File Number:_____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA
(ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO)

B E T W E E N :

INVESCO CANADA LTD., NORTHWEST & ETHICAL INVESTMENTS L.P., COMITÉ SYNDICAL NATIONAL DE RETRAITE BÂTIRENTE INC., MATRIX ASSET MANAGEMENT INC., GESTION FÉRIQUE, AND MONTRUSCO BOLTON INVESTMENTS INC.

Applicants
(Moving Parties/Appellants)

- and -

SINO-FOREST CORPORATION, ERNST & YOUNG LLP, BDO LIMITED (formerly known as BDO MCCABE LO LIMITED), ALLEN T.Y. CHAN, KAI KIT POON, DAVID J. HORSLEY, CREDIT SUISSE SECURITIES (CANADA), INC., TD SECURITIES INC., DUNDEE SECURITIES CORPORATION, RBC DOMINION SECURITIES INC., SCOTIA CAPITAL INC., CIBC WORLD MARKETS INC., MERRILL LYNCH CANADA INC., CANACCORD FINANCIAL LTD., MAISON PLACEMENTS CANADA INC., CREDIT SUISSE SECURITIES (USA) LLC and MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH INCORPORATED (successor by merger to Banc of America Securities LLC), THE TRUSTEES OF THE LABOURERS' PENSION FUND OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN CANADA, THE TRUSTEES OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS LOCAL 793 PENSION PLAN FOR OPERATING ENGINEERS IN ONTARIO, SJUNDE AP-FONDEN, DAVID GRANT, ROBERT WONG and PÖYRY (BEIJING) CONSULTING COMPANY LIMITED

Respondents
(Respondents)

Proceeding under the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL OF THE APPLICANTS INVESCO CANADA LTD., NORTHWEST & ETHICAL INVESTMENTS L.P., COMITÉ SYNDICAL NATIONAL DE RETRAITE BÂTIRENTE INC., MATRIX ASSET MANAGEMENT INC., GESTION FÉRIQUE, AND MONTRUSCO BOLTON INVESTMENTS INC.

Section 40 of the *Supreme Court Act,* R.S.C. 1995, c. S-26
Rules 25(1) of the *Rules of the Supreme Court of Canada*, SOR/2002-156

VOLUME I of IV

KIM ORR BARRISTERS P.C.
19 Mercer Street, 4th Floor,
Toronto, ON M5V 1H2

Won J. Kim (LSUC # 32918H)
E-mail: wjk@kimorr.ca
Michael C. Spencer (LSUC # 59637F)
E-mail: mcs@kimorr.ca
Megan B. McPhee (LSUC # 48351G)
E-mail: mbm@kimorr.ca
Yonatan Rozenszajn (LSUC #59057H)
E-mail: yr@kimorr.ca
Tanya T. Jemec (LSUC #61889E)
E-mail: ttj@kimorr.ca

Tel: (416) 349-6578
Fax: (416) 598-0601

Counsel for the Applicants (Moving Parties/Appellants), Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments L.P., Comité Syndical National de Retraite Bâtirente Inc., Matrix Asset Management Inc., Gestion Férique and Montrusco Bolton Investments Inc.

LEW LEDERMAN QC
733 Eastbourne Avenue
Ottawa, ON K1K 0H8

Lewis T. Lederman QC
E-mail: lew.lederman@ledlaw.com
Tel: (613) 277-7617

Ottawa Agent of Counsel for the Applicants (Moving Parties/Appellants), Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments L.P., Comité Syndical National de Retraite Bâtirente Inc., Matrix Asset Management Inc., Gestion Férique and Montrusco Bolton Investments Inc.

ORIGINAL TO:

THE REGISTRAR
Supreme Court of Canada
Supreme Court of Canada Building
301 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON K1A 0J1

Tel: (613) 996-9277
Fax: (613) 996-3063

COPIES TO:

BENNETT JONES LLP
3400 One First Canadian Place,
P.O. Box 130
Toronto, Ontario M5X 1A4

Robert W. Staley
Email: staleyr@bennettjones.com
Derek J. Bell
Email: belld@bennettjones.com
Raj S. Sahni
Email: sahnir@bennettjones.com
Jonathan Bell
Email: bellj@bennettjones.com
Sean Zweig
Email: zweigs@bennettjones.com

Tel: (416) 777-857
Fax: (416) 863-1716

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Sino-Forest Corporation

GOWLING LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP
1 First Canadian Place
100 King Street West, Suite 1600
Toronto, Ontario M5X 1G5

Derrick Tay
Email: derrick.tay@gowlings.com
Clifton Prophet
Email: clifton.prophet@gowlings.com
Jennifer Stam
Email: jennifer.stam@gowlings.com
Ava Kim
Email: ava.kim@gowlings.com
Jason McMurtrie
Email: jason.mcmurtrie@gowlings.com

Tel: (416) 369-7330
Fax: (416) 862-7661

Counsel for the Monitor

FTI CONSULTING CANADA INC.
T-D Waterhouse Tower
79 Wellington Street West, P.O. Box 104
Toronto-Dominion Centre, Suite 2010,
Toronto, Ontario M5K 1G8

Greg Watson
Email: greg.watson@fticonsulting.com
Jodi Porepa
Email: Jodi.porepa@fticonsulting.com

Tel: (416) 649-8100
Fax: (416) 649-8101

Monitor

AFFLECK GREENE MCMURTY LLP
365 Bay Street, Suite 200
Toronto, ON M5H 2V1

Peter Greene
Email: pgreene@agmlawyers.com
Kenneth Dekker
Email: kdekker@agmlawyers.com

Tel: (416) 360-2800
Fax: (416) 360-8767

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent) BDO Limited

BAKER MCKENZIE LLP
Brookfield Place, 2100-181 Bay Street
Toronto, ON M5J 2T3

John Pirie
Email: john.pirie@bakermckenzie.com
David Gadsden
Email: david.gadsden@bakermckenzie.com

Tel: (416) 865-2325
Fax: (416) 863-6275

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Pöyry (Beijing) Consulting Company Limited

LENCZNER SLAGHT ROYCE SMITH GRIFFIN LLP
Suite 2600, 130 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 3P5

Peter H. Griffin
Email: pgriffin@litigate.com
Peter J. Osborne
Email: posborne@litigate.com
Linda L. Fuerst
Email: lfuerst@litigate.com
Shara Roy
Email: sroy@litigate.com

Tel: 416.865.9500
Fax: 416.865.3558

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Ernst & Young LLP

McCARTHY TETRAULT LLP
Suite 2500, 1000 De La Gauchetiere St. West
Montreal, QC H3B 0A2

Alain N. Tardif
Email: atardif@mccarthy.ca
Mason Poplaw
Email: mpoplaw@mccarthy.ca
Céline Legendre
Email: clegendre@mccarthy.ca

Tel: 514.397.4274
Fax : 514.875.6246

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent) Ernst & Young LLP

OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP
1 First Canadian Place, 100 King Street West
Suite 6100, P.O. Box 50
Toronto, ON M5X 1B8

Larry Lowenstein
Email: llowenstein@osler.com
Edward Sellers
Email: esellers@osler.com
Geoffrey Grove
Email: ggrove@osler.com

Tel: (416) 862-6454
Fax: (416) 862-6666

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Board of Directors of Sino-Forest Corporation

SISKINDS LLP
680 Waterloo Street, P.O. Box 2520
London, ON N6A 3V8

A. Dimitri Lascaris
Email: dimitri.lascaris@siskinds.com
Charles M. Wright
Email: charles.wright@siskinds.com

Tel: (519) 660-7844
Fax: (519) 672-6065

Counsel for the Respondents (Respondents) Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities, including the Representative Plaintiffs in the Ontario Class Action against the Applicant

KOSKIE MINSKY LLP
20 Queen Street West, Suite 900
Toronto, ON M5H 3R3

Kirk M. Baert
Email: kbaert@kmlaw.ca
Jonathan Ptak
Email: jptak@kmlaw.ca
Jonathan Bida
Email: jbida@kmlaw.ca
Garth Myers
Email: gmyers@kmlaw.ca

Tel: (416) 595-2117
Fax: (416) 204-2899

Counsel for the Respondents (Respondents) Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities, including the Representative Plaintiffs in the Ontario Class Action against the Applicant

PALIARE ROLAND ROSENBERG ROTHSTEIN LLP
155 Wellington Street, 35th Floor
Toronto, ON M5V 3H1

Ken Rosenberg
Email: ken.rosenberg@paliareroland.com
Massimo (Max) Starnino
Email: max.starnino@paliareroland.com

Tel: (416) 646-4304
Fax: (416) 646-4301

Counsel for the Respondents (Respondents) Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities, including the Representative Plaintiffs in the Ontario Class Action against the Applicant

MILLER THOMSON LLP
Scotia Plaza, 40 King Street West, Suite 5800
Toronto, ON M5H 3S1

Emily Cole
Email: ecole@millerthomson.com
Joseph Marin
Email: jmarin@millerthomson.com

Tel: (416) 595-8640
Fax: (416) 595-8695

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Allen T. Y. Chan

THORNTON GROUT FINNIGAN LLP
Suite 3200, 100 Wellington Street West
P. O. Box 329, Toronto-Dominion Centre
Toronto, ON M5K 1K7

James H. Grout
Email: jgrout@tgf.ca
Kyle Plunkett
Email: kplunkett@tgf.ca

Tel: (416) 304-0557
Fax: (416) 304-1313

Counsel for the Ontario Securities Commission

GOODMANS LLP
333 Bay Street, Suite 3400
Toronto, ON M5H 2S7

Benjamin Zarnett
Email: bzarnett@goodmans.ca
Robert Chadwick
Email: rchadwick@goodmans.ca
Brendan O'Neill
Email: boneill@goodmans.ca
Caroline Descours
Email: cdescours@goodmans.ca

Tel: (416) 597-4204
Fax: (416) 979-1234

Counsel for Ad Hoc Committee of Bondholders

DAVIS LLP
1 First Canadian Place, Suite 6000
100 King Street West, P.O. Box 367
Toronto, ON M5X 1E2

Susan E. Friedman
Email: sfriedman@davis.ca
Bruce Darlington
Email: bdarlington@davis.ca
Brandon Barnes
Email: bbarnes@davis.ca

Tel: (416) 365-3503
Fax: (416) 777-7415

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent) Kai Kat Poon

WARDLE DALEY BERNSTEIN LLP
2104 - 401 Bay Street, P.O. Box 21
Toronto, ON M5H 2Y4

Peter Wardle
Email: pwardle@wdblaw.ca
Simon Bieber
Email: sbieber@wdblaw.ca
Erin Pleet
Email: epleet@wdblaw.ca

Tel: (416) 351-2771
Fax: (416) 351-9196

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent) David Horsley

TORYS LLP
Toronto-Dominion Centre
79 Wellington Street West
Suite 3000, Box 270
Toronto, ON M5K 1N2

John Fabello
Email: jfabello@torys.com
David Bish
Email: dbish@torys.com
Andrew Gray
Email: agray@torys.com

Tel: (416) 865-8228
Fax: (416) 865-7380

Counsel for the Respondents (Respondents) the Underwriters named in Ontario Class Action, *The Trustees of the Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada, et al. v. Sino-Forest Corporation, et al.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TAB 1

File Number:_____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA
(ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO)

B E T W E E N :

INVESCO CANADA LTD., NORTHWEST & ETHICAL INVESTMENTS L.P., COMITÉ SYNDICAL NATIONAL DE RETRAITE BÂTIRENTE INC., MATRIX ASSET MANAGEMENT INC., GESTION FÉRIQUE, AND MONTRUSCO BOLTON INVESTMENTS INC.

Applicants
(Appellants)

- and -

SINO-FOREST CORPORATION, ERNST & YOUNG LLP, BDO LIMITED (formerly known as BDO MCCABE LO LIMITED), ALLEN T.Y. CHAN, KAI KIT POON, DAVID J. HORSLEY, CREDIT SUISSE SECURITIES (CANADA), INC., TD SECURITIES INC., DUNDEE SECURITIES CORPORATION, RBC DOMINION SECURITIES INC., SCOTIA CAPITAL INC., CIBC WORLD MARKETS INC., MERRILL LYNCH CANADA INC., CANACCORD FINANCIAL LTD., MAISON PLACEMENTS CANADA INC., CREDIT SUISSE SECURITIES (USA) LLC and MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH INCORPORATED (successor by merger to Banc of America Securities LLC), THE TRUSTEES OF THE LABOURERS' PENSION FUND OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN CANADA, THE TRUSTEES OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS LOCAL 793 PENSION PLAN FOR OPERATING ENGINEERS IN ONTARIO, SJUNDE AP-FONDEN, DAVID GRANT, ROBERT WONG and PÖYRY (BEIJING) CONSULTING COMPANY LIMITED

Respondents
(Respondents)

Proceeding under the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

NOTICE OF APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL
OF THE APPLICANTS
INVESCO CANADA LTD., NORTHWEST & ETHICAL INVESTMENTS L.P., COMITÉ SYNDICAL NATIONAL DE RETRAITE BÂTIRENTE INC., MATRIX ASSET MANAGEMENT INC., GESTION FÉRIQUE, AND MONTRUSCO BOLTON INVESTMENTS INC.

Section 40 of the *Supreme Court Act*, R.S.C. 1995, c. S-26
Rules 25(1) of the *Rules of the Supreme Court of Canada*, SOR/2002-156

TAKE NOTICE that Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments L.P., Comité Syndical National de Retraite Bâtirente Inc., Matrix Asset Management Inc., Gestion Férique and Montrusco Bolton Investments Inc. (the "Applicants") hereby apply for leave to appeal to the Court, pursuant to section 40(1) of the *Supreme Court Act*, R.S.C. 1995, c. S-26, from the judgment of the Court of Appeal for Ontario, Court File numbers M42068 and M42399, made June 26, 2013, dismissing the motions for leave to appeal from the orders of Morawetz J. dated December 10, 2012 and March 20, 2013 and for costs of this leave application, or any further or other order that the Court may deem appropriate;

AND FURTHER TAKE NOTICE that this application for leave is made on the following grounds:

1. In this case, the courts below approved a settlement between a class action plaintiff and a settling defendant that explicitly prohibited absent class members from opting out in order to pursue their claims individually.

2. This Court and the provincial courts have always protected the right of class members to opt out of class action certifications and settlements as a fundamental hallmark of procedural fairness. Within class actions, opt-out rights serve as a counter-weight against inadequate class settlements, which may lose their viability if enough class members are dissatisfied and opt out. The rights are so important that Canadian courts will not recognize class judgments rendered elsewhere unless opt-out rights were part of the class action procedure there.

3. The present proceeding involves the largest securities fraud in recent Canadian history: the Sino-Forest case. Sino-Forest was an Ontario company listed on the TSX, but its forestry operations were largely in China. Its market capitalization at the end of 2010 was over $6 billion, but a report in June 2011 claiming that the company was a "near total fraud" caused the stock to collapse. Class action securities claims have been commenced against the company and its auditors, experts, directors and officers, and underwriters. Sino-Forest itself sought insolvency protection under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("*CCAA*") in March 2012.

4. In December 2012, on the day of the creditors' vote on the *CCAA* reorganization plan, the plaintiffs' counsel in the as-yet-uncertified class action and defendant Ernst & Young LLP ("E&Y"), Sino-Forest's main auditor, announced a proposed settlement for $117 million. The settlement terms explicitly prohibited opt outs by any class members. Class counsel later explained that E&Y was willing to pay more in order to avoid opt outs. The *CCAA* plan, amended to reflect this new approach, also provided that the other class action defendants -- including the former CEO accused by the Ontario Securities Commission of masterminding the fraud -- could qualify for no-opt-out settlements as well. All parties to the *CCAA* proceeding favored this approach.

5. The Applicants are institutional investors in Sino-Forest who suffered significant losses and who are absent class members. As soon as they heard about the no-opt-out provision of the proposed settlement, they objected in the Superior Court. The Applicants respectfully submit that class members' rights to opt out and pursue their claims individually are fundamental to procedural fairness in class actions, and a settlement that explicitly abrogates those rights should not be countenanced.

6. While insolvent debtor applicants in *CCAA* proceedings may obtain full (no-opt-out) releases of claims against them, including class claims, as part of their reorganization, there is no proper statutory or equitable basis for extending no-opt-out releases and settlements to parties that are not insolvent applicants. There is no reason to permit class counsel and E&Y to prohibit and neuter opt-out rights as a term of the settlement. Nevertheless, acting under both the Ontario Class Proceedings Act and the *CCAA*, the courts below approved E&Y's no-opt-out settlement and the *CCAA* "framework" for similar settlements by other defendants.

7. Ultimately, allowing abrogation of opt-out rights would have the perverse consequence of damaging investors' trust in the integrity of Canada's legal system dealing with financial and investor affairs, and thus would in the long run impair the proper functioning of Canadian capital markets.

8. This proposed appeal thus raises the following questions of public importance:

a) In a class action, is it permissible for a settling defendant and the counsel for (uncertified) class plaintiffs to agree on an explicit no-opt-out provision as part of the proposed settlement, and for the court to approve such a provision?

b) Does a CCAA insolvency proceeding pending against a company that is a defendant in a class action give the CCAA court jurisdiction or discretion to provide non-opt-out releases to other (non-applicant, solvent) defendants?

c) In the accompanying appeal: Do absent class members lack standing under the Class Proceedings Act to appeal an order approving the settlement of a class proceeding that explicitly prohibits them from opting out?

9. The Applicants' position is that a class member's right to opt out of a class proceeding is fundamental and it is of public importance to ensure that the right is not abrogated. If a settlement is approved with a no-opt-out provision such that class members are not allowed to prosecute their own claims, it is of public importance to ensure that those class members may appeal that decision.

Dated at Toronto, Ontario this 20th day of September, 2013.

Won J. Kim

KIM ORR BARRISTERS P.C.
19 Mercer Street, 4th Floor,
Toronto, ON M5V 1H2

Won J. Kim (LSUC # 32918H)
E-mail: wjk@kimorr.ca
Michael C. Spencer (LSUC # 59637F)
E-mail: mcs@kimorr.ca
Megan B. McPhee (LSUC # 48351G)
E-mail: mbm@kimorr.ca
Yonatan Rozenszajn (LSUC #59057H)
E-mail: yr@kimorr.ca

Tanya T. Jemec (LSUC #61889E)
E-mail: ttj@kimorr.ca

Counsel for the Applicants, Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments L.P., Comité Syndical National de Retraite Bâtirente Inc., Matrix Asset Management Inc., Gestion Férique and Montrusco Bolton Investments Inc.

ORIGINAL TO:

THE REGISTRAR
Supreme Court of Canada
Supreme Court of Canada Building
301 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON K1A 0J1

Tel: (613) 996-9277
Fax: (613) 996-3063

COPIES TO:

BENNETT JONES LLP
3400 One First Canadian Place,
P.O. Box 130
Toronto, Ontario M5X 1A4

Robert W. Staley
Email: staleyr@bennettjones.com
Derek J. Bell
Email: belld@bennettjones.com
Raj S. Sahni
Email: sahnir@bennettjones.com
Jonathan Bell
Email: bellj@bennettjones.com
Sean Zweig
Email: zweigs@bennettjones.com

Tel: (416) 777-857
Fax: (416) 863-1716
Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Sino-Forest Corporation

GOWLING LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP
1 First Canadian Place
100 King Street West, Suite 1600
Toronto, Ontario M5X 1G5

Derrick Tay
Email: derrick.tay@gowlings.com
Clifton Prophet
Email: clifton.prophet@gowlings.com
Jennifer Stam
Email: jennifer.stam@gowlings.com
Ava Kim
Email: ava.kim@gowlings.com
Jason McMurtrie
Email: jason.mcmurtrie@gowlings.com

Tel: (416) 369-7330
Fax: (416) 862-7661

Counsel for the Monitor

FTI CONSULTING CANADA INC.
T-D Waterhouse Tower
79 Wellington Street West, P.O. Box 104
Toronto-Dominion Centre, Suite 2010,
Toronto, Ontario M5K 1G8

Greg Watson
Email: greg.watson@fticonsulting.com
Jodi Porepa
Email: Jodi.porepa@fticonsulting.com

Tel: (416) 649-8100
Fax: (416) 649-8101

Monitor

AFFLECK GREENE MCMURTY LLP
365 Bay Street, Suite 200
Toronto, ON M5H 2V1

Peter Greene
Email: pgreene@agmlawyers.com
Kenneth Dekker
Email: kdekker@agmlawyers.com

Tel: (416) 360-2800
Fax: (416) 360-8767

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
BDO Limited

BAKER MCKENZIE LLP
Brookfield Place, 2100-181 Bay Street
Toronto, ON M5J 2T3

John Pirie
Email: john.pirie@bakermckenzie.com
David Gadsden
Email:
david.gadsden@bakermckenzie.com

Tel: (416) 865-2325
Fax: (416) 863-6275

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Pöyry (Beijing) Consulting Company
Limited

LENCZNER SLAGHT ROYCE SMITH GRIFFIN LLP
Suite 2600, 130 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 3P5

Peter H. Griffin
Email: pgriffin@litigate.com
Peter J. Osborne
Email: posborne@litigate.com
Linda L. Fuerst
Email: lfuerst@litigate.com
Shara Roy
Email: sroy@litigate.com

Tel: 416.865.9500
Fax: 416.865.3558

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Ernst & Young LLP

McCARTHY TETRAULT LLP
Suite 2500, 1000 De La Gauchetiere St. West
Montreal, QC H3B 0A2

Alain N. Tardif
Email: atardif@mccarthy.ca
Mason Poplaw
Email: mpoplaw@mccarthy.ca
Céline Legendre
Email: clegendre@mccarthy.ca

Tel: 514.397.4274
Fax : 514.875.6246

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Ernst & Young LLP

OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP
1 First Canadian Place, 100 King Street West
Suite 6100, P.O. Box 50
Toronto, ON M5X 1B8

Larry Lowenstein
Email: llowenstein@osler.com
Edward Sellers
Email: esellers@osler.com
Geoffrey Grove
Email: ggrove@osler.com

Tel: (416) 862-6454
Fax: (416) 862-6666

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent) Board of Directors of Sino-Forest Corporation

SISKINDS LLP
680 Waterloo Street, P.O. Box 2520
London, ON N6A 3V8

A. Dimitri Lascaris
Email: dimitri.lascaris@siskinds.com
Charles M. Wright
Email: charles.wright@siskinds.com

Tel: (519) 660-7844
Fax: (519) 672-6065

Counsel for the Respondents (Respondents) Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities, including the Representative Plaintiffs in the Ontario Class Action against the Applicant

KOSKIE MINSKY LLP
20 Queen Street West, Suite 900
Toronto, ON M5H 3R3

Kirk M. Baert
Email: kbaert@kmlaw.ca
Jonathan Ptak
Email: jptak@kmlaw.ca
Jonathan Bida
Email: jbida@kmlaw.ca
Garth Myers
Email: gmyers@kmlaw.ca

Tel: (416) 595-2117
Fax: (416) 204-2899

Counsel for the Respondents (Respondents)
Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the
Applicant's Securities, including the
Representative Plaintiffs in the Ontario
Class Action against the Applicant

PALIARE ROLAND ROSENBERG ROTHSTEIN LLP
155 Wellington Street, 35th Floor
Toronto, ON M5V 3H1

Ken Rosenberg
Email: ken.rosenberg@paliareroland.com
Massimo (Max) Starnino
Email: max.starnino@paliareroland.com

Tel: (416) 646-4304
Fax: (416) 646-4301

Counsel for the Respondents (Respondents)
Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the
Applicant's Securities, including the
Representative Plaintiffs in the Ontario
Class Action against the Applicant

MILLER THOMSON LLP
Scotia Plaza, 40 King Street West, Suite 5800
Toronto, ON M5H 3S1

Emily Cole
Email: ecole@millerthomson.com
Joseph Marin
Email: jmarin@millerthomson.com

Tel: (416) 595-8640
Fax: (416) 595-8695

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Allen T. Y. Chan

THORNTON GROUT FINNIGAN LLP
Suite 3200, 100 Wellington Street West
P. O. Box 329, Toronto-Dominion Centre
Toronto, ON M5K 1K7

James H. Grout
Email: jgrout@tgf.ca
Kyle Plunkett
Email: kplunkett@tgf.ca

Tel: (416) 304-0557
Fax: (416) 304-1313

Counsel for the Ontario Securities Commission

GOODMANS LLP
333 Bay Street, Suite 3400
Toronto, ON M5H 2S7

Benjamin Zarnett
Email: bzarnett@goodmans.ca
Robert Chadwick
Email: rchadwick@goodmans.ca
Brendan O'Neill
Email: boneill@goodmans.ca
Caroline Descours
Email: cdescours@goodmans.ca

Tel: (416) 597-4204
Fax: (416) 979-1234

Counsel for Ad Hoc Committee of Bondholders

DAVIS LLP
1 First Canadian Place, Suite 6000
100 King Street West, P.O. Box 367
Toronto, ON M5X 1E2

Susan E. Friedman
Email: sfriedman@davis.ca
Bruce Darlington
Email: bdarlington@davis.ca
Brandon Barnes
Email: bbarnes@davis.ca

Tel: (416) 365-3503
Fax: (416) 777-7415

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Kai Kat Poon

WARDLE DALEY BERNSTEIN LLP
2104 - 401 Bay Street, P.O. Box 21
Toronto, ON M5H 2Y4

Peter Wardle
Email: pwardle@wdblaw.ca
Simon Bieber
Email: sbieber@wdblaw.ca
Erin Pleet
Email: epleet@wdblaw.ca

Tel: (416) 351-2771
Fax: (416) 351-9196

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
David Horsley

TORYS LLP
Toronto-Dominion Centre, Suite 3000,
79 Wellington Street West, Box 270
Toronto, ON M5K 1N2

John Fabello
Email: jfabello@torys.com
David Bish
Email: dbish@torys.com
Andrew Gray
Email: agray@torys.com

Tel: (416) 865-8228
Fax: (416) 865-7380

Counsel for the Respondents (Respondents)
the Underwriters named in Ontario Class
Action, *The Trustees of the Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada, et al. v. Sino-Forest Corporation, et al.*

NOTICE TO THE RESPONDENTS: A respondent may serve and file a memorandum in response to this application for leave to appeal within 30 days after service of the application. If no response is filed within that time, the Registrar will submit this application for leave to appeal to the Court for consideration pursuant to section 43 of the *Supreme Court Act*.

TAB 2

File Number:_____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA
(ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO)

BETWEEN:

INVESCO CANADA LTD., NORTHWEST & ETHICAL INVESTMENTS L.P., COMITÉ SYNDICAL NATIONAL DE RETRAITE BÂTIRENTE INC., MATRIX ASSET MANAGEMENT INC., GESTION FÉRIQUE, AND MONTRUSCO BOLTON INVESTMENTS INC.

Applicants
(Moving Parties/Appellants)

- and -

SINO-FOREST CORPORATION, ERNST & YOUNG LLP, BDO LIMITED (formerly known as BDO MCCABE LO LIMITED), ALLEN T.Y. CHAN, KAI KIT POON, DAVID J. HORSLEY, CREDIT SUISSE SECURITIES (CANADA), INC., TD SECURITIES INC., DUNDEE SECURITIES CORPORATION, RBC DOMINION SECURITIES INC., SCOTIA CAPITAL INC., CIBC WORLD MARKETS INC., MERRILL LYNCH CANADA INC., CANACCORD FINANCIAL LTD., MAISON PLACEMENTS CANADA INC., CREDIT SUISSE SECURITIES (USA) LLC and MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH INCORPORATED (successor by merger to Banc of America Securities LLC), THE TRUSTEES OF THE LABOURERS' PENSION FUND OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN CANADA, THE TRUSTEES OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS LOCAL 793 PENSION PLAN FOR OPERATING ENGINEERS IN ONTARIO, SJUNDE AP-FONDEN, DAVID GRANT, ROBERT WONG and PÖYRY (BEIJING) CONSULTING COMPANY LIMITED

Respondents
(Respondents)

Proceeding under the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANTS INVESCO CANADA LTD., NORTHWEST & ETHICAL INVESTMENTS L.P., COMITÉ SYNDICAL NATIONAL DE RETRAITE BÂTIRENTE INC., MATRIX ASSET MANAGEMENT INC., GESTION FÉRIQUE, AND MONTRUSCO BOLTON INVESTMENTS INC.

Section 40 of the *Supreme Court Act,* R.S.C. 1995, c. S-26
Rules 25(1) of the *Rules of the Supreme Court of Canada,* SOR/2002-156

I, Won J. Kim, counsel for the Applicants, Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments L.P., Comité Syndical National de Retraite Bâtirente Inc., Matrix Asset Management Inc., Gestion Férique and Montrusco Bolton Investments Inc., hereby certify that:

(a) there is no sealing or confidentiality order in effect in the file from a lower court or the Court, and there is no document filed that includes information subject to a sealing or confidentiality order or that is classified as confidential by legislation;

(b) there is no sealing order or ban on the publication of evidence or the name or identity of a party or witness; and,

(c) there is no confidential information or document filed that includes such information that is subject to limitations on public access by virtue of specific legislation.

Dated at Toronto, Ontario this 20th day of September, 2013.

Won J. Kim

KIM ORR BARRISTERS P.C.
19 Mercer Street, 4th Floor,
Toronto, ON M5V 1H2

Won J. Kim (LSUC # 32918H)
E-mail: wjk@kimorr.ca
Michael C. Spencer (LSUC # 59637F)
E-mail: mcs@kimorr.ca
Megan B. McPhee (LSUC # 48351G)
E-mail: mbm@kimorr.ca
Yonatan Rozenszajn (LSUC #59057H)
E-mail: yr@kimorr.ca
Tanya T. Jemec (LSUC #61889E)
E-mail: ttj@kimorr.ca

Tel: (416) 349-6578
Fax: (416) 598-0601

Counsel for the Applicants (Moving Parties/Appellants), Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments L.P., Comité Syndical National de Retraite Bâtirente Inc., Matrix Asset Management Inc., Gestion Férique and Montrusco Bolton Investments Inc.

LEW LEDERMAN QC
733 Eastbourne Avenue
Ottawa, ON K1K 0H8

Lewis T. Lederman QC
E-mail: lew.lederman@ledlaw.com
Tel: (613) 277-7617

Ottawa Agent of Counsel for the Applicants (Moving Parties/Appellants), Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments L.P., Comité Syndical National de Retraite Bâtirente Inc., Matrix Asset Management Inc., Gestion Férique and Montrusco Bolton Investments Inc.

ORIGINAL TO:

THE REGISTRAR
Supreme Court of Canada
Supreme Court of Canada Building
301 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON K1A 0J1

Tel: (613) 996-9277
Fax: (613) 996-3063

COPIES TO:

BENNETT JONES LLP
3400 One First Canadian Place,
P.O. Box 130
Toronto, Ontario M5X 1A4

Robert W. Staley
Email: staleyr@bennettjones.com
Derek J. Bell
Email: belld@bennettjones.com
Raj S. Sahni
Email: sahnir@bennettjones.com
Jonathan Bell
Email: bellj@bennettjones.com
Sean Zweig
Email: zweigs@bennettjones.com

Tel: (416) 777-857
Fax: (416) 863-1716

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Sino-Forest Corporation

GOWLING LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP
1 First Canadian Place
100 King Street West, Suite 1600
Toronto, Ontario M5X 1G5

Derrick Tay
Email: derrick.tay@gowlings.com
Clifton Prophet
Email: clifton.prophet@gowlings.com
Jennifer Stam
Email: jennifer.stam@gowlings.com
Ava Kim
Email: ava.kim@gowlings.com
Jason McMurtrie
Email: jason.mcmurtrie@gowlings.com

Tel: (416) 369-7330
Fax: (416) 862-7661

Counsel for the Monitor

FTI CONSULTING CANADA INC.
T-D Waterhouse Tower
79 Wellington Street West, P.O. Box 104
Toronto-Dominion Centre, Suite 2010,
Toronto, Ontario M5K 1G8

Greg Watson
Email: greg.watson@fticonsulting.com
Jodi Porepa
Email: Jodi.porepa@fticonsulting.com

Tel: (416) 649-8100
Fax: (416) 649-8101

Monitor

AFFLECK GREENE MCMURTY LLP
365 Bay Street, Suite 200
Toronto, ON M5H 2V1

Peter Greene
Email: pgreene@agmlawyers.com
Kenneth Dekker
Email: kdekker@agmlawyers.com

Tel: (416) 360-2800
Fax: (416) 360-8767

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
BDO Limited

BAKER MCKENZIE LLP
Brookfield Place, 2100-181 Bay Street
Toronto, ON M5J 2T3

John Pirie
Email: john.pirie@bakermckenzie.com
David Gadsden
Email: david.gadsden@bakermckenzie.com

Tel: (416) 865-2325
Fax: (416) 863-6275

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Pöyry (Beijing) Consulting Company Limited

LENCZNER SLAGHT ROYCE SMITH GRIFFIN LLP
Suite 2600, 130 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 3P5

Peter H. Griffin
Email: pgriffin@litigate.com
Peter J. Osborne
Email: posborne@litigate.com
Linda L. Fuerst
Email: lfuerst@litigate.com
Shara Roy
Email: sroy@litigate.com

Tel: 416.865.9500
Fax: 416.865.3558

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Ernst & Young LLP

McCARTHY TETRAULT LLP
Suite 2500, 1000 De La Gauchetiere St. West
Montreal, QC H3B 0A2

Alain N. Tardif
Email: atardif@mccarthy.ca
Mason Poplaw
Email: mpoplaw@mccarthy.ca
Céline Legendre
Email: clegendre@mccarthy.ca

Tel: 514.397.4274
Fax : 514.875.6246

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Ernst & Young LLP

OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP
1 First Canadian Place, 100 King Street West
Suite 6100, P.O. Box 50
Toronto, ON M5X 1B8

Larry Lowenstein
Email: llowenstein@osler.com
Edward Sellers
Email: esellers@osler.com
Geoffrey Grove
Email: ggrove@osler.com

Tel: (416) 862-6454
Fax: (416) 862-6666

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Board of Directors of Sino-Forest Corporation

SISKINDS LLP
680 Waterloo Street, P.O. Box 2520
London, ON N6A 3V8

A. Dimitri Lascaris
Email: dimitri.lascaris@siskinds.com
Charles M. Wright
Email: charles.wright@siskinds.com

Tel: (519) 660-7844
Fax: (519) 672-6065

Counsel for the Respondents (Respondents) Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities, including the Representative Plaintiffs in the Ontario Class Action against the Applicant

KOSKIE MINSKY LLP
20 Queen Street West, Suite 900
Toronto, ON M5H 3R3

Kirk M. Baert
Email: kbaert@kmlaw.ca
Jonathan Ptak
Email: jptak@kmlaw.ca
Jonathan Bida
Email: jbida@kmlaw.ca
Garth Myers
Email: gmyers@kmlaw.ca

Tel: (416) 595-2117
Fax: (416) 204-2899

Counsel for the Respondents (Respondents) Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities, including the Representative Plaintiffs in the Ontario Class Action against the Applicant

PALIARE ROLAND ROSENBERG ROTHSTEIN LLP
155 Wellington Street, 35th Floor
Toronto, ON M5V 3H1

Ken Rosenberg
Email: ken.rosenberg@paliareroland.com
Massimo (Max) Starnino
Email: max.starnino@paliareroland.com

Tel: (416) 646-4304
Fax: (416) 646-4301

Counsel for the Respondents (Respondents) Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities, including the Representative Plaintiffs in the Ontario Class Action against the Applicant

MILLER THOMSON LLP
Scotia Plaza, 40 King Street West, Suite 5800
Toronto, ON M5H 3S1

Emily Cole
Email: ecole@millerthomson.com
Joseph Marin
Email: jmarin@millerthomson.com

Tel: (416) 595-8640
Fax: (416) 595-8695

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent)
Allen T. Y. Chan

THORNTON GROUT FINNIGAN LLP
Suite 3200, 100 Wellington Street West
P. O. Box 329, Toronto-Dominion Centre
Toronto, ON M5K 1K7

James H. Grout
Email: jgrout@tgf.ca
Kyle Plunkett
Email: kplunkett@tgf.ca

Tel: (416) 304-0557
Fax: (416) 304-1313

Counsel for the Ontario Securities Commission

GOODMANS LLP
333 Bay Street, Suite 3400
Toronto, ON M5H 2S7

Benjamin Zarnett
Email: bzarnett@goodmans.ca
Robert Chadwick
Email: rchadwick@goodmans.ca
Brendan O'Neill
Email: boneill@goodmans.ca
Caroline Descours
Email: cdescours@goodmans.ca

Tel: (416) 597-4204
Fax: (416) 979-1234

Counsel for Ad Hoc Committee of Bondholders

DAVIS LLP
1 First Canadian Place, Suite 6000
100 King Street West, P.O. Box 367
Toronto, ON M5X 1E2

Susan E. Friedman
Email: sfriedman@davis.ca
Bruce Darlington
Email: bdarlington@davis.ca
Brandon Barnes
Email: bbarnes@davis.ca

Tel: (416) 365-3503
Fax: (416) 777-7415

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent) Kai Kat Poon

WARDLE DALEY BERNSTEIN LLP
2104 - 401 Bay Street, P.O. Box 21
Toronto, ON M5H 2Y4

Peter Wardle
Email: pwardle@wdblaw.ca
Simon Bieber
Email: sbieber@wdblaw.ca
Erin Pleet
Email: epleet@wdblaw.ca

Tel: (416) 351-2771
Fax: (416) 351-9196

Counsel for the Respondent (Respondent) David Horsley

TORYS LLP
Toronto-Dominion Centre
79 Wellington Street West
Suite 3000, Box 270
Toronto, ON M5K 1N2

John Fabello
Email: jfabello@torys.com
David Bish
Email: dbish@torys.com
Andrew Gray
Email: agray@torys.com

Tel: (416) 865-8228
Fax: (416) 865-7380

Counsel for the Respondents (Respondents) the Underwriters named in the Ontario Class Action against the Applicant

TAB A

CITATION: Sino-Forest Corporation (Re), 2012 ONSC 7041
COURT FILE NO.: CV-12-9667-00CL
DATE: 20121210

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

RE: 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, Applicant

BEFORE: MORAWETZ J.

COUNSEL: Robert W. Staley, Kevin Zych, Derek J. Bell and Jonathan Bell, for Sino-Forest Corporation

Derrick Tay, Jennifer Stam, and Cliff Prophet for the Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Robert Chadwick and Brendan O'Neill, for the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders

Kenneth Rosenberg, Kirk Baert, Max Starnino, and A. Dimitri Lascaris, for the Class Action Plaintiffs

Won J. Kim, James C. Orr, Michael C. Spencer, and Megan B. McPhee, for Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments LP and Comité Syndicale Nationale de Retraite Bâtirente Inc.

Peter Griffin, Peter Osborne and Shara Roy, for Ernst & Young Inc.

Peter Greene and Ken Dekkar, for BDO Limited

Edward A. Sellers and Larry Lowenstein, for the Board of Directors of Sino-Forest Corporation

John Pirie and David Gadsden, for Poyry (Beijing)

James Doris, for the Plaintiff in the New York Class Action

David Bish, for the Underwriters

Simon Bieber and Erin Pleet, for David Horsley

James Grout, for the Ontario Securities Commission

Emily Cole and Joseph Marin, for Allen Chan

Susan E. Freedman and Brandon Barnes, for Kai Kit Poon

Paul Emerson, for ACE/Chubb

Sam Sasso, for Travelers

HEARD: **DECEMBER 7, 2012**

ENDORSEMENT

[1] The Applicant, Sino-Forest Corporation ("SFC"), seeks an order sanctioning the Plan of Compromise and Arrangement dated December 3, 2012, as modified, amended, varied or supplemented in accordance with its terms (the "Plan") pursuant to section 6 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA"), and ancillary relief as set out in the proposed sanction order (the "Sanction Order").

[2] The Plan is supported by:

(a) the Monitor;

(b) SFC's largest creditors, the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders (the "Ad Hoc Committee");

(c) Ernst & Young LLP ("E&Y");

(d) BDO Limited ("BDO"); and

(e) the Underwriters.

The Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities (the "Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee" including the "Class Action Plaintiffs") has agreed not to oppose the Plan.

[3] The Plan was approved by an overwhelming majority of Affected Creditors voting on the Plan in person or by proxy. In total, 99% in number, and greater than 99% in value, of those Affected Creditors voting favoured the Plan.

[4] Invesco Canada Ltd. ("Invesco"), Northwest & Ethical Investments LP and Comité Syndicale Nationale de Retraite Bâtirente Inc. (collectively, the "Funds") object to the proposed Sanction Order. The Funds request an adjournment of the motion for a period of one month. Alternatively, the Funds request that the Plan be altered so as to remove Article 11 "Settlement of Claims Against Third Party Defendants".

[5] This endorsement fully addresses the adjournment request of the Funds. In this endorsement, defined terms have been taken from the motion record.

[6] The Funds are institutional, public and private equity funds that owned 3,085,786 common shares of SFC on June 2, 2011. The Funds alleged that they suffered substantial losses after the market in SFC shares collapsed following a public issuance of a report suggesting that fraud permeated SFC's assets and operations.

[7] Following the collapse of SFC's share price, class actions were commenced against SFC, certain of its directors and officers, the auditors, the Underwriters and other expert firms.

[8] On January 6, 2012, Perell J. granted carriage of the class action to Koskie Minsky LLP and Siskinds LLP ("Class Counsel"). The class has not been certified.

[9] Counsel to the Funds takes the position that Class Counsel does not represent the Funds.

[10] In his affidavit sworn December 6, 2012, Mr. Eric J. Adelson, Senior Vice President, Secretary and head of Legal of Invesco stated that on December 3, 2012, Class Counsel and E&Y announced that they had entered into a settlement by which E&Y would pay $117 million into a "Trust" formed as part of the CCAA proceedings, in return for releases of all claims that could be brought against E&Y by any person in connection with SFC.

[11] Mr. Adelson also states that on December 3, 2012, an Amended Plan was issued that, for the first time in the CCAA proceedings, contained provisions for settlement of claims against Third Party Defendants (Article 11), including specific provisions concerning the settlement by and releases for E&Y, and also allowing other Third Party Defendants to avail themselves of similar provisions for unspecified settlements and releases in the future.

[12] Mr. Adelson acknowledges that on December 5, 2012, counsel for E&Y advised Invesco's counsel that the parties had decided not to request court approval of the proposed E&Y Settlement at the motion scheduled for December 7, 2012. However, Mr. Adelson takes the position that provisions of the Plan, even apart from the E&Y Settlement, appear to affect the legal and practical ability of Invesco and other investors to seek adjudication of their claims against defendants in the SFC litigation on the merits, rendering it vital that sufficient time be provided to fully understand the present matters.

[13] Mr. Adelson also details "preliminary reasons for objecting to the Plan's release provisions":

> 15. If the effect of the Plan is to allow a Third Party Defendant (such as E&Y) to settle its liability to investors in connection with Sino-Forest through a settlement agreement with Class Counsel, and to bind the investors to that settlement without giving them the opportunity to opt out and pursue their claims on the merits outside the Class Action, then Invesco would strenuously object and oppose approval of such an arrangement.
>
> 16. The Class Action has not been certified, so Invesco does not view Class Counsel, with whom we have no other relationship, as authorized to represent its

> interests in connection with Sino-Forest. Our views have not been heard and our interests have not been represented in connection with the Plan and the proposed settlement. It is my understanding that Invesco, as an investor with claims against Sino-Forest and the other defendants in the Class Action, is not a "creditor" with respect to the Plan. Invesco accordingly submits that it would be contrary to its rights to bind it to a release or a settlement involving Third Party Defendants unless Invesco directly participated in proceedings or unless in certified class proceedings it was given the opportunity to opt out. We do not understand the CCAA to authorize releases of third parties, that is, parties other than the Applicant and certain officers and directors under certain circumstances, as part of a Sanction Order. Invesco objects to any such provisions or results in this matter.

[14] Counsel to the Funds made specific reference to Article 11.2 of the Plan which, counsel submits, if approved, establishes an open-ended mechanism for eligible Third Party Defendants, defined to include the 11 Underwriters named as defendants in the class action, BDO and/or E&Y (if its proposed settlement is not already concluded), to enter into a "Named Third Party Defendant Settlement" with "one or more of (i) counsel to the plaintiffs in any of the class actions...".

[15] Counsel to the Funds further submits that under Articles 11.2 (b) and (c), once a settlement is concluded among the specified parties, the settling defendant will obtain releases and bar orders in the CCAA proceeding, preventing the continued litigation of any SFC-related claims against them. If a settlement is reached in the future, counsel submits that the CCAA release and bar orders will remain available notwithstanding that the CCAA process may have concluded. Accordingly, counsel submits that it appears that these provisions purport to vest authority in the parties as described to enter into settlements that may have the effect of barring any claimants (such as the Funds) from prosecuting SFC-related claims against the Underwriters, BDO and/or E&Y, subject to the approval of this court. This bar, counsel submits, would be imposed without compliance with establishes prerequisites of the *Class Proceedings Act* ("CPA") – including class certification, a fairness hearing, approval by the court supervising the class action, and provision of opt-out rights – necessary to impose releases or other restrictions on class members who are not named parties before that court.

[16] Stated more succinctly, counsel submits that the Plan appears designed to unnecessarily fetter the powers of a future court, namely, the class action case management court, by assigning to the CCAA court the power to approve and effectuate class-wide settlements without regard to established statutory and rule-based procedural safeguards found in the CPA.

[17] The adjournment request was opposed, primarily on the basis that the Funds had misunderstood the terms of the Plan. Oral submissions were made by counsel on behalf of the Monitor, SFC, Ad Hoc Noteholders, SFC Board, Ontario Securities Commission, E&Y and the Class Action Plaintiffs. Specifically, these parties submit there was a misunderstanding on the part of the Funds as to what was before the court for approval and, perhaps more importantly, what was not before the court for approval.

[18] Counsel to the Monitor also submits that SFC has limited funds and time is critical.

[19] The thrust of the arguments of the combined forces opposing the adjournment request is that the court is not being asked, at this time, to approve the settlement. Rather, what is before the court is a motion to approve the Plan, which includes approval of a framework with respect to a proposed settlement of claims against Third Party Defendants.

[20] Essentially, if certain conditions are met and further court approvals and orders are obtained, it is conceivable that E&Y will get a release. However, such a release is not being requested at this time. Further, it is not a condition of Plan Implementation that the E&Y matter be settled.

[21] To support this position, counsel referenced a number of provisions in the Plan including:

1. The defined term "Settlement Trust Order", which means a court order that establishes the Settlement Trust (section 11.1 (a) of the Plan) and approves the E&Y Settlement and the E&Y Release...;

2. Section 8.2, which outlines the effect the Sanction Order and includes a reference in Section 8.2 (z) that the E&Y Release shall become effective on the E&Y Settlement Date in the manner set forth in section 11.1;

3. Section 11.1, which details settlement of claims against Third Party Defendants and specifically E&Y. This provision sets out a number of pre-conditions to the required payment to be made by E&Y as provided for in the E&Y Settlement. These pre-conditions are:

   (i) the granting of the Sanction Order;

   (ii) the issuance of the Settlement Trust Order;

   (iii) the granting of an order under Chapter 15 of the United States Bankruptcy Code recognizing and enforcing the Sanction Order and the Settlement Trust Order in the United States;

   (iv) any other order necessary to give effect to the E&Y Settlement;

   (v) the fulfillment of all conditions precedent in the E&Y Settlement and the fulfillment by the Ontario Class Action Plaintiffs of all of their obligations thereunder; and

   (vi) the Sanction Order, the Settlement Trust Order and all E&Y Orders being final orders and not subject to further appeal or challenge.

[22] Having reviewed these documents, it is apparent that approval of the E&Y Settlement is not before the court on this motion and no release is being provided to E&Y as a result of this motion. In the event all of the pre-conditions are satisfied and if all of the required court approvals and orders are issued, the position of the Funds could be affected. However, the Funds will have the opportunity to make argument on such hearings.

TAB B

[23] I have also reviewed the form of Sanction Order being requested specifically paragraph 40. This provision provides that the E&Y Settlement and the release of the E&Y Claims pursuant to section 11.1 of the Plan shall become effective upon the satisfaction of certain conditions precedent, including court approval of the terms of the E&Y Settlement, the terms and scope of the E&Y Release and the Settlement Trust Order and the granting of the Settlement Trust Order.

[24] Paragraph 41 of the draft Sanction Order also provides that any Named Third Party Defendant Settlement, Named Third Party Defendant Settlement Order and Named Third Party Defendant Release, the terms and scope of which remain in each case subject to further court approval in accordance with the Plan, shall only become effective after the Plan Implementation Date and upon the satisfaction of the conditions precedent, set forth in section 11.2 of the Plan.

[25] The requested Sanction Order confirms my view that the arguments put forth by counsel on behalf of the Funds are premature and can be addressed on the return of the motion to approve the specific settlements and releases.

[26] In the result, I have not been persuaded that the adjournment is necessary. The motion for the adjournment is accordingly denied.

MORAWETZ J.

Date: December 10, 2012

CITATION: Sino-Forest Corporation (Re), 2012 ONSC 7050
COURT FILE NO.: CV-12-9667-00CL
DATE: 20121212

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

RE: 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, Applicant

BEFORE: MORAWETZ J.

COUNSEL: Robert W. Staley, Kevin Zych, Derek J. Bell and Jonathan Bell, for Sino-Forest Corporation

Derrick Tay, Jennifer Stam, and Cliff Prophet for the Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Robert Chadwick and Brendan O'Neill, for the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders

Kenneth Rosenberg, Kirk Baert, Max Starnino, and A. Dimitri Lascaris, for the Class Action Plaintiffs

Won J. Kim, James C. Orr, Michael C. Spencer, and Megan B. McPhee, for Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments LP and Comité Syndicale Nationale de Retraite Bâtirente Inc.

Peter Griffin, Peter Osborne and Shara Roy, for Ernst & Young Inc.

Peter Greene and Ken Dekkar, for BDO Limited

Edward A. Sellers and Larry Lowenstein, for the Board of Directors of Sino-Forest Corporation

John Pirie and David Gadsden, for Poyry (Beijing)

James Doris, for the Plaintiff in the New York Class Action

David Bish, for the Underwriters

Simon Bieber and Erin Pleet, for David Horsley

James Grout, for the Ontario Securities Commission

Emily Cole and Joseph Marin, for Allen Chau

Susan E. Freedman and Brandon Barnes, for Kai Kit Poon

Paul Emerson, for ACE/Chubb

Sam Sasso, for Travelers

HEARD: **DECEMBER 7, 2012**

ENDORSED: DECEMBER 10, 2012

REASONS: DECEMBER 12, 2012

ENDORSEMENT

[1] On December 10, 2012, I released an endorsement granting this motion with reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

Overview

[2] The Applicant, Sino-Forest Corporation ("SFC"), seeks an order sanctioning (the "Sanction Order") a plan of compromise and reorganization dated December 3, 2012 as modified, amended, varied or supplemented in accordance with its terms (the "Plan") pursuant to section 6 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA").

[3] With the exception of one party, SFC's position is either supported or is not opposed.

[4] Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments LP and Comité Syndicale Nationale de Retraite Bâtirente Inc. (collectively, the "Funds") object to the proposed Sanction Order. The Funds requested an adjournment for a period of one month. I denied the Funds' adjournment request in a separate endorsement released on December 10, 2012 (*Re Sino-Forest Corporation*, 2012 ONSC 7041). Alternatively, the Funds requested that the Plan be altered so as to remove Article 11 "Settlement of Claims Against Third Party Defendants".

[5] The defined terms have been taken from the motion record.

[6] SFC's counsel submits that the Plan represents a fair and reasonable compromise reached with SFC's creditors following months of negotiation. SFC's counsel submits that the Plan, including its treatment of holders of equity claims, complies with CCAA requirements and is consistent with this court's decision on the equity claims motions (the "Equity Claims Decision") (2012 ONSC 4377, 92 C.B.R. (5th) 99), which was subsequently upheld by the Court of Appeal for Ontario (2012 ONCA 816).

[7] Counsel submits that the classification of creditors for the purpose of voting on the Plan was proper and consistent with the CCAA, existing law and prior orders of this court, including the Equity Claims Decision and the Plan Filing and Meeting Order.

[8] The Plan has the support of the following parties:

(a) the Monitor;

(b) SFC's largest creditors, the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders (the "Ad Hoc Noteholders");

(c) Ernst & Young LLP ("E&Y");

(d) BDO Limited ("BDO"); and

(e) the Underwriters.

[9] The Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities (the "Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee", also referred to as the "Class Action Plaintiffs") has agreed not to oppose the Plan. The Monitor has considered possible alternatives to the Plan, including liquidation and bankruptcy, and has concluded that the Plan is the preferable option.

[10] The Plan was approved by an overwhelming majority of Affected Creditors voting in person or by proxy. In total, 99% in number, and greater than 99% in value, of those Affected Creditors voting favoured the Plan.

[11] Options and alternatives to the Plan have been explored throughout these proceedings. SFC carried out a court-supervised sales process (the "Sales Process"), pursuant to the sales process order (the "Sales Process Order"), to seek out potential qualified strategic and financial purchasers of SFC's global assets. After a canvassing of the market, SFC determined that there were no qualified purchasers offering to acquire its assets for qualified consideration ("Qualified Consideration"), which was set at 85% of the value of the outstanding amount owing under the notes (the "Notes").

[12] SFC's counsel submits that the Plan achieves the objective stated at the commencement of the CCAA proceedings (namely, to provide a "clean break" between the business operations of the global SFC enterprise as a whole ("Sino-Forest") and the problems facing SFC, with the aspiration of saving and preserving the value of SFC's underlying business for the benefit of SFC's creditors).

Facts

[13] SFC is an integrated forest plantation operator and forest products company, with most of its assets and the majority of its business operations located in the southern and eastern regions of the People's Republic of China ("PRC"). SFC's registered office is located in Toronto and its principal business office is located in Hong Kong.

[14] SFC is a holding company with six direct subsidiaries (the "Subsidiaries") and an indirect majority interest in Greenheart Group Limited (Bermuda), a publicly-traded company. Including SFC and the Subsidiaries, there are 137 entities that make up Sino-Forest: 67 companies incorporated in PRC, 58 companies incorporated in British Virgin Islands, 7 companies incorporated in Hong Kong, 2 companies incorporated in Canada and 3 companies incorporated elsewhere.

[15] On June 2, 2011, Muddy Waters LLC ("Muddy Waters"), a short-seller of SFC's securities, released a report alleging that SFC was a "near total fraud" and a "Ponzi scheme". SFC subsequently became embroiled in multiple class actions across Canada and the United States and was subjected to investigations and regulatory proceedings by the Ontario Securities Commission ("OSC"), Hong Kong Securities and Futures Commission and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

[16] SFC was unable to file its 2011 third quarter financial statements, resulting in a default under its note indentures.

[17] Following extensive arm's length negotiations between SFC and the Ad Hoc Noteholders, the parties agreed on a framework for a consensual resolution of SFC's defaults under its note indentures and the restructuring of its business. The parties ultimately entered into a restructuring support agreement (the "Support Agreement") on March 30, 2012, which was initially executed by holders of 40% of the aggregate principal amount of SFC's Notes. Additional consenting noteholders subsequently executed joinder agreements, resulting in noteholders representing a total of more than 72% of aggregate principal amount of the Notes agreeing to support the restructuring.

[18] The restructuring contemplated by the Support Agreement was commercially designed to separate Sino-Forest's business operations from the problems facing the parent holding company outside of PRC, with the intention of saving and preserving the value of SFC's underlying business. Two possible transactions were contemplated:

(a) First, a court-supervised Sales Process to determine if any person or group of persons would purchase SFC's business operations for an amount in excess of the 85% Qualified Consideration;

(b) Second, if the Sales Process was not successful, a transfer of six immediate holding companies (that own SFC's operating business) to an acquisition vehicle to be owned by Affected Creditors in compromise of their claims against SFC. Further, the creation of a litigation trust (including funding) (the "Litigation Trust") to enable SFC's litigation claims against any person not otherwise released within the CCAA proceedings, preserved and pursued for the benefit of SFC's stakeholders in accordance with the Support Agreement (concurrently, the "Restructuring Transaction").

[19] SFC applied and obtained an initial order under the CCAA on March 30, 2012 (the "Initial Order"), pursuant to which a limited stay of proceedings ("Stay of Proceedings") was also granted in respect of the Subsidiaries. The Stay of Proceedings was subsequently extended

by orders dated May 31, September 28, October 10, and November 23, 2012, and unless further extended, will expire on February 1, 2013.

[20] On March 30, 2012, the Sales Process Order was granted. While a number of Letters of Intent were received in respect of this process, none were qualified Letters of Intent, because none of them offered to acquire SFC's assets for the Qualified Consideration. As such, on July 10, 2012, SFC announced the termination of the Sales Process and its intention to proceed with the Restructuring Transaction.

[21] On May 14, 2012, this court granted an order (the "Claims Procedure Order") which approved the Claims Process that was developed by SFC in consultation with the Monitor.

[22] As of the date of filing, SFC had approximately $1.8 billion of principal amount of debt owing under the Notes, plus accrued and unpaid interest. As of May 15, 2012, Noteholders holding in aggregate approximately 72% of the principal amount of the Notes, and representing more than 66.67% of the principal amount of each of the four series of Notes, agreed to support the Plan.

[23] After the Muddy Waters report was released, SFC and certain of its officers, directors and employees, along with SFC's former auditors, technical consultants and Underwriters involved in prior equity and debt offerings, were named as defendants in a number of proposed class action lawsuits. Presently, there are active proposed class actions in four jurisdictions: Ontario, Quebec, Saskatchewan and New York (the "Class Action Claims").

[24] *The Labourers v. Sino-Forest Corporation Class Action* (the "Ontario Class Action") was commenced in Ontario by Koskie Minsky LLP and Siskinds LLP. It has the following two components: first, there is a shareholder claim (the "Shareholder Class Action Claims") brought on behalf of current and former shareholders of SFC seeking damages in the amount of $6.5 billion for general damages, $174.8 million in connection with a prospectus issued in June 2007, $330 million in relation to a prospectus issued in June 2009, and $319.2 million in relation to a prospectus issued in December 2009; second, there is a $1.8 billion noteholder claim (the "Noteholder Class Action Claims") brought on behalf of former holders of SFC's Notes. The noteholder component seeks damages for loss of value in the Notes.

[25] The Quebec Class Action is similar in nature to the Ontario Class Action, and both plaintiffs filed proof of claim in this proceeding. The plaintiffs in the Saskatchewan Class Action did not file a proof of claim in this proceeding, whereas the plaintiffs in the New York Class Action did file a proof of claim in this proceeding. A few shareholders filed proofs of claim separately, but no proof of claim was filed by the Funds.

[26] In this proceeding, the Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee - represented by Siskinds LLP, Koskie Minsky, and Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP - has appeared to represent the interests of the shareholders and noteholders who have asserted Class Action Claims against SFC and others.

[27] Since 2000, SFC has had the following two auditors ("Auditors"): E&Y from 2000 to 2004 and 2007 to 2012 and BDO from 2005 to 2006.

[28] The Auditors have asserted claims against SFC for contribution and indemnity for any amounts paid or payable in respect of the Shareholder Class Action Claims, with each of the Auditors having asserted claims in excess of $6.5 billion. The Auditors have also asserted indemnification claims in respect the Noteholder Class Action Claims.

[29] The Underwriters have similarly filed claims against SFC seeking contribution and indemnity for the Shareholder Class Action Claims and Noteholder Class Action Claims.

[30] The Ontario Securities Commission ("OSC") has also investigated matters relating to SFC. The OSC has advised that they are not seeking any monetary sanctions against SFC and are not seeking monetary sanctions in excess of $100 million against SFC's directors and officers (this amount was later reduced to $84 million).

[31] SFC has very few trade creditors by virtue of its status as a holding company whose business is substantially carried out through its Subsidiaries in PRC and Hong Kong.

[32] On June 26, 2012, SFC brought a motion for an order declaring that all claims made against SFC arising in connection with the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest in SFC and related indemnity claims to be "equity claims" (as defined in section 2 of the CCAA). These claims encapsulate the commenced Shareholder Class Action Claims asserted against SFC. The Equity Claims Decision did not purport to deal with the Noteholder Class Action Claims.

[33] In reasons released on July 27, 2012, I granted the relief sought by SFC in the Equity Claims Decision, finding that the "the claims advanced in the shareholder claims are clearly equity claims." The Auditors and Underwriters appealed the decision and on November 23, 2012, the Court of Appeal for Ontario dismissed the appeal.

[34] On August 31, 2012, an order was issued approving the filing of the Plan (the "Plan Filing and Meeting Order").

[35] According to SFC's counsel, the Plan endeavours to achieve the following purposes:

(a) to effect a full, final and irrevocable compromise, release, discharge, cancellation and bar of all affected claims;

(b) to effect the distribution of the consideration provided in the Plan in respect of proven claims;

(c) to transfer ownership of the Sino-Forest business to Newco and then to Newco II, in each case free and clear of all claims against SFC and certain related claims against the Subsidiaries so as to enable the Sino-Forest business to continue on a viable, going concern basis for the benefit of the Affected Creditors; and

(d) to allow Affected Creditors and Noteholder Class Action Claimants to benefit from contingent value that may be derived from litigation claims to be advanced by the litigation trustee.

[36] Pursuant to the Plan, the shares of Newco ("Newco Shares") will be distributed to the Affected Creditors. Newco will immediately transfer the acquired assets to Newco II.

[37] SFC's counsel submits that the Plan represents the best available outcome in the circumstances and those with an economic interest in SFC, when considered as a whole, will derive greater benefit from the implementation of the Plan and the continuation of the business as a going concern than would result from bankruptcy or liquidation of SFC. Counsel further submits that the Plan fairly and equitably considers the interests of the Third Party Defendants, who seek indemnity and contribution from SFC and its Subsidiaries on a contingent basis, in the event that they are found to be liable to SFC's stakeholders. Counsel further notes that the three most significant Third Party Defendants (E&Y, BDO and the Underwriters) support the Plan.

[38] SFC filed a version of the Plan in August 2012. Subsequent amendments were made over the following months, leading to further revised versions in October and November 2012, and a final version dated December 3, 2012 which was voted on and approved at the meeting. Further amendments were made to obtain the support of E&Y and the Underwriters. BDO availed itself of those terms on December 5, 2012.

[39] The current form of the Plan does not settle the Class Action Claims. However, the Plan does contain terms that would be engaged if certain conditions are met, including if the class action settlement with E&Y receives court approval.

[40] Affected Creditors with proven claims are entitled to receive distributions under the Plan of (i) Newco Shares, (ii) Newco notes in the aggregate principal amount of U.S. $300 million that are secured and guaranteed by the subsidiary guarantors (the "Newco Notes"), and (iii) Litigation Trust Interests.

[41] Affected Creditors with proven claims will be entitled under the Plan to: (a) their *pro rata* share of 92.5% of the Newco Shares with early consenting noteholders also being entitled to their *pro rata* share of the remaining 7.5% of the Newco Shares; and (b) their *pro rata* share of the Newco Notes. Affected Creditors with proven claims will be concurrently entitled to their *pro rata* share of 75% of the Litigation Trust Interests; the Noteholder Class Action Claimants will be entitled to their *pro rata* share of the remaining 25% of the Litigation Trust Interests.

[42] With respect to the indemnified Noteholder Class Action Claims, these relate to claims by former noteholders against third parties who, in turn, have alleged corresponding indemnification claims against SFC. The Class Action Plaintiffs have agreed that the aggregate amount of those former noteholder claims will not exceed the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit of $150 million. In turn, indemnification claims of Third Party Defendants against SFC with respect to indemnified Noteholder Class Action Claims are also limited to the $150 million Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit.

[43] The Plan includes releases for, among others, (a) the subsidiary; (b) the Underwriters' liability for Noteholder Class Action Claims in excess of the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit; (c) E&Y in the event that all of the preconditions to the E&Y settlement with the Ontario Class Action plaintiffs are met; and (d) certain current and former directors and officers of SFC (collectively, the "Named Directors and Officers"). It was emphasized that non-released

D&O Claims (being claims for fraud or criminal conduct), conspiracy claims and section 5.1 (2) D&O Claims are not being released pursuant to the Plan.

[44] The Plan also contemplates that recovery in respect of claims of the Named Directors and Officers of SFC in respect of any section 5.1 (2) D&O Claims and any conspiracy claims shall be directed and limited to insurance proceeds available from SFC's maintained insurance policies.

[45] The meeting was carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Plan Filing and Meeting Order and that the meeting materials were sent to stakeholders in the manner required by the Plan Filing and Meeting Order. The Plan supplement was authorized and distributed in accordance with the Plan Filing and Meeting Order.

[46] The meeting was ultimately held on December 3, 2012 and the results of the meeting were as follows:

(a) the number of voting claims that voted on the Plan and their value for and against the Plan;

(b) The results of the Meeting were as follows:

a. the number of Voting Claims that voted on the Plan and their value for and against the Plan:

	Number of Votes	%	Value of Votes	%
Total Claims Voting For	250	98.81%	$ 1,465,766,204	99.97%
Total Claims Voting Against	3	1.19%	$ 414,087	0.03%
Total Claims Voting	253	100.00%	$ 1,466,180,291	100.00%

b. the number of votes for and against the Plan in connection with Class Action Indemnity Claims in respect of Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Claims up to the Indemnified Noteholder Limit:

	Vote For	Vote Against	Total Votes
Class Action Indemnity Claims	4	1	5

c. the number of Defence Costs Claims votes for and against the Plan and their value:

	Number of Votes	%	Value of Votes	%
Total Claims Voting For	12	92.31%	$ 8,375,016	96.10%
Total Claims Voting Against	1	7.69%	$ 340,000	3.90%
Total Claims Voting	13	100.00%	$ 8,715,016	100.00%

d. the overall impact on the approval of the Plan if the count were to include Total Unresolved Claims (including Defence Costs Claims) and, in order to demonstrate the "worst case scenario" if the entire $150 million of the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit had been voted a "no" vote (even

though 4 of 5 votes were "yes" votes and the remaining "no" vote was from BDO, who has now agreed to support the Plan):

	Number of Votes	%	Value of Votes	%
Total Claims Voting For	263	98.50%	$ 1,474,149,082	90.72%
Total Claims Voting Against	4	1.50%	$ 150,754,087	9.28%
Total Claims Voting	267	100.00%	$ 1,624,903,169	100.00%

[47] E&Y has now entered into a settlement ("E&Y Settlement") with the Ontario plaintiffs and the Quebec plaintiffs, subject to several conditions and approval of the E&Y Settlement itself.

[48] As noted in the endorsement dated December 10, 2012, which denied the Funds' adjournment request, the E&Y Settlement does not form part of the Sanction Order and no relief is being sought on this motion with respect to the E&Y Settlement. Rather, section 11.1 of the Plan contains provisions that provide a framework pursuant to which a release of the E&Y claims under the Plan will be effective if several conditions are met. That release will only be granted if all conditions are met, including further court approval.

[49] Further, SFC's counsel acknowledges that any issues relating to the E&Y Settlement, including fairness, continuing discovery rights in the Ontario Class Action or Quebec Class Action, or opt out rights, are to dealt with at a further court-approval hearing.

Law and Argument

[50] Section 6(1) of the CCAA provides that courts may sanction a plan of compromise if the plan has achieved the support of a majority in number representing two-thirds in value of the creditors.

[51] To establish the court's approval of a plan of compromise, the debtor company must establish the following:

(a) there has been strict compliance with all statutory requirements and adherence to previous orders of the court;

(b) nothing has been done or purported to be done that is not authorized by the CCAA; and

(c) the plan is fair and reasonable.

(See *Re Canadian Airlines Corporation*, 2000 ABQB 442, leave to appeal denied, 2000 ABCA 238, aff'd 2001 ABCA 9, leave to appeal to SCC refused July 21, 2001, [2001] S.C.C.A. No. 60 and Re Nelson Financial Group Limited, 2011 ONSC 2750, 79 C.B.R. (5th) 307).

[52] SFC submits that there has been strict compliance with all statutory requirements.

[53] On the initial application, I found that SFC was a "debtor company" to which the CCAA applies. SFC is a corporation continued under the *Canada Business Corporations Act* ("CBCA") and is a "company" as defined in the CCAA. SFC was "reasonably expected to run out of

liquidity within a reasonable proximity of time" prior to the Initial Order and, as such, was and continues to be insolvent. SFC has total claims and liabilities against it substantially in excess of the $5 million statutory threshold.

[54] The Notice of Creditors' Meeting was sent in accordance with the Meeting Order and the revised Noteholder Mailing Process Order and, further, the Plan supplement and the voting procedures were posted on the Monitor's website and emailed to each of the ordinary Affected Creditors. It was also delivered by email to the Trustees and DTC, as well as to Globic who disseminated the information to the Registered Noteholders. The final version of the Plan was emailed to the Affected Creditors, posted on the Monitor's website, and made available for review at the meeting.

[55] SFC also submits that the creditors were properly classified at the meeting as Affected Creditors constituted a single class for the purposes of considering the voting on the Plan. Further, and consistent with the Equity Claims Decision, equity claimants constituted a single class but were not entitled to vote on the Plan. Unaffected Creditors were not entitled to vote on the Plan.

[56] Counsel submits that the classification of creditors as a single class in the present case complies with the commonality of interests test. See *Re Canadian Airlines Corporation.*

[57] Courts have consistently held that relevant interests to consider are the legal interests of the creditors hold *qua* creditor in relationship to the debtor prior to and under the plan. Further, the commonality of interests should be considered purposively, bearing in mind the object of the CCAA, namely, to facilitate reorganizations if possible. See *Stelco Inc.* (2005), 78 O.R. (3d) 241 (Ont. C.A.), *Re Canadian Airlines Corporation*, and *Re Nortel Networks Corporation* (2009) O.J. No. 2166 (Ont. S.C.). Further, courts should resist classification approaches that potentially jeopardize viable plans.

[58] In this case, the Affected Creditors voted in one class, consistent with the commonality of interests among Affected Creditors, considering their legal interests as creditors. The classification was consistent with the Equity Claims Decision.

[59] I am satisfied that the meeting was properly constituted and the voting was properly carried out. As described above, 99% in number, and more than 99% in value, voting at the meeting favoured the Plan.

[60] SFC's counsel also submits that SFC has not taken any steps unauthorized by the CCAA or by court orders. SFC has regularly filed affidavits and the Monitor has provided regular reports and has consistently opined that SFC is acting in good faith and with due diligence. The court has so ruled on this issue on every stay extension order that has been granted.

[61] In *Nelson Financial,* I articulated relevant factors on the sanction hearing. The following list of factors is similar to those set out in *Re Canwest Global Communications Corporation*, 2010 ONSC 4209, 70 C.B.R. (5th) 1:

1. The claims must have been properly classified, there must be no secret arrangements to give an advantage to a creditor or creditor; the approval of the plan by the requisite majority of creditors is most important;

2. It is helpful if the Monitor or some other disinterested person has prepared an analysis of anticipated receipts and liquidation or bankruptcy;

3. If other options or alternatives have been explored and rejected as workable, this will be significant;

4. Consideration of the oppression rights of certain creditors; and

5. Unfairness to shareholders.

6. The court will consider the public interest.

[62] The Monitor has considered the liquidation and bankruptcy alternatives and has determined that it does not believe that liquidation or bankruptcy would be a preferable alternative to the Plan. There have been no other viable alternatives presented that would be acceptable to SFC and to the Affected Creditors. The treatment of shareholder claims and related indemnity claims are, in my view, fair and consistent with CCAA and the Equity Claims Decision.

[63] In addition, 99% of Affected Creditors voted in favour of the Plan and the Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee have agreed not to oppose the Plan. I agree with SFC's submission to the effect that these are exercises of those parties' business judgment and ought not to be displaced.

[64] I am satisfied that the Plan provides a fair and reasonable balance among SFC's stakeholders while simultaneously providing the ability for the Sino-Forest business to continue as a going concern for the benefit of all stakeholders.

[65] The Plan adequately considers the public interest. I accept the submission of counsel that the Plan will remove uncertainty for Sino-Forest's employees, suppliers, customers and other stakeholders and provide a path for recovery of the debt owed to SFC's non-subordinated creditors. In addition, the Plan preserves the rights of aggrieved parties, including SFC through the Litigation Trust, to pursue (in litigation or settlement) those parties that are alleged to share some or all of the responsibility for the problems that led SFC to file for CCAA protection. In addition, releases are not being granted to individuals who have been charged by OSC staff, or to other individuals against whom the Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee wishes to preserve litigation claims.

[66] In addition to the consideration that is payable to Affected Creditors, Early Consent Noteholders will receive their *pro rata* share of an additional 7.5% of the Newco Shares ("Early Consent Consideration"). Plans do not need to provide the same recovery to all creditors to be considered fair and reasonable and there are several plans which have been sanctioned by the courts featuring differential treatment for one creditor or one class of creditors. See, for example, *Canwest Global* and *Re Armbro Enterprises Inc.* (1993), 22 C.B.R. (3d) 80 (Ont. Gen.

Div.). A common theme permeating such cases has been that differential treatment does not necessarily result in a finding that the Plan is unfair, as long as there is a sufficient rational explanation.

[67] In this case, SFC's counsel points out that the Early Consent Consideration has been a feature of the restructuring since its inception. It was made available to any and all noteholders and noteholders who wished to become Early Consent Noteholders were invited and permitted to do so until the early consent deadline of May 15, 2012. I previously determined that SFC made available to the noteholders all information needed to decide whether they should sign a joinder agreement and receive the Early Consent Consideration, and that there was no prejudice to the noteholders in being put to that election early in this proceeding.

[68] As noted by SFC's counsel, there was a rational purpose for the Early Consent Consideration. The Early Consent Noteholders supported the restructuring through the CCAA proceedings which, in turn, provided increased confidence in the Plan and facilitated the negotiations and approval of the Plan. I am satisfied that this feature of the Plan is fair and reasonable.

[69] With respect to the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit, I have considered SFC's written submissions and accept that the $150 million agreed-upon amount reflects risks faced by both sides. The selection of a $150 million cap reflects the business judgment of the parties making assessments of the risk associated with the noteholder component of the Ontario Class Action and, in my view, is within the "general range of acceptability on a commercially reasonable basis". See *Re Ravelston Corporation,* (2005) 14 C.B.R. (5th) 207 (Ont. S.C). Further, as noted by SFC's counsel, while the New York Class Action Plaintiffs filed a proof of claim, they have not appeared in this proceeding and have not stated any opposition to the Plan, which has included this concept since its inception.

[70] Turning now to the issue of releases of the Subsidiaries, counsel to SFC submits that the unchallenged record demonstrates that there can be no effective restructuring of SFC's business and separation from its Canadian parent if the claims asserted against the Subsidiaries arising out of or connected to claims against SFC remain outstanding. The Monitor has examined all of the releases in the Plan and has stated that it believes that they are fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

[71] The Court of Appeal in *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corporation*, 2008 ONCA 587, 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163 stated that the "court has authority to sanction plans incorporating third party releases that are reasonably related to the proposed restructuring".

[72] In this case, counsel submits that the release of Subsidiaries is necessary and essential to the restructuring of SFC. The primary purpose of the CCAA proceedings was to extricate the business of Sino-Forest, through the operation of SFC's Subsidiaries (which were protected by the Stay of Proceedings), from the cloud of uncertainty surrounding SFC. Accordingly, counsel submits that there is a clear and rational connection between the release of the Subsidiaries in the Plan. Further, it is difficult to see how any viable plan could be made that does not cleanse the Subsidiaries of the claims made against SFC.

[73] Counsel points out that the Subsidiaries who are to have claims against them released are contributing in a tangible and realistic way to the Plan. The Subsidiaries are effectively contributing their assets to SFC to satisfy SFC's obligations under their guarantees of SFC's note indebtedness, for the benefit of the Affected Creditors. As such, counsel submits the releases benefit SFC and the creditors generally.

[74] In my view, the basis for the release falls within the guidelines previously set out by this court in *ATB Financial, Re Nortel Networks*, 2010 ONSC 1708, and *Re Kitchener Frame Limited*, 2012 ONSC 234, 86 C.B.R. (5th) 274. Further, it seems to me that the Plan cannot succeed without the releases of the Subsidiaries. I am satisfied that the releases are fair and reasonable and are rationally connected to the overall purpose of the Plan.

[75] With respect to the Named Directors and Officers release, counsel submits that this release is necessary to effect a greater recovery for SFC's creditors, rather than having those directors and officers assert indemnity claims against SFC. Without these releases, the quantum of the unresolved claims reserve would have to be materially increased and, to the extent that any such indemnity claim was found to be a proven claim, there would have been a corresponding dilution of consideration paid to Affected Creditors.

[76] It was also pointed out that the release of the Named Directors and Officers is not unlimited; among other things, claims for fraud or criminal conduct, conspiracy claims, and section 5.1 (2) D&O Claims are excluded.

[77] I am satisfied that there is a reasonable connection between the claims being compromised and the Plan to warrant inclusion of this release.

[78] Finally, in my view, it is necessary to provide brief comment on the alternative argument of the Funds, namely, the Plan be altered so as to remove Article 11 "Settlement of Claims Against Third Party Defendants". The Plan was presented to the meeting with Article 11 in place. This was the Plan that was subject to the vote and this is the Plan that is the subject of this motion. The alternative proposed by the Funds was not considered at the meeting and, in my view, it is not appropriate to consider such an alternative on this motion.

Disposition

[79] Having considered the foregoing, I am satisfied that SFC has established that:

(i) there has been strict compliance with all statutory requirements and adherence to the previous orders of the court;

(ii) nothing has been done or purported to be done that is not authorized by the CCAA; and

(iii) the Plan is fair and reasonable.

[80] Accordingly, the motion is granted and the Plan is sanctioned. An order has been signed substantially in the form of the draft Sanction Order.

MORAWETZ J.

Date: December 12, 2012

TAB C

CITATION: Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada v. Sino-Forest Corporation, 2013 ONSC 1078
COURT FILE NO.: CV-12-9667-00CL
CV-11-431153-00CP
DATE: 20130320

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

RE: 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, Applicant

AND RE: THE TRUSTEES OF THE LABOURERS' PENSION FUND OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN CANADA, THE TRUSTEES OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS LOCAL 793 PENSION PLAN FOR OPERATING ENGINEERS IN ONTARIO, SJUNDE AP-FONDEN, DAVID GRANT AND ROBERT WONG, Plaintiffs

AND:

SINO-FOREST CORPORATION, ERNST & YOUNG LLP, BDO LIMITED (FORMERLY KNOWN AS BDO MCCABE LO LIMITED), ALLEN T.Y. CHAN, W. JUDSON MARTIN, KAI KIT POON, DAVID J. HORSLEY, WILLIAM E. ARDELL, JAMES P. BOWLAND, JAMES M.E. HYDE, EDMUND MAK, SIMON MURRAY, PETER WANG, GARRY J. WEST, PÖYRY (BEIJING) CONSULTING COMPANY LIMITED, CREDIT SUISSE SECURITIES (CANADA) IN., TD SECURITIES INC., DUNDEE SECURITIES CORPORATION, RBC DOMINION SECURITIES INC., SCOTIA CAPITAL INC., CIBC WORLD MARKETS INC., MERRILL LUNCH CANADA INC., CANACCORD FINANCIAL LTD., MAISON PLACEMENTS CANADA INC., CREDIT SUISSE SECURITIES (USA) LLC AND MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH INCORPORATED (SUCCESSOR BY MERGER TO BANC OF AMERICA SECURITIES LLC), Defendants

BEFORE: MORAWETZ J.

COUNSEL: Kenneth Rosenberg, Max Starnino, A. Dimitri Lascaris, Daniel Bach, Charles M. Wright, and Jonathan Ptak, for the Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers including the Class Action Plaintiffs

Peter Griffin, Peter Osborne, and Shara Roy, for Ernst & Young LLP

John Pirie and David Gadsden, for Pöyry (Beijing) Consulting Company Ltd.

Robert W. Staley, for Sino-Forest Corporation

Won J. Kim, Michael C. Spencer, and Megan B. McPhee, for the Objectors, Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments LP and Comité Syndical National de Retraite Bâtirente Inc.

John Fabello and Rebecca Wise for the Underwriters

Ken Dekker and Peter Greene, for BDO Limited

Emily Cole and Joseph Marin, for Allen Chan

James Doris, for the U.S. Class Action

Brandon Barnes, for Kai Kit Poon

Robert Chadwick and Brendan O'Neill, for the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders

Derrick Tay and Cliff Prophet for the Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Simon Bieber, for David Horsley

James Grout, for the Ontario Securities Commission

Miles D. O'Reilly, Q.C., for the Junior Objectors, Daniel Lam and Senthilvel Kanagaratnam

HEARD: **FEBRUARY 4, 2013**

ENDORSEMENT

INTRODUCTION

[1] The Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities (the "Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers' Committee" or the "Applicant"), including the representative plaintiffs in the Ontario class action (collectively, the "Ontario Plaintiffs"), bring this motion for approval of a settlement and release of claims against Ernst & Young LLP [the "Ernst & Young Settlement", the "Ernst & Young Release", the "Ernst & Young Claims" and "Ernst & Young", as further defined in the Plan of Compromise and Reorganization of Sino-Forest Corporation ("SFC") dated December 3, 2012 (the "Plan")].

[2] Approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement is opposed by Invesco Canada Limited ("Invesco"), Northwest and Ethical Investments L.P. ("Northwest"), Comité Syndical National de Retraite Bâtirente Inc. ("Bâtirente"), Matrix Asset Management Inc. ("Matrix"), Gestion

Férique and Montrusco Bolton Investments Inc. ("Montrusco") (collectively, the "Objectors"). The Objectors particularly oppose the no-opt-out and full third-party release features of the Ernst & Young Settlement. The Objectors also oppose the motion for a representation order sought by the Ontario Plaintiffs, and move instead for appointment of the Objectors to represent the interests of all objectors to the Ernst & Young Settlement.

[3] For the following reasons, I have determined that the Ernst & Young Settlement, together with the Ernst & Young Release, should be approved.

FACTS

Class Action Proceedings

[4] SFC is an integrated forest plantation operator and forest productions company, with most of its assets and the majority of its business operations located in the southern and eastern regions of the People's Republic of China. SFC's registered office is in Toronto, and its principal business office is in Hong Kong.

[5] SFC's shares were publicly traded over the Toronto Stock Exchange. During the period from March 19, 2007 through June 2, 2011, SFC made three prospectus offerings of common shares. SFC also issued and had various notes (debt instruments) outstanding, which were offered to investors, by way of offering memoranda, between March 19, 2007 and June 2, 2011.

[6] All of SFC's debt or equity public offerings have been underwritten. A total of 11 firms (the "Underwriters") acted as SFC's underwriters, and are named as defendants in the Ontario class action.

[7] Since 2000, SFC has had two auditors: Ernst & Young, who acted as auditor from 2000 to 2004 and 2007 to 2012, and BDO Limited ("BDO"), who acted as auditor from 2005 to 2006. Ernst & Young and BDO are named as defendants in the Ontario class action.

[8] Following a June 2, 2011 report issued by short-seller Muddy Waters LLC ("Muddy Waters"), SFC, and others, became embroiled in investigations and regulatory proceedings (with the Ontario Securities Commission (the "OSC"), the Hong Kong Securities and Futures Commission and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police) for allegedly engaging in a "complex fraudulent scheme". SFC concurrently became embroiled in multiple class action proceedings across Canada, including Ontario, Quebec and Saskatchewan (collectively, the "Canadian Actions"), and in New York (collectively with the Canadian Actions, the "Class Action Proceedings"), facing allegations that SFC, and others, misstated its financial results, misrepresented its timber rights, overstated the value of its assets and concealed material information about its business operations from investors, causing the collapse of an artificially inflated share price.

[9] The Canadian Actions are comprised of two components: first, there is a shareholder claim, brought on behalf of SFC's current and former shareholders, seeking damages in the amount of $6.5 billion for general damages, $174.8 million in connection with a prospectus issued in June 2007, $330 million in relation to a prospectus issued in June 2009, and $319.2 million in relation to a prospectus issued in December 2009; and second, there is a noteholder

claim, brought on behalf of former holders of SFC's notes (the "Noteholders"), in the amount of approximately $1.8 billion. The noteholder claim asserts, among other things, damages for loss of value in the notes.

[10] Two other class proceedings relating to SFC were subsequently commenced in Ontario: *Smith et al. v. Sino-Forest Corporation et al.*, which commenced on June 8, 2011; and *Northwest and Ethical Investments L.P. et al. v. Sino-Forest Corporation et al.*, which commenced on September 26, 2011.

[11] In December 2011, there was a motion to determine which of the three actions in Ontario should be permitted to proceed and which should be stayed (the "Carriage Motion"). On January 6, 2012, Perell J. granted carriage to the Ontario Plaintiffs, appointed Siskinds LLP and Koskie Minsky LLP to prosecute the Ontario class action, and stayed the other class proceedings.

CCAA Proceedings

[12] SFC obtained an initial order under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA") on March 30, 2012 (the "Initial Order"), pursuant to which a stay of proceedings was granted in respect of SFC and certain of its subsidiaries. Pursuant to an order on May 8, 2012, the stay was extended to all defendants in the class actions, including Ernst & Young. Due to the stay, the certification and leave motions have yet to be heard.

[13] Throughout the CCAA proceedings, SFC asserted that there could be no effective restructuring of SFC's business, and separation from the Canadian parent, if the claims asserted against SFC's subsidiaries arising out of, or connected to, claims against SFC remained outstanding.

[14] In addition, SFC and FTI Consulting Canada Inc. (the "Monitor") continually advised that timing and delay were critical elements that would impact on maximization of the value of SFC's assets and stakeholder recovery.

[15] On May 14, 2012, an order (the "Claims Procedure Order") was issued that approved a claims process developed by SFC, in consultation with the Monitor. In order to identify the nature and extent of the claims asserted against SFC's subsidiaries, the Claims Procedure Order required any claimant that had or intended to assert a right or claim against one or more of the subsidiaries, relating to a purported claim made against SFC, to so indicate on their proof of claim.

[16] The Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers' Committee filed a proof of claim (encapsulating the approximately $7.3 billion shareholder claim and $1.8 billion noteholder claim) in the CCAA proceedings on behalf of all putative class members in the Ontario class action. The plaintiffs in the New York class action filed a proof of claim, but did not specify quantum of damages. Ernst & Young filed a proof of claim for damages and indemnification. The plaintiffs in the Saskatchewan class action did not file a proof of claim. A few shareholders filed proofs of claim separately. No proof of claim was filed by Kim Orr Barristers P.C. ("Kim Orr"), who represent the Objectors.

[17] Prior to the commencement of the CCAA proceedings, the plaintiffs in the Canadian Actions settled with Pöyry (Beijing) Consulting Company Limited ("Pöyry") (the "Pöyry Settlement"), a forestry valuator that provided services to SFC. The class was defined as all persons and entities who acquired SFC's securities in Canada between March 19, 2007 to June 2, 2011, and all Canadian residents who acquired SFC securities outside of Canada during that same period (the "Pöyry Settlement Class").

[18] The notice of hearing to approve the Pöyry Settlement advised the Pöyry Settlement Class that they may object to the proposed settlement. No objections were filed.

[19] Perell J. and Émond J. approved the settlement and certified the Pöyry Settlement Class for settlement purposes. January 15, 2013 was fixed as the date by which members of the Pöyry Settlement Class, who wished to opt-out of either of the Canadian Actions, would have to file an opt-out form for the claims administrator, and they approved the form by which the right to opt-out was required to be exercised.

[20] Notice of the certification and settlement was given in accordance with the certification orders of Perell J. and Émond J. The notice of certification states, in part, that:

> IF YOU CHOOSE TO OPT OUT OF THE CLASS, YOU WILL BE OPTING OUT OF THE **ENTIRE** PROCEEDING. THIS MEANS THAT YOU WILL BE UNABLE TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY FUTURE SETTLEMENT OR JUDGMENT REACHED WITH OR AGAINST THE REMAINING DEFENDANTS.

[21] The opt-out made no provision for an opt-out on a conditional basis.

[22] On June 26, 2012, SFC brought a motion for an order directing that claims against SFC that arose in connection with the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest in SFC, and related indemnity claims, were "equity claims" as defined in section 2 of the CCAA, including the claims by or on behalf of shareholders asserted in the Class Action Proceedings. The equity claims motion did not purport to deal with the component of the Class Action Proceedings relating to SFC's notes.

[23] In reasons released July 27, 2012 [*Re Sino-Forest Corp.*, 2012 ONSC 4377], I granted the relief sought by SFC (the "Equity Claims Decision"), finding that "the claims advanced in the shareholder claims are clearly equity claims". The Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers' Committee did not oppose the motion, and no issue was taken by any party with the court's determination that the shareholder claims against SFC were "equity claims". The Equity Claims Decision was subsequently affirmed by the Court of Appeal for Ontario on November 23, 2012 [*Re Sino-Forest Corp.*, 2012 ONCA 816].

Ernst & Young Settlement

[24] The Ernst & Young Settlement, and third party releases, was not mentioned in the early versions of the Plan. The initial creditors' meeting and vote on the Plan was scheduled to occur on November 29, 2012; when the Plan was amended on November 28, 2012, the creditors' meeting was adjourned to November 30, 2012.

[25] On November 29, 2012, Ernst & Young's counsel and class counsel concluded the proposed Ernst & Young Settlement. The creditors' meeting was again adjourned, to December 3, 2012; on that date, a new Plan revision was released and the Ernst & Young Settlement was publicly announced. The Plan revision featured a new Article 11, reflecting the "framework" for the proposed Ernst & Young Settlement and for third-party releases for named third-party defendants as identified at that time as the Underwriters or in the future.

[26] On December 3, 2012, a large majority of creditors approved the Plan. The Objectors note, however, that proxy materials were distributed weeks earlier and proxies were required to be submitted three days prior to the meeting and it is evident that creditors submitting proxies only had a pre-Article 11 version of the Plan. Further, no equity claimants, such as the Objectors, were entitled to vote on the Plan. On December 6, 2012, the Plan was further amended, adding Ernst & Young and BDO to Schedule A, thereby defining them as named third-party defendants.

[27] Ultimately, the Ernst & Young Settlement provided for the payment by Ernst & Young of $117 million as a settlement fund, being the full monetary contribution by Ernst & Young to settle the Ernst & Young Claims; however, it remains subject to court approval in Ontario, and recognition in Quebec and the United States, and conditional, pursuant to Article 11.1 of the Plan, upon the following steps:

(a) the granting of the sanction order sanctioning the Plan including the terms of the Ernst & Young Settlement and the Ernst & Young Release (which preclude any right to contribution or indemnity against Ernst & Young);

(b) the issuance of the Settlement Trust Order;

(c) the issuance of any other orders necessary to give effect to the Ernst & Young Settlement and the Ernst & Young Release, including the Chapter 15 Recognition Order;

(d) the fulfillment of all conditions precedent in the Ernst & Young Settlement; and

(e) all orders being final orders not subject to further appeal or challenge.

[28] On December 6, 2012, Kim Orr filed a notice of appearance in the CCAA proceedings on behalf of three Objectors: Invesco, Northwest and Bâtirente. These Objectors opposed the sanctioning of the Plan, insofar as it included Article 11, during the Plan sanction hearing on December 7, 2012.

[29] At the Plan sanction hearing, SFC's counsel made it clear that the Plan itself did not embody the Ernst & Young Settlement, and that the parties' request that the Plan be sanctioned did not also cover approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement. Moreover, according to the Plan and minutes of settlement, the Ernst & Young Settlement would not be consummated (*i.e.* money paid and releases effective) unless and until several conditions had been satisfied in the future.

[30] The Plan was sanctioned on December 10, 2012 with Article 11. The Objectors take the position that the Funds' opposition was dismissed as premature and on the basis that nothing in the sanction order affected their rights.

[31] On December 13, 2012, the court directed that its hearing on the Ernst & Young Settlement would take place on January 4, 2013, under both the CCAA and the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*, S.O. 1992, c. 6 ("CPA"). Subsequently, the hearing was adjourned to February 4, 2013.

[32] On January 15, 2013, the last day of the opt-out period established by orders of Perell J. and Émond J., six institutional investors represented by Kim Orr filed opt-out forms. These institutional investors are Northwest and Bâtirente, who were two of the three institutions represented by Kim Orr in the Carriage Motion, as well as Invesco, Matrix, Montrusco and Gestion Ferique (all of which are members of the Pöyry Settlement Class).

[33] According to the opt-out forms, the Objectors held approximately 1.6% of SFC shares outstanding on June 30, 2011 (the day the Muddy Waters report was released). By way of contrast, Davis Selected Advisors and Paulson and Co., two of many institutional investors who support the Ernst & Young Settlement, controlled more than 25% of SFC's shares at this time. In addition, the total number of outstanding objectors constitutes approximately 0.24% of the 34,177 SFC beneficial shareholders as of April 29, 2011.

LAW AND ANALYSIS

Court's Jurisdiction to Grant Requested Approval

[34] The Claims Procedure Order of May 14, 2012, at paragraph 17, provides that any person that does not file a proof of claim in accordance with the order is barred from making or enforcing such claim as against any other person who could claim contribution or indemnity from the Applicant. This includes claims by the Objectors against Ernst & Young for which Ernst & Young could claim indemnity from SFC.

[35] The Claims Procedure Order also provides that the Ontario Plaintiffs are authorized to file one proof of claim in respect of the substance of the matters set out in the Ontario class action, and that the Quebec Plaintiffs are similarly authorized to file one proof of claim in respect of the substance of the matters set out in the Quebec class action. The Objectors did not object to, or oppose, the Claims Procedure Order, either when it was sought or at any time thereafter. The Objectors did not file an independent proof of claim and, accordingly, the Canadian Claimants were authorized to and did file a proof of claim in the representative capacity in respect of the Objectors' claims.

[36] The Ernst & Young Settlement is part of a CCAA plan process. Claims, including contingent claims, are regularly compromised and settled within CCAA proceedings. This includes outstanding litigation claims against the debtor and third parties. Such compromises fully and finally dispose of such claims, and it follows that there are no continuing procedural or other rights in such proceedings. Simply put, there are no "opt-outs" in the CCAA.

[37] It is well established that class proceedings can be settled in a CCAA proceeding. See *Robertson v. ProQuest Information and Learning Co.*, 2011 ONSC 1647 [*Robertson*].

[38] As noted by Pepall J. (as she then was) in *Robertson*, para. 8:

> When dealing with the consensual resolution of a CCAA claim filed in a claims process that arises out of ongoing litigation, typically no court approval is required. In contrast, class proceedings settlements must be approved by the court. The notice and process for dissemination of the settlement agreement must also be approved by the court.

[39] In this case, the notice and process for dissemination have been approved.

[40] The Objectors take the position that approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement would render their opt-out rights illusory; the inherent flaw with this argument is that it is not possible to ignore the CCAA proceedings.

[41] In this case, claims arising out of the class proceedings are claims in the CCAA process. CCAA claims can be, by definition, subject to compromise. The Claims Procedure Order establishes that claims as against Ernst & Young fall within the CCAA proceedings. Thus, these claims can also be the subject of settlement and, if settled, the claims of all creditors in the class can also be settled.

[42] In my view, these proceedings are the appropriate time and place to consider approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement. This court has the jurisdiction in respect of both the CCAA and the CPA.

Should the Court Exercise Its Discretion to Approve the Settlement

[43] Having established the jurisdictional basis to consider the motion, the central inquiry is whether the court should exercise its discretion to approve the Ernst & Young Settlement.

CCAA Interpretation

[44] The CCAA is a "flexible statute", and the court has "jurisdiction to approve major transactions, including settlement agreements, during the stay period defined in the Initial Order". The CCAA affords courts broad jurisdiction to make orders and "fill in the gaps in legislation so as to give effect to the objects of the CCAA." [*Re Nortel Networks Corp.*, 2010 ONSC 1708, paras. 66-70 (*"Re Nortel"*)); *Re Canadian Red Cross Society* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299, 72 O.T.C. 99, para. 43 (Ont. C.J.)]

[45] Further, as the Supreme Court of Canada explained in *Re Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd. [Century Services]*, 2010 SCC 60, para. 58:

> CCAA decisions are often based on discretionary grants of jurisdiction. The incremental exercise of judicial discretion in commercial courts under conditions one practitioner aptly described as "the hothouse of real time litigation" has been the primary method by which the CCAA has been adapted and has evolved to meet contemporary business and social needs (internal citations omitted). ...When large companies encounter difficulty, reorganizations become increasingly complex. CCAA courts have been called upon to innovate accordingly in exercising their jurisdiction beyond merely staying proceedings against the

> Debtor to allow breathing room for reorganization. They have been asked to sanction measures for which there is no explicit authority in the CCAA.

[46] It is also established that third-party releases are not an uncommon feature of complex restructurings under the CCAA [*ATB Financial v. Metcalf and Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*, 2008 ONCA 587 ("*ATB Financial*"); *Re Nortel, supra*; *Robertson, supra*; *Re Muscle Tech Research and Development Inc.* (2007), 30 C.B.R. (5th) 59, 156 A.C.W.S. (3d) 22 (Ontario S.C.J.) ("*Muscle Tech*"); *Re Grace Canada Inc.* (2008), 50 C.B.R. (5th) 25 (Ont. S.C.J.); *Re Allen-Vanguard Corporation*, 2011 ONSC 5017].

[47] The Court of Appeal for Ontario has specifically confirmed that a third-party release is justified where the release forms part of a comprehensive compromise. As Blair J. A. stated in *ATB Financial, supra*:

> 69. In keeping with this scheme and purpose, I do not suggest that any and all releases between creditors of the debtor company seeking to restructure and third parties may be made the subject of a compromise or arrangement between the debtor and its creditors. Nor do I think the fact that the releases may be "necessary" in the sense that the third parties or the debtor may refuse to proceed without them, of itself, advances the argument in favour of finding jurisdiction (although it may well be relevant in terms of the fairness and reasonableness analysis).
>
> 70. The release of the claim in question must be justified as part of the compromise or arrangement between the debtor and its creditors. In short, there must be a reasonable connection between the third party claim being compromised in the plan and the restructuring achieved by the plan to warrant inclusion of the third party release in the plan ...
>
> 71. In the course of his reasons, the application judge made the following findings, all of which are amply supported on the record:
>
> a) The parties to be released are necessary and essential to the restructuring of the debtor;
>
> b) The claims to be released are rationally related to the purpose of the Plan and necessary for it;
>
> c) The Plan cannot succeed without the releases;
>
> d) The parties who are to have claims against them released are contributing in a tangible and realistic way to the Plan; and
>
> e) The Plan will benefit not only the debtor companies but creditor Noteholders generally.
>
> 72. Here, then – as was the case in T&N – there is a close connection between the claims being released and the restructuring proposal. The tort claims arise out of

the sale and distribution of the ABCP Notes and their collapse in value, just as do the contractual claims of the creditors against the debtor companies. The purpose of the restructuring is to stabilize and shore up the value of those notes in the long run. The third parties being released are making separate contributions to enable those results to materialize. Those contributions are identified earlier, at para. 31 of these reasons. The application judge found that the claims being released are not independent of or unrelated to the claims that the Noteholders have against the debtor companies; they are closely connected to the value of the ABCP Notes and are required for the Plan to succeed ...

73. I am satisfied that the wording of the CCAA – construed in light of the purpose, objects and scheme of the Act and in accordance with the modern principles of statutory interpretation – supports the court's jurisdiction and authority to sanction the Plan proposed here, including the contested third-party releases contained in it.

...

78. ... I believe the open-ended CCAA permits third-party releases that are reasonably related to the restructuring at issue because they are encompassed in the comprehensive terms "compromise" and "arrangement" and because of the double-voting majority and court sanctioning statutory mechanism that makes them binding on unwilling creditors.

...

113. At para. 71 above I recited a number of factual findings the application judge made in concluding that approval of the Plan was within his jurisdiction under the CCAA and that it was fair and reasonable. For convenience, I reiterate them here – with two additional findings – because they provide an important foundation for his analysis concerning the fairness and reasonableness of the Plan. The application judge found that:

a) The parties to be released are necessary and essential to the restructuring of the debtor;

b) The claims to be released are rationally related to the purpose of the Plan and necessary for it;

c) The Plan cannot succeed without the releases;

d) The parties who are to have claims against them released are contributing in a tangible and realistic way to the Plan;

e) The Plan will benefit not only the debtor companies but creditor Noteholders generally;

f) The voting creditors who have approved the Plan did so with knowledge of the nature and effect of the releases; and that,

g) The releases are fair and reasonable and not overly broad or offensive to public policy.

[48] Furthermore, in *ATB Financial*, *supra*, para. 111, the Court of Appeal confirmed that parties are entitled to settle allegations of fraud and to include releases of such claims as part of the settlement. It was noted that "there is no legal impediment to granting the release of an antecedent claim in fraud, provided the claim is in the contemplation of the parties to the release at the time it is given".

Relevant CCAA Factors

[49] In assessing a settlement within the CCAA context, the court looks at the following three factors, as articulated in *Robertson*, *supra*:

(a) whether the settlement is fair and reasonable;

(b) whether it provides substantial benefits to other stakeholders; and

(c) whether it is consistent with the purpose and spirit of the CCAA.

[50] Where a settlement also provides for a release, such as here, courts assess whether there is "a reasonable connection between the third party claim being compromised in the plan and the restructuring achieved by the plan to warrant inclusion of the third party release in the plan". Applying this "nexus test" requires consideration of the following factors: [*ATB Financial*, *supra*, para. 70]

(a) Are the claims to be released rationally related to the purpose of the plan?

(b) Are the claims to be released necessary for the plan of arrangement?

(c) Are the parties who have claims released against them contributing in a tangible and realistic way? and

(d) Will the plan benefit the debtor and the creditors generally?

Counsel Submissions

[51] The Objectors argue that the proposed Ernst & Young Release is not integral or necessary to the success of Sino-Forest's restructuring plan, and, therefore, the standards for granting third-party releases in the CCAA are not satisfied. No one has asserted that the parties require the Ernst & Young Settlement or Ernst & Young Release to allow the Plan to go forward; in fact, the Plan has been implemented prior to consideration of this issue. Further, the Objectors contend that the $117 million settlement payment is not essential, or even related, to the restructuring, and that it is concerning, and telling, that varying the end of the Ernst & Young Settlement and Ernst & Young Release to accommodate opt-outs would extinguish the settlement.

[52] The Objectors also argue that the Ernst & Young Settlement should not be approved because it would vitiate opt-out rights of class members, as conferred as follows in section 9 of the CPA: "Any member of a class involved in a class proceeding may opt-out of the proceeding in the manner and within the time specified in the certification order." This right is a fundamental element of procedural fairness in the Ontario class action regime [*Fischer v. IG Investment Management Ltd.*, 2012 ONCA 47, para. 69], and is not a mere technicality or illusory. It has been described as absolute [*Durling v. Sunrise Propane Energy Group Inc.*, 2011 ONSC 266]. The opt-out period allows persons to pursue their self-interest and to preserve their rights to pursue individual actions [*Mangan v. Inco Ltd.*, (1998) 16 C.P.C. (4th) 165 38 O.R. (3d) 703 (Ont. C.J.)].

[53] Based on the foregoing, the Objectors submit that a proposed class action settlement with Ernst & Young should be approved solely under the CPA, as the Pöyry Settlement was, and not through misuse of a third-party release procedure under the CCAA. Further, since the minutes of settlement make it clear that Ernst & Young retains discretion not to accept or recognize normal opt-outs if the CPA procedures are invoked, the Ernst & Young Settlement should not be approved in this respect either.

[54] Multiple parties made submissions favouring the Ernst & Young Settlement (with the accompanying Ernst & Young Release), arguing that it is fair and reasonable in the circumstances, benefits the CCAA stakeholders (as evidenced by the broad-based support for the Plan and this motion) and rationally connected to the Plan.

[55] Ontario Plaintiffs' counsel submits that the form of the bar order is fair and properly balances the competing interests of class members, Ernst & Young and the non-settling defendants as:

(a) class members are not releasing their claims to a greater extent than necessary;

(b) Ernst & Young is ensured that its obligations in connection to the Settlement will conclude its liability in the class proceedings;

(c) the non-settling defendants will not have to pay more following a judgment than they would be required to pay if Ernst & Young remained as a defendant in the action; and

(d) the non-settling defendants are granted broad rights of discovery and an appropriate credit in the ongoing litigation, if it is ultimately determined by the court that there is a right of contribution and indemnity between the co-defendants.

[56] SFC argues that Ernst & Young's support has simplified and accelerated the Plan process, including reducing the expense and management time otherwise to be incurred in litigating claims, and was a catalyst to encouraging many parties, including the Underwriters and BDO, to withdraw their objections to the Plan. Further, the result is precisely the type of compromise that the CCAA is designed to promote; namely, Ernst & Young has provided a tangible and significant contribution to the Plan (notwithstanding any pitfalls in the litigation claims against Ernst & Young) that has enabled SFC to emerge as Newco/NewcoII in a timely way and with potential viability.

[57] Ernst & Young's counsel submits that the Ernst & Young Settlement, as a whole, including the Ernst & Young Release, must be approved or rejected; the court cannot modify the terms of a proposed settlement. Further, in deciding whether to reject a settlement, the court should consider whether doing so would put the settlement in "jeopardy of being unravelled". In this case, counsel submits there is no obligation on the parties to resume discussions and it could be that the parties have reached their limits in negotiations and will backtrack from their positions or abandon the effort.

Analysis and Conclusions

[58] The Ernst & Young Release forms part of the Ernst & Young Settlement. In considering whether the Ernst & Young Settlement is fair and reasonable and ought to be approved, it is necessary to consider whether the Ernst & Young Release can be justified as part of the Ernst & Young Settlement. See *ATB Financial, supra*, para. 70, as quoted above.

[59] In considering the appropriateness of including the Ernst & Young Release, I have taken into account the following.

[60] Firstly, although the Plan has been sanctioned and implemented, a significant aspect of the Plan is a distribution to SFC's creditors. The significant and, in fact, only monetary contribution that can be directly identified, at this time, is the $117 million from the Ernst & Young Settlement. Simply put, until such time as the Ernst & Young Settlement has been concluded and the settlement proceeds paid, there can be no distribution of the settlement proceeds to parties entitled to receive them. It seems to me that in order to effect any distribution, the Ernst & Young Release has to be approved as part of the Ernst & Young Settlement.

[61] Secondly, it is apparent that the claims to be released against Ernst & Young are rationally related to the purpose of the Plan and necessary for it. SFC put forward the Plan. As I outlined in the Equity Claims Decision, the claims of Ernst & Young as against SFC are intertwined to the extent that they cannot be separated. Similarly, the claims of the Objectors as against Ernst & Young are, in my view, intertwined and related to the claims against SFC and to the purpose of the Plan.

[62] Thirdly, although the Plan can, on its face, succeed, as evidenced by its implementation, the reality is that without the approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement, the objectives of the Plan remain unfulfilled due to the practical inability to distribute the settlement proceeds. Further, in the event that the Ernst & Young Release is not approved and the litigation continues, it becomes circular in nature as the position of Ernst & Young, as detailed in the Equity Claims Decision, involves Ernst & Young bringing an equity claim for contribution and indemnity as against SFC.

[63] Fourthly, it is clear that Ernst & Young is contributing in a tangible way to the Plan, by its significant contribution of $117 million.

[64] Fifthly, the Plan benefits the claimants in the form of a tangible distribution. Blair J.A., at paragraph 113 of *ATB Financial, supra*, referenced two further facts as found by the application

judge in that case; namely, the voting creditors who approved the Plan did so with the knowledge of the nature and effect of the releases. That situation is also present in this case.

[65] Finally, the application judge in *ATB Financial*, *supra*, held that the releases were fair and reasonable and not overly broad or offensive to public policy. In this case, having considered the alternatives of lengthy and uncertain litigation, and the full knowledge of the Canadian plaintiffs, I conclude that the Ernst & Young Release is fair and reasonable and not overly broad or offensive to public policy.

[66] In my view, the Ernst & Young Settlement is fair and reasonable, provides substantial benefits to relevant stakeholders, and is consistent with the purpose and spirit of the CCAA. In addition, in my view, the factors associated with the *ATB Financial* nexus test favour approving the Ernst & Young Release.

[67] In *Re Nortel*, *supra*, para. 81, I noted that the releases benefited creditors generally because they "reduced the risk of litigation, protected Nortel against potential contribution claims and indemnity claims and reduced the risk of delay caused by potentially complex litigation and associated depletion of assets to fund potentially significant litigation costs". In this case, there is a connection between the release of claims against Ernst & Young and a distribution to creditors. The plaintiffs in the litigation are shareholders and Noteholders of SFC. These plaintiffs have claims to assert against SFC that are being directly satisfied, in part, with the payment of $117 million by Ernst & Young.

[68] In my view, it is clear that the claims Ernst & Young asserted against SFC, and SFC's subsidiaries, had to be addressed as part of the restructuring. The interrelationship between the various entities is further demonstrated by Ernst & Young's submission that the release of claims by Ernst & Young has allowed SFC and the SFC subsidiaries to contribute their assets to the restructuring, unencumbered by claims totalling billions of dollars. As SFC is a holding company with no material assets of its own, the unencumbered participation of the SFC subsidiaries is crucial to the restructuring.

[69] At the outset and during the CCAA proceedings, the Applicant and Monitor specifically and consistently identified timing and delay as critical elements that would impact on maximization of the value and preservation of SFC's assets.

[70] Counsel submits that the claims against Ernst & Young and the indemnity claims asserted by Ernst & Young would, absent the Ernst & Young Settlement, have to be finally determined before the CCAA claims could be quantified. As such, these steps had the potential to significantly delay the CCAA proceedings. Where the claims being released may take years to resolve, are risky, expensive or otherwise uncertain of success, the benefit that accrues to creditors in having them settled must be considered. See *Re Nortel, supra*, paras. 73 and 81; and *Muscle Tech, supra*, paras. 19-21.

[71] Implicit in my findings is rejection of the Objectors' arguments questioning the validity of the Ernst & Young Settlement and Ernst & Young Release. The relevant consideration is whether a proposed settlement and third-party release sufficiently benefits all stakeholders to justify court approval. I reject the position that the $117 million settlement payment is not

essential, or even related, to the restructuring; it represents, at this point in time, the only real monetary consideration available to stakeholders. The potential to vary the Ernst & Young Settlement and Ernst & Young Release to accommodate opt-outs is futile, as the court is being asked to approve the Ernst & Young Settlement and Ernst & Young Release as proposed.

[72] I do not accept that the class action settlement should be approved solely under the CPA. The reality facing the parties is that SFC is insolvent; it is under CCAA protection, and stakeholder claims are to be considered in the context of the CCAA regime. The Objectors' claim against Ernst & Young cannot be considered in isolation from the CCAA proceedings. The claims against Ernst & Young are interrelated with claims as against SFC, as is made clear in the Equity Claims Decision and Claims Procedure Order.

[73] Even if one assumes that the opt-out argument of the Objectors can be sustained, and opt-out rights fully provided, to what does that lead? The Objectors are left with a claim against Ernst & Young, which it then has to put forward in the CCAA proceedings. Without taking into account any argument that the claim against Ernst & Young may be affected by the claims bar date, the claim is still capable of being addressed under the Claims Procedure Order. In this way, it is again subject to the CCAA fairness and reasonable test as set out in *ATB Financial*, *supra*.

[74] Moreover, CCAA proceedings take into account a class of creditors or stakeholders who possess the same legal interests. In this respect, the Objectors have the same legal interests as the Ontario Plaintiffs. Ultimately, this requires consideration of the totality of the class. In this case, it is clear that the parties supporting the Ernst & Young Settlement are vastly superior to the Objectors, both in number and dollar value.

[75] Although the right to opt-out of a class action is a fundamental element of procedural fairness in the Ontario class action regime, this argument cannot be taken in isolation. It must be considered in the context of the CCAA.

[76] The Objectors are, in fact, part of the group that will benefit from the Ernst & Young Settlement as they specifically seek to reserve their rights to "opt-in" and share in the spoils.

[77] It is also clear that the jurisprudence does not permit a dissenting stakeholder to opt-out of a restructuring. [*Re Sammi Atlas Inc.*, (1998) 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Gen. Div. (Commercial List)).] If that were possible, no creditor would take part in any CCAA compromise where they were to receive less than the debt owed to them. There is no right to opt-out of any CCAA process, and the statute contemplates that a minority of creditors are bound by the plan which a majority have approved and the court has determined to be fair and reasonable.

[78] SFC is insolvent and all stakeholders, including the Objectors, will receive less than what they are owed. By virtue of deciding, on their own volition, not to participate in the CCAA process, the Objectors relinquished their right to file a claim and take steps, in a timely way, to assert their rights to vote in the CCAA proceeding.

[79] Further, even if the Objectors had filed a claim and voted, their minimal 1.6% stake in SFC's outstanding shares when the Muddy Waters report was released makes it highly unlikely that they could have altered the outcome.

[80] Finally, although the Objectors demand a right to conditionally opt-out of a settlement, that right does not exist under the CPA or CCAA. By virtue of the certification order, class members had the ability to opt-out of the class action. The Objectors did not opt-out in the true sense; they purported to create a conditional opt-out. Under the CPA, the right to opt-out is "in the manner and within the time specified in the certification order". There is no provision for a conditional opt-out in the CPA, and Ontario's single opt-out regime causes "no prejudice...to putative class members". [CPA, section 9; *Osmun v. Cadbury Adams Canada Inc.* (2009), 85 C.P.C. (6th) 148, paras. 43-46 (Ont. S.C.J.); and *Eidoo v. Infineon Technologies AG*, 2012 ONSC 7299.]

Miscellaneous

[81] For greater certainty, it is my understanding that the issues raised by Mr. O'Reilly have been clarified such that the effect of this endorsement is that the Junior Objectors will be included with the same status as the Ontario Plaintiffs.

DISPOSITION

[82] In the result, for the foregoing reasons, the motion is granted. A declaration shall issue to the effect that the Ernst & Young Settlement is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances. The Ernst & Young Settlement, together with the Ernst & Young Release, is approved and an order shall issue substantially in the form requested. The motion of the Objectors is dismissed.

MORAWETZ J.

Date: March 20, 2013

TAB D

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

DATE: 20130626
DOCKET: M42068 & M42399

MacFarland, Watt and Epstein JJ.A.

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

BETWEEN

The Trustees of the Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada, the Trustees of the International Union of Operating Engineers Local 793 Pension Plan for Operating Engineers in Ontario, Sjunde Ap-Fonden, David Grant and Robert Wong

Plaintiffs

and

Sino-Forest Corporation, Ernst & Young LLP, BDO Limited (formerly known as BDO McCabe Lo Limited), Allen T.Y. Chan, W. Judson Martin, Kai Kit Poon, David J. Horsley, William E. Ardell, James P. Bowland, James M.E. Hyde, Edmund Mak, Simon Murray, Peter Wang, Garry J. West, Poyry (Beijing) Consulting Company Limited, Credit Suisse Securities (Canada), Inc., TD Securities Inc., Dundee Securities Corporation, RBC Dominion Securities Inc., Scotia Capital Inc., CIBC World Markets Inc., Merrill Lynch Canada Inc., Canaccord Financial Ltd., Maison Placements Canada Inc., Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC and Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Incorported (successor by merger to Banc of America Securities LLC)

Proceedings under the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

Defendants

James C. Orr, Won J. Kim, Megan B. McPhee and Michael C. Spencer, for the moving parties, Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments L.P., and Comité Syndical National de Retraite Bâtirente Inc.

Ken Rosenberg, Massimo Starnino, Jonathan Ptak, Jonathan Bida, Charles M. Wright and A. Dimitri Lascaris, for the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities, including the Representative Plaintiffs in the Ontario Class Action

Benjamin Zarnett, Robert Chadwick and Brendan O'Neill, for the respondent *Ad Hoc* Committee of Noteholders

Peter R. Greene, Kathryn L. Knight and Kenneth A. Dekker, for the responding party DBO Limited

Robert W. Staley, Kevin Zych, Derek J. Bell, Raj Sahni and Jonathan Bell, for Sino-Forest Corporation

David Bish, John Fabello and Adam M. Slavens, for the Underwriters

Derrick Tay, Clifton Prophet and Jennifer Stam, for FTI Consulting Canada Inc., in its capacity as Monitor

Peter H. Griffin, Peter J. Osborne and Shara N. Roy, for Ernst & Young LLP

Heard in writing

On appeal from the orders of Justice Geoffrey B. Morawetz of the Superior Court of Justice, dated December 10, 2012, with reasons reported at 2012 ONSC 7050, and March 20, 2013, with reasons reported at 2013 ONSC 1078.

ENDORSEMENT

[1] Leave to appeal is denied.

[2] The test for granting leave to appeal in *CCAA* proceedings is well-settled. It is to be granted sparingly and only where there are serious and arguable grounds that are of real and significant interest to the parties. In determining

whether leave ought to be granted, this court is required to consider the following four-part inquiry:

- Whether the point on the proposed appeal is of significance to the practice;
- Whether the point is of significance to the action;
- Whether the proposed appeal is *prima facie* meritorious or frivolous; and
- Whether the appeal will unduly hinder the progress of the action.

See *Re Country Style Food Services Inc.* (2002), 158 O.A.C. 30 (C.A.).

[3] In our view the proposed appeals fail to meet this stringent test.

[4] These motions for leave to appeal relate to the supervising judge's approval of a settlement releasing Ernst & Young LLP from any claims arising from its auditing of Sino-Forest Corporation.

[5] The Ernst & Young settlement is part of Sino-Forest's Plan of Compromise and Reorganization ("the Plan") following a bankruptcy triggered by allegations of corporate fraud. The settlement has the support of all parties to the *CCAA* proceedings, including the Monitor, Sino-Forest's creditors and a group of plaintiffs seeking to recover their investment losses in a contemplated, but not yet certified, class action ("the Ontario Plaintiffs").

[6] These motions for leave to appeal are brought by a single group of Sino-Forest investors, collectively known as Invesco, who together held approximately 1.6% of Sino-Forest's outstanding shares at the time of its collapse. Invesco

chose not to participate in any of the *CCAA* proceedings leading to the Ernst & Young settlement. It appeared for the first time at the hearing to sanction the Plan. Invesco objects to the Ernst & Young settlement because it wishes to preserve its right to opt out of any class proceedings and pursue an independent claim against Ernst & Young.

[7] Invesco is represented by Kim Orr LLP, the firm that ranked last in a fight for carriage of the Ontario class action against Sino-Forest and its auditors and underwriters. In January 2012, Perell J. awarded carriage of that action to Koskie Minsky and Siskinds LLP, with the Ontario Plaintiffs as the proposed representative plaintiffs. No appeal was taken from the order of Perell J.

[8] There are two motions for leave to appeal before the court.

- **M42068** – Invesco seeks leave to appeal the supervising judge's order dated December 10, 2012, sanctioning a Plan of Compromise and Reorganization for Sino-Forest (the "Sanction Order")

- **M42399** – Invesco seeks leave to appeal the supervising judge's orders dated March 20, 2013, approving the Ernst & Young settlement and dismissing Invesco's motion for an order to

represent all prospective class members who oppose the settlement (the "Settlement Order" and the "Representation Dismissal Order").

[9] By order of Simmons J.A. dated May 1, 2013, the motion for leave to appeal the Sanction Order was ordered to be consolidated and heard together with the motion for leave to appeal the Settlement Order and the Representation Dismissal Order.

[10] The motions for leave to appeal are opposed by Sino-Forest, the Monitor, Sino-Forest's auditors and underwriters, the Ontario Plaintiffs, and a group representing Sino-Forest's major creditors.

The Sanction Order

[11] The supervising judge dismissed Invesco's arguments opposing the Sanction Order on the ground that, since the settlement was not part of the Plan at that point, its objections were premature. It could raise those objections when the court considered whether or not to approve the settlement.

[12] Invesco did not move to stay this order and the Plan has since been implemented. This proposed appeal is moot, and in any event, we see no basis to interfere with the supervising judge's decision.

The Settlement Order and the Representation Dismissal Order

[13] In approving the settlement, the supervising judge applied the test set out in *Robertson v. ProQuest Information and Learning Co.*, 2011 ONSC 1647. And because the proposed settlement provided for a release to Ernst & Young, he went on to consider the test prescribed by this court in *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe and Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*, 2008 ONCA 587, 92 O.R. (3d) 513, leave to appeal refused, [2008] S.C.C.A. No. 337 (*"ATB Financial"*). He found that the proposed settlement met those requirements. He concluded that the Ernst & Young settlement was fair and reasonable, provided substantial benefits to relevant stakeholders and was consistent with the purpose and spirit of the *CCAA*.

[14] There is no basis on which to interfere with his decision. The issues raised on this proposed appeal are, at their core, the very issues settled by this court in *ATB Financial*.

[15] Having dismissed their objection to the settlement order, it follows that Invesco's motion for a representation order would also be dismissed.

[16] The motions for leave to appeal are dismissed.

[17] Costs are to the responding parties on the motions on a partial indemnity scale fixed in the sum of $1,500 per motion inclusive of disbursements and applicable taxes.

Juriec Feldman J.A.

Daniel Sheppard J.A.

Gloria Epstein J.A.

TAB 4