

**ONTARIO  
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE  
COMMERCIAL LIST**

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

**AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR  
ARRANGEMENT OF SINO-FOREST CORPORATION**

---

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF ALLEN T. Y. CHAN  
(Motions returnable October 9 & 10, 2012)**

---

**MILLER THOMSON LLP**

Scotia Plaza  
40 King Street West, Suite 5800  
Toronto, ON Canada M5H 3S1  
Fax: 416.595.8695

Emily Cole (LSUC#: 34620Q)  
Tel: 416.595.8640  
Email: [ecole@millერთhompson.com](mailto:ecole@millერთhompson.com)

Joseph Marin (LSUC#: 16957R)  
Tel: 416.595.8579  
Email: [jmarin@millერთhompson.com](mailto:jmarin@millერთhompson.com)

Craig Mills (LSUC#: 40947B)  
Tel: 416.595.8596  
Email: [cmills@millერთhompson.com](mailto:cmills@millერთhompson.com)

Lawyers for Allen T.Y. Chan

**TO: THE SERVICE LIST**

## INDEX

1. *Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.*, 1992 CarswellOnt 185 (Gen. Div.)
2. *Canadian Airlines Corp. (Re)*, (2000) 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1, 2000 CarswellAlta 622 (Alta Q.B.)
3. *Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)*, 2011 ONSC 2215, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156, 2011 CarswellOnt 2392 (S.C.J.)
4. *ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v Bricore Land Group Ltd.*, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, 2007 CarswellSask 324
5. *Menegon v. Phillip Services Corp.*, (1999) 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 1999 CarswellOnt 3240 (S.C.J.)
6. *Muscletech Research & Development Inc. (Re)*, (2006) 25 C.B.R. (5th) 231, 2006 CarswellOnt 6230 (S.C.J.)
7. *Northland Properties Ltd. (Re)*, (1988) 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141, 1988 CarswellBC 553 (B.C.S.C.)
8. *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada* (Minister of Finance), [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522
9. *Stelco Inc. (Re)*, (2005) 75 O.R. (3d) 5, 2005 CarswellOnt 1188 (C.A.)
10. *Timminco Limited (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 2515 (Ont. S.C.J.)

**TAB 1**

1992 CarswellOnt 185, 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 14 C.P.C. (3d) 339

1992 CarswellOnt 185, 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 14 C.P.C. (3d) 339

Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.

ROBERT CAMPEAU, ROBERT CAMPEAU INC., 75090 ONTARIO INC., and ROBERT CAMPEAU INVESTMENTS INC. v. OLYMPIA & YORK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED, 857408 ONTARIO INC., and NATIONAL BANK OF CANADA

Ontario Court of Justice (General Division)

R.A. Blair J.

Judgment: September 21, 1992  
Docket: Docs. 92-CQ-19675, B-125/92

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

Counsel: *Stephen T. Goudge, Q.C.* and *Peter C. Wardle*, for the plaintiffs.

*Peter F. C. Howard*, for National Bank of Canada.

*Yoine Goldstein*, for Olympia & York Development Limited and 857408 Ontario Inc.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

Practice --- Disposition without trial — Stay or dismissal of action — Grounds — Another proceeding pending — General.

Application for lifting of CCAA stay refused where proposed action being part of "controlled stream" of litigation and best dealt with under CCAA.

The plaintiffs brought an action against the defendant, O & Y, alleging that it breached an obligation to assist in the restructuring of C Corp. The plaintiffs also alleged that O & Y actually frustrated the individual plaintiff's efforts to restructure C Corp.'s Canadian real estate operation. Damages in the amount of \$1 billion for breach of contract or, alternatively, for breach of fiduciary duty, plus punitive damages of \$250 million were claimed. The plaintiffs also claimed against the defendant bank alleging breach of fiduciary duty, negligence and breach of the provisions of s. 17(1) of the *Personal Property Security Act* (Ont.). Damages in the amount of \$1 billion were claimed against the bank. This action was brought two weeks before an order was made extending the protection of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") to O & Y.

The plaintiffs brought a motion to lift the stay imposed by the order under the CCAA and to allow them to pursue their action against O & Y. They argued that the claim would be better dealt with in the context of the action than in the context of the CCAA proceedings as it was uniquely complex.

1992 CarswellOnt 185, 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 14 C.P.C. (3d) 339

The bank brought a motion opposing the plaintiffs' motion and seeking an order staying the plaintiffs' action against it pending the disposition of the CCAA proceedings. The bank argued that the factual basis of the claim against it was entirely dependent on the success of the allegations against O & Y and that the claim against O & Y would be better addressed within the context of the CCAA proceedings.

**Held:**

The plaintiffs' motion was dismissed and the bank's motion was allowed.

In considering whether to grant a stay, a court must look at the balance of convenience. The balance of convenience must weigh significantly in favour of granting the stay, as a party's right to have access to the courts is something with which the court must not lightly interfere. The court must be satisfied that a continuance of the proceeding would serve as an injustice to the party seeking the stay. The onus of satisfying the court is on the party seeking the stay.

The CCAA proceedings in this case involved numerous applicants, claimants and complex issues and could be considered a "controlled stream" of litigation; maintaining the integrity of the flow was an important consideration.

The stay under the CCAA was not lifted, and a stay made under the court's general jurisdiction to order stays was imposed, preventing the continuation of the action against the bank. There was no prejudice to the plaintiffs arising from these decisions, as the processing of their action was not precluded, but merely postponed. Were the CCAA stay lifted, there might be great prejudice to O & Y resulting from the diversion of its attention from the corporate restructuring process in order to defend the complex action proposed. There might not, however, be much prejudice to the bank in allowing the plaintiffs' action to proceed against it; however, such a proceeding could not proceed very far or effectively without the participation of O & Y.

**Cases considered:**

*Arab Monetary Fund v. Hashim* (June 25, 1992), Doc.34127/88, O'Connell J. (Ont. Gen. Div.), [1992] O.J. No. 1330 — referred to

*Attorney General v. Arthur Anderson & Co.* (1988), [1989] E.C.C. 244 (C.A.) — referred to

*Canada Systems Group (EST) Ltd. v. Allendale Mutual Insurance Co.* (1982), 29 C.P.C. 60, 137 D.L.R. (3d) 287 (Ont. H.C.) — applied

*Empire-Universal Films Ltd. v. Rank*, [1947] O.R. (H.C.) — referred to

*Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361, 92 A.R. 81 (Q.B.) — referred to

*Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 105 (C.A.) — applied

*Weight Watchers International Inc. v. Weight Watchers of Ontario Ltd.* (1972), 25 D.L.R. (3d) 419, 5 C.P.R. (2d) 122 (Fed. T.D.), appeal allowed by consent without costs (1972), 10 C.P.R. (2d) 96n, 42 D.L.R. (3d) 320n (Fed. C.A.) — referred to

*Weight Watchers International Inc. v. Weight Watchers of Ontario Ltd.* (1972), 10 C.P.R. (2d) 96n, 42 D.L.R. (3d) 320n (Fed. C.A.) — referred to

1992 CarswellOnt 185, 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 14 C.P.C. (3d) 339

**Statutes considered:**

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

s. 11

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

s. 106

Personal Property Security Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.10 —

s. 17(1)

**Rules considered:**

Ontario, Rules of Civil Procedure —

r. 6.01(1)

Motion to lift stay under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act; Motion for stay under Courts of Justice Act.

***R.A. Blair J :***

1 These motions raise questions regarding the court's power to stay proceedings. Two competing interests are to be weighed in the balance, namely,

a) the interests of a debtor which has been granted the protection of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, and the "breathing space" offered by a s. 11 stay in such proceedings, on the one hand, and,

b) the interests of a unliquidated contingent claimant to pursue an action against that debtor *and* an arm's length third party, on the other hand.

2 At issue is whether the court should resort to an interplay between its specific power to grant a stay, under s. 11 of the C.C.A.A., and its general power to do so under the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43 in order to stay the action completely; or whether it should lift the s. 11 stay to allow the action to proceed; or whether it should exercise some combination of these powers.

**Background and Overview**

3 This action was commenced on April 28, 1992, and the statement of claim was served before May 14, 1992, the date on which an order was made extending the protection of the C.C.A.A. to Olympia & York Developments Limited and a group of related companies ("Olympia & York", or "O & Y" or the "Olympia & York Group").

4 The plaintiffs are Robert Campeau and three Campeau family corporations which, together with Mr. Campeau, held the control block of shares of Campeau Corporation. Mr. Campeau is the former chairman and CEO of

1992 CarswellOnt 185, 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 14 C.P.C. (3d) 339

Campeau Corporation, said to have been one of North America's largest real estate development companies, until its recent rather high profile demise. It is the fall of that empire which forms the subject matter of the lawsuit.

### **The Claim against the Olympia & York Defendants**

5 The story begins, according to the statement of claim, in 1987, after Campeau Corporation had completed a successful leveraged buy-out of Allied Stores Corporation, a very large retailer based in the United States. Olympia & York had aided in funding the Allied takeover by purchasing half of Campeau Corporation's interest in the Scotia Plaza in Toronto and subsequently also purchasing 10 per cent of the shares of Campeau Corporation. By late 1987, it is alleged, the relationship between Mr. Campeau and Mr. Paul Reichmann (one of the principals of Olympia & York) had become very close, and an agreement had been made whereby Olympia & York was to provide significant financial support, together with the considerable expertise and the experience of its personnel, in connection with Campeau Corporation's subsequent bid for control of Federated Stores Inc. (a second major U.S. department store chain). The story ends, so it is said, in 1991 after Mr. Campeau had been removed as chairman and CEO of Campeau Corporation and that company, itself, had filed for protection under the C.C.A.A. (from which it has since emerged, bearing the new name of Camdev Corp.).

6 In the meantime, in September 1989, the Olympia & York defendants, through Mr. Paul Reichmann, had entered into a shareholders' agreement with the plaintiffs in which, it is further alleged, Olympia & York obliged itself to develop and implement expeditiously a viable restructuring plan for Campeau Corporation. The allegation that Olympia & York breached this obligation by failing to develop and implement such a plan, together with the further assertion that the O & Y defendants actually frustrated Mr. Campeau's efforts to restructure Campeau Corporation's Canadian real estate operation, lies at the heart of the Campeau action. The plaintiffs plead that as a result they have suffered very substantial damages, including the loss of the value of their shares in Campeau Corporation, the loss of the opportunity of completing a refinancing deal with the Edward DeBartolo Corporation, and the loss of the opportunity on Mr. Campeau's part to settle his personal obligations on terms which would have preserved his position as chairman and CEO and majority shareholder of Campeau Corporation.

7 Damages are claimed in the amount of \$1 billion, for breach of contract or, alternatively, for breach of fiduciary duty. Punitive damages in the amount of \$250 million are also sought.

### **The Claim against National Bank of Canada**

8 Similar damages, in the amount of \$1 billion (but no punitive damages), are claimed against the defendant National Bank of Canada, as well. The causes of action against the bank are framed as breach of fiduciary duty, negligence, and breach of the provisions of s. 17(1) of the *Personal Property Security Act* [R.S.O. 1990, c. P.10]. They arise out of certain alleged acts of misconduct on the part of the bank's representatives on the board of directors of Campeau Corporation.

9 In 1988 the plaintiffs had pledged some of their shares in Campeau Corporation to the bank as security for a loan advanced in connection with the Federated Stores transaction. In early 1990, one of the plaintiffs defaulted on its obligations under the loan and the bank took control of the pledged shares. Thereafter, the statement of claim alleges, the bank became more active in the management of Campeau, through its nominees on the board.

10 The bank had two such nominees. Olympia & York had three. There were 12 directors in total. What is asserted against the bank is that its directors, in co-operation with the Olympia & York directors, acted in a way to frustrate Campeau's restructuring efforts and favoured the interests of the bank as a secured lender rather than the interests of Campeau Corporation, of which they were directors. In particular, it is alleged that the bank's representatives failed to ensure that the DeBartolo refinancing was implemented and, indeed, actively supported Olympia & York's efforts to frustrate it, and in addition, that they supported Olympia & York's efforts to refuse to approve or

1992 CarswellOnt 185, 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 14 C.P.C. (3d) 339

delay the sale of real estate assets.

### The Motions

11 There are two motions before me.

12 The first motion is by the Campeau plaintiffs to lift the stay imposed by the order of May 14, 1992 under the C.C.A.A. and to allow them to pursue their action against the Olympia & York defendants. They argue that a plaintiff's right to proceed with an action ought not lightly to be precluded; that this action is uniquely complex and difficult; and that the claim is better and more easily dealt with in the context of the action rather than in the context of the present C.C.A.A. proceedings. Counsel acknowledge that the factual bases of the claims against Olympia & York and the bank are closely intertwined and that the claim for damages is the same, but argue that the causes of action asserted against the two are different. Moreover, they submit, this is not the usual kind of situation where a stay is imposed to control the process and avoid inconsistent findings when the same parties are litigating the same issues in parallel proceedings.

13 The second motion is by National Bank, which of course opposes the first motion, and which seeks an order staying the Campeau action as against it as well, pending the disposition of the C.C.A.A. proceedings. Counsel submits that the factual substratum of the claim against the bank is dependent entirely on the success of the allegations against the Olympia & York defendants, and that the claim against those defendants is better addressed within the parameters of the C.C.A.A. proceedings. He points out also that if the action were to be taken against the bank alone, his client would be obliged to bring Olympia & York back into the action as third parties in any event.

### The Power to Stay

14 The court has always had an inherent jurisdiction to grant a stay of proceedings whenever it is just and convenient to do so, in order to control its process or prevent an abuse of that process: see *Canada Systems Group (EST) Ltd. v. Allendale Mutual Insurance Co.* (1982), 29 C.P.C. 60, 137 D.L.R. (3d) 287 (Ont. H.C.), and cases referred to therein. In the civil context, this general power is also embodied in the very broad terms of s. 106 of the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, which provides as follows:

106. A court, on its own initiative or on motion by any person, whether or not a party, may stay any proceeding in the court on such terms as are considered just.

15 Recently, Mr. Justice O'Connell has observed that this discretionary power is "highly dependent on the facts of each particular case": *Arab Monetary Fund v. Hashim* (unreported) [(June 25, 1992), Doc. 34127/88 (Ont. Gen. Div.)], [1992] O.J. No. 1330.

16 Apart from this inherent and general jurisdiction to stay proceedings, there are many instances where the court is specifically granted the power to stay in a particular context, by virtue of statute or under the *Rules of Civil Procedure*. The authority to prevent multiplicity of proceedings in the same court, under r. 6.01(1), is an example of the latter. The power to stay judicial and extra-judicial proceedings under s. 11 of the C.C.A.A., is an example of the former. Section 11 of the C.C.A.A. provides as follows:

11. Notwithstanding anything in the *Bankruptcy Act* or the *Winding-up Act*, whenever an application has been made under this Act in respect of any company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit,

(a) make an order staying, until such time as the court may prescribe or until any further order, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy Act* and the *Winding-up*



1992 CarswellOnt 185, 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 14 C.P.C. (3d) 339

*Act* or either of them;

(b) restrain further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company on such terms as the court sees fit; and

(c) make an order that no suit, action or other proceeding shall be proceeded with or commenced against the company except with the leave of the court and subject to such terms as the court imposes.

### *The Power to Stay in the Context of C.C.A.A. Proceedings*

17 By its formal title the C.C.A.A. is known as "An Act to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors". To ensure the effective nature of such a "facilitative" process it is essential that the debtor company be afforded a respite from the litigious and other rights being exercised by creditors, while it attempts to carry on as a going concern and to negotiate an acceptable corporate restructuring arrangement with such creditors.

18 In this respect it has been observed that the C.C.A.A. is "to be used as a practical and effective way of restructuring corporate indebtedness": see the case comment following the report of *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleum Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361, 92 A.R. 81 (Q.B), and the approval of that remark as "a perceptive observation about the attitude of the courts" by Gibbs J.A. in *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 105 (C.A.) at p. 113 [B.C.L.R.].

19 Gibbs J.A. continued with this comment:

To the extent that a general principle can be extracted from the few cases directly on point, and the others in which there is persuasive obiter, it would appear to be that the courts have concluded that under s. 11 there is a *discretionary power to restrain judicial or extra-judicial conduct* against the debtor company *the effect of which is, or would be, seriously to impair the ability of the debtor company to continue in business during the compromise or arrangement negotiating period*.

(emphasis added)

20 I agree with those sentiments and would simply add that, in my view, the restraining power extends as well to conduct which could seriously impair the debtor's ability to focus and concentrate its efforts on the business purpose of negotiating the compromise or arrangement.

21 I must have regard to these foregoing factors while I consider, as well, the general principles which have historically governed the court's exercise of its power to stay proceedings. These principles were reviewed by Mr. Justice Montgomery in *Canada Systems Group (EST) Ltd. v. Allendale Mutual Insurance*, supra (a "Mississauga Derailment" case), at pp. 65-66 [C.P.C.]. The balance of convenience must weigh significantly in favour of granting the stay, as a party's right to have access to the courts must not be lightly interfered with. The court must be satisfied that a continuance of the proceeding would serve as an injustice to the party seeking the stay, in the sense that it would be oppressive or vexatious or an abuse of the process of the court in some other way. The stay must not cause an injustice to the plaintiff. On all of these issues the onus of satisfying the court is on the party seeking the stay: see also *Weight Watchers International Inc. v. Weight Watchers of Ontario Ltd.* (1972), 25 D.L.R. (3d) 419, 5 C.P.R. (2d) 122 (Fed. T.D.), appeal allowed by consent without costs (1972), 10 C.P.R. (2d) 96n, 42 D.L.R. (3d) 320n (Fed. C.A.), where Mr. Justice Heald recited the foregoing principles from *Empire-Universal Films Ltd. v. Rank*, [1947] O.R. 775 (H.C.) at p.779.

22 *Canada Systems Group (EST) Ltd. v. Allendale Mutual Insurance*, supra, is a particularly helpful authority,

1992 CarswellOnt 185, 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 14 C.P.C. (3d) 339

although the question in issue there was somewhat different than those in issue on these motions. The case was one of several hundred arising out of the Mississauga derailment in November 1979, all of which actions were being case-managed by Montgomery J. These actions were all part of what Montgomery J. called "a controlled stream" of litigation involving a large number of claims and innumerable parties. Similarly, while the Olympia & York proceedings under the C.C.A.A. do not involve a large number of separate actions, they do involve numerous applicants, an even larger number of very substantial claimants, and a diverse collection of intricate and broad-sweeping issues. In that sense the C.C.A.A. proceedings are a controlled stream of litigation. Maintaining the integrity of the flow is an important consideration.

### Disposition

23 I have concluded that the proper way to approach this situation is to continue the stay imposed under the C.C.A.A. prohibiting the action against the Olympia & York defendants, and in addition, to impose a stay, utilizing the court's general jurisdiction in that regard, preventing the continuation of the action against National Bank as well. The stays will remain in effect for as long as the s. 11 stay remains operative, unless otherwise provided by order of this court.

24 In making these orders, I see no prejudice to the Campeau plaintiffs. The processing of their action is not being precluded, but merely postponed. Their claims may, indeed, be addressed more expeditiously than might have otherwise been the case, as they may be dealt with — at least for the purposes of that proceeding — in the C.C.A.A. proceeding itself. On the other hand, there might be great prejudice to Olympia & York if its attention is diverted from the corporate restructuring process and it is required to expend time and energy in defending an action of the complexity and dimension of this one. While there may not be a great deal of prejudice to National Bank in allowing the action to proceed against it, I am satisfied that there is little likelihood of the action proceeding very far or very effectively unless and until Olympia & York — whose alleged misdeeds are the real focal point of the attack on both sets of defendants — is able to participate.

25 In addition to the foregoing, I have considered the following factors in the exercise of my discretion:

1. Counsel for the plaintiffs argued that the Campeau claim must be dealt with, either in the action or in the C.C.A.A. proceedings and that it cannot simply be ignored. I agree. However, in my view, it is more appropriate, and in fact is essential, that the claim be addressed within the parameters of the C.C.A.A. proceedings rather than outside, in order to maintain the integrity of those proceedings. Were it otherwise, the numerous creditors in that mammoth proceeding would have no effective way of assessing the weight to be given to the Campeau claim in determining their approach to the acceptance or rejection of the Olympia & York plan filed under the Act.

2. In this sense, the Campeau claim — like other secured, undersecured, unsecured, and contingent claims — must be dealt with as part of a "controlled stream" of claims that are being negotiated with a view to facilitating a compromise and arrangement between Olympia & York and its creditors. In weighing "the good management" of the two sets of proceedings — i.e., the action and the C.C.A.A. proceeding — the scales tip in favour of dealing with the Campeau claim in the context of the latter: see *Attorney General v. Arthur Andersen & Co.* (1988), [1989] E.C.C. 224 (C.A.), cited in *Arab Monetary Fund v. Hashim*, supra.

I am aware, when saying this, that in the initial plan of compromise and arrangement filed by the applicants with the court on August 21, 1992, the applicants have chosen to include the Campeau plaintiffs amongst those described as "Persons not Affected by the Plan". This treatment does not change the issues, in my view, as it is up to the applicants to decide how they wish to deal with that group of "creditors" in presenting their plan, and up to the other creditors to decide whether they will accept such treatment. In either case, the matter is being dealt with, as it should be, within the context of the C.C.A.A. proceedings.

1992 CarswellOnt 185, 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 14 C.P.C. (3d) 339

3. Pre-judgment interest will compensate the plaintiffs for any delay caused by the imposition of the stays, should the action subsequently proceed and the plaintiffs ultimately be successful.

4. While there may not be great prejudice to National Bank if the action were to continue against it alone and the causes of action asserted against the two groups of defendants are different, the complex factual situation is common to both claims and the damages are the same. The potential of two different inquiries at two different times into those same facts and damages is not something that should be encouraged. Such multiplicity of inquiries should in fact be discouraged, particularly where — as is the case here — the delay occasioned by the stay is relatively short (at least in terms of the speed with which an action like this Campeau action is likely to progress).

#### Conclusion

26 Accordingly, an order will go as indicated, dismissing the motion of the Campeau plaintiffs and allowing the motion of National Bank. Each stay will remain in effect until the expiration of the stay period under the C.C.A.A., unless extended or otherwise dealt with by the court prior to that time. Costs to the defendants in any event of the cause in the Campeau action. I will fix the amounts if counsel wish me to do so.

*Order accordingly.*

END OF DOCUMENT

**TAB 2**

2000 CarswellAlta 622, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1

2000 CarswellAlta 622, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1

Canadian Airlines Corp., Re

In the Matter of Canadian Airlines Corporation and Canadian Airlines International Ltd.

The Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company of New York, As Trustee for the Holders of Senior Secured Notes and Montreal Trust Company of Canada, As Collateral Agent for the Holders of Senior Secured Notes, Plaintiffs and Canadian Airlines Corporation, Canadian Airlines International Ltd., Canadian Regional Airlines Ltd., Canadian Regional Airlines (1998) Ltd. and Canadian Airlines Fuel Corporation Inc., Defendants

Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Paperny J.

Judgment: May 4, 2000

Docket: Calgary 0001-05071, 0001-05044

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

Counsel: *G. Morawetz, A.J. McConnell* and *R.N. Billington*, for Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Co. of New York and Montreal Trust Co. of Canada.

*A.L. Friend, Q.C.*, and *H.M. Kay, Q.C.*, for Canadian Airlines.

*S. Dunphy*, for Air Canada and 853350 Alberta Ltd.

*R. Anderson, Q.C.*, for Loyalty Group.

*H. Gorman*, for ABN AMRO Bank N.V.

*P. McCarthy*, for Monitor - Price Waterhouse Cooper.

*D. Haigh, Q.C.*, and *D. Nishimura*, for Unsecured noteholders - Resurgence Asset Management.

*C.J. Shaw*, for Airline Pilots Association International.

*G. Wells*, for NavCanada.

*D. Hardy*, for Royal Bank of Canada.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

2000 CarswellAlta 622, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1

Corporations --- Arrangements and compromises — Under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Effect of arrangement — Stay of proceedings

Senior secured noteholders brought application for appointment of receiver over collateral on same day that airline was granted CCAA protection — Noteholders constituted separate class that intended to vote against plan and had voted to realize on security — Noteholders brought application for order lifting stay of proceedings against them to allow for appointment of receiver and manager over assets and property charged in their favour, and for order appointing court officer with exclusive right to negotiate sale of assets or shares of airline's subsidiary — Application dismissed — In determining whether stay should be lifted, court had to balance interests of all parties who stood to be affected — This would include general public, which would be affected by collapse of airline — Evidence indicated that liquidation would be inevitable were noteholders to realize on collateral — Objective of stay was not to maintain literal status quo but to maintain situation that was not prejudicial to creditors while allowing airline "breathing room" — It was premature to conclude that plan would be rejected or that proposal acceptable to noteholders could not be reached — Evidence indicated that airline was moving to effect compromises swiftly and in good faith — Appointment of receiver to manage collateral would negate effect of stay and thwart purposes of Act — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36.

Corporations --- Arrangements and compromises — Under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Miscellaneous issues

Senior secured noteholders brought application for appointment of receiver over collateral on same day that airline was granted CCAA protection — Noteholders constituted separate class that intended to vote against plan and voted to realize on security — Noteholders brought application for order lifting stay of proceedings against them to allow for appointment of receiver and manager over assets and property charged in their favour, and for order appointing court officer with exclusive right to negotiate sale of assets or shares of airline's subsidiary — Application dismissed — Proposal that airline make interim payments for use of security was not viable — Suggestion that other airline financially supporting plan should pay out airline's debts to noteholders was without legal foundation — Existence of solvent entity financially supporting plan with view to obtaining economic benefit for itself did not create obligation on that entity to pay airline's creditors — Noteholders could not require sale of assets or shares of airline's subsidiary — Subsidiary was not debtor company but was itself property of airline — Marketing of subsidiary's assets would constitute "proceeding in respect of petitioners' property" within meaning of s. 11 of Act — Even if marketing of subsidiary's assets did not so qualify, court has inherent jurisdiction to grant stays in relation to proceedings against third parties where exercise of jurisdiction is important to reorganization process — In deciding whether to exercise inherent jurisdiction, court weighs interests of insolvent corporation against interests of parties who would be affected by stay — Threshold of prejudice required to persuade court not to exercise inherent jurisdiction to grant stay is lower than threshold required to persuade court not to exercise discretion under s. 11 of Act — Noteholders failed to meet either threshold — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11.

#### Cases considered by *Paperny J.*:

*Alberta-Pacific Terminals Ltd., Re* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 99 (B.C. S.C.) — considered

*Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.* (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 14 C.P.C. (3d) 339 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

*Citibank Canada v. Chase Manhattan Bank of Canada* (1991), 5 C.B.R. (3d) 165, 2 P.P.S.A.C. (2d) 21, 4 B.L.R. (2d) 147 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

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

2000 CarswellAlta 622, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1

*Meridian Development Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank*, [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215, 52 C.B.R. (N.S.) 109, 32 Alta. L.R. (2d) 150, 53 A.R. 39, 11 D.L.R. (4th) 576 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

*Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.* (1988), 64 Alta. L.R. (2d) 139, [1989] 2 W.W.R. 566, 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 20, 72 C.R. (N.S.) 20 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

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

*Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re* (1992), 72 B.C.L.R. (2d) 368, 19 B.C.A.C. 134, 34 W.A.C. 134, 15 C.B.R. (3d) 265 (B.C. C.A. [In Chambers]) — considered

*Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25, 67 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, 4 B.L.R. (2d) 142 (B.C. C.A.) — considered

*Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 57 (note), 143 N.R. 286 (note), 70 B.C.L.R. (2d) xxxiii (note), 15 B.C.A.C. 240 (note), 27 W.A.C. 240 (note), 6 B.L.R. (2d) 149 (note) (S.C.C.) — referred to

*Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* (1990), 80 C.B.R. (N.S.) 98 (B.C. S.C.) — considered

*Woodward's Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 236, 79 B.C.L.R. (2d) 257 (B.C. S.C.) — considered

#### **Statutes considered:**

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

Generally — referred to

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

Generally — considered

s. 11 — considered

s. 11(4) — considered

APPLICATION by holders of senior secured notes in corporation for order lifting stay of proceedings against them in *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* proceeding to allow for appointment of receiver and manager over assets and property charged in their favour and for order appointing court officer with exclusive right to negotiate sale of assets or shares of corporation's subsidiary.

#### **Paperny J. (orally):**

1 Montreal Trust Company of Canada, Collateral Agent for the holders of the Senior Secured Notes, and the Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company of New York, Trustee for the holders of the Senior Secured Notes, apply for the following relief:

2000 CarswellAlta 622, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1

1. In the CCAA proceeding (Action No. 0001-05071) an order lifting the stay of proceedings against them contained in the orders of this court dated March 24, 2000 and April 19, 2000 to allow for the court-ordered appointment of Ernst & Young Inc. as receiver and manager over the assets and property charged in favour of the Senior Secured Noteholders; and

2. In Action No. 0001-05044, an order appointing Ernst & Young Inc. as a court officer with the exclusive right to negotiate the sale of the assets or shares of Canadian Regional Airlines (1998) Ltd.

2 Canadian Airlines Corporation ("CAC") is a Canadian based holding company which, through its majority owned subsidiary Canadian Airlines International Ltd. ("CAIL") provides domestic, U.S.-Canada transborder and international jet air transportation services. CAC also provides regional transportation through its subsidiary Canadian Regional Airlines (1998) Ltd. ("Canadian Regional"). Canadian Regional is not an applicant under the CCAA proceedings.

3 The Senior Secured Notes were issued under an Indenture dated April 24, 1998 between CAC and the Trustee. The principal face amount is \$175 million U.S. As well, there is interest outstanding. The Senior Secured Notes are directly and indirectly secured by a diverse package of assets and property of the CCAA applicants, including spare engines, rotables, repairables, hangar leases and ground equipment. The security comprises the key operational assets of CAC and CAIL. The security also includes the outstanding shares of Canadian Regional and the \$56 million intercompany indebtedness owed by Canadian Regional to CAIL.

4 Under the terms of the Indenture, CAC is required to make an offer to purchase the Senior Secured Notes where there is a "change of control" of CAC. It is submitted by the Senior Secured Noteholders that Air Canada indirectly acquired control of CAC on January 4, 2000 resulting in a change of control. Under the Indenture, CAC is then required to purchase the notes at 101 percent of the outstanding principal, interest and costs. CAC did not do so. According to the Trustee, an Event of Default occurred, and on March 6, 2000 the Trustee delivered Notices of Intention to Enforce Security under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act.

5 On March 24, 2000, the Senior Secured Noteholders commenced Action No. 0001-05044 and brought an application for the appointment of a receiver over their collateral. On the same day, CAC and CAIL were granted CCAA protection and the Senior Secured Noteholders adjourned their application for a receiver. However, the Senior Secured Noteholders made further application that day for orders that Ernst & Young be appointed monitor over their security and for weekly payments from CAC and CAIL of \$500,000 U.S. These applications were dismissed.

6 The CCAA Plan filed on April 25, 2000, proposes that the Senior Secured Noteholders constitute a separate class and offers them two alternatives:

1. To accept repayment of less than the outstanding amount; or
2. To be unaffected by the CCAA Plan and realize on their security.

7 On April 26th, 2000, the Senior Secured Noteholders met and unanimously rejected the first option. They passed a resolution to take steps to realize on the security.

8 The Senior Secured Noteholders argue that the time has come to permit them to realize on their security. They have already rejected the Plan and see no utility in waiting to vote in this regard on May 26th, 2000, the date set by this court.

9 The Senior Secured Noteholders submit that since the CCAA proceedings began five weeks ago, the following has occurred:



2000 CarswellAlta 622, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1

- interest has continued to accrue at approximately \$2 million U.S. per month;
- the security has decreased in value by approximately \$6 million Canadian;
- the Collateral Agent and the Trustee have incurred substantial costs;
- no amounts have been paid for the continued use of the collateral, which is key to the operations of CAIL;
- no outstanding accrued interest has been paid; and- they are the only secured creditor not getting paid.

10 The Senior Secured Noteholders emphasize that one of the end results of the Plan is a transfer of CAIL's assets to Air Canada. The Senior Secured Noteholders assert that the Plan is sponsored by this very solvent proponent, who is in a position to pay them in full. They argue that Air Canada has made an economic decision not to do so and instead is using the CCAA to achieve its own objectives at their expense, an inappropriate use of the Act.

11 The Senior Secured Noteholders suggest that the Plan will not be impacted if they are permitted to realize on their security now instead of after a formal rejection of the Plan at the court-scheduled vote on May 26, 2000. The Senior Secured Noteholders argue that for all of the preceding reasons lifting the stay would be in accordance with the spirit and intent of the CCAA.

12 The CCAA is remedial legislation which should be given a large and liberal interpretation: See, for example, *Citibank Canada v. Chase Manhattan Bank of Canada* (1991), 5 C.B.R. (3d) 165 (Ont. Gen. Div.). It is intended to permit the court to make orders which will effectively maintain the status quo for a period while the struggling company attempts to develop a plan to compromise its debts and ultimately continue operations for the benefit of both the company and its creditors: See for example, *Meridian Development Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank* (1984), 52 C.B.R. (N.S.) 109 (Alta. Q.B.), and *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 (B.C. C.A.).

13 This aim is facilitated by the power to stay proceedings provided by Section 11 of the Act. The stay power is the key element of the CCAA process.

14 The granting of a stay under Section 11 is discretionary. On the debtor's initial application, the court may order a stay at its discretion for a period not to exceed 30 days. The burden of proof to obtain a stay extension under Section 11(4) is on the debtor. The debtor must satisfy the court that circumstances exist that make the request for a stay extension appropriate and that the debtor has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence. CAC and CAIL discharged this burden on April 19, 2000. However, unlike under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, there is no statutory test under the CCAA to guide the court in lifting a stay against a certain creditor.

15 In determining whether a stay should be lifted, the court must always have regard to the particular facts. However, in every order in a CCAA proceeding the court is required to balance a number of interests. McFarlane J.A. states in his closing remarks of his reasons in *Re Pacific National Lease Holding Corp.* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 265 (B.C. C.A. [In Chambers]):

In supervising a proceeding under the C.C.A.A. orders are made, and orders are varied as changing circumstances require. Orders depend upon a careful and delicate balancing of a variety of interests and problems.

16 Also see Blair J.'s decision in *Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.* (1992), 14 C.P.C. (3d) 339 (Ont. Gen. Div.), for another example of the balancing approach.

2000 CarswellAlta 622, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1

17 As noted above, the stay power is to be used to preserve the status quo among the creditors of the insolvent company. Huddart J., as she then was, commented on the status quo in *Re Alberta-Pacific Terminals Ltd.* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 99 (B.C. S.C.). She stated:

The status quo is not always easy to find... Nor is it always easy to define. The preservation of the status quo cannot mean merely the preservation of the relative pre-stay debt status of each creditor. Other interests are served by the CCAA. Those of investors, employees, and landlords among them, and in the case of the Fraser Surrey terminal, the public too, not only of British Columbia, but also of the prairie provinces. The status quo is to be preserved in the sense that manoeuvres by creditors that would impair the financial position of the company while it attempts to reorganize are to be prevented, not in the sense that all creditors are to be treated equally or to be maintained at the same relative level. It is the company and all the interests its demise would affect that must be considered.

18 Further commentary on the status quo is contained in *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* (1990), 80 C.B.R. (N.S.) 98 (B.C. S.C.). Thackray J. comments that the maintenance of the status quo does not mean that every detail of the status quo must survive. Rather, it means that the debtor will be able to stay in business and will have breathing space to develop a proposal to remain viable.

19 Finally, in making orders under the CCAA, the court must never lose sight of the objectives of the legislation. These were concisely summarized by the chambers judge and adopted by the British Columbia Court of Appeal in *Re Pacific National Lease Holding Corp.* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 265 (B.C. C.A. [In Chambers]):

(1) The purpose of the CCAA is to allow an insolvent company a reasonable period of time to reorganize its affairs and prepare and file a plan for its continued operation subject to the requisite approval of the creditors and court.

(2) The CCAA is intended to serve not only the company's creditors but also a broad constituency which includes the shareholders and employees.

(3) During the stay period, the Act is intended to prevent manoeuvres for positioning amongst the creditors of the company.

(4) The function of the court during the stay period is to play a supervisory role to preserve the status quo and to move the process along to the point where a compromise or arrangement is approved or it is evident that the attempt is doomed to failure.

(5) The status quo does not mean preservation of the relative pre-stay debt status of each creditor. Since the companies under CCAA orders continue to operate and having regard to the broad constituency of interests the Act is intended to serve, the preservation of the status quo is not intended to create a rigid freeze of relative pre-stay positions.

(6) The court has a broad discretion to apply these principles to the facts of the particular case.

20 At pages 342 and 343 of this text, *Canadian Commercial Reorganization: Preventing Bankruptcy* (Aurora: Canada Law Book, looseleaf), R.H. McLaren describes situations in which the court will lift a stay:

1. When the plan is likely to fail;

2000 CarswellAlta 622, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1

2. The applicant shows hardship (the hardship must be caused by the stay itself and be independent of any pre-existing condition of the applicant creditor);
3. The applicant shows necessity for payment (where the creditors' financial problems are created by the order or where the failure to pay the creditor would cause it to close and thus jeopardize the debtor's company's existence);
4. The applicant would be severely prejudiced by refusal to lift the stay and there would be no resulting prejudice to the debtor company or the positions of creditors;
5. It is necessary to permit the applicant to take steps to protect a right which could be lost by the passage of time;
6. After the lapse of a significant time period, the insolvent is no closer to a proposal than at the commencement of the stay period.

21 I now turn to the particular circumstances of the applications before me.

22 I would firstly address the matter of the Senior Secured Noteholders' current rejection of the compromise put forward under the Plan. Although they are in a separate class under CAC's Plan and can control the vote as it affects their interest, they are not in a position to vote down the Plan in its entirety. However, the Senior Secured Noteholders submit that where a plan offers two options to a class of creditors and the class has selected which option it wants, there is no purpose to be served in delaying that class from proceeding with its chosen course of action. They rely on the *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101 (Ont. C.A.) at 115, as just one of several cases supporting this proposition. *Re Philip's Manufacturing Ltd.* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25 (B.C. C.A.) at pp. 27-28, leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 57 (note) (S.C.C.), would suggest that the burden is on the Senior Secured Noteholders to establish that the Plan is "doomed to fail". To the extent that Nova Metal and Philip's Manufacturing articulate different tests to meet in this context, the application of either would not favour the Senior Secured Noteholders.

23 The evidence before me suggests that progress may still be made in the negotiations with the representatives of the Senior Secured Noteholders and that it would be premature to conclude that any further discussions would be unsuccessful. The parties are continuing to explore revisions and alternative proposals which would satisfy the Senior Secured Noteholders.

24 Mr. Carty's affidavit sworn May 1, 2000, in response to these applications states his belief that these efforts are being made in good faith and that, if allowed to continue, there is a real prospect for an acceptable proposal to be made at or before the creditors' meeting on May 26, 2000. Ms. Allen's affidavit does not contain any assertion that negotiations will cease. Despite the emphatic suggestion of the Senior Secured Noteholders' counsel that negotiations would be "one way", realistically I do not believe that there is no hope of the Senior Secured Noteholders coming to an acceptable compromise.

25 Further, there is no evidence before me that would indicate the Plan is "doomed to fail". The evidence does disclose that CAC and CAIL have already achieved significant compromises with creditors and continue to work swiftly and diligently to achieve further progress in this regard. This is reflected in the affidavits of Mr. Carty and the reports from the Monitor.

26 In any case, there is a fundamental problem in the application of the Senior Secured Noteholders to have a receiver appointed in respect of their security which the certainty of a "no" vote at this time does not vitiate: It disregards the interests of the other stakeholders involved in the process. These include other secured creditors, unse-

2000 CarswellAlta 622, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1

cured creditors, employees, shareholders and the flying public. It is not insignificant that the debtor companies serve an important national need in the operation of a national and international airline which employs tens of thousands of employees. As previously noted, these are all constituents the court must consider in making orders under the CCAA proceeding.

27 Paragraph 11 of Mr. Carty's May 1, 2000 affidavit states as follows:

In my opinion, the continuation of the stay of proceedings to allow the restructuring process to continue will be of benefit to all stakeholders including the holders of the Senior Secured Notes. A termination of the stay proceedings as regards the security of the holders of the Senior Secured Notes would immediately deprive CAIL of assets which are critical to its operational integrity and would result in grave disruption of CAIL's operations and could lead to the cessation of operations. This would result in the destruction of value for all stakeholders, including the holders of the Senior Secured Notes. Furthermore, if CAIL ceased to operate, it is doubtful that Canadian Regional Airlines (1998) Ltd. ("CRAL98"), whose shares form a significant part of the security package of the holders of the Senior Secured Notes, would be in a position to continue operating and there would be a very real possibility that the equity of CAIL and CRAL, valued at approximately \$115 million for the purposes of the issuance of the Senior Secured Notes in 1998, would be largely lost. Further, if such seizure caused CAIL to cease operations, the market for the assets and equipment which are subject to the security of the holders of the Senior Secured Notes could well be adversely affected, in that it could either lengthen the time necessary to realize on these assets or reduce realization values.

28 The alternative to this Plan proceeding is addressed in the Monitor's reports to the court. For example, in Paragraph 8 of the Monitor's third report to the court states:

The Monitor believes that if the Plan is not approved and implemented, CAIL will not be able to continue as a going concern. In that case, the only foreseeable alternative would be a liquidation of CAIL's assets by a receiver and manager and/or by a trustee. Under the Plan, CAIL's obligations to parties it considers to be essential in order to continue operations, including employees, customers, travel agents, fuel, maintenance, catering and equipment suppliers, and airport authorities, are in most cases to be treated as unaffected and paid in full. In the event of a liquidation, those parties would not, in most cases, be paid in full and, except for specific lien rights, statutory priorities or other legal protection, would rank as ordinary unsecured creditors. The Monitor estimates that the additional unsecured claims which would arise if CAIL were to cease operation as a going concern and be forced into liquidation would be in excess of \$1.1 billion.

29 This evidence is uncontradicted and flies in the face of the Senior Secured Noteholders' assertion that realizing on their collateral at this point in time will not affect the Plan. Although, as the Senior Secured Noteholders heavily emphasized the Plan does contemplate a "no" vote by the Senior Secured Noteholders, the removal of their security will follow that vote. 9.8(c) of the Plan states that:

If the Required Majority of Affected Secured Noteholders fails to approve the Plan, arrangements in form and substance satisfactory to the Applicants will have been made with the Affected Secured Noteholders or with a receiver appointed over the assets comprising the Senior Notes Security, which arrangements provide for the transitional use by [CAIL], and subsequent sale, of the assets comprising the Senior Notes Security.

30 On the other side of the scale, the evidence of the Senior Secured Noteholders is that the value of their security is well in excess of what they are owed. Paragraph 15(a) of the Monitor's third report to the court values the collateral at \$445 million. The evidence suggests that they are not the only secured creditor going unpaid. CAIL is asking that they be permitted to continue the restructuring process and their good faith efforts to attempt to reach an acceptable proposal with the Senior Secured Noteholders until the date of the creditors meeting, which is in three weeks. The Senior Secured Noteholders have not established that they will suffer any material prejudice in the inter-

2000 CarswellAlta 622, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1

vening period.

31 The appointment of a receiver at this time would negate the effect of the order staying proceedings and thwart the purposes of the CCAA.

32 Accordingly, I am dismissing the application, with leave to reapply in the event that the Senior Secured Noteholders vote to reject the Plan on May 26, 2000.

33 An alternative to receivership raised by the Senior Secured Noteholders was interim payment for use of the security. The Monitor's third report makes it clear that the debtor's cash flow forecasts would not permit such payments.

34 The Senior Secured Noteholders suggested Air Canada could make the payments and, indeed, that Air Canada should pay out the debt owed to them by CAC. It is my view that, in the absence of abuse of the CCAA process, simply having a solvent entity financially supporting a plan with a view to ultimately obtaining an economic benefit for itself does not dictate that that entity should be required to pay creditors in full as requested. In my view, the evidence before me at this time does not suggest that the CCAA process is being improperly used. Rather, the evidence demonstrates these proceedings to be in furtherance of the objectives of the CCAA.

35 With respect to the application to sell shares or assets of Canadian Regional, this application raises a distinct issue in that Canadian Regional is not one of the debtor companies. In my view, Paragraph 5(a) of Chief Justice Moore's March 24, 2000 order encompasses marketing the shares or assets of Canadian Regional. That paragraph stays, inter alia:

...any and all proceedings ... against or in respect of ... any of the Petitioners' property ... whether held by the Petitioners directly or indirectly, as principal or nominee, beneficially or otherwise...

36 As noted above, Canadian Regional is CAC's subsidiary, and its shares and assets are the "property" of CAC and marketing of these would constitute a "proceeding ... in respect of ... the Petitioners' property" within the meaning of Paragraph 5(a) and Section 11 of the CCAA.

37 If I am incorrect in my interpretation of Paragraph 5(a), I rely on the inherent jurisdiction of the court in these proceedings.

38 As noted above, the CCAA is to be afforded a large and liberal interpretation. Two of the landmark decisions in this regard hail from Alberta: *Meridian Development Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank*, supra, and *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleum Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 20 (Alta. Q.B.). At least one court has also recognized an inherent jurisdiction in relation to the CCAA in order to grant stays in relation to proceedings against third parties: *Re Woodward's Ltd.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 236 (B.C. S.C.). Tysoe J. urged that although this power should be used cautiously, a prerequisite to its use should not be an inability to otherwise complete the reorganization. Rather, what must be shown is that the exercise of the inherent jurisdiction is important to the reorganization process. The test described by Tysoe J. is consistent with the critical balancing that must occur in CCAA proceedings. He states:

In deciding whether to exercise its inherent jurisdiction, the court should weigh the interests of the insolvent company against the interests of parties who will be affected by the exercise of the inherent jurisdiction. If, in relative terms, the prejudice to the affected party is greater than the benefit that will be achieved by the insolvent company, the court should decline to its inherent jurisdiction. The threshold of prejudice will be much lower than the threshold required to persuade the court that it should not exercise its discretion under Section 11 of the CCAA to grant or continue a stay that is prejudicial to a creditor of the insolvent company (or other party

2000 CarswellAlta 622, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1

affected by the stay).

39 The balancing that I have described above in the context of the receivership application equally applies to this application. While the threshold of prejudice is lower, the Senior Secured Noteholders still fail to meet it. I cannot see that it is important to the CCAA proceedings that the Senior Secured Noteholders get started on marketing Canadian Regional. Instead, it would be disruptive and endanger the CCAA proceedings which, on the evidence before me, have progressed swiftly and in good faith.

40 The application in Action No. 0001-05044 is dismissed, also with leave to reapply after the vote on May 26, 2000.

41 I appreciate that the Senior Secured Noteholders will be disappointed and likely frustrated with the outcome of these applications. I would emphasize that on the evidence before me their rights are being postponed and not eradicated. Any hardship they experience at this time must yield to the greater hardship that the debtor companies and the other constituents would suffer were the stay to be lifted at this time.

*Application dismissed.*

END OF DOCUMENT

**TAB 3**

2011 CarswellOnt 2392, 2011 ONSC 2215, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156

**C**

2011 CarswellOnt 2392, 2011 ONSC 2215, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re

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

And In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Canwest Global Communications Corp. and Other Applicants

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Pepall J.

Judgment: April 7, 2011  
Docket: CV-09-8396-00CL

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

Counsel: Douglas J. Wray, Jesse B. Kugler for Applicant, Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada

David Byers, Maria Konyukhova for Monitor

Subject: Insolvency; Labour and Employment; Public

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

C Entities obtained initial order under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) staying all proceedings against them — As part of CCAA proceedings, claims procedure order was granted which established procedure for identification and quantification of claims against C Entities — B was dismissed after having been employed by division of one of C Entities for 20 years — Union filed claims pursuant to claims procedure order in respect of certain outstanding grievances — Claim with respect to B's grievances was not resolved — Plan was implemented, at which time all operating assets of C Entities were transferred and C Entities ceased operations — Stay with respect to employer was terminated — Stay with respect to remaining C Entities was extended — Union brought motion for order lifting stay of proceedings in respect of B's grievances and directing that they be adjudicated in accordance with collective agreement — Motion granted — Generally speaking, grievances should be adjudicated along with other claims pursuant to provisions of claims procedure order within context of CCAA proceedings — Present case was unique — Employer emerged from CCAA protection and was currently operating under different name — B was 20 year employee — Given stage of CCAA proceedings, fact that stay relating to employer had been lifted, and B's employment tenure, B ought to be given opportunity to pursue his claim for reinstatement rather than being compelled to have that entitlement monetized by claims officer if so ordered — No meaningful prejudice would ensue to any stakeholder — Balance of convenience and interests of justice favoured lifting stay to permit griev-



2011 CarswellOnt 2392, 2011 ONSC 2215, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156

ances to proceed through arbitration rather than before claims procedure officer.

**Cases considered by *Pepall J.*:**

*Canadian Airlines Corp., Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1, 2000 CarswellAlta 622 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

*Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re* (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 7882, 61 C.B.R. (5th) 200 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed

*Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re* (2010), 321 D.L.R. (4th) 561, 2010 ONSC 1746, 2010 CarswellOnt 3948, 82 C.C.E.L. (3d) 180 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

*Health Services & Support-Facilities Subsector Bargaining Assn. v. British Columbia* (2007), 2007 C.L.L.C. 220-035, 363 N.R. 226, 400 W.A.C. 1, [2007] 7 W.W.R. 191, D.T.E. 2007T-507, 65 B.C.L.R. (4th) 201, 283 D.L.R. (4th) 40, 137 C.L.R.B.R. (2d) 166, 242 B.C.A.C. 1, 164 L.A.C. (4th) 1, 157 C.R.R. 21, 2007 SCC 27, 2007 CarswellBC 1289, 2007 CarswellBC 1290, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 391 (S.C.C.) — followed

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

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

*Smoky River Coal Ltd., Re* (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 94, 1999 ABCA 179, 71 Alta. L.R. (3d) 1, 175 D.L.R. (4th) 703, 237 A.R. 326, 197 W.A.C. 326, [1999] 11 W.W.R. 734, 1999 CarswellAlta 491 (Alta. C.A.) — followed

*White Birch Paper Holding Co., Re* (2010), 2010 CarswellQue 14255, [2010] R.J.Q. 1518, [2010] R.J.D.T. 887, 2010 CarswellQue 6229, 2010 QCCS 2590, D.T.E. 2010T-443, 65 C.B.R. (5th) 186, 82 C.C.P.B. 192 (Que. S.C.) — considered

**Statutes considered:**

*Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, Part I of the Constitution Act, 1982, being Schedule B to the Canada Act 1982 (U.K.), 1982, c. 11

Generally — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — considered

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

s. 33 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 131] — referred to

2011 CarswellOnt 2392, 2011 ONSC 2215, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156

s. 33(1) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 131] — referred to

s. 33(8) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 131] — referred to

MOTION by union for order lifting stay of proceedings in respect of certain grievances and ordering adjudication pursuant to collective agreement.

*Pepall J.:*

### **Introduction**

1 The Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada ("CEP") requests an order lifting the stay of proceedings in respect of certain grievances and directing that they be adjudicated in accordance with the provisions of the applicable collective agreement. In the alternative, CEP requests an order amending the claims procedure order so as to permit the subject claim to be adjudicated in accordance with the provisions of the collective agreement.

### **Background Facts**

2 On October 6, 2009, the CMI Entities obtained an initial order pursuant to the *CCAA* staying all proceedings and claims against them. Specifically, paragraphs 15 and 16 of that order stated:

#### **NO PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE CMI ENTITIES OR THE CMI PROPERTY**

15. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that until and including November 5, 2009, or such later date as this Court may order (the "Stay Period"), no proceeding or enforcement process in any court or tribunal (each, a "Proceeding") shall be commenced or continued against or in respect of the CMI Entities, the Monitor or the CMI CRA or affecting the CMI Business or the CMI Property, except with the written consent of the applicable CMI Entity, the Monitor and the CMI CRA (in respect of Proceedings affecting the CMI Entities, the CMI Property or the CMI Business), the CMI CRA (in respect of Proceedings affecting the CMI CRA), or with leave of this Court, and any and all Proceedings currently under way against or in respect of the CMI Entities or the CMI CRA or affecting the CMI Business or the CMI Property are hereby stayed and suspended pending further Order of this Court. In the case of the CMI CRA, no Proceeding shall be commenced against the CMI CRA or its directors and officers without prior leave of this Court on seven (7) days notice to Stonecrest Capital Inc.

#### **NO EXERCISE OF RIGHTS OR REMEDIES**

16. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that during the Stay Period, all rights and remedies of any individual, firm, corporation, governmental body or agency, or any other entities (all of the foregoing, collectively being "Persons" and each being a "Person") against or in respect of the CMI Entities, the Monitor and/or the CMI CRA, or affecting the CMI Business or the CMI Property, are hereby stayed and suspended except with the written consent of the applicable CMI Entity, the Monitor and the CMI CRA (in respect of rights and remedies affecting the CMI Entities, the CMI Property or the CMI Business), the CMI CRA (in respect of rights or remedies affecting the CMI CRA), or leave of this Court, provided that nothing in this Order shall (i) empower the CMI Entities to carry on any business which the CMI entities are not lawfully entitled to carry on, (ii) exempt the CMI Entities from compliance with statutory or regulatory provisions relating to health, safety or the environment, (iii) prevent the filing of any registration to preserve or perfect a security interest, or (iv) prevent the registration of claim for lien.

2011 CarswellOnt 2392, 2011 ONSC 2215, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156

3 On October 14, 2009, as part of the CCAA proceedings, I granted a claims procedure order which established a claims procedure for the identification and quantification of claims against the CMI Entities. In that order, "Claim" is defined as any right or claim of any Person against one or more of the CMI Entities in existence on the Filing Date<sup>[FN1]</sup> (a "Prefiling Claim") and any right or claim of any Person against one or more of the CMI Entities arising out of the restructuring on or after the Filing Date (a "Restructuring Claim"). Claims arising prior to certain dates had to be asserted within the claims procedure failing which they were forever extinguished and barred. Pursuant to the claims procedure order, subject to the discretion of the Court, claims of any person against one or more of the CMI Entities were to be determined by a claims officer who would determine the validity and amount of the disputed claim in accordance with the claims procedure order. The Honourable Ed Saunders, The Honourable Jack Ground and The Honourable Coulter Osborne were appointed as claims officers. Other persons could also be appointed by court order or on consent of the CMI Entities and the Monitor. This order was unopposed. It was amended on November 30, 2009 and again the motion was unopposed. As at October 29, 2010, over 1,800 claims asserted against the CMI Entities had been finally resolved in accordance with and pursuant to the claims procedure order.

4 On October 27, 2010, CEP was authorized to represent its current and former union members including pensioners employed or formerly employed by the CMI Entities to the extent, if any, that it was necessary to do so.

5 On the date of the initial order, CEP had a number of outstanding grievances. CEP filed claims pursuant to the claims procedure order in respect of those grievances. The claim that is the subject matter of this motion is the only claim filed by CEP that has not been resolved and therefore is the only claim filed by CEP that requires adjudication. There is at least one other claim in Western Canada that may require adjudication.

6 John Bradley had been employed for 20 years by Global Television, a division of Canwest Television Limited Partnership ("CTLTP"), one of the CMI Entities. Mr. Bradley is a member of CEP. On February 24, 2010, CTLTP suspended Mr. Bradley for alleged misconduct. On March 8, 2010, CEP filed a grievance relating to his suspension under the applicable collective agreement. On March 25, 2010, CTLTP terminated his employment. On March 26, 2010, CEP filed a grievance requesting full redress for Mr. Bradley's termination. This would include reinstatement to his employment. On June 23, 2010 a restructuring period claim was filed with respect to the Bradley grievances on the following basis:

The Union has filed this claim in order to preserve its rights. Filing this claim is without prejudice to the Union's ability to pursue all other remedies at its disposal to enforce its rights, including any other statutory remedies available. Notwithstanding that the Union has filed the present claim, the Union does not agree that this claim is subject to compromise pursuant [to the CCAA]<sup>[FN2]</sup>. The Union reserves its right to make further submissions in this regard.

7 In spite of the parties' good faith attempts to resolve the Bradley grievances and the Bradley claim, no resolution was achieved.

8 The Plan was sanctioned on July 28, 2010 and implemented on October 27, 2010. At that time, all of the operating assets of the CMI Entities were transferred to the Plan Sponsor and the CMI Entities ceased operations. The CTLTP stay was also terminated. The stay with respect to the Remaining CMI Entities (as that term is defined in the Plan) was extended until May 5, 2011. Pursuant to an order dated September 27, 2010, following the Plan implementation date the Monitor shall be:

(a) empowered and authorized to exercise all of the rights and powers of the CMI Entities under the Claims Procedure Order, including, without limitation, revise, reject, accept, settle and/or refer for adjudication Claims (as defined in the Claims Procedure Order) all without (i) seeking or obtaining the consent of the CMI Entities, the Chief Restructuring Advisor or any other person, and (ii) consulting with the Chief Re-

2011 CarswellOnt 2392, 2011 ONSC 2215, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156

structuring Advisor in the CMI Entities; and

(b) take such further steps and seek such amendments to the Claims Procedure Order or additional orders as the Monitor considers necessary or appropriate in order to fully determine, resolve or deal with any Claims.

9 The Monitor has taken the position that if the Bradley matter is not resolved, the claim should be referred to a claims officer for determination. It is conceded that a claims officer would have no jurisdiction to reinstate Mr. Bradley to his employment.

10 CEP now requests an order lifting the stay of proceedings in respect of the Bradley grievances and directing that they be adjudicated in accordance with the provisions of the collective agreement. In the alternative, CEP requests an order amending the claims procedure order so as to permit the Bradley claim to be adjudicated in accordance with the provisions of the collective agreement.

11 For the purposes of this motion and as is obvious from the motion seeking to lift the stay, both CEP and the Monitor agree that the stay did catch the Bradley claim and that it is encompassed by the definition of claim found in the claims procedure order.

12 Since the commencement of the CCAA proceedings, CEP has only sought to lift the stay in respect of one other claim, that being a claim relating to a grievance filed by CEP on behalf of Vicky Anderson. The CMI Entities consented to lifting the stay in respect of Ms. Anderson's claim because at the date of the initial order, there had already been eight days of hearing before an arbitrator, all evidence had already been called, and only one further date was scheduled for final argument. Ultimately, the arbitrator ordered that Ms. Anderson be reinstated but made no order for compensation.

13 Pursuant to Article 12.3 of the applicable collective agreement, discharge grievances are to be heard by a single arbitrator. All other grievances are to be heard by a three person Board of Arbitration unless the parties consent to submit the grievance to a single arbitrator. The single arbitrator is to be selected within 10 days of the notice of referral to arbitration from a list of 5 people drawn by lot. An award is to be given within 30 days of the conclusion of the hearing. The list of arbitrators was negotiated and included in the collective agreement. The arbitrator has the power to reinstate with or without compensation.

14 The evidence before me suggests that adjudications of grievances under collective agreements are typically much more costly and time consuming than adjudications before a claims officer as the latter may determine claims in a summary manner and there is more control over scheduling. The Monitor takes the position that additional cost and delay would arise if the claims were adjudicated pursuant to the terms of the collective agreement rather than pursuant to the terms of the claims procedure order.

#### Issues

15 Both parties agree that the following two issues are to be considered:

(a) Should this court lift the stay of proceedings in respect of the Bradley grievances and direct that the Bradley grievances be adjudicated in accordance with the provisions of the collective agreement?

(b) Should this court amend the claims procedure order so as to permit the Bradley claim to be adjudicated in accordance with the provisions of the collective agreement?

#### Positions of the Parties

16 In brief, dealing firstly with the stay, CEP submits that the balance of convenience favours pursuit of the grievances through arbitration. CEP is seeking to compel the employer to comply with fundamental obligations that flow from the collective agreement. This includes the appointment of an arbitrator on consent who has jurisdiction to award reinstatement if he or she determines that there was no just cause to terminate Mr. Bradley's employment. Requiring that the claim and the grievances be adjudicated in a manner that is inconsistent with the collective agreement would have the effect of depriving the grievor of some of the most fundamental rights under a collective agreement. Furthermore, permitting the grievances to proceed to arbitration would prejudice no one.

17 Alternatively, CEP submits that the claims procedure order ought to be amended. It is in conflict with the terms of the collective agreement. Pursuant to section 33 of the *CCAA*, the collective agreement remains in force during the *CCAA* proceedings. The claims procedure order must comply with the express requirements of the *CCAA*. Lastly, orders issued under the *CCAA* should not infringe upon the right to engage in associational activities which are protected by the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

18 The Monitor opposes the relief requested. On the issue of the lifting of the stay, it submits that the *CCAA* is intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both. The stay of proceedings permits the *CCAA* to accomplish its legislative purpose and in particular enables continuance of the company seeking *CCAA* protection.

19 The lifting of a stay is discretionary. Mr. Bradley is no more prejudiced than any other creditor and the claims procedure established under the order has been uniformly applied. The claims officer has the power to recognize Mr. Bradley's right to reinstatement and monetize that right. The efficacy of *CCAA* proceedings would be undermined if a debtor company was forced to participate in an arbitration outside the *CCAA* proceedings. This would place the resources of an insolvent *CCAA* debtor under strain. The Monitor submits that CEP has not satisfied the onus to demonstrate that the lifting of the stay is appropriate in this case.

20 As for the second issue, the Monitor submits that the claims procedure order should not be amended. Courts regularly affect employee rights arising from collective agreements during *CCAA* proceedings and recent amendments to the *CCAA* do not change the existing case law in this regard. Furthermore, amending the claims procedure order would undermine the purpose of the *CCAA*. Lastly, relying on the Supreme Court of Canada's statements in *Health Services & Support-Facilities Subsector Bargaining Assn. v. British Columbia*[FN3], the claims procedure order does not interfere with freedom of association.

21 Following argument, I requested additional brief written submissions on certain issues and in particular, to what employment Mr. Bradley would be reinstated if so ordered. I have now received those submissions from both parties.

## Discussion

### 1. Stay of Proceedings

22 The purpose of the *CCAA* has frequently been described but bears repetition. In *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re*[FN4], Farley J. stated:

The *CCAA* is intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both.

23 The stay provisions in the *CCAA* are discretionary and very broad. Section 11.02 provides that:

2011 CarswellOnt 2392, 2011 ONSC 2215, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156

(1) A court may, on an initial application in respect of the debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 30 days,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act or the Winding Up and Restructuring Act;

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

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

(2) 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.

24 As the Court of Appeal noted in *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*[FN5], the discretion provided in section 11 is the engine that drives this broad and flexible statutory scheme. The stay of proceedings in section 11 should be broadly construed to accomplish the legislative purpose of the *CCAA* and in particular to enable continuance of the company seeking *CCAA* protection: *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.*[FN6].

25 Section 11 provides an insolvent company with breathing room and by doing so, preserves the status quo to assist the company in its restructuring or arrangement and prevents any particular stakeholder from obtaining an advantage over other stakeholders during the restructuring process. It is anticipated that one or more creditors may be prejudiced in favour of the collective whole. As stated in *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.*[FN7]:

The possibility that one or more creditors may be prejudiced should not affect the court's exercise of its authority to grant a stay of proceedings under the *CCAA* because this effect is offset by the benefit to all creditors and to the company of facilitating a reorganization. The court's primary concerns under the *CCAA* must be for the debtor and all of the creditors.

26 In *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*[FN8], I had occasion to address the issue of lifting a stay in a *CCAA* proceeding. I referred to situations in which a court had lifted a stay as described by Paperny J. (as she then was) in *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re.*[FN9] and by Professor McLaren in his book, "*Canadian Commercial Reorganization: Preventing Bankruptcy*"[FN10]. They included where:

a) a plan is likely to fail;

2011 CarswellOnt 2392, 2011 ONSC 2215, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156

- b) the applicant shows hardship (the hardship must be caused by the stay itself and be independent of any pre-existing condition of the applicant creditor);
- c) the applicant shows necessity for payment;
- d) the applicant would be significantly prejudiced by refusal to lift the stay and there would be no resulting prejudice to the debtor company or the positions of creditors;
- e) it is necessary to permit the applicant to take steps to protect a right that could be lost by the passage of time;
- f) after the lapse of a significant period, the insolvent debtor is no closer to a proposal than at the commencement of the stay period;
- g) there is a real risk that a creditor's loan will become unsecured during the stay period;
- h) it is necessary to allow the applicant to perfect a right that existed prior to the commencement of the stay period;
- i) it is in the interests of justice to do so.

27 The lifting of a stay is discretionary. As I wrote in *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*[FN11]:

There are no statutory guidelines contained in the Act. According to Professor R.H. McLaren in his book "Canadian Commercial Reorganization: Preventing Bankruptcy", an opposing party faces a very heavy onus if it wishes to apply to the court for an order lifting the stay. In determining whether to lift the stay, the court should consider whether there are sound reasons for doing so consistent with the objectives of the CCAA, including a consideration of the balance of convenience, the relative prejudice to parties, and where relevant, the merits of the proposed action: *ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.* (2007), 33 C.B.R. (5<sup>th</sup>) 50 (Sask. C.A.) at para. 68. That decision also indicated that the judge should consider the good faith and due diligence of the debtor company.

28 There appears to be no real issue that the grievances are caught by the stay of proceedings. In *Smoky River Coal Ltd., Re*[FN12], the issue was whether a judge had the discretion under the CCAA to establish a procedure for resolving a dispute between parties who had previously agreed by contract to arbitrate their disputes. The question before the court was whether the dispute should be resolved as part of the supervised reorganization of the company under the CCAA or whether the court should stay the proceedings while the dispute was resolved by an arbitrator. The presiding judge was of the view that the dispute should be resolved as expeditiously as possible under the CCAA proceedings. The Alberta Court of Appeal upheld the decision stating:

The above jurisprudence persuades me that "proceedings" in section 11 includes the proposed arbitration under the B.C. *Arbitration Act*. The Appellants assert that arbitration is expeditious. That is often, but not always, the case. Arbitration awards can be appealed. Indeed, this is contemplated by section 15(5) of the *Rules*. Arbitration awards, moreover, can be subject to judicial review, further lengthening and complicating the decision making process. Thus, the efficacy of CCAA proceedings (many of which are time sensitive) could be seriously undermined if a debtor company was forced to participate in an extra-CCAA arbitration. For these reasons, having taken into account the nature and purpose of the CCAA, I conclude that, in appropriate cases, arbitration is a "proceeding" that can be stayed under section 11 of the CCAA.[FN13]

2011 CarswellOnt 2392, 2011 ONSC 2215, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156

29 I do recognize that the *Smoky River* decision did not involve a collective agreement but an agreement to arbitrate. That said, the principles described also apply to an arbitration pursuant to the terms of a collective agreement.

30 In considering balance of convenience, CEP's primary concerns are that the claims procedure order does not accord with the rights and obligations contained in the collective agreement. Firstly, a claims officer is the adjudicator rather than an arbitrator chosen pursuant to the terms of the collective agreement and secondly, reinstatement is not an available remedy before a claims officer. Thirdly, an arbitration imports rules of natural justice and procedural fairness whereas the claims procedure is summary in nature.

31 The claims officers who were identified in the claims procedure order are all former respected and experienced judges who are well suited and capable of addressing the issues arising from the Bradley claim. Furthermore, had this been a real issue, CEP could have raised it earlier and identified another claims officer for inclusion in the claims procedure order. Indeed, an additional claims officer still could be appointed but no such request was ever advanced by CEP.

32 Should the claims officer find that CTLP did not have just cause to terminate Mr. Bradley's employment, he can recognize Mr. Bradley's right to reinstatement by monetizing that right. This was done for a multitude of other claims in the CCAA proceedings including claims filed by CEP on behalf of other members. I note that Mr. Bradley would not be receiving treatment different from that of any other creditor participating in the claims process.

33 The claims process is summary in nature for a reason. It reduces delay, streamlines the process, and reduces expense and in so doing promotes the objectives of CCAA. Indeed, if grievances were to customarily proceed to arbitration, potential exists to significantly undermine the CCAA proceedings. Arbitration of all claims arising from collective agreements would place the already stretched resources of insolvent CCAA debtors under significant additional strain and could divert resources away from the restructuring. It is my view that generally speaking, grievances should be adjudicated along with other claims pursuant to the provisions of a claims procedure order within the context of the CCAA proceedings.

34 That said, it seems to me that this case is unique. While the claims procedure order and the meeting order of June 23, 2010 provide that all claims against CTLP and others arising prior to certain dates must be asserted within the claims procedure failing which they are forever extinguished and barred, the stay relating to CTPL was terminated on October 27, 2010. CTLP has emerged from CCAA protection and is currently operating in the normal course having changed its name to Shaw Television Limited Partnership ("STLP"). If the grievance relating to Mr. Bradley's termination is successful, he could be reinstated to his employment at STLP. The position of CEP, Mr. Bradley and the Monitor is that reinstatement, if ordered, would be to STLP. Counsel for CEP advised the court that notice of the motion was given to STLP and that a representative was present in court for the argument of the motion although did not appear on the record. The Monitor has also confirmed that Shaw Communications Inc., the parent of STLP, was aware of the motion and its counsel has confirmed its understanding that any reinstatement of Mr. Bradley, if ordered, would be to STLP.

35 As mentioned, Mr. Bradley was a 20 year employee. While I do not consider the identity of the arbitrator and the natural justice arguments of CEP to be persuasive, given the stage of the CCAA proceedings, the fact that the stay relating to CTLP has been lifted, and Mr. Bradley's employment tenure, I am persuaded that he ought to be given the opportunity to pursue his claim for reinstatement rather than being compelled to have that entitlement monetized by a claims officer if so ordered. Counsel for the Monitor has confirmed that the timing of the distributions would not appear to be affected by the outcome of this motion. No meaningful prejudice would ensue to any stakeholder. It seems to me that the balance of convenience and the interests of justice favour lifting the stay to permit the grievances to proceed through arbitration rather than before the claims procedure officer. Therefore, CEP's motion to lift the stay is granted and the Bradley grievances may be adjudicated in accordance with the terms of the collective agreement.



## 2. Amendment of the Claims Procedure Order

36 In light of my decision on the stay, it is not strictly necessary to consider whether the claims procedure order should be amended as requested by CEP as alternative relief. As this issue was argued, however, I will address it.

37 Section 33 of *CCAA* was added to the statute in September, 2009. The relevant sub-sections now provide:

33(1) If proceedings under this Act have been commenced in respect of a debtor company, any collective agreement that the company has entered into as the employer remains in force, and may not be altered except as provided in this section or under the laws of the jurisdiction governing collective bargaining between the company and the bargaining agent.

33(8) For greater certainty, any collective agreement that the company and the bargaining agent have not agreed to revise remains in force, and the court shall not alter its terms.

38 Justice Mongeon of the Québec Superior Court had occasion to address the effect of section 33 of the *CCAA* in *White Birch Paper Holding Co., Re*[FN14]. He stated that the fact that a collective agreement remains in force under a *CCAA* proceeding does not have the effect of "excluding the entire collective labour relations process from the application of the *CCAA*." [FN15] He went on to write that:

It would be tantamount to paralyzing the employer with respect to reducing its costs by any means at all, and to providing the union with a veto with regard to the restructuring process. [FN16]

39 In *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*. [FN17], I wrote that section 33 of the *CCAA* "maintains the terms and obligations contained in the collective agreement but does not alter priorities or status." [FN18] In that case when dealing with the issue of immediate payment of severance payments, I wrote:

There are certain provisions in the amendments that expressly mandate certain employee related payments. In those instances, section 6(5) dealing with a sanction of a plan and section 36 dealing with a sale outside the ordinary course of business being two such examples, Parliament specifically dealt with certain employee claims. If Parliament had intended to make such a significant amendment whereby severance and termination payments (and all other payments under a collective agreement) would take priority over secured creditors, it would have done so expressly. [FN19]

40 I agree with the Monitor's position that if Parliament had intended to carve grievances out of the claims process, it would have done so expressly. To do so, however, would have undermined the purpose of the *CCAA* and in particular, the claims process which is designed to streamline the resolution of the multitude of claims against an insolvent debtor in the most time sensitive and cost efficient manner. It is hard to imagine that it was Parliament's intention that grievances under collective agreements be excluded from the reach of the stay provisions of section 11 of the *CCAA* or the ancillary claims process. In my view, such a result would seriously undermine the objectives of the *Act*.

41 Furthermore, I note that over 1,800 claims have been processed and dealt with by way of the claims procedure order, many of them involving claims filed by CEP on behalf of its members. CEP was provided with notice of the motion wherein the claims procedure order and the claims officers were approved. CEP did not raise any objection to the claims procedure order, the claims officers or the inclusion of grievances in the claims procedure at the time that the order was granted. The claims procedure order was not an order made without notice and none of the prerequisites to variation of an order has been met. Had I not lifted the stay, I would not have amended the claims procedure order as requested by CEP.

2011 CarswellOnt 2392, 2011 ONSC 2215, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156

42 CEP's last argument is that the claims procedure order interferes with Mr. Bradley's freedoms under the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. In this regard I make the following observations. Firstly, this argument was not advanced when the claims procedure order was granted. Secondly, CEP is not challenging the validity of any section of the *CCAA*. Thirdly, nothing in the statute or the claims procedure inhibits the ability to collectively bargain. In *Health Services & Support-Facilities Subsector Bargaining Assn. v. British Columbia*[FN20], the Supreme Court of Canada stated:

We conclude that section 2(d) of the *Charter* protects the capacity of members of labour unions to engage, in association, in collective bargaining on fundamental workplace issues. This protection does not cover all aspects of "collective bargaining", as that term is understood in the statutory labour relations regimes that are in place across the country. Nor does it ensure a particular outcome in a labour dispute or guarantee access to any particularly statutory regime. ...

In our view, it is entirely possible to protect the "procedure" known as collective bargaining without mandating constitutional protection for the fruits of that bargaining process.[FN21]

43 In my view, nothing in the claims procedure or the *CCAA* impacts the procedure known as collective bargaining.

#### Conclusion

44 Under the circumstances, the request to lift the stay as requested by CEP is granted. Had it been necessary to do so, I would have dismissed the alternative relief requested.

*Motion granted.*

FN1 The Filing Date was October 6, 2009, the date of the initial order.

FN2 The words in brackets were omitted but presumably this was the intention.

FN3 (S.C.C.).

FN4 (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at para. 6.

FN5 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 33.

FN6 *Supra*, note 4 at para. 10.

FN7 *Ibid*, at para. 6.

FN8 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

FN9 (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1 (Alta. Q.B.)

FN10 (Aurora: Canada Law Book, looseleaf) at para. 3.3400.

FN11 *Supra*, note 8 at para. 32.

2011 CarswellOnt 2392, 2011 ONSC 2215, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156

FN12 (Alta. C.A.)

FN13 *Ibid*, at para. 33.

FN14 2010 QCCS 2590 (Que. S.C.)

FN15 *Ibid*, at para. 31.

FN16 *Ibid*, at para. 35.

FN17 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])

FN18 *Ibid*, at para. 32.

FN19 *Ibid*, at para. 33.

FN20 *Supra*, note 3.

FN21 *Ibid*, at at paras. 19 and 29.

END OF DOCUMENT

**TAB 4**

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

## H

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.

ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. (Appellant) and Bricore Land Group Ltd., Bricore Investment Group Ltd., 624796 Saskatchewan Ltd. 603767 Saskatchewan Ltd.,(Respondents)

Saskatchewan Court of Appeal

Klebuc C.J.S., Jackson, Smith JJ.A.

Heard: June 7, 2007

Judgment: June 13, 2007

Docket: 1443, 1452

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

Proceedings: affirming *ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.* (2007), 2007 SKQB 121, 2007 CarswellSask 157 (Sask. Q.B.); additional reasons at *ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.* (2007), 2007 SKQB 144, 2007 CarswellSask 264 (Sask. Q.B.); and reversing *ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.* (2007), 2007 SKQB 144, 2007 CarswellSask 264 (Sask. Q.B.)

Counsel: Fred C. Zinkhan for Appellant

Jeffrey M. Lee for Respondents

Kim Anderson for Monitor, Ernst & Young

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Practice and procedure in courts — Stay of proceedings

Application to lift stay — B Ltd. owned building and other properties — B Ltd. filed under Companies Creditors' Arrangement Act ("CCAA") and stay of proceedings was imposed — Supervising judge appointed exclusive selling officer for B Ltd. properties, and appointed chief restructuring officer ("CRO") to assist with sale — CRO accepted purchaser's offer on B Ltd. properties ("offer") — CRO submitted report to supervising judge recommending sale of building and advising that offer represented greatest value obtainable — CRO signed agreement with realtor ("disputed agreement") — Disputed agreement provided that realtor would be protected as agent of record if B Ltd. properties were sold to other potential buyers, including City of Regina ("city") — B Ltd. properties were ultimately sold pursuant to offer, and purchaser later resold building to city — Realtor took position that it had introduced city

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

to opportunity to purchase building, and was therefore entitled to commission — Realtor's application for leave to commence action against B Ltd. was dismissed — Supervising judge held that realtor failed to establish "prima facie case" — Realtor appealed — Appeal allowed in part — Appeal was allowed with respect to costs only — "Sound reasons" test was better than "prima facie case" test in deciding whether to lift stay under CCAA — Nonetheless, realtor did not reach necessary threshold — Relevant facts included that building was subject to exclusive selling officer agreement; that two days before disputed agreement, supervising judge received CRO report recommending sale of building; that disputed agreement stated that properties were under contract to sell; and that there was no sale from B Ltd. to city — Language in disputed agreement supported CRO's position that purpose of agreement was to provide for eventuality of failed sale — Further, supervising judge issued at least five orders dealing substantively with sale of building to purchaser — B Ltd.'s argument, that it was not subject to stay order, was rejected — Application to lift stay must be made to commence action against debtor subject to CCAA order, regardless of whether claim arises before or after initial order — Section 11.3 of CCAA does not grant post-filing creditor right to sue without obtaining leave.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Proposal — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Effect of arrangement — Stay of proceedings

Application to lift stay — B Ltd. owned building and other properties — B Ltd. filed under Companies Creditors' Arrangement Act ("CCAA") and stay of proceedings was imposed — Supervising judge appointed exclusive selling officer for B Ltd. properties, and appointed chief restructuring officer ("CRO") to assist with sale — CRO accepted purchaser's offer on B Ltd. properties ("offer") — CRO submitted report to supervising judge recommending sale of building and advising that offer represented greatest value obtainable — CRO signed agreement with realtor ("disputed agreement") — Disputed agreement provided that realtor would be protected as agent of record if B Ltd. properties were sold to other potential buyers, including City of Regina ("city") — B Ltd. properties were ultimately sold pursuant to offer, and purchaser later resold building to city — Realtor took position that it had introduced city to opportunity to purchase building, and was therefore entitled to commission — Realtor's application for leave to commence action against B Ltd. was dismissed — Supervising judge held that realtor failed to establish "prima facie case" — Realtor appealed — Appeal allowed in part — Appeal was allowed with respect to costs only — "Sound reasons" test was better than "prima facie case" test in deciding whether to lift stay under CCAA — Nonetheless, realtor did not reach necessary threshold — Relevant facts included that building was subject to exclusive selling officer agreement; that two days before disputed agreement, supervising judge received CRO report recommending sale of building; that disputed agreement stated that properties were under contract to sell; and that there was no sale from B Ltd. to city — Language in disputed agreement supported CRO's position that purpose of agreement was to provide for eventuality of failed sale — Further, supervising judge issued at least five orders dealing substantively with sale of building to purchaser — B Ltd.'s argument, that it was not subject to stay order, was rejected — Application to lift stay must be made to commence action against debtor subject to CCAA order, regardless of whether claim arises before or after initial order — Section 11.3 of CCAA does not grant post-filing creditor right to sue without obtaining leave.

Debtors and creditors --- Receivers — Actions by and against receiver — Actions against receiver

Against chief restructuring officer — Application to lift stay — B Ltd. owned building and other properties — B Ltd. filed under Companies Creditors' Arrangement Act ("CCAA") — Supervising judge stayed proceedings and appointed chief restructuring officer ("CRO") — Order appointing CRO stated that he could not be sued personally except for acts of fraud, gross negligence or wilful misconduct, but order was ambiguous about acts of bad faith — CRO accepted purchaser's offer on B Ltd. properties ("offer") — CRO submitted report to supervising judge recommending sale of building and advising that offer represented greatest value obtainable — CRO signed agreement with realtor ("disputed agreement") — Disputed agreement provided that realtor would be protected as agent of record if B Ltd. properties were sold to other potential buyers, including City of Regina ("city") — B Ltd. properties were ultimately sold pursuant to offer, and purchaser later resold building to city — Realtor took position that it had introduced city to opportunity to purchase building, and was therefore entitled to commission — Realtor's applica-

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

tion for leave to commence action against CRO personally based on bad faith was dismissed — Supervising judge held that realtor was required to allege fraud, gross negligence or wilful misconduct, and failed to do so — Supervising judge accepted CRO's explanation that he was not aware that purchaser was going to resell building — Realtor appealed — Appeal allowed in part — Appeal was allowed with respect to costs only — Supervising judge did not err in refusing to lift stay to permit action against CRO personally — Supervising judge considered status of CRO as officer of court, noted ambiguity in order, and weighed evidence to certain extent.

Debtors and creditors --- Receivers — Actions by and against receiver — Practice and procedure — Costs

On application to lift stay — B Ltd. owned building and other properties — B Ltd. filed under Companies Creditors' Arrangement Act ("CCAA") — Supervising judge stayed proceedings and appointed chief restructuring officer ("CRO") — Order appointing CRO stated that he could not be sued personally except for bad faith or other acts of misconduct — CRO accepted purchaser's offer on B Ltd. properties ("offer") — CRO signed agreement with realtor ("disputed agreement") — Disputed agreement provided that realtor would be protected as agent of record if B Ltd. properties were sold to other potential buyers, including City of Regina ("city") — B Ltd. properties were ultimately sold pursuant to offer, and purchaser later resold building to city — Realtor took position that it had introduced city to opportunity to purchase building, and was therefore entitled to commission — Realtor's application for leave to commence action against B Ltd. and against CRO personally was dismissed — Supervising judge held that realtor did not have tenable cause of action against B Ltd. or CRO — Supervising judge accepted CRO's explanation that he was not aware that purchaser was going to resell building — Supervising judge awarded substantial indemnity costs to B Ltd. and CRO, on ground that realtor had alleged bad faith by CRO — Supervising judge declined to award solicitor-and-client costs on ground that there was no inappropriate conduct giving rise to litigation — Realtor appealed — Appeal allowed in part — Appeal was allowed with respect to costs only — Supervising judge erred in awarding substantial indemnity costs — There was no basis on which to order substantial indemnity costs with respect to stay in relation to B Ltd. — Bad faith was not alleged on part of B Ltd. — With respect to allegation of bad faith against CRO, realtor could not be faulted for making very allegation that it was required to make to bring application — Award of substantial indemnity costs is punitive and must meet same test used for solicitor-and-client costs.

Civil practice and procedure --- Costs — Particular orders as to costs — Costs on solicitor and client basis — Grounds for awarding — Unfounded allegations

Against chief restructuring officer — B Ltd. owned building and other properties — B Ltd. filed under Companies Creditors' Arrangement Act ("CCAA") — Supervising judge stayed proceedings and appointed chief restructuring officer ("CRO") — Order appointing CRO stated that he could not be sued personally except for bad faith or other acts of misconduct — CRO accepted purchaser's offer on B Ltd. properties ("offer") — CRO signed agreement with realtor ("disputed agreement") — Disputed agreement provided that realtor would be protected as agent of record if B Ltd. properties were sold to other potential buyers, including City of Regina ("city") — B Ltd. properties were ultimately sold pursuant to offer, and purchaser later resold building to city — Realtor took position that it had introduced city to opportunity to purchase building, and was therefore entitled to commission — Realtor's application for leave to commence action against B Ltd. and against CRO personally was dismissed — Supervising judge held that realtor did not have tenable cause of action against B Ltd. or CRO — Supervising judge accepted CRO's explanation that he was not aware that purchaser was going to resell building — Supervising judge awarded substantial indemnity costs to B Ltd. and CRO, on ground that realtor had alleged bad faith by CRO — Supervising judge declined to award solicitor-and-client costs on ground that there was no inappropriate conduct giving rise to litigation — Realtor appealed — Appeal allowed in part — Appeal was allowed with respect to costs only — Supervising judge erred in awarding substantial indemnity costs — There was no basis on which to order substantial indemnity costs with respect to stay in relation to B Ltd. — Bad faith was not alleged on part of B Ltd. — With respect to allegation of bad faith against CRO, realtor could not be faulted for making very allegation that it was required to make to bring application — Award of substantial indemnity costs is punitive and must meet same test used for solicitor-and-client costs.

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

**Cases considered by Jackson J.A.:**

*Air Canada, Re* (2004), 47 C.B.R. (4th) 182, 2004 CarswellOnt 643 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

*Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.* (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 14 C.P.C. (3d) 339, 1992 CarswellOnt 185 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

*Canadian Airlines Corp., Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1, 2000 CarswellAlta 622 (Alta. Q.B.) — considered

*Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. v. 360networks corp.* (2007), 2007 BCCA 14, 2007 CarswellBC 29, 61 B.C.L.R. (4th) 334, 28 E.T.R. (3d) 186, 27 C.B.R. (5th) 115, 10 P.P.S.A.C. (3d) 311, 235 B.C.A.C. 95, 388 W.A.C. 95 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

*Hadmor Productions Ltd. v. Hamilton* (1982), [1983] 1 A.C. 191, [1982] 1 All E.R. 1042 (U.K. H.L.) — referred to

*Hashemian v. Wilde* (2006), [2007] 2 W.W.R. 52, 40 C.P.C. (6th) 10, 2006 SKCA 126, 2006 CarswellSask 740, 382 W.A.C. 105, 289 Sask. R. 105 (Sask. C.A.) — followed

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

*Ivaco Inc., Re* (2003), 2003 CarswellOnt 6097, 1 C.B.R. (5th) 204, 6 P.P.S.A.C. (3d) 261 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

*Ivaco Inc., Re* (2006), 2006 CarswellOnt 8025 (Ont. S.C.J.) — considered

*Ma, Re* (2001), 143 O.A.C. 52, 2001 CarswellOnt 1019, 24 C.B.R. (4th) 68 (Ont. C.A.) — followed

*Martin v. Deutch* (1943), [1943] O.R. 683, 1943 CarswellOnt 36, [1943] 4 D.L.R. 600 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

*Mosaic Group Inc., Re* (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 2254, 3 C.B.R. (5th) 40 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

*New Skeena Forest Products Inc., Re* (2005), 7 M.P.L.R. (4th) 153, [2005] 8 W.W.R. 224, (sub nom. *New Skeena Forest Products Inc. v. Kitwanga Lumber Co.*) 210 B.C.A.C. 247, (sub nom. *New Skeena Forest Products Inc. v. Kitwanga Lumber Co.*) 348 W.A.C. 247, 2005 BCCA 192, 2005 CarswellBC 705, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 278, 39 B.C.L.R. (4th) 338 (B.C. C.A.) — considered

*Ptarmigan Airways Ltd. v. Federated Mining Corp.* (1973), 1973 CarswellNWT 10, [1973] 3 W.W.R. 723 (N.W.T. S.C.) — referred to

*Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 105, 1990 CarswellBC 384, 2 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to



2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

*Ramsay Plate Glass Co. v. Modern Wood Products Ltd.* (1954), 1954 CarswellQue 24, 34 C.B.R. 82 (Que. S.C.) — considered

*Siemens v. Bawolin* (2002), 2002 SKCA 84, 2002 CarswellSask 448, 46 E.T.R. (2d) 254, [2002] 11 W.W.R. 246, 219 Sask. R. 282, 272 W.A.C. 282 (Sask. C.A.) — followed

*Smart v. South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre* (1989), 75 Sask. R. 34, 60 D.L.R. (4th) 8, [1989] 5 W.W.R. 289, 1989 CarswellSask 266 (Sask. C.A.) — considered

*Smith Brothers Contracting Ltd., Re* (1998), 1998 CarswellBC 678, 53 B.C.L.R. (3d) 264, 13 P.P.S.A.C. (2d) 316 (B.C. S.C.) — considered

*Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 2005 CarswellOnt 5024, 15 C.B.R. (5th) 283 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

*360networks Inc., Re* (2003), 45 C.B.R. (4th) 151, 2003 BCSC 1030, 2003 CarswellBC 1636 (B.C. S.C.) — considered

#### Statutes considered:

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

Generally — referred to

*Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Income Tax Act, Act to amend the*, S.C. 1997, c. 12

Generally — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

s. 11 [rep. & sub. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 11(3) — considered

s. 11(4) — considered

s. 11(4)(c) — considered

s. 11(6) — considered

s. 11(6) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.1(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.11 [en. 2001, c. 9, s. 577] — considered

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

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

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

s. 12(1) "claim" — considered

s. 13 — referred to

*Real Estate Act*, S.S. 1995, c. R-1.3

Generally — referred to

#### Rules considered:

*Queen's Bench Rules*, Sask. Q.B. Rules

R. 173 — referred to

#### Words and phrases considered:

#### Substantial indemnity costs

[Jackson J.A. (Klebec C.J.S. and Smith J.A. concurring):] . . . while [the judge, in awarding substantial indemnity costs,] indicated he was not awarding solicitor-and-client costs, there is not a sufficient distinction between substantial indemnity costs and solicitor-and-client costs. An award approaching solicitor-and-client costs is still a punitive order and, as there is no authority for the awarding of substantial indemnity costs, relies upon the same jurisprudential base as solicitor-and-client costs.

APPEAL by creditor from judgment reported at *ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.* (2007), 2007 SKQB 121, 2007 CarswellSask 157, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 39 (Sask. Q.B.) dismissing application to lift stay against debtor under Companies Creditors' Arrangement Act, and from judgment reported at *ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.* (2007), 2007 SKQB 144, 2007 CarswellSask 264, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 46 (Sask. Q.B.) ordering costs against creditor.

***Jackson J.A.:***

#### I. Introduction

1 This appeal concerns a claim arising on a "post-filing" basis after a restructuring order had been made under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*<sup>[FN1]</sup> (the "CCAA"). The restructuring failed. The principal assets of the companies have been sold and the net proceeds are being held for distribution. The post-filing claim is asserted against: (i) the companies, which are subject to the CCAA order; and (ii) against the companies' Chief Restructuring Officer.

2 The post-filing claimant is ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. ("ICR"). ICR claims a real estate commission with respect to the sale of a building belonging to Bricore Land Group Ltd. Bricore Land and four related companies (collectively "Bricore") are all subject to an initial order ("Initial Order") granted by Koch J. on January

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

4, 2006 pursuant to s. 11(3) of the *CCAA*. The Chief Restructuring Officer, Maurice Duval (the "CRO"), was appointed by Koch J. on May 23, 2006 (the "CRO Order"). Koch J. has been the supervising *CCAA* judge since the Initial Order.

3 The Initial Order and the CRO Order impose the usual stay of proceedings against Bricore and prohibit the commencement of new actions against Bricore and the CRO, without leave of the Court.

4 ICR applied to Koch J. for directions and, in the alternative, for leave to commence actions against Bricore and the CRO. By fiats dated April 9, 2007 and April 25, 2007, Koch J. held that the Initial Order and the CRO Order prohibiting the commencement of actions apply to ICR and that leave of the Court is required. He refused leave and also awarded substantial indemnity costs against ICR.

5 On May 23, 2007, ICR applied in Court of Appeal chambers for leave to appeal, pursuant to s. 13 of the *CCAA*, and received leave to appeal the same day. The appeal was heard on June 7, 2007 and dismissed in relation to the lifting of the stay application and allowed in relation to the costs order on June 13, 2007, with reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

## II. Issues

6 The issues are:

1. Does the stay of proceedings imposed by the supervising *CCAA* judge J. under the Initial Order apply to an action commenced by ICR, a post-filing claimant, such that leave to commence an action against Bricore is required?
2. Does s. 11.3 of the *CCAA* mean that a post-filing claimant cannot be subject to the stay of proceedings imposed by the Initial Order?
3. If leave is required, did the supervising *CCAA* judge commit a reviewable error in refusing ICR leave to commence an action against Bricore?
4. Did the supervising *CCAA* judge make a reviewable error in refusing leave to commence an action against the CRO?
5. Did the supervising *CCAA* judge err in awarding costs on a substantial indemnity basis?

## III. Background

7 ICR's claim to a real estate commission arises as a result of these brief facts. Bricore owned four commercial real estate properties in Saskatoon and three such properties in Regina (the "Bricore Properties"). ICR argued that it had marketed one of the Regina properties, known as the Department of Education Building (the "Building"), to the City of Regina.

8 Bricore sold the Building, at a purchase price of \$700,000,<sup>[FN2]</sup> to a proposed purchaser, which assigned its interest to 101086849 Saskatchewan Ltd. 101086849 Saskatchewan in its turn sold the Building to the City of Regina for a price of \$1,075,000.<sup>[FN3]</sup> The certificate of title to the Building issued in early January, 2007 to 101086849 Saskatchewan, and the certificate of title issued to the City of Regina in late January, 2007. The Building came to be sold pursuant to a series of Court Orders made by Koch J., which I will now summarize.

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

9 As I have indicated, the Initial Order was made on January 4, 2006. On February 13, 2006 Koch J. appointed CMN Calgary Inc. as an Officer of the Court to pursue opportunities and to solicit offers for the sale or refinancing of the Bricore Properties. He also authorized Bricore to enter into an agreement with CMN Calgary dated as of January 30, 2006 entitled "Exclusive Authority To Solicit Offers To Purchase."

10 In May 2006, it was determined that Bricore could not be reorganized and, therefore, all the Bricore Properties should be sold. On May 23, 2006, Koch J. appointed Maurice Duval, C.A., of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan as an officer of the Court to act as CRO, and to assist with the sale of the assets.

11 The CRO Order confers these powers on the CRO pertaining to the proposed sale of the Bricore Properties:

7 ...

(e) subject to the stay of proceedings in effect in these proceedings, the power to take steps for the preservation and protection of the Bricore Properties, including, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, (i) the right to make payments to persons, if any, having charges or encumbrances on the Bricore Properties or any part or parts thereof on or after the date of this Order, which payments shall include payments in respect of realty taxes owing in respect of any of the Bricore Properties, (ii) the right to make repairs and improvements to the Bricore Properties or any parts thereof and (iii) the right to make payments for ongoing services in respect of the Bricore Properties;

.....

(g) subject to paragraphs 7C, 7D and 7E hereof, **the power to work with, consult with and assist the court-appointed selling officer (CMN Calgary Inc.) to negotiate with parties who make offers to purchase the Bricore Properties in a manner substantially in accordance with the process and proposed timeline for solicitation of such offers to purchase the Bricore Properties recommended by the Monitor in the Monitor's Third Report. ...[FN4] [Emphasis added.]**

12 On June 19, 2006, Koch J. authorized the CRO to accept an offer to purchase the Bricore Properties, including the Building, made by an undisclosed purchaser (the "Proposed Purchaser"), which offer to purchase was filed with the Court and temporarily sealed. The order directed that any further negotiations between the CRO and the Proposed Purchaser were to be completed by August 1, 2006.

13 Negotiations were protracted resulting in a further series of orders:

(a) August 1, 2006: Koch J. extended the timeframe for due diligence and further negotiations to be completed by August 15, 2006;[FN5]

(b) August 18, 2006: Koch J. authorized the CRO to accept an Amended Offer to Purchase made the 15th day of August, 2006. The Amended Offer to Purchase contemplated the sale by Bricore to the Proposed Purchaser of six of the seven Bricore Properties including the Building;[FN6]

(c) September 25, 2006: The closing date for the proposed sale by Bricore to the Proposed Purchaser of the six properties was extended from October 15, 2006 to November 15, 2006;[FN7]

(d) October 10, 2006: Koch J. approved the sale of the six properties to their respective purchasers; in the case of the Building, it was sold to 101086849 Saskatchewan Ltd.[FN8]

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

Koch J. ultimately approved the sale of the Building to 101086849 Saskatchewan Ltd. as of November 30, 2006.

14 ICR said it had introduced the City of Regina to the opportunity to purchase the Building and it was therefore entitled to a real estate commission based on the sale price to the City of Regina. Once its claim was denied by the Monitor, ICR applied to Koch J. on March 22, 2007 contending that (a) "prior Orders of this Court requiring leave to commence action" against Bricore and the CRO "do not apply in the circumstances"; and (b) in the alternative, "it is entitled to an order granting leave to commence the proposed proceedings." In support of its notice of motion, ICR filed a draft statement of claim and a supporting affidavit with exhibits.

15 This is the substance of ICR's draft statement of claim against Bricore and the CRO:

4. At all material times Duval's actions in relation to the matters in issue in the within proceedings were carried out in his capacity as chief restructuring officer for the Bricore Group.

.....

7. Duval, pursuant to Order of the Court under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, was authorized in accordance in such order to market various assets of the Bricore Group, including the [Building]. [sic]

8. In the course of his efforts to market the [Building], Duval enlisted the aid of the plaintiff and its commercial realtors, licensed as brokers under *The Real Estate Act*.

9. The plaintiff, in its efforts to market the properties of the Bricore Group under the direction of Duval, including the [Building], introduced a prospective purchaser to Duval, namely the City of Regina.

10. By agreement dated September 27, 2006 made between the Plaintiff, the Bricore Group and Duval, it was agreed that the Plaintiff would be protected as the agent of record to a commission for the sale of any of the Bricore Group Properties for which the Plaintiff had located a purchaser.

11. The Plaintiff says that at the time of execution of the said Agreement by Duval on September 28, 2006, the City of Regina was in the process of doing its "due diligence" on the [Building] and it was expected that a sale of the [Building] to the City of Regina would be completed in the near future.

12. The Plaintiff says that, contrary to the Agreement entered into between the Plaintiff and the Defendants, Duval, **without the Plaintiff's knowledge and in bad faith**, proceeded to arrange to sell the [Building] to a third party, namely 101086849 Saskatchewan Ltd., which became the owner of the [Building] on or about January 3, 2007.[FN9] [Emphasis added.]

16 While the words "bad faith" are not repeated in the affidavit evidence, Paul Mehlsen, the principal of ICR, swore an affidavit in support of the application for leave, stating that he had examined the statement of claim and that to the best of his knowledge the allegations contained therein are true. His affidavit also states:

13. Insofar as the attached letter states that "ICR is protected as agent of record", this is commonly understood in the industry as meaning that in the event a sale of the property took place in the protected period to a purchaser introduced by the agent of record, then they would receive the usual commission for such sale, which in this case would be 5%.

14. It would appear from the attached exhibit "A" that Larry Ruf arranged to have the Respondent, Maurice Duval, agree to the arrangement, as well as adding that the protection would extend to the closing of any sale or

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

December 31, 2006, whichever was the earlier.

15. Attached hereto and marked as exhibit "B" to this my Affidavit is a true copy of an email dated October 31, 2006 from Larry Ruf to Evan Hubick, Jim Kambeitz and Jim Thompson of the proposed plaintiff, ICR. Such email states in part:

I can confirm, on behalf of the CRO, that protection for the potential deals referenced in your letter of September 27, 2006 will be honoured to November 30, 2006.[FN10]

17 Exhibit "A" is a letter dated September 27, 2006 from Mr. Jim Thompson of ICR to Mr. Larry Ruf of Horizon West Management Inc. It reads, in material part, as follows:

Please be advised that we have had ongoing discussions with potential buyers and tenants as follows:

1. 1500 — 4th Avenue [Department of Education Building] — we have been in regular contact with the City of Regina Real Estate Department for over a year regarding the possibility of this site being acquired by the City. In July a large contingent of City employees including a number from the Works and Engineering Department toured the building over several hours. We have had continuous follow up with a Real Estate Department official who confirmed recently that there still is an interest in the property and officials are in the due diligence stage. In addition, we have exposed the property to Alford's Furniture and Flooring who have an ongoing interest.

.....

The purpose of this memo is to reinforce our ongoing efforts to market and represent the Bricore assets in Regina. We are aware that the properties are under contract to sell and request that ICR be protected in the specific situations as outlined.

In the event we are not able to carry on in a formal fashion we would ask that you sign where indicated to acknowledge that ICR is protected as the agent of record for the Tenants/Buyers noted herein for a period to extend to December 31, 2006.[FN11]

The words "December 31, 2006" are struck out and these words are added: "Date of closing of a sale or December 31, 2006 whichever is earlier." Mr. Ruf's name is crossed out and the signature of Maurice Duval, Chief Restructuring Officer is added in its place.

18 Mr. Ruf, on behalf of Bricore, refuted ICR's claim in a sworn affidavit stating:

3. At no time did I approach ICR Regina in 2006 to initiate discussions regarding the sale or lease of the Department of Education Building.

4. I received two or three unsolicited telephone calls regarding the Department of Education Building in September of 2006 from representatives of ICR Regina (including Paul Mehlsen, Jim Kambeitz and Evan Hubick). During those calls, representatives of ICR Regina informed me that they knew of certain parties who would be interested in purchasing the Department of Education Building. In response to each of these inquiries, I informed representatives of ICR:

(a) that I had no authority to participate in communications regarding a sale of the Department of Education Building, and that all such inquiries should be directed to Maurice Duval, the court-appointed

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

Chief Restructuring Officer of Bricore Group; and

(b) that further information on the status of the restructuring of Bricore Group could be obtained on the website of MLT.[FN12]

19 The CRO filed a report in response to ICR:

6. At the time of my review of the September 27, 2006 letter from ICR Regina, I was working very hard to attempt to negotiate and conclude the final closing of the sale of the Bricore Properties to the purchasers identified in the Accepted Offer to Purchase. I fully expected that sale to close (as it ultimately did effective November 30, 2006). However, I determined that, in the event that such sale failed to close, Bricore Group would need to identify other potential purchasers of the Bricore Properties very quickly. I therefore decided that it would be appropriate for Bricore Group, by the CRO, to agree to protect ICR Regina for a commission in the unlikely event that the sale contemplated by the Accepted Offer to Purchase did not close, and it subsequently became necessary for Bricore Group instead to conclude a sale of the Bricore Properties to one or more of the prospective purchasers of the three Bricore Properties located in Regina (as specifically identified in Mr. Thompson's September 27, 2006 letter). For that reason, and that reason only, I agreed to sign the September 27, 2006 letter.

7. In signing the September 27, 2006 letter, my intention, as court-appointed CRO of Bricore Group, was to strike an agreement that, in the unlikely event that:

(a) the sale of the Bricore Properties identified in the Accepted Offer to Purchase fell apart; and

(b) it subsequently became necessary for Bricore Group to sell the Bricore Properties to one or more of the prospective purchasers identified in the September 27, 2006 letter;

then Bricore Group would agree to pay a commission to ICR Regina. In regard to the Department of Education Building located at 1500 — 4th Avenue in Regina (the "Department of Education Building"), the two prospective purchasers in respect of which ICR Regina was protected for a commission were the City of Regina and Alford's Furniture and Flooring. The reference to closing date was to the closing of the Avenue Sale, which occurred effective November 30, 2006.

8. In January of 2007, after much effort and expenditure of resources, the sale of the Bricore Properties contemplated in the Accepted Offer to Purchase was unconditionally closed (effective November 30, 2006). The entity named as purchaser of the Department of Education Building in the final closing documents was a numbered Saskatchewan company controlled by Avenue Commercial Group of Calgary. Such entity was a nominee corporation operating entirely at arm's length from the City of Regina and Bricore Group. At all times after June 2006, the CRO had no authority to sell the property, as it was already sold.

9. It was subsequently brought to my attention that the numbered company which purchased the Department of Education Building had promptly "flipped" such property to the City of Regina. I knew nothing of such a proposed flip prior to learning of it from ICR Regina.[FN13]

20 To rebut this, Mr. Mehlsen of ICR swore a further affidavit deposing:

3. As indicated in my Affidavit sworn March 22, 2007, ICR had an ongoing relationship with the Bricore Companies prior to 2006. This relationship continued after the Initial Order in January 2006 in that ICR continued to show Bricore Properties for lease or sale, including the [Building].

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

4. Attached hereto and marked as Exhibit E to this my Affidavit is a true copy of an e-mail from my contact at the City of Regina ... dated April 13, 2006 advising that the City was interested in purchasing the [Building].

5. I immediately passed this information along to Larry Ruf, as evidenced in the e-mail dated April 13, 2006 attached hereto and marked as Exhibit "F" to this my affidavit.

6. In reply to paras. 2 and 12 of Mr. Duval's Report, it was not known to ICR that all of the Bricore Properties were sold as claimed; rather, it was known that some of the Bricore Properties had been sold, but not the subject property, [the Building], as it was the "ugly duckling" of the Bricore Properties and therefore had been excluded from the reported sale. ICR's efforts were directed at the sale of [the Building] and leasing the other two Regina properties.

7. In response to para. 13 of Mr. Duval's Report, it is true that there were no direct communications between ICR and Mr. Duval as all communications were with Larry Ruf, who indicated that he acted under the authority and with the knowledge of Mr. Duval.

8. As a result of contact in early summer with Mr. Ruf, ICR actively marketed the [Building] by placing signage on the property, developing an "information" or "fact" sheet detailing aspects of the building, and showed the property to the City of Regina and other prospective purchasers.

.....

11. Because of delays on the part of the City of Regina in its due diligence and the fact that ICR has been working without any formal agreement, I caused the letter of September 27, 2006 (exhibit "A" to my Affidavit sworn March 22, 2007) to be sent.

12. At no time did either Mr. Ruf or Mr. Duval advise that the [Building] was sold and that ICR's role was merely that of a "backup offer". The signed letter of September 27, 2006 and Mr. Ruf's e-mail of October 31, 2006 make no mention of these events and this was never disclosed to myself or ICR.

.....

14. In hindsight, it would appear that the confidential information concerning the intention of the City of Regina to purchase the [Building] that was provided by myself and representatives of ICR to Mr. Ruf and Mr. Duval was communicated to the [Proposed Purchaser], who then incorporated 101086849 Saskatchewan Ltd. to take advantage of this opportunity. Attached hereto and marked as exhibit "I" to this my Affidavit is a true copy of a Profile Report from the Corporate Registry indicating that 101086849 Saskatchewan Ltd. was incorporated by solicitors as a "shelf company" on May 31, 2006, with new Directors in the form of Garry Bobke and Steven Butt taking office on August 17, 2006.

15. My understanding is that the [Proposed Purchaser] initially excluded the [Building] from their offer to purchase the Bricore Group properties and made a separate offer through 101086849 Saskatchewan Ltd. when they were made aware of the confidential information about the City of Regina's plans to purchase the property.[FN14]

21 In refusing ICR leave to commence action, Koch J. wrote:

[1] On January 4, 2006, I granted an initial order pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, (the "CCAA") protecting the respondent corporations Bricore Land Group Ltd. et al. (collectively



2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

"Bricore"), from claims of their respective creditors. The order (paragraph 5) explicitly provides in accordance with the authority conferred upon the Court pursuant to s. 11(3) of the *CCAA* that "no Person shall commence or continue any Enforcement or Proceeding of any kind against or in respect of Bricore Group or the Property". The initial period of 30 days has been extended many times. The stay of proceedings continues in effect. Ernst & Young Inc. was appointed monitor. That appointment continues.

.....

[16] Although the interpretation of s. 11.3 of the *CCAA* is not necessarily well settled in all aspects, it appears that the import of s. 11.3, which was introduced as an amendment to the Act in 1997, is this:

(a) An application to lift a stay of proceedings must be addressed in the context of the broad objectives of the *CCAA* which is to promote re-organization and restructuring of companies. If s. 11.3 is interpreted too literally, it can render the stay provisions ineffective, leaving the collective good of the restructuring process subservient to the self-interest of a single creditor. Clearly, s. 11.3 must be construed so as not to defeat the overall objectives of the Act. See *Smith Brothers Contracting Ltd. (Re)* (1998), 53 B.C.L.R. (3d) 264 (B.C.S.C.).

(b) The standard for determining whether to lift the stay of proceedings is not, as ICR contends, whether the action is frivolous, analogous to the standard which a defendant applicant under Rule 173 of *The Queen's Bench Rules* must meet to set aside a statement of claim. Rather, to obtain an order lifting the stay ad hoc to permit the suit to proceed, the proposed plaintiff must establish that the cause of action is tenable. I interpret that to mean that the proposed plaintiff has a *prima facie* case. See *Ivaco Inc. (Re)*, [2006] O.J. No. 5029 (Ont. S.C.J.).

(c) In determining whether to lift a stay, the Court must take into consideration the relative prejudice to the parties. See *Ivaco, Inc. (Re)*, *supra*, para. 20; and Richard H. McLaren & Sabrina Gherbaz, *Canadian Commercial Reorganization: Preventing Bankruptcy* (Toronto: Canada Law Book, 1995) at 3-18.1. Counsel have cited the case of *GMAC Commercial Credit Corporation — Canada v. T.C.T. Logistics Inc.*, [2006] 2 S.C.R. 123, 2006 SCC 35. The circumstances in that case are somewhat analogous but it is of limited assistance because the *CCAA* does not contain a provision equivalent to s. 215 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, which expressly provides that no action lies against the superintendent, an official receiver, an interim receiver or a trustee in certain circumstances without leave of the Court.

[17] For reasons outlined *supra*, I do not find the cause of action ICR asserts against Bricore to be tenable, not even as against Bricore Land Group Ltd. Therefore, the application to lift the stay of proceedings to permit the proposed action against Bricore is dismissed.

[18] Neither is there any basis upon which to lift the stay with respect to the proposed action against Maurice Duval, the Chief Restructuring Officer. Considerations applicable to Bricore under s. 11.3 do not apply to a court-appointed restructuring officer. Maurice Duval, as an officer of the Court, has explained his position in a cogent way. I accept his explanation. He did not sell the Department of Education Building to the City of Regina. He was not aware at the relevant time that the purchaser was going to resell. Indeed, his efforts were directed toward closing a single transaction involving all six Bricore properties. Although the proposed pleading accuses Mr. Duval of acting in "bad faith", it is not suggested on behalf of ICR that Mr. Duval has been guilty of fraud, gross negligence or wilful misconduct; that is, any of the limitations or exceptions expressly listed in paragraph 20(c) of the order of May 23, 2006.

[19] As stated previously, the overriding purpose of the *CCAA* must also be considered. That applies in the Du-

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

val situation too. The statute is intended to facilitate restructuring to serve the public interest. In many cases such as the present it is necessary for the Court to appoint officers whose expertise is required to fulfill its mandate. It is clearly in the public interest that capable people be willing to accept such assignments. It is to be expected that such acceptance be contingent on protective provisions such as are included in the order of May 23, 2006, appointing Mr. Duval. It is important that the Court exercise caution in removing such restrictions; otherwise, the ability of the Court to obtain the assistance of needed experts will necessarily be impaired. Qualified professionals will be less willing to accept assignments absent the protection provisions in the appointing order. [FN15]

**IV. Issue #1: Does the Stay of Proceedings Imposed by the Supervising CCAA Judge under the Initial Order Apply to an Action Commenced by ICR, a Post-Filing Claimant, Such That Leave to Commence an Action Against Bricore Is Required?**

22 ICR argues that, as a post-filing creditor, the Initial Order does not apply to it, either as a matter of law or on the basis of a proper interpretation of the Initial Order.

23 The authority to make an order staying and prohibiting proceedings against a debtor company is contained in s. 11(3) of the *CCAA*:

11. (3) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a company, make an order on such terms as it may impose, effective for such period as the court deems necessary not exceeding thirty days,

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

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

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

24 Pursuant to s. 11(3) of the *CCAA*, Koch J. granted the Initial Order providing for a stay and prohibition of new proceedings in these terms:

5. During the 30-day period from and after the date of filing of this application on January 4, 2006 or during the period of any extension of such 30-day period granted by further order of the Court (the "Stay Period"), no Person shall commence or continue any Enforcement or Proceeding of any kind against or in respect of Bricore Group or the Property. Any and all Enforcement or Proceedings already commenced (as at the date of this Order) against or in respect of Bricore Group or the Property are hereby stayed and suspended.

6. During the Stay Period, no person shall assert, invoke, rely upon, exercise or attempt to assert, invoke, rely upon or exercise any rights:

a) against Bricore Group or the Property;

b) as a result of any default or non-performance by Bricore Group, the making or filing of this proceeding or any admission or evidence in this proceeding, or

c) in respect of any action taken by Bricore Group or in respect of any of the Property under, pursuant

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

to or in furtherance of this Order.

.....

11. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this Order:

a) no creditor of Bricore Group shall be under any obligation, by reason only of the issuance of this Order, to advance or re-advance any monies or otherwise extend any credit to Bricore Group, except as such creditor may agree; and

b) Bricore Group may, by written consent of its counsel of record, agree to waive any of the protections that this Order provides to them, whether such waiver is given in respect of a single creditor or class of creditors or is given in respect of all creditors generally.

.....

13. Any act or action taken or notice given by creditors or other Persons or their agents, from and after 12:01 a.m. (local Saskatoon time) on the date of the filing of the application for this Order to the time of the granting of this Order, to commence or continue Enforcement or to take any Proceeding (including, without limitation, the application of funds in reduction of any debt, set-off or the consolidation of accounts) is, unless the Court orders otherwise, deemed not to have been taken or given.

"Proceeding" is defined in para. 22 of Schedule "A" to the Initial Order as "a lawsuit, legal action, court application, arbitration, hearing, mediation process, enforcement process, grievance, extrajudicial proceeding of any kind or other proceeding of any kind."

25 The authority to extend an initial order is contained in s. 11(4) of the *CCAA*:

11(4) A court may, on an application in respect of a company other than an initial application, make an order on such terms as it may impose,

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

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

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

Koch J., pursuant to this subsection, extended the stay many times and the stay continues in force.

26 As authority for the proposition that the Initial Order does not stay proceedings with respect to claims that arise after the Initial Order, ICR's counsel cites Professor Honsberger's *Debt Restructuring Principles & Practice*:

The scope of an order staying proceedings extends only to claims that arose prior to the order. A proceeding based on a claim that arose after an order was made staying proceedings is not affected by the stay.<sup>[FN16]</sup> [Footnote omitted.]

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

The only case footnoted is *Ramsay Plate Glass Co. v. Modern Wood Products Ltd.*[FN17] In my respectful view, the facts in *Ramsay Plate Glass* narrow its application.

27 In *Ramsay Plate Glass Co.*, the initial CCAA order, dated April 12, 1951, suspended all proceedings against Modern Wood Products Ltd. Modern Wood Products made an offer of compromise that was accepted by its existing creditors and approved by the Court on May 21, 1951. Ramsay Glass sought to enforce a claim against Modern Wood Products that arose in 1953. Modern Wood Products sought to strike Ramsay Glass's claim on the basis that its proceedings were stayed by the April 1951 order.

28 In dismissing the application to strike, Prevoist J. wrote:

CONSIDERING that said claim is not provable in bankruptcy and that under *The Bankruptcy Act* an order staying proceedings would not apply to such a claim: *Richardson & Co. v. Storey*, 23 C.B.R. 145, [1942] 1 D.L.R. 182, Abr. Con. 301; *In re Bolf*, 26 C.B.R. 149, [1945] Que. S.C. 173, Abr. Con. 303;

CONSIDERING that s. 10 of *The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* and the judgments rendered under its authority should receive the same interpretation in this respect as s. 40 of *The Bankruptcy Act*;

CONSIDERING that the present claim is in no way affected by the judgment rendered on April 12, 1951 by Boyer J. under *The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, ordering suspension of all proceedings against defendant company the present claim being posterior to said date and having not been made the subject of any compromise or arrangement homologated by this Court;

CONSIDERING that the present claim arose in 1953, two years after the judgment of Boyer J. homologating the compromise following the non-payment by defendant company of merchandise purchased by it from plaintiff company during said year:[FN18]

I do not interpret *Ramsay Plate Glass* as permitting a post-filing claimant to commence an action against a debtor company without obtaining leave while the CCAA stay is in effect. In my opinion, *Ramsay Plate Glass* can be read as authority for the proposition that a post-filing creditor need not apply for leave after the stay has been lifted. In that respect, it parallels *360networks Inc., Re*:[FN19] *Stelco Inc., Re*:[FN20] and *Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.*[FN21]

29 In *360networks*, a creditor (Caterpillar Financial Services Limited) had both pre-filing and post-filing claims. Caterpillar applied, *inter alia*, for an order lifting the stay of proceedings. Tysoe J. wrote:

8 On the hearing of the applications, Caterpillar continued to take the position that all of its claims could properly be determined within the CCAA proceedings on the first of its two applications. I agree that the Deficiency Claim and the Secured Creditor Claim are properly determinable within the CCAA proceedings, but it is my view that it would not be appropriate to make determinations in respect of the Trust Claim or the Post-Filing Claim in the CCAA proceedings. The only remaining thing to be done in the CCAA proceedings is the determination of the validity of claims for the purposes of the Restructuring Plan (with Caterpillar's claims being the only unresolved ones). **Neither the Trust Claim nor the Post-Filing Claim falls into this category of claim because each of these types of claim is not affected by the Restructuring Plan.** Indeed, the Post-Filing Claim was not asserted in Caterpillar's proof of claim and surely cannot be adjudicated upon within Caterpillar's appeal of the disallowance of its proof of claim. The B.C. Court of Appeal has recently affirmed, in *United Properties Ltd. v. 642433 B.C. Ltd.*, 2003 BCCA 203 (B.C.C.A.), that it is appropriate for the court to decline jurisdiction to resolve a dispute in CCAA proceedings which, although it may relate to them, is not part and parcel of the proceedings. [Emphasis added.]

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

.....

11 Counsel for Caterpillar relies for the first ground on the fact that s. 12 of the *CCAA* authorizes the court to deal with secured and unsecured claims. However, s. 12 deals with the determination of claims for the purposes of the *CCAA* and does not authorize the court to determine claims which fall outside of *CCAA* proceedings, such as the Trust Claim and the Post-Filing Claim.<sup>[FN22]</sup>

In the result, Tysoe J. lifted the stay so as to permit an action to be commenced to resolve all of Caterpillar's claims. The significance of the decision for our purposes is that the Court in *360networks* considered the stay as applying to claims that arose after the initial order.

30 In *Stelco*, Farley J., relying on *360networks*, also held that the post-filing creditor's claim in that case "continues to be stayed and is to be dealt with in the ordinary course of litigation after Stelco's *CCAA* protection is terminated."<sup>[FN23]</sup>

31 *Campeau* does not deal with a post-filing creditor, but it does address the situation where a creditor, whose claim is not accepted as part of the plan of arrangement, wants to commence action. Blair J. (as he then was) refused an application brought by Robert Campeau and the Campeau Corporations to lift the stay of proceeding imposed by the initial order. In doing so, he wrote:

24. In making these orders, I see no prejudice to the Campeau plaintiffs. The processing of their action is not being precluded, but merely postponed. Their claims may, indeed, be addressed more expeditiously than might have otherwise been the case, as they may be dealt with — at least for the purposes of that proceeding — in the C.C.A.A. proceeding itself. On the other hand, there might be great prejudice to Olympia & York if its attention is diverted from the corporate restructuring process and it is required to expend time and energy in defending an action of the complexity and dimension of this one. While there may not be a great deal of prejudice to National Bank in allowing the action to proceed against it, I am satisfied that there is little likelihood of the action proceeding very far or very effectively unless and until Olympia & York — whose alleged misdeeds are the real focal point of the attack on both sets of defendants — is able to participate.

25 In addition to the foregoing, I have considered the following factors in the exercise of my discretion:

1. Counsel for the plaintiffs argued that the Campeau claim must be dealt with, either in the action or in the C.C.A.A. proceedings and that it cannot simply be ignored. I agree. However, in my view, it is more appropriate, and in fact is essential, that the claim be addressed within the parameters of the C.C.A.A. proceedings rather than outside, in order to maintain the integrity of those proceedings. Were it otherwise, the numerous creditors in that mammoth proceeding would have no effective way of assessing the weight to be given to the Campeau claim in determining their approach to the acceptance or rejection of the Olympia & York Plan filed under the Act.

2. In this sense, the Campeau claim — like other secured, undersecured, unsecured, and contingent claims — must be dealt with as part of a "controlled stream" of claims that are being negotiated with a view to facilitating a compromise and arrangement between Olympia & York and its creditors. In weighing "the good management" of the two sets of proceedings — i.e. the action and the *CCAA* proceeding — the scales tip in favour of dealing with the Campeau claim in the context of the latter: see *Attorney General v. Arthur Andersen & Co. (United Kingdom) (1988)*, [1989] E.C.C. 224 (C.A.), cited in *Arab Monetary Fund v. Hashim, supra*.

**I am aware, when saying this, that in the initial plan of compromise and arrangement filed by the appli-**

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

cants with the court on August 21, 1992, the applicants have chosen to include the Campeau plaintiffs amongst those described as "Persons not Affected by the Plan". This treatment does not change the issues, in my view, as it is up to the applicants to decide how they wish to deal with that group of "creditors" in presenting their plan, and up to the other creditors to decide whether they will accept such treatment. In either case, the matter is being dealt with, as it should be, within the context of the C.C.A.A. proceedings.[FN24] [Emphasis added.]

*Campeau* is further authority for the proposition that a supervising CCAA judge can refuse a prospective creditor, who is not part of the plan of arrangement, leave to commence proceedings and that the creditor may commence action after the stay is lifted.

32 Each of *360networks*[FN25], *Stelco*[FN26] and *Campeau*[FN27] supports the proposition that while a stay of proceedings is extant, an application to lift the stay must be made to permit an action to be commenced against a debtor that is subject to a CCAA order, regardless of whether the claim arises before or after the initial order, or whether the prospective creditor is able to take part in the plan of arrangement.

33 Prevost J. in *Ramsay Plate Glass* points out that under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*[FN28] (the "BIA") the stay of proceedings does not extend to a claim not provable in bankruptcy. This is so, however, because of the definition of "claim provable in bankruptcy" and ss. 69.3(1) and s. 121. (See Houlden & Morawetz, *The 2007 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.[FN29]) While s. 12 of the CCAA defines "claim" by reference to "claim provable in bankruptcy," it has not been interpreted as limiting the extent of the stay.

34 On the face of ss. 11(3) and (4) of the CCAA, the authority to safeguard the company is not limited to staying existing actions, but extends to "prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of ... any other action, suit or proceeding against the company." Unlike the BIA there are no words limiting this phrase to debts or claims in existence at the time of the initial order.

35 With respect to the wording of the Initial Order, there can be no question that it applies to post-filing creditors. The broad wording of paras. 5 and 6 of the Initial Order and the definition of "proceeding" confirm this. No distinction is made between creditors in existence at the time of the Initial Order and those who become creditors after. Paragraph 11(b) also establishes a mechanism for post-filing creditors to seek relief by obtaining an exemption from the protection afforded Bricore, which would include the prohibition of proceedings. The obvious implication is that the prohibition of proceedings applies to post-filing creditors, subject, of course, to obtaining leave of the Court to commence action.

#### **V. Issue #2. Does s. 11.3 of the CCAA Mean That a Post-Filing Claimant Cannot Be Subject to the Stay of Proceedings Imposed by the Initial Order?**

36 ICR argued that by the addition of s. 11.3 in 1997[FN30] to the CCAA, Parliament intended to grant a post-filing creditor the right to sue without obtaining leave.

37 In my respectful view, s. 11.3 cannot be interpreted in the way in which ICR contends. Indeed, a more logical and internally consistent reading of s. 11.3 and the other sections of the CCAA is to permit the supervising judge to determine, as a matter of discretion, whether an action commenced by a post-filing creditor should be permitted to proceed.

38 Section 11.3 forms part of a comprehensive series of sections addressing the question of stays added in 1997 and 2001:[FN31]

**No stay, etc., in certain cases**

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

11.1 (2) No order may be made under this Act **staying or restraining** the exercise of any right to terminate, amend or claim any accelerated payment under an eligible financial contract or preventing a member of the Canadian Payments Association established by the *Canadian Payments Act* from ceasing to act as a clearing agent or group clearer for a company in accordance with that Act and the by-laws and rules of that Association. (Added by S.C.1997, c. 12, s. 124)

**No stay, etc., in certain cases**

11.11 No order may be made under this Act **staying or restraining**

(a) the exercise by the Minister of Finance or the Superintendent of Financial Institutions of any power, duty or function assigned to them by the *Bank Act*, the *Cooperative Credit Associations Act*, the *Insurance Companies Act* or the *Trust and Loan Companies Act*;

(b) the exercise by the Governor in Council, the Minister of Finance or the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation of any power, duty or function assigned to them by the *Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act*; or

(c) the exercise by the Attorney General of Canada of any power, assigned to him or her by the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*. (Added by S.C. 2001, c. 9, s. 577.)

**No stay, etc. in certain cases**

11.2 No order may be made under section 11 **staying or restraining any action, suit or proceeding** against a person, other than a debtor company in respect of which an application has been made under this Act, who is obligated under a letter of credit or guarantee in relation to the company. (Added by S.C.1997, c. 12, s. 124)

11.3 No order made under section 11 shall have the effect of

(a) prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration provided after the order is made; or

(b) requiring the further advance of money or credit. (Added by S.C.1997, c. 12, s. 124)

[Emphasis added.]

39 In ss. 11.1(2), 11.11 and 11.2, Parliament uses the words "staying or restraining" to describe those circumstances limiting the scope of the stay power, but these words are not repeated in s. 11.3. This application of the *expressio unius* principle supports the obvious implication that s. 11.3 does not limit the authority of the court to stay all proceedings.

40 While the debates of the House of Commons in Hansard do not comment on s. 11.3, several text book authors assist with the task of interpretation. Professor Honsberger states:

A distinction is made between the compulsory supply of goods and services and the extension of credit by suppliers to a debtor company in CCAA proceedings.

Suppliers may be enjoined from cutting off services or discontinuing the supply of goods by reason of there be-

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

ing arrears of payment provided the debtor commences regular payments for current deliveries.

However, no order made under s. 11 of the Act has the effect of prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration after the order is made.

.....

... A court could make a similar order after the 1997 amendments provided it stipulated that the debtor company made immediate payment for goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration after the order is made. [FN32]

[Footnotes omitted.]

41 Professor McLaren similarly comments in his text "Canadian Commercial Reorganization":[FN33]

3.800 ... Section 11.3 acts as an exemption to the stay provisions of s. 11 of the CCAA. It appears the section is meant to balance the rights of creditors with debtors. The section addresses the concern that judges had too much discretion in issuing stays. Under s. 11.3(a), if a person supplies goods or services or if the debtor continues to occupy or use leased or licensed property, the court will not issue a stay order with respect to the payment for such goods or services or leased or licensed property. In essence, s. 11.3(a) will not permit the court to prohibit these individuals from demanding payment from the debtor for goods, services or use of leased property, after a court order is made.

42 Finally, Professor Sarra in *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*[FN34] provides this insight:

While the court cannot compel a supplier to continue to extend credit to the debtor during a CCAA proceeding, the court can protect trade suppliers that choose to supply goods or credit during the stay period by granting them a charge on the assets of the debtor that will rank ahead of other claims. While section 11.3 of the CCAA states that no stay of proceedings can have the effect of prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for goods, services or the use of leased or licensed property, or requiring the further advance of money or credit, trade suppliers were often continuing credit only to find that they had lost further assets during the workout period because of their priority in the hierarchy of claims. Hence the practice of post-petition trade credit priority charges developed, first recognized in Alberta.[FN35] [Footnotes omitted.]

43 *Smith Brothers Contracting Ltd., Re*[FN36] also supports a narrow reading of s. 11.3. After citing *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.*[FN37] and *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.*[FN38] with respect to the intention of Parliament and the object and scheme of the CCAA, Bauman J. in *Smith Brothers* wrote:

45 It is interesting that Gibbs J.A. suggested that it would be unlikely that a court would exercise its s. 11 jurisdiction:

... where the result would be to enforce the continued supply of goods and services to the debtor company without payment for current deliveries ...

46 Parliament has now precluded that by adding s. 11.3(a) to the CCAA. It is instructive to note, however, that the subsection has been added against the backdrop of jurisprudence which has underlined the very broad scope of the court's jurisdiction to stay proceedings under s. 11.



2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

47 To repeat the relevant portion of the section:

11.3 No order made under s. 11 shall have the effect of

(a) prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for ... use of leased or licenced property ... provided after the order is made;

It is noted that the remedy which is preserved for creditors is a relatively narrow one; it is the right to require immediate payment for the use of the leased property.<sup>[FN39]</sup>

Thus, Bauman J. interpreted s. 11.3 in accordance with Parliament's intention and the object and scheme of the *CCAA* as creating a narrow right — the right to withhold services without immediate payment.

44 I agree with Bricore's counsel. When a supplier is requested to provide goods or services on a post-filing basis to a company operating under a stay of proceedings imposed by the *CCAA*, s. 11.3 allows the supplier the right:

(a) to refuse to supply any such goods or services at all;

(b) to supply such goods or services on a "cash on demand" basis only;

(c) to negotiate with the insolvent corporation for the amendment of the *CCAA* Order to create a post-filing supplier's charge on the assets of the insolvent corporation to secure the payment by the insolvent corporation of amounts owing by it to such post-filing suppliers; or

(d) to take the risk of supplying goods or services on credit.

Where the Initial Order imposes a stay of proceedings and prohibits further proceedings, s. 11.3 does not permit the supplier of goods or services to sue without obtaining leave of the court to do so.

#### **VI. Issue #3: If Leave Is Required, Did the Supervising CCAA Judge Commit a Reviewable Error in Refusing ICR Leave to Commence an Action Against Bricore?**

45 Having determined that the stay and prohibition of proceedings applies to ICR, notwithstanding its status as a post-filing creditor, the next issue is whether Koch J. erred in refusing to lift the stay on the basis that the claim was not tenable.

46 The claim against Bricore is presumably against Bricore both in its own right and pursuant to its indemnification agreement with the CRO. Paragraph 18 of the CRO Order requires Bricore to indemnify the CRO:

18. Bricore Group shall indemnify and hold harmless the CRO from and against all costs (including, without limitation, defence costs), claims, charges, expenses, liabilities and obligations of any nature whatsoever incurred by the CRO that may arise as a result of any matter directly or indirectly relating to or pertaining to any one or more of:

(a) the CRO's position or involvement with Bricore Group;

(b) the CRO's administration of the management, operations and business and financial affairs of Bricore Group;

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

(c) any sale of all or part of the Property pursuant to these proceedings;

(d) any plan or plans of compromise or arrangement under the CCAA between Bricore Group and one or more classes of its creditors; and/or

(e) any action or proceeding to which the CRO may be made a party by reason of having taken over the management of the business of Bricore Group.[FN40]

47 The authority to lift the stay imposed by the Initial Order against Bricore is contained in s. 11(4) of the CCAA:

11(4) A court may, on an application in respect of a company other than an initial application, make an order on such terms as it may impose,

.....

(c) prohibiting, **until otherwise ordered by the court**, the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company. [Emphasis added.]

48 This is a discretionary power, which invokes the standard of appellate review stated as follows:

[22] ... [T]he function of an appellate court is not to exercise an independent discretion of its own. It must defer to the judge's exercise of his discretion and must not interfere with it merely on the ground that members of the appellate court would have exercised the discretion differently. The function of the appellate court is one of review only. It may set aside the judge's exercise of his discretion on the ground that it was based on a misunderstanding of the law or of the evidence before him or on an inference that particular facts existed or did not exist, which, although it was one that might legitimately have been drawn on the evidence that was before the judge, can be demonstrated to be wrong by further evidence that has become available by the time of the appeal, or on the ground that there has been a change of circumstances after the judge made his order. [FN41]

It is often expressed as permitting intervention where the judge acts arbitrarily, on a wrong principle, or on an erroneous view of the facts, or when the appeal court is satisfied that there is likely to be a failure of justice as a result of the refusal. See: *Martin v. Deutch*[FN42]

49 With respect to discretionary decisions made under the CCAA, there is a particular reluctance to intervene. The reluctance is justified on the basis of the specialization of the judges who have carriage of complex proceedings that are often replete with compromised solutions.[FN43] This does not mean that the Court of Appeal can turn a blind eye or permit an injustice, but it does provide the backdrop against which CCAA discretionary decisions are reviewed.

50 Unlike the BIA,[FN44] the CCAA contains no specific statutory test to provide guidance on the circumstances in which a CCAA stay of proceedings is to be lifted. Some guidance, nonetheless, can be found in the statute and in the jurisprudence.

51 Subsection 11(6) of the CCAA states:

11 (6) The court shall not make an order under subsection (3) or (4) unless

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

- (a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make such an order appropriate; and
- (b) in the case of an order under subsection (4), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

While the reference to "order" in the opening clause "[t]he court shall not make an order under s. (3) or (4)" may very well be to the Initial Order and not to the order lifting the stay, s. 11(6) and, in particular, its legislative history, are also relevant to an application to lift the stay.

52 Subsection 11(6) was brought into effect in 1997 by Bill C-5, which enacted "An Act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Income Tax Act." When Bill C-5 received third reading on October 23, 1996, s. 11(6) took this form:

11 (6) The court shall not make an order under subsection (3) or (4) unless

- (a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make such an order appropriate; and
- (b) in the case of an order under subsection (4), the applicant also satisfies the court that:
  - (i) the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence,
  - (ii) a viable compromise or arrangement could likely be made in respect of the company, if the order being applied for were made, and
  - (iii) no creditor would be materially prejudiced if the order being applied for were made.

After Bill C-5 received third reading, it was referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce.<sup>[FN45]</sup> The Committee reported:

A number of insolvency experts were of the opinion that the proposed amendment would make it virtually impossible to obtain extensions of the initial 30-day stay under the CCAA and force companies to file plans of arrangement within 30 days after the making of the initial stay order.

Others suggested that some CCAA reorganizations would have turned out differently if the amendment had been in place.

.....

Of the submissions received about proposed subsection 11(6), all but one condemned the provision. ...

The CLHIA [Canadian Life and Health Insurance Association] argued that the amendment to the bill would be a significant improvement to the CCAA for four reasons:

- (a) it would give direction to the courts as to the tests that must be met before the extension order was granted;
- (b) it would more closely align the CCAA with the BIA;

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

(c) the tests are well-established under the BIA and have received extensive scrutiny and study; and

(d) the tests would direct the courts to consider how the stay would affect creditors. [Footnote omitted.]

.....

The Committee shares the concerns expressed about the potential impact of proposed subsection 11(6) of the CCAA, particularly the concern that the CCAA may no longer be a sufficiently flexible vehicle for large, complex corporate reorganizations.

While the Committee fully supports initiatives to align the provisions of the CCAA more closely with those of the BIA, these initiatives must be the subject of thorough discussion and analysis before [making] their way into legislation. Unfortunately, such discussion did not take place prior [to] the introduction of proposed subsection 11(6).[FN46]

Notwithstanding the submissions of the Canadian Life and Health Insurance Association, the Standing Committee recommended that Bill C-5 be amended by striking subparagraphs 11(6)(b)(ii) and (iii).

53 The House of Commons concurred in the Amendments recommended by the Senate on April 15, 1997.[FN47] Bill C-5, as thus amended, received Royal Assent on April 25, 1997 and was proclaimed in its present skeletal form on September 30, 1997.[FN48] Neither the amending legislation[FN49] nor the proposed Bill presently before the Senate[FN50] make any change to s. 11 in this regard.

54 The Senate's and Parliament's specific rejection of a limitation on the court's discretion is a strong indication of Parliamentary intention. The fact that Parliament did not see fit to limit the discretion in any significant manner, despite having been given the opportunity to do so, confirms the broad discretion given in ss. 11(3) and (4) to the supervising CCAA judge. Discretion is never completely unfettered, but an appellate court should be reluctant to impose rigid tests, standards or criteria where Parliament has declined to do so. Some guidance can be taken from the jurisprudence.

55 In *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*[FN51] Paperny J. (as she then was) indicated that the obligation of the supervising CCAA judge is to "always have regard to the particular facts" and "to balance" the interests. As Farley J. said in *Ivaco Inc., Re*,[FN52] the supervising CCAA judge must also be concerned not to permit one creditor to mount "an indirect but devastating attack on the CCAA stay" so as to give one creditor an inappropriate advantage over other unsecured creditors as well as over secured creditors with priority.

56 In *Ivaco Inc., Re*[FN53] Ground J. stated this to be the criteria to determine whether a stay should be lifted:

20 It appears to me that the criteria which the court must consider in determining whether to lift a stay, being whether the proposed cause of action is tenable, the balancing of interests as between the parties, the relative prejudice to the parties, and whether the proposed action would be oppressive or vexatious or an abuse of the court process, would all be met with respect to a trial of issues to resolve interpretation of the APAs with respect to the calculation of the working capital adjustments.

Ground J. went on to confirm that finding a tenable or reasonable cause of action is not the only factor to be considered:

30 Even if the Statement of Claim did disclose a tenable or reasonable cause of action, there are a number of other factors which this court must consider which militate against the lifting of the stay in the circumstances of

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

this case. The institution of the Proposed Action, even if a tight timetable is imposed, would inevitably result in considerable delay and complication with respect to the full distribution of the estate to the detriment of many small trade creditors and individual creditors as well as to pension claimants. In addition, it would appear from the evidence before this court that Heico has been aware of most of the matters alleged in the Statement of Claim for approximately 2 years and there does not appear to be any valid reason given for the delay in commencing the application to lift the stay.

57 Turning back to the case before us, Koch J.'s reasons for refusing to lift the stay were:

[16] . . .

(a) An application to lift a stay of proceedings must be addressed in the context of the broad objectives of the *CCAA* which is to promote re-organization and restructuring of companies. ....

(b) The standard for determining whether to lift the stay of proceedings is not, as ICR contends, whether the action is frivolous, analogous to the standard which a defendant applicant under Rule 173 of *The Queen's Bench Rules* must meet to set aside a statement of claim. Rather, to obtain an order lifting the stay ad hoc to permit the suit to proceed, the proposed plaintiff must establish that the cause of action is tenable. I interpret that to mean that the proposed plaintiff has a *prima facie* case. See *Ivaco Inc. (Re)*, [2006] O.J. No. 5029 (Ont. S.C.J.).

(c) In determining whether to lift a stay, the Court must take into consideration the relative prejudice to the parties. See *Ivaco, Inc. (Re)*, *supra*, para. 20; and Richard H. McLaren & Sabrina Gherbaz, *Canadian Commercial Reorganization: Preventing Bankruptcy* (Toronto: Canada Law Book, 1995) at 3-18.1. ...[FN54]

He went on to find that the proposed action against Bricore was not "tenable."

58 On an application made by a post-filing creditor, a supervising *CCAA* judge can refuse to lift the stay on the basis that the creditor's claim is outside the *CCAA* process and the action can be commenced after the *CCAA* order is lifted. (See *360networks*[FN55] and *Stelco*[FN56]). Koch J. did not exercise this option. He was no doubt motivated in part by the fact that by the time ICR's claim could be tried, after the stay is no longer in effect, there may be no funds for it to claim as Bricore has now liquidated all of its assets and there remains, for all intents and purposes, a pool of funds only. The funds are subject to a plan of distribution, approved by the creditors, and will be distributed over this year.

59 Instead of simply rejecting the claim, Koch J. appears to have weighed the evidence to a certain extent as a means of deciding the next step. He concluded that the claim was not frivolous within the meaning of a Queen's Bench Rule 173 striking motion, but it was nonetheless an untenable claim. The question becomes whether a supervising *CCAA* judge can weigh a post-filing claim in this manner.

60 Professor Sarra comments on the anomalous position of liquidating *CCAA* proceedings:

One policy issue that has not to date been fully explored is whether the *CCAA* should be used to effect an organized liquidation that should properly occur under the *BIA* or receivership proceedings. Increasingly, there are liquidating *CCAA* proceedings, whereby the debtor corporation is for all intents and purposes liquidated, but not under the supervision of a trustee in bankruptcy or in compliance with all of the requirements of the *BIA*. While creditors still must vote in support of such plans in the requisite amounts, there may be some public policy concerns regarding the use of a restructuring statute, under the broad scope of judicial discretion, to effect liquidation. ...[FN57]

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

The issue of whether the *CCAA* should be used for a liquidating, as opposed to a restructuring purpose, is not before us. In the case at bar, when the Initial Order was granted, it was thought possible that Bricore could be restructured. It was only some months after the Initial Order that it became clear that all of the assets would have to be sold. Our task at this point is to address the position of an undetermined claim arising post-filing in such a context.

61 If a claim had some reasonable prospect of success and were otherwise meritorious in the *CCAA* context, it seems inappropriate to refuse simply to lift the stay on the basis that the claim is outside the *CCAA* process knowing that, by the time the matter is heard in the ordinary course, there will be no assets remaining. On the other hand, it also seems inappropriate to delay distribution of the assets under a plan of arrangement, or make some other accommodation, for an action that is likely to fail. I should make it clear that I am not addressing the issue of whether a meritorious claimant can share in a proposed plan of distribution as a result of the liquidation of the assets. The issue before this Court is whether a post-filing creditor should be permitted to commence action, in the context of what is now a liquidating *CCAA*, and avail itself of whatever pre-judgment remedies might be available to it as a result of its claim.

62 In the face of a liquidating plan of arrangement, given the broad jurisdiction conferred by the *CCAA* on the Court, it seems appropriate that the supervising judge establish some mechanism to weigh the post-filing claim to determine the next step. The next step might entail permitting the claimant to commence action and attempt to convince a chambers judge to grant it a pre-judgment remedy in relation to the funds. It is also possible that the supervising judge may delay distribution of the funds, or some portion thereof, with or without full security for costs, or on such other terms as seems fit. Mechanisms to test the claim could include referral to a special claims officer, examination of the pertinent principal parties, or a settlement conference, or, as in this case, a preliminary examination by the supervising *CCAA* judge in chambers based on affidavit evidence.

63 In the case at bar, having determined that it was appropriate to assess ICR's claim in some way, did Koch J. err either in his statement of the appropriate test or in its application?

64 Koch J. used *prima facie* case, which he equated with tenable cause of action. "Tenable cause of action" is taken from Ground J.'s decision in *Ivaco Inc., Re.*[FN58] but Ground J. used "reasonable cause of action" or "tenable case," as comparable terms and as only one of four criteria to be considered. The use of "*prima facie* case" defined as "tenable cause of action" is not particularly helpful as the words have been used in different contexts with different purposes in mind. Even in the context of bankruptcy where specific guidelines are given, and the courts have had long experience with the application of the tests, the debate continues as to what is meant by *prima facie* case and whether it is too high of a standard to apply in determining whether an action may be commenced.[FN59]

65 Koch J. was clearly correct to hold that the threshold established by s. 173 of *The Queen's Bench Rules* is too low. On the other hand, it is also important not to decide the case. The purpose for passing on the claim is not to determine whether it will or will not succeed, but to determine whether the plan of arrangement should be delayed or further compromised to accommodate a future claim, or some other step need be taken to maintain the integrity of the *CCAA* proceeding.

66 Given the broad discretion granted to a supervisory judge under the *CCAA*, as well as the knowledge and experience he or she gains from the ongoing dealings with the parties under the proceedings, it would be contrary to the purpose of the *CCAA* for the law under it to develop in a restrictive way. Having regard for this, there ought not to be rigid requirements imposed on how a supervising *CCAA* judge must exercise his or her discretion with respect to lifting the stay.

67 Nonetheless, a broad test articulated along the lines of that in *Ma, Re*[FN60] may be of assistance. The test from *Ma, Re* is:

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

3 ... As stated in *Re Francisco*, the role of the court is to ensure that there are "sound reasons, consistent with the scheme of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*" to relieve against the automatic stay. While the test is not whether there is a *prima facie* case, that does not, in our view, preclude any consideration of the merits of the proposed action where relevant to the issue of whether there are "sound reasons" for lifting the stay. For example, if it were apparent that the proposed action had little prospect of success, it would be difficult to find that there were sound reasons for lifting the stay.

While the *Ma, Re* test was developed for use under the *BIA*, a test based on sound reasons, consistent with the scheme of the *CCAA*, to relieve against the stay imposed by ss. 11(3) and (4) of the *CCAA*, may be a better way to express the task of the chambers judge faced with a liquidating *CCAA* than a test based simply on *prima facie* case. It must be kept firmly in mind that the Court is dealing with a claimant that did not avail itself of the remedy of withholding services under s. 11.3. It is also useful to remind oneself that, in a case such as this, the *CCAA* proceeding began as a restructuring exercise with the attendant possibility of creating s. 11.3 claimants. The threshold must be a significant one, but not insurmountable.

68 In determining what constitutes "sound reasons," much is left to the discretion of the judge. However, previous decisions on this point provide some guidance as to factors that may be considered:

- (a) the balance of convenience;
- (b) the relative prejudice to the parties;
- (c) the merits of the proposed action, where they are relevant to the issue of whether there are "sound reasons" for lifting the stay (i.e., as was said in *Ma, Re*, if the action has little chance of success, it may be harder to establish "sound reasons" for allowing it to proceed).

The supervising *CCAA* judge should also consider the good faith and due diligence of the debtor company as referenced in s. 11(6). Ultimately, it is in the discretion of the supervising *CCAA* judge as to whether the proposed action ought to be allowed to proceed in the face of the stay.

69 While Koch J. did not state the test as broadly as I have, I agree that ICR does not reach the necessary threshold. ICR did not structure its affairs or establish a claim with the specificity that justifies the development of a remedy to allow it to participate in the liquidation of the Bricore assets. There is also no aspect of the liquidation that requires the Court in this case to be concerned. In particular, the stay need not be lifted, and no other step need be taken in the context of the *CCAA* proceedings in light of these facts:

1. as of January 30, 2006, the Building was subject to an exclusive Selling Officer Agreement that provided CMN Calgary with the exclusive right to sell the property and to earn a commission of 1.25% of the purchase price,<sup>[FN61]</sup> which is significantly less than that being claimed by ICR at a 5% commission;
2. the sale to the Proposed Purchaser was a sale of six of the seven Bricore properties;
3. the trial judge received a report dated September 25, 2006 from the CRO recommending approval of the sale, which is two days before the alleged contract with ICR was proposed;<sup>[FN62]</sup>
4. in the September 25 report, the CRO advised the Court that "the total aggregate purchase price for the Bricore Properties obtained by Bricore in the Accepted Offer to Purchase represented the greatest value which it would be possible to obtain for all of the Bricore Properties;"<sup>[FN63]</sup>

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

5. the September 27, 2006 letter from ICR to Bricore, states "we are aware that the properties are under contract to sell ..."; and,

6. there was no sale from Bricore to the City of Regina.

70 While ICR denies knowledge of the sale, it is important to come back to the September 27th letter from ICR to Mr. Ruf. It states:

**We are aware that the properties are under contract to sell** and request that ICR be protected in the specific situations as outlined.[FN64] [Emphasis added]

The addition by the CRO of these words, "Date of closing of a sale or December 31, 2006 whichever is earlier," to that letter adds further support to the veracity of the CRO's report to the effect that the CRO entered into discussions with ICR to provide for the eventuality of a failed sale to the purchaser with whom Bricore already had a contractual relationship.

71 Finally, in assessing Koch J.'s decision, and in determining the deference that is owed to it, I am not unmindful that he issued some 20 orders in 2006, pertaining to the Bricore restructuring, at least five of which dealt substantively with the Building and its prospective sale to the Proposed Purchaser.

72 Thus, applying the standard of review previously articulated, I cannot say that Koch J. acted arbitrarily, on a wrong principle, or on an erroneous view of the facts, or that a failure of justice is likely to result from the exercise of his discretion in the manner he did.

#### **VII. Issue #4. Did the Supervising CCAA Judge Make a Reviewable Error in Refusing Leave to Commence an Action Against the CRO?**

73 In addition to the indemnification provided by para. 18 of the CRO Order quoted above, the Order goes on to indicate the only circumstances in which the CRO can be sued personally:

20. For greater clarity, the CRO [sic]:

....:

(c) the CRO shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of his appointment or as a result of the fulfillment of his powers and duties as CRO, except as a result of instances of fraud, gross negligence or wilful misconduct on his part; and

(d) no Proceeding shall be commenced against the CRO as a result of or relating in any way to his appointment or to the fulfillment of his powers and duties as CRO, without prior leave of the Court on at least seven days' notice to Bricore Group, the CRO and legal counsel to Bricore Group.

21. Subject to paragraph 20 hereof, nothing in this Order shall restrict an action against the CRO for acts of gross negligence, bad faith or wilful misconduct committed by him.

Setting aside the obvious ambiguity in this Order, it can be taken that to assert a claim against the CRO personally, ICR had to claim "fraud, gross negligence, wilful misconduct or bad faith." ICR claimed "bad faith."



2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

74 Based on para. 20(d) of the Initial Order, there is no question that ICR was required to obtain prior leave of the court. The issue thus becomes whether the supervising CCAA judge erred in exercising his discretion in refusing to lift the stay.

75 Koch J.'s reasons for refusing to lift the stay are these:

[18] Neither is there any basis upon which to lift the stay with respect to the proposed action against Maurice Duval, the Chief Restructuring Officer. Considerations applicable to Bricore under s. 11.3 do not apply to a court-appointed restructuring officer. Maurice Duval, as an officer of the Court, has explained his position in a cogent way. I accept his explanation. He did not sell the Department of Education Building to the City of Regina. He was not aware at the relevant time that the purchaser was going to resell. Indeed, his efforts were directed toward closing a single transaction involving all six Bricore properties. Although the proposed pleading accuses Mr. Duval of acting in "bad faith", it is not suggested on behalf of ICR that Mr. Duval has been guilty of fraud, gross negligence or wilful misconduct; that is, any of the limitations or exceptions expressly listed in paragraph 20(c) of the order of May 23, 2006.

[19] As stated previously, the overriding purpose of the CCAA must also be considered. That applies in the Duval situation too. The statute is intended to facilitate restructuring to serve the public interest. In many cases such as the present it is necessary for the Court to appoint officers whose expertise is required to fulfill its mandate. It is clearly in the public interest that capable people be willing to accept such assignments. It is to be expected that such acceptance be contingent on protective provisions such as are included in the order of May 23, 2006, appointing Mr. Duval. It is important that the Court exercise caution in removing such restrictions; otherwise, the ability of the Court to obtain the assistance of needed experts will necessarily be impaired. Qualified professionals will be less willing to accept assignments absent the protection provisions in the appointing order. [FN65]

76 Again, Koch J. employed the same mechanism that he used to assess the claim against Bricore. He considered the status of the CRO as an officer of the court, noted the ambiguity in the Order and weighed the evidence to a certain extent. The question he was answering was the sufficiency of the claim to permit an action to be commenced against the Court's officer.

77 Again, applying the standard of review with respect to discretionary orders, there is no basis upon which the Court can intervene with Koch J.'s refusal to lift the stay so as to permit an action against the CRO in his personal capacity.

#### VIII. Issue #5. Did the Supervising CCAA Judge Err in Awarding Costs on a Substantial Indemnity Basis?

78 Koch J. awarded substantial indemnity costs for this reason:

[6] In my view, allegations of misconduct against a court officer are rare and exceptional. Therefore costs on this motion should be imposed on a substantial indemnity scale, although not on the full solicitor and client basis sought. Bricore is entitled to costs on the motion of \$2,000.00, and Maurice Duval is entitled to costs of \$1,000.00, payable in each instance by the applicant, ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. [FN66]

79 I note that Newbury J.A. in *New Skeena Forest Products Inc., Re* [FN67] dismissed a challenge to a costs award, holding that "these are the kinds of considerations which the [CCAA] Chambers judge ... was especially qualified to make." And, of course, all costs orders are discretionary orders.

80 Nonetheless in this case, it would appear that the supervising CCAA judge erred. There is no basis upon which to order substantial indemnity costs with respect to the application to lift the stay in relation to Bricore. Bad

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

faith was not alleged on its part. With respect to the CRO, the only basis upon which the stay could be lifted was to make an allegation of "bad faith." In the absence of some other factor, ICR cannot be faulted for making the very allegation that it was required to make in order to bring its application within the ambit of the stay of proceedings that had been granted.

81 In addition, while Koch J. indicated he was not awarding solicitor-and-client costs, there is not a sufficient distinction between substantial indemnity costs and solicitor-and-client costs. An award approaching solicitor-and-client costs is still a punitive order and, as there is no authority for the awarding of substantial indemnity costs, relies upon the same jurisprudential base as solicitor-and-client costs. As such, the award does not seem to meet the test established in *Siemens v. Bawolin*[FN68] and *Hashemian v. Wilde*[FN69] wherein it is stated that solicitor-and-client costs are generally awarded where there has been reprehensible, scandalous or egregious conduct on the part of one of the parties in the context of the litigation.

82 If the parties are unable to agree with respect to costs in the Court of Queen's Bench and in this Court, they may speak to the Registrar to fix a time for a conference call hearing regarding costs.

*Appeal allowed in part.*

FN1 R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36.

FN2 Appeal Book, pp. 17a and 22a [Affidavit of Paul Mehlsen].

FN3 *Ibid.* at pp. 27a and 32a.

FN4 Order (Appointment of Chief Restructuring Officer, Extension of Stay of Proceedings; Additional DIP Financing) made May 23, 2006.

FN5 Order (Extension of Stay of Proceedings) made August 1, 2006.

FN6 Order (Extension of Stay of Proceedings) made August 18, 2006.

FN7 Order (Extension of Stay of Proceedings, Extension of Appointment of CRO and Increase in Maximum CRO Remuneration; Increase to Administrative Charge) made September 25, 2006.

FN8 Order (Approving Sale; Extending Stay of Proceedings; Extending Appointment of CRO) made October 10, 2006.

FN9 Appeal Book, p. 7a-8a.

FN10 *Ibid.* at p. 12a.

FN11 *Ibid.* at pp. 14a-15a.

FN12 *Ibid.* at p. 46a.

FN13 *Ibid.* at pp. 38a-39a.

FN14 *Ibid.* at p. 51a-52a.

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

FN15 *ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.*, 2007 SKQB 121 (Sask. Q.B.).

FN16 John D. Honsberger, *Debt Restructuring: Principles and Practice*, looseleaf (Aurora, Ont.: Canada Law Book, 2007) at p. 9.61.

FN17 (1954), 34 C.B.R. 82 (Que. S.C.). There are no cases referring to *Ramsay Plate Glass* on the point that Prof. Honsberger raises in his text. (*Ptarmigan Airways Ltd. v. Federated Mining Corp.*, [1973] 3 W.W.R. 723 (N.W.T. S.C.) mentions *Ramsay Plate Glass* but not in reference to the point made here.)

FN18 *Ibid.* at p. 83.

FN19 (2003), 45 C.B.R. (4th) 151 (B.C. S.C.), appeal dismissed [*Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. v. 360networks corp.*] (2007), 27 C.B.R. (5th) 115 (B.C. C.A.).

FN20 (2005), 15 C.B.R. (5th) 283 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

FN21 (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (Ont. Gen. Div.).

FN22 *360networks*, *supra* note 19.

FN23 *Stelco*, *supra* note 20 at para. 11.

FN24 *Campeau*, *supra* note 21.

FN25 *360networks*, *supra* note 19.

FN26 *Stelco*, *supra* note 20.

FN27 *Campeau*, *supra* note 21.

FN28 R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3.

FN29 Lloyd W. Houlden & Geoffrey B. Morawetz, *The 2007 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2006) at pp. 562 and 789.

FN30 *An Act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Income Tax Act*, S.C. 1997, c. 12, s. 124.

FN31 *Financial Consumer Agency of Canada Act*, S.C. 2001, c. 9, s. 577.

FN32 *Debt Restructuring Principles and Practice*, *supra* note 16 at p. 9-88.1.

FN33 Richard H. McLaren, *Canadian Commercial Reorganization: Preventing Bankruptcy*, looseleaf (Aurora, Ont.: Canada Law Book, 2007) at p. 3-17.

FN34 Janis Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2007).

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

FN35 *Ibid.* at pp. 110-11.

FN36 (1998), 53 B.C.L.R. (3d) 264 (B.C. S.C.). See also *Air Canada, Re* (2004), 47 C.B.R. (4th) 182 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), and *Mosaic Group Inc., Re* (2004), 3 C.B.R. (5th) 40 (Ont. S.C.J.).

FN37 (1990), [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136 (B.C. C.A.).

FN38 (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 105 (B.C. C.A.).

FN39 *Smith Brothers Contracting Ltd.*, *supra* note 36.

FN40 Order (Appointment of Chief Restructuring Officer; Extension of Stay of Proceedings; Additional DIP Financing) made May 23, 2006.

FN41 Bayda C.J.S., for the majority, in *Smart v. South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre* (1989), 75 Sask. R. 34 (Sask. C.A.), paraphrasing Lord Diplock in *Hadmor Productions Ltd. v. Hamilton*, [1982] 1 All E.R. 1042 (U.K. H.L.) at 1046.

FN42 [1943] O.R. 683 (Ont. C.A.) at 698.

FN43 *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, *supra* note 34 at pp. 88-92.

FN44 *Supra* note 28.

FN45 Twelfth Report of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, February 1997, unnumbered p. 3 of the Chairman's Report, and p. 18.

FN46 *Ibid.* at pp. 17-18.

FN47 Canada Legislative Index, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 35<sup>th</sup> Parliament, Bill C-5, S.C. 1997, c. 12, pp. 1 & 2.

FN48 *Ibid.*

FN49 *An Act to establish the Wage Earner Protection Program Act, to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts*, S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 128.

FN50 Bill C-62, *An Act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, the Wage Earner Protection Program Act and chapter 47 of the Statutes of Canada*, 2005, 1st Sess., 39th Parl., 2006-2007.

FN51 (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 1 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 15.

FN52 (2003), 1 C.B.R. (5th) 204 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para 3.

FN53 [2006] O.J. No. 5029 (Ont. S.C.J.).

FN54 *ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.*, *supra* note 15.

2007 CarswellSask 324, 2007 SKCA 72, 33 C.B.R. (5th) 50, [2007] 9 W.W.R. 79, 299 Sask. R. 194, 408 W.A.C. 194

FN55 *360networks*, *supra* note 19.

FN56 *Stelco*, *supra* note 20.

FN57 *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangements Act*, *supra* note 34 at p. 82.

FN58 *Ivaco Inc., Re*, *supra* note 53.

FN59 *Ma, Re* (2001), 24 C.B.R. (4th) 68 (Ont. C.A.). See Houlden & Morawetz, *The 2007 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, *supra* note 29 at p. 403.

FN60 *Ibid.*

FN61 Order (Extension of Stay, DIP Financing, Sale Process & Shareholder Proceedings) of Koch J. in Chambers dated February 13, 2006.

FN62 Order made September 25, 2006, *supra* note 7.

FN63 Appeal Book, p. 37a, para. 3.

FN64 *Supra* note 11.

FN65 *ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.*, *supra* note 15.

FN66 *ICR Commercial Real Estate (Regina) Ltd. v. Bricore Land Group Ltd.*, 2007 SKQB 144 (Sask. Q.B.).

FN67 [2005] 8 W.W.R. 224 (B.C. C.A.) at para. 23.

FN68 2002 SKCA 84, [2002] 11 W.W.R. 246 (Sask. C.A.).

FN69 2006 SKCA 126, [2007] 2 W.W.R. 52 (Sask. C.A.).

END OF DOCUMENT

**TAB 5**

1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

**C**

1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

Menegon v. Philip Services Corp.

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

In the Matter of the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990 c. C-43, as Amended

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Philip Services Corp. and the Applicants Listed on Schedule "A"

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

Joseph Menegon, Plaintiff and Philip Services Corp., Salomon Brothers Canada Inc., Merrill Lynch Canada Inc., CIBC Wood Gundy Securities Inc., Midland Walwyn Capital Inc., First Marathon Securities Limited, Gordon Capital Corporation, RBC Dominion Securities Inc., TD Securities Inc., and Deloitte & Touche, Defendants

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Blair J.

Judgment: August 27, 1999  
Docket: 99-CL-3442, 4166CP/98

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

Counsel: *David R. Byers, Sean Dunphy and Colleen Stanley*, for Philip Services Corp. et al.

*John McDonald*, for the Class Proceedings plaintiffs.

*J.L. McDougall, Q.C. and B.R. Leonard*, for Deloitte & Touche.

*B. Zarnett*, for Merrill Lynch Canada Inc., Midland Walwyn Capital Inc., First Marathon Securities Limited, Gordon Capital Corporation and Salomon Brothers Canada Inc. ("The Underwriters").

*Hilary Clarke*, for Royal Bank of Canada.

*Pamela Huff and Susan Grundy*, for lenders under the credit agreement.

*Joseph Groia and Subrata Bhattacharjee*, for certain directors.

1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

*E.A. Sellers*, for CIBC as account intermediary.

*Steven Graff*, for PHH Vehicle Leasing.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Civil Practice and Procedure; International; Insolvency

Practice --- Parties — Representative or class actions — Procedural requirements

Class action brought against insolvent corporation, pursuant to Class Proceedings Act, alleging misrepresentation in share offering — Corporation reached proposed settlement with plaintiffs — Settlement was part of plan of compromise and arrangement under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Corporation and plaintiff brought motion for certification of proceeding — Motion granted — Test set out in s. 5(1) of Class Proceedings Act was met — Statement of claim disclosed cause of action based on faulty disclosure, articulated identifiable class and common issue — Proceeding certified against corporation and for settlement purposes only — Notice of certification and of pending motion for approval of settlement to be given to all members of class as certified — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 — Class Proceedings Act, 1992, S.O. 1992, c. 6.

Corporations --- Practice and procedure in actions involving corporations — Miscellaneous issues

Class action brought against insolvent corporation alleging misrepresentation in share offering — Co-defendants included underwriters — Corporation was bound by underwriting agreement to indemnify and hold underwriters harmless against claims based on untrue statements in prospectus — Corporation reached proposed settlement with plaintiffs — Settlement was part of plan of compromise and arrangement under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Corporation and plaintiff brought motion for certification of proceeding and approval of settlement — Motion granted in part — Proceeding certified against corporation and for settlement purposes only — Approval of proposed settlement premature and adjourned to date closer to sanctioning hearing under Act — Proposed settlement affected corporation's relationship not only with class action plaintiffs but also with co-defendants — Under underwriting agreement, company was not entitled to settle action without consent and unconditional release of underwriters — Approval of proposed settlement at that stage would deprive underwriters of contractual right — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36.

Corporations --- Arrangements and compromises — Under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Approval by court — "Fair and reasonable"

Insolvent corporation and subsidiaries filed for protection both under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("Act") and U.S. Bankruptcy Code ("Code") — Class actions brought in both United States and Canada, against corporation, subsidiaries, auditors, underwriters and certain directors and officers — Interrelated plans of compromise and reorganization filed in both courts — Plans provided all claims against corporation to be dealt with in U.S. proceedings, including those of Canadian claimants — Bank had claim in relation to equipment leases in Canada — Corporation applied for approval under Act to enter proposed settlement of class action — Co-defendants in class action and bank brought motions for declaration that plan, proposing that claimants be dealt with under Code, was not fair and reasonable — Motions granted in part — Under Canadian plan, co-defendants lost right to pursue indemnity claims in Canadian class action, by dealing with them under Code — Right to vote under Canadian insolvency regime is central counterpart to debtor's right to compromise — Under American regime, Canadian creditors would lose right to vote and corporation was entitled to "reject" Bank's lease claims — Having chosen to proceed under Canadian insolvency regime, corporation could not evade statutory requirements by dealing with claimants under foreign regime which treats claimants less favourably — No issue of comity was involved — Bank's claims to be determined under Canadian law and in Canadian proceeding — Issue of whether plan fair or reasonable was matter for sanctioning hearing, after negotiations concluded and votes counted — Canadian plan, as then constituted, was flawed and declared to fail to comply with Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act regime — Companies'



1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 — Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. 1982.

**Cases considered by Blair J.:**

*Carom v. Bre-X Minerals Ltd.* (1999), 43 O.R. (3d) 441, 30 C.P.C. (4th) 133 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

*Nantais v. Telectronics Proprietary (Canada) Ltd.* (1995), 127 D.L.R. (4th) 552, 40 C.P.C. (3d) 245, 25 O.R. (3d) 331 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

*Nantais v. Telectronics Proprietary (Canada) Ltd.* (1995), 40 C.P.C. (3d) 263, 129 D.L.R. (4th) 110, 25 O.R. (3d) 331 at 347 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

*Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 1, (sub nom. *Olympia & York Developments Ltd., Re*) 12 O.R. (3d) 500 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

*Roberts v. Picture Butte Municipal Hospital* (1998), 64 Alta. L.R. (3d) 218, 23 C.P.C. (4th) 300, 227 A.R. 308, [1999] 4 W.W.R. 443 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

**Statutes considered:**

*Bankruptcy Code*, 11 U.S.C. 1982

Chapter 11 — referred to

*Class Proceedings Act, 1992*, S.O. 1992, c. 6

Generally — referred to

s. 5(1) — considered

s. 17 — referred to

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

s. 4 — referred to

s. 5.1(3) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 122] — pursuant to

s. 6 — referred to

s. 12 — referred to

s. 18.6(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — referred to

s. 18.6(5) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — referred to

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

1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

s. 97 — pursuant to

MOTION by insolvent corporation and class action plaintiff for certification of proceeding and for approval of proposed settlement agreement; CROSS-MOTIONS by co-defendants and by unsecured creditor for declaration that plan of compromise and arrangement under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* was not fair and reasonable.

**Blair J.:**

## I — Facts

### **Background**

1 The issues raised on these Motions touch upon difficult areas in the burgeoning field of cross-border insolvencies.

2 Philip Services Corp. is the ultimate parent company of a network of approximately 200 directly and indirectly owned subsidiaries in Canada, the United States and elsewhere. The operations of this international conglomerate of companies are service oriented, with a primary focus on what are referred to as "Metals Services" and "Industrial Services." The former involves the collection, processing and recycling of scrap metal for steel mills and for the foundry and automotive industries. The latter entails providing such things as cleaning and maintenance services, waste collection and transportation, emergency response services and tank cleaning for major industries ("outsourcing services"), and providing "by-products recovery services," with heavy emphasis on chemicals and fuel and polyurethane recycling, for the same industries.

3 The Philips conglomerate — with consolidated revenues in 1998 of U.S. \$2 billion, but a consolidated, net loss of U.S. \$1.587 billion for the period ending December 31, 1998 — has fallen into insolvent circumstances. On June 25, 1999, Philip Services Corp. and its Canadian subsidiaries sought and obtained the protection of this Court under the provisions of the CCAA to enable them to attempt to restructure their affairs. On the same date, Philip Service Corp. and its primary subsidiary for its U.S. operations, Philip Services (Delaware) Inc., together with other U.S. subsidiaries, filed for Chapter 11 protection under the U.S. *Bankruptcy Code* in United States Bankruptcy Court (District of Delaware). On July 12, 1999, a "Disclosure Statement and a Plan of Reorganization" was filed in the U.S. Bankruptcy Proceedings ("the U.S. Plan"). On July 15<sup>th</sup>, a Plan of Compromise and Arrangement was filed in the CCAA Proceedings ("the Canadian Plan").

4 As the parties and counsel have done, I shall refer to Philip Services Corp. as "Philip" and to Philip Services (Delaware) Inc. as "PSI." I shall refer to the conglomerate as a whole as "Consolidated Philip."

5 Philip is an Ontario corporation with head offices in Hamilton, Ontario. It is a public company with stock trading on the Toronto Stock Exchange, the Montreal Exchange, and the New York Stock Exchange. Although trading is suspended at the present time, the bulk of trading occurred on the New York Stock Exchange. Eighty-two percent of Philip's issued and outstanding shares are owned by U.S. residents. Moreover, it appears, the majority of Philip's operating assets, and of its operations, are located in the United States. Consolidated Philip carries on business at more than 260 locations, and employs more than 12,000 employees, primarily in North America. Its customer list includes more than 40,000 industrial and commercial customers world-wide. In Canada, there are 94 locations, about 2,000 employees, and annual revenues in the neighbourhood of U.S. \$333 million.

6 Philip expanded very rapidly in the past few years — perhaps too rapidly, as it turns out. Consolidated Philip grew by more than 40 new businesses acquisitions in 1996 and 1997. Associated with this expansion was the negotiation of a U.S. \$1.5 billion Credit Agreement between Philip and PSI as borrowers and a syndicate of more than 40

1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

lenders (the "Lenders"). Under the Credit Agreement Philip guaranteed the borrowings of PSI, and PSI guaranteed the borrowings of Philip. In addition, certain subsidiaries of Philip and PSI guaranteed all of the liabilities of Philip and PSI to the lenders, and the guarantees from the subsidiaries were secured by general agreements and specific assignments of assets. In short, the Lenders have security over virtually all of the assets of Consolidated Philip. Moreover, subject to certain specific exceptions, it is first security.

7 During this same period of expansion, Philip raised about U.S. \$362 million through a public offering in the U.S. and Canada. Seventy-five percent of these shares were sold in the U.S. As events transpired, these public offerings have led to a series of class actions against Philip both in the U.S. and in Canada. They arose out of certain discrepancies between copper inventory as shown on the books and records of Philip and actual inventory on hand, which were revealed in audits in early 1998. Publicity surrounding the discrepancies led to a drop in the price of Philip shares, which led to various class actions. Eventually, it was determined that Philip's liabilities had been understated by approximately U.S. 35 million. As a result, it was required to file an Amended Form 10-K with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission restating its financial results for 1997 to show an additional loss of \$35 million. It was also required to revise the amount of pre-tax special and non-recurring charges for that same year.

8 It is said that the unsettling effects of the financial irregularities and the class action proceedings, in conjunction with a general uncertainty in the markets serviced by Consolidated Philip, caused Philip's earnings to drop dramatically. It could not refinance its long-term debt under the Credit Agreement. Its trade credit was curtailed. It lost contracts and, because its bonding capacity was impaired, it was further hampered in its ability to win new contracts. In spite of concerted efforts over a period of nearly a year, Philip was not able to re-finance its debt or to restructure its affairs outside of the court restructuring context. Cash conservation measures in late 1998 led to defaults under the Credit Agreement. Debt restructuring negotiations with *the Lenders* since that time led ultimately to the parallel insolvency proceedings in Canada and the U.S. to which I have referred above.

### *The Class Proceedings*

9 Developments in the class action proceedings are what have led specifically to the Motions which are presently before this Court.

10 In February and March of 1998 various class actions were filed in the United States against Philip, certain of its past and present directors and officers, the underwriters of the Company's November 1997 public offering, and the Company's auditors (Deloitte & Touche).<sup>[FN1]</sup> The actions, now consolidated, alleged that Philip's financial disclosure for various time periods between 1995 and 1997 contained material misstatements or omissions in violation of U.S. federal securities laws.

11 In May, 1998, a class proceeding was also commenced in Ontario, under the *Class Proceedings Act*, 1992 ("the CPA Proceeding"). The plaintiff is Joseph Menegon, a retired school teacher living in Hamilton, who had purchased 300 common shares of Philip on the TSE in November, 1998. The CPA Proceedings is an action for misrepresentation, negligent misrepresentation and rescission relating to the purchase of shares of Philip by people in Canada between February 28 and May 7, 1998. The defendants are Philip, the various Underwriters, and Deloitte & Touche.

12 At the instance of Philip and Deloitte & Touche, however, a motion was brought for an order dismissing the U.S. Class Action on the grounds that the United States Court was not the proper Court for the disposition of the claims, but that the Ontario Court was. This motion was successful and on May 4, 1999 the U.S. Class Action was dismissed. A motion to reconsider was also dismissed. Although the U.S. Class Action plaintiffs have appealed, the present status of those proceedings is that they have been dismissed.

13 Nonetheless, the U.S. claims persist, and there have been negotiations between counsel for the U.S. and Ca-

1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

nadian Class Action plaintiffs and Philip since early 1999 with a view to arriving at a settlement of the class action claims against Philip. Because of the nature of these claims, and the potential quantum of any judgments that might be obtained, a resolution of the Class Action proceedings, according to Philip, is an essential element of any successful restructuring. On June 23, 1999, the parties to the negotiations entered into a Memorandum of Understanding which outlined a proposed settlement between Philip and the U.S. Class Action and CPA Proceedings plaintiffs.

14 Philip and the CPA Proceeding plaintiff now seek certification of the CPA Proceeding and approval of the Settlement by the Court. Philip, separately, seeks approval of this Court under the CCAA to enter into the proposed Settlement. These motions have triggered the series of matters that are now to be disposed of. Deloitte & Touche not only opposes the Motions, but seeks separate declaratory relief on its own part touching upon the Settlement itself and as well the overall "fairness" and "reasonableness" of the proposed Canadian Plan. I shall return to the specifics of the competing Motions and the relief sought shortly. First, however, some brief reference to the controversial aspects of the Canadian and U.S. Plans, and to the terms of the Settlement, is required.

#### *The Controversial Aspects of the Plans, and the Settlement*

15 The principle terms and conditions of the U.S. and Canadian Plans, as they presently stand, were hammered out in a "Lock-Up Agreement" entered into in April, 1999 and later amended on June 21<sup>st</sup>, between Philip (as Canadian borrower), PSI (as U.S. borrower), and a Steering Committee representing the Lenders. There were also negotiations with certain of Philip's major unsecured creditors and with counsel for the U.S. and Canadian class action plaintiffs. The Lock-Up Agreement is variously described as the result of "heavy" negotiations and "very hard bargaining." No doubt that is indeed the case.

16 The amended Lock-Up Agreement provides in substance that the Lenders will become the holders of 91% of the equity in the newly restructured Philip, and that they will as well receive U.S. \$300 million of senior secured debt (now reduced to \$250 million through asset sales) and \$100 million of secured "payment in kind" notes. Under the U.S. Plan the remaining 9% of the equity in the restructured Philip is to be made available to other stakeholders, on the following basis: 5% (plus U.S. \$60 million in junior notes) is to be for the compromised unsecured creditors; 2% for the existing shareholders; 1.5% for the Canadian and U.S. class action plaintiffs; and, 0.5% for the holders of other securities claims. The formula is conditional upon cross-approvals of the U.S. and Canadian Plans.

17 From Philip's perspective the Plans filed in both the U.S. and in Canada are interdependent and form a single Plan from a "business point of view." The general concept of the overall plan is that each class of stakeholders in the Consolidated Philip with similar characteristics are to be treated similarly whether they are located in the U.S. or in Canada. With this in mind, and having regard to the need for a coordinated restructuring of claims and interests against Philip, PSI, and the Canadian and U.S. subsidiaries, the Plans provide that,

- a) creditors with claims against *Philip's Canadian subsidiaries but not against Philip itself* are to file their claims in the CCAA proceedings in Canada, and are to be dealt with in the Canadian Plan; and,
- b) creditors with claims *against Philip* or its U.S. subsidiaries are to have their claims processed in the U.S. proceedings and are to be dealt with in the U.S. Plan.

18 The result of this is that the claims of *Philip's* creditors, whether Canadian or U.S., are to be dealt with under the U.S. Plan and governed by Chapter 11 of the *U.S. Bankruptcy Code*. This includes the claims of Deloitte & Touche and of the Underwriters, and of certain former officers and directors, for contribution and indemnity in relation to the U.S. and Canadian class proceedings. It also includes the claims of certain creditors, such as Royal Bank of Canada, in relation to personal property leases.

19 Not surprisingly, those so affected take umbrage at this treatment. They submit that it contravenes the provi-

1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

sions of the CCAA and their substantive rights under Canadian law, and should not be countenanced. It renders the Canadian Plan unfair and unreasonable, in their submission, and should not be sanctioned. Philip argues, on the other hand, that matters relating to whether or not the Plan is fair and reasonable are matters to be dealt with at the sanctioning hearing, when the Plan is brought before the Court for approval after it has received the earlier approval of the Company's creditors. Counsel for Philip — supported by counsel for the Lenders and counsel for the Canadian class action plaintiff — submits that it is premature at this stage to consider such contentions. Counsel for Deloitte & Touche and for the Underwriters and for Royal Bank counter this argument, however, by asserting that the certification and approval of the Settlement as sought raises the very same issues and that they are so "inextricably linked" that they must be dealt with together. In an earlier endorsement, I agreed with this latter submission. It fails now to consider the two matters together.

### *The Proposed Settlement*

20 Under the proposed Settlement the Canadian and U.S. class action plaintiffs are to receive 1.5% of the common shares of a restructured Philip, as noted above. The shares are to be distributed *pro rata* amongst the Canadian and U.S. plaintiffs. There is to be, in addition, an amount of up to U.S. \$575,000 for costs of counsel for the U.S. and Canadian class action plaintiffs. The Settlement is embodied in the U.S. Plan as "Allowed Class 8B Claims." It includes the right of persons caught by the class proceedings to opt out; however, any member of the class who elects to opt out of the proposed settlement is also to be dealt with in the U.S. Plan as a Class 8B claimant.

21 The proposed Settlement is conditional upon its being approved by the Courts in Canada and in the U.S. and, according to Philip, upon the successful implementation of both the Canadian and the U.S. Plan. Philip has made it clear that it and its professional advisors do not believe that a restructuring of Philip can be accomplished without resolution of the class action claims in Canada and the U.S. Philip, counsel in the Canadian class action, and the Lenders all argue that in the event of liquidation, the plaintiffs will get nothing because — even if they are successful on liability — they will have no chance of recovering a damage award against the insolvent Philip. The Settlement is also recommended by Ernst & Young, the court appointed Monitor for Philip in the CCAA proceedings.

22 What, then, are the specific issues that the Court is asked to determine on the pending Motions?

## **II — The Issues Raised**

23 The following Motions, as summarized, are before the Court:

- 1) A Motion by Philip pursuant to the CCAA for authorization and direction to enter into the proposed Settlement of the proceeding pending against it under the *Class Proceeding Act*;
- 2) A joint Motion by Philip and Mr. Menegon, the representative plaintiff in the CPA Proceedings, for certification of the class proceeding as against the defendant Philip only, and for approval of the Settlement Agreement together with directions regarding notification of members of the proposed class;
- 3) A cross-Motion by Deloitte & Touche — one of Philip's co-defendants in the CPA Proceedings, supported by the other co-defendant Underwriters — for declaratory relief in the nature of an order:
  - a) declaring, pursuant to s. 5.1(3) of the CCAA and s. 97 of the *Courts of Justice Act* that the Canadian Plan is not fair and reasonable in the circumstances, having regard to those provisions in the Canadian Plan which compromise the ability of Deloitte & Touche to claim contribution and indemnity against Philip and certain of its directors, officers and employees;
  - b) precluding the compromise of the Deloitte & Touche claims and amending both the Canadian Plan and

1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

the U.S. Plan so that Deloitte & Touche's rights are to be determined under the Canadian Plan alone, and in accordance with Canadian law and without unfairly prejudicing its rights.

4) A Motion by Royal Bank of Canada for an order,

a) declaring that the claim of Royal Bank against Philip under certain leases shall be determined with reference to Canadian law and in the Canadian proceedings;

b) declaring that the Canadian Plan is not fair and reasonable because it seeks to compromise the Bank's claims in the U.S. Plan, thus adversely affecting the Bank's rights and circumventing Philip's obligations under Canadian law;

c) amending the Canadian Plan so that the Bank's claim is not dealt with in the U.S. Plan; and,

d) amending sub-paragraph 14(d) of the initial Order granted in the CCAA proceeding on June 25, 1999 — which presently permits Philip to terminate any and all arrangements entered into by them — by providing that the sub-paragraph does not apply to leases of personal property; and, finally,

5) A Motion on behalf of certain former officers and directors of Philip seeking to have the Canadian Plan and the U.S. Plan declared not fair and reasonable in the circumstances, having regard to those provisions,

a) which attempt to compromise or otherwise limit the ability of the Moving Parties to claim contribution and indemnity from Philip without compensation whatsoever;

b) which call for releases to be provided to current directors and officers of Philip, but not to former directors and officers;

c) which deprive the Moving Parties of their rights as creditors to vote on the Canadian Plan.

### III — Law and Analysis

#### *The Class Proceedings*

24 There is little difference in substance between the joint Motion of Philip and the Canadian class action plaintiff under the *Class Proceedings Act*, and that of Philip alone, under the CCAA. Both ultimately seek approval and implementation of the proposed Settlement. However, the CCAA proceeding provides the context in which this approval is sought and, indeed — as I have already mentioned — Philip and others are of the view that a successful restructuring of Consolidated Philip is not possible without the implementation of the proposed Settlement, and that the converse is also true. Thus, there is a close link between the two, and in my opinion the issue of settlement approval cannot be viewed in isolation from the CCAA/restructuring environment in the context of which it was developed.

#### *Certification*

25 I have little hesitation in certifying — and do certify — the CPA Proceeding as a class proceeding pursuant to subsection 5(1) of the *Class Proceedings Act*, as requested. That is, the proceeding is certified as a class proceeding as against the defendant Philip only and for settlement purposes only. It is without prejudice to any arguments the other defendants to the CPA Proceedings may wish to make in opposition to any element of the plaintiff's claim, including, but not limited to, certification of a class as against them.

1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

26 For those purposes, however, I am satisfied that the tests set out in subsection 5(1) have been met. The statement of claim discloses a cause of action based upon faulty disclosure. There is an identifiable class, as articulated in the materials, and a common issue, as therein very broadly defined.<sup>[FN2]</sup> A class proceeding makes sense, and is the preferable procedure for the resolution of the common issue in the circumstances, and Mr. Menegon constitutes a representative plaintiff as called for in the subsection. An Ontario Court has jurisdiction pursuant to the *Class Proceedings Act* to certify a Canada-wide opt out class where the action has a "real and substantial" connection to Ontario, as is the case here: see, *Carom v. Bre-X Minerals Ltd.*, February 11, 1999, unreported, Court file No. 99-02614 (Ont. Gen. Div.) [reported at 43 O.R. (3d) 441]; *Nantais v. Telectronics Proprietary (Canada) Ltd. (1995)*, 25 O.R. (3d) 331 (Ont. Gen. Div.), leave to appeal refused (1995), 25 O.R. (3d) 331 at 347 (Ont. Gen. Div.).

#### *Approval and Notice*

27 I have concluded, however, that Notice should be given at this time to the members of the class as certified, in accordance with the provisions of section 17 of the *Class Proceedings Act*, but that the proposed Settlement ought not to be approved at this time and at this stage of the restructuring proceedings.

28 This conclusion is based not so much on the issue of whether notification under the *Act* may be given jointly for certification *and* approval, and not so much of the question of the merits of the proposed Settlement as between the class action plaintiffs and Philip. The former issue has not yet been settled, but need not be determined in this case. The latter is supported by the recommendations of the Monitor and seasoned U.S. representative counsel, and by the "reality check" that if there is no settlement it is unlikely that the class action plaintiffs will ever recover anything from Philip.

29 Rather, my conclusion is based upon my sense that it is *premature* to approve a settlement of the U.S. and Canadian class action proceedings at this stage of the restructuring process. Philip and the Lenders have made it clear that the settlement of those claims forms a central underpinning to the ability of Consolidated Philip to reorganize successfully. But the reverberations of the class actions extend to more than merely the relations between Philip and the class action plaintiffs. They affect the relations between Philip and the co-defendants in the proceedings, and between the class action plaintiffs and the co-defendants as well. The class action plaintiffs and the co-defendants are all unsecured claimants of Philip in the restructuring process — the claims of the co-defendants for contribution and indemnity against Philip and its former officers and directors arise out of the same "nucleus of operative facts"<sup>[FN3]</sup> as the claims of the class action plaintiffs against Philip; and one follows from the other. It has frequently been noted that the full name of the CCAA is "An Act to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors." In the bare-knuckled ring of commercial restructuring negotiations, this cannot be accomplished if one group of unsecured claimants is given an unwarranted advantage over another.

30 To grant approval to the proposed Settlement of the class action plaintiffs with Philip at this stage would in effect immunize both those plaintiffs and Philip from the need to have regard to the co-defendants in resolving their dispute. It may well be that a plaintiff in an action with multi-party defendants can settle unilaterally with one of those defendants without creating other repercussions in the lawsuit. It may also be, however, that such a settlement cannot be effected without taking into account some aspects of the "other party" issues — things such as the impact of the settlement on the co-defendants' claims for contribution and indemnity, including the quantum of or a cap on recovery and questions of releases, to take only some examples.

31 For instance, Philip is contractually bound under the terms of its Underwriting Agreement with the Underwriters to indemnify and hold the Underwriters harmless against all claims based on allegations of untrue statements or alleged untrue statements in a prospectus. More to the point, Philip is *not entitled without the consent of the Underwriters*, under the terms of the same Agreement, to settle any action in which such claims are made against it and unless the settlement includes an unconditional release in favour of the Underwriters. Approval of the proposed Set-

1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

tlement at this stage of the restructuring proceedings would deprive the Underwriters of that contractual right. What is significant at this point is not the attempt to compromise the claim, including the contractual right to the release, but rather the loss of the bargaining chip on the part of the Underwriters in the process as a result of the *unilateral* settlement as between Philip and the plaintiffs.

32 Philip, the Lenders, and counsel for the class action plaintiffs have mounted an adamant chorus that if the proposed Settlement is not approved the U.S. and Canadian class action plaintiffs will get nothing because Philip will be liquidated and, in addition, that there is simply no room for the class action plaintiffs to receive anything more than the 1.5% share distribution in the restructured Philip which is currently on the table. The Lenders point out that they are fully secured and that they need not leave available even that 1.5% interest (not to mention the 9% equity interest which they have agreed to leave available to other stakeholders generally). These pronouncements may well reflect the final reality of the situation. However, I am somewhat less inclined to accept them at face value than the parties are to make them, particularly at this stage of the proceedings. It would not be the first time in restructuring negotiations where an adamant chorus turned into a more harmonious melody before the end of the day. Only the final moments of the process will tell the tale. In the meantime, as many negotiating options as possible should be kept open as amongst claimants of equal status in the restructuring, in my view.

33 I do not say that this proposed Settlement, in its present or some other form, will not ultimately be approved. It is simply premature at this stage in the restructuring process to give it that imprimatur, in my opinion — if the imprimatur is to be given — for the reasons I have articulated. Accordingly, the question of approval of the proposed Settlement is adjourned to a date to be fixed which is more contemporaneous with the sanctioning hearing. In the meantime, Notice of certification and of the *pending* motion for approval is to be sent to all members of the class.

#### *The Fairness Issues Regarding the Canadian Plan.*

34 Much of the foregoing reasoning applies to the conclusions I have reached with respect to the issues raised by Deloitte & Touche and others respecting the Canadian Plan and its nexus with the proposed Settlement.

35 The claim of the plaintiffs in the CPA Proceedings as against Deloitte & Touche and the Underwriters includes a claim for the difference between the value received by the plaintiffs as a result of the settlement and their actual loss. If the Settlement and the Canadian and U.S. Plans are approved, however, these co-defendants will lose their rights to claim contribution and indemnity from Philip in the class action. This, in itself, is not a reason for impugning the fairness and reasonableness of the Plans, because the ability to compromise claims against it is essential to the ability of a debtor corporation to restructure its affairs. Nonetheless, where the proposed structure of the reorganization affects the substantive rights of claimants in a fashion which treats them differently than they would otherwise be treated under Canadian law, and where the effect of that treatment is to place the claimants in a position where their ability to engage in full and complete negotiations with the debtor company are impaired, there is cause for concern on the part of the Court. That, in my view, is the case here.

36 The effect of the Canadian Plan, as presently structured, is to deprive Deloitte & Touche, the Underwriters and others such as the former directors and officers of Philip who may have claims of contribution and indemnity as against Philip arising out of the same "nucleus of operative facts" pertaining to the class action claims, from pursuing those contribution claims in the Canadian CCAA proceeding. The same is true, but for different reasons, of the claim of Royal Bank with respect to its equipment leases. This is accomplished by carving out the claims in question from the CCAA proceedings and providing that they are to be dealt with under the U.S. Plan in U.S. Bankruptcy Court in accordance with the provisions of the *U.S. Bankruptcy Code*. All claims against Philip are to be dealt with in that fashion, notwithstanding that it was Philip which set in motion the CCAA proceedings in the first place and which sought and obtained the stay of proceedings preventing these very same claimants from pursuing their claims in Canada against it. At the same time, the Canadian Plan, but its very terms, is to be binding upon all holders of claims against Philip — including those which are subject to the Canadian Plan: see section 9.15 of the Canadian



1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

Plan. This is to be accomplished without even according the right to those claimants to vote on the Plan.

37 The binding nature of the Canadian Plan has the effect of requiring the responding claimants to provide releases in favour of Philip while they are at the same time not released by Philip from claims that might be subsequently asserted against them. Furthermore, as the Plan presently stands, Deloitte & Touche and the Underwriters will be deemed to have released former directors and officers from claims for contribution and indemnity. The Class Action plaintiffs have chosen not to pursue the directors and officers, at the present time, and there is apparently upwards of \$100 million in insurance that might be available to satisfy such claims. This is a matter of considerable concern for Deloitte & Touche and for the Underwriters. Philip has advised, during the course of these motions and before, that it does not intend the proposed Settlement or the Plan to preclude the ability of Deloitte & Touche and of the Underwriters to pursue the former officers and directors. For the present, however, the Plan is worded in such a way that they will be so precluded. The real point is that all of this is being visited upon the responding claimants without there being entitled to any say in the Canadian proceedings as to their willingness or lack of willingness to be so treated.

38 In my opinion it is the loss of the right to vote in the Canadian Plan which lies at the heart of the present dilemma. The mere fact that a Canadian creditor's rights are to be dealt with and affected by single or parallel insolvency proceedings in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court — or that the reverse may be the case (U.S. creditor/Canadian Court) — is not necessarily sufficient, in itself, to undermine the fairness and reasonableness of a proposed Plan: see, for example *Roberts v. Picture Butte Municipal Hospital* (1998), 64 Alta. L.R. (3d) 218 (Alta. Q.B.); *Re Starcom Services Corp.*, Bankr. W.D. Wash., case no. M-98-60005, Nov. 20, 1998. In Canadian insolvency proceedings under the CCAA, however, it is the right to vote on the compromise or arrangement which the debtor company proposes to make with them which is the central counterpart, on the part of the creditors, to the debtors right to attempt to make that compromise or arrangement. In my view, having chosen to initiate and take advantage of the CCAA proceedings, Philip cannot now evade the implications and statutory requirements of those proceedings by seeking to carve out certain pesky — and potentially large — contingent claimants, and to require them to be dealt with under a foreign regime (where they will be treated less favourably) while at the same time purporting to bind them to the provisions of the Canadian Plan. All of this without the right to vote on the proposal.

39 While the fact that their treatment under U.S. Bankruptcy law will apparently be considerably less favourable than their treatment under Canadian law is not determinative, it is certainly a factor for consideration when taken in conjunction with the loss of voting rights in the Canadian Plan. As counsel have presented it, contribution claimants such as Deloitte & Touche, the Underwriters and the directors and officers will have the status equivalent to *equity* holders under the U.S. Plan. Their claims will not be considered as unsecured *debt* claims in terms of priority ranking. Pursuant to the "cram down" provisions of the *U.S. Bankruptcy Code*, the Bankruptcy Court can approve a plan of reorganization even if a class of creditors votes not to accept the plan provided no junior-ranking class receives a distribution and the plan is otherwise fair and reasonable. Moreover, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court may on motion deem such a class of stakeholders to have voted to reject the plan in order to dispense with the necessity of having such a vote amongst its members. While Philip's deponents and its counsel have not said so expressly, it is the clear inference from the materials filed that that is precisely the route which Philip proposes to follow *vis à vis* the contribution claimants whose claims have been left to be dealt with under the *U.S. Bankruptcy Code*.

40 For purposes of the CCAA the claim of an unsecured creditor includes a claim in respect of any indebtedness, obligation or liability which would be a claim provable in bankruptcy, and therefore includes a contingent claim for unliquidated damages. Thus, Deloitte & Touche, the Underwriters, the officers and directors, and Royal Bank are all entitled to assert claims in the CCAA proceedings. They are Canadian claimants, asserting claims against a Canadian company in a Canadian proceeding. In respect of the claims for contribution and indemnity those claims arise out of a "nucleus of operating facts" which the U.S. Courts — at the urging of Philip, amongst others — have already determined are more conveniently litigated in Canadian class action proceedings.

41 In respect of the Royal Bank, the claim relates to some 57 equipment leases entered into between the Bank

1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

and Philip under lease agreements governed by the laws of Ontario and with respect to equipment located (with one exception) in Ontario. However, under U.S. Bankruptcy laws, Philip would be entitled to "reject" leases, which it is not entitled to do under Ontario law, although it may of course "break" the leases if it is prepared to suffer the legal consequences. Again the attempt by Philip is to treat the claims under a regime which is more favourable to it and less so to the claimant. That attempt may not in itself be objectionable, but to the extent that it is accomplished by depriving the creditor of its right to vote and to participate in the Canadian proceedings which were initiated for the purposes of shielding Philip against the claim, it is troubling.

42 The rights of creditors under the CCAA cannot be compromised unless,

- a) the creditor has been given a right to vote, in the appropriate class, on the proposed compromise;
- b) the creditor's vote is in accordance with a value ascribed to the claim by a Court approved procedure;
- c) the class in which the creditor has been appropriately placed has voted by a majority in number and two-thirds in value in favour of the compromise; and,
- d) the Court has sanctioned the compromise on the basis that it is fair and reasonable (with considerable deference being given by the Court in this regard to the votes of the creditors).

43 See CCAA, section 4,6 and 12; *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 12 O.R. (3d) 500 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p. 510.

44 Here, for the reasons I have outlined, what Philip proposes is inconsistent with the foregoing.

45 Philip and the Lenders argue that the issues raised in this regard by the Respondents go entirely to the fairness and reasonableness of the U.S. and Canadian Plans, and that such considerations should be reserved for determination at the sanctioning hearings. I agree that generally speaking matters relating to fairness and reasonableness are better considered in the overall context of the final sanctioning hearing. Where, as here, however, the debtor company has acted earlier to obtain approval of a step in the restructuring process — in this case, the Class Action Settlement — which gives rise to issues that are inextricably linked to the overall fairness of the proposed Plan, and its compliance with statutory requirements, the consideration of those issues may be called for. This is one of those cases, in my opinion, because the reverberations of approving the proposed Settlement — in conjunction with the manner in which the debtor intends to treat other claimants directly affected by the settlement, have the effect of requiring those claimants to participate in the subsequent restructuring negotiations without a full deck of cards.

46 Philip and the Lenders also argue that "comity" demands that this Court defer to the U.S. Bankruptcy Court in allowing the claims of Deloitte & Touche, the Underwriters, the former directors and officers, and the Royal Bank to be dealt with in the U.S. Plan. They point out that in its Initial Order in the CCAA proceedings this Court approved an international Protocol which provides for co-operation between the U.S. and Canadian Courts, to the extent possible. I do not think that either comity or the question of whether the claims will be dealt with ultimately under the U.S. Plan, are the issues here. In addition, the effect of the Protocol as I read it — given the circumstances outlined above — is to provide some protection to claimants on either side of the border from being swept into the rigours of the other countries regimes where to do so might prevent them from asserting their substantive rights under the applicable laws of their own jurisdiction.

47 In this regard, the following provisions of the Protocol are worthy of note:

**(C) Comity and Independence of the Courts**

1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

7. The approval and implementation of this Protocol shall not divest or diminish the U.S. Court's and the Canadian Court's independent jurisdiction over the subject matter of the U.S. Cases and the Canadian Case, respectively. By approving and implementing the Protocol, neither the U.S. Court, the Canadian Court, the Debtors nor any creditors or interested parties shall be deemed to have approved or engaged in any infringement on the sovereignty of the United States or Canada.

8. The U.S. Court shall have sole and exclusive jurisdiction and power over the conduct and hearing of the U.S. Cases. The Canadian Court shall have sole and exclusive jurisdiction and power over the conduct and hearing of the Canadian Cases.

9. In accordance with the principles of comity and independence established in paragraphs 7 and 8 above, nothing contained herein shall be construed to:

- increase, decrease or otherwise modify the independence, sovereignty or jurisdiction of the U.S. Court, the Canadian Court or any other court or tribunal in the United States or Canada ...;
- *preclude any creditor or other interested party from asserting such party's substantive rights under the applicable laws of the United States, Canada or any other jurisdiction including, without limitation, the rights of interested parties or affected persons to appeal from the decisions taken by one or both of the Courts.*

(emphasis added)

**(J) Preservation of Rights**

*27. Neither the terms of this Protocol nor any actions taken under the terms of this Protocol shall prejudice or affect the powers, rights, claims and defenses of the Debtors and their estates, the Committee, the Estate Representatives, the U.S. Trustee or any of the Debtors' creditors under applicable law, including the Bankruptcy Code and the CCAA.*

(emphasis added)

48 The extension of comity as between Courts in cross-border insolvency situations, and co-operation generally in such matters, are matters of great importance, to be sure, in order to facilitate the successful and orderly implementation of insolvency arrangements in such circumstances. Nothing I have said in these Reasons is intended to counter that ethic. However, comity and international co-operation do not mean that one Court must cede its authority and jurisdiction over its own process or over the application of the substantive laws of its own jurisdiction, whenever any kind of differences between the two jurisdictions may arise. Both the Protocol and the provisions of subsection 18.6(2) of the CCAA — which gives this Court authority "to make such orders and grant such relief as it considers appropriate to facilitate, approve or implement arrangements that will result in a co-ordination of proceedings under [the CCAA] with any foreign proceeding" — confirm this. Subsection 18.6(5) of the CCAA provides that "nothing in this section requires the Court to make any order that is *not in compliance with the laws of Canada* or to enforce any order made by a foreign court" (emphasis added).

49 Here, there is yet no order of the U.S. Court, or treatment of the Claimants or Debtor to which comity may be extended, but there is — as I have outlined above — a failure to comply with the requirements of insolvency laws and procedure of Canada, as stipulated in the CCAA. I conclude, therefore, that the Canadian Plan as it presently stands is flawed because it seeks to exclude Canadian claimants from participation in its process by providing that their claims against Philip itself are to be governed by and treated in the U.S. proceedings while at the same time

1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

seeking to bind them to the provisions of the Canadian Plan, all without affording those claimants any right to vote.

50 There was much debate in argument over whether the issue of treatment of the claims in the Canadian or U.S. proceedings was a function of the "real and substantial connection" of Philip with the U.S. jurisdiction, or a function of the "real and substantial connection" of the responding claimants and their claims to the Canadian proceedings. There is no doubt that Philip has a substantial connection with the United States in terms of the residence of the majority of shareholders and the location of the majority of operating assets. This connection certainly justifies the U.S. Chapter 11 proceedings. However, Philip also has a substantial connection to Canada, with its headquarters in Ontario, its Canadian subsidiaries, and its 94 locations and 2,000 employees throughout the country. This connection, together with its array of Canadian creditors, sustains the resort to the CCAA proceedings.

51 I do not think that the analysis falls to be made, in these particular circumstances, on purely *foreign conveniens* grounds. There is more to the situation than that. Philip initiated the CCAA proceedings and sought and accepted the benefits flowing from that step. The responding claimants seek to assert claims in the Canadian proceeding against the Canadian company which instituted those proceedings, in relation to matters arising out of a Canadian class proceeding or (in the case of Royal Bank) out of Canadian contracts and equipment largely located in Canada. The substantive law of Canada under the CCAA, and the procedures therein laid down, entitle them to assert those claims in the Canadian proceedings and to have a vote on the "Plan" which is set forth by the debtor company to compromise them. They should not be deprived of those substantive and procedural rights without having any say in the matter. Putting it another way, I am satisfied that the unquestioned "juridical advantage" which Philip seeks to achieve through its proposed treatment of the responding claimants is outweighed by the unquestioned "juridical disadvantage" on the part of the latter, given that the juridical scales would otherwise be tipped towards Philip through the resort to a stratagem which in my view is not sanctioned under the CCAA.

52 Philip and the Lenders argue that there is great urgency to effect the restructuring process, and that requiring Philip to adhere to the procedures relating to classification, the valuation of claims, and voting — with the numerous issues that may have to be determined in that context — may well doom the process from the beginning. The Lenders are truculent, as their secured position leads them to be; they say that if the reorganization is not completed quickly they may simply abandon the process and exercise their rights to realize on their security, and the entire restructuring process will fail, with dire consequences for all concerned. Mr. McDougall, on behalf of Deloitte & Touche, characterized this as "the cry of doom."

53 I am very aware of the need for timeliness in situations such as these — particularly given the sensitive nature of Consolidated Philip's service oriented business. However, I do not think that the need for a timely resolution alone is justification for depriving claimants of their substantive rights under Canadian law, and for abrogating their right to vote which lies at the very heart of the Canadian restructuring process from the creditor's perspective. It is the tool which gives them ultimate leverage in the bargaining process, and without it their practical rights — as well as their substantive and procedural ones — are greatly diminished.

### III — Conclusion

54 An order will therefore go in terms of the foregoing.

#### *The Class Proceedings*

55 As indicated, an Order is granted certifying the CPA Proceeding as a class proceeding, pursuant to subsection 5(1) of the *Class Proceedings Act*, as against Philip only and for settlement purposes only. The certification is without prejudice to any arguments the other defendants in the CPA Proceeding may wish to make in opposition to any element of the plaintiffs' claim including, but not limited to, certification of a class as against them. In addition, notice of the certification and of the pending motion for approval of the proposed Settlement is to given to members

1999 CarswellOnt 3240, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 262, 39 C.P.C. (4th) 287

of the class as certified, in accordance with the provisions of section 17 of the *Act*. The question of approval of the Settlement, in its present form or some other form as may be advised, is adjourned to a date to be fixed which is more contemporaneous with the sanctioning hearing.

*The Fairness/Substantive Law Issues*

56 Notwithstanding the observations in these Reasons about the Canadian Plan and the treatment of claims in the U.S. proceedings, I am reluctant to grant the sweeping declaratory relief sought by the Respondents. Whether the Plan is ultimately found to be fair and reasonable and in accordance with all necessary requirements remains still a matter for determination in the sanctioning hearing, after all the negotiations have been concluded and the votes counted. As much as is reasonably possible should be left to that process.

57 I am prepared to make an Order, however — and do — declaring that the Canadian Plan as it is presently constituted fails to comply with the procedural and statutory requirement of the CCAA regime in that it seeks to exclude the responding claimants from participation in its process by providing that their claims against Philip itself are to be governed by and treated in the U.S. proceedings while at the same time seeking to bind them to the provisions of the Canadian Plan, all without affording those claimants any right to vote. Anything further in this respect, it seems to me, should be left to the negotiation arena.

58 The position of the Royal Bank is slightly different. It is entitled, in addition, to an order,

a) declaring that the claim of Royal Bank against Philip under certain leases shall be determined with reference to Canadian law and in the Canadian proceedings;

b) amending the Canadian Plan so that the Bank's claim is not dealt with in the U.S. Plan; and,

c) amending sub-paragraph 14(d) of the Initial Order granted in the CCAA proceeding on June 25, 1999 — which presently permits Philip to terminate any and all arrangements entered into by them — by providing that the sub-paragraph does not apply to the Royal Bank leases of personal property.

59 There will be no order as to costs.

60 Order accordingly.

*Orders accordingly.*

FN1 These various actions were eventually consolidated and transferred to the United States District Court, Southern District of New York, by order dated June 2, 1998.

FN2 The common issue is very broadly and vaguely defined, and while such a definition has received approval in other cases, I do not mean to be taken as having approved such a definition for any purposes other than those of this particular case.

FN3 To use the phrase adopted by the parties.

END OF DOCUMENT

**TAB 6**

2006 CarswellOnt 6230, 25 C.B.R. (5th) 231, 152 A.C.W.S. (3d) 16

▷

2006 CarswellOnt 6230, 25 C.B.R. (5th) 231, 152 A.C.W.S. (3d) 16

Muscletech Research & Development Inc., Re

Muscletech Research and Development Inc. et al

Ontario Superior Court of Justice

Ground J.

Heard: September 29, 2006

Judgment: October 13, 2006

Docket: 06-CL-6241

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

Counsel: Fred Myers, David Bish for Applicants, Muscletech Research and Development Inc. et al

Natasha MacParland, Jay Swartz for Monitor, RSM Richter Inc.

Justin Fogarty, Fraser Hughes, Chris Robertson for Ishman, McLaughlin, Jaramillo Claimants

Jeff Carhart for Ad Hoc Tort Claimants Committee

Sara J. Erskine for Ward et al

Alan Mark, Suzanne Wood for Iovate Companies, Paul Gardiner

A. Kauffman for GNC Oldco Inc.

Tony Kurian for HVL Incorporated

Steven Golick for Zurich Insurance Company

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial

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

Applicant companies sought relief under Act as means of achieving global resolution of numerous actions brought against them and third parties in United States — Liability of third parties was linked to that of applicants — Certain of third parties agreed to provide funding of settlement of actions — Most of plaintiffs settled claims but claimants

2006 CarswellOnt 6230, 25 C.B.R. (5th) 231, 152 A.C.W.S. (3d) 16

in three actions did not — Claimants brought motions for various interim orders — Motions dismissed — Claimants were not entitled to make collateral attack on claims resolution order — Court had jurisdiction to make order affecting claims against third parties — Practicality of plan of compromise depended on resolution of all claims — Claimants filed proof of claims including their claims against third parties — Claims were not deemed to be accepted pursuant to claims resolution order — Request for better notices of objection could be dealt with by claims officer — There was no reason to appoint investigator given thorough and impartial report already prepared by monitor.

**Cases considered by *Ground J.*:**

*Canadian Airlines Corp., Re* (2000), [2000] 10 W.W.R. 269, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 1, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 41, 2000 CarswellAlta 662, 2000 ABQB 442, 265 A.R. 201 (Alta. Q.B.) — considered

**Statutes considered:**

*Bankruptcy Code*, 11 U.S.C. 1982

Chapter 15 — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

MOTIONS by objecting claimants in proceedings under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* for various interim orders.

***Ground J.*:**

1 This is a somewhat unique proceeding under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. (1985) Ch. c.36 as amended ("CCAA"). The Applicants have also commenced ancillary proceedings under Chapter 15 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code and are now before the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York ("U.S. Court"). All of the assets of the Applicants have been disposed of and no proceeds of such disposition remain in the estate. The Applicants no longer carry on business and have no employees. The Applicants sought relief under the CCAA principally as a means of achieving a global resolution of the large number of product liability and other lawsuits commenced by numerous claimants against the Applicants and others (the "Third Parties") in the United States. In addition to the Applicants, the Third Parties, which include affiliated and non-affiliated parties, were named as defendants or otherwise involved in some 33 Product Liability Actions. The liability of the Third Parties in the Product Liability Actions is linked to the liability of the Applicants, as the Product Liability Actions relate to products formerly sold by the Applicants.

2 Certain of the Third Parties have agreed to provide funding for settlement of the Product Liability Actions and an ad hoc committee of tort claimants (the "Committee") has been formed to represent the Plaintiffs in such Product Liability Actions (the "Claimants"). Through its participation in a court-ordered mediation (the "Mediation Process") that included the Applicants and the Third Parties, the Committee played a fundamental role in the settlement of 30 of the 33 Product Liability Actions being the Product Liability Claims of all of those Product Liability Claimants represented in the Mediation Process by the Committee.

3 The Moving Parties in the motions now before this court, being the Claimants in the three Product Liability Actions which have not been settled (the "Objecting Claimants"), elected not to be represented by the Committee in



2006 CarswellOnt 6230, 25 C.B.R. (5th) 231, 152 A.C.W.S. (3d) 16

the Mediation Process and mediated their cases individually. Such mediations were not successful and the Product Liability Actions of the Moving Parties remain unresolved.

4 Pursuant to a Call for a Claims Order issued by this court on March 3, 2006, and approved by the U.S. court on March 22, 2006, each of the Objecting Claimants filed Proofs of Claim providing details of their claims against the Applicants and Third Parties. The Call for Claims Order did not contain a process to resolve the Claims and Product Liability Claims. Accordingly, the Applicants engaged in a process of extensive discussions and negotiations. With the input of various key players, including the Committee, the Applicants established a claims resolution process (the "Claims Resolution Process"). The Committee negotiated numerous protections in the Claims Resolution Process for the benefit of its members and consented to the Claims Resolution Order issued by this court on August 1, 2006, and approved by the U.S. court on August 11, 2006.

5 The Claims Resolution Order appoints the Honourable Edward Saunders as Claims Officer. The Claims Resolution Order also sets out the Claims Resolution Process including the delivery of a Notice of Objection to Claimants for any claims not accepted by the Monitor, the provision for a Notice of Dispute to be delivered by the Claimants who do not accept the objection of the Monitor, the holding of a hearing by the Claims Officer to resolve Disputed Claims and an appeal therefrom to this court. The definition of "Product Liability Claims" in the Claims Resolution Order provides in part:

"Product Liability Claim" means any right or claim, including any action, proceeding or class action in respect of any such right or claim, other than a Claim, Related Claim or an Excluded Claim, of any Person which alleges, arises out of or is in any way related to wrongful death or personal injury (whether physical, economic, emotional or otherwise), whether or not asserted and however acquired, against any of the Subject Parties arising from, based on or in connection with the development, advertising and marketing, and sale of health supplements, weight-loss and sports nutrition or other products by the Applicants of any of them.

.....

#### **Nature of the Motions**

6 The motions now before this court emanate from Notices of Motion originally returnable August 22, 2006 seeking:

1. An Order providing for joint hearings before Canadian and U.S. Courts and the establishment of a cross-border insolvency protocol in this CCAA proceeding, to determine the application or conflict of Canadian and U.S. law in respect of the relief requested herein.
2. An Order amending the June 8, 2006 Claims Resolution Claim to remove any portions that purport to determine the liabilities of third party non-debtors who have not properly applied for CCAA relief.

.....

3. An Order requiring the Monitor and the Applicants herein,
  - (a) to provide an investigator, funded by the Claimants (the "Investigator"), with access to all books and records relied upon by the Monitor in preparing its Sixth Report, including all documents listed at Appendix "2" to that report;
  - (b) to provide the Investigator with copies of or access to documents relevant to the investigation of the

2006 CarswellOnt 6230, 25 C.B.R. (5th) 231, 152 A.C.W.S. (3d) 16

impugned transactions as the Investigator may request, and

(c) providing that the Investigator shall report back to this Honourable Court as to its findings, and a Notice of Motion returnable September 29, 2006 seeking.

4. An Order finding that the Notices of Objection sent by the Monitor/Applicants do not properly object to the Claimants' claims against non-debtor third parties;

5. An Order that the Claimants' Product Liability Claims against non-debtor third parties are deemed to be accepted by the Applicants pursuant to paragraph 14 of the Claims Resolution Order;

6. In the alternative, an Order that the Monitor, on behalf of the Applicants, provide further and better Notices of Objection properly objecting to claims against non-debtor third parties so that the Claimants may know the case they are to meet and may respond appropriately.

### Analysis

7 With respect to the relief sought relating to Claims against Third Parties, the position of the Objecting Claimants appears to be that this court lacks jurisdiction to make any order affecting claims against third parties who are not applicants in a CCAA proceeding. I do not agree. In the case at bar, the whole plan of compromise which is being funded by Third Parties will not proceed unless the plan provides for a resolution of all claims against the Applicants and Third Parties arising out of "the development, advertising and marketing, and sale of health supplements, weight loss and sports nutrition or other products by the Applicants or any of them" as part of a global resolution of the litigation commenced in the United States. In his Endorsement of January 18, 2006, Farley J. stated:

the Product Liability system vis-à-vis the Non-Applicants appears to be in essence derivative of claims against the Applicants and it would neither be logical nor practical/functional to have that Product Liability litigation not be dealt with on an all encompassing basis.

8 Moreover, it is not uncommon in CCAA proceedings, in the context of a plan of compromise and arrangement, to compromise claims against the Applicants and other parties against whom such claims or related claims are made. In addition, the Claims Resolution Order, which was not appealed, clearly defines Product Liability Claims to include claims against Third Parties and all of the Objecting Claimants did file Proofs Of Claim settling out in detail their claims against numerous Third Parties.

9 It is also, in my view, significant that the claims of certain of the Third Parties who are funding the proposed settlement have against the Applicants under various indemnity provisions will be compromised by the ultimate Plan to be put forward to this court. That alone, in my view, would be a sufficient basis to include in the Plan, the settlement of claims against such Third Parties. The CCAA does not prohibit the inclusion in a Plan of the settlement of claims against Third Parties. In *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re (2000)*, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 1 (Alta. Q.B.), Paperney J. stated at p. 92:

While it is true that section 5.2 of the CCAA does not authorize a release of claims against third parties other than directors, it does not prohibit such releases either. The amended terms of the release will not prevent claims from which the CCAA expressly prohibits release.

10 I do not regard the motions before this court with respect to claims against Third Parties as being made pursuant to paragraph 37 of the Claims Resolution Order which provides that a party may move before this court "to seek advice and directions or such other relief in respect of this Order and the Claims Resolution Process." The relief sought by the Objecting Creditors with respect to claims against Third Parties is an attack upon the substance of the

2006 CarswellOnt 6230, 25 C.B.R. (5th) 231, 152 A.C.W.S. (3d) 16

Claims Resolution Order and of the whole structure of this CCAA proceeding which is to resolve claims against the Applicants and against Third Parties as part of a global settlement of the litigation in the United States arising out of the distribution and sale of the offending products by the Applicants. What the Objecting Claimants are, in essence, attempting to do is to vary or set aside the Claims Resolution Order. The courts have been loathe to vary or set aside an order unless it is established that there was:

- (a) fraud in obtaining the order in question;
- (b) a fundamental change in circumstances since the granting of the order making the order no longer appropriate;
- (c) an overriding lack of fairness; or
- (d) the discovery of additional evidence between the original hearing and the time when a review is sought that was not known at the time of the original hearing and the time when a review is sought that was not known at the time of the original hearing and that could have led to a different result.

None of such circumstances can be established in the case at bar.

11 In any event, it must be remembered that the Claims of the Objecting Claimants are at this stage unliquidated contingent claims which may in the course of the hearings by the Claims Officer, or on appeal to this court, be found to be without merit or of no or nominal value. It also appears to me that, to challenge the inclusion of a settlement of all or some claims against Third Parties as part of a Plan of compromise and arrangement, should be dealt with at the sanction hearing when the Plan is brought forward for court approval and that it is premature to bring a motion before this court at this stage to contest provisions of a Plan not yet fully developed.

12 The Objecting Claimants also seek an order of this court that their claims against Third Parties are deemed to be accepted pursuant to paragraph 14 of the Claims Resolution Order. Section 14 of the Claims Resolution Order provides in part as follows:

This Court Orders that, subject to further order of this Court, in respect of any Claim or Product Liability Claim set out in a Proof of Claim for which a Notice of Objection has not been sent by the Monitor in accordance with paragraph 12(b) above on or before 5:00 p.m. (Eastern Standard Time) on August 11, 2006, such Claim or Product Liability Claim is and shall be deemed to be accepted by the Applicants.

13 The submission of the Objecting Claimants appears to be based on the fact that, at least in one case, the Notice of Objection appears to be an objection solely on behalf of the Applicants in that Exhibit 1 to the Notice states "the Applicants hereby object to each and all of the Ishman Plaintiffs' allegations and claims." The Objecting Claimants also point out that none of the Notices of Objection provide particulars of the objections to the Objecting Claimants' direct claims against third parties. I have some difficulty with this submission. The structure of the Claims Resolution Order is that a claimant files a single Proof of Claim setting out its Claims or Product Liability Claims and that if the Applicants dispute the validity or quantum of any Claim or Product Liability Claim, they shall instruct the Monitor to send a single Notice of Objection to the Claimant. Paragraph 12 of the Claims Resolution Order states that the Applicants, with the assistance of the Monitor, may "dispute the validity and/or quantum or in whole or in part of a Claims or a Product Liability Claim as set out in a Proof of Claim." The Notices of Objection filed with the court do, in my view, make reference to certain Product Liability Claims against Third Parties and, in some cases, in detail. More importantly, the Notices of Objection clearly state that the Applicants, with the assistance of the Monitor, have reviewed the Proof of Claim and have valued the amount claimed at zero dollars for voting purposes and zero dollars for distribution purposes. I fail to understand how anyone could read the Notices of Objection as not applying to Product Liability Claims against Third Parties as set out in the Proof of Claim. The

2006 CarswellOnt 6230, 25 C.B.R. (5th) 231, 152 A.C.W.S. (3d) 16

Objecting Claimants must have read the Notices of Objection that way initially as their Dispute Notices all appear to refer to all claims contained in their Proofs of Claim. Accordingly, I find no basis on which to conclude that the Product Liability Claims against the Third Parties are deemed to have been accepted.

14 The Objecting Claimants seek, in the alternative, an order that the Monitor provide further and better Notices of Objection with respect to the claims against the Third Parties so that the Objecting Claimants may know the case they have to meet and may respond appropriately. I have some difficulty with this position. In the context of the Claims Resolution Process, I view the Objecting Claimants as analogous to plaintiffs and it is the Applicants who need to know the case they have to meet. The Proofs of Claim set out in detail the nature of the claims of the Objecting Claimants against the Applicants and Third Parties and, to the extent that the Notices of Objection do not fully set out in detail the basis of the objection with respect to each particular claim, it appears to me that this is a procedural matter, which should be dealt with by the Claims Officer and then, if the Objecting Claimants remain dissatisfied, be appealed to this court. Section 25 of the Claims Resolution Order provides:

This Court Orders that, subject to paragraph 29 hereof, the Claims Officer shall determine the manner, if any, in which evidence may be brought before him by the parties, as well as any other procedural or evidentiary matters that may arise in respect of the hearing of a Disputed Claim, including, without limitation, the production of documentation by any of the parties involved in the hearing of a Disputed Claim.

15 In fact, with respect to the medical causation issue which is the first issue to be determined by the Claims Officer, the Claims Officer has already held a scheduling hearing and has directed that by no later than August 16, 2006, all parties will file and serve all experts reports and will-say statements for all non-expert witnesses as well as comprehensive memoranda of fact of law in respect of the medical causation issues. To the extent that the Objecting Claimants appear to have some concerns as to natural justice, due process and fairness, in spite of the earlier decision of Judge Rakoff with respect to the Claims Resolution Order and the consequent amendments made to such Order, in my view, any such concerns are adequately addressed by the rulings made by the Claims Officer with respect to the hearing of the medical causation issue. I would expect that the Claims Officer would make similar rulings with respect to the other issues to be determined by him.

16 In addition, as I understand it, all three actions commenced by the Objecting Claimants in the United States were ready for trial at the time that the CCAA proceedings commenced and I would have thought, as a result, that the Objecting Claimants are well aware of the defences being raised by the Applicants and the Third Parties to their claims and as to the positions they are taking with respect to all of the claims.

17 Accordingly, it appears to me to be premature and unproductive to order further and better Notices of Objection at this time.

18 The motion seeking an order requiring the Monitor and the Applicants to provide an Investigator selected by the Objecting Claimants relates to transactions referred to by the Monitor in preparing its Sixth Report which dealt with certain transactions entered into by the Applicants with related parties prior to the institution of these CCAA proceedings. The Objecting Creditors also seek to have the Investigator provided with copies of, or access to, all documents relevant to an investigation of the impugned transactions as the Investigator may request. It appears from the evidence before this court that the Applicants prepared for the Monitor a two-volume report (the "Corporate Transactions Report") setting out in extensive detail the negotiation, documentation and implementation of the impugned transactions. Subsequently by order of this court dated February 6, 2006, the Monitor was directed to review the Corporate Transactions Report and prepare its own report to provide sufficient information to allow creditors to make an informed decision on any plan advanced by the Applicants. This review was incorporated in the Monitor's Sixth Report filed with this court and the U.S. court on March 31, 2006. In preparing its Sixth Report, the Monitor had the full cooperation of, and full access to the documents of, the Iovate Companies and Mr. Gardiner, the principal of the Iovate Companies. No stakeholder has made any formal allegation that the review conducted by the Monitor was flawed or incomplete in any way. The Monitor has also, pursuant to further requests, provided documenta-

2006 CarswellOnt 6230, 25 C.B.R. (5th) 231, 152 A.C.W.S. (3d) 16

tion and additional information to stakeholders on several occasions, subject in certain instances to the execution of confidentiality agreements particularly with respect to commercially sensitive information of the Applicants and the Iovate Companies which are Third Parties in this proceeding. There is no evidence before this court that the Monitor has, at any time, refused to provide information or to provide access to documents other than in response to a further request from the Objecting Claimants made shortly before the return date of these motions, which request is still under consideration by the Monitor. The Sixth Report is, in the opinion of the Respondents, including the Committee, a comprehensive, thorough, detailed and impartial report on the impugned transactions and I fail to see any utility in appointing another person to duplicate the work of the Monitor in reviewing the impugned transactions where there has been no allegation of any deficiency, incompleteness or error in the Sixth Report of the Monitor.

19 I also fail to see how a further report of an Investigator duplicating the Monitor's work would be of any assistance to the Objecting Claimants in making a decision as to whether to support any Plan that may be presented to this court. The alternative to acceptance of a Plan is, of course, the bankruptcy of the Applicants and I would have thought that, equipped with the Corporate Transactions Report and the Sixth Report of the Monitor, the Objecting Claimants would have more than enough information to consider whether they wish to attempt to defeat any Plan and take their chances on the availability of relief in bankruptcy.

20 In any event, it is my understanding that, at the request of the Committee, any oppression claims or claims as to reviewable transactions have been excluded from the Claims Resolution Process.

21 The final relief sought in the motions before this court is for an Order providing for joint hearings before this court and the U.S. court and the establishment of a cross-border protocol in this proceeding to determine the application of Canadian and U.S. law or evidentiary rulings in respect of the determination of the liability of Third Parties. During the currency of the hearing of these motions, I believe it was conceded by the Objecting Claimants that the question of the applicability of U.S. law or evidentiary rulings would be addressed by the Claims Officer. The Objecting Claimants did not, on the hearing of these motions, press the need for the establishment of a protocol at this time. An informal protocol has been established with the consent of all parties whereby Justice Farley and Judge Rakoff have communicated with each other with respect to all aspects of this proceeding and I intend to follow the same practice. Any party may, of course, at any time bring a motion before this court and the U.S. court for an order for a joint hearing on any matter to be considered by both courts.

22 The motions are dismissed. Any party wishing to make submissions as to the costs of this proceeding may do so by brief written submissions to me prior to October 31, 2006.

*Motions dismissed.*

END OF DOCUMENT

**TAB 7**

1988 CarswellBC 553, 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141

**C**

1988 CarswellBC 553, 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141

Northland Properties Ltd., Re

Re NORTHLAND PROPERTIES LIMITED et al.

British Columbia Supreme Court

Trainor J. [in Chambers]

Judgment: June 20, 1988  
Docket: Vancouver No. A880966

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

Counsel: *A. Czepil*, for Guardian Trust.

*A.G. Sandilands*, for petitioners.

*R. Ellis* and *D. Tysoe*, for B.C. Telephone.

*S. R. Stark*, for Co-op Trust Co.

*G. Thompson*, for Bank of Montreal.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Secured creditors — Mortgages — Court allowing debtors time to make proposal under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Court ordering no proceedings to be taken by creditors without leave — Court denying leave to commence mortgage foreclosure proceedings but allowing collection of rent under assignment of rents.

Secured creditors — Specific assignments — Assignment of rents — Court allowing debtors time to make proposal under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Court ordering no proceedings to be taken by creditors without leave — Court denying leave to commence mortgage foreclosure proceedings but allowing collection of rent under assignment of rents.

The company had granted a mortgage and executed an assignment of rents which was registered as security for a loan from the trust company. The assignment provided that, upon default under the mortgage, the trust company was entitled to all rents falling due from the date of service of notice to the tenants. The land involved was the only asset of the company.

The company and several related companies ran into financial difficulty and applied under the Companies' Creditors

1988 CarswellBC 553, 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141

Arrangement Act for approval to attempt a reorganization plan. An ex parte order was made on 7th April granting the application and providing that any creditor wishing to take proceedings to commence or continue any action or realize upon any security must obtain leave of the court.

The company had not made its 1st April mortgage payment and, following this order, the company informed the trust company that no further payments would be made. At this time the property was worth approximately \$340,000 and the value of the mortgage and outstanding taxes was about \$450,000.

An application was brought by the trust company for leave to realize on the mortgage and assignment of rents.

**Held:**

Application granted in part.

The intention of the Act (and the ex parte order) was to allow a judge to make orders which will maintain the status quo for a period of time while an insolvent company attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for an arrangement which would allow the company to remain in operation for the future benefit of both the company and its creditors.

The term "proceedings" should be broadly interpreted to also include non-judicial proceedings which might prejudice other creditors and make an effective arrangement impossible.

The ex parte order generally envisioned that the company was to make a proposal to its creditors by the end of the summer. With regard to this time frame, leave should not be presently granted to the trust company to take any steps with respect to a foreclosure of the mortgage.

As of 1st April the trust company had become vested with the right to take an assignment of rents. The only step which had to be taken was notification of the tenants. That right was in existence prior to the ex parte order being made and should be recognized. This would not prejudice the other creditors as the recognition of the assignment of rents simply put the trust company in a position to receive moneys which it ordinarily would have received if matters had continued on the basis existing prior to 1st April.

**Cases considered:**

*Meridian Dev. Inc. v. T.D. Bank; Meridian Dev. Inc. v. Nu-West Ltd.*, [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215, 52 C.B.R. (N.S.) 109, 32 Alta. L.R. (2d) 150, 53 A.R. 39 (Q.B.) — *applied*

**Statutes considered:**

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-25 [now R.S.C. 1985, c. C-346]

Application for leave to realize on mortgage and assignment of rents.

***Trainor J. (orally):***

1 In these proceedings I made an order on 7th April 1988 which contains a provision that all proceedings taken or that might be taken by any of the petitioners' creditors:

2 ... shall be stayed until further order of this Court upon notice to the Petitioners and that further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding commenced by any person against any of the Petitioners be stayed until



1988 CarswellBC 553, 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141

further order of this Court, upon notice to the Petitioners, that no action, suit or other proceeding may be proceeded with or commenced against any of the Petitioners by any person except with leave of this Court, upon notice to the Petitioners, and subject to such terms as this Court may impose, and that the right of any person to realize upon or otherwise deal with any security held by that person on the undertaking, property and assets of any of the Petitioners be and the same is postponed on such terms and conditions as this Court may deem proper ...

3 The motion before me today is by counsel on behalf of Guardian Trust Company. He asks for an order that Guardian Trust have leave to realize on an indenture of mortgage and an assignment of rents both made between Unity Investment Company Limited and Guardian Trust Company. The affidavit of the principal of the petitioner companies, Mr. Gaglardi, filed on 30th May of this year contains this paragraph:

4 Unity is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Northland and is the registered owner of a single parcel of property situate in Nelson, British Columbia. Northland acquired all of the issued and outstanding shares of Unity in or about December, 1980 for the sole purpose of acquiring the Nelson property, Unity's sole asset. The vendors had insisted on a share rather than asset purchase at the time.

5 Margaret Anderson, who is an assistant vice-president of Guardian Trust Company, in her affidavit filed on 27th May said:

6 That on or about July 16 1983, Unity Investment Company, Limited, granted a mortgage to Guardian Trust Company which was guaranteed by Robert John Phillip Gaglardi to secure payment of a loan in the principal sum of \$500,000.00.

7 I am advised in the course of these proceedings, and I think it is disclosed by the affidavit material which is here, that the present assessed value of the property is about \$340,000, that there is currently owing in respect to that mortgage about \$400,000, and I believe the taxes are payable in addition to that amount, in the sum of about another \$50,000.

8 The Anderson affidavit contains this paragraph:

9 That in addition to obtaining a mortgage from Unity Investment Company, Limited as security for the loan, Guardian Trust Company obtained an Assignment of Rents dated July 13, 1983, which was registered in the Nelson Land Title Office on August 3, 1983, under No. S19466 charging the land and premises described herein.

She further avers:

10 That the Assignment of Rents provides that the Assignor, Unity Investment Company, Limited is entitled to receive all rents until default is made under the mortgage at which time the Assignee, upon notice to the tenants, is entitled to all rents falling due from the date of service of notice.

And further:

11 That prior to April 1, 1988, monthly mortgage payments due pursuant to the mortgage between Guardian Trust Company and Unity Investment Company, Limited had been regularly paid.

And:

1988 CarswellBC 553, 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141

12 That following pronouncement of the Ex Parte Order of The Honourable Mr. Justice Trainor in these proceedings on April 7, 1988, we were advised by a representative of the "Northland Group" that no further payments would be made pursuant to the mortgage and none have been received.

13 It is in those circumstances that the motion has been made for leave to realize on the indenture of mortgage and assignment of rents.

14 With respect to this particular legislation, I would like to refer to what is said by the court in *Meridian Dev. Inc. v. T.D. Bank; Meridian Dev. Inc. v. Nu-West Ltd.*, [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215, 52 C.B.R. (N.S.) 109, 32 Alta. L.R. (2d) 150, 53 A.R. 39 (Q.B.). At p. 113, Mr. Justice Wachowich said:

15 This Act, though little used, is one of a number of federal statutes dealing with insolvency. In common with the various other statutes, it envisages the protection of creditors and the orderly administration of the debtor's affairs or assets.

Then he cites authority for that proposition and continues [pp. 113-14]:

16 In the words of Duff C.J.C. who spoke for the court in *A.G. Can. v. A.G. Que.*, [1934] S.C.R. 659, 16 C.B.R. 1 at 2, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75:

17 ... the aim of the Act is to deal with the existing condition of insolvency in itself to enable arrangements to be made in view of the insolvent condition of the company under judicial authority which, otherwise, might not be valid prior to the initiation of proceedings in bankruptcy. *Ex facie* it would appear that such a scheme in principle does not radically depart from the normal character of bankruptcy legislation.

18 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.

19 I adopt that as a statement of the purpose of this legislation and the underlying purpose behind the order which was made on 7th April last. The particular problem that was dealt with in the *Meridian* case had to do with letters of credit, and there was consideration as to whether or not action upon that letter of credit demanding that it be honoured would amount to a proceeding. There was some discussion of that at p. 117 where he said:

20 ... I am mindful of the wide scope of action which Parliament intended for this section of the Act. To narrow the interpretation of "proceeding" could lessen the ability of a court to restrain a creditor from acting to prejudice an eventual arrangement in the interim when other creditors are being consulted. As I indicated earlier, it is necessary to give this section a wide interpretation in order to ensure its effectiveness. I hesitate therefore to restrict the term "proceedings" to those necessarily involving a court or court official because there are situations in which to do so would allow non-judicial proceedings to go against the creditor which would effectively prejudice other creditors and make effective arrangement impossible. The restriction could thus defeat the purpose of the Act.

21 It is true insofar as that particular case is concerned what he said there is obiter dicta, but it underlines again the general purpose of the Act and the intent to put things in a position for a period of time so that action can be taken for the general welfare and well-being of the company and of the creditors of the company.

22 On that basis it would seem to me that the leave to act on the indenture of mortgage as is requested would be going too far and that that should not be permitted at this time. The time that I am talking about is the time period

1988 CarswellBC 553, 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141

involved in the implementation of the order that was made in April. There are a number of applications with respect to the procedures which should be followed which are pending before me at this time, but the proposal generally is that by the end of this summer the proposal should be made to the creditors and an opportunity to have their response to that proposal given to them so that the next steps can be taken.

23 In those circumstances and in that time frame I would not think that it would be appropriate to grant leave to Guardian to take any steps with respect to a foreclosure of the mortgage.

24 That leaves consideration of the assignment of rents. It seems to me that in the circumstances here Guardian was in a position as of 1st April, when there was default under the mortgage, that they then became vested with the right to take an assignment of the rents. The only step which had to be taken was notification of the tenants. There is in the affidavit material some indication that the petitioners in these proceedings generally were aware of the legislation by that time and were giving consideration to the steps which might be taken and which in fact were taken, resulting in the order of 7th April.

25 In those circumstances, it seems to me that Guardian's right to take action on the assignment of rents should be recognized. I cannot, in the circumstances, see that that would prejudice the other creditors. It was a right which was in existence prior to the order being made, and it seems to me as well, on the basis of what I have heard, that it would be in keeping with what has taken place concerning other mortgages. So in essence the recognition of the assignment of rents really simply puts Guardian in the position where they can receive moneys which they ordinarily would have received if matters had continued on the basis that had existed prior to 1st April. In those circumstances the assignment of rents should be recognized, but the application is dismissed with respect to taking any other proceedings or any proceedings in respect to the mortgage.

26 In those circumstances, since the success is divided, I think probably I should just leave the question of costs and make no order concerning costs.

*Application allowed in part.*

END OF DOCUMENT

**TAB 8**

Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance), [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522, 2002 SCC 41

**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*

**Indexed as: Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)**

**Neutral citation: 2002 SCC 41.**

File No.: 28020.

2001: November 6; 2002: April 26.

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

on appeal from the federal court of appeal

*Practice — Federal Court of Canada — Filing of confidential material —  
Environmental organization seeking judicial review of federal government's decision to*

*provide financial assistance to Crown corporation for construction and sale of nuclear reactors — Crown corporation requesting confidentiality order in respect of certain documents — Proper analytical approach to be applied to exercise of judicial discretion where litigant seeks confidentiality order — Whether confidentiality order should be granted — Federal Court Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106, r. 151.*

Sierra Club is an environmental organization seeking judicial review of the federal government's decision to provide financial assistance to Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. ("AECL"), a Crown corporation, for the construction and sale to China of two CANDU reactors. The reactors are currently under construction in China, where AECL is the main contractor and project manager. Sierra Club maintains that the authorization of financial assistance by the government triggered s. 5(1)(b) of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* ("CEAA"), requiring an environmental assessment as a condition of the financial assistance, and that the failure to comply compels a cancellation of the financial arrangements. AECL filed an affidavit in the proceedings which summarized confidential documents containing thousands of pages of technical information concerning the ongoing environmental assessment of the construction site by the Chinese authorities. AECL resisted Sierra Club's application for production of the confidential documents on the ground, *inter alia*, that the documents were the property of the Chinese authorities and that it did not have the authority to disclose them. The Chinese authorities authorized disclosure of the documents on the condition that they be protected by a confidentiality order, under which they would only be made available to the parties and the court, but with no restriction on public access to the judicial proceedings. AECL's application for a confidentiality order was rejected by the Federal Court, Trial Division. The Federal Court of Appeal upheld that decision.

*Held:* The appeal should be allowed and the confidentiality order granted on the terms requested by AECL.

In light of the established link between open courts and freedom of expression, the fundamental question for a court to consider in an application for a confidentiality order is whether the right to freedom of expression should be compromised in the circumstances. The court must ensure that the discretion to grant the order is exercised in accordance with *Charter* principles because a confidentiality order will have a negative effect on the s. 2(b) right to freedom of expression. A confidentiality order should only be granted when (1) such an order is necessary 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 (2) 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. Three important elements are subsumed under the first branch of the test. First, the risk must be real and substantial, well grounded in evidence, posing a serious threat to the commercial interest in question. Second, the important commercial interest must be one which can be expressed in terms of a public interest in confidentiality, where there is a general principle at stake. Finally, the judge is required to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives are available to such an order but also to restrict the order as much as is reasonably possible while preserving the commercial interest in question.

Applying the test to the present circumstances, the commercial interest at stake here relates to the objective of preserving contractual obligations of confidentiality, which is sufficiently important to pass the first branch of the test as long as certain

criteria relating to the information are met. The information must have been treated as confidential at all relevant times; on a balance of probabilities, proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could reasonably be harmed by disclosure of the information; and the information must have been accumulated with a reasonable expectation of it being kept confidential. These requirements have been met in this case. Disclosure of the confidential documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of AECL, and there are no reasonably alternative measures to granting the order.

Under the second branch of the test, the confidentiality order would have significant salutary effects on AECL's right to a fair trial. Disclosure of the confidential documents would cause AECL to breach its contractual obligations and suffer a risk of harm to its competitive position. If a confidentiality order is denied, AECL will be forced to withhold the documents in order to protect its commercial interests, and since that information is relevant to defences available under the *CEAA*, the inability to present this information hinders AECL's capacity to make full answer and defence. Although in the context of a civil proceeding, this does not engage a *Charter* right, the right to a fair trial is a fundamental principle of justice. Further, the confidentiality order would allow all parties and the court access to the confidential documents, and permit cross-examination based on their contents, assisting in the search for truth, a core value underlying freedom of expression. Finally, given the technical nature of the information, there may be a substantial public security interest in maintaining the confidentiality of such information.

The deleterious effects of granting a confidentiality order include a negative effect on the open court principle, and therefore on the right to freedom of expression. The more detrimental the confidentiality order would be to the core values of (1) seeking the truth and the common good, (2) promoting self-fulfilment of individuals by allowing



them to develop thoughts and ideas as they see fit, and (3) ensuring that participation in the political process is open to all persons, the harder it will be to justify the confidentiality order. In the hands of the parties and their experts, the confidential documents may be of great assistance in probing the truth of the Chinese environmental assessment process, which would assist the court in reaching accurate factual conclusions. Given the highly technical nature of the documents, the important value of the search for the truth which underlies both freedom of expression and open justice would be promoted to a greater extent by submitting the confidential documents under the order sought than it would be by denying the order.

Under the terms of the order sought, the only restrictions relate to the public distribution of the documents, which is a fairly minimal intrusion into the open court rule. Although the confidentiality order would restrict individual access to certain information which may be of interest to that individual, the second core value of promoting individual self-fulfilment would not be significantly affected by the confidentiality order. The third core value figures prominently in this appeal as open justice is a fundamental aspect of a democratic society. By their very nature, environmental matters carry significant public import, and openness in judicial proceedings involving environmental issues will generally attract a high degree of protection, so that the public interest is engaged here more than if this were an action between private parties involving private interests. However, the narrow scope of the order coupled with the highly technical nature of the confidential documents significantly temper the deleterious effects the confidentiality order would have on the public interest in open courts. The core freedom of expression values of seeking the truth and promoting an open political process are most closely linked to the principle of open courts, and most affected by an order restricting that openness. However, in the context of this case, the confidentiality order would only marginally impede, and in some

respects would even promote, the pursuit of these values. The salutary effects of the order outweigh its deleterious effects and the order should be granted. A balancing of the various rights and obligations engaged indicates that the confidentiality order would have substantial salutary effects on AECL's right to a fair trial and freedom of expression, while the deleterious effects on the principle of open courts and freedom of expression would be minimal.

### Cases Cited

**Applied:** *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326; *Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480; *Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835; *R. v. Mentuck*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 442, 2001 SCC 76; *M. (A.) v. Ryan*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157; *Irwin Toy Ltd. v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, [1989] 1 S.C.R. 927; *R. v. Keegstra*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697; **referred to:** *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health and Welfare)*, [2000] 3 F.C. 360, aff'g (1998), 83 C.P.R. (3d) 428; *Ethyl Canada Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)* (1998), 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278; *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103; *R. v. O.N.E.*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 478, 2001 SCC 77; *F.N. (Re)*, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, 2000 SCC 35; *Eli Lilly and Co. v. Novopharm Ltd.* (1994), 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437.

### Statutes and Regulations Cited

*Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, ss. 1, 2(b).

*Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, S.C. 1992, c. 37, ss. 5(1)(b), 8, 54, 54(2)(b).

*Federal Court Rules, 1998*, SOR/98-106, rr. 151, 312.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal, [2000] 4 F.C. 426, 187 D.L.R. (4th) 231, 256 N.R. 1, 24 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, [2000] F.C.J. No. 732 (QL), affirming a decision of the Trial Division, [2000] 2 F.C. 400, 178 F.T.R. 283, [1999] F.C.J. No. 1633 (QL). Appeal allowed.

*J. Brett Ledger and Peter Chapin*, for the appellant.

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

*Graham Garton, Q.C.*, and *J. Sanderson Graham*, for the respondents 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.

The judgment of the Court was delivered by

IACOBUCCI J. —

## I. Introduction

1           In our country, courts are the institutions generally chosen to resolve legal disputes as best they can through the application of legal principles to the facts of the case involved. One of the underlying principles of the judicial process is public openness, both in the proceedings of the dispute, and in the material that is relevant to its resolution. However, some material can be made the subject of a confidentiality order. This appeal raises the important issues of when, and under what circumstances, a confidentiality order should be granted.

2                   For the following reasons, I would issue the confidentiality order sought and  
accordingly would allow the appeal.

II. Facts

3                   The appellant, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (“AECL”) is a Crown  
corporation that owns and markets CANDU nuclear technology, and is an intervener  
with the rights of a party in the application for judicial review by the respondent, the  
Sierra Club of Canada (“Sierra Club”). Sierra Club is an environmental organization  
seeking judicial review of the federal government’s decision to provide financial  
assistance in the form of a \$1.5 billion guaranteed loan relating to the construction and  
sale of two CANDU nuclear reactors to China by the appellant. The reactors are  
currently under construction in China, where the appellant is the main contractor and  
project manager.

4                   The respondent maintains that the authorization of financial assistance by  
the government triggered s. 5(1)(b) of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, S.C.  
1992, c. 37 (“*CEAA*”), which requires that an environmental assessment be undertaken  
before a federal authority grants financial assistance to a project. Failure to undertake  
such an assessment compels cancellation of the financial arrangements.

5                   The appellant and the respondent Ministers argue that the *CEAA* does not  
apply to the loan transaction, and that if it does, the statutory defences available under  
ss. 8 and 54 apply. Section 8 describes the circumstances where Crown corporations are  
required to conduct environmental assessments. Section 54(2)(b) recognizes the validity

of an environmental assessment carried out by a foreign authority provided that it is consistent with the provisions of the *CEAA*.

6           In the course of the application by Sierra Club to set aside the funding arrangements, the appellant filed an affidavit of Dr. Simon Pang, a senior manager of the appellant. In the affidavit, Dr. Pang referred to and summarized certain documents (the “Confidential Documents”). The Confidential Documents are also referred to in an affidavit prepared by Mr. Feng, one of AECL’s experts. Prior to cross-examining Dr. Pang on his affidavit, Sierra Club made an application for the production of the Confidential Documents, arguing that it could not test Dr. Pang’s evidence without access to the underlying documents. The appellant resisted production on various grounds, including the fact that the documents were the property of the Chinese authorities and that it did not have authority to disclose them. After receiving authorization by the Chinese authorities to disclose the documents on the condition that they be protected by a confidentiality order, the appellant sought to introduce the Confidential Documents under Rule 312 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*, SOR/98-106, and requested a confidentiality order in respect of the documents.

7           Under the terms of the order requested, the Confidential Documents would only be made available to the parties and the court; however, there would be no restriction on public access to the proceedings. In essence, what is being sought is an order preventing the dissemination of the Confidential Documents to the public.

8           The Confidential Documents comprise two Environmental Impact Reports on Siting and Construction Design (the “EIRs”), a Preliminary Safety Analysis Report (the “PSAR”), and the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang which summarizes the

contents of the EIRs and the PSAR. If admitted, the EIRs and the PSAR would be attached as exhibits to the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang. The EIRs were prepared by the Chinese authorities in the Chinese language, and the PSAR was prepared by the appellant with assistance from the Chinese participants in the project. The documents contain a mass of technical information and comprise thousands of pages. They describe the ongoing environmental assessment of the construction site by the Chinese authorities under Chinese law.

9           As noted, the appellant argues that it cannot introduce the Confidential Documents into evidence without a confidentiality order, otherwise it would be in breach of its obligations to the Chinese authorities. The respondent's position is that its right to cross-examine Dr. Pang and Mr. Feng on their affidavits would be effectively rendered nugatory in the absence of the supporting documents to which the affidavits referred. Sierra Club proposes to take the position that the affidavits should therefore be afforded very little weight by the judge hearing the application for judicial review.

10           The Federal Court of Canada, Trial Division refused to grant the confidentiality order and the majority of the Federal Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. In his dissenting opinion, Robertson J.A. would have granted the confidentiality order.

### III. Relevant Statutory Provisions

11   *Federal Court Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106*

151. (1) On motion, the Court may order that material to be filed shall be treated as confidential.

(2) Before making an order under subsection (1), the Court must be satisfied that the material should be treated as confidential, notwithstanding the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

#### IV. Judgments Below

##### A. *Federal Court, Trial Division*, [2000] 2 F.C. 400

12 Pelletier J. first considered whether leave should be granted pursuant to Rule 312 to introduce the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang to which the Confidential Documents were filed as exhibits. In his view, the underlying question was that of relevance, and he concluded that the documents were relevant to the issue of the appropriate remedy. Thus, in the absence of prejudice to the respondent, the affidavit should be permitted to be served and filed. He noted that the respondent would be prejudiced by delay, but since both parties had brought interlocutory motions which had contributed to the delay, the desirability of having the entire record before the court outweighed the prejudice arising from the delay associated with the introduction of the documents.

13 On the issue of confidentiality, Pelletier J. concluded that he must be satisfied that the need for confidentiality was greater than the public interest in open court proceedings, and observed that the argument for open proceedings in this case was significant given the public interest in Canada's role as a vendor of nuclear technology. As well, he noted that a confidentiality order was an exception to the rule of open access to the courts, and that such an order should be granted only where absolutely necessary.

14 Pelletier J. applied the same test as that used in patent litigation for the issue of a protective order, which is essentially a confidentiality order. The granting of such an order requires the appellant to show a subjective belief that the information is confidential and that its interests would be harmed by disclosure. In addition, if the order is challenged, then the person claiming the benefit of the order must demonstrate objectively that the order is required. This objective element requires the party to show that the information has been treated as confidential, and that it is reasonable to believe that its proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could be harmed by the disclosure of the information.

15 Concluding that both the subjective part and both elements of the objective part of the test had been satisfied, he nevertheless stated: “However, I am also of the view that in public law cases, the objective test has, or should have, a third component which is whether the public interest in disclosure exceeds the risk of harm to a party arising from disclosure” (para. 23).

16 A very significant factor, in his view, was the fact that mandatory production of documents was not in issue here. The fact that the application involved a voluntary tendering of documents to advance the appellant’s own cause as opposed to mandatory production weighed against granting the confidentiality order.

17 In weighing the public interest in disclosure against the risk of harm to AECL arising from disclosure, Pelletier J. noted that the documents the appellant wished to put before the court were prepared by others for other purposes, and recognized that the appellant was bound to protect the confidentiality of the information. At this stage, he again considered the issue of materiality. If the documents were shown to be very



material to a critical issue, “the requirements of justice militate in favour of a confidentiality order. If the documents are marginally relevant, then the voluntary nature of the production argues against a confidentiality order” (para. 29). He then decided that the documents were material to a question of the appropriate remedy, a significant issue in the event that the appellant failed on the main issue.

18 Pelletier J. also considered the context of the case and held that since the issue of Canada’s role as a vendor of nuclear technology was one of significant public interest, the burden of justifying a confidentiality order was very onerous. He found that AECL could expunge the sensitive material from the documents, or put the evidence before the court in some other form, and thus maintain its full right of defence while preserving the open access to court proceedings.

19 Pelletier J. observed that his order was being made without having perused the Confidential Documents because they had not been put before him. Although he noted the line of cases which holds that a judge ought not to deal with the issue of a confidentiality order without reviewing the documents themselves, in his view, given their voluminous nature and technical content as well as his lack of information as to what information was already in the public domain, he found that an examination of these documents would not have been useful.

20 Pelletier J. ordered that the appellant could file the documents in current form, or in an edited version if it chose to do so. He also granted leave to file material dealing with the Chinese regulatory process in general and as applied to this project, provided it did so within 60 days.

(1) Evans J.A. (Sharlow J.A. concurring)

21           At the Federal Court of Appeal, AECL appealed the ruling under Rule 151  
of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*, and Sierra Club cross-appealed the ruling under Rule  
312.

22           With respect to Rule 312, Evans J.A. held that the documents were clearly  
relevant to a defence under s. 54(2)(b) which the appellant proposed to raise if s. 5(1)(b)  
of the *CEAA* was held to apply, and were also potentially relevant to the exercise of the  
court's discretion to refuse a remedy even if the Ministers were in breach of the *CEAA*.  
Evans J.A. agreed with Pelletier J. that the benefit to the appellant and the court of being  
granted leave to file the documents outweighed any prejudice to the respondent owing  
to delay and thus concluded that the motions judge was correct in granting leave under  
Rule 312.

23           On the issue of the confidentiality order, Evans J.A. considered Rule 151,  
and all the factors that the motions judge had weighed, including the commercial  
sensitivity of the documents, the fact that the appellant had received them in confidence  
from the Chinese authorities, and the appellant's argument that without the documents  
it could not mount a full answer and defence to the application. These factors had to be  
weighed against the principle of open access to court documents. Evans J.A. agreed with  
Pelletier J. that the weight to be attached to the public interest in open proceedings varied  
with context and held that, where a case raises issues of public significance, the principle  
of openness of judicial process carries greater weight as a factor in the balancing process.  
Evans J.A. noted the public interest in the subject matter of the litigation, as well as the  
considerable media attention it had attracted.

24           In support of his conclusion that the weight assigned to the principle of openness may vary with context, Evans J.A. relied upon the decisions in *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health and Welfare)*, [2000] 3 F.C. 360 (C.A.), where the court took into consideration the relatively small public interest at stake, and *Ethyl Canada Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)* (1998), 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278 (Ont. Ct. (Gen. Div.)), at p. 283, where the court ordered disclosure after determining that the case was a significant constitutional case where it was important for the public to understand the issues at stake. Evans J.A. observed that openness and public participation in the assessment process are fundamental to the *CEAA*, and concluded that the motions judge could not be said to have given the principle of openness undue weight even though confidentiality was claimed for a relatively small number of highly technical documents.

25           Evans J.A. held that the motions judge had placed undue emphasis on the fact that the introduction of the documents was voluntary; however, it did not follow that his decision on the confidentiality order must therefore be set aside. Evans J.A. was of the view that this error did not affect the ultimate conclusion for three reasons. First, like the motions judge, he attached great weight to the principle of openness. Secondly, he held that the inclusion in the affidavits of a summary of the reports could go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals, should the appellant choose not to put them in without a confidentiality order. Finally, if AECL submitted the documents in an expunged fashion, the claim for confidentiality would rest upon a relatively unimportant factor, i.e., the appellant's claim that it would suffer a loss of business if it breached its undertaking with the Chinese authorities.

26 Evans J.A. rejected the argument that the motions judge had erred in deciding the motion without reference to the actual documents, stating that it was not necessary for him to inspect them, given that summaries were available and that the documents were highly technical and incompletely translated. Thus the appeal and cross-appeal were both dismissed.

(2) Robertson J.A. (dissenting)

27 Robertson J.A. disagreed with the majority for three reasons. First, in his view, the level of public interest in the case, the degree of media coverage, and the identities of the parties should not be taken into consideration in assessing an application for a confidentiality order. Instead, he held that it was the nature of the evidence for which the order is sought that must be examined.

28 In addition, he found that without a confidentiality order, the appellant had to choose between two unacceptable options: either suffering irreparable financial harm if the confidential information was introduced into evidence, or being denied the right to a fair trial because it could not mount a full defence if the evidence was not introduced.

29 Finally, he stated that the analytical framework employed by the majority in reaching its decision was fundamentally flawed as it was based largely on the subjective views of the motions judge. He rejected the contextual approach to the question of whether a confidentiality order should issue, emphasizing the need for an objective framework to combat the perception that justice is a relative concept, and to promote consistency and certainty in the law.

30 To establish this more objective framework for regulating the issuance of confidentiality orders pertaining to commercial and scientific information, he turned to the legal rationale underlying the commitment to the principle of open justice, referring to *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326. There, the Supreme Court of Canada held that open proceedings foster the search for the truth, and reflect the importance of public scrutiny of the courts.

31 Robertson J.A. stated that although the principle of open justice is a reflection of the basic democratic value of accountability in the exercise of judicial power, in his view, the principle that justice itself must be secured is paramount. He concluded that justice as an overarching principle means that exceptions occasionally must be made to rules or principles.

32 He observed that, in the area of commercial law, when the information sought to be protected concerns “trade secrets”, this information will not be disclosed during a trial if to do so would destroy the owner’s proprietary rights and expose him or her to irreparable harm in the form of financial loss. Although the case before him did not involve a trade secret, he nevertheless held that the same treatment could be extended to commercial or scientific information which was acquired on a confidential basis and attached the following criteria as conditions precedent to the issuance of a confidentiality order (at para. 13):

- (1) the information is of a confidential nature as opposed to facts which one would like to keep confidential;
- (2) the information for which confidentiality is sought is not already in the public domain;
- (3) on a balance of probabilities the party seeking the confidentiality order would suffer irreparable harm if the information were made public;
- (4) the information is relevant to the legal issues raised in the case;
- (5)

correlatively, the information is “necessary” to the resolution of those issues; (6) the granting of a confidentiality order does not unduly prejudice the opposing party; and (7) the public interest in open court proceedings does not override the private interests of the party seeking the confidentiality order. The onus in establishing that criteria one to six are met is on the party seeking the confidentiality order. Under the seventh criterion, it is for the opposing party to show that a *prima facie* right to a protective order has been overtaken by the need to preserve the openness of the court proceedings. In addressing these criteria one must bear in mind two of the threads woven into the fabric of the principle of open justice: the search for truth and the preservation of the rule of law. As stated at the outset, I do not believe that the perceived degree of public importance of a case is a relevant consideration.

33 In applying these criteria to the circumstances of the case, Robertson J.A. concluded that the confidentiality order should be granted. In his view, the public interest in open court proceedings did not override the interests of AECL in maintaining the confidentiality of these highly technical documents.

34 Robertson J.A. also considered the public interest in the need to ensure that site plans for nuclear installations were not, for example, posted on a Web site. He concluded that a confidentiality order would not undermine the two primary objectives underlying the principle of open justice: truth and the rule of law. As such, he would have allowed the appeal and dismissed the cross-appeal.

#### V. Issues

35 A. What is the proper analytical approach to be applied to the exercise of judicial discretion where a litigant seeks a confidentiality order under Rule 151 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*?

B. Should the confidentiality order be granted in this case?

VI. Analysis

A. *The Analytical Approach to the Granting of a Confidentiality Order*

(1) The General Framework: Herein the *Dagenais* Principles

36           The link between openness in judicial proceedings and freedom of expression has been firmly established by this Court. In *Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480, at para. 23, La Forest J. expressed the relationship as follows:

The principle of open courts is inextricably tied to the rights guaranteed by s. 2(b). Openness permits public access to information about the courts, which in turn permits the public to discuss and put forward opinions and criticisms of court practices and proceedings. While the freedom to express ideas and opinions about the operation of the courts is clearly within the ambit of the freedom guaranteed by s. 2(b), so too is the right of members of the public to obtain information about the courts in the first place.

Under the order sought, public access and public scrutiny of the Confidential Documents would be restricted; this would clearly infringe the public's freedom of expression guarantee.

37           A discussion of the general approach to be taken in the exercise of judicial discretion to grant a confidentiality order should begin with the principles set out by this Court in *Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835. Although that case dealt with the common law jurisdiction of the court to order a publication ban in the criminal law context, there are strong similarities between publication bans and

confidentiality orders in the context of judicial proceedings. In both cases a restriction on freedom of expression is sought in order to preserve or promote an interest engaged by those proceedings. As such, the fundamental question for a court to consider in an application for a publication ban or a confidentiality order is whether, in the circumstances, the right to freedom of expression should be compromised.

38           Although in each case freedom of expression will be engaged in a different context, the *Dagenais* framework utilizes overarching *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* principles in order to balance freedom of expression with other rights and interests, and thus can be adapted and applied to various circumstances. As a result, the analytical approach to the exercise of discretion under Rule 151 should echo the underlying principles laid out in *Dagenais*, although it must be tailored to the specific rights and interests engaged in this case.

39           *Dagenais* dealt with an application by four accused persons under the court's common law jurisdiction requesting an order prohibiting the broadcast of a television programme dealing with the physical and sexual abuse of young boys at religious institutions. The applicants argued that because the factual circumstances of the programme were very similar to the facts at issue in their trials, the ban was necessary to preserve the accuseds' right to a fair trial.

40           Lamer C.J. found that the common law discretion to order a publication ban must be exercised within the boundaries set by the principles of the *Charter*. Since publication bans necessarily curtail the freedom of expression of third parties, he adapted the pre-*Charter* common law rule such that it balanced the right to freedom of expression with the right to a fair trial of the accused in a way which reflected the substance of the



test from *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103. At p. 878 of *Dagenais*, Lamer C.J. set out his reformulated test:

A publication ban should only be ordered when:

- (a) Such a ban is necessary in order to prevent a real and substantial risk to the fairness of the trial, because reasonably available alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and
- (b) The salutary effects of the publication ban outweigh the deleterious effects to the free expression of those affected by the ban. [Emphasis in original.]

41 In *New Brunswick, supra*, this Court modified the *Dagenais* test in the context of the related issue of how the discretionary power under s. 486(1) of the *Criminal Code*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, to exclude the public from a trial should be exercised. That case dealt with an appeal from the trial judge's order excluding the public from the portion of a sentencing proceeding for sexual assault and sexual interference dealing with the specific acts committed by the accused on the basis that it would avoid "undue hardship" to both the victims and the accused.

42 La Forest J. found that s. 486(1) was a restriction on the s. 2(b) right to freedom of expression in that it provided a "discretionary bar on public and media access to the courts": *New Brunswick*, at para. 33; however he found this infringement to be justified under s. 1 provided that the discretion was exercised in accordance with the *Charter*. Thus, the approach taken by La Forest J. at para. 69 to the exercise of discretion under s. 486(1) of the *Criminal Code*, closely mirrors the *Dagenais* common law test:

- (a) the judge must consider the available options and consider whether there are any other reasonable and effective alternatives available;

(b) the judge must consider whether the order is limited as much as possible; and

(c) the judge must weigh the importance of the objectives of the particular order and its probable effects against the importance of openness and the particular expression that will be limited in order to ensure that the positive and negative effects of the order are proportionate.

In applying this test to the facts of the case, La Forest J. found that the evidence of the potential undue hardship consisted mainly in the Crown's submission that the evidence was of a "delicate nature" and that this was insufficient to override the infringement on freedom of expression.

43                This Court has recently revisited the granting of a publication ban under the court's common law jurisdiction in *R. v. Mentuck*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 442, 2001 SCC 76, and its companion case *R. v. O.N.E.*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 478, 2001 SCC 77. In *Mentuck*, the Crown moved for a publication ban to protect the identity of undercover police officers and operational methods employed by the officers in their investigation of the accused. The accused opposed the motion as an infringement of his right to a fair and public hearing under s. 11(d) of the *Charter*. The order was also opposed by two intervening newspapers as an infringement of their right to freedom of expression.

44                The Court noted that, while *Dagenais* dealt with the balancing of freedom of expression on the one hand, and the right to a fair trial of the accused on the other, in the case before it, both the right of the accused to a fair and public hearing, and freedom of expression weighed in favour of denying the publication ban. These rights were balanced against interests relating to the proper administration of justice, in particular, protecting the safety of police officers and preserving the efficacy of undercover police operations.

45 In spite of this distinction, the Court noted that underlying the approach taken in both *Dagenais* and *New Brunswick* was the goal of ensuring that the judicial discretion to order publication bans is subject to no lower a standard of compliance with the *Charter* than legislative enactment. This goal is furthered by incorporating the essence of s. 1 of the *Charter* and the *Oakes* test into the publication ban test. Since this same goal applied in the case before it, the Court adopted a similar approach to that taken in *Dagenais*, but broadened the *Dagenais* test (which dealt specifically with the right of an accused to a fair trial) such that it could guide the exercise of judicial discretion where a publication ban is requested in order to preserve any important aspect of the proper administration of justice. At para. 32, the Court reformulated the test as follows:

A publication ban should only be ordered when:

(a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to the proper administration of justice because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and

(b) the salutary effects of the publication ban outweigh the deleterious effects on the rights and interests of the parties and the public, including the effects on the right to free expression, the right of the accused to a fair and public trial, and the efficacy of the administration of justice.

46 The Court emphasized that under the first branch of the test, three important elements were subsumed under the “necessity” branch. First, the risk in question must be a serious risk well grounded in the evidence. Second, the phrase “proper administration of justice” must be carefully interpreted so as not to allow the concealment of an excessive amount of information. Third, the test requires the judge ordering the ban to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives are available, but also to restrict the ban as far as possible without sacrificing the prevention of the risk.

47 At para. 31, the Court also made the important observation that the proper administration of justice will not necessarily involve *Charter* rights, and that the ability to invoke the *Charter* is not a necessary condition for a publication ban to be granted:

The [common law publication ban] rule can accommodate orders that must occasionally be made in the interests of the administration of justice, which encompass more than fair trial rights. As the test is intended to “reflec[t] the substance of the *Oakes* test”, we cannot require that *Charter* rights be the only legitimate objective of such orders any more than we require that government action or legislation in violation of the *Charter* be justified exclusively by the pursuit of another *Charter* right. [Emphasis added.]

The Court also anticipated that, in appropriate circumstances, the *Dagenais* framework could be expanded even further in order to address requests for publication bans where interests other than the administration of justice were involved.

48 *Mentuck* is illustrative of the flexibility of the *Dagenais* approach. Since its basic purpose is to ensure that the judicial discretion to deny public access to the courts is exercised in accordance with *Charter* principles, in my view, the *Dagenais* model can and should be adapted to the situation in the case at bar where the central issue is whether judicial discretion should be exercised so as to exclude confidential information from a public proceeding. As in *Dagenais*, *New Brunswick* and *Mentuck*, granting the confidentiality order will have a negative effect on the *Charter* right to freedom of expression, as well as the principle of open and accessible court proceedings, and, as in those cases, courts must ensure that the discretion to grant the order is exercised in accordance with *Charter* principles. However, in order to adapt the test to the context of this case, it is first necessary to determine the particular rights and interests engaged by this application.

49           The immediate purpose for AECL's confidentiality request relates to its commercial interests. The information in question is the property of the Chinese authorities. If the appellant were to disclose the Confidential Documents, it would be in breach of its contractual obligations and suffer a risk of harm to its competitive position. This is clear from the findings of fact of the motions judge that AECL was bound by its commercial interests and its customer's property rights not to disclose the information (para. 27), and that such disclosure could harm the appellant's commercial interests (para. 23).

50           Aside from this direct commercial interest, if the confidentiality order is denied, then in order to protect its commercial interests, the appellant will have to withhold the documents. This raises the important matter of the litigation context in which the order is sought. As both the motions judge and the Federal Court of Appeal found that the information contained in the Confidential Documents was relevant to defences available under the *CEAA*, the inability to present this information hinders the appellant's capacity to make full answer and defence, or, expressed more generally, the appellant's right, as a civil litigant, 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, 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*, 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 Rule 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*, 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 *F.N. (Re)*, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, 2000 SCC 35, 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 be alive to the fundamental importance of the open court rule. See generally Muldoon J. in *Eli Lilly and Co. v. Novopharm Ltd.* (1994), 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437 (F.C.T.D.), at p. 439.

57 Finally, the phrase “reasonably alternative measures” requires the judge to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives to a confidentiality order are available, but also to restrict the order as much as is reasonably possible while preserving the commercial interest in question.

*B. Application of the Test to this Appeal*

(1) Necessity

58 At this stage, it must be determined whether disclosure of the Confidential Documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of the appellant, and whether there are reasonable alternatives, either to the order itself, or to its terms.



59           The commercial interest at stake here relates to the objective of preserving contractual obligations of confidentiality. The appellant argues that it will suffer irreparable harm to its commercial interests if the Confidential Documents are disclosed. In my view, the preservation of confidential information constitutes a sufficiently important commercial interest to pass the first branch of the test as long as certain criteria relating to the information are met.

60           Pelletier J. noted that the order sought in this case was similar in nature to an application for a protective order which arises in the context of patent litigation. Such an order requires the applicant to demonstrate that the information in question has been treated at all relevant times as confidential and that on a balance of probabilities its proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could reasonably be harmed by the disclosure of the information: *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health and Welfare)* (1998), 83 C.P.R. (3d) 428 (F.C.T.D.), at p. 434. To this I would add the requirement proposed by Robertson J.A. that the information in question must be of a “confidential nature” in that it has been “accumulated with a reasonable expectation of it being kept confidential” as opposed to “facts which a litigant would like to keep confidential by having the courtroom doors closed” (para. 14).

61           Pelletier J. found as a fact that the *AB Hassle* test had been satisfied in that the information had clearly been treated as confidential both by the appellant and by the Chinese authorities, and that, on a balance of probabilities, disclosure of the information could harm the appellant’s commercial interests (para. 23). As well, Robertson J.A. found that the information in question was clearly of a confidential nature as it was commercial information, consistently treated and regarded as confidential, that would

be of interest to AECL's competitors (para. 16). Thus, the order is sought to prevent a serious risk to an important commercial interest.

62           The first branch of the test also requires the consideration of alternative measures to the confidentiality order, as well as an examination of the scope of the order to ensure that it is not overly broad. Both courts below found that the information contained in the Confidential Documents was relevant to potential defences available to the appellant under the *CEAA* and this finding was not appealed at this Court. Further, I agree with the Court of Appeal's assertion (at para. 99) that, given the importance of the documents to the right to make full answer and defence, the appellant is, practically speaking, compelled to produce the documents. Given that the information is necessary to the appellant's case, it remains only to determine whether there are reasonably alternative means by which the necessary information can be adduced without disclosing the confidential information.

63           Two alternatives to the confidentiality order were put forward by the courts below. The motions judge suggested that the Confidential Documents could be expunged of their commercially sensitive contents, and edited versions of the documents could be filed. As well, the majority of the Court of Appeal, in addition to accepting the possibility of expungement, was of the opinion that the summaries of the Confidential Documents included in the affidavits could go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals. If either of these options is a reasonable alternative to submitting the Confidential Documents under a confidentiality order, then the order is not necessary, and the application does not pass the first branch of the test.

64           There are two possible options with respect to expungement, and in my view, there are problems with both of these. The first option would be for AECL to expunge the confidential information without disclosing the expunged material to the parties and the court. However, in this situation the filed material would still differ from the material used by the affiants. It must not be forgotten that this motion arose as a result of Sierra Club's position that the summaries contained in the affidavits should be accorded little or no weight without the presence of the underlying documents. Even if the relevant information and the confidential information were mutually exclusive, which would allow for the disclosure of all the information relied on in the affidavits, this relevancy determination could not be tested on cross-examination because the expunged material would not be available. Thus, even in the best case scenario, where only irrelevant information needed to be expunged, the parties would be put in essentially the same position as that which initially generated this appeal, in the sense that, at least some of the material relied on to prepare the affidavits in question would not be available to Sierra Club.

65           Further, I agree with Robertson J.A. that this best case scenario, where the relevant and the confidential information do not overlap, is an untested assumption (para. 28). Although the documents themselves were not put before the courts on this motion, given that they comprise thousands of pages of detailed information, this assumption is at best optimistic. The expungement alternative would be further complicated by the fact that the Chinese authorities require prior approval for any request by AECL to disclose information.

66           The second option is that the expunged material be made available to the court and the parties under a more narrowly drawn confidentiality order. Although this

option would allow for slightly broader public access than the current confidentiality request, in my view, this minor restriction to the current confidentiality request is not a viable alternative given the difficulties associated with expungement in these circumstances. The test asks whether there are reasonably alternative measures; it does not require the adoption of the absolutely least restrictive option. With respect, in my view, expungement of the Confidential Documents would be a virtually unworkable and ineffective solution that is not reasonable in the circumstances.

67           A second alternative to a confidentiality order was Evans J.A.’s suggestion that the summaries of the Confidential Documents included in the affidavits “may well go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals” (para. 103). However, he appeared to take this fact into account merely as a factor to be considered when balancing the various interests at stake. I would agree that at this threshold stage to rely on the summaries alone, in light of the intention of Sierra Club to argue that they should be accorded little or no weight, does not appear to be a “reasonably alternative measure” to having the underlying documents available to the parties.

68           With the above considerations in mind, I find the confidentiality order necessary in that disclosure of the Confidential Documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of the appellant, and that there are no reasonably alternative measures to granting the order.

(2) The Proportionality Stage

69           As stated above, at this stage, the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the appellant’s right to a fair trial, must be weighed against the

deleterious effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in turn is connected to the principle of open and accessible court proceedings. This balancing will ultimately determine whether the confidentiality order ought to be granted.

(a) *Salutary Effects of the Confidentiality Order*

70 As discussed above, the primary interest that would be promoted by the confidentiality order is the public interest in the right of a civil litigant to present its case, or, more generally, the fair trial right. Because the fair trial right is being invoked in this case in order to protect commercial, not liberty, interests of the appellant, the right to a fair trial in this context is not a *Charter* right; however, a fair trial for all litigants has been recognized as a fundamental principle of justice: *Ryan, supra*, at para. 84. It bears repeating that there are circumstances where, in the absence of an affected *Charter* right, the proper administration of justice calls for a confidentiality order: *Mentuck, supra*, at para. 31. In this case, the salutary effects that such an order would have on the administration of justice relate to the ability of the appellant to present its case, as encompassed by the broader fair trial right.

71 The Confidential Documents have been found to be relevant to defences that will be available to the appellant in the event that the *CEAA* is found to apply to the impugned transaction and, as discussed above, the appellant cannot disclose the documents without putting its commercial interests at serious risk of harm. As such, there is a very real risk that, without the confidentiality order, the ability of the appellant to mount a successful defence will be seriously curtailed. I conclude, therefore, that the

confidentiality order would have significant salutary effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial.

72           Aside from the salutary effects on the fair trial interest, the confidentiality order would also have a beneficial impact on other important rights and interests. First, as I discuss in more detail below, the confidentiality order would allow all parties and the court access to the Confidential Documents, and permit cross-examination based on their contents. By facilitating access to relevant documents in a judicial proceeding, the order sought would assist in the search for truth, a core value underlying freedom of expression.

73           Second, I agree with the observation of Robertson J.A. that, as the Confidential Documents contain detailed technical information pertaining to the construction and design of a nuclear installation, it may be in keeping with the public interest to prevent this information from entering the public domain (para. 44). Although the exact contents of the documents remain a mystery, it is apparent that they contain technical details of a nuclear installation, and there may well be a substantial public security interest in maintaining the confidentiality of such information.

*(b) Deleterious Effects of the Confidentiality Order*

74           Granting the confidentiality order would have a negative effect on the open court principle, as the public would be denied access to the contents of the Confidential Documents. As stated above, the principle of open courts is inextricably tied to the s. 2(b) *Charter* right to freedom of expression, and public scrutiny of the courts is a fundamental aspect of the administration of justice: *New Brunswick, supra*, at paras. 22-

23. Although as a general principle, the importance of open courts cannot be overstated, it is necessary to examine, in the context of this case, the particular deleterious effects on freedom of expression that the confidentiality order would have.

75                 Underlying freedom of expression are the core values of (1) seeking the truth and the common good; (2) promoting self-fulfilment of individuals by allowing them to develop thoughts and ideas as they see fit; and (3) ensuring that participation in the political process is open to all persons: *Irwin Toy Ltd. v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, [1989] 1 S.C.R. 927, at p. 976; *R. v. Keegstra*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697, at pp. 762-64, *per* Dickson C.J. *Charter* jurisprudence has established that the closer the speech in question lies to these core values, the harder it will be to justify a s. 2(b) infringement of that speech under s. 1 of the *Charter*: *Keegstra*, at pp. 760-61. Since the main goal in this case is to exercise judicial discretion in a way which conforms to *Charter* principles, a discussion of the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order on freedom of expression should include an assessment of the effects such an order would have on the three core values. The more detrimental the order would be to these values, the more difficult it will be to justify the confidentiality order. Similarly, minor effects of the order on the core values will make the confidentiality order easier to justify.

76                 Seeking the truth is not only at the core of freedom of expression, but it has also been recognized as a fundamental purpose behind the open court rule, as the open examination of witnesses promotes an effective evidentiary process: *Edmonton Journal*, *supra*, at pp. 1357-58, *per* Wilson J. Clearly the confidentiality order, by denying public and media access to documents relied on in the proceedings, would impede the search for truth to some extent. Although the order would not exclude the public from the

courtroom, the public and the media would be denied access to documents relevant to the evidentiary process.

77           However, as mentioned above, to some extent the search for truth may actually be promoted by the confidentiality order. This motion arises as a result of Sierra Club's argument that it must have access to the Confidential Documents in order to test the accuracy of Dr. Pang's evidence. If the order is denied, then the most likely scenario is that the appellant will not submit the documents with the unfortunate result that evidence which may be relevant to the proceedings will not be available to Sierra Club or the court. As a result, Sierra Club will not be able to fully test the accuracy of Dr. Pang's evidence on cross-examination. In addition, the court will not have the benefit of this cross-examination or documentary evidence, and will be required to draw conclusions based on an incomplete evidentiary record. This would clearly impede the search for truth in this case.

78           As well, it is important to remember that the confidentiality order would restrict access to a relatively small number of highly technical documents. The nature of these documents is such that the general public would be unlikely to understand their contents, and thus they would contribute little to the public interest in the search for truth in this case. However, in the hands of the parties and their respective experts, the documents may be of great assistance in probing the truth of the Chinese environmental assessment process, which would in turn assist the court in reaching accurate factual conclusions. Given the nature of the documents, in my view, the important value of the search for truth which underlies both freedom of expression and open justice would be promoted to a greater extent by submitting the Confidential Documents under the order



sought than it would by denying the order, and thereby preventing the parties and the court from relying on the documents in the course of the litigation.

79           In addition, under the terms of the order sought, the only restrictions on these documents relate to their public distribution. The Confidential Documents would be available to the court and the parties, and public access to the proceedings would not be impeded. As such, the order represents a fairly minimal intrusion into the open court rule, and thus would not have significant deleterious effects on this principle.

80           The second core value underlying freedom of speech, namely, the promotion of individual self-fulfilment by allowing open development of thoughts and ideas, focusses on individual expression, and thus does not closely relate to the open court principle which involves institutional expression. Although the confidentiality order would restrict individual access to certain information which may be of interest to that individual, I find that this value would not be significantly affected by the confidentiality order.

81           The third core value, open participation in the political process, figures prominently in this appeal, as open justice is a fundamental aspect of a democratic society. This connection was pointed out by Cory J. in *Edmonton Journal*, *supra*, at p. 1339:

It can be seen that freedom of expression is of fundamental importance to a democratic society. It is also essential to a democracy and crucial to the rule of law that the courts are seen to function openly. The press must be free to comment upon court proceedings to ensure that the courts are, in fact, seen by all to operate openly in the penetrating light of public scrutiny.

Although there is no doubt as to the importance of open judicial proceedings to a democratic society, there was disagreement in the courts below as to whether the weight to be assigned to the open court principle should vary depending on the nature of the proceeding.

82                On this issue, Robertson J.A. was of the view that the nature of the case and the level of media interest were irrelevant considerations. On the other hand, Evans J.A. held that the motions judge was correct in taking into account that this judicial review application was one of significant public and media interest. In my view, although the public nature of the case may be a factor which strengthens the importance of open justice in a particular case, the level of media interest should not be taken into account as an independent consideration.

83                Since cases involving public institutions will generally relate more closely to the core value of public participation in the political process, the public nature of a proceeding should be taken into consideration when assessing the merits of a confidentiality order. It is important to note that this core value will always be engaged where the open court principle is engaged owing to the importance of open justice to a democratic society. However, where the political process is also engaged by the substance of the proceedings, the connection between open proceedings and public participation in the political process will increase. As such, I agree with Evans J.A. in the court below where he stated, at para. 87:

While all litigation is important to the parties, and there is a public interest in ensuring the fair and appropriate adjudication of all litigation that comes before the courts, some cases raise issues that transcend the immediate interests of the parties and the general public interest in the due administration of justice, and have a much wider public interest significance.

84                    This motion relates to an application for judicial review of a decision by the government to fund a nuclear energy project. Such an application is clearly of a public nature, as it relates to the distribution of public funds in relation to an issue of demonstrated public interest. Moreover, as pointed out by Evans J.A., openness and public participation are of fundamental importance under the *CEAA*. Indeed, by their very nature, environmental matters carry significant public import, and openness in judicial proceedings involving environmental issues will generally attract a high degree of protection. In this regard, I agree with Evans J.A. that the public interest is engaged here more than it would be if this were an action between private parties relating to purely private interests.

85                    However, with respect, to the extent that Evans J.A. relied on media interest as an indicium of public interest, this was an error. In my view, it is important to distinguish public interest, from media interest, and I agree with Robertson J.A. that media exposure cannot be viewed as an impartial measure of public interest. It is the public nature of the proceedings which increases the need for openness, and this public nature is not necessarily reflected by the media desire to probe the facts of the case. I reiterate the caution given by Dickson C.J. in *Keegstra, supra*, at p. 760, where he stated that, while the speech in question must be examined in light of its relation to the core values, “we must guard carefully against judging expression according to its popularity”.

86                    Although the public interest in open access to the judicial review application as a whole is substantial, in my view, it is also important to bear in mind the nature and scope of the information for which the order is sought in assigning weight to the public interest. With respect, the motions judge erred in failing to consider the narrow scope

of the order when he considered the public interest in disclosure, and consequently attached excessive weight to this factor. In this connection, I respectfully disagree with the following conclusion of Evans J.A., at para. 97:

Thus, having considered the nature of this litigation, and having assessed the extent of public interest in the openness of the proceedings in the case before him, the Motions Judge cannot be said in all the circumstances to have given this factor undue weight, even though confidentiality is claimed for only three documents among the small mountain of paper filed in this case, and their content is likely to be beyond the comprehension of all but those equipped with the necessary technical expertise.

Open justice is a fundamentally important principle, particularly when the substance of the proceedings is public in nature. However, this does not detract from the duty to attach weight to this principle in accordance with the specific limitations on openness that the confidentiality order would have. As Wilson J. observed in *Edmonton Journal*, *supra*, at pp. 1353-54:

One thing seems clear and that is that one should not balance one value at large and the conflicting value in its context. To do so could well be to pre-judge the issue by placing more weight on the value developed at large than is appropriate in the context of the case.

87           In my view, it is important that, although there is significant public interest in these proceedings, open access to the judicial review application would be only slightly impeded by the order sought. The narrow scope of the order coupled with the highly technical nature of the Confidential Documents significantly temper the deleterious effects the confidentiality order would have on the public interest in open courts.

88 In addressing the effects that the confidentiality order would have on freedom of expression, it should also be borne in mind that the appellant may not have to raise defences under the *CEAA*, in which case the Confidential Documents would be irrelevant to the proceedings, with the result that freedom of expression would be unaffected by the order. However, since the necessity of the Confidential Documents will not be determined for some time, in the absence of a confidentiality order, the appellant would be left with the choice of either submitting the documents in breach of its obligations, or withholding the documents in the hopes that either it will not have to present a defence under the *CEAA*, or that it will be able to mount a successful defence in the absence of these relevant documents. If it chooses the former option, and the defences under the *CEAA* are later found not to apply, then the appellant will have suffered the prejudice of having its confidential and sensitive information released into the public domain, with no corresponding benefit to the public. Although this scenario is far from certain, the possibility of such an occurrence also weighs in favour of granting the order sought.

89 In coming to this conclusion, I note that if the appellant is not required to invoke the relevant defences under the *CEAA*, it is also true that the appellant's fair trial right will not be impeded, even if the confidentiality order is not granted. However, I do not take this into account as a factor which weighs in favour of denying the order because, if the order is granted and the Confidential Documents are not required, there will be no deleterious effects on either the public interest in freedom of expression or the appellant's commercial interests or fair trial right. This neutral result is in contrast with the scenario discussed above where the order is denied and the possibility arises that the appellant's commercial interests will be prejudiced with no corresponding public benefit.

As a result, the fact that the Confidential Documents may not be required is a factor which weighs in favour of granting the confidentiality order.

90           In summary, the core freedom of expression values of seeking the truth and promoting an open political process are most closely linked to the principle of open courts, and most affected by an order restricting that openness. However, in the context of this case, the confidentiality order would only marginally impede, and in some respects would even promote, the pursuit of these values. As such, the order would not have significant deleterious effects on freedom of expression.

## VII. Conclusion

91           In balancing the various rights and interests engaged, I note that the confidentiality order would have substantial salutary effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial, and freedom of expression. On the other hand, the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order on the principle of open courts and freedom of expression would be minimal. In addition, if the order is not granted and in the course of the judicial review application the appellant is not required to mount a defence under the *CEAA*, there is a possibility that the appellant will have suffered 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. As a result, I find that the salutary effects of the order outweigh its deleterious effects, and the order should be granted.

92           Consequently, I would allow the appeal with costs throughout, set aside the judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal, and grant the confidentiality order on the terms requested by the appellant under Rule 151 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*.

*Appeal allowed with costs.*

*Solicitors for the appellant: Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt, Toronto.*

*Solicitors for the respondent Sierra Club of Canada: Timothy J. Howard, Vancouver; Franklin S. Gertler, Montréal.*

*Solicitor for the respondents 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: The Deputy Attorney General of Canada, Ottawa.*

**TAB 9**



2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5



2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

Stelco Inc., Re

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

And In the Matter of a proposed plan of compromise or arrangement with respect to Stelco Inc. and the other Applicants listed in Schedule "A"

Application under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended

Ontario Court of Appeal

Goudge, Feldman, Blair JJ.A.

Heard: March 18, 2005

Judgment: March 31, 2005

Docket: CA M32289

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

Proceedings: reversed *Stelco Inc., Re ((2005))*, 2005 CarswellOnt 742, [2005] O.J. No. 729, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 307 ((Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])); reversed *Stelco Inc., Re ((2005))*, 2005 CarswellOnt 743, [2005] O.J. No. 730, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 310 ((Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])); additional reasons to *Stelco Inc., Re ((2005))*, 2005 CarswellOnt 742, [2005] O.J. No. 729, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 307 ((Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]))

Counsel: Jeffrey S. Leon, Richard B. Swan for Appellants, Michael Woollcombe, Roland Keiper

Kenneth T. Rosenberg, Robert A. Centa for Respondent, United Steelworkers of America

Murray Gold, Andrew J. Hatnay for Respondent, Retired Salaried Beneficiaries of Stelco Inc., CHT Steel Company Inc., Stelpipe Ltd., Stelwire Ltd., Welland Pipe Ltd.

Michael C.P. McCreary, Carrie L. Clynick for USWA Locals 5328, 8782

John R. Varley for Active Salaried Employee Representative

Michael Barrack for Stelco Inc.

Peter Griffin for Board of Directors of Stelco Inc.

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

K. Mahar for Monitor

David R. Byers (Agent) for CIT Business Credit, DIP Lender

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency; Property; Civil Practice and Procedure

Business associations --- Specific corporate organization matters — Directors and officers — Appointment — General principles

Corporation entered protection under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — K and W were involved with companies who made capital proposal regarding corporation — Companies held approximately 20 per cent of corporation's shares — K and W, allegedly with support of over 30 per cent of shareholders, requested to fill two vacant directors' positions of corporation, and be appointed to review committee — K and W claimed that their interest as shareholders would not be represented in proceedings — K and W appointed directors by board, and made members of review committee — Employees' motion for removal of K and W as directors was granted and appointments were voided — Trial judge found possibility existed that K and W would not have best interests of corporation at heart, and might favour certain shareholders — Trial judge found interference with business judgment of board was appropriate, as issue touched on constitution of corporation — Trial judge found reasonable apprehension of bias existed, although no evidence of actual bias had been shown — K and W appealed — Appeal allowed — K and W reinstated to board — Court's discretion under s. 11 of Act does not give authority to remove directors, which is not part of restructuring process — Trial judge erred in not deferring to corporation's business judgment — Trial judge erred in adopting principle of reasonable apprehension of bias.

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

Corporation entered protection under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — K and W were involved with companies who made capital proposal regarding corporation — Companies held approximately 20 per cent of corporation's shares — K and W, allegedly with support of over 30 per cent of shareholders, requested to fill two vacant directors' positions of corporation and be appointed to review committee — K and W claimed that their interest as shareholders would not be represented in proceedings — K and W appointed directors by board, and made members of review committee — Employees' motion for removal of K and W as directors was granted and appointments were voided — Trial judge found possibility existed that K and W would not have best interests of corporation at heart, and might favour certain shareholders — Trial judge found interference with business judgment of board was appropriate, as issue touched on constitution of corporation — Trial judge found reasonable apprehension of bias existed, although no evidence of actual bias had been shown — K and W appealed — Appeal allowed — K and W reinstated to board — Court's discretion under s. 11 of Act does not give authority to remove directors, which is not part of restructuring process — Trial judge erred in not deferring to corporation's business judgment — Trial judge erred in adopting principle of reasonable apprehension of bias.

**Cases considered by *Blair J.A.*:**

*Alberta-Pacific Terminals Ltd., Re* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 99, 1991 CarswellBC 494 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

*Algoma Steel Inc., Re* (2001), 2001 CarswellOnt 1742, 25 C.B.R. (4th) 194, 147 O.A.C. 291 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

*Algoma Steel Inc. v. Union Gas Ltd.* (2003), 2003 CarswellOnt 115, 39 C.B.R. (4th) 5, 169 O.A.C. 89, 63 O.R. (3d) 78 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

*Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re* (2000), 2000 CarswellOnt 704, 5 B.L.R. (3d) 75, 18 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont.

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

*Baxter Student Housing Ltd. v. College Housing Co-operative Ltd.* (1975), [1976] 2 S.C.R. 475, [1976] 1 W.W.R. 1, 20 C.B.R. (N.S.) 240, 57 D.L.R. (3d) 1, 5 N.R. 515, 1975 CarswellMan 3, 1975 CarswellMan 85 (S.C.C.) — referred to

*Blair v. Consolidated Enfield Corp.* (1995), 128 D.L.R. (4th) 73, 187 N.R. 241, 86 O.A.C. 245, 25 O.R. (3d) 480 (note), 24 B.L.R. (2d) 161, [1995] 4 S.C.R. 5, 1995 CarswellOnt 1393, 1995 CarswellOnt 1179 (S.C.C.) — considered

*Brant Investments Ltd. v. KeepRite Inc.* (1991), 1 B.L.R. (2d) 225, 3 O.R. (3d) 289, 45 O.A.C. 320, 80 D.L.R. (4th) 161, 1991 CarswellOnt 133 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

*Catalyst Fund General Partner I Inc. v. Hollinger Inc.* (2004), 1 B.L.R. (4th) 186, 2004 CarswellOnt 4772 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

*Country Style Food Services Inc., Re* (2002), 2002 CarswellOnt 1038, 158 O.A.C. 30 (Ont. C.A. [In Chambers]) — considered

*Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106, 1995 CarswellOnt 54 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

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

*Ivaco Inc., Re* (2004), 3 C.B.R. (5th) 33, 2004 CarswellOnt 2397 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

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

*London Finance Corp. v. Banking Service Corp.* (1922), 23 O.W.N. 138, [1925] 1 D.L.R. 319 (Ont. H.C.) — referred to

*Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 1, (sub nom. *Olympia & York Developments Ltd., Re*) 12 O.R. (3d) 500, 1993 CarswellOnt 182 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

*Peoples Department Stores Ltd. (1992) Inc., Re* (2004), (sub nom. *Peoples Department Stores Inc. (Trustee of v. Wise)*) 244 D.L.R. (4th) 564, (sub nom. *Peoples Department Stores Inc. (Bankrupt) v. Wise*) 326 N.R. 267 (Eng.), (sub nom. *Peoples Department Stores Inc. (Bankrupt) v. Wise*) 326 N.R. 267 (Fr.), 4 C.B.R. (5th) 215, 49 B.L.R. (3d) 165, 2004 SCC 68, 2004 CarswellQue 2862, 2004 CarswellQue 2863 (S.C.C.) — considered

*R. v. Sharpe* (2001), 2001 SCC 2, 2001 CarswellBC 82, 2001 CarswellBC 83, 194 D.L.R. (4th) 1, 150 C.C.C. (3d) 321, 39 C.R. (5th) 72, 264 N.R. 201, 146 B.C.A.C. 161, 239 W.A.C. 161, 88 B.C.L.R. (3d) 1, [2001] 6 W.W.R. 1, [2001] 1 S.C.R. 45, 86 C.R.R. (2d) 1 (S.C.C.) — referred to

*Richtree Inc., Re* (2005), 2005 CarswellOnt 255, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 294 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd., Re (1998), 1998 CarswellOnt 1, 1998 CarswellOnt 2, 154 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 36 O.R. (3d) 418 (headnote only), (sub nom. Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd. (Bankrupt), Re) 221 N.R. 241, (sub nom. Adrien v. Ontario Ministry of Labour) 98 C.L.L.C. 210-006, 50 C.B.R. (3d) 163, (sub nom. Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd. (Bankrupt), Re) 106 O.A.C. 1, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 27, 33 C.C.E.L. (2d) 173 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re (1999), 1999 CarswellOnt 792, 7 C.B.R. (4th) 293 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered

Sammi Atlas Inc., Re (1998), 1998 CarswellOnt 1145, 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re (2003), 43 C.B.R. (4th) 187, 184 B.C.A.C. 54, 302 W.A.C. 54, 2003 BCCA 344, 2003 CarswellBC 1399, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236 (B.C. C.A.) — followed

Stephenson v. Vokes (1896), 27 O.R. 691 (Ont. H.C.) — referred to

Westar Mining Ltd., Re (1992), 70 B.C.L.R. (2d) 6, 14 C.B.R. (3d) 88, [1992] 6 W.W.R. 331, 1992 CarswellBC 508 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

#### **Statutes considered:**

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

Generally — referred to

s. 2(1) "affairs" — considered

s. 102 — referred to

s. 106(3) — referred to

s. 109(1) — referred to

s. 111 — referred to

s. 122(1) — referred to

s. 122(1)(a) — referred to

s. 122(1)(b) — referred to

s. 145 — referred to

s. 145(2)(b) — referred to

s. 241 — referred to

s. 241(3)(e) — referred to

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

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

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 11(1) — considered

s. 11(3) — considered

s. 11(4) — considered

s. 11(6) — considered

s. 20 — considered

APPEAL by potential board members from judgments reported at *Stelco Inc., Re (2005)*, 2005 CarswellOnt 742, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 307 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) and at *Stelco Inc., Re (2005)*, 2005 CarswellOnt 743, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 310 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), granting motion by employees for removal of certain directors from board of corporation under protection of *Companies Creditors' Arrangement Act*.

**Blair J.A.:**

**Part I — Introduction**

1 Stelco Inc. and four of its wholly owned subsidiaries obtained protection from their creditors under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*<sup>[FN1]</sup> on January 29, 2004. Since that time, the Stelco Group has been engaged in a high profile, and sometimes controversial, process of economic restructuring. Since October 2004, the restructuring has revolved around a court-approved capital raising process which, by February 2005, had generated a number of competitive bids for the Stelco Group.

2 Farley J., an experienced judge of the Superior Court Commercial List in Toronto, has been supervising the CCAA process from the outset.

3 The appellants, Michael Woollcombe and Roland Keiper, are associated with two companies — Clearwater Capital Management Inc., and Equilibrium Capital Management Inc. — which, respectively, hold approximately 20% of the outstanding publicly traded common shares of Stelco. Most of these shares have been acquired while the CCAA process has been ongoing, and Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper have made it clear publicly that they believe there is good shareholder value in Stelco in spite of the restructuring. The reason they are able to take this position is that there has been a solid turn around in worldwide steel markets, as a result of which Stelco, although remaining in insolvency protection, is earning annual operating profits.

4 The Stelco board of directors ("the Board") has been depleted as a result of resignations, and in January of this year Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper expressed an interest in being appointed to the Board. They were supported in this request by other shareholders who, together with Clearwater and Equilibrium, represent about 40% of the Stelco common shareholders. On February 18, 2005, the Board appointed the appellants directors. In announcing the appointments publicly, Stelco said in a press release:

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

After careful consideration, and given potential recoveries at the end of the company's restructuring process, the Board responded favourably to the requests by making the appointments announced today.

Richard Drouin, Chairman of Stelco's Board of Directors, said: "I'm pleased to welcome Roland Keiper and Michael Woolcombe to the Board. Their experience and their perspective will assist the Board as it strives to serve the best interests of all our stakeholders. We look forward to their positive contribution."

5 On the same day, the Board began its consideration of the various competing bids that had been received through the capital raising process.

6 The appointments of the appellants to the Board incensed the employee stakeholders of Stelco ("the Employees"), represented by the respondent Retired Salaried Beneficiaries of Stelco and the respondent United Steelworkers of America ("USWA"). Outstanding pension liabilities to current and retired employees are said to be Stelco's largest long-term liability — exceeding several billion dollars. The Employees perceive they do not have the same, or very much, economic leverage in what has sometimes been referred to as 'the bare knuckled arena' of the restructuring process. At the same time, they are amongst the most financially vulnerable stakeholders in the piece. They see the appointments of Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper to the Board as a threat to their well being in the restructuring process, because the appointments provide the appellants, and the shareholders they represent, with direct access to sensitive information relating to the competing bids to which other stakeholders (including themselves) are not privy.

7 The Employees fear that the participation of the two major shareholder representatives will tilt the bid process in favour of maximizing shareholder value at the expense of bids that might be more favourable to the interests of the Employees. They sought and obtained an order from Farley J. removing Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper from their short-lived position of directors, essentially on the basis of that apprehension.

8 The Employees argue that there is a reasonable apprehension the appellants would not be able to act in the best interests of the corporation — as opposed to their own best interests as shareholders — in considering the bids. They say this is so because of prior public statements by the appellants about enhancing shareholder value in Stelco, because of the appellants' linkage to such a large shareholder group, because of their earlier failed bid in the restructuring, and because of their opposition to a capital proposal made in the proceeding by Deutsche Bank (known as "the Stalking Horse Bid"). They submit further that the appointments have poisoned the atmosphere of the restructuring process, and that the Board made the appointments under threat of facing a potential shareholders' meeting where the members of the Board would be replaced en masse.

9 On the other hand, Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper seek to set aside the order of Farley J. on the grounds that (a) he did not have the jurisdiction to make the order under the provisions of the CCAA, (b) even if he did have jurisdiction, the reasonable apprehension of bias test applied by the motion judge has no application to the removal of directors, (c) the motion judge erred in interfering with the exercise by the Board of its business judgment in filling the vacancies on the Board, and (d) the facts do not meet any test that would justify the removal of directors by a court in any event.

10 For the reasons that follow, I would grant leave to appeal, allow the appeal, and order the reinstatement of the applicants to the Board.

## Part II — Additional Facts

11 Before the initial CCAA order on January 29, 2004, the shareholders of Stelco had last met at their annual general meeting on April 29, 2003. At that meeting they elected eleven directors to the Board. By the date of the initial order, three of those directors had resigned, and on November 30, 2004, a fourth did as well, leaving the com-

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

pany with only seven directors.

12 Stelco's articles provide for the Board to be made up of a minimum of ten and a maximum of twenty directors. Consequently, after the last resignation, the company's corporate governance committee began to take steps to search for new directors. They had not succeeded in finding any prior to the approach by the appellants in January 2005.

13 Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper had been accumulating shares in Stelco and had been participating in the CCAA proceedings for some time before their request to be appointed to the Board, through their companies, Clearwater and Equilibrium. Clearwater and Equilibrium are privately held, Ontario-based, investment management firms. Mr. Keiper is the president of Equilibrium and associated with Clearwater. Mr. Woolcombe is a consultant to Clearwater. The motion judge found that they "come as a package".

14 In October 2004, Stelco sought court approval of its proposed method of raising capital. On October 19, 2004, Farley J. issued what has been referred to as the Initial Capital Process Order. This order set out a process by which Stelco, under the direction of the Board, would solicit bids, discuss the bids with stakeholders, evaluate the bids, and report on the bids to the court.

15 On November 9, 2004, Clearwater and Equilibrium announced they had formed an investor group and had made a capital proposal to Stelco. The proposal involved the raising of \$125 million through a rights offering. Mr. Keiper stated at the time that he believed "the value of Stelco's equity would have the opportunity to increase substantially if Stelco emerged from CCAA while minimizing dilution of its shareholders." The Clearwater proposal was not accepted.

16 A few days later, on November 14, 2004, Stelco approved the Stalking Horse Bid. Clearwater and Equilibrium opposed the Deutsche Bank proposal. Mr. Keiper criticized it for not providing sufficient value to existing shareholders. However, on November 29, 2004, Farley J. approved the Stalking Horse Bid and amended the Initial Capital Process Order accordingly. The order set out the various channels of communication between Stelco, the monitor, potential bidders and the stakeholders. It provided that members of the Board were to see the details of the different bids before the Board selected one or more of the offers.

17 Subsequently, over a period of two and a half months, the shareholding position of Clearwater and Equilibrium increased from approximately 5% as at November 19, to 14.9% as at January 25, 2005, and finally to approximately 20% on a fully diluted basis as at January 31, 2005. On January 25, Clearwater and Equilibrium announced that they had reached an understanding jointly to pursue efforts to maximize shareholder value at Stelco. A press release stated:

Such efforts will include seeking to ensure that the interests of Stelco's equity holders are appropriately protected by its board of directors and, ultimately, that Stelco's equity holders have an appropriate say, by vote or otherwise, in determining the future course of Stelco.

18 On February 1, 2005, Messrs. Keiper and Woolcombe and others representatives of Clearwater and Equilibrium, met with Mr. Drouin and other Board members to discuss their views of Stelco and a fair outcome for all stakeholders in the proceedings. Mr. Keiper made a detailed presentation, as Mr. Drouin testified, "encouraging the Board to examine how Stelco might improve its value through enhanced disclosure and other steps". Mr. Keiper expressed confidence that "there was value to the equity of Stelco", and added that he had backed this view up by investing millions of dollars of his own money in Stelco shares. At that meeting, Clearwater and Equilibrium requested that Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper be added to the Board and to Stelco's restructuring committee. In this respect, they were supported by other shareholders holding about another 20% of the company's common shares.

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

19 At paragraphs 17 and 18 of his affidavit, Mr. Drouin, summarized his appraisal of the situation:

17. It was my assessment that each of Mr. Keiper and Mr. Woollcombe had personal qualities which would allow them to make a significant contribution to the Board in terms of their backgrounds and their knowledge of the steel industry generally and Stelco in particular. In addition I was aware that their appointment to the Board was supported by approximately 40% of the shareholders. In the event that these shareholders successfully requisitioned a shareholders meeting they were in a position to determine the composition of the entire Board.

18. I considered it essential that there be continuity of the Board through the CCAA process. I formed the view that the combination of existing Board members and these additional members would provide Stelco with the most appropriate board composition in the circumstances. The other members of the Board also shared my views.

20 In order to ensure that the appellants understood their duties as potential Board members and, particularly that "they would no longer be able to consider only the interests of shareholders alone but would have fiduciary responsibilities as a Board member to the corporation as a whole", Mr. Drouin and others held several further meetings with Mr. Woollcombe and Mr. Keiper. These discussions "included areas of independence, standards, fiduciary duties, the role of the Board Restructuring Committee and confidentiality matters". Mr. Woollcombe and Mr. Keiper gave their assurances that they fully understood the nature and extent of their prospective duties, and would abide by them. In addition, they agreed and confirmed that:

- a) Mr. Woollcombe would no longer be an advisor to Clearwater and Equilibrium with respect to Stelco;
- b) Clearwater and Equilibrium would no longer be represented by counsel in the CCAA proceedings; and
- c) Clearwater and Equilibrium then had no involvement in, and would have no future involvement, in any bid for Stelco.

21 On the basis of the foregoing — and satisfied "that Messrs. Keiper and Woollcombe would make a positive contribution to the various issues before the Board both in [the] restructuring and the ongoing operation of the business" — the Board made the appointments on February 18, 2005.

22 Seven days later, the motion judge found it "appropriate, just, necessary and reasonable to declare" those appointments "to be of no force and effect" and to remove Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper from the Board. He did so not on the basis of any actual conduct on the part of the appellants as directors of Stelco but because there was some risk of anticipated conduct in the future. The gist of the motion judge's rationale is found in the following passage from his reasons (at para. 23):

In these particular circumstances and aside from the Board feeling coerced into the appointments for the sake of continuing stability, I am not of the view that it would be appropriate to wait and see if there was any explicit action on behalf of K and W while conducting themselves as Board members which would demonstrate that they had not lived up to their obligations to be "neutral". They may well conduct themselves beyond reproach. But if they did not, the fallout would be very detrimental to Stelco and its ability to successfully emerge. What would happen to the bids in such a dogfight? I fear that it would be trying to put Humpty Dumpty back together again. The same situation would prevail even if K and W conducted themselves beyond reproach but with the Board continuing to be concerned that they not do anything seemingly offensive to the bloc. The risk to the process and to Stelco in its emergence is simply too great to risk the wait and see approach.

### Part III — Leave to Appeal



2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

23 Because of the "real time" dynamic of this restructuring project, Laskin J.A. granted an order on March 4, 2005, expediting the appellants' motion for leave to appeal, directing that it be heard orally and, if leave be granted, directing that the appeal be heard at the same time. The leave motion and the appeal were argued together, by order of the panel, on March 18, 2005.

24 This court has said that it will only sparingly grant leave to appeal in the context of a CCAA proceeding and will only do so where there are "serious and arguable grounds that are of real and significant interest to the parties": *Country Style Food Services Inc., Re* (2002), 158 O.A.C. 30, [2002] O.J. No. 1377 (Ont. C.A. [In Chambers]), at para. 15. This criterion is determined in accordance with a four-pronged test, namely,

- a) whether the point on appeal is of significance to the practice;
- b) whether the point is of significance to the action;
- c) whether the appeal is *prima facie* meritorious or frivolous;
- d) whether the appeal will unduly hinder the progress of the action.

25 Counsel agree that (d) above is not relevant to this proceeding, given the expedited nature of the hearing. In my view, the tests set out in (a) - (c) are met in the circumstances, and as such, leave should be granted. The issue of the court's jurisdiction to intervene in corporate governance issues during a CCAA restructuring, and the scope of its discretion in doing so, are questions of considerable importance to the practice and on which there is little appellate jurisprudence. While Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper are pursuing their remedies in their own right, and the company and its directors did not take an active role in the proceedings in this court, the Board and the company did stand by their decision to appoint the new directors at the hearing before the motion judge and in this court, and the question of who is to be involved in the Board's decision making process continues to be of importance to the CCAA proceedings. From the reasons that follow it will be evident that in my view the appeal has merit.

26 Leave to appeal is therefore granted.

#### **Part IV — The Appeal**

##### *The Positions of the Parties*

27 The appellants submit that,

- a) in exercising its discretion under the CCAA, the court is not exercising its "inherent jurisdiction" as a superior court;
- b) there is no jurisdiction under the CCAA to remove duly elected or appointed directors, notwithstanding the broad discretion provided by s. 11 of that Act; and that,
- c) even if there is jurisdiction, the motion judge erred:
  - (i) by relying upon the administrative law test for reasonable apprehension of bias in determining that the directors should be removed;
  - (ii) by rejecting the application of the "business judgment" rule to the unanimous decision of the Board to appoint two new directors; and,

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

(iii) by concluding that Clearwater and Equilibrium, the shareholders with whom the appellants are associated, were focussed solely on a short-term investment horizon, without any evidence to that effect, and therefore concluding that there was a tangible risk that the appellants would not be neutral and act in the best interests of Stelco and all stakeholders in carrying out their duties as directors.

28 The respondents' arguments are rooted in fairness and process. They say, first, that the appointment of the appellants as directors has poisoned the atmosphere of the CCAA proceedings and, secondly, that it threatens to undermine the even-handedness and integrity of the capital raising process, thus jeopardizing the ability of the court at the end of the day to approve any compromise or arrangement emerging from that process. The respondents contend that Farley J. had jurisdiction to ensure the integrity of the CCAA process, including the capital raising process Stelco had asked him to approve, and that this court should not interfere with his decision that it was necessary to remove Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper from the Board in order to ensure the integrity of that process. A judge exercising a supervisory function during a CCAA proceeding is owed considerable deference: *Algoma Steel Inc., Re* (2001), 25 C.B.R. (4th) 194 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 8.

29 The crux of the respondents' concern is well-articulated in the following excerpt from paragraph 72 of the factum of the Retired Salaried Beneficiaries:

The appointments of Keiper and Woollcombe violated every tenet of fairness in the restructuring process that is supposed to lead to a plan of arrangement. One stakeholder group — particular investment funds that have acquired Stelco shares during the CCAA itself — have been provided with privileged access to the capital raising process, and voting seats on the Corporation's Board of Directors and Restructuring Committee. No other stakeholder has been treated in remotely the same way. To the contrary, the salaried retirees have been completely excluded from the capital raising process and have no say whatsoever in the Corporation's decision-making process.

30 The respondents submit that fairness, and the perception of fairness, underpin the CCAA process, and depend upon effective judicial supervision: see *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 12 O.R. (3d) 500 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Ivaco Inc., Re* (2004), 3 C.B.R. (5th) 33 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), at para.15-16. The motion judge reasonably decided to remove the appellants as directors in the circumstances, they say, and this court should not interfere.

### ***Jurisdiction***

31 The motion judge concluded that he had the power to rescind the appointments of the two directors on the basis of his "inherent jurisdiction" and "the discretion given to the court pursuant to the CCAA". He was not asked to, nor did he attempt to rest his jurisdiction on other statutory powers imported into the CCAA.

32 The CCAA is remedial legislation and is to be given a liberal interpretation to facilitate its objectives: *Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re*, [2000] O.J. No. 786 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), at para. 11. See also, *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 (B.C. C.A.), at p. 320; *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]). Courts have adopted this approach in the past to rely on inherent jurisdiction, or alternatively on the broad jurisdiction under s. 11 of the CCAA, as the source of judicial power in a CCAA proceeding to "fill in the gaps" or to "put flesh on the bones" of that Act: see *Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), *Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re* (1999), 7 C.B.R. (4th) 293 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]); and *Westar Mining Ltd., Re* (1992), 70 B.C.L.R. (2d) 6 (B.C. S.C.).

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

33 It is not necessary, for purposes of this appeal, to determine whether inherent jurisdiction is excluded for all supervisory purposes under the CCAA, by reason of the existence of the statutory discretionary regime provided in that Act. In my opinion, however, the better view is that in carrying out his or her supervisory functions under the legislation, the judge is not exercising inherent jurisdiction but rather the statutory discretion provided by s. 11 of the CCAA and supplemented by other statutory powers that may be imported into the exercise of the s. 11 discretion from other statutes through s. 20 of the CCAA.

#### *Inherent Jurisdiction*

34 Inherent jurisdiction is a power derived "from the very nature of the court as a superior court of law", permitting the court "to maintain its authority and to prevent its process being obstructed and abused". It embodies the authority of the judiciary to control its own process and the lawyers and other officials connected with the court and its process, in order "to uphold, to protect and to fulfill the judicial function of administering justice according to law in a regular, orderly and effective manner". See I.H. Jacob, "The Inherent Jurisdiction of the Court" (1970) 23 Current Legal Problems 27-28. In Halsbury's Laws of England, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (London: Lexis-Nexis UK, 1973 - ) vol. 37, at para. 14, the concept is described as follows:

In sum, it may be said that the inherent jurisdiction of the court is a virile and viable doctrine, and has been defined as being the reserve or fund of powers, a residual source of powers, which the court may draw upon as necessary whenever it is just or equitable to do so, in particular to ensure the observation of the due process of law, to prevent improper vexation or oppression, to do justice between the parties and to secure a fair trial between them.

35 In spite of the expansive nature of this power, inherent jurisdiction does not operate where Parliament or the Legislature has acted. As Farley J. noted in *Royal Oak Mines Inc.*, *supra*, inherent jurisdiction is "not limitless; if the legislative body has not left a functional gap or vacuum, then inherent jurisdiction should not be brought into play" (para. 4). See also, *Baxter Student Housing Ltd. v. College Housing Co-operative Ltd.* (1975), [1976] 2 S.C.R. 475 (S.C.C.) at 480; *Richtree Inc., Re*, [2005] O.J. No. 251 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

36 In the CCAA context, Parliament has provided a statutory framework to extend protection to a company while it holds its creditors at bay and attempts to negotiate a compromised plan of arrangement that will enable it to emerge and continue as a viable economic entity, thus benefiting society and the company in the long run, along with the company's creditors, shareholders, employees and other stakeholders. The s. 11 discretion is the engine that drives this broad and flexible statutory scheme, and that for the most part supplants the need to resort to inherent jurisdiction. In that regard, I agree with the comment of Newbury J.A. in *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re*, [2003] B.C.J. No. 1335, 43 C.B.R. (4th) 187 (B.C. C.A.) at para. 46, that:

. . . the court is not exercising a power that arises from its nature as a superior court of law, but is exercising the discretion given to it by the CCAA. . . . This is the discretion, given by s. 11, to stay proceedings against the debtor corporation and the discretion, given by s. 6, to approve a plan which appears to be reasonable and fair, to be in accord with the requirements and objects of the statute, and to make possible the continuation of the corporation as a viable entity. It is these considerations the courts have been concerned with in the cases discussed above,[FN2] rather than the integrity of their own process.

37 As Jacob observes, in his article "The Inherent Jurisdiction of the Court", *supra*, at p. 25:

The inherent jurisdiction of the court is a concept which must be distinguished from the exercise of judicial discretion. These two concepts resemble each other, particularly in their operation, and they often appear to overlap, and are therefore sometimes confused the one with the other. There is nevertheless a vital juridical distinction between jurisdiction and discretion, which must always be observed.

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

38 I do not mean to suggest that inherent jurisdiction can never apply in a CCAA context. The court retains the ability to control its own process, should the need arise. There is a distinction, however — difficult as it may be to draw — between the *court's* process with respect to the restructuring, on the one hand, and the course of action involving the negotiations and corporate actions accompanying them, which are the *company's* process, on the other hand. The court simply supervises the latter process through its ability to stay, restrain or prohibit proceedings against the company during the plan negotiation period "on such terms as it may impose".<sup>[FN3]</sup> Hence the better view is that a judge is generally exercising the court's statutory discretion under s. 11 of the Act when supervising a CCAA proceeding. The order in this case could not be founded on inherent jurisdiction because it is designed to supervise the company's process, not the court's process.

#### *The Section 11 Discretion*

39 This appeal involves the scope of a supervisory judge's discretion under s. 11 of the CCAA, in the context of corporate governance decisions made during the course of the plan negotiating and approval process and, in particular, whether that discretion extends to the removal of directors in that environment. In my view, the s. 11 discretion — in spite of its considerable breadth and flexibility — does not permit the exercise of such a power in and of itself. There may be situations where a judge in a CCAA proceeding would be justified in ordering the removal of directors pursuant to the oppression remedy provisions found in s. 241 of the CBCA, and imported into the exercise of the s. 11 discretion through s. 20 of the CCAA. However, this was not argued in the present case, and the facts before the court would not justify the removal of Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper on oppression remedy grounds.

40 The pertinent portions of s. 11 of the CCAA provide as follows:

#### **Powers of court**

11. (1) Notwithstanding anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up Act*, where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make an order under this section.

#### **Initial application court orders**

(3) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a company, make an order on such terms as it may impose, effective for such period as the court deems necessary not exceeding thirty days.

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

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

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

#### **Other than initial application court orders**

(4) A court may, on an application in respect of a company other than an initial application, make an order on such terms as it may impose.

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

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

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

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

### **Burden of proof on application**

(6) The court shall not make an order under subsection (3) or (4) unless

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

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (4), the applicant also satisfied the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

41 The rule of statutory interpretation that has now been accepted by the Supreme Court of Canada, in such cases as *R. v. Sharpe*, [2001] 1 S.C.R. 45 (S.C.C.), at para. 33, and *Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd., Re*, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 27 (S.C.C.), at para. 21 is articulated in E.A. Driedger, *The Construction of Statutes*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 1983) as follows:

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

See also Ruth Sullivan, *Sullivan and Driedger on the Construction of Statutes*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 2002) at page 262.

42 The interpretation of s. 11 advanced above is true to these principles. It is consistent with the purpose and scheme of the CCAA, as articulated in para. 38 above, and with the fact that corporate governance matters are dealt with in other statutes. In addition, it honours the historical reluctance of courts to intervene in such matters, or to second-guess the business decisions made by directors and officers in the course of managing the business and affairs of the corporation.

43 Mr. Leon and Mr. Swan argue that matters relating to the removal of directors do not fall within the court's discretion under s. 11 because they fall outside of the parameters of the court's role in the restructuring process, in contrast to the company's role in the restructuring process. The court's role is defined by the "on such terms as may be imposed" jurisdiction under subparagraphs 11(3)(a)-(c) and 11(4)(a)-(c) of the CCAA to stay, or restrain, or prohibit proceedings against the company during the "breathing space" period for negotiations and a plan. I agree.

44 What the court does under s. 11 is to establish the boundaries of the playing field and act as a referee in the process. The company's role in the restructuring, and that of its stakeholders, is to work out a plan or compromise that a sufficient percentage of creditors will accept and the court will approve and sanction. The corporate activities that take place in the course of the workout are governed by the legislation and legal principles that normally apply to such activities. In the course of acting as referee, the court has great leeway, as Farley J. observed in *Lehndorff*

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

*General Partner Ltd.*, *supra*, at para 5, "to make order[s] so as to effectively maintain the status quo in respect of an insolvent company while it attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for the proposed compromise or arrangement which will be to the benefit of both the company and its creditors". But the s. 11 discretion is not open-ended and unfettered. Its exercise must be guided by the scheme and object of the Act and by the legal principles that govern corporate law issues. Moreover, the court is not entitled to usurp the role of the directors and management in conducting what are in substance *the company's* restructuring efforts.

45 With these principles in mind, I turn to an analysis of the various factors underlying the interpretation of the s. 11 discretion.

46 I start with the proposition that at common law directors could not be removed from office during the term for which they were elected or appointed: *London Finance Corp. v. Banking Service Corp.* (1922), 23 O.W.N. 138 (Ont. H.C.); *Stephenson v. Vokes* (1896), 27 O.R. 691 (Ont. H.C.). The authority to remove must therefore be found in statute law.

47 In Canada, the CBCA and its provincial equivalents govern the election, appointment and removal of directors, as well as providing for their duties and responsibilities. Shareholders elect directors, but the directors may fill vacancies that occur on the board of directors pending a further shareholders meeting: CBCA, ss. 106(3) and 111.[FN4] The specific power to remove directors is vested in the shareholders by s. 109(1) of the CBCA. However, s. 241 empowers the court — where it finds that oppression as therein defined exists — to "make any interim or final order it thinks fit", including (s. 241(3)(e)) "an order appointing directors in place of or in addition to all or any of the directors then in office". This power has been utilized to remove directors, but in very rare cases, and only in circumstances where there has been actual conduct rising to the level of misconduct required to trigger oppression remedy relief: see, for example, *Catalyst Fund General Partner I Inc. v. Hollinger Inc.*, [2004] O.J. No. 4722 (Ont. S.C.J.).

48 There is therefore a statutory scheme under the CBCA (and similar provincial corporate legislation) providing for the election, appointment, and removal of directors. Where another applicable statute confers jurisdiction with respect to a matter, a broad and undefined discretion provided in one statute cannot be used to supplant or override the other applicable statute. There is no legislative "gap" to fill. See *Baxter Student Housing Ltd. v. College Housing Co-operative Ltd.*, *supra*, at p. 480; *Royal Oak Mines Inc. (Re)*, *supra*; and *Richtree Inc. (Re)*, *supra*.

49 At paragraph 7 of his reasons, the motion judge said:

The board is charged with the standard duty of "manage[ing], [*sic*] or supervising the management, of the business and affairs of the corporation": s. 102(1) CBCA. *Ordinarily the Court will not interfere with the composition of the board of directors. However, if there is good and sufficient valid reason to do so, then the Court must not hesitate to do so to correct a problem.* The directors should not be required to constantly look over their shoulders for this would be the sure recipe for board paralysis which would be so detrimental to a restructuring process; thus interested parties should only initiate a motion where it is reasonably obvious that there is a problem, actual or poised to become actual.

[emphasis added]

50 Respectfully, I see no authority in s. 11 of the CCAA for the court to interfere with the composition of a board of directors on such a basis.

51 Court removal of directors is an exceptional remedy, and one that is rarely exercised in corporate law. This reluctance is rooted in the historical unwillingness of courts to interfere with the internal management of corporate affairs and in the court's well-established deference to decisions made by directors and officers in the exercise of

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

their business judgment when managing the business and affairs of the corporation. These factors also bolster the view that where the CCAA is silent on the issue, the court should not read into the s. 11 discretion an extraordinary power — which the courts are disinclined to exercise in any event — except to the extent that that power may be introduced through the application of other legislation, and on the same principles that apply to the application of the provisions of the other legislation.

#### *The Oppression Remedy Gateway*

52 The fact that s. 11 does not itself provide the authority for a CCAA judge to order the removal of directors does not mean that the supervising judge is powerless to make such an order, however. Section 20 of the CCAA offers a gateway to the oppression remedy and other provisions of the CBCA and similar provincial statutes. Section 20 states:

The provisions of this Act may be applied together with the provisions of any Act of Parliament or of the legislature of any province that authorizes or makes provision for the sanction of compromises or arrangements between a company and its shareholders or any class of them.

53 The CBCA is legislation that "makes provision for the sanction of compromises or arrangements between a company and its shareholders or any class of them". Accordingly, the powers of a judge under s. 11 of the CCAA may be applied together with the provisions of the CBCA, including the oppression remedy provisions of that statute. I do not read s. 20 as limiting the application of outside legislation to the provisions of such legislation dealing specifically with the sanctioning of compromises and arrangements between the company and its shareholders. The grammatical structure of s. 20 mandates a broader interpretation and the oppression remedy is, therefore, available to a supervising judge in appropriate circumstances.

54 I do not accept the respondents' argument that the motion judge had the authority to order the removal of the appellants by virtue of the power contained in s. 145(2)(b) of the CBCA to make an order "declaring the result of the disputed election or appointment" of directors. In my view, s. 145 relates to the procedures underlying disputed elections or appointments, and not to disputes over the composition of the board of directors itself. Here, it is conceded that the appointment of Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper as directors complied with all relevant statutory requirements. Farley J. quite properly did not seek to base his jurisdiction on any such authority.

#### *The Level of Conduct Required*

55 Colin Campbell J. recently invoked the oppression remedy to remove directors, without appointing anyone in their place, in *Catalyst Fund General Partner I Inc. v. Hollinger Inc.*, *supra*. The bar is high. In reviewing the applicable law, C. Campbell J. said (para. 68):

Director removal is *an extraordinary remedy* and certainly should be *imposed most sparingly*. As a starting point, I accept the basic proposition set out in Peterson, "Shareholder Remedies in Canada"[FN5]:

SS. 18.172 *Removing and appointing directors to the board is an extreme form of judicial intervention*. The board of directors is elected by the shareholders, vested with the power to manage the corporation, and appoints the officers of the company who undertake to conduct the day-to-day affairs of the corporation. [Footnote omitted.] It is clear that the board of directors has control over policymaking and management of the corporation. *By tampering with a board, a court directly affects the management of the corporation*. If a reasonable balance between protection of corporate stakeholders and the freedom of management to conduct the affairs of the business in an efficient manner is desired, altering the board of directors should be *a measure of last resort*. The order could be suitable where the continuing presence of the incumbent directors is harmful to both the company and the interests of corporate stakeholders, and where the appointment

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

of a new director or directors would remedy the oppressive conduct without a receiver or receiver-manager.

[emphasis added]

56 C. Campbell J. found that the continued involvement of the Ravelston directors in the *Hollinger* situation would "significantly impede" the interests of the public shareholders and that those directors were "motivated by putting their interests first, not those of the company" (paras. 82-83). The evidence in this case is far from reaching any such benchmark, however, and the record would not support a finding of oppression, even if one had been sought.

57 Everyone accepts that there is no evidence the appellants have conducted themselves, as directors — in which capacity they participated over two days in the bid consideration exercise — in anything but a neutral fashion, having regard to the best interests of Stelco and all of the stakeholders. The motion judge acknowledged that the appellants "may well conduct themselves beyond reproach". However, he simply decided there was a risk — a reasonable apprehension — that Messrs. Woollcombe and Keiper would not live up to their obligations to be neutral in the future.

58 The risk or apprehension appears to have been founded essentially on three things: (1) the earlier public statements made by Mr. Keiper about "maximizing shareholder value"; (2) the conduct of Clearwater and Equilibrium in criticizing and opposing the Stalking Horse Bid; and (3) the motion judge's opinion that Clearwater and Equilibrium — the shareholders represented by the appellants on the Board — had a "vision" that "usually does not encompass any significant concern for the long-term competitiveness and viability of an emerging corporation", as a result of which the appellants would approach their directors' duties looking to liquidate their shares on the basis of a "short-term hold" rather than with the best interests of Stelco in mind. The motion judge transposed these concerns into anticipated predisposed conduct on the part of the appellants as directors, despite their apparent understanding of their duties as directors and their assurances that they would act in the best interests of Stelco. He therefore concluded that "the risk to the process and to Stelco in its emergence [was] simply too great to risk the wait and see approach".

59 Directors have obligations under s. 122(1) of the CBCA (a) to act honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interest of the corporation (the "statutory fiduciary duty" obligation), and (b) to exercise the care, diligence and skill that a reasonably prudent person would exercise in comparable circumstances (the "duty of care" obligation). They are also subject to control under the oppression remedy provisions of s. 241. The general nature of these duties does not change when the company approaches, or finds itself in, insolvency: *People's Department Stores Ltd. (1992) Inc., Re*, [2004] S.C.J. No. 64 (S.C.C.) at paras. 42-49.

60 In *Peoples* the Supreme Court noted that "the interests of the corporation are not to be confused with the interests of the creditors or those of any other stakeholders" (para. 43), but also accepted "as an accurate statement of the law that in determining whether [directors] are acting with a view to the best interests of the corporation it may be legitimate, given all the circumstances of a given case, for the board of directors to consider, *inter alia*, the interests of shareholders, employees, suppliers, creditors, consumers, governments and the environment" (para. 42). Importantly as well — in the context of "the shifting interest and incentives of shareholders and creditors" — the court stated (para. 47):

In resolving these competing interests, it is incumbent upon the directors to act honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interests of the corporation. In using their skills for the benefit of the corporation when it is in troubled waters financially, the directors must be careful to attempt to act in its best interests by creating a "better" corporation, and not to favour the interests of any one group of stakeholders.

61 In determining whether directors have fallen foul of those obligations, however, more than some risk of an-



2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

anticipated misconduct is required before the court can impose the extraordinary remedy of removing a director from his or her duly elected or appointed office. Although the motion judge concluded that there was a risk of harm to the Stelco process if Messrs Woolcombe and Keiper remained as directors, he did not assess the level of that risk. The record does not support a finding that there was a sufficient risk of sufficient misconduct to warrant a conclusion of oppression. The motion judge was not asked to make such a finding, and he did not do so.

62 The respondents argue that this court should not interfere with the decision of the motion judge on grounds of deference. They point out that the motion judge has been case-managing the restructuring of Stelco under the CCAA for over fourteen months and is intimately familiar with the circumstances of Stelco as it seeks to restructure itself and emerge from court protection.

63 There is no question that the decisions of judges acting in a supervisory role under the CCAA, and particularly those of experienced commercial list judges, are entitled to great deference: see *Algoma Steel Inc. v. Union Gas Ltd.* (2003), 63 O.R. (3d) 78 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 16. The discretion must be exercised judicially and in accordance with the principles governing its operation. Here, respectfully, the motion judge misconstrued his authority, and made an order that he was not empowered to make in the circumstances.

64 The appellants argued that the motion judge made a number of findings without any evidence to support them. Given my decision with respect to jurisdiction, it is not necessary for me to address that issue.

#### *The Business Judgment Rule*

65 The appellants argue as well that the motion judge erred in failing to defer to the unanimous decision of the Stelco directors in deciding to appoint them to the Stelco Board. It is well-established that judges supervising restructuring proceedings — and courts in general — will be very hesitant to second-guess the business decisions of directors and management. As the Supreme Court of Canada said in *Peoples, supra*, at para. 67:

Courts are ill-suited and should be reluctant to second-guess the application of business expertise to the considerations that are involved in corporate decision making . . .

66 In *Brant Investments Ltd. v. KeepRite Inc.* (1991), 3 O.R. (3d) 289 (Ont. C.A.) at 320, this court adopted the following statement by the trial judge, Anderson J.:

Business decisions, honestly made, should not be subjected to microscopic examination. There should be no interference simply because a decision is unpopular with the minority.[FN6]

67 McKinlay J.A then went on to say:

There can be no doubt that on an application under s. 234[FN7] the trial judge is required to consider the nature of the impugned acts and the method in which they were carried out. That does not mean that the trial judge should substitute his own business judgment for that of managers, directors, or a committee such as the one involved in assessing this transaction. Indeed, it would generally be impossible for him to do so, regardless of the amount of evidence before him. He is dealing with the matter at a different time and place; it is unlikely that he will have the background knowledge and expertise of the individuals involved; he could have little or no knowledge of the background and skills of the persons who would be carrying out any proposed plan; and it is unlikely that he would have any knowledge of the specialized market in which the corporation operated. In short, he does not know enough to make the business decision required.

68 Although a judge supervising a CCAA proceeding develops a certain "feel" for the corporate dynamics and a certain sense of direction for the restructuring, this caution is worth keeping in mind. See also *Skeena Cellulose Inc.*,

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

*Re, supra, Sammi Atlas Inc., Re (1998)*, 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]); *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Re), supra; Alberta-Pacific Terminals Ltd., Re (1991)*, 8 C.B.R. (3d) 99 (B.C. S.C.). The court is not catapulted into the shoes of the board of directors, or into the seat of the chair of the board, when acting in its supervisory role in the restructuring.

69 Here, the motion judge was alive to the "business judgment" dimension in the situation he faced. He distinguished the application of the rule from the circumstances, however, stating at para. 18 of his reasons:

With respect I do not see the present situation as involving the "management of the business and affairs of the corporation", but rather as a quasi-constitutional aspect of the corporation entrusted albeit to the Board pursuant to s. 111(1) of the CBCA. I agree that where a board is actually engaged in the business of a judgment situation, the board should be given appropriate deference. However, to the contrary in this situation, I do not see it as a situation calling for (as asserted) more deference, but rather considerably less than that. With regard to this decision of the Board having impact upon the capital raising process, as I conclude it would, then similarly deference ought not to be given.

70 I do not see the distinction between the directors' role in "the management of the business and affairs of the corporation" (CBCA, s. 102) — which describes the directors' overall responsibilities — and their role with respect to a "quasi-constitutional aspect of the corporation" (i.e. in filling out the composition of the board of directors in the event of a vacancy). The "affairs" of the corporation are defined in s. 1 of the CBCA as meaning "the relationships among a corporation, its affiliates and the shareholders, directors and officers of such bodies corporate but does not include the business carried on by such bodies corporate". Corporate governance decisions relate directly to such relationships and are at the heart of the Board's business decision-making role regarding the corporation's business and affairs. The dynamics of such decisions, and the intricate balancing of competing interests and other corporate-related factors that goes into making them, are no more within the purview of the court's knowledge and expertise than other business decisions, and they deserve the same deferential approach. Respectfully, the motion judge erred in declining to give effect to the business judgment rule in the circumstances of this case.

71 This is not to say that the conduct of the Board in appointing the appellants as directors may never come under review by the supervising judge. The court must ultimately approve and sanction the plan of compromise or arrangement as finally negotiated and accepted by the company and its creditors and stakeholders. The plan must be found to be fair and reasonable before it can be sanctioned. If the Board's decision to appoint the appellants has somehow so tainted the capital raising process that those criteria are not met, any eventual plan that is put forward will fail.

72 The respondents submit that it makes no sense for the court to have jurisdiction to declare the process flawed only after the process has run its course. Such an approach to the restructuring process would be inefficient and a waste of resources. While there is some merit in this argument, the court cannot grant itself jurisdiction where it does not exist. Moreover, there are a plethora of checks and balances in the negotiating process itself that moderate the risk of the process becoming irretrievably tainted in this fashion — not the least of which is the restraining effect of the prospect of such a consequence. I do not think that this argument can prevail. In addition, the court at all times retains its broad and flexible supervisory jurisdiction — a jurisdiction which feeds the creativity that makes the CCAA work so well — in order to address fairness and process concerns along the way. This case relates only to the court's exceptional power to order the removal of directors.

### *The Reasonable Apprehension of Bias Analogy*

73 In exercising what he saw as his discretion to remove the appellants as directors, the motion judge thought it would be useful to "borrow the concept of reasonable apprehension of bias . . . with suitable adjustments for the nature of the decision making involved" (para. 8). He stressed that "there was absolutely no allegation against [Mr.

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

Woolcombe and Mr. Keiper] of any actual 'bias' or its equivalent" (para. 8). He acknowledged that neither was alleged to have done anything wrong since their appointments as directors, and that at the time of their appointments the appellants had confirmed to the Board that they understood and would abide by their duties and responsibilities as directors, including the responsibility to act in the best interests of the corporation and not in their own interests as shareholders. In the end, however, he concluded that because of their prior public statements that they intended to "pursue efforts to maximize shareholder value at Stelco", and because of the nature of their business and the way in which they had been accumulating their shareholding position during the restructuring, and because of their linkage to 40% of the common shareholders, there was a risk that the appellants would not conduct themselves in a neutral fashion in the best interests of the corporation as directors.

74 In my view, the administrative law notion of apprehension of bias is foreign to the principles that govern the election, appointment and removal of directors, and to corporate governance considerations in general. Apprehension of bias is a concept that ordinarily applies to those who preside over judicial or quasi-judicial decision-making bodies, such as courts, administrative tribunals or arbitration boards. Its application is inapposite in the business decision-making context of corporate law. There is nothing in the CBCA or other corporate legislation that envisages the screening of directors in advance for their ability to act neutrally, in the best interests of the corporation, as a prerequisite for appointment.

75 Instead, the conduct of directors is governed by their common law and statutory obligations to act honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interests of the corporation, and to exercise the care, diligence and skill that a reasonably prudent person would exercise in comparable circumstances (CBCA, s. 122(1)(a) and (b)). The directors also have fiduciary obligations to the corporation, and they are liable to oppression remedy proceedings in appropriate circumstances. These remedies are available to aggrieved complainants — including the respondents in this case — but they depend for their applicability on the director having engaged in conduct justifying the imposition of a remedy.

76 If the respondents are correct, and reasonable apprehension that directors may not act neutrally because they are aligned with a particular group of shareholders or stakeholders is sufficient for removal, all nominee directors in Canadian corporations, and all management directors, would automatically be disqualified from serving. No one suggests this should be the case. Moreover, as Iacobucci J. noted in *Blair v. Consolidated Enfield Corp.*, [1995] 4 S.C.R. 5 (S.C.C.) at para. 35, "persons are assumed to act in good faith unless proven otherwise". With respect, the motion judge approached the circumstances before him from exactly the opposite direction. It is commonplace in corporate/commercial affairs that there are connections between directors and various stakeholders and that conflicts will exist from time to time. Even where there are conflicts of interest, however, directors are not removed from the board of directors; they are simply obliged to disclose the conflict and, in appropriate cases, to abstain from voting. The issue to be determined is not whether there is a connection between a director and other shareholders or stakeholders, but rather whether there has been some conduct on the part of the director that will justify the imposition of a corrective sanction. An apprehension of bias approach does not fit this sort of analysis.

#### Part V — Disposition

77 For the foregoing reasons, then, I am satisfied that the motion judge erred in declaring the appointment of Messrs. Woolcombe and Keiper as directors of Stelco of no force and effect.

78 I would grant leave to appeal, allow the appeal and set aside the order of Farley J. dated February 25, 2005.

79 Counsel have agreed that there shall be no costs of the appeal.

**Goudge J.A.:**

2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5

I agree.

***Feldman J.A.:***

I agree.

*Appeal allowed.*

FN1 R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended.

FN2 The reference is to the decisions in *Dyle, Royal Oak Mines, and Westar*, cited above.

FN3 See paragraph 43, *infra*, where I elaborate on this distinction.

FN4 It is the latter authority that the directors of Stelco exercised when appointing the appellants to the Stelco Board.

FN5 Dennis H. Peterson, *Shareholder Remedies in Canada* (Markham: LexisNexis — Butterworths — Looseleaf Service, 1989) at 18-47.

FN6 Or, I would add, unpopular with other stakeholders.

FN7 Now s. 241.

END OF DOCUMENT

**TAB 10**

2012 CarswellOnt 5390, 2012 ONSC 2515, 216 A.C.W.S. (3d) 286

2012 CarswellOnt 5390, 2012 ONSC 2515, 216 A.C.W.S. (3d) 286

Timminco Ltd., Re

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

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

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Morawetz J.

Heard: March 26, 2012  
Judgment: April 27, 2012  
Docket: CV-12-9539-00CL

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

Counsel: James C. Orr, N. Mizobuchi, for St. Clair Penneyfeather, Plaintiff in Class Proceeding, Penneyfeather v. Timminco Limited et al

P. O'Kelly, A. Taylor, for Applicants

P. LeVay, for Photon Defendants

A. Lockhart, for Wacker Chemie AG

K.D. Kraft, for Chubb Insurance Company of Canada

D.J. Bell, for John P. Walsh

A. Hatnay, James Harnum, for Mercer Canada, Administrator of the Timminco Haley Plan

S. Weisz, for Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Subject: Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

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

Plaintiff sought to bring class proceedings regarding insurance proceeds against company that was protected under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Stay under Act was lifted for purposes of bringing leave to appeal regarding limitation period — Hearing was held regarding lifting stay generally — Stay not lifted — Stay was put in place for restructuring and sale — If plaintiff's proceedings were to continue, executive team would have to devote

2012 CarswellOnt 5390, 2012 ONSC 2515, 216 A.C.W.S. (3d) 286

considerable time to proceedings — Time sensitivity was largely alleviated by lifting stay with regards to leave proceedings — Insurance proceeds were not available to other creditors.

**Cases considered by Morawetz J.:**

*Algoma Steel Corp. v. Royal Bank* (1992), 8 O.R. (3d) 449, 93 D.L.R. (4th) 98, 55 O.A.C. 303, 11 C.B.R. (3d) 11, 1992 CarswellOnt 163 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

*Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re* (2011), 2011 ONSC 2215, 2011 CarswellOnt 2392, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

*Carey Canada Inc., Re* (2006), 29 C.B.R. (5th) 81, 2006 CarswellOnt 7748 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

*Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 196 O.A.C. 142 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

*Western Canadian Shopping Centres Inc. v. Dutton* (2001), (sub nom. *Western Canadian Shopping Centres Inc. v. Bennett Jones Verchere*) 201 D.L.R. (4th) 385, [2002] 1 W.W.R. 1, 286 A.R. 201, 253 W.A.C. 201, 8 C.P.C. (5th) 1, 94 Alta. L.R. (3d) 1, 272 N.R. 135, 2001 SCC 46, 2001 CarswellAlta 884, 2001 CarswellAlta 885, [2001] 2 S.C.R. 534 (S.C.C.) — referred to

**Statutes considered:**

*Class Proceedings Act, 1992*, S.O. 1992, c. 6

Generally — referred to

s. 12 — referred to

s. 28 — referred to

*Securities Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5

Generally — referred to

s. 138.14 [en. 2002, c. 22, s. 185] — referred to

HEARING regarding lifting stay of proceedings imposed under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

**Morawetz J.:**

1 St. Clair Penneyfeather, the Plaintiff in the *Penneyfeather v. Timminco Limited, et al* action, Court File No. CV-09-378701-00CP (the "Class Action"), brought this motion for an order lifting the stay of proceedings, as provided by the Initial Order of January 3, 2012 and extended by court order dated January 27, 2012, and permitting Mr. Penneyfeather to continue the Class Action against Timminco Limited ("Timminco"), Dr. Heinz Schimmelbusch, Mr. Robert Dietrich, Mr. Rene Boisvert, Mr. Arthur R. Spector, Mr. Jack Messman, Mr. John C. Fox, Mr. Michael D. Winfield, Mr. Mickey M. Yaksich and Mr. John P. Walsh.

2012 CarswellOnt 5390, 2012 ONSC 2515, 216 A.C.W.S. (3d) 286

2 The Class Action was commenced on May 14, 2009 and has been case managed by Perell J. The following steps have taken place in the litigation:

- (a) a carriage motion;
- (b) a motion to substitute the Representative Plaintiff;
- (c) a motion to force disclosure of insurance policies;
- (d) a motion for leave to appeal the result of the insurance motion which was heard by the Divisional Court and dismissed;
- (e) settlement discussions;
- (f) when settlement discussions were terminated, Perell J. declined an expedited leave hearing and instead declared any limitation period to be stayed;
- (g) a motion for particulars; and
- (h) a motion served but not heard to strike portions of the Statement of Claim.

3 On February 16, 2012, the Court of Appeal for Ontario set aside the decision of Perell J. declaring that s. 28 of the *Class Proceedings Act* suspended the running of the three-year limitation period under s. 138.14 of the *Securities Act*.

4 The Plaintiffs' counsel received instructions to seek leave to appeal the decision of the Court of Appeal for Ontario to the Supreme Court of Canada. The leave materials were required to be served and filed by April 16, 2012.

5 On April 10, 2012, the following endorsement was released in respect of this motion:

The portion of the motion dealing with lifting the stay for the Plaintiff to seek leave to appeal the recent decision of the Court of Appeal for Ontario to the Supreme Court of Canada on the limitation period issue was not opposed. This portion of the motion is granted and an order shall issue to give effect to the foregoing. The balance of the requested relief is under reserve.

6 Counsel to Mr. Penneyfeather submits that, apart from the leave to appeal issues, there are steps that may occur before Perell J. as a result of the Court of Appeal ruling. Counsel references that the Defendants may bring motions for partial judgment and the Plaintiff could seek to have the court proceed with leave and certification with any order to be granted *nunc pro tunc* pursuant to s. 12 of the *Class Proceedings Act*.

7 Counsel to Mr. Penneyfeather submits that the three principal objectives of the *Class Proceedings Act* are judicial economy, access to justice and behaviour modification. (See *Western Canadian Shopping Centres Inc. v. Dutton*, [2001] 2 S.C.R. 534 (S.C.C.) at paras. 27-29.), and under the *Securities Act*, the deterrent represented by private plaintiffs armed with a realistic remedy is important in ensuring compliance with continuous disclosure rules.

8 Counsel submits that, in this situation, there is only one result that will not do violence to a primary legislative purpose and that is to lift the stay to permit the Class Action to proceed on the condition that any potential execution excludes Timminco's assets. Counsel further submits that, as a practical result, this would limit recovery in the Class



2012 CarswellOnt 5390, 2012 ONSC 2515, 216 A.C.W.S. (3d) 286

Action to the proceeds of the insurance policies, or in the event that the insurers decline coverage because of fraud, to the personal assets of those officers and directors found responsible for the fraud.

9 Counsel to Mr. Penneyfeather takes the position that the requested outcome is consistent with the judicial principal that the CCAA is not meant as a refuge insulating insurers from providing appropriate indemnification. (See *Algoma Steel Corp. v. Royal Bank*, [1992] O.J. No. 889 (Ont. C.A.) at paras. 13-15 and *Carey Canada Inc., Re*, [2006] O.J. No. 4905 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 7, 16-17.)

10 In this case, counsel contends that, when examining the relative prejudice to the parties, the examination strongly favours lifting the stay in the manner proposed since the insurance proceeds are not available to other creditors and there would be no financial unfairness caused by lifting the stay.

11 The position put forward by Mr. Penneyfeather must be considered in the context of the CCAA proceedings. As stated in the affidavit of Ms. Konyukhova, the stay of proceedings was put in place in order to allow Timminco and Bécancour Silicon Inc. ("BSI" and, together with Timminco, the "Timminco Entities") to pursue a restructuring and sales process that is intended to maximize recovery for the stakeholders. The Timminco Entities continue to operate as a going concern, but with a substantially reduced management team. The Timminco Entities currently have only ten active employees, including Mr. Kalins, President, General Counsel and Corporate Secretary and three executive officers (the "Executive Team").

12 Counsel to the Timminco Entities submits that, if Mr. Penneyfeather is permitted to pursue further steps in the Class Action, key members of the Executive Team will be required to spend significant amounts of their time dealing with the Class Action in the coming months, which they contend is a key time in the CCAA proceedings. Counsel contends that the executive team is currently focussing on the CCAA proceedings and the sales process.

13 Counsel to the Timminco Entities points out that the Executive Team has been required to direct most of their time to restructuring efforts and the sales process. Currently, the "stalking horse" sales process will continue into June 2012 and I am satisfied that it will require intensive time commitments from management of the Timminco Entities.

14 It is reasonable to assume that, by late June 2012, all parties will have a much better idea as to when the sales process will be complete.

15 The stay of proceedings is one of the main tools available to achieve the purpose of the CCAA. The stay provides the Timminco Entities with a degree of time in which to attempt to arrange an acceptable restructuring plan or sale of assets in order to maximize recovery for stakeholders. The court's jurisdiction in granting a stay extends to both preserving the *status quo* and facilitating a restructuring. See *Stelco Inc., Re*, [2005] O.J. No. 1171 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 36.

16 Further, the party seeking to lift a stay bears a heavy onus as the practical effect of lifting a stay is to create a scenario where one stakeholder is placed in a better position than other stakeholders, rather than treating stakeholders equally in accordance with their priorities. See *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*, [2011] O.J. No. 1590 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 27.

17 Courts will consider a number of factors in assessing whether it is appropriate to lift a stay, but those factors can generally be grouped under three headings: (a) the relative prejudice to parties; (b) the balance of convenience; and (c) where relevant, the merits (*i.e.* if the matter has little chance of success, there may not be sound reasons for lifting the stay). See *Canwest Global Communications (Re), supra*, at para. 27.

18 Counsel to the Timminco Entities submits that the relative prejudice to the parties and the balance of conven-

2012 CarswellOnt 5390, 2012 ONSC 2515, 216 A.C.W.S. (3d) 286

ience clearly favours keeping the stay in place, rather than to allow the Plaintiff to proceed with the SCC leave application. As noted above, leave has been granted to allow the Plaintiff to proceed with the SCC leave application. Counsel to the Timminco Entities further submits that, while the merits are vigorously disputed by the Defendants in the context of a Class Action, the Timminco Entities will not ask this court to make any determinations based on the merits of the Plaintiff's claim.

19 I can well recognize why Mr. Penneyfeather wishes to proceed. The objective of the Plaintiff in the Class Action is to access insurance proceeds that are not available to other creditors. However, the reality of the situation is that the operating side of Timminco is but a shadow of its former self. I accept the argument put forth by counsel to the Applicant that, if the Executive Team is required to spend significant amounts of time dealing with the Class Action in the coming months, it will detract from the ability of the Executive Team to focus on the sales process in the CCAA proceeding to the potential detriment of the Timminco Entities' other stakeholders. These are two competing interests. It seems to me, however, that the primary focus has to be on the sales process at this time. It is important that the Executive Team devote its energy to ensuring that the sales process is conducted in accordance with the timelines previously approved. A delay in the sales process may very well have a negative impact on the creditors of Timminco. Conversely, the time sensitivity of the Class Action has been, to a large extent, alleviated by the lifting of the stay so as to permit the leave application to the Supreme Court of Canada.

20 It is also significant to recognize the submission of counsel on behalf of Mr. Walsh. Counsel to Mr. Walsh takes the position that Mr. Penneyfeather has nothing more than an "equity claim" as defined in the CCAA and, as such, his claim (both against the company and its directors who, in turn, would have an equity claim based on indemnity rights) would be subordinated to any creditor claims. Counsel further submits that of all the potential claims to require adjudication, presumably, equity claims would be the least pressing to be adjudicated and do not become relevant until all secured and unsecured claims have been paid in full.

21 In my view, it is not necessary for me to comment on this submission, other than to observe that to the extent that the claim of Mr. Penneyfeather is intended to access certain insurance proceeds, it seems to me that the prosecution of such claim can be put on hold, for a period of time, so as to permit the Executive Team to concentrate on the sales process.

22 Having considered the relative prejudice to the parties and the balance of convenience, I have concluded that it is premature to lift the stay at this time, with respect to the Timminco Entities, other than with respect to the leave application to the Supreme Court of Canada. It also follows, in my view, that the stay should be left in place with respect to the claim as against the directors and officers. Certain members of this group are involved in the Executive Team and, for the reasons stated above, I am satisfied that it is not appropriate to lift the stay as against them.

23 With respect to the claim against Photon, as pointed out by their counsel, it makes no sense to lift the stay only as against Photon and leave it in place with respect to the Timminco Entities. As counsel submits, the Timminco Entities have an interest in both the legal issues and the factual issues that may be advanced if Mr. Penneyfeather proceeds as against Photon, as any such issues as are determined in Timminco's absence may cause unfairness to Timminco, particularly, if Mr. Penneyfeather later seeks to rely on those findings as against Timminco. I am in agreement with counsel's submission that to make such an order would be prejudicial to Timminco's business and property. In addition, I accept the submission that it would also be unfair to require it to answer Mr. Penneyfeather's allegations in the absence of Timminco as counsel has indicated that Photon will necessarily rely on documents and information produced by Timminco as part of its own defence.

24 I am also in agreement with the submission that it would be wasteful of judicial resources to permit the class proceedings to proceed as against Photon but not Timminco as, in addition to the duplicative use of court time, there would be the possibility of inconsistent findings on similar or identical factual issues and legal issues. For these reasons, I have concluded that it is not appropriate to lift the stay as against Photon.

2012 CarswellOnt 5390, 2012 ONSC 2515, 216 A.C.W.S. (3d) 286

25 In the result, the motion dealing with issues not covered by the April 10, 2012 endorsement is dismissed without prejudice to the rights of the Plaintiff to renew his request no sooner than 75 days after today's date.

*Order accordingly.*

END OF DOCUMENT

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 SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

Court File No: CV-12-9667-00CL

**ONTARIO  
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF ALLEN T. Y. CHAN  
(MOTIONS RETURNABLE OCTOBER 9 & 10, 2012)**

**MILLER THOMSON LLP  
SCOTIA PLAZA  
40 KING STREET WEST, SUITE 5800  
TORONTO, ON CANADA M5H 3S1  
Fax: 416.595.8695**

Emily Cole (LSUC#: 34620Q)  
Tel: 416.595.8640  
Email: [ecole@millerthomson.com](mailto:ecole@millerthomson.com)

Joseph Marin (LSUC#: 16957R)  
Tel: 416.595.8579  
Email: [jmarin@millerthomson.com](mailto:jmarin@millerthomson.com)

Craig Mills (LSUC#: 40947B)  
Tel: 416.595.8596  
Email: [cmills@millerthomson.com](mailto:cmills@millerthomson.com)

Lawyers for Allen T.Y. Chan