAA*, Mantle must provide:

- (a) a statement indicating, on a weekly basis, the projected cash flow of the debtor company;
- (b) a report containing the prescribed representations of the debtor company regarding the preparation of the cash-flow statement; and
- (c) copies of all financial statements, audited or unaudited, prepared during the year before the application or, if no such statements were prepared in that year, a copy of the most recent such statement.

31 This material was provided as exhibits attached to the affidavit of Byron Levkulich, dated November 27, 2023. Mr. Levkulich is a director of Mantle. There are also cash-flow statements attached to the fourth report of the proposed monitor FTI.

32 Based on the evidence and my analysis of the law, I find that Mantle has satisfied the Third Factor.

33 Based on my review of the evidence and my analysis of the law, I find Mantle has satisfied the three factors forming the test in *Modern*. As a result, it is appropriate to continue this matter from the *BIA* to the *CCAA*.

B. Should the proposed extension to the stay of proceedings be granted?

34 Under section 11.02(2) of the *CCAA*, on application from a debtor company other than during an initial application, a court may stay for any period considered necessary all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph 1(a) of section 11.02.

TAB 9

2002 SCC 41, 2002 CSC 41

Supreme Court of Canada

Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)

2002 CarswellNat 822, 2002 CarswellNat 823, 2002 SCC 41, 2002 CSC 41, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522, [2002] S.C.J. No. 42, 113 A.C.W.S. (3d) 36, 18 C.P.R. (4th) 1, 20 C.P.C. (5th) 1, 211 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 223 F.T.R. 137 (note), 287 N.R. 203, 40 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, 44 C.E.L.R. (N.S.) 161, 93 C.R.R. (2d) 219, J.E. 2002-803, REJB 2002-30902

Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, Appellant v. Sierra Club of Canada, Respondent and The Minister of Finance of Canada, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada, the Minister of International Trade of Canada and the Attorney General of Canada, Respondents

McLachlin C.J.C., Gonthier, Iacobucci, Bastarache, Binnie, Arbour, LeBel JJ.

Heard: November 6, 2001

Judgment: April 26, 2002

Docket: 28020

Proceedings: reversing (2000), 2000 CarswellNat 970, (sub nom. Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada) 187 D.L.R. (4th) 231, 256 N.R. 1, 24 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, [2000] 4 F.C. 426, 182 F.T.R. 284 (note), 2000 CarswellNat 3271, [2000] F.C.J. No. 732 (Fed. C.A.); affirming (1999), 1999 CarswellNat 2187, [2000] 2 F.C. 400, 1999 CarswellNat 3038, 179 F.T.R. 283, [1999] F.C.J. No. 1633 (Fed. T.D.)

Counsel: *J. Brett Ledger* and *Peter Chapin*, for appellant

Timothy J. Howard and *Franklin S. Gertler*, for respondent Sierra Club of Canada

Graham Garton, Q.C., and *J. Sanderson Graham*, for respondents Minister of Finance of Canada, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada, Minister of International Trade of Canada, and Attorney General of Canada

Subject: Intellectual Property; Property; Civil Practice and Procedure; Evidence; Environmental

Related Abridgment Classifications

Civil practice and procedure

XII Discovery

XII.2 Discovery of documents

XII.2.h Privileged document

XII.2.h.xiii Miscellaneous

Civil practice and procedure

XII Discovery

XII.4 Examination for discovery

XII.4.h Range of examination

XII.4.h.ix Privilege

XII.4.h.ix.F Miscellaneous

Evidence

XIV Privilege

XIV.8 Public interest immunity

XIV.8.a Crown privilege

Headnote

Evidence --- Documentary evidence — Privilege as to documents — Miscellaneous documents

Confidentiality order was necessary in this case because disclosure of confidential documents would impose serious risk on important commercial interest of Crown corporation and there were no reasonable alternative measures to granting of order

— Confidentiality order would have substantial salutary effects on Crown corporation's right to fair trial and on freedom of expression — Deleterious effects of confidentiality order on open court principle and freedom of expression would be minimal — Salutary effects of order outweighed deleterious effects — Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, S.C. 1992, c. 37, s. 5(1)(b) — [Federal Court Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106, R. 151, 312.](#)

Practice --- Discovery — Discovery of documents — Privileged document — Miscellaneous privileges

Confidentiality order was necessary in this case because disclosure of confidential documents would impose serious risk on important commercial interest of Crown corporation and there were no reasonable alternative measures to granting of order — Confidentiality order would have substantial salutary effects on Crown corporation's right to fair trial and on freedom of expression — Deleterious effects of confidentiality order on open court principle and freedom of expression would be minimal — Salutary effects of order outweighed deleterious effects — Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, S.C. 1992, c. 37, s. 5(1)(b) — [Federal Court Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106, R. 151, 312.](#)

Practice --- Discovery — Examination for discovery — Range of examination — Privilege — Miscellaneous privileges

Confidentiality order was necessary in this case because disclosure of confidential documents would impose serious risk on important commercial interest of Crown corporation and there were no reasonable alternative measures to granting of order — Confidentiality order would have substantial salutary effects on Crown corporation's right to fair trial and on freedom of expression — Deleterious effects of confidentiality order on open court principle and freedom of expression would be minimal — Salutary effects of order outweighed deleterious effects — Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, S.C. 1992, c. 37, s. 5(1)(b) — [Federal Court Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106, R. 151, 312.](#)

Preuve --- Preuve documentaire — Confidentialité en ce qui concerne les documents — Documents divers

Ordonnance de confidentialité était nécessaire parce que la divulgation des documents confidentiels menacerait gravement l'intérêt commercial important de la société d'État et parce qu'il n'y avait aucune autre option raisonnable que celle d'accorder l'ordonnance — Ordonnance de confidentialité aurait des effets bénéfiques considérables sur le droit de la société d'État à un procès équitable et à la liberté d'expression — Ordonnance de confidentialité n'aurait que des effets préjudiciables minimes sur le principe de la publicité des débats et sur la liberté d'expression — Effets bénéfiques de l'ordonnance l'emportaient sur ses effets préjudiciables — Loi canadienne sur l'évaluation environnementale, L.C. 1992, c. 37, art. 5(1)(b) — Règles de la Cour fédérale, 1998, DORS/98-106, r. 151, 312.

Procédure --- Communication de la preuve — Communication des documents — Documents confidentiels — Divers types de confidentialité

Ordonnance de confidentialité était nécessaire parce que la divulgation des documents confidentiels menacerait gravement l'intérêt commercial important de la société d'État et parce qu'il n'y avait aucune autre option raisonnable que celle d'accorder l'ordonnance — Ordonnance de confidentialité aurait des effets bénéfiques considérables sur le droit de la société d'État à un procès équitable et à la liberté d'expression — Ordonnance de confidentialité n'aurait que des effets préjudiciables minimes sur le principe de la publicité des débats et sur la liberté d'expression — Effets bénéfiques de l'ordonnance l'emportaient sur ses effets préjudiciables — Loi canadienne sur l'évaluation environnementale, L.C. 1992, c. 37, art. 5(1)(b) — Règles de la Cour fédérale, 1998, DORS/98-106, r. 151, 312.

Procédure --- Communication de la preuve — Interrogatoire préalable — Étendue de l'interrogatoire — Confidentialité — Divers types de confidentialité

Ordonnance de confidentialité était nécessaire parce que la divulgation des documents confidentiels menacerait gravement l'intérêt commercial important de la société d'État et parce qu'il n'y avait aucune autre option raisonnable que celle d'accorder l'ordonnance — Ordonnance de confidentialité aurait des effets bénéfiques considérables sur le droit de la société d'État à un procès équitable et à la liberté d'expression — Ordonnance de confidentialité n'aurait que des effets préjudiciables minimes sur le principe de la publicité des débats et sur la liberté d'expression — Effets bénéfiques de l'ordonnance l'emportaient sur ses effets préjudiciables — Loi canadienne sur l'évaluation environnementale, L.C. 1992, c. 37, art. 5(1)(b) — Règles de la Cour fédérale, 1998, DORS/98-106, r. 151, 312.

The federal government provided a Crown corporation with a \$1.5 billion loan for the construction and sale of two CANDU nuclear reactors to China. An environmental organization sought judicial review of that decision, maintaining that the authorization of financial assistance triggered s. 5(1)(b) of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*. The Crown corporation was an intervenor with the rights of a party in the application for judicial review. The Crown corporation filed an affidavit by a senior manager referring to and summarizing confidential documents. Before cross-examining the senior manager, the

environmental organization applied for production of the documents. After receiving authorization from the Chinese authorities to disclose the documents on the condition that they be protected by a confidentiality order, the Crown corporation sought to introduce the documents under [R. 312 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*](#) and requested a confidentiality order. The confidentiality order would make the documents available only to the parties and the court but would not restrict public access to the proceedings.

The trial judge refused to grant the order and ordered the Crown corporation to file the documents in their current form, or in an edited version if it chose to do so. The Crown corporation appealed under [R. 151 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*](#) and the environmental organization cross-appealed under [R. 312](#). The majority of the Federal Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal and the cross-appeal. The confidentiality order would have been granted by the dissenting judge. The Crown corporation appealed.

Held: The appeal was allowed.

Publication bans and confidentiality orders, in the context of judicial proceedings, are similar. The analytical approach to the exercise of discretion under [R. 151](#) should echo the underlying principles set out in [Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp., \[1994\] 3 S.C.R. 835 \(S.C.C.\)](#). A confidentiality order under [R. 151](#) should be granted in only two circumstances, when an order is needed to prevent serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk, and when the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which includes public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

The alternatives to the confidentiality order suggested by the Trial Division and Court of Appeal were problematic. Expunging the documents would be a virtually unworkable and ineffective solution. Providing summaries was not a reasonable alternative measure to having the underlying documents available to the parties. The confidentiality order was necessary in that disclosure of the documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of the Crown corporation, and there were no reasonable alternative measures to granting the order.

The confidentiality order would have substantial salutary effects on the Crown corporation's right to a fair trial and on freedom of expression. The deleterious effects of the confidentiality order on the open court principle and freedom of expression would be minimal. If the order was not granted and in the course of the judicial review application the Crown corporation was not required to mount a defence under the [Canadian Environmental Assessment Act](#), it was possible that the Crown corporation would suffer the harm of having disclosed confidential information in breach of its obligations with no corresponding benefit to the right of the public to freedom of expression. The salutary effects of the order outweighed the deleterious effects.

Le gouvernement fédéral a fait un prêt de l'ordre de 1,5 milliards de dollar en rapport avec la construction et la vente par une société d'État de deux réacteurs nucléaires CANDU à la Chine. Un organisme environnemental a sollicité le contrôle judiciaire de cette décision, soutenant que cette autorisation d'aide financière avait déclenché l'application de l'art. 5(1)b de la *Loi canadienne sur l'évaluation environnementale*. La société d'État était intervenante au débat et elle avait reçu les droits de partie dans la demande de contrôle judiciaire. Elle a déposé l'affidavit d'un cadre supérieur dans lequel ce dernier faisait référence à certains documents confidentiels et en faisait le résumé. L'organisme environnemental a demandé la production des documents avant de procéder au contre-interrogatoire du cadre supérieur. Après avoir obtenu l'autorisation des autorités chinoises de communiquer les documents à la condition qu'ils soient protégés par une ordonnance de confidentialité, la société d'État a cherché à les introduire en invoquant la [r. 312 des *Règles de la Cour fédérale, 1998*](#), et elle a aussi demandé une ordonnance de confidentialité. Selon les termes de l'ordonnance de confidentialité, les documents seraient uniquement mis à la disposition des parties et du tribunal, mais l'accès du public aux débats ne serait pas interdit.

Le juge de première instance a refusé l'ordonnance de confidentialité et a ordonné à la société d'État de déposer les documents sous leur forme actuelle ou sous une forme révisée, à son gré. La société d'État a interjeté appel en vertu de la [r. 151 des *Règles de la Cour fédérale, 1998*](#), et l'organisme environnemental a formé un appel incident en vertu de la [r. 312](#). Les juges majoritaires de la Cour d'appel ont rejeté le pourvoi et le pourvoi incident. Le juge dissident aurait accordé l'ordonnance de confidentialité. La société d'État a interjeté appel.

Arrêt: Le pourvoi a été accueilli.

Il y a de grandes ressemblances entre l'ordonnance de non-publication et l'ordonnance de confidentialité dans le contexte des procédures judiciaires. L'analyse de l'exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire sous le régime de la [r. 151](#) devrait refléter les principes sous-jacents énoncés dans l'arrêt [Dagenais c. Société Radio-Canada, \[1994\] 3 R.C.S. 835](#). Une ordonnance de confidentialité rendue en vertu de la [r. 151](#) ne devrait l'être que lorsque: 1) une telle ordonnance est nécessaire pour écarter un risque sérieux

pour un intérêt important, y compris un intérêt commercial, dans le cadre d'un litige, en l'absence d'autres solutions raisonnables pour écarter ce risque; et 2) les effets bénéfiques de l'ordonnance de confidentialité, y compris les effets sur les droits des justiciables civils à un procès équitable, l'emportent sur ses effets préjudiciables, y compris les effets sur le droit à la liberté d'expression, lequel droit comprend l'intérêt du public à l'accès aux débats judiciaires.

Les solutions proposées par la Division de première instance et par la Cour d'appel comportaient toutes deux des problèmes. Épurer les documents serait virtuellement impraticable et inefficace. Fournir des résumés des documents ne constituait pas une « autre option raisonnable » à la communication aux parties des documents de base. L'ordonnance de confidentialité était nécessaire parce que la communication des documents menacerait gravement un intérêt commercial important de la société d'État et parce qu'il n'existait aucune autre option raisonnable que celle d'accorder l'ordonnance.

L'ordonnance de confidentialité aurait d'importants effets bénéfiques sur le droit de la société d'État à un procès équitable et à la liberté d'expression. Elle n'aurait que des effets préjudiciables minimes sur le principe de la publicité des débats et sur la liberté d'expression. Advenant que l'ordonnance ne soit pas accordée et que, dans le cadre de la demande de contrôle judiciaire, la société d'État n'ait pas l'obligation de présenter une défense en vertu de la *Loi canadienne sur l'évaluation environnementale*, il se pouvait que la société d'État subisse un préjudice du fait d'avoir communiqué cette information confidentielle en violation de ses obligations, sans avoir pu profiter d'un avantage similaire à celui du droit du public à la liberté d'expression. Les effets bénéfiques de l'ordonnance l'emportaient sur ses effets préjudiciables.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Iacobucci J.*:

AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health & Welfare), 1998 CarswellNat 2520, 83 C.P.R. (3d) 428, 161 F.T.R. 15 (Fed. T.D.) — considered

AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health & Welfare), 2000 CarswellNat 356, 5 C.P.R. (4th) 149, 253 N.R. 284, [2000] 3 F.C. 360, 2000 CarswellNat 3254 (Fed. C.A.) — considered

Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General), 2 C.R. (5th) 1, 110 C.C.C. (3d) 193, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480, 139 D.L.R. (4th) 385, 182 N.B.R. (2d) 81, 463 A.P.R. 81, 39 C.R.R. (2d) 189, 203 N.R. 169, 1996 CarswellNB 462, 1996 CarswellNB 463, 2 B.H.R.C. 210 (S.C.C.) — followed

Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp., 34 C.R. (4th) 269, 20 O.R. (3d) 816 (note), [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835, 120 D.L.R. (4th) 12, 175 N.R. 1, 94 C.C.C. (3d) 289, 76 O.A.C. 81, 25 C.R.R. (2d) 1, 1994 CarswellOnt 112, 1994 CarswellOnt 1168 (S.C.C.) — followed

Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General) (1989), [1990] 1 W.W.R. 577, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326, 64 D.L.R. (4th) 577, 102 N.R. 321, 71 Alta. L.R. (2d) 273, 103 A.R. 321, 41 C.P.C. (2d) 109, 45 C.R.R. 1, 1989 CarswellAlta 198, 1989 CarswellAlta 623 (S.C.C.) — followed

Eli Lilly & Co. v. Novopharm Ltd., 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437, 82 F.T.R. 147, 1994 CarswellNat 537 (Fed. T.D.) — referred to
Ethyl Canada Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General), 1998 CarswellOnt 380, 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered
Irwin Toy Ltd. c. Québec (Procureur général), 94 N.R. 167, (sub nom. *Irwin Toy Ltd. v. Québec (Attorney General)*) [1989] 1 S.C.R. 927, 58 D.L.R. (4th) 577, 24 Q.A.C. 2, 25 C.P.R. (3d) 417, 39 C.R.R. 193, 1989 CarswellQue 115F, 1989 CarswellQue 115 (S.C.C.) — followed

M. (A.) v. Ryan, 143 D.L.R. (4th) 1, 207 N.R. 81, 4 C.R. (5th) 220, 29 B.C.L.R. (3d) 133, [1997] 4 W.W.R. 1, 85 B.C.A.C. 81, 138 W.A.C. 81, 34 C.C.L.T. (2d) 1, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, 42 C.R.R. (2d) 37, 8 C.P.C. (4th) 1, 1997 CarswellBC 99, 1997 CarswellBC 100 (S.C.C.) — considered

N. (F.), Re, 2000 SCC 35, 2000 CarswellNfld 213, 2000 CarswellNfld 214, 146 C.C.C. (3d) 1, 188 D.L.R. (4th) 1, 35 C.R. (5th) 1, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, 191 Nfld. & P.E.I.R. 181, 577 A.P.R. 181 (S.C.C.) — considered

R. v. E. (O.N.), 2001 SCC 77, 2001 CarswellBC 2479, 2001 CarswellBC 2480, 158 C.C.C. (3d) 478, 205 D.L.R. (4th) 542, 47 C.R. (5th) 89, 279 N.R. 187, 97 B.C.L.R. (3d) 1, [2002] 3 W.W.R. 205, 160 B.C.A.C. 161, 261 W.A.C. 161 (S.C.C.) — referred to

R. v. Keegstra, 1 C.R. (4th) 129, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697, 77 Alta. L.R. (2d) 193, 117 N.R. 1, [1991] 2 W.W.R. 1, 114 A.R. 81, 61 C.C.C. (3d) 1, 3 C.R.R. (2d) 193, 1990 CarswellAlta 192, 1990 CarswellAlta 661 (S.C.C.) — followed

R. v. Mentuck, 2001 SCC 76, 2001 CarswellMan 535, 2001 CarswellMan 536, 158 C.C.C. (3d) 449, 205 D.L.R. (4th) 512, 47 C.R. (5th) 63, 277 N.R. 160, [2002] 2 W.W.R. 409 (S.C.C.) — followed

to present its case. In that sense, preventing the appellant from disclosing these documents on a confidential basis infringes its right to a fair trial. Although in the context of a civil proceeding this does not engage a *Charter* right, the right to a fair trial generally can be viewed as a fundamental principle of justice: *M. (A.) v. Ryan*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157 (S.C.C.), at para. 84, *per* L'Heureux-Dubé J. (dissenting, but not on that point). Although this fair trial right is directly relevant to the appellant, there is also a general public interest in protecting the right to a fair trial. Indeed, as a general proposition, all disputes in the courts should be decided under a fair trial standard. The legitimacy of the judicial process alone demands as much. Similarly, courts have an interest in having all relevant evidence before them in order to ensure that justice is done.

51 Thus, the interests which would be promoted by a confidentiality order are the preservation of commercial and contractual relations, as well as the right of civil litigants to a fair trial. Related to the latter are the public and judicial interests in seeking the truth and achieving a just result in civil proceedings.

52 In opposition to the confidentiality order lies the fundamental principle of open and accessible court proceedings. This principle is inextricably tied to freedom of expression enshrined in s. 2(b) of the *Charter*: *New Brunswick*, *supra*, at para. 23. The importance of public and media access to the courts cannot be understated, as this access is the method by which the judicial process is scrutinized and criticized. Because it is essential to the administration of justice that justice is done and is *seen* to be done, such public scrutiny is fundamental. The open court principle has been described as "the very soul of justice," guaranteeing that justice is administered in a non-arbitrary manner: *New Brunswick*, *supra*, at para. 22.

(3) Adapting the Dagenais Test to the Rights and Interests of the Parties

53 Applying the rights and interests engaged in this case to the analytical framework of *Dagenais* and subsequent cases discussed above, the test for whether a confidentiality order ought to be granted in a case such as this one should be framed as follows:

A confidentiality order under R. 151 should only be granted when:

(a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and

(b) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

54 As in *Mentuck*, *supra*, I would add that three important elements are subsumed under the first branch of this test. First, the risk in question must be real and substantial, in that the risk is well-grounded in the evidence and poses a serious threat to the commercial interest in question.

55 In addition, the phrase "important commercial interest" is in need of some clarification. In order to qualify as an "important commercial interest," the interest in question cannot merely be specific to the party requesting the order; the interest must be one which can be expressed in terms of a public interest in confidentiality. For example, a private company could not argue simply that the existence of a particular contract should not be made public because to do so would cause the company to lose business, thus harming its commercial interests. However, if, as in this case, exposure of information would cause a breach of a confidentiality agreement, then the commercial interest affected can be characterized more broadly as the general commercial interest of preserving confidential information. Simply put, if there is no general principle at stake, there can be no "important commercial interest" for the purposes of this test. Or, in the words of Binnie J. in *Re N. (F)*, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, 2000 SCC 35 (S.C.C.), at para. 10, the open court rule only yields "where the *public* interest in confidentiality outweighs the public interest in openness" (emphasis added).

56 In addition to the above requirement, courts must be cautious in determining what constitutes an "important commercial interest." It must be remembered that a confidentiality order involves an infringement on freedom of expression. Although the balancing of the commercial interest with freedom of expression takes place under the second branch of the test, courts must

TAB 10

2021 SCC 25, 2021 CSC 25

Supreme Court of Canada

Sherman Estate v. Donovan

2021 CarswellOnt 8339, 2021 CarswellOnt 8340, 2021 SCC 25, 2021 CSC 25, [2021] S.C.J. No. 25, 331 A.C.W.S. (3d) 489, 458 D.L.R. (4th) 361, 66 C.P.C. (8th) 1, 67 E.T.R. (4th) 163, 72 C.R. (7th) 223, EYB 2021-391973

Estate of Bernard Sherman and Trustees of the Estate and Estate of Honey Sherman and Trustees of the Estate (Appellants) and Kevin Donovan and Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. (Respondents) and Attorney General of Ontario, Attorney General of British Columbia, Canadian Civil Liberties Association, Income Security Advocacy Centre, Ad IDEM/Canadian Media Lawyers Association, Postmedia Network Inc., CTV, a Division of Bell Media Inc., Global News, a division of Corus Television Limited Partnership, The Globe and Mail Inc., Citytv, a division of Rogers Media Inc., British Columbia Civil Liberties Association, HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario, HIV Legal Network and Mental Health Legal Committee (Interveners)

Wagner C.J.C., Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Brown, Rowe, Martin, Kasirer JJ.

Heard: October 6, 2020

Judgment: June 11, 2021

Docket: 38695

Proceedings: affirming *Donovan v. Sherman Estate* (2019), 56 C.P.C. (8th) 82, 47 E.T.R. (4th) 1, 2019 CarswellOnt 6867, 2019 ONCA 376, C.W. Hourigan J.A., Doherty J.A., Paul Rouleau J.A. (Ont. C.A.); reversing *Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. v. Sherman Estate* (2018), 41 E.T.R. (4th) 126, 2018 CarswellOnt 13017, 2018 ONSC 4706, 28 C.P.C. (8th) 102, 417 C.R.R. (2d) 321, S.F. Dunphy J. (Ont. S.C.J.)

Counsel: Chantelle Cseh, Timothy Youdan, for Appellants

Iris Fischer, Skye A. Sepp, for Respondents

Peter Scrutton, for Intervener, Attorney General of Ontario

Jacqueline Hughes, for Intervener, Attorney General of British Columbia

Ryder Gilliland, for Intervener, Canadian Civil Liberties Association

Ewa Krajewska, for Intervener, Income Security Advocacy Centre

Robert S. Anderson, Q.C., for Interveners, Ad IDEM/Canadian Media Lawyers Association, Postmedia Network Inc., CTV, a Division of Bell Media Inc., Global News, a division of Corus Television Limited Partnership, The Globe and Mail Inc. and Citytv, a division of Rogers Media Inc.

Adam Goldenberg, for Intervener, British Columbia Civil Liberties Association

Khalid Janmohamed, for Interveners, HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario, the HIV Legal Network and the Mental Health Legal Committee

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Criminal; Estates and Trusts

Related Abridgment Classifications

Civil practice and procedure

XXIII Practice on appeal

XXIII.13 Powers and duties of appellate court

XXIII.13.e Evidence on appeal

XXIII.13.e.i New evidence

Judges and courts

XVI Jurisdiction

XVI.11 Jurisdiction of court over own process

XVI.11.c Sealing files

Headnote

Judges and courts --- Jurisdiction — Jurisdiction of court over own process — Sealing files

Wealthy couple were found dead in their home and deaths generated intense public interest and press scrutiny — Estates and estate trustees sought to stem press scrutiny — When applications to obtain certificates of appointment of estate trustees were made, trustees sought sealing order — Application judge granted sealing order — Journalist and newspaper successfully appealed and sealing order was set aside — Trustees appealed — Appeal dismissed — Court of Appeal was right to set aside sealing order — Information in court files was not of highly sensitive character that it could be said to strike at core identity of affected persons — Trustees had failed to show how lifting of sealing orders engaged dignity of affected individuals — It could not be said that risk to privacy was sufficiently serious to overcome strong presumption of openness — Same was true of risk to physical safety.

Civil practice and procedure --- Practice on appeal — Powers and duties of appellate court — Evidence on appeal — New evidence

Juges et tribunaux --- Compétence — Compétence de la cour sur sa propre procédure — Mise sous scellés de dossiers

Couple riche et célèbre a été retrouvé sans vie dans sa résidence, et la mort du couple a suscité un vif intérêt dans le public et provoqué une attention médiatique intense — Successions ainsi que les fiduciaires des successions ont cherché à réfréner l'attention médiatique intense — Quand le temps est venu d'obtenir leurs certificats de nomination à titre de fiduciaires des successions, les fiduciaires ont sollicité une ordonnance de mise sous scellés — Juge de première instance a accordé l'ordonnance de mise sous scellés — Journaliste et journal ont eu gain de cause en appel et l'ordonnance a été annulée — Fiduciaires ont formé un pourvoi — Pourvoi rejeté — Cour d'appel a eu raison d'annuler l'ordonnance de mise sous scellés — Renseignements contenus dans les dossiers judiciaires ne revêtaient pas un caractère si sensible qu'on pourrait dire qu'ils touchaient à l'identité fondamentale des personnes concernées — Fiduciaires n'ont pas démontré en quoi la levée des ordonnances de mise sous scellés mettait en jeu la dignité des personnes touchées — On ne saurait affirmer que le risque pour la vie privée était suffisamment sérieux pour permettre de réfuter la forte présomption de publicité des débats judiciaires — Il en était de même du risque pour la sécurité physique.

Procédure civile --- Procédure en appel — Pouvoirs et obligations de la cour d'appel — Preuve en appel — Nouvelle preuve

A wealthy and prominent husband and wife were found dead in their home. Their deaths generated intense public interest and press scrutiny, and the following year the police service announced that the deaths were being investigated as homicides. The couple's estates and the estate trustees sought to stem the intense press scrutiny. When the time came to obtain certificates of appointment of estate trustees, the trustees sought a sealing order so that the trustees and beneficiaries might be spared any further intrusions into their privacy and be protected from what was alleged to be a risk to their safety. These sealing orders were granted, with the application judge sealing the orders for an initial period of two years with the possibility of renewal.

The sealing orders were challenged by a journalist, who had written a series of articles on the couple's death, and the newspaper for which he wrote. The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal and the sealing orders were lifted. The Court of Appeal concluded that the privacy interest for which the trustees sought protection lacked the quality of public interest and that there was no evidence that could warrant a finding that disclosure of the content of the estate files posed a real risk to anyone's physical safety. The trustees had failed the first stage of the test for obtaining orders sealing the probate files.

The trustees appealed, seeking to restore the sealing orders. The newspaper brought a motion to adduce new evidence on the appeal.

Held: The appeal was dismissed; the motion was dismissed as moot.

Per Kasirer J. (Wagner C.J.C., Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Brown, Rowe, Martin JJ. concurring): There is a strong presumption in favour of open courts. Notwithstanding this presumption, exceptional circumstances do arise where competing interests justified a restriction on the open court principle. Where a discretionary court order limiting constitutionally-protected openness was sought, the applicant must demonstrate as a threshold requirement that openness presents a serious risk to a competing interest of public importance. The applicant must show that the order was necessary to prevent the risk and that, as a matter of proportionality, the benefits of that order restricting openness outweighed its negative effects. For the purposes of the relevant test, an aspect of privacy was recognized as an important public interest. Proceedings in open court could lead to the dissemination of highly sensitive personal information that would result not just in discomfort or embarrassment, but in an

affront to the affected person's dignity. Where this narrower dimension of privacy, rooted in what was seen as the public interest in protecting human dignity, was shown to be at serious risk, an exception to the open court principle may be justified. It could not be said that the risk to privacy was sufficiently serious to overcome the strong presumption of openness. The same was true of the risk to physical safety. The Court of Appeal was right to set aside the sealing orders.

The broad claims of the trustees failed to focus on the elements of privacy that were deserving of public protection in the open court context. Personal information disseminated in open court could be more than a source of discomfort and may result in an affront to a person's dignity. Insofar as privacy served to protect individuals from this affront, it was an important public interest relevant under the 2002 Supreme Court of Canada judgment that set out the relevant test. This public interest would only be seriously at risk where the information in question struck at what was the core identity of the individual concerned: information so sensitive that its dissemination could be an affront to dignity that the public would not tolerate, even in service of open proceedings. The information in the court files was not of this highly sensitive character that it could be said to strike at the core identity of the affected persons. The trustees had failed to show how the lifting of the sealing orders engaged the dignity of the affected individuals.

In order to succeed, the person asking a court to exercise discretion in a way that limits the open court presumption must establish that: (1) court openness poses a serious risk to an important public interest; (2) the order sought is necessary to prevent this serious risk to the identified interest because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent this risk; and (3) as a matter of proportionality, the benefits of the order outweigh its negative effects. Only where all three of these prerequisites have been met can a discretionary limit on openness properly be ordered. Contrary to what the trustees argue, the matters in a probate file are not quintessentially private or fundamentally administrative. The fundamental rationale for openness applies to probate proceedings and thus to the transfer of property under court authority and other matters affected by that court action. The emphasis that the Court of Appeal placed on personal concerns as a means of deciding that the sealing orders failed to meet the necessity requirement was mistaken. It was inappropriate to dismiss the public interest in protecting privacy as merely a personal concern. The important public interest in privacy, as understood in the context of the limits on court openness, is aimed at allowing individuals to preserve control over their core identity in the public sphere to the extent necessary to preserve their dignity. The public has a stake in openness, but it also has an interest in the preservation of dignity: the administration of justice requires that where dignity is threatened in this way, measures be taken to accommodate this privacy concern. The risk to this interest would be serious only where the information that would be disseminated as a result of court openness was sufficiently sensitive such that openness could be shown to meaningfully strike at the individual's biographical core in a manner that threatens their integrity.

The failure of the application judge to assess the sensitivity of the information constituted a failure to consider a required element of the legal test, and this warranted intervention on appeal. Applying the appropriate framework to the facts of this case, it was concluded that the risk to the important public interest in the affected individuals' privacy was not serious. The information that the trustees sought to protect was not highly sensitive and this alone was sufficient to conclude that there was no serious risk to the important public interest in privacy so defined. The relevant privacy interest bearing on the dignity of the affected persons had not been shown. Merely associating the beneficiaries or trustees with the couple's unexplained deaths was not enough to constitute a serious risk to the identified important public interest in privacy, defined in reference to dignity. The trustees did not advance any specific reason why the contents of these files were more sensitive than they may seem at first glance. While some of the material in the court files may well be broadly disseminated, the nature of the information had not been shown to give rise to a serious risk to the important public interest in privacy.

There was no controversy that there was an important public interest in protecting individuals from physical harm. Direct evidence was not necessarily required to establish a serious risk to an important interest. It was not just the probability of the feared harm but also the gravity of the harm itself that was relevant to the assessment of serious risk. There was no dispute that the feared physical harm was grave, but it was agreed that the probability of this harm was speculative. The bare assertion that such a risk exists failed to meet the threshold necessary to establish a serious risk of physical harm. The application judge's conclusion to the contrary was an error warranting intervention. Even if the trustees had succeeded in showing a serious risk to the privacy interest they asserted, a publication ban would likely have been sufficient as a reasonable alternative to prevent this risk. The trustees were not entitled to any discretionary order limiting the open court principle. The Court of Appeal rightly concluded that there was no basis for asking for redactions because the trustees had failed at this stage of the test for discretionary limits on court openness.

Les cadavres d'un homme et de sa femme, un couple riche et célèbre, ont été retrouvés dans leur résidence. Leur mort a suscité un vif intérêt dans le public et provoqué une attention médiatique intense et, au cours de l'année qui a suivi, le service de police a annoncé que les morts faisaient l'objet d'une enquête pour homicides. La succession du couple ainsi que les fiduciaires des successions ont cherché à réfréner l'attention médiatique intense. Quand le temps est venu d'obtenir leurs certificats de nomination à titre de fiduciaires des successions, les fiduciaires ont sollicité une ordonnance de mise sous scellés dans le but d'épargner aux fiduciaires des successions et aux bénéficiaires de nouvelles atteintes à leur vie privée, et de les protéger contre ce qui, selon les allégations, aurait constitué un risque pour leur sécurité. Les ordonnances de mise sous scellés ont été accordées et le juge de première instance a fait placer sous scellés les dossiers pour une période initiale de deux ans avec possibilité de renouvellement.

Les ordonnances de mise sous scellés ont été contestées par un journaliste qui avait écrit une série d'articles sur la mort du couple et par le journal pour lequel il écrivait. La Cour d'appel a accueilli l'appel et les ordonnances de mise sous scellés ont été levées. La Cour d'appel a conclu que l'intérêt en matière de vie privée à l'égard duquel les fiduciaires sollicitaient une protection ne comportait pas la qualité d'intérêt public et qu'il n'y avait aucun élément de preuve permettant de conclure que la divulgation du contenu des dossiers de succession posait un risque réel pour la sécurité physique de quiconque. Les fiduciaires n'avaient pas franchi la première étape du test relatif à l'obtention d'ordonnances de mise sous scellés des dossiers d'homologation.

Les fiduciaires ont formé un pourvoi visant à faire rétablir les ordonnances de mise sous scellés. Le journal a déposé une requête visant à introduire une nouvelle preuve dans le cadre du pourvoi.

Arrêt: Le pourvoi a été rejeté; la requête, devenue théorique, a été rejetée.

Kasirer, J. (Wagner, J.C.C., Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Brown, Rowe, Martin, JJ., souscrivant à son opinion) : Il existe une forte présomption en faveur de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Malgré cette présomption, il peut arriver des circonstances exceptionnelles où des intérêts opposés justifient de restreindre le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Lorsqu'un demandeur sollicite une ordonnance judiciaire discrétionnaire limitant le principe constitutionnalisé de la publicité des procédures judiciaires, il doit démontrer, comme condition préliminaire, que la publicité des débats en cause présente un risque sérieux pour un intérêt opposé qui revêt une importance pour le public. Le demandeur doit démontrer que l'ordonnance est nécessaire pour écarter le risque et que, du point de vue de la proportionnalité, les avantages de cette ordonnance restreignant la publicité l'emportent sur ses effets négatifs. On a reconnu qu'un aspect de la vie privée constituait un intérêt public important pour l'application du test pertinent. La tenue de procédures judiciaires publiques était susceptible de mener à la diffusion de renseignements personnels très sensibles, laquelle entraînerait non seulement un désagrément ou de l'embarras pour la personne touchée, mais aussi une atteinte à sa dignité. Dans les cas où il est démontré que cette dimension plus restreinte de la vie privée, qui semble tirer son origine de l'intérêt du public à la protection de la dignité humaine, était sérieusement menacée, une exception au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires peut être justifiée. On ne saurait affirmer que le risque pour la vie privée était suffisamment sérieux pour permettre de réfuter la forte présomption de publicité des débats judiciaires. Il en était de même du risque pour la sécurité physique. La Cour d'appel a eu raison d'annuler les ordonnances de mise sous scellés.

Les larges revendications des fiduciaires n'étaient pas axées sur les éléments de la vie privée qui méritaient une protection publique dans le contexte de la publicité des débats judiciaires. La diffusion de renseignements personnels dans le cadre de débats judiciaires publics peut être plus qu'une source de désagrément et peut aussi entraîner une atteinte à la dignité d'une personne. Dans la mesure où elle sert à protéger les personnes contre une telle atteinte, la vie privée constitue un intérêt public important qui est pertinent en vertu du critère établi par la Cour suprême du Canada dans une décision rendue en 2002. L'intérêt public ne serait sérieusement menacé que si les renseignements en question portaient atteinte à ce que l'on considère comme l'identité fondamentale de la personne concernée : des renseignements si sensibles que leur diffusion pourrait porter atteinte à la dignité de la personne d'une manière que le public ne tolérerait pas, pas même au nom du principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires. En l'espèce, les renseignements contenus dans les dossiers judiciaires ne revêtaient pas ce caractère si sensible qu'on pourrait dire qu'ils touchaient à l'identité fondamentale des personnes concernées. Les fiduciaires n'ont pas démontré en quoi la levée des ordonnances de mise sous scellés mettait en jeu la dignité des personnes touchées.

Pour obtenir gain de cause, la personne qui demande au tribunal d'exercer son pouvoir discrétionnaire de façon à limiter la présomption de publicité doit établir que : 1) la publicité des débats judiciaires pose un risque sérieux pour un intérêt public important; 2) l'ordonnance sollicitée est nécessaire pour écarter ce risque sérieux pour l'intérêt mis en évidence, car d'autres mesures raisonnables ne permettront pas d'écarter ce risque; et 3) du point de vue de la proportionnalité, les avantages de l'ordonnance l'emportent sur ses effets négatifs. Ce n'est que lorsque ces trois conditions préalables sont remplies

qu'une ordonnance discrétionnaire ayant pour effet de limiter la publicité des débats judiciaires pourra dûment être rendue. Contrairement à ce que les fiduciaires soutiennent, les questions soulevées dans un dossier d'homologation ne sont pas typiquement de nature privée ou fondamentalement de nature administrative. La raison d'être fondamentale de la publicité des débats s'applique aux procédures d'homologation et donc au transfert de biens sous l'autorité d'un tribunal ainsi qu'à d'autres questions touchées par ce recours judiciaire. La Cour d'appel a eu tort de mettre l'accent sur les préoccupations personnelles pour décider que les ordonnances de mise sous scellés ne satisfaisaient pas à l'exigence de la nécessité. Il est inapproprié de rejeter l'intérêt du public à la protection de la vie privée au motif qu'il s'agit d'une simple préoccupation personnelle. L'intérêt public important en matière de vie privée, tel qu'il est considéré dans le contexte des limites à la publicité des débats, vise à permettre aux personnes de garder un contrôle sur leur identité fondamentale dans la sphère publique dans la mesure nécessaire pour protéger leur dignité. Le public a un intérêt dans la publicité des débats, mais il a aussi un intérêt dans la protection de la dignité : l'administration de la justice exige que, lorsque la dignité est menacée de cette façon, des mesures puissent être prises pour tenir compte de cette préoccupation en matière de vie privée. Le risque pour cet intérêt ne sera sérieux que lorsque les renseignements qui seraient diffusés en raison de la publicité des débats judiciaires sont suffisamment sensibles pour que l'on puisse démontrer que la publicité porte atteinte de façon significative au coeur même des renseignements biographiques de la personne d'une manière qui menace son intégrité.

En n'examinant pas le caractère sensible des renseignements, le juge de première instance a omis de se pencher sur un élément nécessaire du test juridique, ce qui justifiait une intervention en appel. En appliquant le cadre approprié aux faits de la présente affaire, on a conclu que le risque pour l'intérêt public important à l'égard de la vie privée des personnes touchées n'était pas sérieux. Les renseignements que les fiduciaires cherchaient à protéger n'étaient pas très sensibles, ce qui suffisait en soi pour conclure qu'il n'y avait pas de risque sérieux pour l'intérêt public important en matière de vie privée tel que défini. L'intérêt pertinent en matière de vie privée se rapportant à la dignité des personnes touchées n'a pas été démontré. Le simple fait d'associer les bénéficiaires ou les fiduciaires à la mort inexplicquée du couple ne suffisait pas à constituer un risque sérieux pour l'intérêt public important en matière de dignité ayant été constaté, intérêt défini au regard de la dignité. Les fiduciaires n'ont pas fait valoir de raison précise pour laquelle le contenu de ces dossiers serait plus sensible qu'il n'y paraît à première vue. Même si certains des éléments contenus dans les dossiers judiciaires pouvaient fort bien être largement diffusés, il n'a pas été démontré que la nature des renseignements en cause entraînerait un risque sérieux pour l'intérêt public important en matière de vie privée. Nul n'a contesté l'existence d'un intérêt public important dans la protection des personnes contre un préjudice physique. Une preuve directe n'est pas nécessairement exigée pour démontrer qu'un intérêt important est sérieusement menacé. Ce n'est pas seulement la probabilité du préjudice appréhendé qui est pertinente lorsqu'il s'agit d'évaluer si un risque est sérieux, mais également la gravité du préjudice lui-même. Si nul ne contestait que le préjudice physique appréhendé fût grave, il fallait cependant reconnaître que la probabilité que ce préjudice se produise était conjecturale. Le simple fait d'affirmer qu'un tel risque existe ne permettait pas de franchir le seuil requis pour établir l'existence d'un risque sérieux de préjudice physique. La conclusion contraire tirée par le juge de première instance était une erreur justifiant l'intervention de la Cour d'appel. Même si les fiduciaires avaient réussi à démontrer l'existence d'un risque sérieux pour l'intérêt en matière de vie privée qu'ils invoquent, une interdiction de publication aurait probablement été suffisante en tant qu'autre option raisonnable pour écarter ce risque. Les fiduciaires n'ont droit à aucune ordonnance discrétionnaire limitant le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires. La Cour d'appel a conclu à juste titre qu'il n'y avait aucune raison de demander un caviardage parce que les fiduciaires n'avaient pas franchi cette étape du test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Kasirer J.*:

- A. c. B. & Southam Inc.* (1990), 1990 CarswellQue 2075 (C.A. Que.) — referred to
- A.B. (Litigation Guardian of) v. Bragg Communications Inc.* (2012), 2012 SCC 46, 2012 CarswellNS 675, 2012 CarswellNS 676, 25 C.P.C. (7th) 1, 350 D.L.R. (4th) 519, 95 C.C.L.T. (3d) 171, 1021 A.P.R. 1, 322 N.S.R. (2d) 1, (sub nom. *A.B. v. Bragg Communications Inc.*) [2012] 2 S.C.R. 567, (sub nom. *B. (A.) v. Bragg Communications Inc.*) 266 C.R.R. (2d) 185 (S.C.C.) — considered
- A.B. v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)* (2017), 2017 FC 629, 2017 CarswellNat 3046, 2017 CF 629, 2017 CarswellNat 3604 (F.C.) — considered
- C. (R.) c. Gourdeau* (2004), 2004 CarswellQue 1804 (C.A. Que.) — considered

with participating in judicial proceedings are likely to justify the exclusion of the public from court (*Attorney General of Nova Scotia v. MacIntyre*, [1982] 1 S.C.R. 175, at p. 185; *New Brunswick*, at para. 41). Determining the role of privacy in the *Sierra Club* analysis requires reconciling these two ideas, which is the nub of the disagreement between the parties. The right of privacy is not absolute; the open court principle is not without exceptions.

32 For the reasons that follow, I disagree with the Trustees that the ostensibly unbounded privacy interest they invoke qualifies as an important public interest within the meaning of *Sierra Club*. Their broad claim fails to focus on the elements of privacy that are deserving of public protection in the open court context. That is not to say, however, that privacy can never ground an exceptional measure such as the sealing orders sought in this case. While the mere embarrassment caused by the dissemination of personal information through the open court process does not rise to the level justifying a limit on court openness, circumstances do exist where an aspect of a person's private life has a plain public interest dimension.

33 Personal information disseminated in open court can be more than a source of discomfort and may result in an affront to a person's dignity. Insofar as privacy serves to protect individuals from this affront, it is an important public interest relevant under *Sierra Club*. Dignity in this sense is a related but narrower concern than privacy generally; it transcends the interests of the individual and, like other important public interests, is a matter that concerns the society at large. A court can make an exception to the open court principle, notwithstanding the strong presumption in its favour, if the interest in protecting core aspects of individuals' personal lives that bear on their dignity is at serious risk by reason of the dissemination of sufficiently sensitive information. The question is not whether the information is "personal" to the individual concerned, but whether, because of its highly sensitive character, its dissemination would occasion an affront to their dignity that society as a whole has a stake in protecting.

34 This public interest in privacy appropriately focuses the analysis on the impact of the dissemination of sensitive personal information, rather than the mere fact of this dissemination, which is frequently risked in court proceedings and is necessary in a system that privileges court openness. It is a high bar — higher and more precise than the sweeping privacy interest relied upon here by the Trustees. This public interest will only be seriously at risk where the information in question strikes at what is sometimes said to be the core identity of the individual concerned: information so sensitive that its dissemination could be an affront to dignity that the public would not tolerate, even in service of open proceedings.

35 I hasten to say that applicants for an order making exception to the open court principle cannot content themselves with an unsubstantiated claim that this public interest in dignity is compromised any more than they could by an unsubstantiated claim that their physical integrity is endangered. Under *Sierra Club*, the applicant must show on the facts of the case that, as an important interest, this dignity dimension of their privacy is at "serious risk". For the purposes of the test for discretionary limits on court openness, this requires the applicant to show that the information in the court file is sufficiently sensitive such that it can be said to strike at the biographical core of the individual and, in the broader circumstances, that there is a serious risk that, without an exceptional order, the affected individual will suffer an affront to their dignity.

36 In the present case, the information in the court files was not of this highly sensitive character that it could be said to strike at the core identity of the affected persons; the Trustees have failed to show how the lifting of the sealing orders engages the dignity of the affected individuals. I am therefore not convinced that the intrusion on their privacy raises a serious risk to an important public interest as required by *Sierra Club*. Moreover, as I shall endeavour to explain, there was no serious risk of physical harm to the affected individuals by lifting the sealing orders. Accordingly, this is not an appropriate case in which to make sealing orders, or any order limiting access to these court files. In the circumstances, the admissibility of the Toronto Star's new evidence is moot. I propose to dismiss the appeal.

A. The Test for Discretionary Limits on Court Openness

37 Court proceedings are presumptively open to the public (*MacIntyre*, at p. 189; *A.B. v. Bragg Communications Inc.*, 2012 SCC 46, [2012] 2 S.C.R. 567, at para. 11).