

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

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

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

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

**BRIEF OF AUTHORITIES OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE OF PURCHASERS OF
THE APPLICANT'S SECURITIES, INCLUDING THE REPRESENTATIVE
PLAINTIFFS IN THE ONTARIO CLASS ACTION**

May 17, 2013

**PALIARE ROLAND ROSENBERG ROTHSTEIN
LLP**

155 Wellington Street West, 35th Floor
Toronto, ON M5V 3H1

Ken Rosenberg (LSUC No. 21102H)
Massimo Starnino (LSUC No. 41048G)
Tel: 416-646-4300 Fax: 416-646-4301
Email: ken.rosenberg@paliareroland.com
Email: max.starnino@paliareroland.com

KOSKIE MINSKY LLP

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

Kirk Baert / Jonathan Bida

Tel: 416-977-8353 Fax: 416-977-3316
Email: kbaert@kmlaw.ca
Email: jbida@kmlaw.ca

SISKINDS LLP

680 Waterloo Street
London, ON N6A 3V8

A. Dimitri Lascaris / Charles M. Wright

Tel: 519-672-2121 Fax: 519-672-6065
Email: dimitri.lascaris@siskinds.com
Email: charles.wright@siskinds.com

**Lawyers for the Ad Hoc Committee of
Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities,
including the Representative Plaintiffs in the
Ontario Class Action**

TO: APPEAL SERVICE LIST

INDEX

INDEX

1. *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*, 2008 ONCA 587
2. *Sino-Forest Corporation (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 4377 [Commercial List]
3. *Sino-Forest Corporation (Re)*, 2012 ONCA 816
4. *Re: Timminco Ltd.*, 2012 ONCA 552
5. *Re Nortel Networks Corp.*, 2010 ONSC 1708 [Commercial List]
6. *Robertson v. ProQuest Information and Learning Co.*, 2011 ONSC 1647 [Commercial List]
7. *Re Muscle Tech Research and Development Inc.* (2007), 30 C.B.R. (5th) 59 (Ont. S.C.J.) [Commercial List]
8. *Re Grace Canada Inc.* (2008), 50 C.B.R. (5th) 25 (Ont. S.C.J.) [Commercial List]
9. *Re Allen-Vanguard Corporation*, 2011 ONSC 501 [Commercial List]
10. *Re Crystallex International Corp.*, 2012 ONCA 404
11. *Re Sammi Atlas Inc.*, (1998) 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Gen. Div.) [Commercial List]

TAB 1

Case Name:

**ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative
Investments II Corp.**

**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 and
Arrangement involving Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative
Investments II Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative
Investments III Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield
Alternative Investments V Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield
Alternative Investments XI Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield
Alternative Investments XII Corp., 4446372 Canada Inc.
and 6932819 Canada Inc., Trustees of the Conduits
Listed In Schedule "A" Hereto**

Between

**The Investors represented on the Pan-Canadian
Investors Committee for Third-Party Structured
Asset-Backed Commercial Paper listed in Schedule "B"
hereto, Applicants (Respondents in Appeal), and
Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.,
Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments III
Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments V
Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments XI
Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments
XII Corp., 6932819 Canada Inc. and 4446372 Canada
Inc., Trustees of the Conduits listed in Schedule "A"
hereto, Respondents (Respondents in Appeal), and
Air Transat A.T. Inc., Transat Tours Canada Inc., The
Jean Coutu Group (PJC) Inc., Aéroports de Montréal
Inc., Aéroports de Montréal Capital Inc., Pomerleau
Ontario Inc., Pomerleau Inc., Labopharm Inc., Domtar
Inc., Domtar Pulp and Paper Products Inc., GIRO Inc.,
Vêtements de sports R.G.R. Inc., 131519 Canada Inc.,
Air Jazz LP, Petrifond Foundation Company Limited,
Petrifond Foundation Midwest Limited, Services
hypothécaires la patrimoniale Inc., TECSYS Inc.,
Société générale de financement du Québec, VibroSystM
Inc., Interquisa Canada L.P., Redcorp Ventures Ltd.,
Jura Energy Corporation, Ivanhoe Mines Ltd., WebTech
Wireless Inc., Wynn Capital Corporation Inc., Hy Bloom**

Inc., Cardacian Mortgage Services, Inc., West Energy Ltd., Sabre Energy Ltd., Petrolifera Petroleum Ltd., Vaquero Resources Ltd. and Standard Energy Inc., Respondents (Appellants)

[2008] O.J. No. 3164

2008 ONCA 587

45 C.B.R. (5th) 163

296 D.L.R. (4th) 135

2008 CarswellOnt 4811

168 A.C.W.S. (3d) 698

240 O.A.C. 245

47 B.L.R. (4th) 123

92 O.R. (3d) 513

Docket: C48969 (M36489)

Ontario Court of Appeal
Toronto, Ontario

J.I. Laskin, E.A. Cronk and R.A. Blair JJ.A.

Heard: June 25-26, 2008.

Judgment: August 18, 2008.

(121 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Proceedings in bankruptcy and insolvency -- Practice and procedure -- General principles -- Legislation -- Interpretation -- Courts -- Jurisdiction -- Federal -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act -- Application by certain creditors opposed to a Plan of Compromise and Arrangement for leave to appeal sanctioning of that Plan -- Pan-Canadian Investors Committee was formed and ultimately put forward the creditor-initiated Plan of Compromise and Arrangement that formed the subject matter of the proceedings -- Plan dealt with liquidity crisis threatening Canadian market in Asset Backed Commercial Paper -- Plan was sanctioned by court -- Leave to appeal allowed and appeal dismissed -- CCAA permitted the inclusion of third party releases in a plan of compromise or arrangement to be sanctioned by the court -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, ss. 4, 6.

Application by certain creditors opposed to a Plan of Compromise and Arrangement for leave to appeal the sanctioning of that Plan. In August 2007, a liquidity crisis threatened the Canadian market in Asset Backed Commercial Paper (ABCP). The crisis was triggered by a loss of confidence amongst investors stemming from the news of widespread defaults on US sub-prime mortgages. By agreement amongst the major Canadian participants, the \$32 billion Canadian market in third-party ABCP was frozen on August 13, 2007, pending an attempt to resolve the crisis through a restructuring of that market. The Pan-Canadian Investors Committee was formed and ultimately put forward the creditor-initiated Plan of Compromise and Arrangement that formed the subject matter of the proceedings. The Plan was sanctioned on June 5, 2008. The applicants raised an important point regarding the permissible scope of restructuring under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act: could the court sanction a Plan that called for creditors to provide releases to third parties who were themselves insolvent and not creditors of the debtor company? They also argued that if the answer to that question was yes, the application judge erred in holding that the Plan, with its particular releases (which barred some claims even in fraud), was fair and reasonable and therefore in sanctioning it under the CCAA.

HELD: Application for leave to appeal allowed and appeal dismissed. The appeal raised issues of considerable importance to restructuring proceedings under the CCAA Canada-wide. There were serious and arguable grounds of appeal and the appeal would not unduly delay the progress of the proceedings. In the circumstances, the criteria for granting leave to appeal were met. Respecting the appeal, the CCAA permitted the inclusion of third party releases in a plan of compromise or arrangement to be sanctioned by the court where the releases were reasonably connected to the proposed restructuring. The wording of the CCAA, construed in light of the purpose, objects and scheme of the Act, supported the court's jurisdiction and authority to sanction the Plan proposed in this case, including the contested third-party releases contained in it. The Plan was fair and reasonable in all the circumstances.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

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

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 4, s. 6

Constitution Act, 1867, R.S.C. 1985, App. II, No. 5, s. 91(21), s. 92(13)

Appeal From:

On appeal from the sanction order of Justice Colin L. Campbell of the Superior Court of Justice, dated June 5, 2008, with reasons reported at [2008] O.J. No. 2265.

Counsel:

See Schedule "A" for the list of counsel.

The judgment of the Court was delivered by

R.A. BLAIR J.A.:--

A. INTRODUCTION

1 In August 2007 a liquidity crisis suddenly threatened the Canadian market in Asset Backed Commercial Paper ("ABCP"). The crisis was triggered by a loss of confidence amongst investors stemming from the news of widespread defaults on U.S. sub-prime mortgages. The loss of confidence placed the Canadian financial market at risk generally and was reflective of an economic volatility worldwide.

2 By agreement amongst the major Canadian participants, the \$32 billion Canadian market in third-party ABCP was frozen on August 13, 2007 pending an attempt to resolve the crisis through a restructuring of that market. The Pan-Canadian Investors Committee, chaired by Purdy Crawford, C.C., Q.C., was formed and ultimately put forward the creditor-initiated Plan of Compromise and Arrangement that forms the subject-matter of these proceedings. The Plan was sanctioned by Colin L. Campbell J. on June 5, 2008.

3 Certain creditors who opposed the Plan seek leave to appeal and, if leave is granted, appeal from that decision. They raise an important point regarding the permissible scope of a restructuring under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 as amended ("CCAA"): can the court sanction a Plan that calls for creditors to provide releases to third parties who are themselves solvent and not creditors of the debtor company? They also argue that, if the answer to this question is yes, the application judge erred in holding that this Plan, with its particular releases (which bar some claims even in fraud), was fair and reasonable and therefore in sanctioning it under the CCAA.

Leave to Appeal

4 Because of the particular circumstances and urgency of these proceedings, the court agreed to collapse an oral hearing for leave to appeal with the hearing of the appeal itself. At the outset of argument we encouraged counsel to combine their submissions on both matters.

5 The proposed appeal raises issues of considerable importance to restructuring proceedings under the CCAA Canada-wide. There are serious and arguable grounds of appeal and -- given the expedited time-table -- the appeal will not unduly delay the progress of the proceedings. I am satisfied that the criteria for granting leave to appeal in CCAA proceedings, set out in such cases as *Re Cineplex Odeon Corp.* (2001), 24 C.B.R. (4th) 21 (Ont. C.A.), and *Re Country Style Food Services* (2002), 158 O.A.C. 30, are met. I would grant leave to appeal.

Appeal

6 For the reasons that follow, however, I would dismiss the appeal.

B. FACTS

The Parties

7 The appellants are holders of ABCP Notes who oppose the Plan. They do so principally on the basis that it requires them to grant releases to third party financial institutions against whom they say they have claims for relief arising out of their purchase of ABCP Notes. Amongst them are an airline, a tour operator, a mining company, a wireless provider, a pharmaceuticals retailer, and several holding companies and energy companies.

8 Each of the appellants has large sums invested in ABCP -- in some cases, hundreds of millions of dollars. Nonetheless, the collective holdings of the appellants -- slightly over \$1 billion -- represent only a small fraction of the more than \$32 billion of ABCP involved in the restructuring.

9 The lead respondent is the Pan-Canadian Investors Committee which was responsible for the creation and negotiation of the Plan on behalf of the creditors. Other respondents include various major international financial institutions, the five largest Canadian banks, several trust companies, and some smaller holders of ABCP product. They participated in the market in a number of different ways.

The ABCP Market

10 Asset Backed Commercial Paper is a sophisticated and hitherto well-accepted financial instrument. It is primarily a form of short-term investment -- usually 30 to 90 days -- typically with a low interest yield only slightly better than that available through other short-term paper from a government or bank. It is said to be "asset backed" because the cash that is used to purchase an ABCP Note is converted into a portfolio of financial assets or other asset interests that in turn provide security for the repayment of the notes.

11 ABCP was often presented by those selling it as a safe investment, somewhat like a guaranteed investment certificate.

12 The Canadian market for ABCP is significant and administratively complex. As of August 2007, investors had placed over \$116 billion in Canadian ABCP. Investors range from individual pensioners to large institutional bodies. On the selling and distribution end, numerous players are involved, including chartered banks, investment houses and other financial institutions. Some of these players participated in multiple ways. The Plan in this proceeding relates to approximately \$32 billion of non-bank sponsored ABCP the restructuring of which is considered essential to the preservation of the Canadian ABCP market.

13 As I understand it, prior to August 2007 when it was frozen, the ABCP market worked as follows.

14 Various corporations (the "Sponsors") would arrange for entities they control ("Conduits") to make ABCP Notes available to be sold to investors through "Dealers" (banks and other investment dealers). Typically, ABCP was issued by series and sometimes by classes within a series.

15 The cash from the purchase of the ABCP Notes was used to purchase assets which were held by trustees of the Conduits ("Issuer Trustees") and which stood as security for repayment of the notes. Financial institutions that sold or provided the Conduits with the assets that secured the ABCP are known as "Asset Providers". To help ensure that investors would be able to redeem their notes, "Liquidity Providers" agreed to provide funds that could be drawn upon to meet the demands of maturing ABCP Notes in certain circumstances. Most Asset Providers were also Liquidity Providers. Many of these banks and financial institutions were also holders of ABCP Notes ("Noteholders"). The Asset and Liquidity Providers held first charges on the assets.

16 When the market was working well, cash from the purchase of new ABCP Notes was also used to pay off maturing ABCP Notes; alternatively, Noteholders simply rolled their maturing notes over into new ones. As I will explain, however, there was a potential underlying predicament with this scheme.

The Liquidity Crisis

17 The types of assets and asset interests acquired to "back" the ABCP Notes are varied and complex. They were generally long-term assets such as residential mortgages, credit card receivables, auto loans, cash collateralized debt obligations and derivative investments such as credit default swaps. Their particular characteristics do not matter for the purpose of this appeal, but they shared a common feature that proved to be the Achilles heel of the ABCP market: because of their long-term nature there was an inherent timing mismatch between the cash they generated and the cash needed to repay maturing ABCP Notes.

18 When uncertainty began to spread through the ABCP marketplace in the summer of 2007, investors stopped buying the ABCP product and existing Noteholders ceased to roll over their maturing notes. There was no cash to redeem those notes. Although calls were made on the Liquidity Providers for payment, most of the Liquidity Providers declined to fund the redemption of the notes, arguing that the conditions for liquidity funding had not been met in the circumstances. Hence the "liquidity crisis" in the ABCP market.

19 The crisis was fuelled largely by a lack of transparency in the ABCP scheme. Investors could not tell what assets were backing their notes -- partly because the ABCP Notes were often sold before or at the same time as the assets backing them were acquired; partly because of the sheer complexity of certain of the underlying assets; and partly because of assertions of confidentiality by those involved with the assets. As fears arising from the spreading U.S. sub-prime mortgage crisis mushroomed, investors became increasingly concerned that their ABCP Notes may be supported by those crumbling assets. For the reasons outlined above, however, they were unable to redeem their maturing ABCP Notes.

The Montreal Protocol

20 The liquidity crisis could have triggered a wholesale liquidation of the assets, at depressed prices. But it did not. During the week of August 13, 2007, the ABCP market in Canada froze -- the result of a standstill arrangement orchestrated on the heels of the crisis by numerous market participants, including Asset Providers, Liquidity Providers, Noteholders and other financial industry representatives. Under the standstill agreement -- known as the Montréal Protocol -- the parties committed to restructuring the ABCP market with a view, as much as possible, to preserving the value of the assets and of the notes.

21 The work of implementing the restructuring fell to the Pan-Canadian Investors Committee, an applicant in the proceeding and respondent in the appeal. The Committee is composed of 17 financial and investment institutions, including chartered banks, credit unions, a pension board, a Crown corporation, and a university board of governors. All 17 members are themselves Noteholders; three of them also participated in the ABCP market in other capacities as well. Between them, they hold about two thirds of the \$32 billion of ABCP sought to be restructured in these proceedings.

22 Mr. Crawford was named the Committee's chair. He thus had a unique vantage point on the work of the Committee and the restructuring process as a whole. His lengthy affidavit strongly informed the application judge's understanding of the factual context, and our own. He was not cross-examined and his evidence is unchallenged.

23 Beginning in September 2007, the Committee worked to craft a plan that would preserve the value of the notes and assets, satisfy the various stakeholders to the extent possible, and restore confidence in an important segment of the Canadian financial marketplace. In March 2008, it and the

other applicants sought CCAA protection for the ABCP debtors and the approval of a Plan that had been pre-negotiated with some, but not all, of those affected by the misfortunes in the Canadian ABCP market.

The Plan

a) Plan Overview

24 Although the ABCP market involves many different players and kinds of assets, each with their own challenges, the committee opted for a single plan. In Mr. Crawford's words, "all of the ABCP suffers from common problems that are best addressed by a common solution." The Plan the Committee developed is highly complex and involves many parties. In its essence, the Plan would convert the Noteholders' paper -- which has been frozen and therefore effectively worthless for many months -- into new, long-term notes that would trade freely, but with a discounted face value. The hope is that a strong secondary market for the notes will emerge in the long run.

25 The Plan aims to improve transparency by providing investors with detailed information about the assets supporting their ABCP Notes. It also addresses the timing mismatch between the notes and the assets by adjusting the maturity provisions and interest rates on the new notes. Further, the Plan adjusts some of the underlying credit default swap contracts by increasing the thresholds for default triggering events; in this way, the likelihood of a forced liquidation flowing from the credit default swap holder's prior security is reduced and, in turn, the risk for ABCP investors is decreased.

26 Under the Plan, the vast majority of the assets underlying ABCP would be pooled into two master asset vehicles (MAV1 and MAV2). The pooling is designed to increase the collateral available and thus make the notes more secure.

27 The Plan does not apply to investors holding less than \$1 million of notes. However, certain Dealers have agreed to buy the ABCP of those of their customers holding less than the \$1-million threshold, and to extend financial assistance to these customers. Principal among these Dealers are National Bank and Canaccord, two of the respondent financial institutions the appellants most object to releasing. The application judge found that these developments appeared to be designed to secure votes in favour of the Plan by various Noteholders, and were apparently successful in doing so. If the Plan is approved, they also provide considerable relief to the many small investors who find themselves unwittingly caught in the ABCP collapse.

b) The Releases

28 This appeal focuses on one specific aspect of the Plan: the comprehensive series of releases of third parties provided for in Article 10.

29 The Plan calls for the release of Canadian banks, Dealers, Noteholders, Asset Providers, Issuer Trustees, Liquidity Providers, and other market participants -- in Mr. Crawford's words, "virtually all participants in the Canadian ABCP market" -- from any liability associated with ABCP, with the exception of certain narrow claims relating to fraud. For instance, under the Plan as approved, creditors will have to give up their claims against the Dealers who sold them their ABCP Notes, including challenges to the way the Dealers characterized the ABCP and provided (or did not provide) information about the ABCP. The claims against the proposed defendants are mainly in tort: negligence, misrepresentation, negligent misrepresentation, failure to act prudently as a dealer/advisor,

acting in conflict of interest, and in a few cases fraud or potential fraud. There are also allegations of breach of fiduciary duty and claims for other equitable relief.

30 The application judge found that, in general, the claims for damages include the face value of the Notes, plus interest and additional penalties and damages.

31 The releases, in effect, are part of a *quid pro quo*. Generally speaking, they are designed to compensate various participants in the market for the contributions they would make to the restructuring. Those contributions under the Plan include the requirements that:

- a) Asset Providers assume an increased risk in their credit default swap contracts, disclose certain proprietary information in relation to the assets, and provide below-cost financing for margin funding facilities that are designed to make the notes more secure;
- b) Sponsors -- who in addition have cooperated with the Investors' Committee throughout the process, including by sharing certain proprietary information -- give up their existing contracts;
- c) The Canadian banks provide below-cost financing for the margin funding facility and,
- d) Other parties make other contributions under the Plan.

32 According to Mr. Crawford's affidavit, the releases are part of the Plan "because certain key participants, whose participation is vital to the restructuring, have made comprehensive releases a condition for their participation."

The CCAA Proceedings to Date

33 On March 17, 2008 the applicants sought and obtained an Initial Order under the CCAA staying any proceedings relating to the ABCP crisis and providing for a meeting of the Noteholders to vote on the proposed Plan. The meeting was held on April 25th. The vote was overwhelmingly in support of the Plan -- 96% of the Noteholders voted in favour. At the instance of certain Noteholders, and as requested by the application judge (who has supervised the proceedings from the outset), the Monitor broke down the voting results according to those Noteholders who had worked on or with the Investors' Committee to develop the Plan and those Noteholders who had not. Re-calculated on this basis the results remained firmly in favour of the proposed Plan -- 99% of those connected with the development of the Plan voted positively, as did 80% of those Noteholders who had not been involved in its formulation.

34 The vote thus provided the Plan with the "double majority" approval -- a majority of creditors representing two-thirds in value of the claims -- required under s. 6 of the CCAA.

35 Following the successful vote, the applicants sought court approval of the Plan under s. 6. Hearings were held on May 12 and 13. On May 16, the application judge issued a brief endorsement in which he concluded that he did not have sufficient facts to decide whether all the releases proposed in the Plan were authorized by the CCAA. While the application judge was prepared to approve the releases of negligence claims, he was not prepared at that point to sanction the release of fraud claims. Noting the urgency of the situation and the serious consequences that would result from the Plan's failure, the application judge nevertheless directed the parties back to the bargaining table to try to work out a claims process for addressing legitimate claims of fraud.

36 The result of this renegotiation was a "fraud carve-out" -- an amendment to the Plan excluding certain fraud claims from the Plan's releases. The carve-out did not encompass all possible claims of fraud, however. It was limited in three key respects. First, it applied only to claims against ABCP Dealers. Secondly, it applied only to cases involving an express fraudulent misrepresentation made with the intention to induce purchase and in circumstances where the person making the representation knew it to be false. Thirdly, the carve-out limited available damages to the value of the notes, minus any funds distributed as part of the Plan. The appellants argue vigorously that such a limited release respecting fraud claims is unacceptable and should not have been sanctioned by the application judge.

37 A second sanction hearing -- this time involving the amended Plan (with the fraud carve-out) -- was held on June 3, 2008. Two days later, Campbell J. released his reasons for decision, approving and sanctioning the Plan on the basis both that he had jurisdiction to sanction a Plan calling for third-party releases and that the Plan including the third-party releases in question here was fair and reasonable.

38 The appellants attack both of these determinations.

C. LAW AND ANALYSIS

39 There are two principal questions for determination on this appeal:

- 1) As a matter of law, may a CCAA plan contain a release of claims against anyone other than the debtor company or its directors?
- 2) If the answer to that question is yes, did the application judge err in the exercise of his discretion to sanction the Plan as fair and reasonable given the nature of the releases called for under it?

(1) Legal Authority for the Releases

40 The standard of review on this first issue -- whether, as a matter of law, a CCAA plan may contain third-party releases -- is correctness.

41 The appellants submit that a court has no jurisdiction or legal authority under the CCAA to sanction a plan that imposes an obligation on creditors to give releases to third parties other than the directors of the debtor company.¹ The requirement that objecting creditors release claims against third parties is illegal, they contend, because:

- a) on a proper interpretation, the CCAA does not permit such releases;
- b) the court is not entitled to "fill in the gaps" in the CCAA or rely upon its inherent jurisdiction to create such authority because to do so would be contrary to the principle that Parliament did not intend to interfere with private property rights or rights of action in the absence of clear statutory language to that effect;
- c) the releases constitute an unconstitutional confiscation of private property that is within the exclusive domain of the provinces under s. 92 of the *Constitution Act, 1867*;
- d) the releases are invalid under Quebec rules of public order; and because
- e) the prevailing jurisprudence supports these conclusions.

42 I would not give effect to any of these submissions.

Interpretation, "Gap Filling" and Inherent Jurisdiction

43 On a proper interpretation, in my view, the CCAA permits the inclusion of third party releases in a plan of compromise or arrangement to be sanctioned by the court where those releases are reasonably connected to the proposed restructuring. I am led to this conclusion by a combination of (a) the open-ended, flexible character of the CCAA itself, (b) the broad nature of the term "compromise or arrangement" as used in the Act, and (c) the express statutory effect of the "double-majority" vote and court sanction which render the plan binding on all creditors, including those unwilling to accept certain portions of it. The first of these signals a flexible approach to the application of the Act in new and evolving situations, an active judicial role in its application and interpretation, and a liberal approach to that interpretation. The second provides the entrée to negotiations between the parties affected in the restructuring and furnishes them with the ability to apply the broad scope of their ingenuity in fashioning the proposal. The latter afford necessary protection to unwilling creditors who may be deprived of certain of their civil and property rights as a result of the process.

44 The CCAA is skeletal in nature. It does not contain a comprehensive code that lays out all that is permitted or barred. Judges must therefore play a role in fleshing out the details of the statutory scheme. The scope of the Act and the powers of the court under it are not limitless. It is beyond controversy, however, that the CCAA is remedial legislation to be liberally construed in accordance with the modern purposive approach to statutory interpretation. It is designed to be a flexible instrument and it is that very flexibility which gives the Act its efficacy: *Canadian Red Cross Society (Re)* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div.). As Farley J. noted in *Re Dylex Ltd.* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 at 111 (Ont. Gen. Div.), "[t]he history of CCAA law has been an evolution of judicial interpretation."

45 Much has been said, however, about the "evolution of judicial interpretation" and there is some controversy over both the source and scope of that authority. Is the source of the court's authority statutory, discerned solely through application of the principles of statutory interpretation, for example? Or does it rest in the court's ability to "fill in the gaps" in legislation? Or in the court's inherent jurisdiction?

46 These issues have recently been canvassed by the Honourable Georgina R. Jackson and Dr. Janis Sarra in their publication "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters,"² and there was considerable argument on these issues before the application judge and before us. While I generally agree with the authors' suggestion that the courts should adopt a hierarchical approach in their resort to these interpretive tools -- statutory interpretation, gap-filling, discretion and inherent jurisdiction -- it is not necessary in my view to go beyond the general principles of statutory interpretation to resolve the issues on this appeal. Because I am satisfied that it is implicit in the language of the CCAA itself that the court has authority to sanction plans incorporating third-party releases that are reasonably related to the proposed restructuring, there is no "gap-filling" to be done and no need to fall back on inherent jurisdiction. In this respect, I take a somewhat different approach than the application judge did.

47 The Supreme Court of Canada has affirmed generally -- and in the insolvency context particularly -- that remedial statutes are to be interpreted liberally and in accordance with Professor

Driedger's modern principle of statutory interpretation. Driedger advocated that "the words of an Act are to be read in their entire context and in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament": *Re Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd.*, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 27 at para. 21, quoting E.A. Driedger, *Construction of Statutes*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 1983); *Bell Expressvu Ltd. Partnership v. R.*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 559 at para. 26.

48 More broadly, I believe that the proper approach to the judicial interpretation and application of statutes -- particularly those like the CCAA that are skeletal in nature -- is succinctly and accurately summarized by Jackson and Sarra in their recent article, *supra*, at p. 56:

The exercise of a statutory authority requires the statute to be construed. The plain meaning or textualist approach has given way to a search for the object and goals of the statute and the intentionalist approach. This latter approach makes use of the purposive approach and the mischief rule, including its codification under interpretation statutes that every enactment is deemed remedial, and is to be given such fair, large and liberal construction and interpretation as best ensures the attainment of its objects. This latter approach advocates reading the statute as a whole and being mindful of Driedger's "one principle", that the words of the Act are to be read in their entire context, in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament. It is important that courts first interpret the statute before them and exercise their authority pursuant to the statute, before reaching for other tools in the judicial toolbox. Statutory interpretation using the principles articulated above leaves room for gap-filling in the common law provinces and a consideration of purpose in *Québec* as a manifestation of the judge's overall task of statutory interpretation. Finally, the jurisprudence in relation to statutory interpretation demonstrates the fluidity inherent in the judge's task in seeking the objects of the statute and the intention of the legislature.

49 I adopt these principles.

50 The remedial purpose of the CCAA -- as its title affirms -- is to facilitate compromises or arrangements between an insolvent debtor company and its creditors. In *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada* (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 at 318 (B.C.C.A.), Gibbs J.A. summarized very concisely the purpose, object and scheme of the Act:

Almost inevitably, liquidation destroyed the shareholders' investment, yielded little by way of recovery to the creditors, and exacerbated the social evil of devastating levels of unemployment. The government of the day sought, through the C.C.A.A., to create a regime whereby the principals of the company and the creditors could be brought together under the supervision of the court to attempt a reorganization or compromise or arrangement under which the company could continue in business.

51 The CCAA was enacted in 1933 and was necessary -- as the then Secretary of State noted in introducing the Bill on First Reading -- "because of the prevailing commercial and industrial depression" and the need to alleviate the effects of business bankruptcies in that context: see the

statement of the Hon. C.H. Cahan, Secretary of State, *House of Commons Debates (Hansard)* (April 20, 1933) at 4091. One of the greatest effects of that Depression was what Gibbs J.A. described as "the social evil of devastating levels of unemployment". Since then, courts have recognized that the Act has a broader dimension than simply the direct relations between the debtor company and its creditors and that this broader public dimension must be weighed in the balance together with the interests of those most directly affected: see, for example, *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289 (C.A.), *per* Doherty J.A. in dissent; *Re Skydome Corp.* (1998), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 125 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Re Anvil Range Mining Corp.* (1998), 3 C.B.R. (4th) 93 (Ont. Gen. Div.).

52 In this respect, I agree with the following statement of Doherty J.A. in *Elan, supra*, at pp. 306-307:

... [T]he Act was designed to serve a "broad constituency of investors, creditors and employees".³ Because of that "broad constituency" the court must, when considering applications brought under the Act, *have regard not only to the individuals and organizations directly affected by the application, but also to the wider public interest.* [Emphasis added.]

Application of the Principles of Interpretation

53 An interpretation of the CCAA that recognizes its broader socio-economic purposes and objects is apt in this case. As the application judge pointed out, the restructuring underpins the financial viability of the Canadian ABCP market itself.

54 The appellants argue that the application judge erred in taking this approach and in treating the Plan and the proceedings as an attempt to restructure a financial market (the ABCP market) rather than simply the affairs between the debtor corporations who caused the ABCP Notes to be issued and their creditors. The Act is designed, they say, only to effect reorganizations between a corporate debtor and its creditors and not to attempt to restructure entire marketplaces.

55 This perspective is flawed in at least two respects, however, in my opinion. First, it reflects a view of the purpose and objects of the CCAA that is too narrow. Secondly, it overlooks the reality of the ABCP marketplace and the context of the restructuring in question here. It may be true that, in their capacity as *ABCP Dealers*, the releasee financial institutions are "third-parties" to the restructuring in the sense that they are not creditors of the debtor corporations. However, in their capacities as *Asset Providers* and *Liquidity Providers*, they are not only creditors but they are prior secured creditors to the Noteholders. Furthermore -- as the application judge found -- in these latter capacities they are making significant contributions to the restructuring by "foregoing immediate rights to assets and ... providing real and tangible input for the preservation and enhancement of the Notes" (para. 76). In this context, therefore, the application judge's remark at para. 50 that the restructuring "involves the commitment and participation of all parties" in the ABCP market makes sense, as do his earlier comments at paras. 48-49:

Given the nature of the ABCP market and all of its participants, it is more appropriate to consider all Noteholders as claimants and the object of the Plan to restore liquidity to the assets being the Notes themselves. The restoration of the li-

quidity of the market necessitates the participation (including more tangible contribution by many) of all Noteholders.

In these circumstances, *it is unduly technical to classify the Issuer Trustees as debtors and the claims of the Noteholders as between themselves and others as being those of third party creditors*, although I recognize that the restructuring structure of the CCAA requires the corporations as the vehicles for restructuring. [Emphasis added.]

56 The application judge did observe that "[t]he insolvency is of the ABCP market itself, the restructuring is that of the market for such paper ..." (para. 50). He did so, however, to point out the uniqueness of the Plan before him and its industry-wide significance and not to suggest that he need have no regard to the provisions of the CCAA permitting a restructuring as between debtor and creditors. His focus was on *the effect* of the restructuring, a perfectly permissible perspective, given the broad purpose and objects of the Act. This is apparent from his later references. For example, in balancing the arguments against approving releases that might include aspects of fraud, he responded that "what is at issue is a liquidity crisis that affects the ABCP market in Canada" (para. 125). In addition, in his reasoning on the fair-and-reasonable issue, he stated at para. 142: "Apart from the Plan itself, there is a need to restore confidence in the financial system in Canada and this Plan is a legitimate use of the CCAA to accomplish that goal."

57 I agree. I see no error on the part of the application judge in approaching the fairness assessment or the interpretation issue with these considerations in mind. They provide the context in which the purpose, objects and scheme of the CCAA are to be considered.

The Statutory Wording

58 Keeping in mind the interpretive principles outlined above, I turn now to a consideration of the provisions of the CCAA. Where in the words of the statute is the court clothed with authority to approve a plan incorporating a requirement for third-party releases? As summarized earlier, the answer to that question, in my view, is to be found in:

- a) the skeletal nature of the CCAA;
- b) Parliament's reliance upon the broad notions of "compromise" and "arrangement" to establish the framework within which the parties may work to put forward a restructuring plan; and in
- c) the creation of the statutory mechanism binding all creditors in classes to the compromise or arrangement once it has surpassed the high "double majority" voting threshold and obtained court sanction as "fair and reasonable".

Therein lies the expression of Parliament's intention to permit the parties to negotiate and vote on, and the court to sanction, third-party releases relating to a restructuring.

59 Sections 4 and 6 of the CCAA state:

4. Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its unsecured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company, of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class

of creditors, and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

6. Where a majority in number representing two-thirds in value of the creditors, or class of creditors, as the case may be, present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or meetings thereof respectively held pursuant to sections 4 and 5, or either of those sections, agree to any compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at the meeting or meetings, the compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by the court, and if so sanctioned is binding

(a) on all the creditors or the class of creditors, as the case may be, and on any trustee for any such class of creditors, whether secured or unsecured, as the case may be, and on the company; and

(b) in the case of a company that has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or is in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, on the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator and contributories of the company.

Compromise or Arrangement

60 While there may be little practical distinction between "compromise" and "arrangement" in many respects, the two are not necessarily the same. "Arrangement" is broader than "compromise" and would appear to include any scheme for reorganizing the affairs of the debtor: Houlden and Morawetz, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada*, loose-leaf, 3rd ed., vol. 4 (Toronto: Thomson Carswell) at 10A-12.2, N para. 10. It has been said to be "a very wide and indefinite [word]": *Re Refund of Dues under Timber Regulations*, [1935] A.C. 184 at 197 (P.C.), affirming S.C.C. [1933] S.C.R. 616. See also, *Re Guardian Assur. Co.*, [1917] 1 Ch. 431 at 448, 450; *Re T&N Ltd. and Others (No. 3)*, [2007] 1 All E.R. 851 (Ch.).

61 The CCAA is a sketch, an outline, a supporting framework for the resolution of corporate insolvencies in the public interest. Parliament wisely avoided attempting to anticipate the myriad of business deals that could evolve from the fertile and creative minds of negotiators restructuring their financial affairs. It left the shape and details of those deals to be worked out within the framework of the comprehensive and flexible concepts of a "compromise" and "arrangement." I see no reason why a release in favour of a third party, negotiated as part of a package between a debtor and creditor and reasonably relating to the proposed restructuring cannot fall within that framework.

62 A proposal under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S., 1985, c. B-3 (the "BIA") is a contract: *Employers' Liability Assurance Corp. Ltd. v. Ideal Petroleum (1959) Ltd.* [1978] 1 S.C.R. 230 at 239; *Society of Composers, Authors & Music Publishers of Canada v. Armitage* (2000), 50 O.R. (3d) 688 at para. 11 (C.A.). In my view, a compromise or arrangement under the CCAA is directly analogous to a proposal for these purposes, and therefore is to be treated as a contract between the debtor and its creditors. Consequently, parties are entitled to put anything into such a plan that could lawfully be incorporated into any contract. See *Re Air Canada* (2004), 2 C.B.R. (5th) 4 at para. 6 (Ont. S.C.J.); *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 12 O.R. (3d) 500 at 518 (Gen. Div.).

63 There is nothing to prevent a debtor and a creditor from including in a contract between them a term providing that the creditor release a third party. The term is binding as between the debtor and creditor. In the CCAA context, therefore, a plan of compromise or arrangement may propose that creditors agree to compromise claims against the debtor and to release third parties, just as any debtor and creditor might agree to such a term in a contract between them. Once the statutory mechanism regarding voter approval and court sanctioning has been complied with, the plan -- including the provision for releases -- becomes binding on all creditors (including the dissenting minority).

64 *Re T&N Ltd. and Others, supra*, is instructive in this regard. It is a rare example of a court focussing on and examining the meaning and breadth of the term "arrangement". T&N and its associated companies were engaged in the manufacture, distribution and sale of asbestos-containing products. They became the subject of many claims by former employees, who had been exposed to asbestos dust in the course of their employment, and their dependents. The T&N companies applied for protection under s. 425 of the U.K. *Companies Act 1985*, a provision virtually identical to the scheme of the CCAA -- including the concepts of compromise or arrangement.⁴

65 T&N carried employers' liability insurance. However, the employers' liability insurers (the "EL insurers") denied coverage. This issue was litigated and ultimately resolved through the establishment of a multi-million pound fund against which the employees and their dependants (the "EL claimants") would assert their claims. In return, T&N's former employees and dependants (the "EL claimants") agreed to forego any further claims against the EL insurers. This settlement was incorporated into the plan of compromise and arrangement between the T&N companies and the EL claimants that was voted on and put forward for court sanction.

66 Certain creditors argued that the court could not sanction the plan because it did not constitute a "compromise or arrangement" between T&N and the EL claimants since it did not purport to affect rights as between them but only the EL claimants' rights against the EL insurers. The Court rejected this argument. Richards J. adopted previous jurisprudence -- cited earlier in these reasons -- to the effect that the word "arrangement" has a very broad meaning and that, while both a compromise and an arrangement involve some "give and take", an arrangement need not involve a compromise or be confined to a case of dispute or difficulty (paras. 46-51). He referred to what would be the equivalent of a solvent arrangement under Canadian corporate legislation as an example.⁵ Finally, he pointed out that the compromised rights of the EL claimants against the EL insurers were not unconnected with the EL claimants' rights against the T&N companies; the scheme of arrangement involving the EL insurers was "an integral part of a single proposal affecting all the parties" (para. 52). He concluded his reasoning with these observations (para. 53):

In my judgment it is not a necessary element of an arrangement for the purposes of s. 425 of the 1985 Act that it should alter the rights existing between the company and the creditors or members with whom it is made. No doubt in most cases it will alter those rights. But, provided that the context and content of the scheme are such as properly to constitute an arrangement between the company and the members or creditors concerned, it will fall within s. 425. It is ... neither necessary nor desirable to attempt a definition of arrangement. The legislature has not done so. To insist on an alteration of rights, or a termination of rights as in the case of schemes to effect takeovers or mergers, is to impose a restriction which is neither warranted by the statutory language nor justified by the courts' approach

over many years to give the term its widest meaning. *Nor is an arrangement necessarily outside the section, because its effect is to alter the rights of creditors against another party or because such alteration could be achieved by a scheme of arrangement with that party.* [Emphasis added.]

67 I find Richard J.'s analysis helpful and persuasive. In effect, the claimants in *T&N* were being asked to release their claims against the EL insurers in exchange for a call on the fund. Here, the appellants are being required to release their claims against certain financial third parties in exchange for what is anticipated to be an improved position for all ABCP Noteholders, stemming from the contributions the financial third parties are making to the ABCP restructuring. The situations are quite comparable.

The Binding Mechanism

68 Parliament's reliance on the expansive terms "compromise" or "arrangement" does not stand alone, however. Effective insolvency restructurings would not be possible without a statutory mechanism to bind an unwilling minority of creditors. Unanimity is frequently impossible in such situations. But the minority must be protected too. Parliament's solution to this quandary was to permit a wide range of proposals to be negotiated and put forward (the compromise or arrangement) and to bind all creditors by class to the terms of the plan, but to do so only where the proposal can gain the support of the requisite "double majority" of votes⁶ and obtain the sanction of the court on the basis that it is fair and reasonable. In this way, the scheme of the CCAA supports the intention of Parliament to encourage a wide variety of solutions to corporate insolvencies without unjustifiably overriding the rights of dissenting creditors.

The Required Nexus

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. This nexus exists here, in my view.

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. At paras. 76-77 he said:

[76] I do not consider that the Plan in this case involves a change in relationship among creditors "that does not directly involve the Company." Those who support the Plan and are to be released are "directly involved in the Company" in the sense that many are foregoing immediate rights to assets and are providing real and tangible input for the preservation and enhancement of the Notes. It would be unduly restrictive to suggest that the moving parties' claims against released parties do not involve the Company, since the claims are directly related to the value of the Notes. The value of the Notes is in this case the value of the Company.

[77] This Plan, as it deals with releases, doesn't change the relationship of the creditors apart from involving the Company and its Notes.

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.

The Jurisprudence

74 Third party releases have become a frequent feature in Canadian restructurings since the decision of the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench in *Re Canadian Airlines Corp.* (2000), 265 A.R. 201, leave to appeal refused by *Resurgence Asset Management LLC v. Canadian Airlines Corp.* (2000), 266 A.R. 131 (C.A.), and [2001] S.C.C.A. No. 60, (2001) 293 A.R. 351 (S.C.C.). In *Re Muscle Tech Research and Development Inc.* (2006), 25 C.B.R (5th) 231 (Ont. S.C.J.) Justice Ground remarked (para. 8):

[It] is not uncommon in CCAA proceedings, in the context of a plan of compromise and arrangement, to compromise claims against the Applicants and other parties against whom such claims or related claims are made.

75 We were referred to at least a dozen court-approved CCAA plans from across the country that included broad third-party releases. With the exception of *Re Canadian Airlines*, however, the releases in those restructurings -- including *Muscle Tech* -- were not opposed. The appellants argue that those cases are wrongly decided, because the court simply does not have the authority to approve such releases.

76 In *Re Canadian Airlines* the releases in question were opposed, however. Paperny J. (as she then was) concluded the court had jurisdiction to approve them and her decision is said to be the well-spring of the trend towards third-party releases referred to above. Based on the foregoing analysis, I agree with her conclusion although for reasons that differ from those cited by her.

77 Justice Paperny began her analysis of the release issue with the observation at para. 87 that "[p]rior to 1997, the CCAA did not provide for compromises of claims against anyone other than the petitioning company." It will be apparent from the analysis in these reasons that I do not accept that premise, notwithstanding the decision of the Quebec Court of Appeal in *Michaud v. Steinberg*,⁷ of which her comment may have been reflective. Paperny J.'s reference to 1997 was a reference to the amendments of that year adding s. 5.1 to the CCAA, which provides for limited releases in favour of directors. Given the limited scope of s. 5.1, Justice Paperny was thus faced with the argument -- dealt with later in these reasons -- that Parliament must not have intended to extend the authority to approve third-party releases beyond the scope of this section. She chose to address this contention by concluding that, although the amendments "[did] not authorize a release of claims against third parties other than directors, [they did] not prohibit such releases either" (para. 92).

78 Respectfully, I would not adopt the interpretive principle that the CCAA permits releases because it does not expressly prohibit them. Rather, as I explain in these reasons, 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.

79 The appellants rely on a number of authorities, which they submit support the proposition that the CCAA may not be used to compromise claims as between anyone other than the debtor company and its creditors. Principal amongst these are *Michaud v. Steinberg, supra*; *NBD Bank, Canada v. Dofasco Inc.*, (1999), 46 O.R. (3d) 514 (C.A.); *Pacific Coastal Airlines Ltd. v. Air Canada* (2001), 19 B.L.R. (3d) 286 (B.C.S.C.); and *Re Stelco Inc.* (2005), 78 O.R. (3d) 241 (C.A.) ("*Stelco I*"). I do not think these cases assist the appellants, however. With the exception of *Steinberg*, they do not involve third party claims that were reasonably connected to the restructuring. As I shall explain, it is my opinion that *Steinberg* does not express a correct view of the law, and I decline to follow it.

80 In *Pacific Coastal Airlines*, Tysoe J. made the following comment at para. 24:

[The purpose of the CCAA proceeding] is not to deal with disputes between a creditor of a company and a third party, even if the company was also involved in the subject matter of the dispute. While issues between the debtor company and non-creditors are sometimes dealt with in CCAA proceedings, it is not a proper use of a CCAA proceeding to determine disputes between parties other than the debtor company.

81 This statement must be understood in its context, however. Pacific Coastal Airlines had been a regional carrier for Canadian Airlines prior to the CCAA reorganization of the latter in 2000. In the action in question it was seeking to assert separate tort claims against Air Canada for contractual interference and inducing breach of contract in relation to certain rights it had to the use of Canadian's flight designator code prior to the CCAA proceeding. Air Canada sought to have the action

dismissed on grounds of *res judicata* or issue estoppel because of the CCAA proceeding. Tysoe J. rejected the argument.

82 The facts in *Pacific Coastal* are not analogous to the circumstances of this case, however. There is no suggestion that a resolution of Pacific Coastal's separate tort claim against Air Canada was in any way connected to the Canadian Airlines restructuring, even though Canadian -- at a contractual level -- may have had some involvement with the particular dispute. Here, however, the disputes that are the subject-matter of the impugned releases are not simply "disputes between parties other than the debtor company". They are closely connected to the disputes being resolved between the debtor companies and their creditors and to the restructuring itself.

83 Nor is the decision of this Court in the *NBD Bank* case dispositive. It arose out of the financial collapse of Algoma Steel, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Dofasco. The Bank had advanced funds to Algoma allegedly on the strength of misrepresentations by Algoma's Vice-President, James Melville. The plan of compromise and arrangement that was sanctioned by Farley J. in the Algoma CCAA restructuring contained a clause releasing Algoma from all claims creditors "may have had against Algoma or its directors, officers, employees and advisors." Mr. Melville was found liable for negligent misrepresentation in a subsequent action by the Bank. On appeal, he argued that since the Bank was barred from suing Algoma for misrepresentation by its officers, permitting it to pursue the same cause of action against him personally would subvert the CCAA process -- in short, he was personally protected by the CCAA release.

84 Rosenberg J.A., writing for this Court, rejected this argument. The appellants here rely particularly upon his following observations at paras. 53-54:

53 In my view, the appellant has not demonstrated that allowing the respondent to pursue its claim against him would undermine or subvert the purposes of the Act. As this court noted in *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey* (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289 at 297, the CCAA is remedial legislation "intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both". It is a means of avoiding a liquidation that may yield little for the creditors, especially unsecured creditors like the respondent, and the debtor company shareholders. However, the appellant has not shown that allowing a creditor to continue an action against an officer for negligent misrepresentation would erode the effectiveness of the Act.

54 In fact, to refuse on policy grounds to impose liability on an officer of the corporation for negligent misrepresentation would contradict the policy of Parliament as demonstrated in recent amendments to the CCAA and the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3. Those Acts now contemplate that an arrangement or proposal may include a term for compromise of certain types of claims against directors of the company except claims that "are based on allegations of misrepresentations made by directors". L.W. Houlden and C.H. Morawetz, the editors of *The 2000 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (Toronto: Carswell, 1999) at p. 192 are of the view that the policy behind the provision is to encourage directors of an insolvent corporation to remain in office so that the affairs of the corporation can be reorganized. I can see no similar policy interest in barring an action against an officer of the company who, prior to

the insolvency, has misrepresented the financial affairs of the corporation to its creditors. It may be necessary to permit the compromise of claims against the debtor corporation, otherwise it may not be possible to successfully reorganize the corporation. The same considerations do not apply to individual officers. Rather, it would seem to me that it would be contrary to good policy to immunize officers from the consequences of their negligent statements which might otherwise be made in anticipation of being forgiven under a subsequent corporate proposal or arrangement. [Footnote omitted.]

85 Once again, this statement must be assessed in context. Whether Justice Farley had the authority in the earlier Algoma CCAA proceedings to sanction a plan that included third party releases was not under consideration at all. What the Court was determining in *NBD Bank* was whether the release extended by its terms to protect a third party. In fact, on its face, it does not appear to do so. Justice Rosenberg concluded only that not allowing Mr. Melville to rely upon the release did not subvert the purpose of the CCAA. As the application judge here observed, "there is little factual similarity in *NBD* to the facts now before the Court" (para. 71). Contrary to the facts of this case, in *NBD Bank* the creditors had not agreed to grant a release to officers; they had not voted on such a release and the court had not assessed the fairness and reasonableness of such a release as a term of a complex arrangement involving significant contributions by the beneficiaries of the release -- as is the situation here. Thus, *NBD Bank* is of little assistance in determining whether the court has authority to sanction a plan that calls for third party releases.

86 The appellants also rely upon the decision of this Court in *Stelco I*. There, the Court was dealing with the scope of the CCAA in connection with a dispute over what were called the "Turn-over Payments". Under an inter-creditor agreement one group of creditors had subordinated their rights to another group and agreed to hold in trust and "turn over" any proceeds received from Stelco until the senior group was paid in full. On a disputed classification motion, the Subordinated Debt Holders argued that they should be in a separate class from the Senior Debt Holders. Farley J. refused to make such an order in the court below, stating:

[Sections] 4, 5 and 6 [of the CCAA] talk of compromises or arrangements between a company and its creditors. There is no mention of this extending by statute to encompass a change of relationship among the creditors vis-à-vis the creditors themselves *and not directly involving the company*. [Citations omitted; emphasis added.]

See *Re Stelco Inc.* (2005), 15 C.B.R. (5th) 297 (Ont. S.C.J.) at para. 7.

87 This Court upheld that decision. The legal relationship between each group of creditors and Stelco was the same, albeit there were inter-creditor differences, and creditors were to be classified in accordance with their legal rights. In addition, the need for timely classification and voting decisions in the CCAA process militated against enmeshing the classification process in the vagaries of inter-corporate disputes. In short, the issues before the Court were quite different from those raised on this appeal.

88 Indeed, the Stelco plan, as sanctioned, included third party releases (albeit uncontested ones). This Court subsequently dealt with the same inter-creditor agreement on an appeal where the Subordinated Debt Holders argued that the inter-creditor subordination provisions were beyond the

reach of the CCAA and therefore that they were entitled to a separate civil action to determine their rights under the agreement: *Re Stelco Inc.*, (2006), 21 C.B.R. (5th) 157 (Ont. C.A.) ("*Stelco II*"). The Court rejected that argument and held that where the creditors' rights amongst themselves were sufficiently related to the debtor and its plan, they were properly brought within the scope of the CCAA plan. The Court said (para. 11):

In [*Stelco I*] -- the classification case -- the court observed that it is not a proper use of a CCAA proceeding to determine disputes between parties other than the debtor company ... [*H*]owever, the present case is not simply an inter-creditor dispute that does not involve the debtor company; it is a dispute that is inextricably connected to the restructuring process. [Emphasis added.]

89 The approach I would take to the disposition of this appeal is consistent with that view. As I have noted, the third party releases here are very closely connected to the ABCP restructuring process.

90 Some of the appellants -- particularly those represented by Mr. Woods -- rely heavily upon the decision of the Quebec Court of Appeal in *Michaud v. Steinberg*, *supra*. They say that it is determinative of the release issue. In *Steinberg*, the Court held that the CCAA, as worded at the time, did not permit the release of directors of the debtor corporation and that third-party releases were not within the purview of the Act. Deschamps J.A. (as she then was) said (paras. 42, 54 and 58 -- English translation):

[42] Even if one can understand the extreme pressure weighing on the creditors and the respondent at the time of the sanctioning, a plan of arrangement is not the appropriate forum to settle disputes other than the claims that are the subject of the arrangement. In other words, one cannot, under the pretext of an absence of formal directives in the Act, transform an arrangement into a potpourri.

...

[54] The Act offers the respondent a way to arrive at a compromise with its creditors. It does not go so far as to offer an umbrella to all the persons within its orbit by permitting them to shelter themselves from any recourse.

...

[58] The [CCAA] and the case law clearly do not permit extending the application of an arrangement to persons other than the respondent and its creditors and, consequently, the plan should not have been sanctioned as is [that is, including the releases of the directors].

91 Justices Vallerand and Delisle, in separate judgments, agreed. Justice Vallerand summarized his view of the consequences of extending the scope of the CCAA to third party releases in this fashion (para. 7):

In short, the Act will have become the Companies' and Their Officers and Employees Creditors Arrangement Act -- an awful mess -- and likely not attain its purpose, which is to enable the company to survive in the face of its creditors and

through their will, and not in the face of the creditors of its officers. This is why I feel, just like my colleague, that such a clause is contrary to the Act's mode of operation, contrary to its purposes and, for this reason, is to be banned.

92 Justice Delisle, on the other hand, appears to have rejected the releases because of their broad nature -- they released directors from all claims, including those that were altogether unrelated to their corporate duties with the debtor company -- rather than because of a lack of authority to sanction under the Act. Indeed, he seems to have recognized the wide range of circumstances that could be included within the term "compromise or arrangement". He is the only one who addressed that term. At para. 90 he said:

The CCAA is drafted in general terms. It does not specify, among other things, what must be understood by "compromise or arrangement". However, it may be inferred from the purpose of this [A]ct that these terms *encompass all that should enable the person who has recourse to it to fully dispose of his debts*, both those that exist on the date when he has recourse to the statute and *those contingent on the insolvency in which he finds himself ...* [Emphasis added.]

93 The decision of the Court did not reflect a view that the terms of a compromise or arrangement should "encompass all that should enable the person who has recourse to [the Act] to dispose of his debts ... and those contingent on the insolvency in which he finds himself," however. On occasion such an outlook might embrace third parties other than the debtor and its creditors in order to make the arrangement work. Nor would it be surprising that, in such circumstances, the third parties might seek the protection of releases, or that the debtor might do so on their behalf. Thus, the perspective adopted by the majority in *Steinberg*, in my view, is too narrow, having regard to the language, purpose and objects of the CCAA and the intention of Parliament. They made no attempt to consider and explain why a compromise or arrangement could not include third-party releases. In addition, the decision appears to have been based, at least partly, on a rejection of the use of contract-law concepts in analysing the Act -- an approach inconsistent with the jurisprudence referred to above.

94 Finally, the majority in *Steinberg* seems to have proceeded on the basis that the CCAA cannot interfere with civil or property rights under Quebec law. Mr. Woods advanced this argument before this Court in his factum, but did not press it in oral argument. Indeed, he conceded that if the Act encompasses the authority to sanction a plan containing third-party releases -- as I have concluded it does -- the provisions of the CCAA, as valid federal insolvency legislation, are paramount over provincial legislation. I shall return to the constitutional issues raised by the appellants later in these reasons.

95 Accordingly, to the extent *Steinberg* stands for the proposition that the court does not have authority under the CCAA to sanction a plan that incorporates third-party releases, I do not believe it to be a correct statement of the law and I respectfully decline to follow it. The modern approach to interpretation of the Act in accordance with its nature and purpose militates against a narrow interpretation and towards one that facilitates and encourages compromises and arrangements. Had the majority in *Steinberg* considered the broad nature of the terms "compromise" and "arrangement" and the jurisprudence I have referred to above, they might well have come to a different conclusion.

96 *Steinberg* led to amendments to the CCAA, however. In 1997, s. 5.1 was added, dealing specifically with releases pertaining to directors of the debtor company. It states:

5.1 (1) A compromise or arrangement made in respect of a debtor company may include in its terms provision for the compromise of claims against directors of the company that arose before the commencement of proceedings under this Act and that relate to the obligations of the company where the directors are by law liable in their capacity as directors for the payment of such obligations.

Exception

- (2) A provision for the compromise of claims against directors may not include claims that
- (a) relate to contractual rights of one or more creditors; or
- (b) are based on allegations of misrepresentations made by directors to creditors or of wrongful or oppressive conduct by directors.

Powers of court

- (3) The court may declare that a claim against directors shall not be compromised if it is satisfied that the compromise would not be fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

Resignation or removal of directors

- (4) Where all of the directors have resigned or have been removed by the shareholders without replacement, any person who manages or supervises the management of the business and affairs of the debtor company shall be deemed to be a director for the purposes of this section.

1997, c. 12, s. 122.

97 Perhaps the appellants' strongest argument is that these amendments confirm a prior lack of authority in the court to sanction a plan including third party releases. If the power existed, why would Parliament feel it necessary to add an amendment specifically permitting such releases (subject to the exceptions indicated) in favour of directors? *Expressio unius est exclusio alterius*, is the Latin maxim sometimes relied on to articulate the principle of interpretation implied in that question: to express or include one thing implies the exclusion of the other.

98 The maxim is not helpful in these circumstances, however. The reality is that there *may* be another explanation why Parliament acted as it did. As one commentator has noted:⁸

Far from being a rule, [the maxim *expressio unius*] is not even lexicographically accurate, because it is simply not true, generally, that the mere express conferral of a right or privilege in one kind of situation implies the denial of the equivalent right or privilege in other kinds. Sometimes it does and sometimes it does not,

and whether it does or does not depends on the particular circumstances of context. Without contextual support, therefore there is not even a mild presumption here. Accordingly, the maxim is at best a description, after the fact, of what the court has discovered from context.

99 As I have said, the 1997 amendments to the CCAA providing for releases in favour of directors of debtor companies in limited circumstances were a response to the decision of the Quebec Court of Appeal in *Steinberg*. A similar amendment was made with respect to proposals in the BIA at the same time. The rationale behind these amendments was to encourage directors of an insolvent company to remain in office during a restructuring, rather than resign. The assumption was that by remaining in office the directors would provide some stability while the affairs of the company were being reorganized: see Houlden and Morawetz, vol. 1, *supra*, at 2-144, Es.11A; *Le Royal Penfield Inc. (Syndic de)*, [2003] R.J.Q. 2157 at paras. 44-46 (C.S.).

100 Parliament thus had a particular focus and a particular purpose in enacting the 1997 amendments to the CCAA and the BIA. While there is some merit in the appellants' argument on this point, at the end of the day I do not accept that Parliament intended to signal by its enactment of s. 5.1 that it was depriving the court of authority to sanction plans of compromise or arrangement in all circumstances where they incorporate third party releases in favour of anyone other than the debtor's directors. For the reasons articulated above, I am satisfied that the court does have the authority to do so. Whether it sanctions the plan is a matter for the fairness hearing.

The Deprivation of Proprietary Rights

101 Mr. Shapray very effectively led the appellants' argument that legislation must not be construed so as to interfere with or prejudice established contractual or proprietary rights -- including the right to bring an action -- in the absence of a clear indication of legislative intention to that effect: *Halsbury's Laws of England*, 4th ed. reissue, vol. 44 (1) (London: Butterworths, 1995) at paras. 1438, 1464 and 1467; Driedger, 2nd ed., *supra*, at 183; Ruth Sullivan, *Sullivan and Driedger on the Construction of Statutes*, 4th ed., (Markham: Butterworths, 2002) at 399. I accept the importance of this principle. For the reasons I have explained, however, I am satisfied that Parliament's intention to clothe the court with authority to consider and sanction a plan that contains third party releases is expressed with sufficient clarity in the "compromise or arrangement" language of the CCAA coupled with the statutory voting and sanctioning mechanism making the provisions of the plan binding on all creditors. This is not a situation of impermissible "gap-filling" in the case of legislation severely affecting property rights; it is a question of finding meaning in the language of the Act itself. I would therefore not give effect to the appellants' submissions in this regard.

The Division of Powers and Paramountcy

102 Mr. Woods and Mr. Sternberg submit that extending the reach of the CCAA process to the compromise of claims as between solvent creditors of the debtor company and solvent third parties to the proceeding is constitutionally impermissible. They say that under the guise of the federal insolvency power pursuant to s. 91(21) of the *Constitution Act, 1867*, this approach would improperly affect the rights of civil claimants to assert their causes of action, a provincial matter falling within s. 92(13), and contravene the rules of public order pursuant to the *Civil Code of Quebec*.

103 I do not accept these submissions. It has long been established that the CCAA is valid federal legislation under the federal insolvency power: *Reference re: Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada)*, [1934] S.C.R. 659. As the Supreme Court confirmed in that case (p. 661), citing

Viscount Cave L.C. in *Royal Bank of Canada v. Larue* [1928] A.C. 187, "the exclusive legislative authority to deal with all matters within the domain of bankruptcy and insolvency is vested in Parliament." Chief Justice Duff elaborated:

Matters normally constituting part of a bankruptcy scheme but not in their essence matters of bankruptcy and insolvency may, of course, from another point of view and in another aspect be dealt with by a provincial legislature; but, when treated as matters pertaining to bankruptcy and insolvency, they clearly fall within the legislative authority of the Dominion.

104 That is exactly the case here. The power to sanction a plan of compromise or arrangement that contains third-party releases of the type opposed by the appellants is embedded in the wording of the CCAA. The fact that this may interfere with a claimant's right to pursue a civil action -- normally a matter of provincial concern -- or trump Quebec rules of public order is constitutionally immaterial. The CCAA is a valid exercise of federal power. Provided the matter in question falls within the legislation directly or as necessarily incidental to the exercise of that power, the CCAA governs. To the extent that its provisions are inconsistent with provincial legislation, the federal legislation is paramount. Mr. Woods properly conceded this during argument.

Conclusion With Respect to Legal Authority

105 For all of the foregoing reasons, then, I conclude that the application judge had the jurisdiction and legal authority to sanction the Plan as put forward.

(2) The Plan is "Fair and Reasonable"

106 The second major attack on the application judge's decision is that he erred in finding that the Plan is "fair and reasonable" and in sanctioning it on that basis. This attack is centred on the nature of the third-party releases contemplated and, in particular, on the fact that they will permit the release of some claims based in fraud.

107 Whether a plan of compromise or arrangement is fair and reasonable is a matter of mixed fact and law, and one on which the application judge exercises a large measure of discretion. The standard of review on this issue is therefore one of deference. In the absence of a demonstrable error an appellate court will not interfere: see *Re Ravelston Corp. Ltd.* (2007), 31 C.B.R. (5th) 233 (Ont. C.A.).

108 I would not interfere with the application judge's decision in this regard. While the notion of releases in favour of third parties -- including leading Canadian financial institutions -- that extend to claims of fraud is distasteful, there is no legal impediment to the inclusion of a release for claims based in fraud in a plan of compromise or arrangement. The application judge had been living with and supervising the ABCP restructuring from its outset. He was intimately attuned to its dynamics. In the end he concluded that the benefits of the Plan to the creditors as a whole, and to the debtor companies, outweighed the negative aspects of compelling the unwilling appellants to execute the releases as finally put forward.

109 The application judge was concerned about the inclusion of fraud in the contemplated releases and at the May hearing adjourned the final disposition of the sanctioning hearing in an effort to encourage the parties to negotiate a resolution. The result was the "fraud carve-out" referred to earlier in these reasons.

110 The appellants argue that the fraud carve-out is inadequate because of its narrow scope. It (i) applies only to ABCP Dealers, (ii) limits the type of damages that may be claimed (no punitive damages, for example), (iii) defines "fraud" narrowly, excluding many rights that would be protected by common law, equity and the Quebec concept of public order, and (iv) limits claims to representations made directly to Noteholders. The appellants submit it is contrary to public policy to sanction a plan containing such a limited restriction on the type of fraud claims that may be pursued against the third parties.

111 The law does not condone fraud. It is the most serious kind of civil claim. There is therefore some force to the appellants' submission. On the other hand, as noted, 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: *Fotinis Restaurant Corp. v. White Spot Ltd.* (1998), 38 B.L.R. (2d) 251 at paras. 9 and 18 (B.C.S.C.). There may be disputes about the scope or extent of what is released, but parties are entitled to settle allegations of fraud in civil proceedings -- the claims here all being untested allegations of fraud -- and to include releases of such claims as part of that settlement.

112 The application judge was alive to the merits of the appellants' submissions. He was satisfied in the end, however, that the need "to avoid the potential cascade of litigation that ... would result if a broader 'carve out' were to be allowed" (para. 113) outweighed the negative aspects of approving releases with the narrower carve-out provision. Implementation of the Plan, in his view, would work to the overall greater benefit of the Noteholders as a whole. I can find no error in principle in the exercise of his discretion in arriving at this decision. It was his call to make.

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.

114 These findings are all supported on the record. Contrary to the submission of some of the appellants, they do not constitute a new and hitherto untried "test" for the sanctioning of a plan under the CCAA. They simply represent findings of fact and inferences on the part of the application judge that underpin his conclusions on jurisdiction and fairness.

115 The appellants all contend that the obligation to release the third parties from claims in fraud, tort, breach of fiduciary duty, etc. is confiscatory and amounts to a requirement that they -- as individual creditors -- make the equivalent of a greater financial contribution to the Plan. In his usual lively fashion, Mr. Sternberg asked us the same rhetorical question he posed to the application judge. As he put it, how could the court countenance the compromise of what in the future might turn out to be fraud perpetrated at the highest levels of Canadian and foreign banks? Several appellants complain that the proposed Plan is unfair to them because they will make very little additional recovery if the Plan goes forward, but will be required to forfeit a cause of action against third-party financial institutions that may yield them significant recovery. Others protest that they are being treated unequally because they are ineligible for relief programs that Liquidity Providers such as Canaccord have made available to other smaller investors.

116 All of these arguments are persuasive to varying degrees when considered in isolation. The application judge did not have that luxury, however. He was required to consider the circumstances of the restructuring as a whole, including the reality that many of the financial institutions were not only acting as Dealers or brokers of the ABCP Notes (with the impugned releases relating to the financial institutions in these capacities, for the most part) but also as Asset and Liquidity Providers (with the financial institutions making significant contributions to the restructuring in these capacities).

117 In insolvency restructuring proceedings almost everyone loses something. To the extent that creditors are required to compromise their claims, it can always be proclaimed that their rights are being unfairly confiscated and that they are being called upon to make the equivalent of a further financial contribution to the compromise or arrangement. Judges have observed on a number of occasions that CCAA proceedings involve "a balancing of prejudices," inasmuch as everyone is adversely affected in some fashion.

118 Here, the debtor corporations being restructured represent the issuers of the more than \$32 billion in non-bank sponsored ABCP Notes. The proposed compromise and arrangement affects that entire segment of the ABCP market and the financial markets as a whole. In that respect, the application judge was correct in adverting to the importance of the restructuring to the resolution of the ABCP liquidity crisis and to the need to restore confidence in the financial system in Canada. He was required to consider and balance the interests of all Noteholders, not just the interests of the appellants, whose notes represent only about 3% of that total. That is what he did.

119 The application judge noted at para. 126 that the Plan represented "a reasonable balance between benefit to all Noteholders and enhanced recovery for those who can make out specific claims in fraud" within the fraud carve-out provisions of the releases. He also recognized at para. 134 that:

No Plan of this size and complexity could be expected to satisfy all affected by it. The size of the majority who have approved it is testament to its overall fairness. No plan to address a crisis of this magnitude can work perfect equity among all stakeholders.

120 In my view we ought not to interfere with his decision that the Plan is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances.

D. DISPOSITION

121 For the foregoing reasons, I would grant leave to appeal from the decision of Justice Campbell, but dismiss the appeal.

R.A. BLAIR J.A.

J.I. LASKIN J.A.:-- I agree.

E.A. CRONK J.A.:-- I agree.

* * * * *

SCHEDULE "A" - CONDUITS

Apollo Trust

Apsley Trust

Aria Trust

Aurora Trust

Comet Trust

Encore Trust

Gemini Trust

Ironstone Trust

MMAI-I Trust

Newshore Canadian Trust

Opus Trust

Planet Trust

Rocket Trust

Selkirk Funding Trust

Silverstone Trust

Slate Trust

Structured Asset Trust

Structured Investment Trust III

Symphony Trust

Whitehall Trust

* * * * *

SCHEDULE "B" - APPLICANTS

ATB Financial

Caisse de Dépôt et Placement du Québec

Canaccord Capital Corporation

Canada Post Corporation

Credit Union Central of Alberta Limited
Credit Union Central of British Columbia
Credit Union Central of Canada
Credit Union Central of Ontario
Credit Union Central of Saskatchewan
Desjardins Group
Magna International Inc.
National Bank Financial Inc./National Bank of Canada
NAV Canada
Northwater Capital Management Inc.
Public Sector Pension Investment Board
The Governors of the University of Alberta

* * * * *

SCHEDULE "A" - COUNSEL

- 1) Benjamin Zarnett and Frederick L. Myers for the Pan-Canadian Investors Committee.
- 2) Aubrey E. Kauffman and Stuart Brotman for 4446372 Canada Inc. and 6932819 Canada Inc.
- 3) Peter F.C. Howard and Samaneh Hosseini for Bank of America N.A.; Citibank N.A.; Citibank Canada, in its capacity as Credit Derivative Swap Counterparty and not in any other capacity; Deutsche Bank AG; HSBC Bank Canada; HSBC Bank USA, National Association; Merrill Lynch International; Merrill Lynch Capital Services, Inc.; Swiss Re Financial Products Corporation; and UBS AG.
- 4) Kenneth T. Rosenberg, Lily Harmer and Max Starnino for Jura Energy Corporation and Redcorp Ventures Ltd.
- 5) Craig J. Hill and Sam P. Rappos for the Monitors (ABCP Appeals).
- 6) Jeffrey C. Carhart and Joseph Marin for Ad Hoc Committee and Pricewaterhouse Coopers Inc., in its capacity as Financial Advisor.
- 7) Mario J. Forte for Caisse de Dépôt et Placement du Québec.
- 8) John B. Laskin for National Bank Financial Inc. and National Bank of Canada.
- 9) Thomas McRae and Arthur O. Jacques for Ad Hoc Retail Creditors Committee (Brian Hunter, et al).
- 10) Howard Shapray, Q.C. and Stephen Fitterman for Ivanhoe Mines Ltd.
- 11) Kevin P. McElcheran and Heather L. Meredith for Canadian Banks, BMO, CIBC RBC, Bank of Nova Scotia and T.D. Bank.

- 12) Jeffrey S. Leon for CIBC Mellon Trust Company, Computershare Trust Company of Canada and BNY Trust Company of Canada, as Indenture Trustees.
- 13) Usman Sheikh for Coventree Capital Inc.
- 14) Allan Sternberg and Sam R. Sasso for Brookfield Asset Management and Partners Ltd. and Hy Bloom Inc. and Cardacian Mortgage Services Inc.
- 15) Neil C. Saxe for Dominion Bond Rating Service.
- 16) James A. Woods, Sebastien Richemont and Marie-Anne Paquette for Air Transat A.T. Inc., Transat Tours Canada Inc., The Jean Coutu Group (PJC) Inc., Aéroports de Montréal, Aéroports de Montréal Capital Inc., Pomerleau Ontario Inc., Pomerleau Inc., Labopharm Inc., Agence Métropolitaine de Transport (AMT), Giro Inc., Vêtements de sports RGR Inc., 131519 Canada Inc., Tecsys Inc., New Gold Inc. and Jazz Air LP.
- 17) Scott A. Turner for Webtech Wireless Inc., Wynn Capital Corporation Inc., West Energy Ltd., Sabre Energy Ltd., Petrolifera Petroleum Ltd., Vaquero Resources Ltd., and Standard Energy Ltd.
- 18) R. Graham Phoenix for Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments III Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments V Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments XI Corp., Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments XII Corp., Quanto Financial Corporation and Metcalfe & Mansfield Capital Corp.

cp/e/ln/qlkxl/qlkbb/qltlt/qlrxg/qlhcs/qlcas/qlhcs/qlhcs

1 Section 5.1 of the CCAA specifically authorizes the granting of releases to directors in certain circumstances.

2 Justice Georgina R. Jackson and Dr. Janis P. Sarra, "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters" in Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law, 2007* (Vancouver: Thomson Carswell, 2007).

3 Citing Gibbs J.A. in *Chef Ready Foods, supra*, at pp. 319-320.

4 The Legislative Debates at the time the CCAA was introduced in Parliament in April 1933 make it clear that the CCAA is patterned after the predecessor provisions of s. 425 of the *Companies Act 1985* (U.K.): see *House of Commons Debates (Hansard), supra*.

5 See *Canada Business Corporations Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44, s. 192; *Ontario Business Corporations Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. B.16, s. 182.

6 A majority in number representing two-thirds in value of the creditors (s. 6).

7 *Steinberg* was originally reported in French: [1993] R.J.Q. 1684 (C.A.). All paragraph references to *Steinberg* in this judgment are from the unofficial English translation available at 1993 CarswellQue 2055.

8 Reed Dickerson, *The Interpretation and Application of Statutes* (1975) at pp. 234-235, cited in Bryan A. Garner, ed., *Black's Law Dictionary*, 8th ed. (West Group, St. Paul, Minn., 2004) at 621.

TAB 2

Case Name:
Sino-Forest Corp. (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**

[2012] O.J. No. 3627

2012 ONSC 4377

92 C.B.R. (5th) 99

2012 CarswellOnt 9430

Court File No. CV-12-9667-00CL

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

G.B. Morawetz J.

Heard: June 26, 2012.
Judgment: July 27, 2012.

(98 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Creditors and claims -- Claims -- Priorities -- Application by Sino-Forest Corporation ("SFC") for a declaration that the shareholder claims and the indemnity claims against SFC were "equity claims" as defined in the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA"), allowed -- Shareholders had commenced actions against SFC and had joined SFC's auditors and underwriters as defendants -- Auditors and underwriters launched contribution and indemnity claims against SFC -- Characterization of indemnity claims were dependent on the characterization of the underlying shareholder claims -- Shareholder claims were clearly equity claims, as they related to the ownership, purchase or sale of SFC shares -- Accordingly, indemnity claims were also equity claims.

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Application of Act -- Compromises and arrangements -- Claims -- Priority -- Application by Si-

no-Forest Corporation ("SFC") for a declaration that the shareholder claims and the indemnity claims against SFC were "equity claims" as defined in the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA"), allowed -- Shareholders had commenced actions against SFC and had joined SFC's auditors and underwriters as defendants -- Auditors and underwriters launched contribution and indemnity claims against SFC -- Characterization of indemnity claims were dependent on the characterization of the underlying shareholder claims -- Shareholder claims were clearly equity claims, as they related to the ownership, purchase or sale of SFC shares -- Accordingly, indemnity claims were also equity claims.

Application by Sino-Forest Corporation ("SFC") for an order directing that the shareholder claims against SFC were "equity claims" as defined in s. 2 of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA") as well as any indemnity claims against SFC that were related to or arose from the shareholder claims. Shareholders had commenced claims against SFC in Ontario, Quebec, Saskatchewan and New York. While the claims varied in certain respects, they all alleged that SFC's actions and misrepresentations artificially inflated SFC's share prices and caused the shareholders to suffer a monetary loss resulting from the ownership, purchase or sale of the shares. The shareholders had joined the auditors and underwriters as defendants to their claims against SFC. The auditors and underwriters consequently claimed against SFC for contribution and indemnity. The auditors argued that their claims were not "equity claims", as they had distinct claims against SFC independent of the shareholders' claims which were not dependent on the success of the shareholders' claims. The underwriters also argued that SFC's application was premature. If the claims were determined to be equity claims, they would be subordinated to other claims.

HELD: Application allowed. SFC's application was not premature, as the threshold issue of whether or not the two sets of claims were equity claims did not depend on the determination or quantification of any claim. Rather, its effect established whether the claims of the auditors and the underwriters would be subordinated pursuant to the provisions of the CCAA. The characterization of the indemnity claims turned on the characterization of the underlying primary claims of the shareholders. The claims advanced in the shareholder claims were clearly equity claims and fell squarely within the definition in s. 2 of the CCAA. Those shareholder claims provided the basis for the indemnity claims. The focus of the definition of "equity claim" was not on the identity of the claimant but the nature of the claim. But for the shareholders' claims, it was inconceivable that the auditors and underwriters would have launched the sizable claims they did against SFC. It would have been inconsistent to have arrived at a conclusion that enabled either the auditors or the underwriters, through a claim for indemnification, to be treated as creditors when the underlying shareholders actions could not have the same status. It did not matter whether the indemnity claims had been made at common law or whether they were based in contract.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 2, s. 2, s. 6(8), s. 22(1)

Securities Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5,

Counsel:

Robert W. Staley and Jonathan Bell, for the Applicant.

Jennifer Stam, for the Monitor.

Kenneth Dekker, for BDO Limited.

Peter Griffin and Peter Osborne, for Ernst & Young LLP.

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

James Grout, for the Ontario Securities Commission.

Emily Cole and Joseph Marin, for Allen Chan.

Simon Bieber, for David Horsley.

David Bish, John Fabello and Adam Slavens, for the Underwriters Named in the Class Action.

Max Starnino and Kirk Baert, for the Ontario Plaintiffs.

Larry Lowenstein, for the Board of Directors.

ENDORSEMENT

G.B. MORAWETZ J.:--

Overview

1 Sino-Forest Corporation ("SFC" or the "Applicant") seeks an order directing that claims against SFC, which result from the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest in SFC, are "equity claims" as defined in section 2 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") including, without limitation: (i) the claims by or on behalf of current or former shareholders asserted in the proceedings listed in Schedule "A" (collectively, the "Shareholder Claims"); and (ii) any indemnification claims against SFC related to or arising from the Shareholder Claims, including, without limitation, those by or on behalf of any of the other defendants to the proceedings listed in Schedule "A" (the "Related Indemnity Claims").

2 SFC takes the position that the Shareholder Claims are "equity claims" as defined in the CCAA as they are claims in respect of a monetary loss resulting from the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest in SFC and, therefore, come within the definition. SFC also takes the position that the Related Indemnity Claims are "equity claims" as defined in the CCAA as they are claims for contribution or indemnity in respect of a claim that is an equity claim and, therefore, also come within the definition.

3 On March 30, 2012, the court granted the Initial Order providing for the CCAA stay against SFC and certain of its subsidiaries. FTI Consulting Canada Inc. was appointed as Monitor.

4 On the same day, the Sales Process Order was granted, approving Sales Process procedures and authorizing and directing SFC, the Monitor and Houlihan Lokey to carry out the Sales Process.

5 On May 14, 2012, the court issued a Claims Procedure Order, which established June 20, 2012 as the Claims Bar Date.

6 The stay of proceedings has since been extended to September 28, 2012.

7 Since the outset of the proceedings, SFC has taken the position that it is important for these proceedings to be completed as soon as possible in order to, among other things, (i) enable the business operated in the Peoples Republic of China ("PRC") to be separated from SFC and put under new ownership; (ii) enable the restructured business to participate in the Q4 sales season in the PRC market; and (iii) maintain the confidence of stakeholders in the PRC (including local and national governmental bodies, PRC lenders and other stakeholders) that the business in the PRC can be successfully separated from SFC and operate in the ordinary course in the near future.

8 SFC has negotiated a Support Agreement with the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders and intends to file a plan of compromise or arrangement (the "Plan") under the CCAA by no later than August 27, 2012, based on the deadline set out in the Support Agreement and what they submit is the commercial reality that SFC must complete its restructuring as soon as possible.

9 Noteholders holding in excess of \$1.296 billion, or approximately 72% of the approximately \$1.8 billion of SFC's noteholders' debt, have executed written support agreements to support the SFC CCAA Plan as of March 30, 2012.

Shareholder Claims Asserted Against SFC

(i) Ontario

10 By Fresh as Amended Statement of Claim dated April 26, 2012 (the "Ontario Statement of Claim"), the Trustees of the Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada and other plaintiffs asserted various claims in a class proceeding (the "Ontario Class Proceedings") against SFC, certain of its current and former officers and directors, Ernst & Young LLP ("E&Y"), BDO Limited ("BDO"), Poyry (Beijing) Consulting Company Limited ("Poyry") and SFC's underwriters (collectively, the "Underwriters").

11 Section 1(m) of the Ontario Statement of Claim defines "class" and "class members" as:

All persons and entities, wherever they may reside who acquired Sino's Securities during the Class Period by distribution in Canada or on the Toronto Stock Exchange or other secondary market in Canada, which securities include those acquired over the counter, and all persons and entities who acquired Sino's Securities during the Class Period who are resident of Canada or were resident of Canada at the time of acquisition and who acquired Sino's Securities outside of Canada, except the Excluded Persons.

12 The term "Securities" is defined as "Sino's common shares, notes and other securities, as defined in the OSA". The term "Class Period" is defined as the period from and including March 19, 2007 up to and including June 2, 2011.

13 The Ontario Class Proceedings seek damages in the amount of approximately \$9.2 billion against SFC and the other defendants.

14 The thrust of the complaint in the Ontario Class Proceedings is that the class members are alleged to have purchased securities at "inflated prices during the Class Period" and that absent the alleged misconduct, sales of such securities "would have occurred at prices that reflected the true value" of the securities. It is further alleged that "the price of Sino's Securities was directly affected during the Class Period by the issuance of the Impugned Documents".

(ii) Quebec

15 By action filed in Quebec on June 9, 2011, Guining Liu commenced an action (the "Quebec Class Proceedings") against SFC, certain of its current and former officers and directors, E&Y and Poyry. The Quebec Class Proceedings do not name BDO or the Underwriters as defendants. The Quebec Class Proceedings also do not specify the quantum of damages sought, but rather reference "damages in an amount equal to the losses that it and the other members of the group suffered as a result of purchasing or acquiring securities of Sino at inflated prices during the Class Period".

16 The complaints in the Quebec Class Proceedings centre on the effect of alleged misrepresentations on the share price. The duty allegedly owed to the class members is said to be based in "law and other provisions of the *Securities Act*", to ensure the prompt dissemination of truthful, complete and accurate statements regarding SFC's business and affairs and to correct any previously-issued materially inaccurate statements.

(iii) Saskatchewan

17 By Statement of Claim dated December 1, 2011 (the "Saskatchewan Statement of Claim"), Mr. Allan Haigh commenced an action (the "Saskatchewan Class Proceedings") against SFC, Allen Chan and David Horsley.

18 The Saskatchewan Statement of Claim does not specify the quantum of damages sought, but instead states in more general terms that the plaintiff seeks "aggravated and compensatory damages against the defendants in an amount to be determined at trial".

19 The Saskatchewan Class Proceedings focus on the effect of the alleged wrongful acts upon the trading price of SFC's securities:

The price of Sino's securities was directly affected during the Class Period by the issuance of the Impugned Documents. The defendants were aware at all material times that the effect of Sino's disclosure documents upon the price of its Sino's [sic] securities.

(iv) New York

20 By Verified Class Action Complaint dated January 27, 2012, (the "New York Complaint"), Mr. David Leopard and IMF Finance SA commenced a class proceeding against SFC, Mr. Allen Chan, Mr. David Horsley, Mr. Kai Kit Poon, a subset of the Underwriters, E&Y, and Ernst & Young Global Limited (the "New York Class Proceedings").

21 SFC contends that the New York Class Proceedings focus on the effect of the alleged wrongful acts upon the trading price of SFC's securities.

22 The plaintiffs in the various class actions have named parties other than SFC as defendants, notably, the Underwriters and the auditors, E&Y, and BDO, as summarized in the table below. The positions of those parties are detailed later in these reasons.

Ontario	Quebec	Saskatchewan	New York
---------	--------	--------------	----------

E&Y LLP	X	X	-	X
E&Y Global	-	-	-	X
BDO	X	-	-	-
Poyry	X	X	-	-
Underwriters	11	-	-	2

Legal Framework

23 Even before the 2009 amendments to the CCAA dealing with equity claims, courts recognized that there is a fundamental difference between shareholder equity claims as they relate to an insolvent entity versus creditor claims. Essentially, shareholders cannot reasonably expect to maintain a financial interest in an insolvent company where creditor claims are not being paid in full. Simply put, shareholders have no economic interest in an insolvent enterprise: *Blue Range Resource Corp. (Re)*, [2000] 4 W.W.R. 738 (Alta. Q.B.) [*Blue Range Resources*]; *Stelco Inc. (Re)*, 2006 CanLII 1773 (Ont. S.C.J.) [*Stelco*]; *Royal Bank of Canada v. Central Capital Corp.* (1996), 27 O.R. (3d) 494 (C.A.).

24 The basis for the differentiation flows from the fundamentally different nature of debt and equity investments. Shareholders have unlimited upside potential when purchasing shares. Creditors have no corresponding upside potential: *Nelson Financial Group Limited (Re)*, 2010 ONSC 6229 [*Nelson Financial*].

25 As a result, courts subordinated equity claims and denied such claims a vote in plans of arrangement: *Blue Range Resource, supra*; *Stelco, supra*; *EarthFirst Canada Inc. (Re)* (2009), 56 C.B.R. (5th) 102 (Alta. Q.B.) [*EarthFirst Canada*]; and *Nelson Financial, supra*.

26 In 2009, significant amendments were made to the CCAA. Specific amendments were made with the intention of clarifying that equity claims are subordinated to other claims.

27 The 2009 amendments define an "equity claim" and an "equity interest". Section 2 of the CCAA includes the following definitions:

"Equity Claim" means a claim that is in respect of an equity interest, including a claim for, among others, (...)

- (d) a monetary loss resulting from the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest or from the rescission, or, in Quebec, the annulment, of a purchase or sale of an equity interest, or
- (e) contribution or indemnity in respect of a claim referred to in any of paragraphs (a) to (d);

"Equity Interest" means

- (a) in the case of a company other than an income trust, a share in the company - or a warrant or option or another right to acquire a share in the company - other than one that is derived from a convertible debt,

28 Section 6(8) of the CCAA prohibits a distribution to equity claimants prior to payment in full of all non-equity claims.

29 Section 22(1) of the CCAA provides that equity claimants are prohibited from voting on a plan unless the court orders otherwise.

Position of Ernst & Young

30 E&Y opposes the relief sought, at least as against E&Y, since the E&Y proof of claim evidence demonstrates in its view that E&Y's claim:

- (a) is not an equity claim;
- (b) does not derive from or depend upon an equity claim (in whole or in part);
- (c) represents discreet and independent causes of action as against SFC and its directors and officers arising from E&Y's direct contractual relationship with such parties (or certain of such parties) and/or the tortious conduct of SFC and/or its directors and officers for which they are in law responsible to E&Y; and
- (d) can succeed independently of whether or not the claims of the plaintiffs in the class actions succeed.

31 In its factum, counsel to E&Y acknowledges that during the periods relevant to the Class Action Proceedings, E&Y was retained as SFC's auditor and acted as such from 2007 until it resigned on April 5, 2012.

32 On June 2, 2011, Muddy Waters LLC ("Muddy Waters") issued a report which purported to reveal fraud at SFC. In the wake of that report, SFC's share price plummeted and Muddy Waters profited from its short position.

33 E&Y was served with a multitude of class action claims in numerous jurisdictions.

34 The plaintiffs in the Ontario Class Proceedings claim damages in the aggregate, as against all defendants, of \$9.2 billion on behalf of resident and non-resident shareholders and noteholders. The causes of action alleged are both statutory, under the *Securities Act (Ontario)* and at common law, in negligence and negligent misrepresentation.

35 In its factum, counsel to E&Y acknowledges that the central claim in the class actions is that SFC made a series of misrepresentations in respect of its timber assets. The claims against E&Y and the other third party defendants are that they failed to detect these misrepresentations and note in particular that E&Y's audit did not comply with Canadian generally accepted accounting standards. Similar claims are advanced in Quebec and the U.S.

36 Counsel to E&Y notes that on May 14, 2012 the court granted a Claims Procedure Order which, among other things, requires proofs of claim to be filed no later than June 20, 2012. E&Y takes issue with the fact that this motion was then brought notwithstanding that proofs of claim and D&O proofs of claim had not yet been filed.

37 E&Y has filed with the Monitor, in accordance with the Claims Procedure Order, a proof of claim against SFC and a proof of claim against the directors and officers of SFC.

38 E&Y takes the position that it has contractual claims of indemnification against SFC and its subsidiaries and has statutory and common law claims of contribution and/or indemnity against SFC and its subsidiaries for all relevant years. E&Y contends that it has stand-alone claims for breach of contract and negligent and/or fraudulent misrepresentation against the company and its directors and officers.

39 Counsel submits that E&Y's claims against Sino-Forest and the SFC subsidiaries are:

- (a) creditor claims;
- (b) derived from E&Y retainers by and/or on behalf of Sino-Forest and the SFC subsidiaries and E&Y's relationship with such parties, all of which are wholly independent and conceptually different from the claims advanced by the class action plaintiffs;
- (c) claims that include the cost of defending and responding to various proceedings, both pre- and post-filing; and
- (d) not equity claims in the sense contemplated by the CCAA. E&Y's submission is that equity holders of Sino-Forest have not advanced, and could not advance, any claims against SFC's subsidiaries.

40 Counsel further contends that E&Y's claim is distinct from any and all potential and actual claims by the plaintiffs in the class actions against Sino-Forest and that E&Y's claim for contribution and/or indemnity is not based on the claims against Sino-Forest advanced in the class actions but rather only in part on those claims, as any success of the plaintiffs in the class actions against E&Y would not necessarily lead to success against Sino-Forest, and vice versa. Counsel contends that E&Y has a distinct claim against Sino-Forest independent of that of the plaintiffs in the class actions. The success of E&Y's claims against Sino-Forest and the SFC subsidiaries, and the success of the claims advanced by the class action plaintiffs, are not co-dependent. Consequently, counsel contends that E&Y's claim is that of an unsecured creditor.

41 From a policy standpoint, counsel to E&Y contends that the nature of the relationship between a shareholder, who may be in a position to assert an equity claim (in addition to other claims) is fundamentally different from the relationship existing between a corporation and its auditors.

Position of BDO Limited

42 BDO was auditor of Sino-Forest Corporation between 2005 and 2007, when it was replaced by E&Y.

43 BDO has a filed a proof of claim against Sino-Forest pursuant to the Claims Procedure Order.

44 BDO's claim against Sino-Forest is primarily for breach of contract.

45 BDO takes the position that its indemnity claims, similar to those advanced by E&Y and the Underwriters, are not equity claims within the meaning of s. 2 of the CCAA.

46 BDO adopts the submissions of E&Y which, for the purposes of this endorsement, are not repeated.

Position of the Underwriters

47 The Underwriters take the position that the court should not decide the equity claims motion at this time because it is premature or, alternatively, if the court decides the equity claims motion, the equity claims order should not be granted because the Related Indemnity Claims are not "equity claims" as defined in s. 2 of the CCAA.

48 The Underwriters are among the defendants named in some of the class actions. In connection with the offerings, certain Underwriters entered into agreements with Sino-Forest and certain of its subsidiaries providing that Sino-Forest and, with respect to certain offerings, the Sino-Forest subsidiary companies, agree to indemnify and hold harmless the Underwriters in connection with an array of matters that could arise from the offerings.

49 The Underwriters raise the following issues:

- (i) Should this court decide the equity claims motion at this time?
- (ii) If this court decides the equity claims motion at this time, should the equity claims order be granted?

50 On the first issue, counsel to the Underwriters takes the position that the issue is not yet ripe for determination.

51 Counsel submits that, by seeking the equity claims order at this time, Sino-Forest is attempting to pre-empt the Claims Procedure Order, which already provides a process for the determination of claims. Until such time as the claims procedure in respect of the Related Indemnity Claims is completed, and those claims are determined pursuant to that process, counsel contends the subject of the equity claims motion raises a merely hypothetical question as the court is being asked to determine the proper interpretation of s. 2 of the CCAA before it has the benefit of an actual claim in dispute before it.

52 Counsel further contends that by asking the court to render judgment on the proper interpretation of s. 2 of the CCAA in the hypothetical, Sino-Forest has put the court in a position where its judgment will not be made in the context of particular facts or with a full and complete evidentiary record.

53 Even if the court determines that it can decide this motion at this time, the Underwriters submit that the relief requested should not be granted.

Position of the Applicant

54 The Applicant submits that the amendments to the CCAA relating to equity claims closely parallel existing U.S. law on the subject and that Canadian courts have looked to U.S. courts for guidance on the issue of equity claims as the subordination of equity claims has long been codified there: see e.g. *Blue Range Resources, supra*, and *Nelson Financial, supra*.

55 The Applicant takes the position that based on the plain language of the CCAA, the Shareholder Claims are "equity claims" as defined in s. 2 as they are claims in respect of a "monetary loss resulting from the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest".

56 The Applicant also submits the following:

- (a) the Ontario, Quebec, Saskatchewan and New York Class Actions (collectively, the "Class Actions") all advance claims on behalf of shareholders.
- (b) the Class Actions also allege wrongful conduct that affected the trading price of the shares, in that the alleged misrepresentation "artificially inflated" the share price; and
- (c) the Class Actions seek damages relating to the trading price of SFC shares and, as such, allege a "monetary loss" that resulted from the ownership, purchase or sale of shares, as defined in s. 2 of the CCAA.

57 Counsel further submits that, as the Shareholder Claims are "equity claims", they are expressly subordinated to creditor claims and are prohibited from voting on the plan of arrangement.

58 Counsel to the Applicant also submits that the definition of "equity claims" in s. 2 of the CCAA expressly includes indemnity claims that relate to other equity claims. As such, the Related Indemnity Claims are equity claims within the meaning of s. 2.

59 Counsel further submits that there is no distinction in the CCAA between the source of any claim for contribution or indemnity; whether by statute, common law, contractual or otherwise. Further, and to the contrary, counsel submits that the legal characterization of a contribution or indemnity claim depends solely on the characterization of the primary claim upon which contribution or indemnity is sought.

60 Counsel points out that in *Return on Innovation Capital v. Gandi Innovations Limited*, 2011 ONSC 5018, leave to appeal denied, 2012 ONCA 10 [*Return on Innovation*] this court characterized the contractual indemnification claims of directors and officers in respect of an equity claim as "equity claims".

61 Counsel also submits that guidance on the treatment of underwriter and auditor indemnification claims can be obtained from the U.S. experience. In the U.S., courts have held that the indemnification claims of underwriters for liability or defence costs constitute equity claims that are subordinated to the claims of general creditors. Counsel submits that insofar as the primary source of liability is characterized as an equity claim, so too is any claim for contribution and indemnity based on that equity claim.

62 In this case, counsel contends, the Related Indemnity Claims are clearly claims for "contribution and indemnity" based on the Shareholder Claims.

Position of the Ad Hoc Noteholders

63 Counsel to the Ad Hoc Noteholders submits that the Shareholder Claims are "equity claims" as they are claims in respect of an equity interest and are claims for "a monetary loss resulting from

the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest" per subsection (d) of the definition of "equity claims" in the CCAA.

64 Counsel further submits that the Related Indemnity Claims are also "equity claims" as they fall within the "clear and unambiguous" language used in the definition of "equity claim" in the CCAA. Subsection (e) of the definition refers expressly and without qualification to claims for "contribution or indemnity" in respect of claims such as the Shareholder Claims.

65 Counsel further submits that had the legislature intended to qualify the reference to "contribution or indemnity" in order to exempt the claims of certain parties, it could have done so, but it did not.

66 Counsel also submits that, if the plain language of subsection (e) is not upheld, shareholders of SFC could potentially create claims to receive indirectly what they could not receive directly (*i.e.*, payment in respect of equity claims through the Related Indemnity Claims) - a result that could not have been intended by the legislature as it would be inconsistent with the purposes of the CCAA.

67 Counsel to the Ad Hoc Noteholders also submits that, before the CCAA amendments in 2009 (the "CCAA Amendments"), courts subordinated claims on the basis of:

- (a) the general expectations of creditors and shareholders with respect to priority and assumption of risks; and
- (b) the equitable principles and considerations set out in certain U.S. cases: see *e.g. Blue Range Resources, supra*.

68 Counsel further submits that, before the CCAA Amendments took effect, courts had expanded the types of claims characterized as equity claims; first to claims for damages of defrauded shareholders and then to contractual indemnity claims of shareholders: see *Blue Range Resources, supra* and *EarthFirst Canada, supra*.

69 Counsel for the Ad Hoc Noteholders also submits that indemnity claims of underwriters have been treated as equity claims in the United States, pursuant to section 510(b) of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code. This submission is detailed at paragraphs 20-25 of their factum which reads as follows:

20. The desire to more closely align the Canadian approach to equity claims with the U.S. approach was among the considerations that gave rise to the codification of the treatment of equity claims. Canadian courts have also looked to the U.S. law for guidance on the issue of equity claims where codification of the subordination of equity claims has been long-standing.

Janis Sarra at p. 209, Ad Hoc Committee's Book of Authorities, Tab 10.

Report of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, "Debtors and Creditors Sharing the Burden: A Review of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* and the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*" (2003) at 158, [...]

Blue Range [Resources] at paras. 41-57 [...]

21. Pursuant to s. 510(b) of the *U.S. Bankruptcy Code*, all creditors must be paid in full before shareholders are entitled to receive any distribution. s. 510(b) of the *U.S. Bankruptcy Code* and the relevant portion of s. 502, which is referenced in s. 510(b), provide as follows:

s. 510. Subordination

- (b) For the purpose of distribution under this title, a claim arising from rescission of a purchase or sale of a security of the debtor or of an affiliate of the debtor, for damages arising from the purchase or sale of such a security, or for reimbursement or contribution allowed under 502 on account of such a claim, shall be subordinated to all claims or interests that are senior to or equal the claim or interest represented by such security, except that if such security is common stock, such claim has the same priority as common stock.

s. 502. Allowance of claims or interests

- (e) (1) Notwithstanding subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section and paragraph (2) of this subsection, the court shall disallow any claim for reimbursement or contribution of an entity that is liable with the debtor on or has secured the claim of a creditor, to the extent that

...

- (B) such claim for reimbursement or contribution is contingent as of the time of allowance or disallowance of such claim for reimbursement or contribution; or

...

- (2) A claim for reimbursement or contribution of such an entity that becomes fixed after the commencement of the case shall be determined, and shall be allowed under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of this section, or disallowed under subsection (d) of this section, the same as if such claim had become fixed before the date of the filing of the petition.

22. U.S. appellate courts have interpreted the statutory language in s. 510(b) broadly to subordinate the claims of shareholders that have a nexus or causal relationship to the purchase or sale of securities, including damages arising from alleged illegality in the sale or purchase of securities or from corporate misconduct whether predicated on pre or post-issuance conduct.

Re Telegroup Inc. (2002), 281 F. 3d 133 (3rd Cir. U.S. Court of Appeals) [...]

American Broadcasting Systems Inc. v. Nugent, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Case Number 98-17133 (24 January 2001) [...]

23. Further, U.S. courts have held that indemnification claims of underwriters against the corporation for liability or defence costs when shareholders or former shareholders have sued underwriters constitute equity claims in the insolvency of the corporation that are subordinated to the claims of general creditors based on: (a) the plain language of s. 510(b), which references claims for "reimbursement or contribution" and (b) risk allocation as between general creditors and those parties that play a role in the purchase and sale of securities that give rise to the shareholder claims (i.e., directors, officers and underwriters).

In re Mid-American Waste Sys., 228 B.R. 816, 1999 Bankr. LEXIS 27 (Bankr. D. Del. 1999) [*Mid-American*] [...]

In re Jacom Computer Servs., 280 B.R. 570, 2002 Bankr. LEXIS 758 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2002) [...]

24. In *Mid-American*, the Court stated the following with respect to the "plain language" of s. 510(b), its origins and the inclusion of "reimbursement or contribution" claims in that section:

... I find that the plain language of s. 510(b), its legislative history, and applicable case law clearly show that s. 510(b) intends to subordinate the indemnification claims of officers, directors, and underwriters for both liability and expenses incurred in connection with the pursuit of claims for rescission or damages by purchasers or sellers of the debtor's securities. The meaning of amended s. 510(b), specifically the language "for reimbursement or contribution . . . on account of [a claim arising from rescission or damages arising from the purchase or sale of a security]," can be discerned by a plain reading of its language.

... it is readily apparent that the rationale for section 510(b) is not limited to preventing shareholder claimants from improving their position vis-a-vis general creditors; Congress also made the decision to subordinate based on risk allocation. Consequently, when Congress amended s. 510(b) to add reimbursement and contribution claims, it was not radically departing from an equityholder claimant treatment provision, as NatWest suggests; it simply added to the subordination treatment new classes of persons and entities involved with the securities transactions giving rise to the rescission and damage claims. The 1984 amendment to s. 510(b) is a logical extension of one of the rationales for the original section -- because Congress intended the holders of securities law claims to be subordinated, why not

also subordinate claims of other parties (e.g., officers and directors and underwriters) who play a role in the purchase and sale transactions which give rise to the securities law claims? As I view it, in 1984 Congress made a legislative judgment that claims emanating from tainted securities law transactions should not have the same priority as the claims of general creditors of the estate. [emphasis added] [...]

25. Further, the U.S. courts have held that the degree of culpability of the respective parties is a non-issue in the disallowance of claims for indemnification of underwriters; the equities are meant to benefit the debtor's direct creditors, not secondarily liable creditors with contingent claims.

In re Drexel Burnham Lambert Group, 148 B.R. 982, 1992 Bankr. LEXIS 2023 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1992) [...]

70 Counsel submits that there is no principled basis for treating indemnification claims of auditors differently than those of underwriters.

Analysis

Is it Premature to Determine the Issue?

71 The class action litigation was commenced prior to the CCAA Proceedings. It is clear that the claims of shareholders as set out in the class action claims against SFC are "equity claims" within the meaning of the CCAA.

72 In my view, this issue is not premature for determination, as is submitted by the Underwriters.

73 The Class Action Proceedings preceded the CCAA Proceedings. It has been clear since the outset of the CCAA Proceedings that this issue - namely, whether the claims of E&Y, BDO and the Underwriters as against SFC, would be considered "equity claims" - would have to be determined.

74 It has also been clear from the outset of the CCAA Proceedings, that a Sales Process would be undertaken and the expected proceeds arising from the Sales Process would generate proceeds insufficient to satisfy the claims of creditors.

75 The Claims Procedure is in place but, it seems to me that the issue that has been placed before the court on this motion can be determined independently of the Claims Procedure. I do not accept that any party can be said to be prejudiced if this threshold issue is determined at this time. The threshold issue does not depend upon a determination of quantification of any claim. Rather, its effect will be to establish whether the claims of E&Y, BDO and the Underwriters will be subordinated pursuant to the provisions of the CCAA. This is independent from a determination as to the validity of any claim and the quantification thereof.

Should the Equity Claims Order be Granted?

76 I am in agreement with the submission of counsel for the Ad Hoc Noteholders to the effect that the characterization of claims for indemnity turns on the characterization of the underlying primary claims.

77 In my view, the claims advanced in the Shareholder Claims are clearly equity claims. The Shareholder Claims underlie the Related Indemnity Claims.

78 In my view, the CCAA Amendments have codified the treatment of claims addressed in pre-amendment cases and have further broadened the scope of equity claims.

79 The plain language in the definition of "equity claim" does not focus on the identity of the claimant. Rather, it focuses on the nature of the claim. In this case, it seems clear that the Shareholder Claims led to the Related Indemnity Claims. Put another way, the inescapable conclusion is that the Related Indemnity Claims are being used to recover an equity investment.

80 The plain language of the CCAA dictates the outcome, namely, that the Shareholder Claims and the Related Indemnity Claims constitute "equity claims" within the meaning of the CCAA. This conclusion is consistent with the trend towards an expansive interpretation of the definition of "equity claims" to achieve the purpose of the CCAA.

81 In *Return on Innovation*, Newbould J. characterized the contractual indemnification claims of directors and officers as "equity claims". The Court of Appeal denied leave to appeal. The analysis in *Return on Innovation* leads to the conclusion that the Related Indemnity Claims are also equity claims under the CCAA.

82 It would be totally inconsistent to arrive at a conclusion that would enable either the auditors or the Underwriters, through a claim for indemnification, to be treated as creditors when the underlying actions of the shareholders cannot achieve the same status. To hold otherwise would indeed provide an indirect remedy where a direct remedy is not available.

83 Further, on the issue of whether the claims of E&Y, BDO and the Underwriters fall within the definition of equity claims, there are, in my view, two aspects of these claims and it is necessary to keep them conceptually separate.

84 The first and most significant aspect of the claims of E&Y, BDO and the Underwriters constitutes an "equity claim" within the meaning of the CCAA. Simply put, but for the Class Action Proceedings, it is inconceivable that claims of this magnitude would have been launched by E&Y, BDO and the Underwriters as against SFC. The class action plaintiffs have launched their actions against SFC, the auditors and the Underwriters. In turn, E&Y, BDO and the Underwriters have launched actions against SFC and its subsidiaries. The claims of the shareholders are clearly "equity claims" and a plain reading of s. 2(1)(e) of the CCAA leads to the same conclusion with respect to the claims of E&Y, BDO and the Underwriters. To hold otherwise, would, as stated above, lead to a result that is inconsistent with the principles of the CCAA. It would potentially put the shareholders in a position to achieve creditor status through their claim against E&Y, BDO and the Underwriters even though a direct claim against SFC would rank as an "equity claim".

85 I also recognize that the legal construction of the claims of the auditors and the Underwriters as against SFC is different than the claims of the shareholders against SFC. However, that distinction is not, in my view, reflected in the language of the CCAA which makes no distinction based on the status of the party but rather focuses on the substance of the claim.

86 Critical to my analysis of this issue is the statutory language and the fact that the CCAA Amendments came into force after the cases relied upon by the Underwriters and the auditors.

87 It has been argued that the amendments did nothing more than codify pre-existing common law. In many respects, I accept this submission. However, I am unable to accept this submission

when considering s. 2(1) of the CCAA, which provides clear and specific language directing that "equity claim" means a claim that is in respect of an equity interest, including a claim for, among other things, "(e) contribution or indemnity in respect of a claim referred to in any of paragraphs (a) to (d)".

88 Given that a shareholder claim falls within s. 2(1)(d), the plain words of subsections (d) and (e) lead to the conclusions that I have set out above.

89 I fail to see how the very clear words of subsection (e) can be seen to be a codification of existing law. To arrive at the conclusion put forth by E&Y, BDO and the Underwriters would require me to ignore the specific words that Parliament has recently enacted.

90 I cannot agree with the position put forth by the Underwriters or by the auditors on this point. The plain wording of the statute has persuaded me that it does not matter whether an indemnity claim is seeking no more than allocation of fault and contribution at common law, or whether there is a free-standing contribution and indemnity claim based on contracts.

91 However, that is not to say that the full amount of the claim by the auditors and Underwriters can be characterized, at this time, as an "equity claim".

92 The second aspect to the claims of the auditors and underwriters can be illustrated by the following hypothetical: if the claim of the shareholders does not succeed against the class action defendants, E&Y, BDO and the Underwriters will not be liable to the class action plaintiffs. However, these parties may be in a position to demonstrate that they do have a claim against SFC for the costs of defending those actions, which claim does not arise as a result of "contribution or indemnity in respect of an equity claim".

93 It could very well be that each of E&Y, BDO and the Underwriters have expended significant amounts in defending the claims brought by the class action plaintiffs which, in turn, could give rise to contractual claims as against SFC. If there is no successful equity claim brought by the class action plaintiffs, it is arguable that any claim of E&Y, BDO and the Underwriters may legitimately be characterized as a claim for contribution or indemnity but not necessarily in respect of an equity claim. If so, there is no principled basis for subordinating this portion of the claim. At this point in time, the quantification of such a claim cannot be determined. This must be determined in accordance with the Claims Procedure.

94 However, it must be recognized that, by far the most significant part of the claim, is an "equity claim".

95 In arriving at this determination, I have taken into account the arguments set forth by E&Y, BDO and the Underwriters. My conclusions recognize the separate aspects of the Related Indemnity Claims as submitted by counsel to the Underwriters at paragraph 40 of their factum which reads:

...it must be recognized that there are, in fact, at least two different kinds of Related Indemnity Claims:

- (a) indemnity claims against SFC in respect of Shareholder Claims against the auditors and the Underwriters; and

- (b) indemnity claims against SFC in respect of the defence costs of the auditors and the Underwriters in connection with defending themselves against Shareholder Claims.

Disposition

96 In the result, an order shall issue that the claims against SFC resulting from the ownership, purchase or sale of equity interests in SFC, including, without limitation, the claims by or on behalf of current or former shareholders asserted in the proceedings listed in Schedule "A" are "equity claims" as defined in s. 2 of the CCAA, being claims in respect of monetary losses resulting from the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest. It is noted that counsel for the class action plaintiffs did not contest this issue.

97 In addition, an order shall also issue that any indemnification claim against SFC related to or arising from the Shareholders Claims, including, without limitation, by or on behalf of any of the other defendants to the proceedings listed in Schedule "A" are "equity claims" under the CCAA, being claims for contribution or indemnity in respect of a claim that is an equity claim. However, I feel it is premature to determine whether this order extends to the aspect of the Related Indemnity Claims that corresponds to the defence costs of the Underwriters and the auditors in connection with defending themselves against the Shareholder Claims.

98 A direction shall also issue that these orders are made without prejudice to SFC's rights to apply for a similar order with respect to (i) any claims in the statement of claim that are in respect of securities other than shares and (ii) any indemnification claims against SFC related thereto.

G.B. MORAWETZ J.

cp/e/qlmdl/qlpmg/qlana/qlgpr

TAB 3

Case Name:
Sino-Forest Corp. (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**

[2012] O.J. No. 5500

2012 ONCA 816

299 O.A.C. 107

98 C.B.R. (5th) 20

114 O.R. (3d) 304

2012 CarswellOnt 14701

Dockets: C56115, C56118 and C56125

Ontario Court of Appeal
Toronto, Ontario

S.T. Goudge, A. Hoy and S.E. Pepall JJ.A.

Heard: November 13, 2012.
Judgment: November 23, 2012.

(62 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Compromises and arrangements -- Claims -- Priority -- Appeal by auditors and underwriters for Sino-Forest from order made under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act dismissed -- Shareholders of Sino-Forest commenced several class action proceedings alleging misrepresentation of company's financial situation -- Appellants were named as defendants and claimed indemnity and contribution from Sino-Forest -- Order under appeal directed that appellants' contribution and indemnity claims were equity claims for purpose of s. 2(1) of CCAA -- Supervising judge made no error in

interpreting provision or in determining that it was not premature to characterize appellants' claims -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, ss. 2(1), 6(8).

Appeal by the auditors and underwriters for Sino-Forest from an order directing that certain claims were equity claims for the purpose of s. 2(1) of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA). In 2009, the CCAA was amended to provide that general creditors were to be paid in full before an equity claim. The appellants provided underwriting and auditor services relevant to several Sino-Forest equity and note offerings. In 2011 and 2012, several proposed class actions were commenced by shareholders against Sino-Forest and certain officers, directors, employees and the appellants. The actions sought damages on the basis Sino-Forest had caused losses to shareholders by misrepresenting its assets and financial situation, and that the appellants had failed to detect and disclose those misrepresentations. The appellants claimed against Sino-Forest for contribution and indemnity arising from the proposed class actions. Sino-Forest subsequently sought protection pursuant to the CCAA. In the judgment under appeal, the judge concluded that the shareholder and related indemnity claims were equity claims within the meaning of the CCAA. The appellants submitted that the judge erred in interpreting the meaning of an "equity claim" and erred in determining the issue prior to completion of the claims procedure in Sino-Forest's CCAA proceeding.

HELD: Appeal dismissed. The judge below properly found that the appellants' claims for contribution and indemnity were equity claims for the purpose of s. 2(1) of the CCAA, based on the expansive language used by Parliament, the absence of certain language, the avoidance of surplusage, the logic of the provision as a whole, and the purpose of the 2009 amendments. The shareholder claims were for a monetary loss resulting from ownership of an equity interest. There was an obvious link between the appellants' indemnity claims and the shareholders' claims. The provision as a whole supported a claim for contribution or indemnity by parties other than shareholders. The judge did not err in determining that the appellants' claims were equity claims prior to the completion of the claims procedure in Sino-Forest's CCAA proceeding. The need to immediately address the characterization of the appellants' claims was clear and did not result in prejudice to the appellants.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, s. 2, s. 121

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 2(1), s. 2(1), s. 2(1), s. 2(1)(d), s. 2(1)(e), s. 6(8)

Negligence Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. N.1, s. 2

Appeal From:

On appeal from the order of Justice Geoffrey B. Morawetz of the Superior Court of Justice, dated July 27, 2012, with reasons reported at 2012 ONSC 4377, 92 C.B.R. (5th) 99.

Counsel:

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

Sheila Block and David Bish, for the appellants Credit Suisse Securities (Canada) Inc., TD Securities Inc., Dundee Securities Corporation (now known as DWM Securities Inc.), RBC Dominion

Securities Inc., Scotia Capital Inc., CIBC World Markets Inc., Merrill Lynch Canada Inc., Canaccord Financial Ltd. (now known as Canaccord Genuity Corp.), 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.

Kenneth Dekker, for the appellant BDO Limited.

Robert W. Staley, Derek J. Bell and Jonathan Bell, for the respondent Sino-Forest Corporation.

Benjamin Zarnett, Robert Chadwick and Julie Rosenthal, for the respondent the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders.

Clifton Prophet, for the Monitor FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Kirk M. Baert, A. Dimitri Lascaris and Massimo Starnino, for the respondent the Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers.

Emily Cole, for the respondent Allen Chan.

Erin Pleet, for the respondent David Horsley.

David Gadsden, for the respondent Pöyry (Beijing).

Larry Lowenstein and Edward A. Sellers, for the respondent the Board of Directors.

The following judgment was delivered by

THE COURT:--

I OVERVIEW

1 In 2009, the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended ("CCAA"), was amended to expressly provide that general creditors are to be paid in full before an equity claim is paid.

2 This appeal considers the definition of "equity claim" in s. 2(1) of the CCAA. More particularly, the central issue is whether claims by auditors and underwriters against the respondent debtor, Sino-Forest Corporation ("Sino-Forest"), for contribution and indemnity fall within that definition. The claims arise out of proposed shareholder class actions for misrepresentation.

3 The appellants argue that the supervising judge erred in concluding that the claims at issue are equity claims within the meaning of the CCAA and in determining the issue before the claims procedure established in Sino-Forest's CCAA proceeding had been completed.

4 For the reasons that follow, we conclude that the supervising judge did not err and accordingly dismiss this appeal.

II THE BACKGROUND

(a) The Parties

5 Sino-Forest is a Canadian public holding company that holds the shares of numerous subsidiaries, which in turn own, directly or indirectly, forestry assets located principally in the People's

Republic of China. Its common shares are listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange. Sino-Forest also issued approximately \$1.8 billion of unsecured notes, in four series. Trading in Sino-Forest shares ceased on August 26, 2011, as a result of a cease-trade order made by the Ontario Securities Commission.

6 The appellant underwriters' provided underwriting services in connection with three separate Sino-Forest equity offerings in June 2007, June 2009 and December 2009, and four separate Sino-Forest note offerings in July 2008, June 2009, December 2009 and October 2010. Certain underwriters entered into agreements with Sino-Forest in which Sino-Forest agreed to indemnify the underwriters in connection with an array of matters that could arise from their participation in these offerings.

7 The appellant BDO Limited ("BDO") is a Hong Kong-based accounting firm that served as Sino-Forest's auditor between 2005 and August 2007 and audited its annual financial statements for the years ended December 31, 2005 and December 31, 2006.

8 The engagement agreements governing BDO's audits of Sino-Forest provided that the company's management bore the primary responsibility for preparing its financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP") and implementing internal controls to prevent and detect fraud and error in relation to its financial reporting.

9 BDO's Audit Report for 2006 was incorporated by reference into a June 2007 prospectus issued by Sino-Forest regarding the offering of its shares to the public. This use by Sino-Forest was governed by an engagement agreement dated May 23, 2007, in which Sino-Forest agreed to indemnify BDO in respect of any claims by the underwriters or any third party that arose as a result of the further steps taken by BDO in relation to the issuance of the June 2007 prospectus.

10 The appellant Ernst & Young LLP ("E&Y") served as Sino-Forest's auditor for the years 2007 to 2012 and delivered Auditors' Reports with respect to the consolidated financial statements of Sino-Forest for fiscal years ended December 31, 2007 to 2010, inclusive. In each year for which it prepared a report, E&Y entered into an audit engagement letter with Sino-Forest in which Sino-Forest undertook to prepare its financial statements in accordance with GAAP, design and implement internal controls to prevent and detect fraud and error, and provide E&Y with its complete financial records and related information. Some of these letters contained an indemnity in favour of E&Y.

11 The respondent Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders consists of noteholders owning approximately one-half of Sino-Forest's total noteholder debt.² They are creditors who have debt claims against Sino-Forest; they are not equity claimants.

12 Sino-Forest has insufficient assets to satisfy all the claims against it. To the extent that the appellants' claims are accepted and are treated as debt claims rather than equity claims, the noteholders' recovery will be diminished.

(b) The Class Actions

13 In 2011 and January of 2012, proposed class actions were commenced in Ontario, Quebec, Saskatchewan and New York State against, amongst others, Sino-Forest, certain of its officers, directors and employees, BDO, E&Y and the underwriters. Sino-Forest is sued in all actions.³

14 The proposed representative plaintiffs in the class actions are shareholders of Sino-Forest. They allege that: Sino-Forest repeatedly misrepresented its assets and financial situation and its compliance with GAAP in its public disclosure; the appellant auditors and underwriters failed to detect these misrepresentations; and the appellant auditors misrepresented that their audit reports were prepared in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards ("GAAS"). The representative plaintiffs claim that these misrepresentations artificially inflated the price of Sino-Forest's shares and that proposed class members suffered damages when the shares fell after the truth was revealed in 2011.

15 The representative plaintiffs in the Ontario class action seek approximately \$9.2 billion in damages. The Quebec, Saskatchewan and New York class actions do not specify the quantum of damages sought.

16 To date, none of the proposed class actions has been certified.

(c) CCAA Protection and Proofs of Claim

17 On March 30, 2012, Sino-Forest sought protection pursuant to the provisions of the CCAA. Morawetz J. granted the initial order which, among other things, appointed FTI Consulting Canada Inc. as the Monitor and stayed the class actions as against Sino-Forest. Since that time, Morawetz J. has been the supervising judge of the CCAA proceedings. The initial stay of the class actions was extended and broadened by order dated May 8, 2012.

18 On May 14, 2012, the supervising judge granted an unopposed claims procedure order which established a procedure to file and determine claims against Sino-Forest.

19 Thereafter, all of the appellants filed individual proofs of claim against Sino-Forest seeking contribution and indemnity for, among other things, any amounts that they are ordered to pay as damages to the plaintiffs in the class actions. Their proofs of claim advance several different legal bases for Sino-Forest's alleged obligation of contribution and indemnity, including breach of contract, contractual terms of indemnity, negligent and fraudulent misrepresentation in tort, and the provisions of the *Negligence Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. N.1.

(d) Order under Appeal

20 Sino-Forest then applied for an order that the following claims are equity claims under the CCAA: claims against Sino-Forest arising from the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest in the company, including shareholder claims ("Shareholder Claims"); and any indemnification claims against Sino-Forest related to or arising from the Shareholder Claims, including the appellants' claims for contribution or indemnity ("Related Indemnity Claims").

21 The motion was supported by the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders.

22 On July 27, 2012, the supervising judge granted the order sought by Sino-Forest and released a comprehensive endorsement.

23 He concluded that it was not premature to determine the equity claims issue. It had been clear from the outset of Sino-Forest's CCAA proceedings that this issue would have to be decided and that the expected proceeds arising from any sales process would be insufficient to satisfy the claims of creditors. Furthermore, the issue could be determined independently of the claims procedure and without prejudice being suffered by any party.

24 He also concluded that both the Shareholder Claims and the Related Indemnity Claims should be characterized as equity claims. In summary, he reasoned that:

- * The characterization of claims for indemnity turns on the characterization of the underlying primary claims. The Shareholder Claims are clearly equity claims and they led to and underlie the Related Indemnity Claims;
- * The plain language of the CCAA, which focuses on the nature of the claim rather than the identity of the claimant, dictates that both Shareholder Claims and Related Indemnity Claims constitute equity claims;
- * The definition of "equity claim" added to the CCAA in 2009 broadened the scope of equity claims established by pre-amendment jurisprudence;
- * This holding is consistent with the analysis in *Return on Innovation Capital Ltd. v. Gandi Innovations Ltd.*, 2011 ONSC 5018, 83 C.B.R. (5th) 123, which dealt with contractual indemnification claims of officers and directors. Leave to appeal was denied by this court, 2012 ONCA 10, 90 C.B.R. (5th) 141; and
- * "It would be totally inconsistent to arrive at a conclusion that would enable either the auditors or the underwriters, through a claim for indemnification, to be treated as creditors when the underlying actions of shareholders cannot achieve the same status" (para. 82). To hold otherwise would run counter to the scheme established by the CCAA and would permit an indirect remedy to the shareholders when a direct remedy is unavailable.

25 The supervising judge did not characterize the full amount of the claims of the auditors and underwriters as equity claims. He excluded the claims for defence costs on the basis that while it was arguable that they constituted claims for indemnity, they were not necessarily in respect of an equity claim. That determination is not appealed.

III INTERPRETATION OF "EQUITY CLAIM"

(a) Relevant Statutory Provisions

26 As part of a broad reform of Canadian insolvency legislation, various amendments to the CCAA were proclaimed in force as of September 18, 2009.

27 They included the addition of s. 6(8):

No compromise or arrangement that provides for the payment of an equity claim is to be sanctioned by the court unless it provides that all claims that are not equity claims are to be paid in full before the equity claim is to be paid.

Section 22.1, which provides that creditors with equity claims may not vote at any meeting unless the court orders otherwise, was also added.

28 Related definitions of "claim", "equity claim", and "equity interest" were added to s. 2(1) of the CCAA:

In this Act,

...

"claim" means any indebtedness, liability or obligation of any kind that would be a claim provable within the meaning of section 2 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*;

...

"equity claim" means a claim that is in respect of an equity interest, including a claim for, among others,

- (a) a dividend or similar payment,
- (b) a return of capital,
- (c) a redemption or retraction obligation,
- (d) a monetary loss resulting from the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest or from the rescission, or, in Quebec, the annulment, of a purchase or sale of an equity interest, or
- (e) contribution or indemnity in respect of a claim referred to in any of paragraphs (a) to (d); [Emphasis added.]

"equity interest" means

- (a) in the case of a company other than an income trust, a share in the company -- or a warrant or option or another right to acquire a share in the company -- other than one that is derived from a convertible debt, and
- (b) in the case of an income trust, a unit in the income trust -- or a warrant or option or another right to acquire a unit in the income trust -- other than one that is derived from a convertible debt;

29 Section 2 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("BIA") defines a "claim provable in bankruptcy". Section 121 of the BIA in turn specifies that claims provable in bankruptcy are those to which the bankrupt is subject.

- 2. "claim provable in bankruptcy", "provable claim" or "claim provable" includes any claim or liability provable in proceedings under this Act by a creditor;
- 121. (1) All debts and liabilities, present or future, to which the bankrupt is subject on the day on which the bankrupt becomes bankrupt or to which the bankrupt may become subject before the bankrupt's discharge by reason of any obligation incurred before the day on which the bankrupt becomes bankrupt shall be deemed to be claims provable in proceedings under this Act. [Emphasis added.]

(b) The Legal Framework Before the 2009 Amendments

30 Even before the 2009 amendments to the CCAA codified the treatment of equity claims, the courts subordinated shareholder equity claims to general creditors' claims in an insolvency. As the supervising judge described:

[23] Essentially, shareholders cannot reasonably expect to maintain a financial interest in an insolvent company where creditor claims are not being paid in full. Simply put, shareholders have no economic interest in an insolvent enterprise.

[24] The basis for the differentiation flows from the fundamentally different nature of debt and equity investments. Shareholders have unlimited upside potential when purchasing shares. Creditors have no corresponding upside potential.

[25] As a result, courts subordinated equity claims and denied such claims a vote in plans of arrangement. [Citations omitted.]'

(c) The Appellants' Submissions

31 The appellants essentially advance three arguments.

32 First, they argue that on a plain reading of s. 2(1), their claims are excluded. They focus on the opening words of the definition of "equity claim" and argue that their claims against Sino-Forest are not claims that are "in respect of an equity interest" because they do not have an equity interest in Sino-Forest. Their relationships with Sino-Forest were purely contractual and they were arm's-length creditors, not shareholders with the risks and rewards attendant to that position. The policy rationale behind ranking shareholders below creditors is not furthered by characterizing the appellants' claims as equity claims. They were service providers with a contractual right to an indemnity from Sino-Forest.

33 Second, the appellants focus on the term "claim" in paragraph (e) of the definition of "equity claim", and argue that the claims in respect of which they seek contribution and indemnity are the shareholders' claims against them in court proceedings for damages, which are not "claims" against Sino-Forest provable within the meaning of the BIA, and, therefore, not "claims" within s. 2(1). They submit that the supervising judge erred in focusing on the characterization of the underlying primary claims.

34 Third, the appellants submit that the definition of "equity claim" is not sufficiently clear to have changed the existing law. It is assumed that the legislature does not intend to change the common law without "expressing its intentions to do so with irresistible clearness": *District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board v. Ontario Public Service Employees Union, Local 324*, 2003 SCC 42, [2003] 2 S.C.R. 157, at para. 39, citing *Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. of Canada Ltd. v. T. Eaton Co. Ltd.*, [1956] S.C.R. 610, at p. 614. The appellants argue that the supervising judge's interpretation of "equity claim" dramatically alters the common law as reflected in *National Bank of Canada v. Merit Energy Ltd.*, 2001 ABQB 583, 294 A.R. 15, aff'd 2002 ABCA 5, 299 A.R. 200. There the court determined that in an insolvency, claims of auditors and underwriters for indemnification are not to be treated in the same manner as claims by shareholders. Furthermore, the Senate debates that preceded the enactment of the amendments did not specifically comment on the effect of the amendments on claims by auditors and underwriters. The amendments should be interpreted as codifying the pre-existing common law as reflected in *National Bank of Canada v. Merit Energy Ltd.*

35 The appellants argue that the decision of *Return on Innovation Capital Ltd. v. Gandi Innovations Ltd.* is distinguishable because it dealt with the characterization of claims for damages by an

equity investor against officers and directors, and it predated the 2009 amendments. In any event, this court confirmed that its decision denying leave to appeal should not be read as a judicial precedent for the interpretation of the meaning of "equity claim" in s. 2(1) of the CCAA.

(d) Analysis

(i) Introduction

36 The exercise before this court is one of statutory interpretation. We are therefore guided by the following oft-cited principle from Elmer A. Driedger, *Construction of Statutes*, 2d ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 1983), at p. 87:

[T]he words of an Act are to be read in their entire context and in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament.

37 We agree with the supervising judge that the definition of equity claim focuses on the nature of the claim, and not the identity of the claimant. In our view, the appellants' claims for contribution and indemnity are clearly equity claims.

38 The appellants' arguments do not give effect to the expansive language adopted by Parliament in defining "equity claim" and read in language not incorporated by Parliament. Their interpretation would render paragraph (e) of the definition meaningless and defies the logic of the section.

(ii) The expansive language used

39 The definition incorporates two expansive terms.

40 First, Parliament employed the phrase "*in respect of*" twice in defining equity claim: in the opening portion of the definition, it refers to an equity claim as a "claim that is *in respect of* an equity interest", and in paragraph (e) it refers to "contribution or indemnity *in respect of* a claim referred to in any of paragraphs (a) to (d)" (emphasis added).

41 The Supreme Court of Canada has repeatedly held that the words "in respect of" are "of the widest possible scope", conveying some link or connection between two related subjects. In *CanadianOxy Chemicals Ltd. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, [1999] 1 S.C.R. 743, at para. 16, citing *Nowegijick v. The Queen*, [1983] 1 S.C.R. 29, at p. 39, the Supreme Court held as follows:

The words "in respect of" are, in my opinion, words of the widest possible scope. They import such meanings as "in relation to", "with reference to" or "in connection with". The phrase "in respect of" is probably the widest of any expression intended to convey some connection between two related subject matters. [Emphasis added in *CanadianOxy*.]

That court also stated as follows in *Markevich v. Canada*, 2003 SCC 9, [2003] 1 S.C.R. 94, at para. 26:

The words "in respect of" have been held by this Court to be words of the broadest scope that convey some link between two subject matters. [Citations omitted.]

42 It is conceded that the Shareholder Claims against Sino-Forest are claims for "a monetary loss resulting from the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest", within the meaning of paragraph (d) of the definition of "equity claim". There is an obvious link between the appellants' claims against Sino-Forest for contribution and indemnity and the shareholders' claims against Sino-Forest. The legal proceedings brought by the shareholders asserted their claims against Sino-Forest together with their claims against the appellants, which gave rise to these claims for contribution and indemnity. The causes of action asserted depend largely on common facts and seek recovery of the same loss.

43 The appellants' claims for contribution or indemnity against Sino-Forest are therefore clearly connected to or "in respect of" a claim referred to in paragraph (d), namely the shareholders' claims against Sino-Forest. They are claims in respect of equity claims by shareholders and are provable in bankruptcy against Sino-Forest.

44 Second, Parliament also defined equity claim as "including a claim for, among others", the claims described in paragraphs (a) to (e). The Supreme Court has held that this phrase "including" indicates that the preceding words - "a claim that is in respect of an equity interest" - should be given an expansive interpretation, and include matters which might not otherwise be within the meaning of the term, as stated in *National Bank of Greece (Canada) v. Katsikonouris*, [1990] 2 S.C.R. 1029, at p. 1041:

[T]hese words are terms of extension, designed to enlarge the meaning of preceding words, and not to limit them.

... [T]he natural inference is that the drafter will provide a specific illustration of a subset of a given category of things in order to make it clear that that category extends to things that might otherwise be expected to fall outside it.

45 Accordingly, the appellants' claims, which clearly fall within paragraph (e), are included within the meaning of the phrase a "claim that is in respect of an equity interest".

(iii) *What Parliament did not say*

46 "Equity claim" is not confined by its definition, or by the definition of "claim", to a claim advanced by the holder of an equity interest. Parliament could have, but did not, include language in paragraph (e) restricting claims for contribution or indemnity to those made by shareholders.

(iv) *An interpretation that avoids surplusage*

47 A claim for contribution arises when the claimant for contribution has been sued. Section 2 of the *Negligence Act* provides that a tortfeasor may recover contribution or indemnity from any other tortfeasor who is, or would if sued have been, liable in respect of the damage to any person suffering damage as a result of a tort. The securities legislation of the various provinces provides that an issuer, its underwriters, and, if they consented to the disclosure of information in the prospectus, its auditors, among others, are jointly and severally liable for a misrepresentation in the prospectus, and provides for rights of contribution.⁵

48 Counsel for the appellants were unable to provide a satisfactory example of when a holder of an equity interest in a debtor company would seek contribution under paragraph (e) against the

debtor in respect of a claim referred to in any of paragraphs (a) to (d). In our view, this indicates that paragraph (e) was drafted with claims for contribution or indemnity by non-shareholders rather than shareholders in mind.

49 If the appellants' interpretation prevailed, and only a person with an equity interest could assert such a claim, paragraph (e) would be rendered meaningless, and as Lamer C.J. wrote in *R. v. Proulx*, 2000 SCC 5, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 61, at para. 28:

It is a well accepted principle of statutory interpretation that no legislative provision should be interpreted so as to render it mere surplusage.

(v) *The scheme and logic of the section*

50 Moreover, looking at s. 2(1) as a whole, it would appear that the remedies available to shareholders are all addressed by ss. 2(1)(a) to (d). The logic of ss. 2(1)(a) to (e) therefore also supports the notion that paragraph (e) refers to claims for contribution or indemnity not by shareholders, but by others.

(vi) *The legislative history of the 2009 amendments*

51 The appellants and the respondents each argue that the legislative history of the amendments supports their respective interpretation of the term "equity claim". We have carefully considered the legislative history. The limited commentary is brief and imprecise. The clause by clause analysis of Bill C-12 comments that "[a]n equity claim is defined to include any claim that is related to an equity interest".⁶ While, as the appellants submit, there was no specific reference to the position of auditors and underwriters, the desirability of greater conformity with United States insolvency law to avoid forum shopping by debtors was highlighted in 2003, some four years before the definition of "equity claim" was included in Bill C-12.

52 In this instance the legislative history ultimately provided very little insight into the intended meaning of the amendments. We have been guided by the plain words used by Parliament in reaching our conclusion.

(vii) *Intent to change the common law*

53 In our view the definition of "equity claim" is sufficiently clear to alter the pre-existing common law. *National Bank of Canada v. Merit Energy Ltd.*, an Alberta decision, was the single case referred to by the appellants that addressed the treatment of auditors' and underwriters' claims for contribution and indemnity in an insolvency before the definition was enacted. As the supervising judge noted, in a more recent decision, *Return on Innovation Capital Ltd. v. Gandi Innovations Ltd.*, the courts of this province adopted a more expansive approach, holding that contractual indemnification claims of directors and officers were equity claims.

54 We are not persuaded that the practical effect of the change to the law implemented by the enactment of the definition of "equity claim" is as dramatic as the appellants suggest. The operations of many auditors and underwriters extend to the United States, where contingent claims for reimbursement or contribution by entities "liable with the debtor" are disallowed pursuant to s. 502(e)(1)(B) of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C.S.⁷

(viii) The purpose of the legislation

55 The supervising judge indicated that if the claims of auditors and underwriters for contribution and indemnity were not included within the meaning of "equity claim", the CCAA would permit an indirect remedy to the shareholders when a direct remedy is not available. We would express this concept differently.

56 In our view, in enacting s. 6(8) of the CCAA, Parliament intended that a monetary loss suffered by a shareholder (or other holder of an equity interest) in respect of his or her equity interest *not* diminish the assets of the debtor available to general creditors in a restructuring. If a shareholder sues auditors and underwriters in respect of his or her loss, in addition to the debtor, and the auditors or underwriters assert claims of contribution or indemnity against the debtor, the assets of the debtor available to general creditors would be diminished by the amount of the claims for contribution and indemnity.

IV PREMATURETY

57 We are not persuaded that the supervising judge erred by determining that the appellants' claims were equity claims before the claims procedure established in Sino-Forest's CCAA proceeding had been completed.

58 The supervising judge noted at para. 7 of his endorsement that from the outset, Sino-Forest, supported by the Monitor, had taken the position that it was important that these proceedings be completed as soon as possible. The need to address the characterization of the appellants' claims had also been clear from the outset. The appellants have not identified any prejudice that arises from the determination of the issue at this stage. There was no additional information that the appellants have identified that was not before the supervising judge. The Monitor, a court-appointed officer, supported the motion procedure. The supervising judge was well positioned to determine whether the procedure proposed was premature and, in our view, there is no basis on which to interfere with the exercise of his discretion.

V SUMMARY

59 In conclusion, we agree with the supervising judge that the appellants' claims for contribution or indemnity are equity claims within s. 2(1)(e) of the CCAA.

60 We reach this conclusion because of what we have said about the expansive language used by Parliament, the language Parliament did not use, the avoidance of surplusage, the logic of the section, and what, from the foregoing, we conclude is the purpose of the 2009 amendments as they relate to these proceedings.

61 We see no basis to interfere with the supervising judge's decision to consider whether the appellants' claims were equity claims before the completion of the claims procedure.

VI DISPOSITION

62 This appeal is accordingly dismissed. As agreed, there will be no costs.

S.T. GOUDGE J.A.

A. HOY J.A.

S.E. PEPALL J.A.

cp/ln/e/qlmdl/qlpmg/qlced/qlcas/qlhcs

1 Credit Suisse Securities (Canada) Inc., TD Securities Inc., Dundee Securities Corporation (now known as DWM Securities Inc.), RBC Dominion Securities Inc., Scotia Capital Inc., CIBC World Markets Inc., Merrill Lynch Canada Inc., Canaccord Financial Ltd. (now known as Canaccord Genuity Corp.), 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.

2 Noteholders holding in excess of \$1.296 billion, or 72%, of Sino-Forest's approximately \$1.8 billion in noteholders' debt have executed written support agreements in favour of the Sino-Forest CCAA plan as of March 30, 2012. These include noteholders represented by the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders.

3 None of the appellants are sued in Saskatchewan and all are sued in Ontario. E&Y is also sued in Quebec and New York and the appellant underwriters are also sued in New York.

4 The supervising judge cited the following cases as authority for these propositions: *Blue Range Resource Corp., Re*, 2000 ABQB 4, 259 A.R. 30; *Stelco Inc., Re* (2006), 17 C.B.R. (5th) 78 (Ont. S.C.); *Central Capital Corp. (Re)* (1996), 27 O.R. (3d) 494 (C.A.); *Nelson Financial Group Ltd., Re*, 2010 ONSC 6229, 71 C.B.R. (5th) 153; *EarthFirst Canada Inc., Re*, 2009 ABQB 316, 56 C.B.R. (5th) 102.

5 *Securities Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5, s. 130(1), (8); *Securities Act*, R.S.A. 2000, c. S-4, s. 203(1), (10); *Securities Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 418, s. 131(1), (11); *The Securities Act*, C.C.S.M. c. S50, s. 141(1), (11); *Securities Act*, S.N.B. 2004, c. S-5.5, s. 149(1), (9); *Securities Act*, R.S.N.L. 1990, c. S-13, s. 130(1), (8); *Securities Act*, R.S.N.S. 1989, c. 418, s. 137(1), (8); *Securities Act*, S.Nu. 2009, c. 12, s. 111(1), (12); *Securities Act*, S.N.W.T. 2008, c. 10, s. 111(1), (12); *Securities Act*, R.S.P.E.I. 1988, c. S-3.1, s. 111(1), (12); *Securities Act*, R.S.Q. c. V-1.1, ss. 218, 219, 221; *The Securities Act, 1988*, S.S. 1988-89, c. S-42.2, s. 137(1), (9); *Securities Act*, S.Y. 2007, c. 16, s. 111(1), (13).

6 We understand that this analysis was before the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce in 2007.

7 The United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware in *In Re: Mid-American Waste Systems, Inc.*, 228 B.R. 816 (1999), indicated that this provision applies to underwriters' claims, and reflects the policy rationale that such stakeholders are in a better position to evaluate the risks associated with the issuance of stock than are general creditors.

TAB 4

Case Name:
Timminco Ltd. (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 Proposed Plan of Compromise or
Arrangement with Respect to Timminco Limited and Becancour
Silicon Inc., Applicants**

[2012] O.J. No. 3931

2012 ONCA 552

Docket: M41062 and M41085

Ontario Court of Appeal
Toronto, Ontario

J.M. Simmons, R.G. Juriansz and G.J. Epstein JJ.A.

Heard: By written submissions.

Judgment: July 20, 2012.

(8 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Compromises and arrangements -- Claims -- Priority -- Application by two unions for leave to appeal from order granting DIP financing provider super priority charge over debtor's assets dismissed -- Debtor would cease operating but for DIP financing -- Financing would only be provided in exchange for super priority charge -- Proceeding with restructuring was in best interests of all parties.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

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

Appeal From:

On leave to appeal from the order of Justice Geoffrey B. Morawetz of the Superior Court of Justice, dated February 9, 2012.

Counsel:

Ashley J. Taylor and Erica Tait, for the applicants.

Douglas J. Wray and Jesse Kugler, for the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada.

Charles E. Sinclair, for the United Steelworkers.

ENDORSEMENT

The following judgment was delivered by

1 THE COURT:-- Leave to appeal is denied.

2 In the CCAA context, leave to appeal 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 Stelco* (2005), 78 O.R. (3d) 241

3 In our view, the proposed appeals lack sufficient merit to meet this stringent test.

4 This court's decision in *Indalex Ltd. (Re)* (2011), 104 O.R. (3d) 641, affirms that a CCAA court may invoke the doctrine of paramountcy to override conflicting provisions of provincial statutes where the application of provincial legislation would frustrate the company's ability to restructure and avoid bankruptcy.

5 Here, the motion judge recognized that in the circumstances of this case there was a conflict between the federal CCAA and the provincial PBA and SPPA. He found that, "[i]n the absence of the court granting the requested super priority, the objectives of the CCAA would be frustrated". Further, he concluded that "to ensure that the objectives of the CCAA are fulfilled, it is necessary to invoke the doctrine of paramountcy such that the provisions of the CCAA override those of the QSPPA and the OPBA".

6 We see no basis on which this court could interfere with the motion judge's decision, including his unassailable findings of fact that: (1) without DIP financing, Timminco would be forced to cease operating; (2) bankruptcy would not be in the interests of anyone, including members of the pension plan; (3) if the DIP lender did not get super priority, it would not have agreed to provide financing; and (4) there was insufficient liquidity or unfavourable terms associated with the rejected DIP proposals. In short, he found that there was "no real alternative" to approving the DIP facility and DIP super priority charge.

7 The motion judge also addressed the union's fiduciary arguments, primarily in his earlier reasons released February 2, 2012, that are incorporated by reference into his February 9, 2012 rea-

sons. He concluded that it was in the best interests of all parties to proceed with the restructuring. We see no basis on which this court could interfere with this finding.

8 Costs are to the responding parties on the motions on a partial indemnity scale fixed in the amount of \$1,500 per motion inclusive of disbursements and applicable taxes.

J.M. SIMMONS J.A.

R.G. JURIAN SZ J.A.

G.J. EPSTEIN J.A.

cp/e/qljel/qlpmg/qlmll

TAB 5

Case Name:
Nortel Networks Corp. (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
Nortel Networks Corporation, Nortel Networks Limited, Nortel
Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Networks International
Corporation and Nortel Networks Technology Corporation,
Applicants**

[2010] O.J. No. 1232

2010 ONSC 1708

63 C.B.R. (5th) 44

81 C.C.P.B. 56

2010 CarswellOnt 1754

Court File No. 09-CL-7950

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

G.B. Morawetz J.

Heard: March 3-5, 2010.

Judgment: March 26, 2010.

(106 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Property of bankrupt -- Pensions and benefits -- Motion by the applicant Nortel corporations for approval of a settlement agreement dismissed -- The settlement agreement contained a clause that stating that no party was precluded from arguing the applicability of any amendment to the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act that changed the priority of claims -- The clause was not fair and reasonable -- The clause resulted in an agreement that did not provide certainty and did not provide finality of a fundamental priority issue -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, s. 5.1(2).

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Compromises and arrangements -- Sanction by court -- Motion by the applicant Nortel corporations for approval of a settlement agreement dismissed -- The settlement agreement contained a clause that stating that no party was precluded from arguing the applicability of any amendment to the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act that changed the priority of claims -- The clause was not fair and reasonable -- The clause resulted in an agreement that did not provide certainty and did not provide finality of a fundamental priority issue -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, s. 5.1(2).

Motion by the applicant Nortel corporations for approval of a settlement agreement. The settlement agreement provided for the termination of pension payments and the termination of benefits paid through Nortel's Health and Welfare Trust (HWT). The applicants were granted a stay of proceedings on January 14, 2009, pursuant to the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, but had continued to provide the HWT benefits and had continued contributions and special payments to the pension plans. The opposing long-term disability employees opposed the settlement agreement, principally as a result of the inclusion of a release of Nortel and its successors, advisors, directors and officers, from all future claims regarding the pension plans and the HWT in the absence of fraud. The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of Nortel Networks Inc. ("UCC"), and the informal Nortel Noteholder Group (the "Noteholders") opposed Clause H.2 of the settlement agreement. Clause H.2 stated that no party was precluded from arguing the applicability of any amendment to the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act that changed the priority of claims. The Monitor supported the Settlement Agreement, submitting that it was necessary to allow the Applicants to wind down operations and to develop a plan of arrangement. The CAW and Board of Directors of Nortel also supported the settlement agreement.

HELD: Motion dismissed. Cause H.2 was not fair and reasonable. Clause H.2 resulted in an agreement that did not provide certainty and did not provide finality of a fundamental priority issue. The third party releases were necessary and connected to a resolution of the claims against the applicants, benefited creditors generally and were not overly broad or offensive to public policy.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

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

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 5.1(2)

Counsel:

Derrick Tay, Jennifer Stam and Suzanne Wood, for the Applicants.

Lyndon Barnes and Adam Hirsh, for the Nortel Directors.

Benjamin Zarnett, Gale Rubenstein, C. Armstrong and Melaney Wagner, for Ernst & Young Inc., Monitor.

Arthur O. Jacques, for the Nortel Canada Current Employees.

Deborah McPhail, for the Superintendent of Financial Services (non-PBGF).

Mark Zigler and Susan Philpott, for the Former and Long-Term Disability Employees.

Ken Rosenberg and M. Starnino, for the Superintendent of Financial Services in its capacity as Administrator of the Pension Benefit Guarantee Fund.

S. Richard Orzy and Richard B. Swan, for the Informal Nortel Noteholder Group.

Alex MacFarlane and Mark Dunsmuir, for the Unsecured Creditors' Committee of Nortel Networks Inc.

Leanne Williams, for Flextronics Inc.

Barry Wadsworth, for the CAW-Canada.

Pamela Huff, for the Northern Trust Company, Canada.

Joel P. Rochon and Sakie Tambakos, for the Opposing Former and Long-Term Disability Employees.

Robin B. Schwill, for the Nortel Networks UK Limited (In Administration).

Sorin Gabriel Radulescu, In Person.

Guy Martin, In Person, on behalf of Marie Josee Perrault.

Peter Burns, In Person.

Stan and Barbara Arnelien, In Person.

ENDORSEMENT

G.B. MORAWETZ J.:--

INTRODUCTION

1 On January 14, 2009, Nortel Networks Corporation ("NNC"), Nortel Networks Limited ("NNL"), Nortel Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Networks International Corporation and Nortel Networks Technology Corporation (collectively, the "Applicants") were granted a stay of proceedings pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") and Ernst & Young Inc. was appointed as Monitor.

2 The Applicants have historically operated a number of pension, benefit and other plans (both funded and unfunded) for their employees and pensioners, including:

- (i) Pension benefits through two registered pension plans, the Nortel Networks Limited Managerial and Non-Negotiated Pension Plan and the Nortel Networks Negotiated Pension Plan (the "Pension Plans"); and
- (ii) Medical, dental, life insurance, long-term disability and survivor income and transition benefits paid, except for survivor termination benefits, through Nortel's Health and Welfare Trust (the "HWT").

3 Since the CCAA filing, the Applicants have continued to provide medical, dental and other benefits, through the HWT, to pensioners and employees on long-term disability ("Former and LTD

Employees") and active employees ("HWT Payments") and have continued all current service contributions and special payments to the Pension Plans ("Pension Payments").

4 Pension Payments and HWT Payments made by the Applicants to the Former and LTD Employees while under CCAA protection are largely discretionary. As a result of Nortel's insolvency and the significant reduction in the size of Nortel's operations, the unfortunate reality is that, at some point, cessation of such payments is inevitable. The Applicants have attempted to address this situation by entering into a settlement agreement (the "Settlement Agreement") dated as of February 8, 2010, among the Applicants, the Monitor, the Former Employees' Representatives (on their own behalf and on behalf of the parties they represent), the LTD Representative (on her own behalf and on behalf of the parties she represents), Representative Settlement Counsel and the CAW-Canada (the "Settlement Parties").

5 The Applicants have brought this motion for approval of the Settlement Agreement. From the standpoint of the Applicants, the purpose of the Settlement Agreement is to provide for a smooth transition for the termination of Pension Payments and HWT Payments. The Applicants take the position that the Settlement Agreement represents the best efforts of the Settlement Parties to negotiate an agreement and is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA.

6 The essential terms of the Settlement Agreement are as follows:

- (a) until December 31, 2010, medical, dental and life insurance benefits will be funded on a pay-as-you-go basis to the Former and LTD Employees;
- (b) until December 31, 2010, LTD Employees and those entitled to receive survivor income benefits will receive income benefits on a pay-as-you-go basis;
- (c) the Applicants will continue to make current service payments and special payments to the Pension Plans in the same manner as they have been doing over the course of the proceedings under the CCAA, through to March 31, 2010, in the aggregate amount of \$2,216,254 per month and that thereafter and through to September 30, 2010, the Applicants shall make only current service payments to the Pension Plans, in the aggregate amount of \$379,837 per month;
- (d) any allowable pension claims, in these or subsequent proceedings, concerning any Nortel Worldwide Entity, including the Applicants, shall rank *pari passu* with ordinary, unsecured creditors of Nortel, and no part of any such HWT claims shall rank as a preferential or priority claim or shall be the subject of a constructive trust or trust of any nature or kind;
- (e) proofs of claim asserting priority already filed by any of the Settlement Parties, or the Superintendent on behalf of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund are disallowed in regard to the claim for priority;
- (f) any allowable HWT claims made in these or subsequent proceedings shall rank *pari passu* with ordinary unsecured creditors of Nortel;
- (g) the Settlement Agreement does not extinguish the claims of the Former and LTD Employees;
- (h) Nortel and, *inter alia*, its successors, advisors, directors and officers, are released from all future claims regarding Pension Plans and the HWT, provided that nothing in the release shall release a director of the Applicants

from any matter referred to in subsection 5.1(2) of the CCAA or with respect to fraud on the part of any Releasee, with respect to that Releasee only;

- (i) upon the expiry of all appeals and rights of appeal in respect thereof, Representative Settlement Counsel will withdraw their application for leave to appeal the decision of the Court of Appeal, dated November 26, 2009, to the Supreme Court of Canada on a with prejudice basis;¹
- (j) a CCAA plan of arrangement in the Nortel proceedings will not be proposed or approved if that plan does not treat the Pension and HWT claimants *pari passu* to the other ordinary, unsecured creditors ("Clause H.1"); and
- (k) if there is a subsequent amendment to the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ("BIA") that "changes the current, relative priorities of the claims against Nortel, no party is precluded by this Settlement Agreement from arguing the applicability" of that amendment to the claims ceded in this Agreement ("Clause H.2").

7 The Settlement Agreement does *not* relate to a distribution of the HWT as the Settlement Parties have agreed to work towards developing a Court-approved distribution of the HWT corpus in 2010.

8 The Applicants' motion is supported by the Settlement Parties and by the Board of Directors of Nortel.

9 The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of Nortel Networks Inc. ("UCC"), the informal Nortel Noteholder Group (the "Noteholders"), and a group of 37 LTD Employees (the "Opposing LTD Employees") oppose the Settlement Agreement.

10 The UCC and Noteholders oppose the Settlement Agreement, principally as a result of the inclusion of Clause H.2.

11 The Opposing LTD Employees oppose the Settlement Agreement, principally as a result of the inclusion of the third party releases referenced in [6h] above.

THE FACTS

A. Status of Nortel's Restructuring

12 Although it was originally hoped that the Applicants would be able to restructure their business, in June 2009 the decision was made to change direction and pursue sales of Nortel's various businesses.

13 In response to Nortel's change in strategic direction and the impending sales, Nortel announced on August 14, 2009 a number of organizational updates and changes including the creation of groups to support transitional services and management during the sales process.

14 Since June 2009, Nortel has closed two major sales and announced a third. As a result of those transactions, approximately 13,000 Nortel employees have been or will be transferred to purchaser companies. That includes approximately 3,500 Canadian employees.

15 Due to the ongoing sales of Nortel's business units and the streamlining of Nortel's operations, it is expected that by the close of 2010, the Applicants' workforce will be reduced to only 475 employees. There is a need to wind-down and rationalize benefits and pension processes.

16 Given Nortel's insolvency, the significant reduction in Nortel's operations and the complexity and size of the Pension Plans, both Nortel and the Monitor believe that the continuation and funding of the Pension Plans and continued funding of medical, dental and other benefits is not a viable option.

B. The Settlement Agreement

17 On February 8, 2010 the Applicants announced that a settlement had been reached on issues related to the Pension Plans, and the HWT and certain employment related issues.

18 Recognizing the importance of providing notice to those who will be impacted by the Settlement Agreement, including the Former Employees, the LTD Employees, unionized employees, continuing employees and the provincial pension plan regulators ("Affected Parties"), Nortel brought a motion to this Court seeking the approval of an extensive notice and opposition process.

19 On February 9, 2010, this Court approved the notice program for the announcement and disclosure of the Settlement (the "Notice Order").

20 As more fully described in the Monitor's Thirty-Sixth, Thirty-Ninth and Thirty-Ninth Supplementary Reports, the Settlement Parties have taken a number of steps to notify the Affected Parties about the Settlement.

21 In addition to the Settlement Agreement, the Applicants, the Monitor and the Superintendent, in his capacity as administrator of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund, entered into a letter agreement on February 8, 2010, with respect to certain matters pertaining to the Pension Plans (the "Letter Agreement").

22 The Letter Agreement provides that the Superintendent will not oppose an order approving the Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Approval Order"). Additionally, the Monitor and the Applicants will take steps to complete an orderly transfer of the Pension Plans to a new administrator to be appointed by the Superintendent effective October 1, 2010. Finally, the Superintendent will not oppose any employee incentive program that the Monitor deems reasonable and necessary or the creation of a trust with respect to claims or potential claims against persons who accept directorships of a Nortel Worldwide Entity in order to facilitate the restructuring.

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES ON THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The Applicants

23 The Applicants take the position that the Settlement is fair and reasonable and balances the interests of the parties and other affected constituencies equitably. In this regard, counsel submits that the Settlement:

- (a) eliminates uncertainty about the continuation and termination of benefits to pensioners, LTD Employees and survivors, thereby reducing hardship and disruption;

- (b) eliminates the risk of costly and protracted litigation regarding Pension Claims and HWT Claims, leading to reduced costs, uncertainty and potential disruption to the development of a Plan;
- (c) prevents disruption in the transition of benefits for current employees;
- (d) provides early payments to terminated employees in respect of their termination and severance claims where such employees would otherwise have had to wait for the completion of a claims process and distribution out of the estates;
- (e) assists with the commitment and retention of remaining employees essential to complete the Applicants' restructuring; and
- (f) does not eliminate Pension Claims or HWT Claims against the Applicants, but maintains their quantum and validity as ordinary and unsecured claims.

24 Alternatively, absent the approval of the Settlement Agreement, counsel to the Applicants submits that the Applicants are not required to honour such benefits or make such payments and such benefits could cease immediately. This would cause undue hardship to beneficiaries and increased uncertainty for the Applicants and other stakeholders.

25 The Applicants state that a central objective in the Settlement Agreement is to allow the Former and LTD Employees to transition to other sources of support.

26 In the absence of the approval of the Settlement Agreement or some other agreement, a cessation of benefits will occur on March 31, 2010 which would have an immediate negative impact on Former and LTD Employees. The Applicants submit that extending payments to the end of 2010 is the best available option to allow recipients to order their affairs.

27 Counsel to the Applicants submits that the Settlement Agreement brings Nortel closer to finalizing a plan of arrangement, which is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA. The Settlement Agreement resolves uncertainties associated with the outstanding Former and LTD Employee claims. The Settlement Agreement balances certainty with clarity, removing litigation risk over priority of claims, which properly balances the interests of the parties, including both creditors and debtors.

28 Regarding the priority of claims going forward, the Applicants submit that because a deemed trust, such as the HWT, is not enforceable in bankruptcy, the Former and LTD Employees are by default *pari passu* with other unsecured creditors.

29 In response to the Noteholders' concern that bankruptcy prior to October 2010 would create pension liabilities on the estate, the Applicants committed that they would not voluntarily enter into bankruptcy proceedings prior to October 2010. Further, counsel to the Applicants submits the court determines whether a bankruptcy order should be made if involuntary proceedings are commenced.

30 Further, counsel to the Applicants submits that the court has the jurisdiction to release third parties under a Settlement Agreement where the releases (1) are connected to a resolution of the debtor's claims, (2) will benefit creditors generally and (3) are not overly broad or offensive to public policy. See *Re Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 92 O.R. (3d) 513 (C.A.), [*Metcalfe*] at para. 71, leave to appeal refused, [2008] S.C.C.A. No. 337 and *Re Grace* [2008] O.J. No. 4208 (S.C.J.) [*Grace 2008*] at para. 40.

31 The Applicants submit that a settlement of the type put forward should be approved if it is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA and is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances. Elements of fairness and reasonableness include balancing the interests of parties, including any objecting creditor or creditors, equitably (although not necessarily equally); and ensuring that the agreement is beneficial to the debtor and its stakeholders generally, as per *Re Air Canada*, [2003] O.J. No. 5319 (S.C.J.) [*Air Canada*]. The Applicants assert that this test is met.

The Monitor

32 The Monitor supports the Settlement Agreement, submitting that it is necessary to allow the Applicants to wind down operations and to develop a plan of arrangement. The Monitor submits that the Settlement Agreement provides certainty, and does so with input from employee stakeholders. These stakeholders are represented by Employee Representatives as mandated by the court and these Employee Representatives were given the authority to approve such settlements on behalf of their constituents.

33 The Monitor submits that Clause H.2 was bargained for, and that the employees did give up rights in order to have that clause in the Settlement Agreement; particularly, it asserts that Clause H.1 is the counterpoint to Clause H.2. In this regard, the Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable.

34 The Monitor asserts that the court may either (1) approve the Settlement Agreement, (2) not approve the Settlement Agreement, or (3) not approve the Settlement Agreement but provide practical comments on the applicability of Clause H.2.

Former and LTD Employees

35 The Former Employees' Representatives' constituents number an estimated 19,458 people. The LTD Employees number an estimated 350 people between the LTD Employee's Representative and the CAW-Canada, less the 37 people in the Opposing LTD Employee group.

36 Representative Counsel to the Former and LTD Employees acknowledges that Nortel is insolvent, and that much uncertainty and risk comes from insolvency. They urge that the Settlement Agreement be considered within the scope of this reality. The alternative to the Settlement Agreement is costly litigation and significant uncertainty.

37 Representative Counsel submits that the Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable for all creditors, but especially the represented employees. Counsel notes that employees under Nortel are unique creditors under these proceedings, as they are not sophisticated creditors and their personal welfare depends on receiving distributions from Nortel. The Former and LTD Employees assert that this is the best agreement they could have negotiated.

38 Representative Counsel submits that bargaining away of the right to litigate against directors and officers of the corporation, as well as the trustee of the HWT, are examples of the concessions that have been made. They also point to the giving up of the right to make priority claims upon distribution of Nortel's estate and the HWT, although the claim itself is not extinguished. In exchange, the Former and LTD Employees will receive guaranteed coverage until the end of 2010. The Former and LTD Employees submit that having money in hand today is better than uncertainty going forward, and that, on balance, this Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable.

39 In response to allegations that third party releases unacceptably compromise employees' rights, Representative Counsel accepts that this was a concession, but submits that it was satisfac-

tory because the claims given up are risky, costly and very uncertain. The releases do not go beyond s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA, which disallows releases relating to misrepresentations and wrongful or oppressive conduct by directors. Releases as to deemed trust claims are also very uncertain and were acceptably given up in exchange for other considerations.

40 The Former and LTD Employees submit that the inclusion of Clause H.2 was essential to their approval of the Settlement Agreement. They characterize Clause H.2 as a no prejudice clause to protect the employees by not releasing any future potential benefit. Removing Clause H.2 from the Settlement Agreement would be not the approval of an agreement, but rather the creation of an entirely new Settlement Agreement. Counsel submits that without Clause H.2, the Former and LTD Employees would not be signatories.

CAW

41 The CAW supports the Settlement Agreement. It characterizes the agreement as Nortel's recognition that it has a moral and legal obligation to its employees, whose rights are limited by the laws in this country. The Settlement Agreement temporarily alleviates the stress and uncertainty its constituents feel over the winding up of their benefits and is satisfied with this result.

42 The CAW notes that some members feel they were not properly apprised of the facts, but all available information has been disclosed, and the concessions made by the employee groups were not made lightly.

Board of Directors

43 The Board of Directors of Nortel supports the Settlement Agreement on the basis that it is a practical resolution with compromises on both sides.

Opposing LTD Employees

44 Mr. Rochon appeared as counsel for the Opposing LTD Employees, notwithstanding that these individuals did not opt out of having Representative Counsel or were represented by the CAW. The submissions of the Opposing LTD Employees were compelling and the court extends its appreciation to Mr. Rochon and his team in co-ordinating the representatives of this group.

45 The Opposing LTD Employees put forward the position that the cessation of their benefits will lead to extreme hardship. Counsel submits that the Settlement Agreement conflicts with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA because the LTD Employees are giving up legal rights in relation to a \$100 million shortfall of benefits. They urge the court to consider the unique circumstances of the LTD Employees as they are the people hardest hit by the cessation of benefits.

46 The Opposing LTD Employees assert that the HWT is a true trust, and submit that breaches of that trust create liabilities and that the claim should not be released. Specifically, they point to a \$37 million shortfall in the HWT that they should be able to pursue.

47 Regarding the third party releases, the Opposing LTD Employees assert that Nortel is attempting to avoid the distraction of third party litigation, rather than look out for the best interests of the Former and LTD Employees. The Opposing LTD Employees urge the court not to release the only individuals the Former and LTD Employees can hold accountable for any breaches of trust. Counsel submits that Nortel has a common law duty to fund the HWT, which the Former and LTD Employees should be allowed to pursue.

48 Counsel asserts that allowing these releases (a) is not necessary and essential to the restructuring of the debtor, (b) does not relate to the insolvency process, (c) is not required for the success of the Settlement Agreement, (d) does not meet the requirement that each party contribute to the plan in a material way and (e) is overly broad and therefore not fair and reasonable.

49 Finally, the Opposing LTD Employees oppose the *pari passu* treatment they will be subjected to under the Settlement Agreement, as they have a true trust which should grant them priority in the distribution process. Counsel was not able to provide legal authority for such a submission.

50 A number of Opposing LTD Employees made in person submissions. They do not share the view that Nortel will act in their best interests, nor do they feel that the Employee Representatives or Representative Counsel have acted in their best interests. They shared feelings of uncertainty, helplessness and despair. There is affidavit evidence that certain individuals will be unable to support themselves once their benefits run out, and they will not have time to order their affairs. They expressed frustration and disappointment in the CCAA process.

UCC

51 The UCC was appointed as the representative for creditors in the U.S. Chapter 11 proceedings. It represents creditors who have significant claims against the Applicants. The UCC opposes the motion, based on the inclusion of Clause H.2, but otherwise the UCC supports the Settlement Agreement.

52 Clause H.2, the UCC submits, removes the essential element of finality that a settlement agreement is supposed to include. The UCC characterizes Clause H.2 as a take back provision; if activated, the Former and LTD Employees have compromised nothing, to the detriment of other unsecured creditors. A reservation of rights removes the finality of the Settlement Agreement.

53 The UCC claims it, not Nortel, bears the risk of Clause H.2. As the largest unsecured creditor, counsel submits that a future change to the BIA could subsume the UCC's claim to the Former and LTD Employees and the UCC could end up with nothing at all, depending on Nortel's asset sales.

Noteholders

54 The Noteholders are significant creditors of the Applicants. The Noteholders oppose the settlement because of Clause H.2, for substantially the same reasons as the UCC.

55 Counsel to the Noteholders submits that the inclusion of H.2 is prejudicial to the non-employee unsecured creditors, including the Noteholders. Counsel submits that the effect of the Settlement Agreement is to elevate the Former and LTD Employees, providing them a payout of \$57 million over nine months while everyone else continues to wait, and preserves their rights in the event the laws are amended in future. Counsel to the Noteholders submits that the Noteholders forego millions of dollars while remaining exposed to future claims.

56 The Noteholders assert that a proper settlement agreement must have two elements: a real compromise, and resolution of the matters in contention. In this case, counsel submits that there is no resolution because there is no finality in that Clause H.2 creates ambiguity about the future. The very object of a Settlement Agreement, assert the Noteholders, is to avoid litigation by withdrawing claims, which this agreement does not do.

Superintendent

57 The Superintendent does not oppose the relief sought, but this position is based on the form of the Settlement Agreement that is before the Court.

Northern Trust

58 Northern Trust, the trustee of the pension plans and HWT, takes no position on the Settlement Agreement as it takes instructions from Nortel. Northern Trust indicates that an oversight left its name off the third party release and asks for an amendment to include it as a party released by the Settlement Agreement.

LAW AND ANALYSIS

A. Representation and Notice Were Proper

59 It is well settled that the Former Employees' Representatives and the LTD Representative (collectively, the "Settlement Employee Representatives") and Representative Counsel have the authority to represent the Former Employees and the LTD Beneficiaries for purposes of entering into the Settlement Agreement on their behalf: *see Grace 2008, supra* at para. 32.

60 The court appointed the Settlement Employee Representatives and the Representative Settlement Counsel. These appointment orders have not been varied or appealed. Unionized employees continue to be represented by the CAW. The Orders appointing the Settlement Employee Representatives expressly gave them authority to represent their constituencies "for the purpose of settling or compromising claims" in these Proceedings. Former Employees and LTD Employees were given the right to opt out of their representation by Representative Settlement Counsel. After provision of notice, only one former employee and one active employee exercised the opt-out right.

B. Effect of the Settlement Approval Order

61 In addition to the binding effect of the Settlement Agreement, many additional parties will be bound and affected by the Settlement Approval Order. Counsel to the Applicants submits that the binding nature of the Settlement Approval Order on all affected parties is a crucial element to the Settlement itself. In order to ensure all Affected Parties had notice, the Applicants obtained court approval of their proposed notice program.

62 Even absent such extensive noticing, virtually all employees of the Applicants are represented in these proceedings. In addition to the representative authority of the Settlement Employee Representatives and Representative Counsel as noted above, Orders were made authorizing a Nortel Canada Continuing Employees' Representative and Nortel Canada Continuing Employees' Representative Counsel to represent the interests of continuing employees on this motion.

63 I previously indicated that "the overriding objective of appointing representative counsel for employees is to ensure that the employees have representation in the CCAA process": *Re Nortel Networks Corp.*, [2009] O.J. No. 2529 at para. 16. I am satisfied that this objective has been achieved.

64 The Record establishes that the Monitor has undertaken a comprehensive notice process which has included such notice to not only the Former Employees, the LTD Employees, the unionized employees and the continuing employees but also the provincial pension regulators and has given the opportunity for any affected person to file Notices of Appearance and appear before this court on this motion.

65 I am satisfied that the notice process was properly implemented by the Monitor.

66 I am satisfied that Representative Counsel has represented their constituents' interests in accordance with their mandate, specifically, in connection with the negotiation of the Settlement Agreement and the draft Settlement Approval Order and appearance on this Motion. There have been intense discussions, correspondence and negotiations among Representative Counsel, the Monitor, the Applicants, the Superintendent, counsel to the Board of the Applicants, the Noteholder Group and the Committee with a view to developing a comprehensive settlement. NCCE's Representative Counsel have been apprised of the settlement discussions and served with notice of this Motion. Representatives have held Webinar sessions and published press releases to inform their constituents about the Settlement Agreement and this Motion.

C. Jurisdiction to Approve the Settlement Agreement

67 The CCAA is a flexible statute that is skeletal in nature. It has been described as a "sketch, an outline, a supporting framework for the resolution of corporate insolvencies in the public interest". *Re Nortel*, [2009] O.J. No. 3169 (S.C.J.) at paras. 28-29, citing *Metcalfe, supra*, at paras. 44 and 61.

68 Three sources for the court's authority to approve pre-plan agreements have been recognized:

- (a) the power of the court to impose terms and conditions on the granting of a stay under s. 11(4) of the CCAA;
- (b) the power of the court to make an order "on such terms as it may impose" pursuant to s. 11(4) of the CCAA; and
- (c) the inherent jurisdiction of the court to "fill in the gaps" of the CCAA in order to give effect to its objects: see *Re Nortel*, [2009] O.J. No. 3169 (S.C.J.) at para. 30, citing *Re Canadian Red Cross Society*, [1998] O.J. No. 3306 (Gen. Div.) [*Canadian Red Cross*] at para. 43; *Metcalfe, supra* at para. 44.

69 In *Re Stelco Inc.*, (2005), 78 O.R. (3d) 254 (C.A.), the Ontario Court of Appeal considered the court's jurisdiction under the CCAA to approve agreements, determining at para. 14 that it is not limited to preserving the *status quo*. Further, agreements made prior to the finalization of a plan or compromise are valid orders for the court to approve: *Grace 2008, supra* at para. 34.

70 In these proceedings, this court has confirmed its jurisdiction to approve major transactions, including settlement agreements, during the stay period defined in the Initial Order and prior to the proposal of any plan of compromise or arrangement: see, for example, *Re Nortel*, [2009] O.J. No. 5582 (S.C.J.); *Re Nortel* [2009] O.J. 5582 (S.C.J.) and *Re Nortel*, 2010 ONSC 1096 (S.C.J.).

71 I am satisfied that this court has jurisdiction to approve transactions, including settlements, in the course of overseeing proceedings during a CCAA stay period and prior to any plan of arrangement being proposed to creditors: see *Re Calpine Canada Energy Ltd.*, [2007] A.J. No. 917 (C.A.) [*Calpine*] at para. 23, affirming [2007] A.J. No. 923 (Q.B.); *Canadian Red Cross, supra*; *Air Canada, supra*; *Grace 2008, supra*, and *Re Grace Canada* [2010] O.J. No. 62 (S.C.J.) [*Grace 2010*], leave to appeal to the C.A. refused February 19, 2010; *Re Nortel*, 2010 ONSC 1096 (S.C.J.).

D. Should the Settlement Agreement Be Approved?

72 Having been satisfied that this court has the jurisdiction to approve the Settlement Agreement, I must consider whether the Settlement Agreement *should* be approved.

73 A Settlement Agreement can be approved if it is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA and is fair and reasonable in all circumstances. What makes a settlement agreement fair and reasonable is its balancing of the interests of all parties; its equitable treatment of the parties, including creditors who are not signatories to a settlement agreement; and its benefit to the Applicant and its stakeholders generally.

i) Spirit and Purpose

74 The CCAA is a flexible instrument; part of its purpose is to allow debtors to balance the conflicting interests of stakeholders. The Former and LTD Employees are significant creditors and have a unique interest in the settlement of their claims. This Settlement Agreement brings these creditors closer to ultimate settlement while accommodating their special circumstances. It is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA.

ii) Balancing of Parties' Interests

75 There is no doubt that the Settlement Agreement is comprehensive and that it has support from a number of constituents when considered in its totality.

76 There is, however, opposition from certain constituents on two aspects of the proposed Settlement Agreement: (1) the Opposing LTD Employees take exception to the inclusion of the third party releases; (2) the UCC and Noteholder Groups take exception to the inclusion of Clause H.2.

Third Party Releases

77 Representative Counsel, after examining documentation pertaining to the Pension Plans and HWT, advised the Former Employees' Representatives and Disabled Employees' Representative that claims against directors of Nortel for failing to properly fund the Pension Plans were unlikely to succeed. Further, Representative Counsel advised that claims against directors or others named in the Third Party Releases to fund the Pension Plans were risky and could take years to resolve, perhaps unsuccessfully. This assisted the Former Employees' Representatives and the Disabled Employees' Representative in agreeing to the Third Party Releases.

78 The conclusions reached and the recommendations made by both the Monitor and Representative Counsel are consistent. They have been arrived at after considerable study of the issues and, in my view, it is appropriate to give significant weight to their positions.

79 In *Grace 2008, supra*, and *Grace 2010, supra*, I indicated that a Settlement Agreement entered into with Representative Counsel that contains third party releases is fair and reasonable where the releases are necessary and connected to a resolution of claims against the debtor, will benefit creditors generally and are not overly broad or offensive to public policy.

80 In this particular case, I am satisfied that the releases are necessary and connected to a resolution of claims against the Applicants.

81 The releases benefit creditors generally as they reduces the risk of litigation against the Applicants and their directors, protect the Applicants against potential contribution claims and indemnity claims by certain parties, including directors, officers and the HWT Trustee; and reduce the risk

of delay caused by potentially complex litigation and associated depletion of assets to fund potentially significant litigation costs.

82 Further, in my view, the releases are not overly broad or offensive to public policy. The claims being released specifically relate to the subject matter of the Settlement Agreement. The parties granting the release receive consideration in the form of both immediate compensation and the maintenance of their rights in respect to the distribution of claims.

Clause H.2

83 The second aspect of the Settlement Agreement that is opposed is the provision known as Clause H.2. Clause H.2 provides that, in the event of a bankruptcy of the Applicants, and notwithstanding any provision of the Settlement Agreement, if there are any amendments to the BIA that change the current, relative priorities of the claims against the Applicants, no party is precluded from arguing the applicability or non-applicability of any such amendment in relation to any such claim.

84 The Noteholders and UCC assert that Clause H.2 causes the Settlement Agreement to not be a "settlement" in the true and proper sense of that term due to a lack of certainty and finality. They emphasize that Clause H.2 has the effect of undercutting the essential compromises of the Settlement Agreement in imposing an unfair risk on the non-employee creditors of NNL, including NNI, after substantial consideration has been paid to the employees.

85 This position is, in my view, well founded. The inclusion of the Clause H.2 creates, rather than eliminates, uncertainty. It creates the potential for a fundamental alteration of the Settlement Agreement.

86 The effect of the Settlement Agreement is to give the Former and LTD Employees preferred treatment for certain claims, notwithstanding that priority is not provided for in the statute nor has it been recognized in case law. In exchange for this enhanced treatment, the Former Employees and LTD Beneficiaries have made certain concessions.

87 The Former and LTD Employees recognize that substantially all of these concessions could be clawed back through Clause H.2. Specifically, they acknowledge that future Pension and HWT Claims will rank *pari passu* with the claims of other ordinary unsecured creditors, but then go on to say that should the BIA be amended, they may assert once again a priority claim.

88 Clause H.2 results in an agreement that does not provide certainty and does not provide finality of a fundamental priority issue.

89 The Settlement Parties, as well as the Noteholders and the UCC, recognize that there are benefits associated with resolving a number of employee-related issues, but the practical effect of Clause H.2 is that the issue is not fully resolved. In my view, Clause H.2 is somewhat inequitable from the standpoint of the other unsecured creditors of the Applicants. If the creditors are to be bound by the Settlement Agreement, they are entitled to know, with certainty and finality, the effect of the Settlement Agreement.

90 It is not, in my view, reasonable to require creditors to, in effect, make concessions in favour of the Former and LTD Employees today, and be subject to the uncertainty of unknown legislation in the future.

91 One of the fundamental purposes of the CCAA is to facilitate a process for a compromise of debt. A compromise needs certainty and finality. Clause H.2 does not accomplish this objective. The inclusion of Clause H.2 does not recognize that at some point settlement negotiations cease and parties bound by the settlement have to accept the outcome. A comprehensive settlement of claims in the magnitude and complexity contemplated by the Settlement Agreement should not provide an opportunity to re-trade the deal after the fact.

92 The Settlement Agreement should be fair and reasonable in all the circumstances. It should balance the interests of the Settlement Parties and other affected constituencies equitably and should be beneficial to the Applicants and their stakeholders generally.

93 It seems to me that Clause H.2 fails to recognize the interests of the other creditors of the Applicants. These creditors have claims that rank equally with the claims of the Former Employees and LTD Employees. Each have unsecured claims against the Applicants. The Settlement Agreement provides for a transfer of funds to the benefit of the Former Employees and LTD Employees at the expense of the remaining creditors. The establishment of the Payments Charge crystallized this agreed upon preference, but Clause H.2 has the effect of not providing any certainty of outcome to the remaining creditors.

94 I do not consider Clause H.2 to be fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

95 In light of this conclusion, the Settlement Agreement cannot be approved in its current form.

96 Counsel to the Noteholder Group also made submissions that three other provisions of the Settlement Agreement were unreasonable and unfair, namely:

- (i) ongoing exposure to potential liability for pension claims if a bankruptcy order is made before October 1, 2010;
- (ii) provisions allowing payments made to employees to be credited against employees' claims made, rather than from future distributions or not to be credited at all; and
- (iii) lack of clarity as to whether the proposed order is binding on the Superintendent in all of his capacities under the *Pension Benefits Act* and other applicable law, and not merely in his capacity as Administrator on behalf of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund.

97 The third concern was resolved at the hearing with the acknowledgement by counsel to the Superintendent that the proposed order would be binding on the Superintendent in all of his capacities.

98 With respect to the concern regarding the potential liability for pension claims if a bankruptcy order is made prior to October 1, 2010, counsel for the Applicants undertook that the Applicants would not take any steps to file a voluntary assignment into bankruptcy prior to October 1, 2010. Although such acknowledgment does not bind creditors from commencing involuntary bankruptcy proceedings during this time period, the granting of any bankruptcy order is preceded by a court hearing. The Noteholders would be in a position to make submissions on this point, if so advised. This concern of the Noteholders is not one that would cause me to conclude that the Settlement Agreement was unreasonable and unfair.

99 Finally, the Noteholder Group raised concerns with respect to the provision which would allow payments made to employees to be credited against employees' claims made, rather than from future distributions, or not to be credited at all. I do not view this provision as being unreasonable and unfair. Rather, it is a term of the Settlement Agreement that has been negotiated by the Settlement Parties. I do note that the proposed treatment with respect to any payments does provide certainty and finality and, in my view, represents a reasonable compromise in the circumstances.

DISPOSITION

100 I recognize that the proposed Settlement Agreement was arrived at after hard-fought and lengthy negotiations. There are many positive aspects of the Settlement Agreement. I have no doubt that the parties to the Settlement Agreement consider that it represents the best agreement achievable under the circumstances. However, it is my conclusion that the inclusion of Clause H.2 results in a flawed agreement that cannot be approved.

101 I am mindful of the submission of counsel to the Former and LTD Employees that if the Settlement Agreement were approved, with Clause H.2 excluded, this would substantively alter the Settlement Agreement and would, in effect, be a creation of a settlement and not the approval of one.

102 In addition, counsel to the Superintendent indicated that the approval of the Superintendent was limited to the proposed Settlement Agreement and would not constitute approval of any altered agreement.

103 In *Grace 2008, supra*, I commented that a line-by-line analysis was inappropriate and that approval of a settlement agreement was to be undertaken in its entirety or not at all, at para. 74. A similar position was taken by the New Brunswick Court of Queen's Bench in *Wandlyn Inns Limited (Re)* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 316. I see no reason or basis to deviate from this position.

104 Accordingly, the motion is dismissed.

105 In view of the timing of the release of this decision and the functional funding deadline of March 31, 2010, the court will make every effort to accommodate the parties if further directions are required.

106 Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to all counsel and in person parties for the quality of written and oral submissions.

G.B. MORAWETZ J.

cp/e/qlrxg/qlpxm/qlaxw/qlced/qljyw

1 On March 25, 2010, the Supreme Court of Canada released the following: *Donald Sproule et al. v. Nortel Networks Corporation et al.* (Ont.) (Civil) (By Leave) (33491) (The motions for directions and to expedite the application for leave to appeal are dismissed. The application for leave to appeal is dismissed with no order as to costs./La requête en vue d'obtenir des directives et la requête visant à accélérer la procédure de demande d'autorisation d'appel sont rejetées. La demande d'autorisation d'appel est rejetée; aucune ordonnance n'est rendue con-

cernant les dépens.): <http://scc.lexum.umontreal.ca/en/news_release/2010/10-03-25.3a/10-03-25.3a.html>

TAB 6

Case Name:

Robertson v. ProQuest Information and Learning Co.

**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
Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Canwest
Books Inc. and Canwest (Canada) Inc.
AND RE: Heather Robertson, Plaintiff, and
ProQuest Information and Learning Company, Cedrom-SNI Inc.,
Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd., Rogers Publishing Limited and
Canwest Publishing Inc., Defendants**

[2011] O.J. No. 1160

2011 ONSC 1647

Court File Nos. 03-CV-252945CP, CV-10-8533-00CL

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

S.E. Pepall J.

March 15, 2011.

(34 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Compromises and arrangements -- Sanction by court -- Application by the representative plaintiff and by one of the defendants, who was governed by an order under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, for approval of a settlement that would resolve plaintiff's class proceeding and claim under the Act allowed -- Settlement would result in fair and reasonable outcome -- Settlement was recommended by all of the involved parties and it was not opposed by the defendants in the class proceeding who were not included in it.

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Proceedings -- Practice and procedure -- Settlements -- Application by the representative plaintiff and by one of the defendants, who was governed by an order under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, for approval of a settlement that would resolve plaintiff's class proceeding and claim under the Act allowed -- Settlement would result in fair and

reasonable outcome -- Settlement was recommended by all of the involved parties and it was not opposed by the defendants in the class proceeding who were not included in it.

Civil litigation -- Civil procedure -- Parties -- Class or representative actions -- Settlements -- Approval -- Application by the representative plaintiff and by one of the defendants, who was governed by an order under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, for approval of a settlement that would resolve plaintiff's class proceeding and claim under the Act allowed -- Settlement would result in fair and reasonable outcome -- Settlement was recommended by all of the involved parties and it was not opposed by the defendants in the class proceeding who were not included in it.

Application by Robertson and by the defendant Canwest Publishing Inc. for approval of a settlement. Robertson, who was a plaintiff in her own capacity and was also the representative plaintiff in a class proceeding, commenced this action in July 2003. The action was certified as a class proceeding in October 2008. Robertson claimed compensatory damages of \$500 million and punitive and exemplary damages of \$250 million against the defendants for copyright infringement. In January 2010 Canwest was granted an initial order pursuant to the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act. In April 2010 Robertson filed a claim under the Arrangement Act for \$500 million. The Monitor's opinion was that this claim was worth \$0. The proposed settlement would resolve the class proceeding and the proceeding under the Arrangement Act. Court approval was not required for the claim under the Arrangement Act but it was required for the class proceeding. Under the settlement the claim under the Arrangement Act would be allowed in the amount of \$7.5 million for voting and distribution purposes. Robertson undertook to vote in favour of the proposed Plan under the Arrangement Act. The action would be dismissed against Canwest, which did not admit liability. The action would not be dismissed against the other defendants. The Monitor was involved in the negotiation of the settlement and recommended approval for it concluded that the settlement agreement was a fair and reasonable resolution for Canwest.

HELD: Application allowed. The settlement agreement met the tests for approval under the Arrangement Act and under the Class Act. No one, including the non-settling defendants who received notice, opposed the settlement. Robertson was a very experienced and sophisticated litigant who previously resolved a similar class proceeding against other media companies. The settlement agreement was recommended by experienced counsel and it was entered into after serious negotiations between sophisticated parties. It would result in a fair and reasonable outcome, partly because Canwest was in an insolvency proceeding with all of its attendant risks and uncertainties.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Class Proceedings Act, 1992, S.O. 1992, c. 6, s. 29, s. 34

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

Counsel:

Kirk Baert, for the Plaintiff.

Peter J. Osborne and Kate McGrann, for Canwest Publishing Inc.

Alex Cobb, for the CCAA Applicants.

Ashley Taylor and Maria Konyukhova, for the Monitor.

REASONS FOR DECISION

S.E. PEPALL J.:--

Overview

1 On January 8, 2010, I granted an initial order pursuant to the provisions of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") in favour of Canwest Publishing Inc. ("CPI") and related entities (the "LP Entities"). As a result of this order and subsequent orders, actions against the LP Entities were stayed. This included a class proceeding against CPI brought by Heather Robertson in her personal capacity and as a representative plaintiff (the "Representative Plaintiff"). Subsequently, CPI brought a motion for an order approving a proposed notice of settlement of the action which was granted. CPI and the Representative Plaintiff then jointly brought a motion for approval of the settlement of both the class proceeding as against CPI and the CCAA claim. The Monitor supported the request and no one was opposed. I granted the judgment requested and approved the settlement with endorsement to follow. Given the significance of the interplay of class proceedings with CCAA proceedings, I have written more detailed reasons for decision rather than simply an endorsement.

Facts

2 The Representative Plaintiff commenced this class proceeding by statement of claim dated July 25, 2003 and the action was case managed by Justice Cullity. He certified the action as a class proceeding on October 21, 2008 which order was subsequently amended on September 15, 2009.

3 The Representative Plaintiff claimed compensatory damages of \$500 million plus punitive and exemplary damages of \$250 million against the named defendants, ProQuest Information and Learning LLC, Cedrom-SNI Inc., Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd., Rogers Publishing Limited and CPI for the alleged infringement of copyright and moral rights in certain works owned by class members. She alleged that class members had granted the defendants the limited right to reproduce the class members' works in the print editions of certain newspapers and magazines but that the defendant publishers had proceeded to reproduce, distribute and communicate the works to the public in electronic media operated by them or by third parties.

4 As set out in the certification order, the class consists of:

- A. All persons who were the authors or creators of original literary works ("Works") which were published in Canada in any newspaper, magazine, periodical, newsletter, or journal (collectively "Print Media") which Print Media have been reproduced, distributed or communicated to the public by telecommunication by, or pursuant to the purported authorization or permission of, one or more of the defendants, through any electronic database, excluding electronic databases in which only a precise electronic reproduction of the Work or substantial portion thereof is made available (such as PDF and analogous copies) (collectively "Electronic Media"), excluding:

- (a) persons who by written document assigned or exclusively licensed all of the copyright in their Works to a defendant, a licensor to a defendant, or any third party; or
- (b) persons who by written document granted to a defendant or a licensor to a defendant a license to publish or use their Works in Electronic Media; or
- (c) persons who provided Works to a not for profit or non-commercial publisher of Print Media which was licensor to a defendant (including a third party defendant), and where such persons either did not expect or request, or did not receive, financial gain for providing such Works; or
- (d) persons who were employees of a defendant or a licensor to a defendant, with respect to any Works created in the course of their employment.

Where the Print Media publication was a Canadian edition of a foreign publication, only Works comprising of the content exclusive to the Canada edition shall qualify for inclusion under this definition.

(Persons included in clause A are thereafter referred to as "Creators". A "licensor to a defendant" is any party that has purportedly authorized or provided permission to one or more defendants to make Works available in Electronic Media. References to defendants or licensors to defendants include their predecessors and successors in interest)

- B. All persons (except a defendant or a licensor to a defendant) to whom a Creator, or an Assignee, assigned, exclusively licensed, granted or transmitted a right to publish or use their Works in Electronic Media.

(Persons included in clause B are hereinafter referred to as "Assignees")

- C. Where a Creator or Assignee is deceased, the personal representatives of the estate of such person unless the date of death of the Creator was on or before December 31, 1950.

5 As part of the *CCAA* proceedings, I granted a claims procedure order detailing the procedure to be adopted for claims to be made against the LP Entities in the *CCAA* proceedings. On April 12, 2010, the Representative Plaintiff filed a claim for \$500 million in respect of the claims advanced against CPI in the action pursuant to the provisions of the claims procedure order. The Monitor was of the view that the claim in the *CCAA* proceedings should be valued at \$0 on a preliminary basis.

6 The Representative Plaintiff's claim was scheduled to be heard by a claims officer appointed pursuant to the terms of the claims procedure order. The claims officer would determine liability and would value the claim for voting purposes in the *CCAA* proceedings.

7 Prior to the hearing before the claims officer, the Representative Plaintiff and CPI negotiated for approximately two weeks and ultimately agreed to settle the *CCAA* claim pursuant to the terms of a settlement agreement.

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 proceeding

settlements must be approved by the court. The notice and process for dissemination of the settlement agreement must also be approved by the court.

9 Pursuant to section 34 of the *Class Proceedings Act*, the same judge shall hear all motions before the trial of the common issues although another judge may be assigned by the Regional Senior Judge (the "RSJ") in certain circumstances. The action had been stayed as a result of the CCAA proceedings. While I was the supervising CCAA judge, I was also assigned by the RSJ to hear the class proceeding notice and settlement motions.

10 Class counsel said in his affidavit that given the time constraints in the CCAA proceedings, he was of the view that the parties had made reasonable attempts to provide adequate notice of the settlement to the class. It would have been preferable to have provided more notice, however, given the exigencies of insolvency proceedings and the proposed meeting to vote on the CCAA Plan, I was prepared to accept the notice period requested by class counsel and CPI.

11 In this case, given the hybrid nature of the proceedings, the motion for an order approving notice of the settlement in both the class action proceeding and the CCAA proceeding was brought before me as the supervising CCAA judge. The notice procedure order required:

- 1) the Monitor and class counsel to post a copy of the settlement agreement and the notice order on their websites;
- 2) the Monitor to publish an English version of the approved form of notice letter in the National Post and the Globe and Mail on three consecutive days and a French translation of the approved form of notice letter in La Presse for three consecutive days;
- 3) distribution of a press release in an approved form by Canadian Newswire Group for dissemination to various media outlets; and
- 4) the Monitor and class counsel were to maintain toll-free phone numbers and to respond to enquiries and information requests from class members.

12 The notice order allowed class members to file a notice of appearance on or before a date set forth in the order and if a notice of appearance was delivered, the party could appear in person at the settlement approval motion and any other proceeding in respect of the class proceeding settlement. Any notices of appearance were to be provided to the service list prior to the approval hearing. In fact, no notices of appearance were served.

13 In brief, the terms of the settlement were that:

- a) the CCAA claim in the amount of \$7.5 million would be allowed for voting and distribution purposes;
- b) the Representative Plaintiff undertook to vote the claim in favour of the proposed CCAA Plan;
- c) the action would be dismissed as against CPI;
- d) CPI did not admit liability; and
- e) the Representative Plaintiff, in her personal capacity and on behalf of the class and/or class members, would provide a licence and release in respect of the freelance subject works as that term was defined in the settlement agreement.

14 The claims in the action in respect of CPI would be fully settled but the claims which also involved ProQuest would be preserved. The licence was a non-exclusive licence to reproduce one or more copies of the freelance subject works in electronic media and to authorize others to do the same. The licence excluded the right to licence freelance subject works to ProQuest until such time as the action was resolved against ProQuest, thereby protecting the class members' ability to pursue ProQuest in the action. The settlement did not terminate the lawsuit against the other remaining defendants. Under the *CCAA* Plan, all unsecured creditors, including the class, would be entitled to share on a pro rata basis in a distribution of shares in a new company. The Representative Plaintiff would share pro rata to the extent of the settlement amount with other affected creditors of the LP Entities in the distributions to be made by the LP Entities, if any.

15 After the notice motion, CPI and the Representative Plaintiff brought a motion to approve the settlement. Evidence was filed showing, among other things, compliance with the claims procedure order. Arguments were made on the process and on the fairness and reasonableness of the settlement.

16 In her affidavit, Ms. Robertson described why the settlement was fair, reasonable and in the best interests of the class members:

In light of Canwest's insolvency, I am advised by counsel, and verily believe, that, absent an agreement or successful award in the Canwest Claims Process, the prospect of recovery for the Class against Canwest is minimal, at best. However, under the Settlement Agreement, which preserves the claims of the Class as against the remaining defendants in the class proceeding in respect of each of their independent alleged breaches of the class members' rights, as well as its claims as against ProQuest for alleged violations attributable to Canwest content, there is a prospect that members of the Class will receive some form of compensation in respect of their direct claims against Canwest.

Because the Settlement Agreement provides a possible avenue of recovery for the Class, and because it largely preserves the remaining claims of the Class as against the remaining defendants in the class proceeding, I am of the view that the Settlement Agreement represents a reasonable compromise of the Class claim as against Canwest, and is both fair and reasonable in the circumstances of Canwest's insolvency.

17 In the affidavit filed by class counsel, Anthony Guindon of the law firm Koskie Minsky LLP noted that he was not in a position to ascertain the approximate dollar value of the potential benefit flowing to the class from the potential share in a pro rata distribution of shares in the new corporation. This reflected the unfortunate reality of the *CCAA* process. While a share price of \$11.45 was used, he noted that no assurance could be given as to the actual market price that would prevail. In addition, recovery was contingent on the total quantum of proven claims in the claims process. He also described the litigation risks associated with attempting to obtain a lifting of the *CCAA* stay of proceedings. The likelihood of success was stated to be minimal. He also observed the problems associated with collection of any judgment in favour of the Representative Plaintiff. He went on to state:

... The Representative Plaintiff, on behalf of the Class, could have elected to challenge Canwest's initial valuation of the Class claim of \$0 before a Claims Officer, rather than entering into a negotiated settlement. However, a number of factors militated against the advisability of such a course of action. Most importantly, the claims of the Class in the class proceeding have not been proven, and the Class does not enjoy the benefit of a final judgment as against Canwest. Thus, a hearing before the Claims Officer would necessarily necessitate a finding of liability as against Canwest, in addition to a quantification of the claims of the Class against Canwest.

... a negative outcome in a hearing before a Claims Officer could have the effect of jeopardizing the Class claims as against the remaining defendants in the class proceeding. Such a finding would not be binding on a judge seized of a common issues trial in the class proceeding; however, it could have persuasive effect.

Given the likely limited recovery available from Canwest in the Claims Process, it is the view of Class Counsel that a negotiated resolution of the quantification of Class claim as against Canwest is preferable to risking a negative finding of liability in the context of a contested Claims hearing before a Claims Officer.

18 The Monitor was also involved in the negotiation of the settlement and was also of the view that the settlement agreement was a fair and reasonable resolution for CPI and the LP Entities' stakeholders. The Monitor indicated in its report that the settlement agreement eliminated a large degree of uncertainty from the *CCAA* proceeding and facilitated the approval of the Plan by the requisite majorities of stakeholders. This of course was vital to the successful restructuring of the LP Entities. The Monitor recommended approval of the settlement agreement.

19 The settlement of the class proceeding action was made prior to the creditors' meeting to vote on the Plan for the LP Entities. The issues of the fees and disbursements of class counsel and the ultimate distribution to class members were left to be dealt with by the class proceedings judge if and when there was a resolution of the action with the remaining defendants.

Discussion

20 Both motions in respect of the settlement were heard by me but were styled in both the *CCAA* proceedings and the class proceeding.

21 As noted by Jay A. Swartz and Natasha J. MacParland in their article "*Canwest Publishing - A Tale of Two Plans*":

"There have been a number of *CCAA* proceedings in which settlements in respect of class proceedings have been implemented including *McCarthy v. Canadian Red Cross Society*, (*Re:*) *Grace Canada Inc.*, *Muscletech Research and Development Inc.*, and (*Re:*) *Hollinger Inc.* ... The structure and process for notice and approval of the settlement used in the LP Entities restructuring appears to be the most efficient and effective and likely a model for future approvals. Both motions in respect of the Settlement, discussed below, were heard by the *CCAA* judge but were styled in both proceedings." [citations omitted]

(a) Approval

(i) CCAA Settlements in General

22 Certainly the court has jurisdiction to approve a CCAA settlement agreement. As stated by Farley J. in *Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.*,² the CCAA is intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both. Very broad powers are provided to the CCAA judge and these powers are exercised to achieve the objectives of the statute. It is well settled that courts may approve settlements by debtor companies during the CCAA stay period: *Re Calpine Canada Energy Ltd.*³; *Re Air Canada*⁴; and *Re Playdium Entertainment Corp.*⁵ To obtain approval of a settlement under the CCAA, the moving party must establish that: the transaction is fair and reasonable; the transaction will be beneficial to the debtor and its stakeholders generally; and the settlement is consistent with the purpose and spirit of the CCAA. See in this regard *Re Air Canada*⁶ and *Re Calpine*.⁷

(ii) Class Proceedings Settlement

23 The power to approve the settlement of a class proceeding is found in section 29 of the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*⁸. That section states:

29(1) A proceeding commenced under this *Act* and a proceeding certified as a class proceeding under this *Act* may be discontinued or abandoned only with the approval of the court, on such terms as the court considers appropriate.

(2) A settlement of a class proceeding is not binding unless approved by the court.

(3) A settlement of a class proceeding that is approved by the court binds all class members.

(4) In dismissing a proceeding for delay or in approving a discontinuance, abandonment or settlement, the court shall consider whether notice should be given under section 19 and whether any notice should include,

- (a) an account of the conduct of the proceedings;
- (b) a statement of the result of the proceeding; and
- (c) a description of any plan for distributing settlement funds.

24 The test for approval of the settlement of a class proceeding was described in *Dabbs v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada*⁹. The court must find that in all of the circumstances the settlement is fair, reasonable and in the best interests of those affected by it. In making this determination, the court should consider, amongst other things:

- a) the likelihood of recovery or success at trial;
- b) the recommendation and experience of class counsel; and
- c) the terms of the settlement.

As such, it is clear that although the *CCAA* and class proceeding tests for approval are not identical, a certain symmetry exists between the two.

25 A perfect settlement is not required. As stated by Sharpe J. (as he then was) in *Dabbs v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada*¹⁰:

Fairness is not a standard of perfection. Reasonableness allows for a range of possible resolutions. A less than perfect settlement may be in the best interests of those affected by it when compared to the alternative of the risks and costs of litigation.

26 Where there is more than one defendant in a class proceeding, the action may be settled against one of the defendants provided that the settlement is fair, reasonable and in the best interests of the class members: *Ontario New Home Warranty Program et al. v. Chevron Chemical et al.*¹¹

(iii) The Robertson Settlement

27 I concluded that the settlement agreement met the tests for approval under the *CCAA* and the *Class Proceedings Act*.

28 As a general proposition, settlement of litigation is to be promoted. Settlement saves time and expense for the parties and the court and enables individuals to extract themselves from a justice system that, while of a high caliber, is often alien and personally demanding. Even though settlements are to be encouraged, fairness and reasonableness are not to be sacrificed in the process.

29 The presence or absence of opposition to a settlement may sometimes serve as a proxy for reasonableness. This is not invariably so, particularly in a class proceeding settlement. In a class proceeding, the court approval process is designed to provide some protection to absent class members.

30 In this case, the proposed settlement is supported by the LP Entities, the Representative Plaintiff, and the Monitor. No one, including the non-settling defendants all of whom received notice, opposed the settlement. No class member appeared to oppose the settlement either.

31 The Representative Plaintiff is a very experienced and sophisticated litigant and has been so recognized by the court. She is a freelance writer having published more than 15 books and having been a regular contributor to Canadian magazines for over 40 years. She has already successfully resolved a similar class proceeding against Thomson Canada Limited, Thomson Affiliates, Information Access Company and Bell Global Media Publishing Inc. which was settled for \$11 million after 13 years of litigation. That proceeding involved allegations quite similar to those advanced in the action before me. In approving the settlement in that case, Justice Cullity described the involvement of the Representative Plaintiff in the class proceeding:

The Representative Plaintiff, Ms. Robertson, has been actively involved throughout the extended period of the litigation. She has an honours degree in English from the University of Manitoba, and an M.A. from Columbia University in New York. She is the author of works of fiction and non-fiction, she has been a regular contributor to Canadian magazines and newspapers for over 40 years, and she was a founder member of each of the Professional Writers' Association of Canada and the Writers' Union of Canada. Ms. Robertson has been in

communication with class members about the litigation since its inception and has obtained funds from them to defray disbursements. She has clearly been a driving force behind the litigation: *Robertson v. Thomson Canada*¹².

32 The settlement agreement was recommended by experienced counsel and entered into after serious and considered negotiations between sophisticated parties. The quantum of the class members' claim for voting and distribution purposes, though not identical, was comparable to the settlement in *Robertson v. Thomson Canada*. In approving that settlement, Justice Cullity stated:

Ms. Robertson's best estimate is that there may be 5,000 to 10,000 members in the class and, on that basis, the gross settlement amount of \$11 million does not appear to be unreasonable. It compares very favourably to an amount negotiated among the parties for a much wider class in the U.S. litigation and, given the risks and likely expense attached to a continuation of the proceeding, does not appear to be out of line. On this question I would, in any event, be very reluctant to second guess the recommendations of experienced class counsel, and their well informed client, who have been involved in all stages of the lengthy litigation.¹³

33 In my view, Ms. Robertson's and Mr. Guindon's description of the litigation risks in this class proceeding were realistic and reasonable. As noted by class counsel in oral argument, issues relating to the existence of any implied license arising from conduct, assessment of damages, and recovery risks all had to be considered. Fundamentally, CPI was in an insolvency proceeding with all its attendant risks and uncertainties. The settlement provided a possible avenue for recovery for class members but at the same time preserved the claims of the class against the other defendants as well as the claims against ProQuest for alleged violations attributable to CPI content. The settlement brought finality to the claims in the action against CPI and removed any uncertainty and the possibility of an adverse determination. Furthermore, it was integral to the success of the consolidated plan of compromise that was being proposed in the *CCAA* proceedings and which afforded some possibility of recovery for the class. Given the nature of the *CCAA* Plan, it was not possible to assess the final value of any distribution to the class. As stated in the joint factum filed by counsel for CPI and the Representative Plaintiff, when measured against the litigation risks, the settlement agreement represented a reasonable, pragmatic and realistic compromise of the class claims.

34 The Representative Plaintiff, Class Counsel and the Monitor were all of the view that the settlement resulted in a fair and reasonable outcome. I agreed with that assessment. The settlement was in the best interests of the class and was also beneficial to the LP Entities and their stakeholders. I therefore granted my approval.

S.E. PEPALL J.

cp/e/qllxr/qlvxw/qlbdp

1 Annual Review of Insolvency Law, 2010, J.P. Sarra Ed, Carswell, Toronto at page 79.

2 (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at 31.

3 2007 ABQB 504 at para. 71; leave to appeal dismissed 2007 ABCA 266 (Alta. C.A.).

4 (2004), 47 C.B.R. (4th) 169 (Ont. S.C.J.).

5 (2001), 31 C.B.R. (4th) 302 (Ont. S.C.J.) at para. 23.

6 *Supra.* at para. 9.

7 *Supra.* at para. 59.

8 S.O. 1992, c. 6.

9 [1998] O.J. No. 1598 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 9.

10 (1998), 40 O.R. (3d) 429 at para 30.

11 [1999] O.J. No. 2245 (Ont. S.C.J.) at para. 97.

12 [2009] O.J. No. 2650 at para. 15.

13 *Robertson v. Thomson Canada*, [2009] O.J. No. 2650 para. 20.

TAB 7

Case Name:

Muscletech Research and Development Inc. (Re)

**RE: IN THE MATTER OF the Companies' Creditors
Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended
AND IN THE MATTER OF Muscletech Research and
Development Inc. and those Entities Listed on
Schedule "A" hereto, Applicants**

[2007] O.J. No. 695

30 C.B.R. (5th) 59

156 A.C.W.S. (3d) 22

2007 CarswellOnt 1029

Court File No. 06-CL-6241

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List - Toronto, Ontario

J.D. Ground J.

Heard: February 15, 2007.

Judgment: February 22, 2007.

(27 paras.)

Insolvency law -- Legislation -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act -- Application by the insolvent applicants for the sanction of a distribution plan to resolve large number of product liability and other lawsuits allowed -- Applicants complied with the Act and did nothing that was contrary to it -- Plan was fair and reasonable.

Application by certain applicants under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act for the sanction of their distribution plan -- Plan proposed distributions to each creditor in the General Claimants Class and each creditor in the Personal Injury Claimants Class -- Such distributions were to be funded from the contributed funds paid to the Monitor by the subject parties defined in the Plan -- Plan was not a restructuring plan but was a unique liquidation plan funded entirely by parties other than the applicants -- Purpose and goal of the applicants seeking relief under the Act was to achieve

global resolution of a large number of product liability and other lawsuits that were commenced principally in the United States by numerous claimants and which related to products formerly advertised, marketed and sold by Muscletech Research and Development Inc. -- Applicants' successful restructuring depended on the resolution of the product liability claims -- HELD: Application allowed -- Applicants complied with all the requirements of Act and had adhered to previous court orders -- They were insolvent and had total claims in excess of \$5 million -- Nothing was done that was not authorized by the Act -- Plan was fair and reasonable -- Applicants had no assets and no funds with which to fund a distribution to creditors -- Without the contributed funds there would be no distribution and no Plan and the applicants' only alternative would be bankruptcy -- Unsecured creditors would receive nothing in the event of a bankruptcy -- Part of the Plan was that certain affected parties to the litigation would receive releases -- Releases were necessary because without them no funds would be contributed -- If the Plan was not sanctioned the parties would continue to be mired in extensive and expensive litigation that would have no predictable outcome.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 2, s. 6, s. 12

Corporations Tax Act, s. 107

Excise Tax Act, s. 270

Income Tax Act, s. 159

Counsel:

Fred Myers and David Bish, for CCAA Applicants.

Derrick Tay and Randy Sutton, for Iovate Companies.

Natasha MacParland and Jay Schwartz, for the RSM Richter Inc.

Steven Gollick, for Zurich Insurance Company.

A. Kauffman, for GNC Oldco.

Sheryl Seigel, for General Nutrition Companies Inc. and other GNC Newcos.

Pamela Huff and Beth Posno for Representative Plaintiffs.

Jeff Carhart, for Ad Hoc Tort Claimants Committee.

David Molton and Steven Smith, for Brown Rudnick.

Brent McPherson, for XL Insurance America Inc.

Alex Ilchenko, for Walgreen Co.

Lisa La Horey, for E&L Associates, Inc.

ENDORSEMENT

1 J.D. GROUND J.:-- The motion before this court is brought by the Applicants pursuant to s. 6 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the "CCAA") for the sanction of a plan (the "Plan") put forward by the Applicants for distributions to each creditor in the General Claimants Class ("GCC") and each creditor in the Personal Injury Claimants Class ("PICC"), such distributions to be funded from the contributed funds paid to the Monitor by the subject parties ("SP") as defined in the Plan.

2 The Plan is not a restructuring plan but is a unique liquidation plan funded entirely by parties other than the Applicants.

3 The purpose and goal of the Applicants in seeking relief under the CCAA is to achieve a global resolution of a large number of product liability and other lawsuits commenced principally in the United States of America by numerous claimants and which relate to products formerly advertised, marketed and sold by MuscleTech Research and Development Inc. ("MDI") and to resolve such actions as against the Applicants and Third Parties.

4 In addition to the Applicants, many of these actions named as a party defendant one or more of: (a) the directors and officers, and affiliates of the Applicants (i.e. one or more of the Iovate Companies); and/or (b) arm's length third parties such as manufacturers, researchers and retailers of MDI's products (collectively, the "Third Parties"). Many, if not all, of the Third Parties have claims for contribution or indemnity against the Applicants and/or other Third Parties relating to these actions.

The Claims Process

5 On March 3, 2006, this court granted an unopposed order (the "Call For Claims Order") that established a process for the calling of: (a) all Claims (as defined in the Call For Claims Order) in respect of the Applicants and its officers and directors; and (b) all Product Liability Claims (as defined in the Call For Claims Order) in respect of the Applicants and Third Parties.

6 The Call For Claims Order required people who wished to advance claims to file proofs of claim with the Monitor by no later than 5:00 p.m. (EST) on May 8, 2006 (the "Claims Bar Date"), failing which any and all such claims would be forever barred. The Call For Claims Order was approved by unopposed Order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (the "U.S. Court") dated March 22, 2006. The Call For Claims Order set out in a comprehensive manner the types of claims being called for and established an elaborate method of giving broad notice to anyone who might have such claims.

7 Pursuant to an order dated June 8, 2006 (the "Claims Resolution Order"), this court approved a process for the resolution of the Claims and Product Liability Claims. The claims resolution process set out in the Claims Resolution Order provided for, *inter alia*: (a) a process for the review of proofs of claim filed with the Monitor; (b) a process for the acceptance, revision or dispute, by the Applicants, with the assistance of the Monitor, of Claims and/or Product Liability Claims for the purposes of voting and/or distribution under the Plan; (c) the appointment of a claims officer to resolve disputed claims; and (d) an appeal process from the determination of the claims officer. The Claims Resolution Order was recognized and given effect in the U.S. by Order of the U.S. Court dated August 1, 2006.

8 From the outset, the Applicants' successful restructuring has been openly premised on a global resolution of the Product Liability Claims and the recognition that this would be achievable pri-

marily on a consensual basis within the structure of a plan of compromise or arrangement only if the universe of Product Liability Claims was brought forward. It was known to the Applicants that certain of the Third Parties implicated in the Product Liability Actions were agreeable in principle to contributing to the funding of a plan, provided that as a result of the restructuring process they would achieve certainty as to the resolution of all claims and prospective claims against them related to MDI products. It is fundamental to this restructuring that the Applicants have no material assets with which to fund a plan other than the contributions of such Third Parties.

9 Additionally, at the time of their filing under the CCAA, the Applicants were involved in litigation with their insurer, Zurich Insurance Company ("Zurich Canada") and Zurich America Insurance Company, regarding the scope of the Applicants' insurance coverage and liability for defence expenses incurred by the Applicants in connection with the Product Liability Actions.

10 The Applicants recognized that in order to achieve a global resolution of the Product Liability Claims, multi-party mediation was more likely to be successful in providing such resolution in a timely manner than a claims dispute process. By unopposed Order dated April 13, 2006 (the "Mediation Order"), this court approved a mediation process (the "Mediation") to advance a global resolution of the Product Liability Claims. Mediations were conducted by a Court-appointed mediator between and among groups of claimants and stakeholders, including the Applicants, the Ad Hoc Committee of MuscleTech Tort Claimants (which had previously received formal recognition by the Court and the U.S. Court), Zurich Canada and certain other Third Parties.

11 The Mediation facilitated meaningful discussions and proved to be a highly successful mechanism for the resolution of the Product Liability Claims. The vast majority of Product Liability Claims were settled by the end of July, 2006. Settlements of three other Product Liability Claims were achieved at the beginning of November, 2006. A settlement was also achieved with Zurich Canada outside the mediation. The foregoing settlements are conditional upon a successfully implemented Plan that contains the releases and injunctions set forth in the Plan.

12 As part of the Mediation, agreements in respect of the funding of the foregoing settlements were achieved by and among the Applicants, the Iovate Companies and certain Third Parties, which funding (together with other funding being contributed by Third Parties) (collectively, the "Contributed Funds") comprises the funds to be distributed to affected creditors under the Plan. The Third Party funding arrangements are likewise conditional upon a successfully implemented Plan that contains the releases and injunctions set forth in the Plan.

13 It is well settled law that, for the court to exercise its discretion pursuant to s. 6 of the CCAA and sanction a plan, the Applicants must establish that: (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.

14 On the evidence before this court I am fully satisfied that the first two requirements have been met. At the outset of these proceedings, Farley J. found that the Applicants met the criteria for access to the protection of the CCAA. The Applicants are insolvent within the meaning of Section 2 of the CCAA and the Applicants have total claims within the meaning of Section 12 of the CCAA in excess of \$5,000,000.

15 By unopposed Order dated December 15, 2006 (the "Meeting Order"), this Court approved a process for the calling and holding of meetings of each class of creditors on January 26, 2007 (collectively, the "Meetings"), for the purpose of voting on the Plan. The Meeting Order was approved

by unopposed Order of the U.S. Court dated January 9, 2007. On December 29, 2006, and in accordance with the Meeting Order, the Monitor served all creditors of the Applicants, with a copy of the Meeting Materials (as defined in the Meeting Order).

16 The Plan was filed in accordance with the Meeting Order. The Meetings were held, quorums were present and the voting was carried out in accordance with the Meeting Order. The Plan was unanimously approved by both classes of creditors satisfying the statutory requirements of the CCAA.

17 This court has made approximately 25 orders since the Initial Order in carrying out its general supervision of all steps taken by the Applicants pursuant to the Initial CCAA order and in development of the Plan. The U.S. Court has recognized each such order and the Applicants have fully complied with each such order.

The Plan is Fair and Reasonable

18 It has been held that in determining whether to sanction a plan, the court must exercise its equitable jurisdiction and consider the prejudice to the various parties that would flow from granting or refusing to grant approval of the plan and must consider alternatives available to the Applicants if the plan is not approved. An important factor to be considered by the court in determining whether the plan is fair and reasonable is the degree of approval given to the plan by the creditors. It has also been held that, in determining whether to approve the plan, a court should not second-guess the business aspects of the plan or substitute its views for that of the stakeholders who have approved the plan.

19 In the case at bar, all of such considerations, in my view must lead to the conclusion that the Plan is fair and reasonable. On the evidence before this court, the Applicants have no assets and no funds with which to fund a distribution to creditors. Without the Contributed Funds there would be no distribution made and no Plan to be sanctioned by this court. Without the Contributed Funds, the only alternative for the Applicants is bankruptcy and it is clear from the evidence before this court that the unsecured creditors would receive nothing in the event of bankruptcy.

20 A unique feature of this Plan is the Releases provided under the Plan to Third Parties in respect of claims against them in any way related to "the research, development, manufacture, marketing, sale, distribution, application, advertising, supply, production, use or ingestion of products sold, developed or distributed by or on behalf of" the Applicants (see Article 9.1 of the Plan). It is self-evident, and the Subject Parties have confirmed before this court, that the Contributed Funds would not be established unless such Third Party Releases are provided and accordingly, in my view it is fair and reasonable to provide such Third Party releases in order to establish a fund to provide for distributions to creditors of the Applicants. With respect to support of the Plan, in addition to unanimous approval of the Plan by the creditors represented at meetings of creditors, several other stakeholder groups support the sanctioning of the Plan, including Iovate Health Sciences Inc. and its subsidiaries (excluding the Applicants) (collectively, the "Iovate Companies"), the Ad Hoc Committee of MuscleTech Tort Claimants, GN Oldco, Inc. f/k/a General Nutrition Corporation, Zurich American Insurance Company, Zurich Insurance Company, HVL, Inc. and XL Insurance America Inc. It is particularly significant that the Monitor supports the sanctioning of the Plan.

21 With respect to balancing prejudices, if the Plan is not sanctioned, in addition to the obvious prejudice to the creditors who would receive nothing by way of distribution in respect of their

claims, other stakeholders and Third Parties would continue to be mired in extensive, expensive and in some cases conflicting litigation in the United States with no predictable outcome.

22 The sanction of the Plan was opposed only by prospective representative plaintiffs in five class actions in the United States. This court has on two occasions denied class action claims in this proceeding by orders dated August 16, 2006 with respect to products containing prohormone and dated December 11, 2006 with respect to Hydroxycut products. The first of such orders was appealed to the Ontario Court of Appeal and the appeal was dismissed. The second of such orders was not appealed. In my reasons with respect to the second order, I stated as follows:

... This CCAA proceeding was commenced for the purpose of achieving a global resolution of all product liability and other lawsuits commenced in the United States against Muscletech. As a result of strenuous negotiation and successful court-supervised mediation through the District Court, the Applicants have succeeded in resolving virtually all of the outstanding claims with the exception of the Osborne claim and, to permit the filing of a class proof of claim at this time, would seriously disrupt and extend the CCAA proceedings and the approval of a Plan and would increase the costs and decrease the benefits to all stakeholders. There appears to have been adequate notice to potential claimants and no member of the putative class other than Osborne herself has filed a proof of claim. It would be reasonable to infer that none of the other members of the putative class is interested in filing a claim in view of the minimal amounts of their claims and of the difficulty of coming up with documentation to support their claim. In this context the comments of Rakoff, J. in *Re Ephedra Products Liability Litigation* (2005) U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16060 at page 6 are particularly apt.

Further still, allowing the consumer class actions would unreasonably waste an estate that was already grossly insufficient to pay the allowed claims of creditors who had filed timely individual proofs of claim. The Debtors and Creditors Committee estimate that the average claim of class [*10] members would be \$ 30, entitling each claimant to a distribution of about \$ 4.50 (figures which Barr and Lackowski do not dispute; although Cirak argues that some consumers made repeated purchases of Twinlabs steroid hormones totaling a few hundred dollars each). Presumably, each claimant would have to show some proof of purchase, such as the product bottle. Because the Debtor ceased marketing these products in 2003, many purchasers would no longer have such proof. Those who did might well find the prospect of someday recovering \$ 4.50 not worth the trouble of searching for the old bottle or store receipt and filing a proof of claim. Claims of class members would likely be few and small. The only real beneficiaries of applying Rule 23 would be the lawyers representing the class. *Cf Woodward*, 205 B.R. at 376-77. The Court has discretion under Rule 9014 to find that the likely total benefit to class members would not justify the cost to the estate of defending a class action under Rule 23.

[35] In addition, in the case at bar, there would appear to be substantial doubt as to whether the basis for the class action, that is the alleged false and misleading

advertising, would be found to be established and substantial doubt as to whether the class is certifiable in view of being overly broad, amorphous or vague and administratively difficult to determine. (See *Perez et al. v. Metabolife International Inc.* (2003) U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21206 at pages 3-5). The timing of the bringing of this motion in this proceeding is also problematic. The claims bar date has passed. The mediation process is virtually completed and the Osborne claim is one of the few claims not settled in mediation although counsel for the putative class were permitted to participate in the mediation process. The filing of the class action in California occurred prior to the initial CCAA Order and at no prior time has this court been asked to approve the filing of a class action proof of claim in these proceedings. The claims of the putative class members as reflected in the comments of Rakoff, J. quoted above would be limited to a refund of the purchase price for the products in question and, in the context of insolvency and restructuring proceedings, *de minimus* claims should be discouraged in that the costs and time in adjudicating such claims outweigh the potential recoveries for the claimants. The claimants have had ample opportunity to file evidence that the call for claims order or the claims process as implemented has been prejudicial or unfair to the putative class members.

23 The representative Plaintiffs opposing the sanction of the Plan do not appear to be rearguing the basis on which the class claims were disallowed. Their position on this motion appears to be that the Plan is not fair and reasonable in that, as a result of the sanction of the Plan, the members of their classes of creditors will be precluded as a result of the Third Party Releases from taking any action not only against MuscleTech but against the Third Parties who are defendants in a number of the class actions. I have some difficulty with this submission. As stated above, in my view, it must be found to be fair and reasonable to provide Third Party Releases to persons who are contributing to the Contributed Funds to provide funding for the distributions to creditors pursuant to the Plan. Not only is it fair and reasonable; it is absolutely essential. There will be no funding and no Plan if the Third Party Releases are not provided. The representative Plaintiffs and all the members of their classes had ample opportunity to submit individual proofs of claim and have chosen not to do so, except for two or three of the representative Plaintiffs who did file individual proofs of claim but withdrew them when asked to submit proof of purchase of the subject products. Not only are the claims of the representative Plaintiffs and the members of their classes now barred as a result of the Claims Bar Order, they cannot in my view take the position that the Plan is not fair and reasonable because they are not participating in the benefits of the Plan but are precluded from continuing their actions against MuscleTech and the Third Parties under the terms of the Plan. They had ample opportunity to participate in the Plan and in the benefits of the Plan, which in many cases would presumably have resulted in full reimbursement for the cost of the product and, for whatever reason, chose not to do so.

The representative Plaintiffs also appear to challenge the jurisdiction of this court to authorize the Third Party Releases as one of the terms of the Plan to be sanctioned. I remain of the view expressed in paragraphs 7-9 of my endorsement dated October 13, 2006 in this proceeding on a motion brought by certain personal injury claimants, as follows:

With respect to the relief sought relating to Claims against Third Parties, the position of the Objecting Claimants appears to be that this court lacks jurisdiction to

make any order affecting claims against third parties who are not applicants in a CCAA proceeding. I do not agree. In the case at bar, the whole plan of compromise which is being funded by Third Parties will not proceed unless the plan provides for a resolution of all claims against the Applicants and Third Parties arising out of "the development, advertising and marketing, and sale of health supplements, weight loss and sports nutrition or other products by the Applicants or any of them" as part of a global resolution of the litigation commenced in the United States. In his Endorsement of January 18, 2006, Farley J. stated:

"the Product Liability system vis-à-vis the Non-Applicants appears to be in essence derivative of claims against the Applicants and it would neither be logical nor practical/functional to have that Product Liability litigation not be dealt with on an all encompassing basis."

Moreover, it is not uncommon in CCAA proceedings, in the context of a plan of compromise and arrangement, to compromise claims against the Applicants and other parties against whom such claims or related claims are made. In addition, the Claims Resolution Order, which was not appealed, clearly defines Product Liability Claims to include claims against Third Parties and all of the Objecting Claimants did file Proofs of Claim settling [sic] out in detail their claims against numerous Third Parties.

It is also, in my view, significant that the claims of certain of the Third Parties who are funding the proposed settlement have against the Applicants under various indemnity provisions will be compromised by the ultimate Plan to be put forward to this court. That alone, in my view, would be a sufficient basis to include in the Plan, the settlement of claims against such Third Parties. The CCAA does not prohibit the inclusion in a Plan of the settlement of claims against Third Parties. In *Re Canadian Airlines Corp.* (2000), 20 C.B.R. (4th) Paperny J. stated at p. 92:

While it is true that section 5.2 of the CCAA does not authorize a release of claims against third parties other than directors, it does not prohibit such releases either. The amended terms of the release will not prevent claims from which the CCAA expressly prohibits release.

24 The representative Plaintiffs have referred to certain decisions in the United States that appear to question the jurisdiction of the courts to grant Third Party Releases. I note, however, that Judge Rakoff, who is the U.S. District Court Judge is seized of the *MuscleTech* proceeding, and Judge Drain stated in a hearing in *Re TL Administration Corporation* on July 21, 2005:

It appears to us to be clear that this release was, indeed, essential to the settlement which underlies this plan as set forth at length on the record, including by counsel for the official claimants committee as well as by the other parties involved, and, as importantly, by our review of the settlement agreement itself, which from the start, before this particular plan in fact was filed, included a re-

lease that was not limited to class 4 claims but would extend to claims in class 5 that would include the type of claim asserted by the consumer class claims.

Therefore, in contrast to the Blechman release, this release is essential to confirmation of this plan and the distributions that will be made to creditors in both classes, class 4 and class 5.

Secondly, the parties who are being released here have asserted indemnification claims against the estate, and because of the active nature of the litigation against them, it appears that those claims would have a good chance, if not resolved through this plan, of actually being allowed and reducing the claims of creditors.

At least there is a clear element of circularity between the third-party claims and the indemnification rights of the settling third parties, which is another very important factor recognized in the Second Circuit cases, including *Manville*, *Drexel*, *Finely*, *Kumble* and the like.

The settling third parties it is undisputed are contributing by far the most assets to the settlement, and those assets are substantial in respect of this reorganization by this Chapter 11 case. They're the main assets being contributed.

Again, both classes have voted overwhelmingly for confirmation of the plan, particularly in terms of the numbers of those voting. Each of those factors, although they may be weighed differently in different cases, appear in all the cases where there have been injunctions protecting third parties.

The one factor that is sometimes cited in other cases, i.e., that the settlement will pay substantially all of the claims against the estate, we do not view to be dispositive. Obviously, substantially all of the claims against the estate are not being paid here. On the other hand, even, again, in the Second Circuit cases, that is not a dispositive factor. There have been numerous cases where plans have been confirmed over opposition with respect to third-party releases and third-party injunctions where the percentage recovery of creditors was in the range provided for under this plan.

The key point is that the settlement was arrived at after arduous arm's length negotiations and that it is a substantial amount and that the key parties in interest and the court are satisfied that the settlement is fair and it is unlikely that substantially more would be obtained in negotiation.

25 The reasoning of Judge Rakoff and Judge Drain is, in my view, equally applicable to the case at bar where the facts are substantially similar.

26 It would accordingly appear that the jurisdiction of the courts to grant Third Party Releases has been recognized both in Canada and in the United States.

27 An order will issue sanctioning the Plan in the form of the order submitted to this court and appended as Schedule B to this endorsement.

J.D. GROUND J.

* * * * *

SCHEDULE "A"

- HC Formulations Ltd.
- CELL Formulations Ltd.
- NITRO Formulations Ltd.
- MESO Formulations Ltd.
- ACE Formulations Ltd.
- MISC Formulations Ltd.
- GENERAL Formulations Ltd.
- ACE US Trademark Ltd.
- MT Canadian Supplement Trademark Ltd.
- MT Foreign Supplement Trademark Ltd.
- HC Trademark Holdings Ltd.
- HC US Trademark Ltd.
- 1619005 Ontario Ltd. (f/k/a New HC US Trademark Ltd.)
- HC Canadian Trademark Ltd.
- HC Foreign Trademark Ltd.

* * * * *

SCHEDULE "B"

Court File No. 06-CL-6241

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

THE HONOURABLE) THURSDAY, THE 15TH

MR. JUSTICE GROUND) DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2007

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF MUSCLETECH RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INC. AND THOSE ENTITIES LISTED ON SCHEDULE "A" HERETO

Applicants

SANCTION ORDER

THIS MOTION, made by MuscleTech Research and Development Inc. ("MDI") and those entities listed on Schedule "A" hereto (collectively with MDI, the "Applicants") for an order approving and sanctioning the plan of compromise or arrangement (inclusive of the schedules thereto) of the Applicants dated December 22, 2006 (the "Plan"), as approved by each class of Creditors on January 26, 2007, at the Meeting, and which Plan (without schedules) is attached as Schedule "C" to this Order, and for certain other relief, was heard this day at 330 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.

ON READING: (a) the within Notice of Motion, filed; (b) the Affidavit of Terry Begley sworn January 31, 2007, filed; and (c) the Seventeenth Report of the Monitor dated February 7, 2007 (the "Seventeenth Report"), filed, and upon hearing submissions of counsel to: (a) the Applicants; (b) the Monitor; (c) Iovate Health Sciences Group Inc. and those entities listed on Schedule "B" hereto; (d) the Ad Hoc Committee of MuscleTech Tort Claimants (the "Committee"); (e) GN Oldco, Inc. f/k/a General Nutrition Companies; (f) Zurich Insurance Company; (g) GNC Corporation and other GNC newcos; and (h) certain representative plaintiffs in purported class actions involving products containing the ingredient prohormone, no one appearing for the other persons served with notice of this Motion, as duly served and listed on the Affidavit of Service of Elana Polan, sworn February 2, 2007, filed,

DEFINITIONS

1. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that any capitalized terms not otherwise defined in this Order shall have the meanings ascribed to such terms in the Plan.

SERVICE AND MEETING OF CREDITORS

2. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that there has been good and sufficient notice, service and delivery of the Plan and the Monitor's Seventeenth Report to all Creditors.
3. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that there has been good and sufficient notice, service and delivery of the Meeting Materials (as defined in the Meeting Order) to all Creditors, and that the Meeting was duly convened, held and conducted, in conformity with the CCAA, the Meeting Order and all other Orders of this Court in the CCAA Proceedings. For greater certainty, and without limiting the foregoing, the vote cast at the Meeting on behalf of Rhodrick Harden by David Molton of Brown Rudnick

Berlack Israelis LLP, in its capacity as representative counsel for the Ad Hoc Committee of MuscleTech Tort Claimants, is hereby confirmed.

4. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that there has been good and sufficient notice, service and delivery of the within Notice of Motion and Motion Record, and of the date and time of the hearing held by this Court to consider the within Motion, such that: (i) all Persons have had an opportunity to be present and be heard at such hearing; (ii) the within Motion is properly returnable today; and (iii) further service on any interested party is hereby dispensed with.

SANCTION OF PLAN

5. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that:
- (a) the Plan has been approved by the requisite majorities of the Creditors in each class present and voting, either in person or by proxy, at the Meeting, all in conformity with the CCAA and the terms of the Meeting Order;
 - (b) the Applicants have acted in good faith and with due diligence, have complied with the provisions of the CCAA, and have not done or purported to do (nor does the Plan do or purport to do) anything that is not authorized by the CCAA;
 - (c) the Applicants have adhered to, and acted in accordance with, all Orders of this Court in the CCAA Proceedings; and
 - (d) the Plan, together with all of the compromises, arrangements, transactions, releases, discharges, injunctions and results provided for therein and effected thereby, including but not limited to the Settlement Agreements, is both substantively and procedurally fair, reasonable and in the best interests of the Creditors and the other stakeholders of the Applicants, and does not unfairly disregard the interests of any Person (whether a Creditor or otherwise).
6. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Plan be and is hereby sanctioned and approved pursuant to Section 6 of the CCAA.

PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

7. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicants and the Monitor, as the case may be, are authorized and directed to take all steps and actions, and to do all things, necessary or appropriate to enter into or implement the Plan in accordance with its terms, and enter into, implement and consummate all of the steps, transactions and agreements contemplated pursuant to the Plan.
8. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that upon the satisfaction or waiver, as applicable, of the conditions precedent set out in Section 7.1 of the Plan, the Monitor shall file with this Court and with the U.S. District Court a certificate that states that all conditions precedent set out in Section 7.1 of the Plan have been satisfied or waived, as applicable, and that, with the filing of such certificate by the Monitor, the Plan Implementation Date shall have occurred in accordance with the Plan.

9. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that as of the Plan Implementation Date, the Plan, including all compromises, arrangements, transactions, releases, discharges and injunctions provided for therein, shall inure to the benefit of and be binding and effective upon the Creditors, the Subject Parties and all other Persons affected thereby, and on their respective heirs, administrators, executors, legal personal representatives, successors and assigns.
10. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that, as of the Plan Implementation Date, the validity or invalidity of Claims and Product Liability Claims, as the case may be, and the quantum of all Proven Claims and Proven Product Liability Claims, accepted, determined or otherwise established in accordance with the Claims Resolution Order, and the factual and legal determinations made by the Claims Officer, this Court and the U.S. District Court in connection with all Claims and Product Liability Claims (whether Proven Claims and Proven Product Liability Claims or otherwise), in the course of the CCAA Proceedings are final and binding on the Subject Parties, the Creditors and all other Persons.
11. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, subject to the provisions of the Plan and the performance by the Applicants and the Monitor of their respective obligations under the Plan, and effective on the Plan Implementation Date, all agreements to which the Applicants are a party shall be and remain in full force and effect, unamended, as at the Plan Implementation Date, and no Person shall, following the Plan Implementation Date, accelerate, terminate, rescind, refuse to perform or otherwise repudiate its obligations under, or enforce or exercise any right (including any right of set-off, dilution or other remedy) or make any demand under or in respect of any such agreement, by reason of:
- (a) any event that occurred on or prior to the Plan Implementation Date that would have entitled any Person thereto to enforce those rights or remedies (including defaults or events of default arising as a result of the insolvency of the Applicants);
 - (b) the fact that the Applicants have: (i) sought or obtained plenary relief under the CCAA or ancillary relief in the United States of America, including pursuant to Chapter 15 of the *United States Bankruptcy Code*, or (ii) commenced or completed the CCAA Proceedings or the U.S. Proceedings;
 - (c) the implementation of the Plan, or the completion of any of the steps, transactions or things contemplated by the Plan; or
 - (d) any compromises, arrangements, transactions, releases, discharges or injunctions effected pursuant to the Plan or this Order.
12. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, from and after the Plan Implementation Date, all Persons (other than Unaffected Creditors, and with respect to Unaffected Claims only) shall be deemed to have waived any and all defaults then existing or previously committed by the Applicants, or caused by the Applicants, or non-compliance with any covenant, warranty, representation, term, provision, condition or obligation, express or implied, in any contract, instrument, credit document, guarantee, agreement for sale, lease or other agreement, written or oral, and any and all amendments or supplements thereto (each, an "Agreement"), existing between such Person and the Applicants or any other Person and any and all notices of default and demands for payment under any

Agreement shall be deemed to be of no further force or effect; provided that nothing in this paragraph shall excuse or be deemed to excuse the Applicants from performing any of their obligations subsequent to the date of the CCAA Proceedings, including, without limitation, obligations under the Plan.

13. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, as of the Plan Implementation Date, each Creditor shall be deemed to have consented and agreed to all of the provisions of the Plan in their entirety and, in particular, each Creditor shall be deemed:
- (a) to have executed and delivered to the Monitor and to the Applicants all consents, releases or agreements required to implement and carry out the Plan in its entirety; and
 - (b) to have agreed that if there is any conflict between the provisions, express or implied, of any agreement or other arrangement, written or oral, existing between such Creditor and the Applicants as of the Plan Implementation Date (other than those entered into by the Applicants on or after the Filing Date) and the provisions of the Plan, the provisions of the Plan take precedence and priority and the provisions of such agreement or other arrangement shall be deemed to be amended accordingly.
14. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that any distributions under the Plan and this Order shall not constitute a "distribution" for the purposes of section 159 of the *Income Tax Act* (Canada), section 270 of the *Excise Tax Act* (Canada) and section 107 of the *Corporations Tax Act* (Ontario) and the Monitor in making any such payments is not "distributing", nor shall be considered to have "distributed", such funds, and the Monitor shall not incur any liability under the above-mentioned statutes for making any payments ordered and is hereby forever released, remised and discharged from any claims against it under section 159 of the *Income Tax Act* (Canada), section 270 of the *Excise Tax Act* (Canada) and section 107 of the *Corporations Tax Act* (Ontario) or otherwise at law, arising as a result of distributions under the Plan and this Order and any claims of this nature are hereby forever barred.

APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND FUNDING AGREEMENTS

15. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that each of the Settlement Agreements be and is hereby approved.
16. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that each of the Confidential Insurance Settlement Agreement and the Mutual Release be and is hereby approved.
17. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that copies of the Settlement Agreements, the Confidential Insurance Settlement Agreement and the Mutual Release shall be sealed and shall not form part of the public record, subject to further Order of this Honourable Court; provided that any party to any of the foregoing shall have received, and is entitled to receive, a copy thereof.
18. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DIRECTS** the Monitor to do such things and take such steps as are contemplated to be done and taken by the Monitor under the Plan and the Settlement Agreements. Without limitation: (i) the Monitor shall hold and distribute the Contributed Funds in accordance with the terms of the Plan, the Settlement Agreements and the escrow agreements referenced in Section 5.1 of the Plan; and (ii) on the

Plan Implementation Date, the Monitor shall complete the distributions to or on behalf of Creditors (including, without limitation, to Creditors' legal representatives, to be held by such legal representatives in trust for such Creditors) as contemplated by, and in accordance with, the terms of the Plan, the Settlement Agreements and the escrow agreements referenced in Section 5.1 of the Plan.

RELEASES, DISCHARGES AND INJUNCTIONS

19. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that the compromises, arrangements, releases, discharges and injunctions contemplated in the Plan, including those granted by and for the benefit of the Subject Parties, are integral components thereof and are necessary for, and vital to, the success of the Plan (and without which it would not be possible to complete the global resolution of the Product Liability Claims upon which the Plan and the Settlement Agreements are premised), and that, effective on the Plan Implementation Date, all such releases, discharges and injunctions are hereby sanctioned, approved and given full force and effect, subject to: (a) the rights of Creditors to receive distributions in respect of their Claims and Product Liability Claims in accordance with the Plan and the Settlement Agreements, as applicable; and (b) the rights and obligations of Creditors and/or the Subject Parties under the Plan, the Settlement Agreements, the Funding Agreements and the Mutual Release. For greater certainty, nothing herein or in the Plan shall release or affect any rights or obligations under the Plan, the Settlement Agreements, the Funding Agreements and the Mutual Release.
20. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, without limiting anything in this Order, including without limitation, paragraph 19 hereof, or anything in the Plan or in the Call For Claims Order, the Subject Parties and their respective representatives, predecessors, heirs, spouses, dependents, administrators, executors, subsidiaries, affiliates, related companies, franchisees, member companies, vendors, partners, distributors, brokers, retailers, officers, directors, shareholders, employees, attorneys, sureties, insurers, successors, indemnitees, servants, agents and assigns (collectively, the "Released Parties"), as applicable, be and are hereby fully, finally, irrevocably and unconditionally released and forever discharged from any and all Claims and Product Liability Claims, and any and all past, present and future claims, rights, interests, actions, liabilities, demands, duties, injuries, damages, expenses, fees (including medical and attorneys' fees and liens), costs, compensation, or causes of action of whatsoever kind or nature whether foreseen or unforeseen, known or unknown, asserted or unasserted, contingent or actual, liquidated or unliquidated, whether in tort or contract, whether statutory, at common law or in equity, based on, in connection with, arising out of, or in any way related to, in whole or in part, directly or indirectly: (A) any proof of claim filed by any Person in accordance with the Call For Claims Order (whether or not withdrawn); (B) any actual or alleged past, present or future act, omission, defect, incident, event or circumstance from the beginning of the world to the Plan Implementation Date, based on, in connection with, arising out of, or in any way related to, in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, any alleged personal, economic or other injury allegedly based on, in connection with, arising out of, or in any way related to, in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, the research, development, manufacture, marketing, sale, distribution, fabrication, advertising, supply, production, use, or ingestion of products sold, developed or distributed by or on behalf of the Applicants; or (C) the CCAA Proceedings; and no Person

shall make or continue any claims or proceedings whatsoever based on, in connection with, arising out of, or in any way related to, in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, the substance of the facts giving rise to any matter herein released (including, without limitation, any action, cross-claim, counter-claim, third party action or application) against any Person who claims or might reasonably be expected to claim in any manner or forum against one or more of the Released Parties, including, without limitation, by way of contribution or indemnity, in common law, or in equity, or under the provisions of any statute or regulation, and that in the event that any of the Released Parties are added to such claim or proceeding, it will immediately discontinue any such claim or proceeding.

21. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, without limiting anything in this Order, including without limitation, paragraph 19 hereof, or anything in the Plan or in the Call For Claims Order, all Persons (regardless of whether or not such Persons are Creditors), on their own behalf and on behalf of their respective present or former employees, agents, officers, directors, principals, spouses, dependents, heirs, attorneys, successors, assigns and legal representatives, are permanently and forever barred, estopped, stayed and enjoined, on and after the Plan Implementation Date, with respect to Claims, Product Liability Claims, Related Claims and all claims otherwise released pursuant to the Plan and this Sanction Order, from:

- (a) commencing, conducting or continuing in any manner, directly or indirectly, any action, suits, demands or other proceedings of any nature or kind whatsoever (including, without limitation, any proceeding in a judicial, arbitral, administrative or other forum) against the Released Parties or any of them;
- (b) enforcing, levying, attaching, collecting or otherwise recovering or enforcing by any manner or means, directly or indirectly, any judgment, award, decree or order against the Released Parties or any of them or the property of any of the Released Parties;
- (c) commencing, conducting or continuing in any manner, directly or indirectly, any action, suits or demands, including without limitation, by way of contribution or indemnity or other relief, in common law, or in equity, or under the provisions of any statute or regulation, or other proceedings of any nature or kind whatsoever (including, without limitation, any proceeding in a judicial, arbitral, administrative or other forum) against any Person who makes such a claim or might reasonably be expected to make such a claim, in any manner or forum, against one or more of the Released Parties;
- (d) creating, perfecting, asserting or otherwise enforcing, directly or indirectly, any lien or encumbrance of any kind; and
- (e) taking any actions to interfere with the implementation or consummation of the Plan.

DISCHARGE OF MONITOR

22. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that RSM Richter Inc. shall be discharged from its duties as Monitor of the Applicants effective as of the Plan Implementation Date; provided that

the foregoing shall not apply in respect of: (i) any obligations of, or matters to be completed by, the Monitor pursuant to the Plan or the Settlement Agreements from and after the Plan Implementation Date; or (ii) matters otherwise requested by the Applicants and agreed to by the Monitor.

23. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, subject to paragraph 22 herein, the completion of the Monitor's duties shall be evidenced, and its final discharge shall be effected by the filing by the Monitor with this Court of a certificate of discharge at, or as soon as practicable after, the Plan Implementation Date.
24. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that the actions and conduct of the Monitor in the CCAA Proceedings and as foreign representative in the U.S. Proceedings, as disclosed in its reports to the Court from time to time, including, without limitation, the Monitor's Fifteenth Report dated December 12, 2006, the Monitor's Sixteenth Report dated December 22, 2006, and the Seventeenth Report, are hereby approved and that the Monitor has satisfied all of its obligations up to and including the date of this Order, and that in addition to the protections in favour of the Monitor as set out in the Orders of this Court in the CCAA Proceedings to date, the Monitor shall not be liable for any act or omission on the part of the Monitor, including with respect to any reliance thereof, including without limitation, with respect to any information disclosed, any act or omission pertaining to the discharge of duties under the Plan or as requested by the Applicants or with respect to any other duties or obligations in respect of the implementation of the Plan, save and except for any claim or liability arising out of any gross negligence or wilful misconduct on the part of the Monitor. Subject to the foregoing, and in addition to the protections in favour of the Monitor as set out in the Orders of this Court, any claims against the Monitor in connection with the performance of its duties as Monitor are hereby released, stayed, extinguished and forever barred and the Monitor shall have no liability in respect thereof.
25. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that no action or other proceeding shall be commenced against the Monitor in any way arising from or related to its capacity or conduct as Monitor except with prior leave of this Court and on prior written notice to the Monitor and upon further order securing, as security for costs, the solicitor and his own client costs of the Monitor in connection with any proposed action or proceeding.
26. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Monitor, its affiliates, and their respective officers, directors, employees and agents, and counsel for the Monitor, are hereby released and discharged from any and all claims that any of the Subject Parties or their respective officers, directors, employees and agents or any other Persons may have or be entitled to assert against the Monitor, whether known or unknown, matured or unmatured, foreseen or unforeseen, existing or hereafter arising, based in whole or in part on any act or omission, transaction, dealing or other occurrence existing or taking place on or prior to the date of issue of this Order in any way relating to, arising out of or in respect of the CCAA proceedings.

CLAIMS OFFICER

27. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the appointment of The Honourable Mr. Justice Edward Saunders as Claims Officer (as defined in the Claims Resolution Order) shall automatically cease, and his roles and duties in the CCAA Proceedings and in the U.S. Proceedings shall terminate, on the Plan Implementation Date.

28. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that the actions and conduct of the Claims Officer pursuant to the Claims Resolution Order, and as disclosed in the Monitor's Reports to this Court, are hereby approved and that the Claims Officer has satisfied all of his obligations up to and including the date of this Order, and that any claims against the Claims Officer in connection with the performance of his duties as Claims Officer are hereby stayed, extinguished and forever barred.

MEDIATOR

29. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the appointment of Mr. David Geronemus (the "Mediator") as a mediator in respect of non-binding mediation of the Product Liability Claims pursuant to the Order of this Court dated April 13, 2006 (the "Mediation Order"), in the within proceedings, shall automatically cease, and his roles and duties in the CCAA Proceedings and in the U.S. Proceedings shall terminate, on the Plan Implementation Date.
30. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that the actions and conduct of the Mediator pursuant to the Mediation Order, and as disclosed in the Monitor's reports to this Court, are hereby approved, and that the Mediator has satisfied all of his obligations up to and including the date of this Order, and that any claims against the Mediator in connection with the performance of his duties as Mediator are hereby stayed, extinguished and forever barred.

ESCROW AGENT

31. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that Duane Morris LLP shall not be liable for any act or omission on its part as a result of its appointment or the fulfillment of its duties as escrow agent pursuant to the escrow agreements executed by Duane Morris LLP and the respective Settling Plaintiffs that are parties to the Settlement Agreements, excluding the Group Settlement Agreement (and which escrow agreements are attached as schedules to such Settlement Agreements), and that no action, application or other proceedings shall be taken, made or continued against Duane Morris LLP without the leave of this Court first being obtained; save and except that the foregoing shall not apply to any claim or liability arising out of any gross negligence or wilful misconduct on its part.

REPRESENTATIVE COUNSEL

32. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that Representative Counsel (as defined in the Order of this Court dated February 8, 2006 (the "Appointment Order")) shall not be liable, either prior to or subsequent to the Plan Implementation Date, for any act or omission on its part as a result of its appointment or the fulfillment of its duties in carrying out the provisions of the Appointment Order, save and except for any claim or liability arising out of any gross negligence or wilful misconduct on its part, and that no action, application or other proceedings shall be taken, made or continued against Representative Counsel without the leave of this Court first being obtained.

CHARGES

33. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, subject to paragraph 33 hereof, the Charges on the assets of the Applicants provided for in the Initial CCAA Order and any subsequent Orders in the CCAA Proceedings shall automatically be fully and finally terminated, discharged and released on the Plan Implementation Date.
34. **THIS COURT ORDERS that:** (i) the Monitor shall continue to hold a charge, as provided in the Administrative Charge (as defined in the Initial CCAA Order), until the fees and disbursements of the Monitor and its counsel have been paid in full; and (ii) the DIP Charge (as defined in the Initial CCAA Order) shall remain in full force and effect until all obligations and liabilities secured thereby have been repaid in full, or unless otherwise agreed by the Applicants and the DIP Lender (as defined in the Initial CCAA Order).
35. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that, notwithstanding any of the terms of the Plan or this Order, the Applicants shall not be released or discharged from their obligations in respect of Unaffected Claims, including, without limitation, to pay the fees and expenses of the Monitor and its respective counsel.

STAY OF PROCEEDINGS

36. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that, subject to further order of this Court, the Stay Period established in the Initial CCAA Order, as extended, shall be and is hereby further extended until the earlier of the Plan Implementation Date and the date that is 60 Business Days after the date of this Order, or such later date as may be fixed by this Court.
37. **THIS COURT AUTHORIZES AND DIRECTS** the Monitor to apply to the U.S. District Court for a comparable extension of the Stay Period as set out in paragraph 36 hereof.

INITIAL CCAA ORDER AND OTHER ORDERS

38. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that:
- (a) except to the extent that the Initial CCAA Order has been varied by or is inconsistent with this Order or any further Order of this Court, the provisions of the Initial CCAA Order shall remain in full force and effect until the Plan Implementation Date; provided that the protections granted in favour of the Monitor shall continue in full force and effect after the Plan Implementation Date; and
 - (b) all other Orders made in the CCAA Proceedings shall continue in full force and effect in accordance with their respective terms, except to the extent that such Orders are varied by, or are inconsistent with, this Order or any further Order of this Court in the CCAA Proceedings; provided that the protections granted in favour of the Monitor shall continue in full force and effect after the Plan Implementation Date.
39. **THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES** that, without limiting paragraph 0 above, the Call For Claims Order, including, without limitation, the Claims Bar Date, releases, injunctions and prohibitions provided for thereunder, be and is hereby confirmed, and shall operate in addition to the provisions of this Order and the Plan, in-

cluding, without limitation, the releases, injunctions and prohibitions provided for hereunder and thereunder, respectively.

APPROVAL OF THE SEVENTEENTH REPORT

40. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Seventeenth Report of the Monitor and the activities of the Monitor referred to therein be and are hereby approved.

FEES

41. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the fees, disbursements and expenses of the Monitor from November 1, 2006 to January 31, 2007, in the amount of \$123,819.56, plus a reserve for fees in the amount of \$100,000 to complete the administration of the Monitor's mandate, be and are hereby approved and fixed.
42. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the fees, disbursements and expenses of Monitor's legal counsel in Canada, Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg LLP, from October 1, 2006 to January 31, 2007, in the amount of \$134,109.56, plus a reserve for fees in the amount of \$75,000 to complete the administration of its mandate, be and are hereby approved and fixed.
43. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the fees, disbursements and expenses of Monitor's legal counsel in the United States, Allen & Overy LLP, from September 1, 2006 to January 31, 2007, in the amount of USD\$98,219.87, plus a reserve for fees in the amount of USD\$50,000 to complete the administration of its mandate, be and are hereby approved and fixed.

GENERAL

44. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Applicants, the Monitor or any other interested parties may apply to this Court for any directions or determination required to resolve any matter or dispute relating to, or the subject matter of or rights and benefits under, the Plan or this Order.

EFFECT, RECOGNITION, ASSISTANCE

45. **THIS COURT AUTHORIZES AND DIRECTS** the Monitor to apply to the U.S. District Court for the Sanction Recognition Order.
46. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that this Order shall have full force and effect in all provinces and territories in Canada, outside Canada and against all Persons against whom it may otherwise be enforceable.
47. **THIS COURT REQUESTS** the aid, recognition and assistance of other courts in Canada in accordance with Section 17 of the CCAA and the Initial CCAA Order, and requests that the Federal Court of Canada and the courts and judicial, regulatory and administrative bodies of or by the provinces and territories of Canada, the Parliament of Canada, the United States of America, the states and other subdivisions of the United States of America including, without limitation, the U.S. District Court, and other nations and states act in aid, recognition and assistance of, and be complementary to, this Court in carrying out the terms of this Order and any other Order in this proceeding. Each of Applicants and the Monitor shall be at liberty, and is hereby authorized and

empowered, to make such further applications, motions or proceedings to or before such other court and judicial, regulatory and administrative bodies, and take such other steps, in Canada or the United States of America, as may be necessary or advisable to give effect to this Order.

cp/e/qlgxc/qlpwb

TAB 8

Case Name:
Grace Canada Inc. (Re)

**IN THE MATTER OF s. 18.6 of the Companies' Creditors
Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended
AND IN THE MATTER OF Grace Canada, Inc.**

[2008] O.J. No. 4208

50 C.B.R. (5th) 25

2008 CarswellOnt 6284

170 A.C.W.S. (3d) 692

Court File No. 01-CL-4081

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

G.B. Morawetz J.

Heard: September 30, 2008.

Judgment: October 17, 2008.

Released: October 23, 2008.

(81 paras.)

Civil litigation -- Civil procedure -- Settlements -- Approval -- Motion by Grace Canada for approval of the minutes of settlement allowed -- The claims against Grace arose from its manufacture of Zonolite Attic Insulation (ZAI) containing asbestos -- Under the minutes, Grace agreed to fund a multimedia notice program, establish a trust for Canadian property damage claims and channel any Canadian personal injury claims to a US asbestos trust -- The minutes were fair and reasonable and did not prejudice the interests of the Crown -- They also provided a mechanism for the resolution of Canadian ZAI claims without the delay and uncertainty of ongoing litigation.

Creditors and debtors law -- Proceedings -- Practice and procedure -- Settlements -- Motion by Grace Canada for approval of the minutes of settlement allowed -- The claims against Grace arose from its manufacture of Zonolite Attic Insulation (ZAI) containing asbestos -- Under the minutes, Grace agreed to fund a multimedia notice program, establish a trust for Canadian property damage

claims and channel any Canadian personal injury claims to a US asbestos trust -- The minutes were fair and reasonable and did not prejudice the interests of the Crown -- They also provided a mechanism for the resolution of Canadian ZAI claims without the delay and uncertainty of ongoing litigation.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 18.6, s. 18.6(3), s. 18.6(4)

United States Bankruptcy Code,

Counsel:

Derrick C. Tay, Orestes Pasparakis and Jennifer Stam for Grace Canada Inc.

Keith J. Ferbers for Raven Thundersky.

Alexander Rose for Sealed Air (Canada).

Michel Bélanger, David Thompson, and Matthew G. Moloci, Representative Counsel for CDN ZAI Claimants.

Jacqueline Dais-Visca and Carmela Maiorino for The Attorney General of Canada.

ENDORSEMENT

1 G.B. MORAWETZ J.:-- Grace Canada Inc. ("Grace Canada" and with the U.S. debtors, "Grace") bring this motion to seek approval of the Minutes of Settlement ("the Minutes") in respect of claims against Grace relating to the manufacture and sale of Zonolite Attic Insulation ("ZAI") in Canada (the "CDN ZAI Claims").

2 Under the Minutes, Grace agrees to:

- (a) fund a broad multimedia notice programme across Canada;
- (b) establish a trust with \$6.5 million for the payment of Canada ZAI property damage claims; and
- (c) channel any Canadian ZAI personal injury claims to a U.S. asbestos trust which will have in excess of US\$1.5 billion in funding.

3 In consideration, Grace would be discharged of any liability in connection with CDN ZAI Claims.

4 Although there was no direct opposition to the terms of the Minutes as being fair and reasonable, certain parties proposed amendments to the form of order sought by Grace.

5 Grace submits that the Minutes ought to be approved in the form submitted. Counsel submitted that Grace's significant settlement contribution is manifestly fair and reasonable, given Grace's defences to CDN ZAI Claims and, in particular, the judicial determination by the U.S. Bankruptcy Court (the "U.S. Court") that ZAI does not pose an unreasonable risk of harm.

6 Further, counsel to Grace submits that the Minutes are an important step towards the successful reorganization of Grace and with this settlement, these insolvency proceedings, which were filed in April 2001, are nearing completion.

7 W. R. Grace & Co. and its 61 subsidiaries (the "U.S. Debtors") have filed a joint Chapter 11 plan of reorganization (the "Plan") with the U.S. Court and expect to commence a confirmation hearing for the Plan in early 2009. The Plan incorporates the terms of the settlement before this Court and if confirmed, sees Grace emerging from Chapter 11 protection in 2009.

8 The chain of events that resulted in the Minutes began in 1963 with Grace's purchase of the assets of the Zonolite Company ("Zonolite"). Zonolite mined and processed vermiculite from a mine near Libby, Montana (the "Libby Mine"). Vermiculite is an insulator which apparently has no known toxic properties. However, the vermiculite ore from the Libby Mine contained impurities, including asbestiform minerals.

9 One of the products made from the U.S. Debtors' vermiculite was ZAI. ZAI was installed in attics of homes. Some ZAI contained trace amounts of asbestos.

10 In addition, 40 years ago the U.S. Debtors manufactured a product known as monokote-3 ("MK-3") which had chrysotile asbestos added during the manufacturing process.

11 Grace stopped manufacturing MK-3 in Canada by 1975 and ceased production of ZAI in 1984 and closed the Libby Mine in 1990.

12 By the 1970s, the U.S. Debtors began to be named in asbestos-related lawsuits. These included both asbestos-related personal injury claims ("PI Claims") and property damage claims relating to ZAI.

13 Due to a rise in the number of PI Claims in 2000 and 2001, the U.S. Debtors filed for protection under Chapter 11 of the *United States Bankruptcy Code* on April 2, 2001.

14 Grace Canada was incorporated in 1997. According to the affidavit of Mr. Finke, it had no direct involvement in any historic use of asbestos.

15 Rather, Grace's historic business operations in Canada were undertaken by a company now known as Sealed Air (Canada) Co./CIE ("Sealed Air Canada"). Sealed Air Canada is the successor to the Canadian companies with past involvement in the sale and distribution of ZAI and asbestos containing products such as MK-3.

16 Sealed Air Canada was spun-off from Grace in 1998 and as part of the transaction, Grace Canada and the U.S. Debtors provided certain indemnities to Sealed Air Canada and its parent, Sealed Air Corporation, relating to historic asbestos liabilities.

17 On April 4, 2001, two days after the Chapter 11 proceedings had been commenced, Grace Canada commenced these proceedings. The Canadian CCAA proceedings were commenced seeking ancillary relief to facilitate and coordinate the U.S. proceedings in Canada. An initial order was granted by this Court pursuant to s.18.6(4) of the CCAA (the "Initial Order").

18 By 2005, despite the Initial Order, 10 proposed class actions (the "Proposed Class Actions") were commenced across Canada in relation to the manufacture, distribution and sale of ZAI. Grace Canada, some of the U.S. Debtors and Sealed Air Canada were named as defendants, as was the Attorney General of Canada (the "Crown").

19 The allegations in the Proposed Class Actions include both ZAI PI Claims as well as damages for the cost of removing ZAI from homes across Canada ("CDN ZAI PD Claims").

20 On November 14, 2005, an order was issued (the "November 14th Order") enjoining the Proposed Class Actions against the U.S. Debtors, Sealed Air Canada and the Crown.

21 As a result, the Proposed Class Actions were brought within the overall restructuring process.

22 By order of February 8, 2006 (the "Representation Order"), Lauzon Bélanger S.E.N.C. ("Lauzon") and Scarfone Hawkins LLP ("Scarfone") (jointly, "Representative Counsel") were appointed to act as the single representative on behalf of all of the holders of Canadian ZAI Claims ("CDN ZAI Claimants") to advocate their interests in the restructuring process.

23 No one has taken issue with the authority of the Representative Counsel to represent all CDN ZAI Claimants in the U.S. Court, this Court or at any of the mediations. The Representation Order provided that Representative Counsel would, among other things, have authority to negotiate a settlement with Grace.

24 After a long history of negotiations, on June 2, 2008, Grace, Representative Counsel and the Crown announced to the U.S. Court that they had reached an agreement in principle that remained subject to the Crown's acceptance. The Crown was not able to obtain firm instructions on whether to participate in the settlement.

25 On September 2, 2008, Grace and Representative Counsel signed the Minutes resolving all CDN ZAI Claims against Grace and Sealed Air Canada.

26 On April 7, 2008, the U.S. Debtors reached an agreement effectively settling all present and future PI Claims (the "PI Settlement") and under this agreement, the U.S. Debtors agreed to pay into trust various assets, including US\$250 million, warrants to acquire common stock, proceeds of insurance, certain litigation and deferred payments and it estimates that the total value of the settlement is in excess of US\$1.5 billion. Sealed Air Canada is making a contribution to the settlement in excess of \$500 million, plus 18 million shares of stock.

27 On September 21, 2008, the U.S. Debtors filed their draft Plan with the U.S. Court and confirmation hearings are scheduled for early in 2009.

28 The Minutes contemplate a settlement of all CDN ZAI Claims, both personal injury ("CDN ZAI PI Claims") and property damage, on the following terms:

- (a) Grace agrees to provide in its Plan for the creation of a separate class of CDN ZAI PD Claims and to establish the CDN ZAI PD Claims Fund, which shall make payments in respect of CDN ZAI Claims;
- (b) on the effective date of Grace's Plan, Grace will contribute \$6,500,000 through a U.S. PD Trust to the CDN ZAI PD Claims Fund;
- (c) Grace's Plan provides that any holder of a CDN ZAI PI Claim ("CDN ZAI PI Claimant") shall be entitled to file his or her claim with the Asbestos Personal Injury Trust to be created for all PI Claims and funded in accordance with the US\$1.5 billion PI Settlement;
- (d) Representative Counsel shall vote, on behalf of CDN ZAI Claimants, in favour of the Plan incorporating the settlement; and

- (e) Representative Counsel shall be entitled to bring a fee application within the U.S. proceedings and any such payments received would reduce the amount otherwise payable to Representative Counsel under the Settlement.

In addition, Grace has agreed to fund a broad based media notice programme across Canada and an extended claims bar procedure for CDN ZAI PD Claims and Grace has also agreed to give direct notice to any known claimant.

29 Under the Minutes, the bar date for CDN ZAI PD Claims is not less than 180 days from substantial completion of the CDN ZAI Claims Notice Program. The period for filing ZAI PD Claims in the U.S. is considerably shorter and Grace has scheduled a motion with the U.S. Court on October 20, 2008 to approve the CDN ZAI PD Claims bar date. Grace has indicated that if granted, recognition of the U.S. order will be sought from this Court. There will be no bar date for CDN ZAI PI Claims.

30 Grace has indicated that it has contemplated that monies will be distributed out of the CDN ZAI PD Claims Fund based on a claimant's ability to prove that his or her property contained ZAI and that monies were expended to contain or remove ZAI from the property. Based on proof of ZAI in the home and the remediation measures taken by a claimant, that claimant may recover \$300 or \$600 per property.

31 The issues for consideration were stated by counsel to Grace as follows:

- (a) Does Representative Counsel have the authority to enter into the Minutes on behalf of all CDN ZAI Claimants?
- (b) Does the CCAA Court have the jurisdiction to approve the Minutes, including the relief in favour of Sealed Air Canada and the Crown?
- (c) Are the Minutes fair and reasonable? In particular, is their prejudice to the key constituencies?

32 The Representation Order is clear. It gives Representative Counsel broad powers, including the ability to negotiate on behalf of CDN ZAI Claimants. No party has objected to or taken issue with the Representation Order or with the authority of Representative Counsel to represent all CDN ZAI Claims.

33 I am satisfied that Lauzon and Scarfone have the authority, as Representative Counsel, to enter the Minutes of Settlement on behalf of all CDN ZAI Claimants.

34 I am also satisfied that the CCAA Court may approve material agreements, including settlement agreements, before the filing of any plan of compromise or arrangement. See *Canadian Red Cross Society (Re)* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div.) and *Calpine Canada Energy Limited (Re)* (2007), 35 C.B.R. (5th) 1 (Alta. Q.B.), leave to appeal denied (2007), 35 C.B.R. (5th) 27 (Alta. C.A.).

35 It is noted that, in this case, the Plan will be voted on by creditors in the U.S. proceedings.

36 With respect to relief in favour of Sealed Air, Grace has agreed to indemnify Sealed Air Canada for certain liabilities in connection with ZAI. As part of the settlement, Grace seeks to ensure that the release of the CDN ZAI Claims includes a release for the benefit of Sealed Air Canada.

37 Counsel submits that such release is not only necessary and essential, but also fair given Sealed Air Canada's contribution to the PI Settlement under the Plan in excess of \$500 million. I am

satisfied that, in these circumstances, the release for the benefit of Sealed Air Canada is fair and reasonable.

38 The Minutes also provide a limited release in favour of the Crown. Pursuant to the Minutes, the Crown's claims for contribution and indemnity against Grace (being CDN ZAI Claims) are released. Counsel submits that the corollary is that the Crown is relieved of any joint liability it shares with Grace for CDN ZAI Claims.

39 Counsel to Grace again submits that such a release of the Crown is necessary. Otherwise, Grace could become indirectly liable through contribution and indemnity claims.

40 Counsel for Grace submits that, in certain circumstances, this Court has ordered third party releases where they are necessary and connected to a resolution of the debtor's claims, will benefit creditors generally, and are not overly broad or offensive to public policy. (See: *Re: Muscletech Research and Development Inc.* (2007), 30 C.B.R. (5th) 59 (Ont. Sup. Ct.) and *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 43 C.B.R. (5th) 269 (Ont. Sup. Ct.), aff'd., [2008] O.J. No. 597, 2008 ONCA 587 ("Metcalfe"), leave to appeal to S.C.C. denied, [2008] S.C.C.A. No. 337.)

41 Subsections 18.6(3) and (4) of the CCAA, allow the Ontario Court to make orders with respect to foreign insolvency proceedings, on such terms and conditions as the Court considers appropriate.

42 In assessing whether to grant its approval, the Court has to consider whether the Minutes are fair and reasonable in all of the circumstances.

43 It is the submission of Grace that the Minutes are fair and reasonable, and that resolutions of the CDN ZAI Claims in particular do not prejudice the Crown, CDN ZAI PD Claimants or, CDN ZAI PI Claimants.

44 Grace also submits that, given the strong defences which it believes are available, the Minutes provide a substantial compromise by Grace, considering the circumstances in which it believes it has no liability for CDN ZAI Claims.

45 Early in the insolvency proceedings, the U.S. Court held a hearing to determine, as a threshold scientific issue, whether the presence of ZAI in a home created an unreasonable risk of harm. The opinion of the U.S. Court was filed as part of the record. Grace states that the U.S. Court came to the conclusion that ZAI did not pose an unreasonable risk of harm. The background and conclusions of the U.S. Court have been summarized at paragraphs 72 to 85 of the Grace factum.

46 I have been persuaded by and accept these submissions.

47 In addition, even if ZAI had been found to pose an unreasonable risk of harm, Grace submits that it still has a complete defence to any claims under Canadian law for the reasons set out at paragraphs 86 to 97 of the factum.

48 Further, the passage of time is such that Grace submits that many cases would be dismissed outright based on the expiry of the limitation period.

49 With respect to the issue of prejudice to the Crown, on the one hand, the Crown has asserted claims against Grace. The Crown has estimated that over 2,000 homes located on military bases have been remediated to contain vermiculite attic insulation or ZAI from homes built by the Canadian military. Under the Settlement, the Crown, as a CDN ZAI Claimant, would receive \$300 per

unit for the sealing of ZAI. Based on the Crown's records, the Crown would potentially have a claim against the Fund for up to \$660,000 and if it chose to pursue this claim, the Crown would recover approximately 50% of its remediation expenditures.

50 On the other hand, the Crown is also a defendant in the Proposed Class Actions. Through the Minutes, the Crown will release its CDN ZAI Claims against Grace, but at the same time, counsel to Grace submits that the Crown is effectively released from any joint liability it may share with Grace. Grace submits that the Crown will be relieved from all CDN ZAI Claims except those for which it is severally responsible.

51 It is with respect to the release language that the Crown takes exception.

52 The Crown acknowledges that Representative Counsel has the authority to negotiate on behalf of ZAI Claimants. However, the Crown disputes the authority of Representative Counsel to purport to negotiate away the Crown's Chapter 11 "claim over" for contribution and indemnity.

53 The Crown supports the approval of the Settlement insofar as it purports to resolve all of Grace's liability with respect to CDN ZAI PD and PI Claims, provided that the approval order expressly recognizes that the Crown's protective "claim over" for contribution and indemnity against Grace is unimpaired by the Settlement and provided that the Approval Order expressly allows the Crown to third party Grace in ZAI related actions where the Crown is sued on a several basis.

54 Counsel to the Crown submits that to interpret the authority of Representative Counsel to have the power to release the Crown's "claim over" against Grace while they simultaneously reserve the right to pursue the claims against the Crown would conflict with the clear direction in the Representation Order. They submit that CCAA Representative Counsel does not represent the Crown's interest with respect to the contribution and indemnity claim, and would be in conflict of interest with respect to the members of the group it represents if it attempted to do so. They further submit that it has always been the position of the Crown that all ZAI related damages give rise to a contribution and indemnity claims against Grace and that no independent claim lies against the Crown; hence, the Crown has and will continue to assert a contribution and indemnity claim against Grace for the totality of the damages.

55 At the hearing, the argument of the Crown was presented without the benefit of a factum. I requested and received a factum from the Crown which was then responded to by counsel to Grace and by Representative Counsel.

56 In my view, the response of Grace is a complete answer to the Crown's submissions. Counsel to Grace notes that the Crown purports to support the Order sought on the proviso that its contribution and indemnity claims against Grace are unimpaired. However, the Minutes do impair the Crown's contribution claims, and with the Order, the Crown will have no claims for contribution and indemnity against Grace.

57 It is Grace's position that Representative Counsel has the authority to resolve and release all CDN ZAI Claims, including Crown claims for contribution and indemnity. Further, in any event, there is no prejudice to the Crown as pursuant to the Minutes, CDN ZAI Claimants have agreed that they cannot pursue the Crown for claims for which Grace is ultimately responsible. Consequently, the Crown has no contribution claims to assert against Grace. Simply put, as submitted by counsel to Grace, there is nothing left.

58 The Representation Order applies to all claims "arising out of or in any way connected to damages or loss suffered, directly or indirectly, from the manufacture, sale or distribution of Zonolite attic insulation products in Canada".

59 It seems to me that the wording of the Representation Order is clear. Representative Counsel have the authority to resolve and release all CDN ZAI Claims, including Crown claims for contribution and indemnity.

60 With respect to the Release itself, the Minutes release any claims or causes of action for which the Crown has a right of contribution and indemnity. As submitted by counsel to Grace, Representative Counsel may not pursue the Crown in respect of claims for which Grace is ultimately liable.

61 Paragraph 13(b)(iii) of the Minutes provides for a release of:

"... any claims or causes of action asserted against the Grace Parties as a result of the Canadian ZAI Claims advanced by CCAA Representative Counsel against the Crown as a result of which the Crown is or may become entitled to contribution or indemnity from the Grace Parties."

62 I accept the submission of counsel to Grace that the purpose of this provision is to protect Grace from indirect claims through the Crown. Since any claim for which Grace is ultimately liable cannot be pursued, the Crown has no need nor any ability to "claim over" against Grace.

63 The Crown also relied on an order of November 7, 2005 of Chaput J. of the Québec Superior Court in the *Brosseau* case, [2005] Q.J. No. 16165, which was one of the Proposed Class Actions. The Crown relied on the order of Chaput J. to argue that all claims against the Crown flow through Grace and that Grace is therefore ultimately responsible for any Crown liability.

64 I agree with the position being taken by Grace to the effect that this argument is misplaced. It was made quite clear at this hearing that the scope of any remaining Crown liability will need to be addressed at a future hearing.

65 Submissions were also made by counsel on behalf of Ms. Thundersky.

66 Counsel pointed out certain concerns and suggested that it was appropriate to alter the proposed form of order.

67 The first concern raised related to the issue of preservation of claims against the Crown and counsel submitted that paragraph 13(b)(iv) creates some ambiguity in this area. In my view, paragraph 13(b)(iv) of the Minutes is clear. The concluding words read as follows:

"For greater certainty, nothing contained in these Minutes shall serve to discharge, extinguish or release Canadian ZAI Claims asserted against the Crown and which claims seek to establish and apportion independent and/or several liability against the Crown."

68 I do not share counsel's concern. The issue does not require clarification. In my view, this paragraph is not ambiguous.

69 Counsel to Ms. Thundersky also raises concern that the draft order provides that all of the legal actions in Canada be "permanently stayed" until all of the actions have formally removed the

Grace Parties as defendants which would not occur until the Effective Date of any approved Plan of Reorganization. In my view, this is not a significant concern. This Court retains jurisdiction over the matters before it in these proceedings and to the extent that further direction is required, the appropriate motion can be brought before me.

70 The third concern raised by counsel to Ms. Thundersky was with respect to the Asbestos PI Fund to be established in the U.S. process. Concerns were raised with respect to the uncertainty surrounding when and in what manner the eligibility criteria for the fund would be established. Counsel to Grace advised that Mr. Ferbers would have the opportunity to provide comment during the Plan process on this issue. I expect that this should be sufficient to alleviate any concerns but, if not, further direction can be sought from this Court.

71 Finally, concern was also raised with respect to the absence of a personal injury notice program. Counsel to Grace advised that this issue would be communicated to those involved in the U.S. Plan. In the circumstances, this would appear to be a pragmatic response to the concern raised by counsel to Ms. Thundersky.

72 Counsel to Ms. Thundersky acknowledged that it was difficult to propose a resolution which stayed within the four corners of the Minutes, but that Ms. Thundersky did wish to bring the foregoing concerns to the attention of the parties and the Court in the hopes that they could be taken into account.

73 Counsel to Grace and Representative Counsel are aware of these issues and will take them into account.

74 I indicated at the hearing that I was inclined to either approve the Minutes or to reject them. The Minutes are the product of extensive negotiation between the Representative Counsel and the Grace Parties. I am of the view that it is not appropriate for me to examine and evaluate the Minutes on a line-by-line basis, nor to amend or alter the agreement as reached between Representative Counsel and the Grace Parties.

75 In my view, to accept the submissions of the Crown and Ms. Thundersky would leave the Court in the position of having to reject the Minutes and refuse to approve the Settlement. Having considered all of the circumstances, I do not consider this to be an appropriate outcome.

76 I have been satisfied that the Minutes are fair and reasonable. The Minutes have been agreed to by Representative Counsel. In my view, the Minutes do not prejudice the interests of the Crown. I am also of the view that there is no prejudice to the ZAI PD Claimants who will have access to a significant fund to assist with their remediation costs. Their alternative is more litigation which, at the end of the day, would have a very uncertain outcome. I am also of the view that there is no prejudice to the ZAI PI Claimants who will have the opportunity to make a claim to the asbestos trust in the U.S. I am satisfied that the ZAI PI Claimants will be receiving treatment that is fair and equal with other PI Claimants. Further, it is noted that counsel to Grace advised that the Thundersky family are the only known ZAI PI Claimants. Their alternative is the continuation of a claim that on its face, would appear to have been statute barred in 1994.

77 I also accept the conclusions as put forth by counsel to Grace. This Settlement provides CDN ZAI PD Claimants with clear recourse to the CDN ZAI PD Claims Fund and CDN ZAI PI Claimants with recourse to the Asbestos Personal Injury Trust in situations where it is Grace's view that the Canadian claims have little or no value.

78 I am also satisfied that third party releases are, in the circumstances of this case, directly connected to the resolution of the debtor's claims and are necessary. The third party releases are not, in my view, overly broad nor offensive to public policy.

79 Counsel to Grace also submitted that Representative Counsel have been continuously active and diligent in both the U.S. and Canadian proceedings and Grace is of the view that it is appropriate that a portion of the funds paid under the settlement go towards compensation of Representative Counsel's fees. I accept this submission and specifically note that the Minutes provide for specified payments to Representative Counsel, a Claims Administrator and a qualified expert to assist in the claims process, in a total amount of approximately CDN\$3,250,000.

80 In conclusion, the Minutes, in my view, represent an important component of the Plan. They provide a mechanism for the resolution of CDN ZAI Claims without the uncertainty and delay associated with ongoing litigation.

81 The Minutes are approved and an order shall issue in the form requested, as amended.

G.B. MORAWETZ J.

cp/e/qlbxm/qlcnt/qlaxr/qlaxw/qlced/qlhcs

TAB 9

Case Name:
Allen-Vanguard Corp. (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 Arrangement and Reorganization
of Allen-Vanguard Corporation under the Companies' Creditors
Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended and Section
186 of the Ontario Business Corporations Act., R.S.O. 1990,
c. B.16, as amended, Applicants**

[2011] O.J. No. 3946

2011 ONSC 5017

81 C.B.R. (5th) 270

2011 CarswellOnt 8984

Court File No. CV-09-00008502-00CL

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

C.L. Campbell J.

Heard: November 16, 2010.

Judgment: August 25, 2011.

(113 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Compromises and arrangements -- Sanction by court -- Motions by directors, officers and underwriters to enjoin actions allowed -- Cross-motion by plaintiffs to vary Sanction Order dismissed -- Initial Order stayed Laneville action against corporation, which plaintiffs sought to continue against directors -- Love action against directors, officers and underwriters claimed negligence and failure to disclose transactions -- Sanction Order permitted only claims contemplated by s. 5.1(2) of CCAA, which these were not -- Plaintiffs could not claim against directors for acts undertaken in Corporation's name prior to initial order -- Release deprived underwriters of indemnity and plaintiffs never sought leave for derivative action -- Sanction Order was relied on by parties.

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Proceedings -- Practice and procedure -- Stays -- Of concurrent proceedings -- Motions by directors, officers and underwriters to enjoin actions allowed -- Cross-motion by plaintiffs to vary Sanction Order dismissed -- Initial Order stayed Laneville action against corporation, which plaintiffs sought to continue against directors -- Love action against directors, officers and underwriters claimed negligence and failure to disclose transactions -- Sanction Order permitted only claims contemplated by s. 5.1(2) of CCAA, which these were not -- Plaintiffs could not claim against directors for acts undertaken in Corporation's name prior to initial order -- Release deprived underwriters of indemnity and plaintiffs never sought leave for derivative action -- Sanction Order was relied on by parties.

Corporations, partnerships and associations law -- Corporations -- Directors and officers -- Personal liability of directors to persons other than the corporation -- Joint and several liability -- Derivative actions -- Powers of court -- Conduct of the action -- Oppression remedy -- Stay, discontinuance, settlement or dismissal -- Motions by directors, officers and underwriters to enjoin actions allowed -- Cross-motion by plaintiffs to vary Sanction Order dismissed -- Initial Order stayed Laneville action against corporation, which plaintiffs sought to continue against directors -- Love action against directors, officers and underwriters claimed negligence and failure to disclose transactions -- Sanction Order permitted only claims contemplated by s. 5.1(2) of CCAA, which these were not -- Plaintiffs could not claim against directors for acts undertaken in Corporation's name prior to initial order -- Release deprived underwriters of indemnity and plaintiffs never sought leave for derivative action -- Sanction Order was relied on by parties.

Securities regulation -- Civil liability -- Misrepresentation in a prospectus -- Persons liable -- Underwriters -- Motions by directors, officers and underwriters to enjoin actions allowed -- Cross-motion by plaintiffs to vary Sanction Order dismissed -- Initial Order stayed Laneville action against corporation, which plaintiffs sought to continue against directors -- Love action against directors, officers and underwriters claimed negligence and failure to disclose transactions -- Sanction Order permitted only claims contemplated by s. 5.1(2) of CCAA, which these were not -- Plaintiffs could not claim against directors for acts undertaken in Corporation's name prior to initial order -- Release deprived underwriters of indemnity and plaintiffs never sought leave for derivative action -- Sanction Order was relied on by parties.

Motion by the former directors and officers of the Corporation to enforce the terms of the Sanction Order and enjoin the class actions against them. Motion by the underwriters to stay or dismiss the shareholder class action against them. Cross-motion by the plaintiffs to vary the Sanction Order to permit the proposed actions. The Initial Order was made in December 2009 and stayed the existing Laneville action against the corporation. 100 per cent of affected creditors voted in favour of the plan, which the Corporation would have been unable to carry on without, and the Sanction Order was made. In the Laneville action, the shareholders alleged the corporation, directors and officers were liable for negligence, misrepresentation and oppression. The plaintiffs sought to continue the Laneville action against the directors. After the Sanction Order was made, the Love action was commenced by shareholders against the directors, officers and Corporation's underwriters and claimed negligence and failure to disclose transactions.

HELD: Motions allowed. Cross-motion dismissed. The release contained in the Sanction Order clearly permitted only those claims against directors that were contemplated by s. 5.1(2). These claims were not the type of claims contemplated by s. 5.1(2). It would be inconsistent with the CCAA to allow the plaintiffs to proceed with their oppression claim against the directors for acts or omissions undertaken in the Corporation's name prior to the Initial Order being made. The plaintiffs did not oppose the Sanction Order, so took their chances that the order would permit their claim to proceed. Allowing the claim to proceed would permit an inappropriate sort of priority for unsecured creditors. The claims against the directors in both actions were enjoined. Protection for the underwriters was not discussed when the Sanction Order was approved, but s. 5.1(2) was to be read narrowly to ensure to objectives of the CCAA. Furthermore, s. 5.1(2) could not be used to create a cause of action that would otherwise require court approval and leave. The plaintiffs had plenty of opportunity to seek leave to commence a derivative action but never did. The terms of the release in the Sanction Order deprived the underwriters of any indemnity they would otherwise be entitled to from the Corporation. The claim against the underwriters was struck in negligence and misrepresentation. Had the plaintiffs claimed and provided full particulars of fraud, such a claim may have survived as the terms of the release did not extend to fraud. The plaintiffs' motion to vary the terms of the Sanction Order was dismissed. It would be inappropriate to vary an order that was relied on by all parties and approved by all affected creditors.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 5.1(1), s. 5.1(2), s. 5.1(3)

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15,

Ontario Business Corporations Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. B.16, s. 131(1), s. 246(1)

Ontario Securities Act, s. 130, s. 138.3

Counsel:

Ronald G. Slaght, Q.C. and Eli S. Lederman for the Directors and Officers of Allen-Vanguard Corporation.

C. Scott Ritchie, Michael G. Robb and Daniel E.H. Bach for class action plaintiffs.

Alan L.W. D'Silva and Daniel S. Murdoch for Underwriters.

REASONS FOR DECISION

1 C.L. CAMPBELL J.:-- Two motions were heard together: the first by former directors and officers of Allen-Vanguard to enforce the terms of a Sanction Order, which the directors and officers say release them as well as Allen-Vanguard from all claims except those specifically provided for in section 5.1(2) of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the "CCAA.") In addition, the former directors assert that the claims of the Plaintiffs in two proposed Class Actions are not sustainable against them in law under s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA.

2 The second motion by the Underwriters of Allen-Vanguard seeks to dismiss or stay the action brought against the Underwriters by shareholders in a proposed Class Action.

3 A cross-motion brought by Plaintiffs in the two proposed Class Actions seeks, if required, variation of the terms contained in the Sanction Order granted December 16, 2009, to permit the Class Actions to proceed.

4 By way of an endorsement dated February 9, 2011, the Court sought further information from the parties with respect to the factual circumstances that surrounded the agreement that was embodied in the terms of the Sanction Order. That information has been provided and will be referred to later in these Reasons.

5 The claims that the directors who are the moving parties seek to effectively enjoin are those brought in two Class Actions (hereinafter the "Laneville action" and the "Love action"), wherein former shareholders seek damages against directors, officers and Underwriters based on alleged misrepresentation to shareholders by the Defendants about the effect on Allen-Vanguard of its purchase of another company in 2007.

Background

6 As of December 2009, Allen-Vanguard was insolvent. An Application was made on December 9 for an Initial Order under the CCAA, appointment of a Monitor and a Plan Filing and Meeting Order. The effect of the Initial Order among other matters stayed the existing Class proceeding.

7 The circumstances that surrounded the Plan Filing/Meeting Order, the Court was advised, were necessary to avoid a bankruptcy. The subsequent vote on December 9, 2010 was approved in favour of the Plan by 100% of affected creditors.

8 The circumstances that surrounded the December 9, 2010 Application and Order were a variation on a CCAA process that has come to be known as a "pre-packaged" Application. The secured creditors agreed to a restructuring of their secured debt in circumstances involving a going concern sale of assets where, had a bankruptcy ensued, there would have been no recovery for creditors or shareholders beyond very incomplete recovery for those secured creditors.

9 The First Report of the then proposed Monitor, Deloitte and Touche, in support of the Initial Order, outlined the transaction that had been proposed to all creditors as early as September 2009, posted on SEDAR and to which (apart from the question of releases) no party was opposed on December 9.

10 The Plan provided for the Secured Lenders foregoing a portion of their existing debt and fees, converting the remainder of the existing debt into a multi-year restructured term loan with terms more favourable to the Company and a new revolving credit facility.

11 The Court accepted the opinion of Deloitte & Touche that without the proposed transaction, the Company would likely not be able to meet its financial obligations as they became due and would likely be unable to carry on the business beyond the very short-term, which would then necessitate liquidation.

12 The conclusion by Deloitte & Touche, accepted by the Court, was that the restructuring process in the Plan maximized the value of the Company for the benefit of all stakeholders and represented the best offer from that process.

13 The alternative faced by the Company was that of a forced liquidation, which as estimated by the Monitor would result in a shortfall to secured lenders in excess of \$100 million.

The Laneville Action

14 The proposed Class Action Plaintiff in the Laneville action issued on October 9, 2009 a Statement of Claim dated November 26, 2009, which sought appointment on behalf of a Representative Plaintiff and for a class of Allen-Vanguard shareholders who allege that Allen-Vanguard Corporation and its directors and officers are liable for various misrepresentations, negligence and oppression.

15 The Statement of Claim detailed a transaction that occurred in 2007 for which the Class Plaintiffs claim the directors and officers failed to properly value and account for in the financial statements of Allen-Vanguard, when Allen-Vanguard purchased all of the shares of a private corporation called Mid-Eng Systems Inc.

16 In addition, the Class Plaintiff claims damages for negligent misrepresentation not only under the common law but as well under s. 138.3 of the *Ontario Securities Act* in connection with the same transaction.

17 The only creditor objection to the Plan taken at the time of the Initial Order was from counsel for the Proposed Class Plaintiff in the Laneville action, who sought an adjournment of the vote based on the wording of the proposed release terms.

18 The adjournment of the vote was not granted given the financial fragility of Allen-Vanguard, and the sanction hearing, which was to deal with the wording of the proposed release terms, was set for December 16, 2009.

19 The Second Report of the Monitor, dated December 10, 2010, advised the Court of the terms of the release and injunctions that had been negotiated, the terms of which were put forward for approval on an unopposed basis. No objection was taken at the sanction hearing by counsel for the Class Plaintiff and no amendment to the Release portion of the Sanction Order sought. Whatever had been negotiated between the parties came before the Court on an unopposed basis. Counsel for the Class Action Plaintiffs and for the Defendant directors had input into and agreed to the wording.

20 The Court has been advised that by agreement of counsel, the wording of the Release was negotiated by the parties with the recognition that there would likely remain an issue on which the Court would have to rule. That issue is now the subject of the first motion and the cross motion. I have been advised as a result of the inquiry of February 9, 2011 and what is now obvious as a result of the recent correspondence (including an affidavit sworn June 30, 2011 and objected to) is that Plaintiffs' counsel in the Laneville action and counsel for the directors had quite different views in respect of the kinds of claims that could be included in s. 5.1(2).

21 As I now understand it, counsel for the Allen-Vanguard Corporation made no representation or agreement that the claims in the Laneville action were within those permitted by s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA.

22 Counsel for the Plaintiff in the Laneville action believe that the language in the Sanction Order preserves the claims in both the Laneville action and the Love action, including the claims against the Underwriters. It is submitted by the Plaintiff that the jurisprudence in respect of s. 5.1(2) permits not only claims against directors but as well officers to the extent there is insurance coverage, and that the Plaintiffs' position is consistent with the jurisprudence under s. 5.1(2).

23 Counsel for the Directors and for Underwriters submit that counsel for the Plaintiff knew or ought to have known at the time they agreed to the language of the Plan of Arrangement and the draft Sanction Order that the claims asserted against the Directors and Officers of Allen-Vanguard might nevertheless fail to meet one of the exceptions set out in s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA.

24 In the result, the issue of what was or was not agreed to as part of the Sanction Order comes down to the question of whether or not the wording of s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA, read in context of statutory interpretation, is sufficient to permit continuance of claims in the Laneville and Love actions.

25 As reported by the Monitor in the First Report, the Plan contemplated two releases: a General Release and an Equity Claims Release, both of which had been contemplated in the proposed Plan. Neither the Equity Claims Release nor the General Release was intended to release or deal with or affect in any respect claims under ss. 5.1(1), (2) and (3) of the CCAA, which read:

5.1(1) a compromise or arrangement made in respect of a debtor company may include in its terms provision for the compromise of claims against directors of the company that arose before the commencement of proceedings under this Act and that relate to the obligations of the company where the directors are by law liable in their capacity as directors for the payment of such obligations.

5.1(2) A provision for the compromise of claims against directors may not include claims that

- (a) relate to contractual rights of one or more creditors; or
- (b) are based on allegations of misrepresentations made by directors to creditors or of wrongful or oppressed conduct of directors.

5.1(3) the court may declare that a claim against directors shall not be compromised if it is satisfied that the compromise would not be fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

26 The Monitor in its Second Report remarked as follows:

- 28. The injunctions provided in the Plan are limited by section 5.1(2) of the CCAA. The injunctions barring any person from commencing, continuing or pursuing any proceeding on or after the Effective Time for a claim that such person may have against the Company or any current or former officer of the Company of the type referred to in subsection 5.1(2) of the CCAA ... but permit any such subsection 5.1(2) claim to proceed against a current or former director of the company except that any such claim against a current or former director of the company is permitted recourse, and sole recourse, to the Company's insurance policies in respect of its current and former directors. The estimated value of any coverage under such insurance is \$30 million as per the Luxton Affidavit.
- 29. The Monitor is aware of at least one group of stakeholders affected and by the Supplemental Injunction, being a group of current and former shareholders of the Company that have served a Notice of Action and Statement of Claim on the Company seeking approximately \$80 million in damages from the Company and

its directors and officers, as further described in the monitors First Report. As stated above the terms of the Supplemental Injunction would permit this claim to survive against the current and former directors of the Company with recourse limited to the Companies insurance as referenced above."

27 The Releases and Sanctions are contained in the language of the Sanction Order. A summary of the provisions with paragraph references to the Sanction Order is as follows:

22. Releases are essential to the Plan
23. All Persons give full release to each of the Released Parties including contribution and indemnity but directors not released in respect of any claim of the kind referred to in section 5.1(2) of the CCAA.
24. Release of Applicant and current and former directors provided that nothing therein releases a director or current or former officer in respect of any claim of the kind referred to in section 5.1(2) of the CCAA.
25. All Persons enjoined and estopped from commencing or continuing actions with the exception of any claim against the directors of the kind referred to in section 5.1(2) of the CCAA..
26. Injunction and bar with respect to section 5.1(2) against the applicant ... and that the sole recourse for any claims against a current or former director or officer of the Applicant Limited to any recoveries from the Applicants insurance policies in respect of current or former directors and officers
27. Laneville Action dismissed as against the Applicant without prejudice to discovery rights against representative of the Applicant.

The Love Action

28 On February 8, 2010, after the Sanction Order had been made, another Proposed Representative Plaintiff, Gordon Love, commenced a second action and is represented by the same counsel as in the Laneville action. The Statement of Claim, dated March 10, 2010 against the directors and officers of Allen-Vanguard Corporation, includes claims against Cannacord Financial Ltd (and others collectively referred to as "Underwriters.")

29 An Amended Statement of Claim dated August 10, 2010 asserts in the Love action claims for negligence against directors, officers and Underwriters, all arising out of the transaction and alleged failure to properly disclose the transaction in the financial statements and transaction referred to in paragraph 15 above in respect of a 2007 acquisition.

Issues

1. Do the Laneville action and the Love action and their proposed class claims fall within those claims non-exempt under s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA?
2. Does the language of the Release contained in the Sanction Order apart from s. 5.1(2) permit either the Laneville or Love actions, including that against Underwriters, to continue?
3. Is there any basis on which the Court could or should vary the terms of the Release section of the Sanction Order?

30 Having reviewed the language of the Releases contained in the Sanction Order, I am satisfied that the only basis that the release language permits claims as against the directors is if they are those contemplated in s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA not to be released.

31 The object of the CCAA is to facilitate the restructuring of an insolvent corporation. In order to effect restructuring, a compromise of creditors' claims is almost inevitably an essential ingredient of a Plan under the CCAA.

32 The Plan, to be effective and to obtain Court approval, requires consensus and agreement by various classes of creditors. Many of the issues that arise before a Plan is approved by the Court involve a contestation between creditor groups as to how they should be classified and what extent of what group approval should be appropriately required. No motion was brought to seek to lift the stay in respect of actions provided for in the Initial Order.

33 In this case, no creditor came forward to oppose approval of the Plan, including the terms of the release language as set out in the Sanction Order. The effect of a Sanction Order is to create a contract between creditors. (See *Canadian Red Cross Society* (2002), 35 C.B.R. (4th) 43 (Ont. S.C.J.).)

34 The most significant feature of the CCAA Applications that have come before the Court in the last two or three years is that the negotiation has taken place to achieve consensus among creditors often before the Initial Order under the statute.

35 One can rightly understand the reluctance on the part of a provider of interim financing to continue to do so on an indefinite basis, when the approval process may be dragged out for days, weeks or months.

36 All secured creditors whose security continues to deteriorate during the period of negotiation will seek an early determination of the consensus necessary for approval of a Plan; otherwise, liquidation may be preferable.

37 Such consensus requires agreement among many stakeholders, including not just creditors but as well current and former directors and officers, many of whose continued cooperation is necessary and integral to a Plan's success.

38 To avoid the inequity that would result from creditor claims that were outstanding as against directors at the time of a CCAA application, s. 5.1(2) was amended in 1997 to its present form. As Hart J. noted in *Re-Liberty Oil & Gas Ltd.* 2002 ABQB 949 at paragraph 4, before the enactment of this section, the legislation provided for compromises of claims only against the petitioning company. The new section extends relief against directors of the petitioning company subject to exceptions.

39 It is appropriate to approach statutory interpretation with the assumption that meaning is to be accorded to each of the words used in the provision within the overall purpose of the CCAA. The absence of other words can also be purposeful.

40 The CCAA has been said to be a skeletal statute designed to give flexibility and expediency in the ability of the company, with the concurrence of its creditors, to accomplish a restructuring of its debt in the avoidance of liquidation or bankruptcy, and does not contain a comprehensive code that lays out all that is permitted or barred. (See *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments 11 Corp.*, 2008 ONCA 587 per Blair J.A. para. 44.)

41 Since the hearing in this matter, the Supreme Court of Canada has rendered a decision in *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)* 2010 SCC 60, which endorses the broad principles of the CCAA and the discretion granted to the Court to effect a restructuring if possible or an orderly liquidation.

42 The case involved a contest between the deemed trust provisions of the *Excise Tax Act* and the CCAA. Madam Justice Deschamps, speaking for the majority, noted the need for clarity of the underlying purpose with respect to the CCAA.

43 Paragraphs 12 to 14, 17, 58-59 and 63 of that decision read as follows:

12. Insolvency is the factual situation that arises when a debtor is unable to pay creditors (see generally, R.J. Wood, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law* (2009), at p. 16). Certain legal proceedings become available upon insolvency, which typically allow a debtor to obtain a court order staying its creditors' enforcement actions and attempt to obtain a binding compromise with creditors to adjust the payment conditions to something more realistic. Alternatively, the debtor's assets may be liquidated and debts paid from the proceeds according to statutory priority rules. The former is usually referred to as reorganization or restructuring while the latter is termed liquidation.
13. Canadian commercial insolvency law is not codified in one exhaustive statute. Instead, Parliament has enacted multiple insolvency statutes, the main one being the *BIA*. The *BIA* offers a self-contained legal regime providing for both reorganization and liquidation. Although bankruptcy legislation has a long history, the *BIA* itself is a fairly recent statute -- it was enacted in 1992. It is characterized by a rules-based approach to proceedings. The *BIA* is available to insolvent debtors owing \$1000 or more, regardless of whether they are natural or legal persons. It contains mechanisms for debtors to make proposals to their creditors for the adjustment of debts. If a proposal fails, the *BIA* contains a bridge to bankruptcy whereby the debtor's assets are liquidated and the proceeds paid to creditors in accordance with the statutory scheme of distribution.
14. Access to the *CCAA* is more restrictive. A debtor must be a company with liabilities in excess of \$5 million. Unlike the *BIA*, the *CCAA* contains no provisions for liquidation of a debtor's assets if reorganization fails. There are three ways of exiting *CCAA* proceedings. The best outcome is achieved when the stay of proceedings provides the debtor with some breathing space during which solvency is restored and the *CCAA* process terminates without reorganization being needed. The second most desirable outcome occurs when the debtor's compromise or arrangement is accepted by its creditors and the reorganized company emerges from the *CCAA* proceedings as a going concern. Lastly, if the compromise or arrangement fails, either the company or its creditors usually seek to have the debtor's assets liquidated under the applicable provisions of the *BIA* or to place the debtor into receivership. As discussed in greater detail below, the key difference between the reorganization regimes under the *BIA* and the *CCAA* is that the latter offers a more flexible mechanism with greater judicial discretion, making it more responsive to complex reorganizations.

...

17. Parliament understood when adopting the *CCAA* that liquidation of an insolvent company was harmful for most of those it affected -- notably creditors and employees -- and that a workout which allowed the company to survive was optimal (Sarrazin, *Creditor Rights*, at pp. 13-15).

...

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 describes 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 (see Jones, at p. 484).
59. Judicial discretion must of course be exercised in furtherance of the *CCAA*'s purposes. The remedial purpose I referred to in the historical overview of the Act is recognized over and over again in the jurisprudence. To cite one early example:

The legislation is remedial in the purest sense in that it provides a means whereby the devastating social and economic effects of bankruptcy or creditor initiated termination of ongoing business operations can be avoided while a court-supervised attempt to reorganize the financial affairs of the debtor company is made.

Elan Corp. v. Comiskey reflex, (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282, at para. 57, per Doherty J.A., dissenting.)

...

63. Judicial innovation during *CCAA* proceedings has not been without controversy. At least two questions it raises are directly relevant to the case at bar: (1) what are the sources of a court's authority during *CCAA* proceedings? (2) what are the limits of this authority?

44 I have quoted from the above decision at length to stress the nature of the discretion that is inherent in the *CCAA* statute to allow the Court to fashion a structure or process to best benefit stakeholders. Consistent with that purpose and as a matter of statutory interpretation, it is appropriate to look at the interpretation of s. 5.1(1) and (2) of the *CCAA*. Section 5.1(1) deals with "obligations of the company where the directors are by law liable in their capacity as directors for the payment of such obligations."

45 A Plan can therefore provide for the compromise of claims against directors where a director may in law be liable for the payment of a company's obligation with the exceptions set out in s. 5.1(2).

46 In my view, the best that can be said of s. 5 is that it is not as clearly drafted as it might have been.

47 It is noteworthy that in the first line of s. 5.1(2), the only claims that may not be excluded in a compromise are those against "directors." Claims that can be excluded in a compromise include those against "officers" and the "company" itself. Why is this the case? One reason undoubtedly is the personal liability that directors face under both Federal and Provincial legislation, or the personal undertaking of a director to a creditor such as a personal guarantee. (See *C.I.T. Financial v Lambert* 2005 BCSC 1779.)

48 By way of example, s. 131(1) of the OBCA provides that directors are made personally liable for unpaid wages of the corporation's employees to a maximum of six months. Reading through s. 5.1(1) and (2), there is nothing in the wording that would prevent the compromise of such claims against officers or the company itself, but not as against directors. The CCAA does not contain a definition of the word "creditor" but does of the terms "secured creditor," "unsecured creditor" and "shareholder." It would seem that for the purposes of the CCAA and in particular s. 5.1(2), a creditor would include both a secured creditor and an unsecured creditor, but would not include a shareholder.

49 Section 5.1(2) refers only to creditors and not shareholders as prospective claimants, whether in contract, tort or statutory oppression.

50 In this case, the claims by the Class Action Plaintiffs are on behalf of shareholders against directors, since the effect of the CCAA stayed the action against the company Allen-Vanguard. The claims arise with respect to a 2007 transaction and the pre-filing financial statements, but the claims do not involve officers or the company, only directors.

51 While framed in negligence, the claims in these actions seek to involve the remedy of oppression under the OBCA to enlist the broad scope of remedy possible under that statute. However, it is only in respect of unpaid obligations of the company and other contract-type claims where the law imposes liability on the Defendant directors that invokes the exception in s. 5.1(2). It is noteworthy that the word "negligence" does not appear in the section at all.

52 In their essence, the claims in the two actions allege a failure on the part of the directors in 2007 and the company to enter into a provident transaction and the transaction represented a misrepresentation to shareholders of the value of the transaction causing a reduction in shareholder value. Such claims are not of the same kind as those contemplated in section 5.1(1). They do not relate to "obligations of the company where the directors are by law liable."

53 The claims relate to transactions that were well in advance of the Initial CCAA Order. In *Re Canadian Airlines Corp.* 2000 ABQB 442 (leave refused to ABCA, [2000] A.J. No. 1028, and to SCC, [2001] S.C.C.A. No. 60), it was held that claims against the directors should only be released if they arose prior to the date of the CCAA proceeding.

54 I agree that the oppression remedy is expansive in scope and empowers the Court to make determinations and orders that can have a direct and even a radical impact on the internal management and status of a corporation, including even an order winding up the corporation. (See *820099 Ontario Inc. v. Harold E. Ballard Ltd.* (1991), 3 B.L.R. (2d) 113 (Ont. Div. Ct.) and *Incorporated Broadcasters Ltd. v. CanWest Global*, [2001] O.J. No. 4882, 2001 CanLII 28395 (Ont. S.C.) at paragraphs 101-105.) Oppression as it occurs within s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA must be read within the context of the section itself.

55 The claims in the Love and Laneville actions are in negligence and no other remedy is sought apart from a claim for damages and access to whatever insurance may be available to respond to claims against directors and officers. There is nothing before the Court to suggest that the insurers, assuming there is a valid policy, are aware of the restriction on remedy.

56 I see no basis from the pleadings in this action for which it would be appropriate to consider the scope of relief that might otherwise apply under the oppression remedy section of the OBCA. Counsel for the Plaintiffs in the Proposed Class Actions cannot bolster their position by limiting recovery to the applicable Directors and Officers Insurance, when there is no basis for the claim at all, either under the language of the Release or the meaning to be accorded to s. 5.1(2).

57 In *BCE Inc. v. 1976 Debentureholders*, [2008] 3 S.C.R. 560, the Supreme Court of Canada commented on the expectations of stakeholders including but not limited to shareholders, in considering a Plan of Arrangement in the context of an oppression claim. Part of the test for "oppression" referred to in that decision is an expectation on the part of the claimant to be "treated in a certain way and that failure to meet the expectation involved unfair conduct."

58 I fail to understand how the expectation of one or more shareholder groups can be any different with respect to the impugned transaction than those of creditors or indeed the company itself vis-à-vis the directors, particularly since neither the officers nor the company itself is pursued.

59 The Sanction Order in this case by its terms provided release of the claims now sought to be pursued. By the terms of the Sanction Order, the only reasonable expectation of stakeholders would be that unless specifically authorized by the Order, any claim against directors would be barred. Potential claims against directors were not assigned to class plaintiffs nor was direction sought by any party about the effect of s. 5.1 prior to the issuance of the Order. Given the issue now before the Court and the disagreement of the parties, perhaps the better practice would have been to advise the Court of the issue and "carve" it out of the Plan.

60 The Court is put in a difficult position when asked in a very constrained timeframe to approve the restructuring with releases. It should certainly not be the expectation that in every instance, releases of the type here should be granted as a matter of course. Those with unpaid obligations of the company may assert that directors are liable if they fail to fulfill the company's obligation when they are legally bound to do so.

61 I am of the view that third-party releases in particular should be the exception rather than the rule. There may very well be instances in which the releases are not integral or necessary to the restructuring and should not be approved. That was not suggested in the approval process here. There was no evidence presented at the time of the granting of the Sanction Order to suggest that directors were not important to the restructuring. Indeed, the only evidence before the Court was to the contrary: that the directors were integral to the Plan's success.

62 In this case, the putative Plaintiffs did not oppose the granting of the Sanction Order and in effect took their chances that the Order might after the fact permit the limited claim referred to in the Monitor's Report.

63 All of the other stakeholders, including the secured creditors, directors, officers and the Applicant Company, approved the form of Order.

64 It is certainly speculative at this time to consider, had the form of Order proposed been objected to, to what extent the Court would have any jurisdiction to grant the language now sought by the Plaintiffs, without rejecting the Plan entirely.

65 The duty of directors is first and foremost to the company itself. The oppression remedy does not in my view permit one group (shareholders) to claim oppression when other stakeholders, for example employees or creditors or indeed the company itself, have allegedly suffered a loss that results in insolvency and are unable to seek redress and still preserve restructuring.

66 To vary or amend the Sanction Order now to permit the claims to continue might at the very least require the presence and concurrence of all of those who supported the form of Order in the first place.

67 Counsel for the proposed Plaintiffs refer to several decisions, which they urged support the proposition that shareholder actions for oppression against directors are permitted under s. 5.1(2) of the CCCA.

68 Each of those decisions, while fact-specific, in my view is consistent with a narrow range of actions warranted for a shareholder against the director under the exception to s. 5.1(2).

69 In *Re-Liberty Oil & Gas Ltd.*, 2002 ABQB 949, where the action did proceed, the allegation involved a personal representation, indeed a fraudulent one, by the defendant director to two individuals who happened to be shareholders. The complained acts were not those of the company (as here), but rather personal and direct as between the director and shareholder. In other words, there was the proximity that one would expect in a tort situation.

70 In *Worldwide Pork Corp.*, 2009 SKQB 414, the action was not permitted to proceed. At paragraphs 14 and 15 Justice Dawson said:

It must be remembered that the oppression remedy is not designed to settle every dispute of a corporation but only those that involve and abuse of the corporate system and for which a common-law remedy does not exist.

As well, the plaintiffs have pled that their claim is for damages, for loss of profits and loss of pay out dividends. There must be a causal connection between the alleged oppressive conduct and the loss claimed to be suffered by the plaintiffs. That is, there must be a causal nexus between the alleged conduct and the loss suffered by the plaintiffs. There is no pleading which sets out how the alleged loss of profit or dividends resulted from the conduct alleged to be oppressive. But in any event the losses claimed are losses as a result of Worldwide Pork not being profitable, that is, being unable to provide a return to shareholders for their investment. Such a loss cannot support an action for oppression since it comes within the exception contained in section 5.1(2)(b) of the CCAA.

71 In *Re-Blue Star Battery Systems International Corp.* (2000), 10 B.L.R. (3d) 221, Farley J. of this Court dealt with a claim very much like that considered by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Century Services, supra*, as it involved G.S.T. At paragraph 12, he said

Thus it appears to me that RevCan, not having put itself into position where it could (and did) perfect its derivative claims as set out in section 323(2)(a) of the

Excise Tax Act never had a claim against the directors which could survive the sanction of the Plan vis-à-vis the Applicants. Nothing that this Court could do at the present time (that is, at the time when considering the CCAA sanctioned motion) could crystallize a RevCan claim against the directors. RevCan would have to take additional multiple steps over some period of time to establish a claim against the directors."

72 Farley J. went on to discuss the hypothetical of a claim in oppression against the directors as provided for in s. 5.1(2) in the context where the creditor had put the directors on notice of the promise of the company to pay the tax.

73 The argument of the Proposed Plaintiffs here is that "oppressive conduct" is not to be carved out, but that wrongful conduct that involves directors, even though the action as against the company cannot continue, it can continue against the directors.

74 What in my view is consistent with the decisions in the three cases mentioned and in the Québec case *Papiers Gaspésia* 2006 QCCS 1460 (CanLII) and with the interpretation of s. 5.1(2) is that the actions of the directors toward persons who may be regarded as creditors, and may in this context include a shareholder, are based on a direct relationship when a director takes on an obligation to make a payment that would otherwise be the obligation of the company and promises to do so or is obliged to do so by legislation. In most cases this will be a post-filing obligation. In other words, a promise by a director directly to a creditor stakeholder that is made following a CCAA Initial Order may attract liability to the director and should not be released.

75 It would be inconsistent with the scheme of the CCAA to allow all claims in which shareholders claim oppression to proceed against directors for acts or omissions that they did in the name of the company prior to the Initial Order. There would be little if any incentive to directors to pursue restructuring if they were going to be so exposed. On the other hand, personal undertakings or obligations of directors made during the CCAA process should not easily be released.

76 To permit the kind of claims as the Proposed Plaintiffs would see them would create a priority to that class of unsecured creditors that properly should belong to the creditors as a group. No leave to continue the Class action was sought before the Sanction Order was granted and even on this motion no submission was put forward for the exercise of discretion under section 5.1(3).

77 None of the cases referred to in argument dealing with s. 5.1(2) squarely deals with the issue raised here -- that the section was intended to related to post-filing claims or personal undertakings of directors to creditors in connection with the proposed plan prior to filing.

78 The final argument on behalf of Class Plaintiffs is that to deny the claim of shareholders as against directors would only benefit their insurers, since the Class Plaintiffs have agreed to limit any recovery to the amount of the insurance. I fail to see how this advances the position of the Proposed Plaintiffs. No information was put before the Court about the particulars of the insurance. The Court has no information to know whether or not the insurers even know of this issue.

79 If the claim does not lie as against the directors in the first place under s. 5.1(2), the limitation of the claim as against the potentially available insurance does not advance the case of the class of Plaintiffs.

80 There would be little meaning left to s. 5.1 if all claims of negligence and wrongful conduct against directors for pre-filing activity could not be released and no need for the discretion provided

for in s. 5.1(3) for Court to override this compromise as not being fair or reasonable. As noted above in the passages from the *Century Services* case, the purpose of the CCAA and the discretion granted to the Court are to permit restructuring to work, not create new causes of action.

81 The concern of the Court, which necessitated the further inquiry, was that the language of the Sanction Order might imply on the part of the Applicant and directors who had knowledge of the particulars of the claim that the facts could give rise to a s. 5.1(2) claim. I am satisfied based on the further information provided that no such admission is to be implied.

82 The relief sought by the directors is therefore granted.

Underwriters

83 Underwriters acted on share and warrant offerings of Allen-Vanguard in September 2007 and certified a related prospectus. The Love Class Action was commenced in February 2010 and the proposed Representative Plaintiff claims damages against Underwriters under s. 130 of the *Securities Act (Ontario)* and also makes claims on the basis of negligence, unjust enrichment and waiver of tort.

84 Underwriters rely on the provisions of the releases granted by the Sanction Order and in particular the claims against the Applicant Company Allen-Vanguard. As well, Underwriters rely on the definition of "Equity Claims" in the Sanction Order and submit that because the provisions of the Order in paragraph 26(ii) bar certain claims against third parties who might claim contribution and indemnity against the restructured company, they should be entitled to the benefit of that provision.

85 The response of the proposed Class Plaintiffs in the Love litigation is that the claim against Underwriters is based on the negligence, fraud or wilful misconduct of Underwriters. It is submitted that Underwriters are not entitled to indemnity as against Allen-Vanguard for the several negligence of Underwriters, either at law or under s. 130 of the *Securities Act*.

86 The proposed Class Plaintiff submits that given the nature of the claim as against Underwriters, Underwriters would never have had a right to an indemnity for the claims asserted in the Love Action and therefore there were no such claims to be released.

87 It is submitted that Underwriters bargained any possible indemnity away by the terms of their contract with Allen-Vanguard in September 2007, and that even if they had the benefit of an indemnity, all that was required for the Plan's success was that Alan-Vanguard be protected from Underwriters, not that Mr. Love's claims against Underwriters be eliminated.

88 Counsel for the Plaintiff in the Love Action also urges that Underwriters did not have the right of indemnity as at the time of the Initial Order, and the Sanction Order bars any indemnity that they might otherwise have had and there is nothing in the language of either Order to preclude the claim of the Class Plaintiff against Underwriters limited to Underwriters' negligence.

89 Finally, it is submitted that since Underwriters did not "bring anything to the table" in respect of the restructuring, there is no basis on which the Court should vary the Sanction Order to now provide the indemnity that the Order fails to provide.

90 In the alternative, the Class Plaintiffs suggest that the Sanction Order be clarified, if necessary, to clearly provide the right of the Class Plaintiff to proceed against Underwriters.

91 In my view, there is a distinction to be made between the claim as against the directors and that against Underwriters, since in the case as against the directors, the parties appear to have bargained that if the claim could be brought under s. 5.1(2), it could proceed. That consideration was known to the parties who negotiated and agreed on the form of the Sanction Order and that was the only claim not otherwise covered by the Release terms.

92 In the case of Underwriters, there was nothing to suggest that any discussion or negotiation took place with respect to specific protection for Underwriters or the allowance of a claim against Underwriters at the time that the Sanction Order was approved.

93 This is another reason why in my view s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA should be read narrowly with respect to pre-filing claims or claims that relate to pre-filing activity.

94 The *Ontario Business Corporations Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c. B. 16 ("OBCA") contains a statutory process for that kind of action and remedy sought by the Class Plaintiffs in both actions. Section 246(1) reads as follows:

246.(1) Subject to subsection (2), a complainant may apply to the court for leave to bring an action in the name and on behalf of a corporation or any of its subsidiaries, or intervene in an action to which any such body corporate is a party, for the purpose of prosecuting, defending or discontinuing the action on behalf of the body corporate.

95 The Supreme Court of Canada dealt with the issue of collective shareholder claims versus claims that are those of the corporation itself in *Hercules Management Ltd. et al. v. Ernst & Young*, 1997 CanLII 345, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 165. The case involved a claim by shareholders of the corporation against its auditors for an alleged negligence in preparation of financial statements of the corporation. Paragraph 48 of the reasons refers to and adopts a statement of Farley J. in *Roman Corp. v Peat Marwick Thorne* (1992), 11 O.R. (3d) 248 (Gen. Div.) at p. 260.

As a matter of law the only purpose for which shareholders receive an auditor's report is to provide the shareholders with information for the purpose of overseeing the management and affairs of the corporation and not for the purpose of guiding personal investment decisions or personal speculation with a view to profit.

96 The plaintiffs in *Hercules* asserted reliance on financial statements in monitoring the value of their equity and then due to auditors' negligence, they failed to extract it before the financial demise of the company.

97 The Supreme Court, in assessing the claim, referred at paragraph 59 to the rule in *Foss v. Harbottle*, 67 E.R. 189:

59. The rule in *Foss v. Harbottle* provides that individual shareholders have no cause of action in law for any wrongs done to the corporation and that if an action is to be brought in respect of such losses, it must be brought either by the corporation itself (through management) or by way of a derivative action. The legal rationale behind the rule was eloquently set out by the English Court of Appeal in *Pruden-*

tial Assurance Co. v. Newman Industries Ltd. (No. 2), [1982] 1 All E.R. 354, at p. 367, as follows:

The rule [in *Foss v. Harbottle*] is the consequence of the fact that a corporation is a separate legal entity. Other consequences are limited liability and limited rights. The company is liable for its contracts and torts; the shareholder has no such liability. The company acquires causes of action for breaches of contract and for torts which damage the company. No cause of action vests in the shareholder. When the shareholder acquires a share he accepts the fact that the value of his investment follows the fortunes of the company and that he can only exercise his influence over the fortunes of the company by the exercise of his voting rights in general meeting. The law confers on him the right to ensure that the company observes the limitations of its memorandum of association and the right to ensure that other shareholders observe the rule, imposed on them by the articles of association. If it is right that the law has conferred or should in certain restricted circumstances confer further rights on a shareholder the scope and consequences of such further rights require careful consideration.

To these lucid comments, I would respectfully add that the rule is also sound from a policy perspective, inasmuch as it avoids the procedural hassle of a multiplicity of actions.

60. The manner in which the rule in *Foss v. Harbottle, supra*, operates with respect to the appellants' claims can thus be demonstrated. As I have already explained, the appellants allege that they were prevented from properly overseeing the management of the audited corporations because the respondents' audit reports painted a misleading picture of their financial state. They allege further that had they known the true situation, they would have intervened to avoid the eventuality of the corporations' going into receivership and the consequent loss of their equity. The difficulty with this submission, I have suggested, is that it fails to recognize that in supervising management, the shareholders must be seen to be acting as a body in respect of the corporation's interests rather than as individuals in respect of their own ends. In a manner of speaking, the shareholders assume what may be seen to be a "managerial role" when, as a collectivity, they oversee the activities of the directors and officers through resolutions adopted at shareholder meetings. In this capacity, they cannot properly be understood to be acting simply as individual holders of equity. Rather, their collective decisions are made in respect of the corporation itself. Any duty owed by auditors in respect of this aspect of the shareholders' functions, then, would be owed not to shareholders *qua* individuals, but rather to all shareholders as a group, acting in the interests of the corporation. And if the decisions taken by the collectivity of shareholders are in respect of the corporation's affairs, then the shareholders' reliance on negligently prepared audit reports in taking such decisions will result in a wrong to the corporation for which the shareholders cannot, as individuals, recover.

61. This line of reasoning finds support in Lord Bridge's comments in *Caparo*, [1980] 1 All E.R. 568, *supra*, at p. 580:

The shareholders of a company have a collective interest in the company's proper management and in so far as a negligent failure of the auditor to report accurately on the state of the company's finances deprives the shareholders of the opportunity to exercise their powers in general meeting to call the directors to book and to ensure that errors in management are corrected, the shareholders ought to be entitled to a remedy. But in practice no problem arises in this regard since the interest of the shareholders in the proper management of the company's affairs is indistinguishable from the interest of the company itself and any loss suffered by the shareholders ... will be recouped by a claim against the auditor in the name of the company, not by individual shareholders. [Emphasis in Supreme Court decision.]

It is also reflected in the decision of Farley J. in *Roman I*, *supra*, the facts of which were similar to those of the case at bar. In that case, the plaintiff shareholders brought an action against the defendant auditors alleging, *inter alia*, that the defendant's audit reports were negligently prepared. That negligence, the shareholders contended, prevented them from properly overseeing management which, in turn, led to the winding up of the corporation and a loss to the shareholders of their equity therein. Farley J. discussed the rule in *Foss v. Harbottle* and concluded that it operated so as to preclude the shareholders from bringing personal actions based on an alleged inability to supervise the conduct of management.

62. One final point should be made here. Referring to the case of *Goldex Mines Ltd. v. Revill* (1974), 7 O.R. (2d) 216 (C.A.), the appellants submit that where a shareholder has been directly and individually harmed, that shareholder may have a personal cause of action even though the corporation may also have a separate and distinct cause of action. Nothing in the foregoing paragraphs should be understood to detract from this principle. In finding that claims in respect of losses stemming from an alleged inability to oversee or supervise management are really derivative and not personal in nature, I have found only that shareholders cannot raise individual claims in respect of a wrong done to the corporation. Indeed, this is the limit of the rule in *Foss v. Harbottle*. Where, however, a separate and distinct claim (say, in tort) can be raised with respect to a wrong done to a shareholder *qua* individual, a personal action may well lie, assuming that all the requisite elements of a cause of action can be made out.

98 The policy of limiting indeterminate liability as in *Hercules* is consistent with the basis for the limitation of claims under s. 5.1(2) as set out above. In my view the words of s. 5.1(2) do not create a cause of action that would otherwise not exist except by leave of the Court. It simply provides an exception to what otherwise could be included in a release.

99 The release terms contained in the Sanction Order would deprive Underwriters from any claims for contribution or indemnity to which they would otherwise be entitled at law from the Company and its directors and officers should the actions of the Class Plaintiffs proceed.

100 This is just one further reason to support not just what is required for a derivative action but also what is required to be taken into consideration before the Court issues a Sanction Order in this case in effect on consent.

101 As noted above, what has come to be known as a "liquidating" CCAA application can provide problems not just for the parties but the Court itself. The presumption behind the timing of the Application in this case was that if not granted quickly, bankruptcy would have ensued with the inevitable loss of jobs, assets and creditor claims.

102 The Class Plaintiffs are taken to have known of the CCAA proposal as early as September 2009 and could have sought leave to commence a derivative action prior to or during the CCAA process. No such step was taken.

103 I am satisfied that it is appropriate in the circumstances to stay the claims as against Underwriters in negligence and misrepresentation.

104 The Claim against Underwriters also alleges fraud. If the only claim were in fraud and full particulars of alleged fraud were contained in the pleading, the claim might survive since the wording of the Release does not extend to fraud.

105 Apart from fraud, claims in negligence against Underwriters are caught by the terms of the Release. Arguably, the claims are those of the Company that are specifically released.

Variation of the Sanction Order

106 As noted above in reference to the decision in *Canadian Red Cross*, a Sanction Order in addition to being an Order of the Court and subject to the normal rules for variation thereof, represents an agreed contract between the creditors of an insolvent corporation.

107 The Class Plaintiffs in the Laneville action did not seek to lift the stay at the time of the Initial Order. The Class Plaintiff accepted the Release provisions which extend to Underwriters when the Sanctioned Order was granted.

108 Underwriters were released by the terms of the Sanction Order, and the Order, which was not appealed, represents a final determination of the rights of shareholders as against Underwriters.

109 As was mentioned above, in respect of the suggestion of variation of the Sanction Order to permit the claim as against the directors, I conclude that it is not appropriate to vary a Sanction Order after the fact. The reliance that parties place on the finality of a Sanction Order is such that it would only be in extraordinary circumstances of a clear mistake, operative misrepresentation or fraud that would permit variation without re-opening the whole process.

110 In *Extreme Retail (Canada) Inc. v. Bank of Montréal*, [2007] O.J. No. 3304 (Ont. S.J.) [Commercial List], Stinson J. held at paragraph 21 that an Approval and Vesting Order was a final determination of the rights of parties represented in that proceeding. Morawetz J. adopted those comments in *Royal Bank Body Blue Inc.*, [2008] O.J. No. 1628, 2008 CanLII 19227 [Ont. S.C.], to the same effect at paragraphs 19 and 20. In my view the same principle applies to a Sanction Order.

111 I see nothing in the requests of either Underwriters or the Class Plaintiffs that would be appropriate to permit variation of the Sanction Order as each of them have proposed.

112 Should the Class Plaintiff in the Laneville action seek to pursue a claim against Underwriters limited alone in fraud, the action should be permitted to proceed subject to the Plaintiff persuading a judge that such a limited claim should be certified.

Conclusion

113 For the above reasons the motion by the directors will succeed to enjoin the claims as against them in both the Love and Laneville actions. The motion of Underwriters to strike is granted, and motions for variation of the Sanction Order of both Underwriters and the Class Plaintiffs are dismissed. Counsel may make written submissions on the issue of costs.

C.L. CAMPBELL J.

cp/e/qlrxg/qlvxw/qlbdp/qlced/qlhcs

TAB 10

Case Name:
Crystallex International Corp. (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
Crystallex International Corporation**

[2012] O.J. No. 2651

2012 ONCA 404

293 O.A.C. 102

91 C.B.R. (5th) 207

2012 CarswellOnt 7329

216 A.C.W.S. (3d) 550

4 B.L.R. (5th) 1

Dockets: C55434 and C55435

Ontario Court of Appeal
Toronto, Ontario

D.R. O'Connor A.C.J.O., R.A. Blair and A. Hoy J.J.A.

Heard: May 11, 2012.
Judgment: June 13, 2012.

(99 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Compromises and arrangements -- Costs of administration -- Appeal by major creditors of company under protection from court's approval of two loans and a management incentive plan dismissed -- Appeal from bridge loan was moot where money had been advanced, spent and repaid -- Approval of DIP loan was reasonable where financing was required for company to pursue arbitration claim which represented its only asset of value -- Loan did not constitute an arrangement requiring cred-

itor approval -- Survival of lenders' right after protection ended did not preclude loan -- Board was in best position to assess which employees were essential to restructuring -- Plan to retain executives was in company's best interest -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, ss. 6, 11.2.

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Proceedings -- Practice and procedure -- Orders -- Interim or interlocutory orders -- Appeal by major creditors of company under protection from court's approval of two loans and a management incentive plan dismissed -- Appeal from bridge loan was moot where money had been advanced, spent and repaid -- Approval of DIP loan was reasonable where financing was required for company to pursue arbitration claim which represented its only asset of value -- Loan did not constitute an arrangement requiring creditor approval -- Survival of lenders' right after protection ended did not preclude loan -- Board was in best position to assess which employees were essential to restructuring -- Plan to retain executives was in company's best interest.

Appeal by Computershare, trustee for holders of senior notes payable by Crystallex, from three orders made by the judge supervising Crystallex's protection proceedings. Crystallex's contract to develop a gold deposit in Venezuela was rescinded by the Venezuelan government, through no fault of Crystallex. As a result, Crystallex was unable to pay \$100,000,000 to the noteholders, due December 31, 2011. Crystallex obtained creditor protection on December 23, 2011. In the orders under appeal, Crystallex was authorized to obtain bridge financing of \$3,125,000 from Tenor, to obtain \$36,000,000 in DIP financing from Tenor, and to implement a Management Incentive Plan designed to ensure the retention of key executives until Crystallex's \$3,400,000,000 arbitration claim against the Venezuelan government was completed. The DIP loan entitled Tenor to 35 per cent of the net proceeds of the arbitration claim, provided governance rights that might continue after Crystallex exited protection, and other rights. Substantially all the creditors opposed these orders. Crystallex represented that it hoped to negotiate a plan of arrangement or compromise with the noteholders and other creditors by July 30, 2012, when the current stay was set to expire. By the time of the appeal, Tenor had advanced the bridge loan, and Crystallex had spent and repaid it.

HELD: Appeal dismissed. The appeal from the bridge loan was moot because the loan funds had been advanced, spent and repaid. The judge was not precluded from approving the DIP loan because the rights Tenor obtained pursuant to it might continue after Crystallex emerged from protection. The DIP loan was necessary for Crystallex to pursue its arbitration claim, its only asset of value. The judge did not err in focusing on this fact in deciding whether or not to approve the DIP loan. He did not misapprehend the evidence in finding the noteholders' offer to provide financing was not made on the same terms as Tenor's offer, and would not provide Crystallex with sufficient funds to pursue its arbitration claim. The judge reasonably exercised his discretion in approving the Tenor DIP loan. The loan was not a plan of arrangement or compromise requiring the approval of two-thirds of Crystallex's creditors. The loan did not compromise the terms of the noteholders' indebtedness or take away any of their legal rights. The recommendations of Crystallex's board, based on expert evidence, provided support for the judge's conclusion that the Management Incentive Plan should be approved. The board was in the best position to assess which employees were essential to the success of Crystallex's restructuring efforts.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

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

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 6(1), s. 11, s. 11.2, s. 11.2(1), s. 11.2(4), s. 11.2(4)(a), s. 11.2(4)(d), s. 23(1)(b)

United States Bankruptcy Code, Chapter 15

Winding-up and Restructuring Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11

Appeal From:

On appeal from the order of Justice Frank J.C. Newbould of the Superior Court of Justice dated January 20, 2012, with reasons reported at 2012 ONSC 538, and from the orders of Justice Frank J.C. Newbould of the Superior Court of Justice dated April 16, 2012, with reasons reported at 2012 ONSC 2125.

Counsel:

Richard B. Swan, S. Richard Orzy, Derek J. Bell and Emrys Davis, for the appellant Computershare Trust Company of Canada.

Andrew J.F. Kent, Markus Koehnen and Jeffrey Levine, for the respondent Crystallex International Corporation.

Barbara L. Grossman, for Tenor Capital Management Company, L.P. and Affiliates.

Robert Frank, for Forbes & Manhattan Inc. and Aberdeen International Inc.

David Byers, for the Monitor Ernst & Young Inc.

The judgment of the Court was delivered by

A. HOY J.A.:--

I. OVERVIEW

1 The primary issue in these appeals is the scope of financing the supervising judge can or should approve, without the sanction of creditors, while a company is under the protection of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the "CCAA").

2 The respondent Crystallex International Corporation ("Crystallex") is a Canadian mining company. Its principal asset was the right to develop Las Cristinas in Venezuela, which is one of the largest undeveloped gold deposits in the world. Crystallex obtained this right through a contract with the Corporacion Venezolana de Guayana (the "CVG"), a state-owned Venezuelan corporation. On February 3, 2011, after Crystallex spent over \$500 million on developing Las Cristinas, the CVG sent Crystallex a letter to "unilaterally rescind" the contract for reasons of "expediency and convenience". There is no suggestion in these proceedings that the rescission was due to any mismanagement by Crystallex.

3 As a result of the cancellation of the contract, Crystallex was unable to pay its \$100 million in senior 9.375 per cent notes due December 23, 2011 (the "Notes"). It sought and, on December 23, 2011 obtained, protection under the CCAA.

4 At present, Crystallex's only asset of significance is an arbitration claim for US \$3.4 billion against the government of Venezuela in relation to the cancellation of the contract. The arbitration claim is the "pot of gold" in the CCAA proceeding.

5 The appellant Computershare Trust Company of Canada, in its capacity as Trustee for the holders of the Notes (the "Noteholders"), appeals, with leave, three orders made by the supervising judge in the CCAA proceeding: (i) the January 20, 2012 CCAA Bridge Financing Order (with reasons released January 25, 2012 and reported at 2012 ONSC 538 (the "Bridge Financing Reasons")) authorizing Crystallex to obtain bridge financing of \$3.125 million (the "Bridge Loan") from the respondent Tenor Special Situations Fund, L.P. ("Tenor L.P."); (ii) the April 16, 2012 CCAA Financing Order authorizing Crystallex to obtain \$36 million of what the supervising judge characterized as Debtor in Possession ("DIP") financing from Tenor Special Situation Fund I, LLC ("Tenor") (the "Tenor DIP Loan"); and (iii) the April 16, 2012 Management Incentive Plan Approval Order approving a Management Incentive Plan ("MIP") designed to ensure the retention of key executives until the arbitration is completed. The supervising judge's reasons for the CCAA Financing Order and Management Incentive Plan Approval Order are reported at 2012 ONSC 2125 (the "DIP Financing Reasons").

6 Among other conditions, the Tenor DIP Loan, due December 31, 2016, entitles Tenor to 35 per cent of the net proceeds of the arbitration in addition to interest, provides governance rights that may continue after Crystallex exits from CCAA protection, and requires Tenor's approval to a range of options that might customarily be offered to unsecured creditors in seeking to negotiate a plan of compromise or arrangement.

7 Substantially all of the creditors opposed the approval of the Bridge Loan, the Tenor DIP Loan and the MIP. Crystallex represents that it hopes to negotiate a plan of arrangement or compromise with the Noteholders and other creditors before the current stay until July 30, 2012 expires.

8 The bulk of the \$36 million Tenor DIP Loan comprises financing to pursue the arbitration claim, which may continue after the period of CCAA protection.

II. THE LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

9 The CCAA was amended effective September 18, 2009 to add the following provisions regarding the grant of a charge to secure financing required by the debtor:

Interim financing

11.2 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge - in an amount that the court considers appropriate - in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

...

Factors to be considered

- (4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,
- (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
 - (b) how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
 - (c) whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
 - (d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;
 - (e) the nature and value of the company's property;
 - (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
 - (g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.¹

Prior to the enactment of these provisions, the court relied on its general authority under the CCAA to approve DIP financing: see Lloyd W. Houlden, Geoffrey B. Morawetz & Janis P. Sarra, *The 2012 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (Toronto: Carswell, 2011), at p. 1175.

III. THE BACKGROUND

A. Events Prior to the CCAA Filings

10 Crystallex has filed a Request for Arbitration pursuant to the Canada-Venezuela Bilateral Investment Treaty, claiming \$3.4 billion plus interest for the loss of its investment in Las Cristinas. The hearing of the arbitration is scheduled for November 11, 2013.

11 Crystallex's most significant liability is its debt to the Noteholders. In addition to amounts owed to the Noteholders, Crystallex has other liabilities of approximately CAD \$1.2 million and approximately US \$8 million.

12 The current Noteholders are hedge funds, some of whom purchased Notes after Venezuela announced its intention to expropriate Las Cristinas at prices as low as 25 cents on the dollar.

13 The relationship between Crystallex and the current Noteholders is hostile. Crystallex and the Noteholders have been in litigation since 2008. Prior to the maturity date of the Notes, the Noteholders twice, unsuccessfully, brought court proceedings against Crystallex alleging that an event had occurred which accelerated Crystallex's obligation to pay the Notes. Those proceedings were also heard by the supervising judge: see *Computershare Trust Co. of Canada v. Crystallex International Corp.* (2009), 65 B.L.R. (4th) 281 (S.C.), *aff'd* 2010 ONCA 364, 263 O.A.C. 137; and *Computershare v. Crystallex*, 2011 ONSC 5748.

B. Commencement of Proceedings under the CCAA and Chapter 15

14 On December 22, 2011, one day prior to the maturity of the Notes, Crystallex and the Noteholders filed competing CCAA applications. The Noteholders' application contemplated that all existing common shares would be cancelled, an equity offering would be undertaken, and if, or to the extent, the equity proceeds were insufficient to pay out the Noteholders, the Notes would be converted to equity.

15 Crystallex sought authority to file a plan of compromise and arrangement, the authority to continue to pursue the arbitration in Venezuela, and the authority to pursue all avenues of interim financing or a refinancing of its business and to conduct an auction to raise financing. In his supporting affidavit sworn December 22, 2011, Robert Fung, Crystallex's Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, indicated that Crystallex wished to have all claims stayed against it until the arbitration settled or Crystallex realized the arbitration award. Crystallex had already received an unsolicited offer of financing from Tenor Capital Management.

16 It was (and is) expected that, if the arbitration is successful and the award is collected, there will be more than enough to pay the creditors and a significant amount will be available to shareholders.

17 On December 23, 2011, the supervising judge made an order granting Crystallex's CCAA application (the "Initial Order"). In his reasons released December 28, 2011, he explained that the Noteholders' proposal was not a fair balancing of the interests of all stakeholders: *Re Crystallex International Corporation*, 2011 ONSC 7701, at para. 26. The Noteholders did not appeal the Initial Order.

18 Crystallex obtained an order under chapter 15 of the United States Bankruptcy Code from the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, among other things giving effect to the Initial Order in the United States as the main proceeding.

C. Crystallex Develops a DIP Auction Process

19 Paragraph 12 of the Initial Order authorized Crystallex to pursue all avenues of interim financing or a refinancing of its business or property, subject to the requirements of the CCAA and court approval, to permit it to proceed with an orderly restructuring. It further provided:

Without limiting the foregoing, the Applicant may conduct an auction to raise interim or DIP financing pursuant to procedures approved by the Monitor and using such professional assistance as the Applicant may determine with the consent of the Monitor. If such approved procedures are followed to the satisfaction of the Monitor then the best offer as determined by the Applicant pursuant to the approved procedures shall be afforded the protection of the *Soundair* principles so that it will be too late to make topping offers thereafter and such offers will not be considered by this Court.

20 Crystallex hired an independent financial advisory firm, Skatoff & Company, LLC, and developed a set of procedures to govern the solicitation of bids to provide financing to Crystallex. The Monitor, Ernst & Young Inc., approved the bid procedures. The bid procedures indicated that Crystallex's objective was to obtain financing of not less than \$35 million, net of costs, that, on completion of the CCAA and U.S. Chapter 15 reorganization proceedings, would roll into financing maturing not sooner than December 31, 2014. The bid deadline was February 1, 2012.

D. The Bridge Loan

21 On January 20, 2012, the supervising judge considered competing proposals from Tenor L.P. and the Noteholders to provide bridge financing. Tenor L.P. offered \$3.125 million with interest at 10 per cent per annum. The Noteholders offered \$3 million with interest at 1 per cent per annum.

22 The board of Crystallex, taking into account advice received from Mr. Skatoff, recommended the Tenor L.P. offer. Mr. Skatoff was concerned that the Noteholders' objective may have been to defeat the larger DIP financing process so that they could ultimately impose financing terms on Crystallex. It was also his view that Crystallex should avoid entering into an important financial relationship with a hostile party.

23 The supervising judge approved Tenor L.P.'s offer.

E. The Noteholders Object to the DIP Auction Process

24 On January 20, 2012, the Noteholders brought a cross-motion to modify the DIP auction process then underway, which they severely criticized. They objected to the amount sought, the term, and the lender back-end entitlement a successful DIP lender could acquire. In their view, Crystallex was inappropriately seeking financing in excess of amounts required until a compromise or plan of arrangement could be arrived at between Crystallex and its creditors. Given their existing position in Crystallex, the Noteholders also objected to being required to sign a non-disclosure agreement containing a standstill provision in order to be a qualified bidder.

25 The supervising judge held that if the Noteholders wished to be considered as a qualified bidder, they would have to sign a non-disclosure agreement: Bridge Financing Reasons, at para. 27. As to their other concerns, he wrote, at para. 29:

In my view these objections are premature and it is not necessary for me to consider their strength at this stage. The time for filing bids from qualified bidders has not yet expired and what bids will be received is unknown. It is when a successful bidder has been chosen and the DIP facility is before the court for approval that these issues raised by the Noteholders would be more appropriately dealt with. Until then, there is no factual foundation for judgment to be passed on the bid procedures for the DIP facility for which Crystallex will seek approval.

F. Competing DIP Financing Offers: The Tenor DIP Loan and the Noteholders' Offer

26 The bidders who responded to the request for DIP financing included three hedge funds that hold approximately 77 per cent of the Notes and Tenor.

27 Those hedgefund Noteholders proposed a loan of \$10 million with a simple interest rate of 1 per cent repayable on October 15, 2012.

28 The supervising judge described Tenor's proposed terms in the DIP Financing Reasons:

[23] The Tenor DIP facility contains the following material financial terms:

- (a) Tenor will advance \$36 million to Crystallex due and payable on December 31, 2016. This period for the loan is based on Crystallex's arbitration counsel's assessment of the likely timing of a decision from the arbitral tribunal and collection of the award.
- (b) The advances will be in four tranches, being \$9 million upon execution of the loan documentation and approval of the facility by court order in Ontario, the second being \$12 million upon any appeal of the Ontario court order approving the facility being dismissed and upon a U.S court order approving the facility, the third being \$10 million when Crystallex has less than \$2.5 million in cash and the fourth being \$5 million when Crystallex again has less than \$2.5 million in cash.
- (c) The loans are to be used to (i) repay an interim bridge loan of \$3.25 million advanced by Tenor with court approval of January 20, 2012 and payable on April 16, 2012, (ii) fees and expenses in connection with the facility, (iii) general corporate expenses of Crystallex including expenses of the restructuring proceedings and of the arbitration in accordance with cash flow statements and budgets of Crystallex approved by Tenor from time to time.
- (d) Crystallex will pay Tenor a \$1 million commitment fee.
- (e) \$35 million of the loan amount will bear PIK interest (payment in kind, meaning it is capitalized and payable only upon maturity of the loan or upon receipt of the proceeds of the arbitration) at the rate of 10% per annum compounded semi-annually.
- (f) Tenor will receive additional compensation equal to 35% of the net proceeds of any arbitral award or settlement, conditional upon the second tranche of the loan being advanced. Net proceeds of the award or settlement is defined as the amount remaining after payment of principal and interest on the DIP loan, taxes and proven and allowed unsecured claims against Crystallex, including the noteholders, the latter of which will have a special charge for the unsecured amounts owing. Alternatively, Tenor can convert the right to additional compensation to 35% of the common

shares of Crystallex. This conversion right is apparently driven by tax considerations.

[24] The Tenor DIP facility also provides for the governance of Crystallex to be changed to give Tenor a substantial say in the governance of Crystallex. More particularly:

- (a) Crystallex shall have a reduced five person board of directors, being two current Crystallex directors, two nominees of Tenor and an independent director selected by agreement of Crystallex and Tenor.
- (b) The independent director shall be chair of the board of directors and shall not have a second-casting or tie-breaking vote.
- (c) The independent director shall be appointed a special managing director and shall have all the powers of the board of directors to (i) the conduct of the reorganization proceedings in Canada and in the U.S. and the efforts of Crystallex to reorganize the pre-filing claims of the unsecured creditors, (ii) any matters relating to the rights of Crystallex and Tenor as against the other under the facility, (iii) the administration of the MIP to the extent not otherwise delegated to the bonus pool committee under the MIP, and (iv) to retain any advisor in respect of these matters. The special manager shall first consult with a non-board advisory panel, consisting of the three Crystallex directors who will step down from the board, and consider in good faith their recommendations.
- (d) With respect to matters that may not at law be delegable to the special managing director, he will be required to obtain board approval. If the Tenor nominees use their votes to block that approval, Tenor will forfeit its 35% additional compensation.

[25] The Tenor DIP facility contains proscribed rights of Tenor in the event of default. Tenor may seize and sell assets other than the arbitration proceeding (i.e. any cash and unsold mining equipment). It may not sell the arbitration claim. If there is a default before any arbitration award, Tenor would have the right to apply to court to have the Monitor or a Canadian receiver and manager appointed to take control of the arbitration proceedings. If such application were not granted, Tenor would be entitled to exercise the rights and remedies of a secured creditor pursuant to an order, the loan documentation or otherwise at law.

29 Mr. Skatoff recommended, and the board of Crystallex agreed, to accept the Tenor DIP Loan. Mr. Skatoff indicated, in an affidavit sworn March 20, 2012, that he had recommended that the board reject the Noteholders' offer of a \$10 million loan for 6 months because Crystallex could not be assured that it could borrow the balance of the required funds at the expiry of that period on the same terms as the Tenor DIP Loan.

G. The Noteholders' Further, Competing Offer to Allay Mr. Skatoff's Concerns

30 In his affidavit on behalf of the Noteholders, sworn March 27, 2012, Mr. Mattoni responded to Mr. Skatoff's concern by committing that the Noteholders would be prepared to,

... provide financing to Crystallex on the same terms as the [Tenor DIP Loan], in the event that prior to October 1, 2012, the Court orders that such long-term financing is appropriate and necessary. The Noteholders would reserve their complete and unfettered ability as creditors to continue to oppose stay extensions or attempts to secure such long-term financing outside of a Plan of compromise (including, specifically, financing to the extent contemplated by the Proposed Loan), but they will provide it if it is ordered by the Court on the same basis as currently proposed with Tenor ...

H. The Noteholders' Proposed Plan

31 Prior to the April 5, 2012 hearing, the Noteholders proposed a plan to indicate a good faith intention to bargain. They did not seek approval of this proposed plan at the April 5, 2012 hearing.

32 The plan's terms included that the Noteholders would provide a \$10 million loan on the terms described above; exchange their debt for approximately 58 per cent of the equity; provide \$35 million to Crystallex in exchange for 22.9 per cent of the equity; and provide incentives to management at a lesser level than the MIP. Their proposed plan left approximately 14 per cent of the equity for the existing shareholders.

I. The Management Incentive Plan

33 The Noteholders had criticized the independent directors of Crystallex as not being sufficiently independent. As a result, the independent directors of Crystallex comprising the compensation committee retained Jay Swartz, a partner of Davies Phillips Vineberg, to determine, from the perspective of an independent director, what an appropriate MIP would be. He in turn retained an independent national executive compensation consulting firm to provide expert advice. Mr. Swartz opined that the overall compensation proposal for the establishment of the bonus pool for the benefit of Crystallex's management was reasonable in the circumstances. The independent directors of Crystallex comprising the compensation committee approved the MIP.

34 At para. 102 of the DIP Financing Reasons, the supervising judge described the MIP:

In sum, a pool of money, consisting of up to 10% of the net proceeds of the arbitration up to \$700 million and 2% of any further net proceeds, after all costs and charges, including the amounts owing to noteholders, is to be set aside and money in this pool may be paid to the beneficiaries of the MIP, depending on the determination of an independent committee. The amounts to be allocated to participants by the compensation committee are discretionary and could be nil. No one

will be entitled to any particular amount. Members of the compensation committee will not be eligible for any payments.

35 The MIP sets out a number of factors to be considered by the compensation committee in exercising its discretion. They include the amount and speed of recovery, the amount of time and energy expended by the individual, and the opportunity cost to the individual in staying with Crystallex.

36 In the view of the Noteholders, the MIP is too generous. They proposed that management receive 5 per cent through an equity participation in any after tax award. They also took issue with the range of persons eligible under the MIP.

J. The April 5, 2012 motion

37 On April 5, 2012, Crystallex sought orders approving, among other things, the Tenor DIP Loan and the MIP. The Noteholders as well as Forbes & Manhattan Inc. and Aberdeen International Inc., creditors owed approximately \$2.5 million by Crystallex, opposed both the Tenor DIP Loan and the MIP. The one shareholder who attended opposed the MIP.

38 The supervising judge approved the Tenor DIP Loan and the MIP.² He also extended the stay until July 30, 2012.

K. Events since April 5, 2012

39 Tenor made the first, \$9 million advance under the Tenor DIP Loan. The Bridge Loan was repaid out of the first advance.

40 At the hearing of this appeal, the Monitor advised that Crystallex would require further funds before the anticipated release of this court's decision. Crystallex accepted Tenor's offer to advance a further \$4 million to Crystallex, on the same terms as the first, \$9 million tranche of the Tenor DIP Loan. Accordingly, this further advance does not entitle Tenor to participate in any arbitration proceeds, or trigger any change in the governance of Crystallex. If the Noteholders' appeal succeeds, the additional amounts advanced by Tenor are, like the first tranche, to be immediately repaid with interest at the rate of 1 per cent per annum, and the Noteholders shall fund the repayment. No commitment fee is payable in respect of this additional advance.

IV. THE SUPERVISING JUDGE'S REASONS

A. The Bridge Loan

41 The supervising judge noted, at para. 5 of the Bridge Financing Reasons, that Tenor L.P.'s bridge financing proposal was "really short-term DIP financing". With respect to the boards' rec-

ommendation - based on Mr. Skatoff's advice - that Tenor L.P.'s proposal be approved, he wrote, at para. 12:

This was a business judgment protected by the business judgment rule so long as it was a considered and informed judgment made honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interests of Crystallex. See *Re Stelco Inc.* (200[5]), 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135 (Ont. C.A.) regarding the rule and its application to CCAA proceedings. I see no grounds for concluding that the decision of Crystallex to prefer the Tenor bridge financing proposal is not protected by the business judgment rule or that I should not give it appropriate deference. [Citation corrected.]

42 The supervising judge noted, at para. 13, that "the Monitor has no basis to say that the business judgment exercised by the Crystallex board of directors was unreasonable". The supervising judge accordingly approved the Bridge Loan.

43 Mr. Skatoff expressed concern that the Noteholders' objective in offering bridge financing on such advantageous terms (interest at the rate of 1 per cent, as opposed to the 10 per cent in the Tenor L.P. offer) was to undermine the DIP auction process. The supervising judge observed, at para. 14:

Whether Mr. Skatoff is correct in his concerns, it seems to me that the relatively minor extra cost involving the Tenor proposed bridge financing for at most a few months must be weighed against the risk of harm to the longer-term DIP financing auction process, and that for the sake of that process, it is preferable not to run the risks that Mr. Skatoff is concerned about.

B. The Tenor DIP Loan

44 The substance of the supervising judge's reasons for approving the Tenor DIP Loan - as set out in the DIP Financing Reasons - may be summarized as follows.

- i. The exercise of business judgment by the board of directors of Crystallex in approving the Tenor DIP Loan is a factor that can be taken into account by the court in considering whether to make an order under s. 11.2(1) of the CCAA (at para. 35).
- ii. The Tenor DIP Loan did not amount to a plan of arrangement or compromise. Notably, it did not take away the rights of the Noteholders as unsecured creditors to apply for a bankruptcy order or to vote on a plan of compromise or arrangement. A vote of the creditors was therefore not required (at para. 50). In coming to this conclusion, the supervising judge relied on *Re Calpine Canada Energy Limited*, 2007 ABQB 504, 415 A.R. 196, leave to appeal refused, 2007 ABCA 266, 417 A.R. 25.
- iii. Crystallex intended to negotiate a plan of compromise or arrangement with the Noteholders during the stay extension until July 30, 2012 (paras. 48, 126). The Tenor DIP Loan is therefore distinguishable from the financing rejected by the

court in *Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp.*, 2008 BCCA 327, 296 D.L.R. (4th) 577, because in that case the debtor did not have an intention to propose an arrangement or compromise to its creditors.

- iv. Because the Tenor DIP Loan involves the grant of a financial interest in part of the assets of Crystallex, it is appropriate to consider the *Soundair* factors in deciding whether to approve it (at para. 59). Crystallex conducted a robust competitive bidding process (at para. 39).
- v. Mr. Skatoff's evidence was that the Noteholders' proposed six month facility "would seriously erode the chances of Crystallex obtaining third party financing in October" (at para. 90). Counsel for Computershare had said during argument on the motion that the Noteholders "were not prepared to agree to such a \$35 million facility at this time but only at some future time as the \$10 million facility they now proposed became due" (at para. 27). While it would have been preferable if the Noteholders had been willing to lend on the basis of the terms of the Tenor DIP facility, "it was made clear during argument that the noteholders were not prepared at this time to do so" (at para. 91).
- vi. As to the enumerated factors in s. 11.2(4):
 - (a) Given that Crystallex intends, if possible, to negotiate an acceptable plan of arrangement or compromise, the length of time during which Crystallex is expected to be subject to the CCAA proceedings is not a determinative factor. The financing will be required to pursue the arbitration (at para. 62) and, as the supervising judge noted, "the only way any of the creditors will receive any substantial cash payment is from the proceeds of the arbitration" (at para. 47);
 - (b) The management of the business and affairs of Crystallex "are a reasonable compromise between Crystallex and Tenor designed to protect the interests of the stakeholders, including the noteholders" (at para. 73). The fact that Tenor is given substantial governance rights does not in itself mean that the DIP Tenor Loan should not be approved. Tenor does not have the right to conduct the reorganization proceedings or the arbitration proceeding. Moreover, under s. 11.5(1) of the CCAA, the court may remove a director whom it is satisfied is unreasonably impairing or is likely to unreasonably impair the possibility of a viable compromise or arrangement being made. Arguably, a court could remove a Tenor nominee under this section without triggering an event of default under the Tenor DIP Loan (at paras. 63-71);
 - (c) While the Noteholders expressed "extreme displeasure" at Crystallex's management's delay in commencing arbitration proceedings, they do not oppose management having a continuing role in the arbitration (at para. 72);
 - (d) The Noteholders' argument that the terms of the Tenor DIP Loan - in particular, the fact that the refusal of the court to grant a stay or a bankruptcy are events of default, the grant of a 35 per cent interest in the arbitration proceeds, and the limits on the type of restructuring that can be concluded without the approval of Tenor - will effectively prevent any plan of ar-

rangement was rejected (at paras. 74-82). While, as the Monitor points out, the introduction of a third party, Tenor, with consent rights to certain actions will add complexity to the negotiation of a CCAA plan (at para. 93), the Tenor DIP Loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement (at para. 83):

... Crystallex requires additional financing to pay its expenses and continue the arbitration. A DIP loan allows the company to have the arbitration financed, which if it were not at this stage would impair the arbitration and perhaps the attitude of Venezuela towards the arbitration claim, and as such enhances the viability of a CCAA plan. I have not accepted the argument of the noteholders that the loan would prevent a plan of arrangement.

- (e) The supervising judge noted that Crystallex's principal asset is its US \$3.4 billion arbitration claim against Venezuela (at para. 12); and
- (f) In considering the Noteholders' complaints of prejudice in the context of what the market is demanding for a DIP loan and in all the circumstances, the creditors have not been materially prejudiced by the Tenor DIP Loan (at para. 84).

C. The Management Incentive Plan

45 The supervising judge considered the Noteholders' objections to the quantum and method for providing an incentive to management, the inclusion of certain persons in the MIP, and the approval of the MIP before the negotiation of a plan.

46 In the DIP Financing Reasons, the supervising judge observed, at para. 109, that whether employee retention provisions should be ordered in a CCAA proceeding was a matter of discretion. He noted that the provisions of the MIP had been approved by an independent committee of the board of directors with impressive qualifications, relying on the opinion of Mr. Swartz. In providing that opinion, Mr. Swartz indicated that the absolute amount of the bonus pool could be very substantial and, in allocating it, the compensation committee "may have to carefully consider the absolute amounts to be paid to each member of the Management Group in order to satisfy its fiduciary duties": see DIP Financing Reasons, at para. 108. The supervising judge also noted that Mr. Swartz had retained an independent national executive compensation consulting firm to provide expert advice.

47 Citing *Grant Forest Products Inc. (Re)* (2009), 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128 (Ont. S.C.) and *Timminco Ltd. (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 948, the supervising judge wrote, at para. 112 of the DIP Financing Reasons, "I see no reason why the business judgment rule is not applicable, particularly when the provisions of the MIP have been approved by an independent committee of the board." He further noted, at para. 115, what appears to be the practice of approving employee retention plans before any plan has been negotiated and, at para. 105, that the Tenor DIP Loan was conditional on the approval of a MIP acceptable to Crystallex and Tenor.

48 As to who should be eligible to participate in the MIP, at para. 117, the supervising judge noted that the independent committee had exercised its business judgment on the matter and that the participants were known to Mr. Swartz. Having reviewed the evidence, the supervising judge could not "say that any of the persons included in the MIP should not be there".

V. THE PARTIES' SUBMISSIONS

A. The Noteholders' Submissions

49 The Noteholders frame their opposition to the Tenor DIP Loan on a number of bases.

50 They argue that s. 11.2, titled "Interim financing", only permits a supervising judge to approve financing to meet the debtor's needs while it is developing a plan to present to its creditors.

51 The Noteholders also argue that the supervising judge's finding that the Tenor DIP Loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement was unreasonable because it resulted from an error of principle, namely an improper focus on the fact that it provided financing for the arbitration.

52 The Noteholders submit that the supervising judge misapprehended the evidence in finding that the Noteholders were not willing to match the Tenor DIP Loan, and this error affected the outcome of the motion.

53 They argue that the supervising judge erred in deferring to the business judgment of the directors of Crystallex in approving both the Bridge Loan and the Tenor DIP Loan. They argue that directors always make a recommendation and, if Parliament had thought this was a relevant factor, it would have specifically enumerated it in s. 11.2(4) of the CCAA.

54 They argue that the supervising judge erred in principle in focusing on what was the most expedient way to fund the arbitration (as opposed to Crystallex's needs while negotiating a plan with the Noteholders) and, in doing so, committed the same error as the motion judge in *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*.

55 The Noteholders' position is that the Tenor DIP Loan is effectively an arrangement, in the guise of a financing, and Crystallex is misusing the CCAA to impose a restructuring without the requisite creditor approval.

56 The Noteholders submit that this court should order Crystallex to accept the Noteholders' "matching" DIP loan offer.

57 They also renew their objections to the MIP.

B. Crystallex's Submissions

58 Crystallex argues that the Noteholders' appeal with respect to the Bridge Loan is moot because the loan has been advanced, spent and repaid.

59 As to the Tenor DIP Loan, it argues that approving it was within the discretion of the supervising judge, the supervising judge exercised his discretion on a wide variety of findings of fact, capable of evidentiary support in the record, and there is no basis for this court to intervene. It relies on *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2010 SCC 60, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, which recently addressed the broad discretionary jurisdiction of a supervising judge under the CCAA. Crystallex also points to *Air Canada (Re)* (2004), 47 C.B.R. (4th) 169 (Ont. S.C.), as an instance where exit financing was approved before a plan had been approved by creditors.

C. Tenor's Submissions

60 Tenor argues that "interim financing" in the heading to s. 11.2 of the CCAA does not mean "short term", but rather refers to the interval between two points or events, and s. 11.2 does not contain anything that would fetter the discretion of the supervising judge to select an "end point" beyond the expected conclusion of a plan. It argues that the duration of the Tenor DIP Loan is tailored to Crystallex's unique circumstance: all stakeholders acknowledge that the arbitration must be pursued in order for there to be meaningful recovery. In any event, it argues, marginal notes, such as the heading "interim financing" in s. 11.2, are not part of the statute, and their value is limited when a court must address a serious problem of statutory interpretation, citing the *Interpretation Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, s. 14, and *Imperial Oil Ltd. v. Canada; Inco Ltd. v. Canada*, 2006 SCC 46, [2006] 2 S.C.R. 447, at para. 57.

61 Moreover, Tenor submits, the supervising judge was in the best position to perform the careful balancing of interests required to facilitate a successful restructuring.

VI. ANALYSIS

A. The Appeal from the Bridge Financing Order

62 The Noteholders did not strongly pursue their appeal of the Bridge Financing Order. The relief sought at the conclusion of the hearing related to the Tenor DIP Loan and not the Bridge Loan. The Bridge Loan was disbursed, spent and repaid. I agree with the respondents that the Noteholders' appeal with respect to the Bridge Loan is moot. I will therefore confine my analysis to the Tenor DIP Loan and the MIP.

B. The Appeal from the Tenor DIP Financing Order

(1) *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*

63 The Supreme Court of Canada had occasion to interpret the CCAA for the first time in *Century Services*. It used that opportunity to make clear that the CCAA gives the courts broad discretionary powers. Those powers must, however, be exercised in furtherance of the CCAA's purposes:

para. 59. Section 11, in particular, was drafted in broad language which provides that a supervising judge "may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act ... make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances".³ For the majority in *Century Services*, Deschamps J. wrote:

[69] The *CCAA* also explicitly provides for certain orders ...

[70] The general language of the *CCAA* should not be read as being restricted by the availability of more specific orders. However, the requirements of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising *CCAA* authority. Appropriateness under the *CCAA* is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the *CCAA*. The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to achieve the remedial purpose of the *CCAA* - avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company. I would add that appropriateness extends not only to the purpose of the order, but also to the means it employs. Courts should be mindful that chances for successful reorganizations are enhanced where participants achieve common ground and all stakeholders are treated as advantageously and fairly as the circumstances permit.

64 It is with the Supreme Court's interpretation of the scope of judicial discretion under the *CCAA* in mind that I turn to s. 11.2 and the question of whether it permits a supervising judge to approve financing that may continue for a significant period after *CCAA* protection ends, without the approval of creditors.

(2) Section 11.2 of the *CCAA*

65 Section 11.2 is headed "Interim Financing". Headings may be used as an aid in interpreting the meaning of a statute: R. Sullivan, *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes*, 5th ed. (Markham: LexisNexis Canada Inc., 2008), at p. 394, "Interim" generally means temporary or provisional: *Canadian Oxford Dictionary*, 2d ed. The weight to be given to a heading depends on the circumstances.

66 I agree with the Noteholders that s. 11.2 contemplates the grant of a charge, the primary purpose of which is to secure financing required by the debtor while it is expected to be subject to proceedings under the *CCAA*. A further purpose, however, is to enhance the prospects of a plan of compromise or arrangement that will lead to a continuation of the company, albeit in restructured form, after plan approval.

67 Section 11.2(4)(a) directs the court to consider the period during which the debtor is expected to be subject to proceedings under the *CCAA*. It stops short of confining the financing to the period that the debtor is subject to the *CCAA*. Section 11.2(4)(d) directs the court to consider if the financing would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement.

68 Having regard to the broad remedial purpose of the *CCAA* and the broad residual authority of a supervising judge described in *Century Services*, in my view section 11.2 does not restrict the ability of the supervising judge, where appropriate, to approve the grant of a charge securing financing before a plan is approved that may continue after the company emerges from *CCAA* protection. Indeed, although in very different circumstances, financing to be available on the debtor's

emergence from CCAA protection (sometimes called "exit financing") was approved before a plan was approved in *Air Canada*.⁴ Both *Century Services* and section 11.2, however, in my view, signal that it would be unusual for a court to approve exit financing where opposed by substantially all of the creditors. Exit or post-plan financing is often a key element, or a pre-requisite, of the plan voted on by creditors.

69 The question becomes whether the unique facts of this case permitted the supervising judge to approve "interim financing" that was of such duration and structure that it could well outlast the CCAA protection period. This court should not substitute its decision for that of the supervising judge. I must ask this question through the lens of the applicable standard of review.

(3) Standard of review

70 Appellate review of a discretionary order under the CCAA is limited. Intervention is justified only for an error in principle or the unreasonable exercise of discretion: *Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108 (C.A.), at para. 71. An appellate court should not interfere with an exercise of discretion "where the question is one of the weight or degree of importance to be given to particular factors, rather than a failure to consider such factors or the correctness, in the legal sense, of the conclusion": *New Skeena Forest Products Inc., Re*, 2005 BCCA 192, 39 B.C.L.R. (4th) 338, at para. 26.

(4) The supervising judge did not err in principle or unreasonably exercise his discretion

71 As detailed below, I conclude that there is no basis for interfering with the supervising judge's exercise of discretion in approving the Tenor DIP Loan.

72 Most significantly, in this case, the supervising judge found there could be no meaningful recovery, and therefore no successful restructuring, without the financing of the arbitration. Although the Noteholders characterized the Tenor DIP Loan as "exit financing", it furthered the remedial purpose of the CCAA. To that extent, it is appropriate in the first sense used by Deschamps J. in *Century Services*, even though it may well outlast the period of CCAA protection. The supervising judge's focus on the fact that the Tenor DIP Loan provided financing for the arbitration was not, in the circumstances, an error of principle.

73 In my view, the Noteholders' real argument is that the *means* by which the Tenor DIP Loan was approved were not appropriate. Ideally, a CCAA supervising judge is able to assist creditors and debtors in coming to a compromise. The creditors and Crystallex have not "achieved common ground" on a very significant matter. Effectively, the Noteholders argue that the creditors have not been treated as advantageously and fairly as the circumstances permit. They are the senior creditors and their offer to provide DIP financing on terms they argue matched those of the Tenor DIP Loan was not accepted. With sufficient financing in place to fund the arbitration, their leverage in negotiating a share of the arbitration proceeds has been reduced. Moreover, the Noteholders argue, the supervising judge erred in applying the business judgment rule, and, contrary to *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*, involuntarily stayed their rights during what they characterize as a restructuring. I consider each of these arguments below.

a. The Noteholders' competing DIP loan offer

74 The Noteholders point to their affidavit on the April motion indicating they would submit to an order to advance funds on the same terms as the Tenor DIP Loan "in the event that prior to October 1, 2012, the Court orders that such long-term financing is appropriate and necessary". The supervising judge wrote that it would have been a preferable outcome if the Noteholders had been prepared to lend at the time of the April motion on the terms of the Tenor DIP facility: DIP Financing Reasons, at para. 91. The Noteholders argue that: they were prepared to advance funds on the terms of the Tenor DIP Loan, if so ordered; the supervising judge misapprehended the evidence; and, given the supervising judge's comment that it would have been preferable if the Noteholders had been prepared to lend, that misapprehension affected the outcome of the motion.

75 The supervising judge's comment at para. 91 of the DIP Financing Reasons makes his real concern clear. There, he stated that "at this time" the Noteholders were not prepared to lend on the terms of the Tenor DIP Loan. The Noteholders' view as of April 5, 2012 was that such long-term financing was not necessary, as the \$10 million they offered to advance at that time met Crystallex's then cash requirements. The Noteholders reserved their rights to continue to oppose the approval of long term financing before they had come to an agreement with Crystallex about their entitlement, as creditors. Further hearings, and further arguments, were required. The supervising judge found, at para. 83 of the DIP Financing Reasons, that not putting sufficient financing in place to finance the arbitration "at this stage" would impair the arbitration. There was no suggestion from counsel for the Noteholders that on April 5, 2012 the Noteholders were prepared to waive the condition permitting them to continue to oppose the approval of long term financing. I am not satisfied that the supervising judge clearly misapprehended the evidence.

b. Loss of leverage

76 In Crystallex's view, a reduction of the Noteholders' leverage was desirable. It points to the Noteholders' competing CCAA application, seeking to cancel all of the shareholders' equity, which the supervising judge rejected as not fairly balancing the interests of all stakeholders. The Noteholders' plan, subsequently proposed, would entitle them to 46 per cent of the equity in return for giving up their Notes, which Crystallex also views as excessive.⁵

77 Crystallex argues that the Noteholders are not contractually entitled to convert their Notes to equity, and should therefore not be entitled to do so. Moreover, they argue, in the event of bankruptcy, the Noteholders would only be entitled to recover their principal and interest at the statutory rate of 5 per cent under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, and, if the arbitration is realized, they will be entitled to the higher rate of interest they are contractually entitled to under the Notes. As Deschamps J. noted at para. 77 of *Century Services*, participants in a reorganization "measure the impact of a reorganization against the position they would enjoy in liquidation".

78 The Noteholders counter that, contractually, they were entitled to be repaid on December 23, 2011 and, since they were not, and Crystallex proposes to defer repayment for several years and repay the Notes only if the arbitration is successful, the long delay entitles them to some equity par-

icipation. Moreover, contractually, Crystallex is restricted from incurring the Tenor DIP Loan, which will be senior to the Notes.

79 Crystallex points to the terms of the Initial Order, affording the "best offer" the protection of the *Soundair* principles, and providing that "topping offers" would not be considered by the court. Crystallex points out that the Noteholders did not appeal the Initial Order and argues that accepting the Noteholders' matching offer would offend the *Soundair* principles. In Crystallex's view, the Noteholders were treated fairly.

80 In turn, the Noteholders argue that the Initial Order authorized Crystallex to conduct an auction to raise *interim or DIP financing* pursuant to procedures approved by the Monitor. Since the outset, the Noteholders maintained their objection that the auction process sought more than interim or true DIP financing. The supervising judge deferred consideration of their objections until the DIP facility was before the court for approval.

81 The Noteholders are sophisticated parties. They pursued a strategy. It ultimately proved less successful than hoped. It appears that the supervising judge would have been prepared to approve the advance of funds to Crystallex by the Noteholders, on the terms of the Tenor DIP Loan, notwithstanding the *Soundair* principles, had the Noteholders agreed to do so, without condition, on April 5, 2012.

82 The facts of this case are unusual: there is a single "pot of gold" asset which, if realized, will provide significantly more than required to repay the creditors. The supervising judge was in the best position to balance the interests of all stakeholders. I am of the view that the supervising judge's exercise of discretion in approving the Tenor DIP Loan was reasonable and appropriate, despite having the effect of constraining the negotiating position of the creditors.

c. The business judgment rule

83 The supervising judge held that in addition to the factors in s. 11.2(4) of the CCAA, he could take into account the exercise or lack thereof of business judgment by the board of directors of a debtor corporation in considering DIP financing: DIP Financing Reasons, at paras. 32-35. He cited *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (C.A.), as authority for this proposition.⁶

84 The fact that a debtor's board of directors recommends interim financing is not a determinative factor, and in some cases may not be a material factor, in considering whether to make an order under s. 11.2. It would be unusual if the board did not recommend the financing for which the debtor seeks approval.

85 *Stelco* should not be read as authority for the principle that the recommendation of the directors of a debtor under CCAA protection is entitled to deference in evaluating whether financing should be approved under s. 11.2 of the CCAA where the factors outlined in s. 11.2(4) have not been complied with. In *Stelco*, the debtor did not seek court approval of a recommendation of the board. In the case of interim financing, the court must make an independent determination, and arrive at an appropriate order, having regard to the factors in s. 11.2(4). It may consider, but not defer to, and is not fettered by, the recommendation of the board.

86 The weight given by the supervising judge to the business judgment of the board of directors of Crystallex in recommending the Tenor DIP Loan is not, however, a basis for this court to interfere with his decision: *New Skeena Forest Products*, at para. 26.

d. *Cliffs Over Maple Bay* is distinguishable

87 In *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*, the debtor was the developer of a 300 acre site intended to include residential units, a golf course and a hotel. The debtor obtained protection under the CCAA and sought approval of financing that would permit it to complete material parts of the development. It believed that the proceeds generated from the sale of units thus completed would be sufficient to fund the remaining portions of the development and that, if the development were completed, there would be sufficient sale proceeds to satisfy all of the debtor's obligations.

88 The motion judge approved the financing; the mortgagees of the development appealed. The British Columbia Court of Appeal noted, at para. 35, that it was not suggested that the debtor intended to propose an arrangement or compromise to its creditors before embarking on its restructuring plan. The court allowed the appeal, writing:

[37] ... DIP financing should not be authorized to permit the debtor company to pursue a restructuring plan that does not involve an arrangement or compromise with its creditors ...

[38] ... What the Debtor Company was endeavouring to accomplish in this case was to freeze the rights of all of its creditors while it undertook its restructuring plan without giving the creditors an opportunity to vote on the plan. The CCAA was not intended, in my view, to accommodate a non-consensual stay of creditors' rights while a debtor company attempts to carry out a restructuring plan that does not involve an arrangement or compromise upon which the creditors may vote.

89 I agree with the supervising judge that this case can be distinguished from *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*, which turned on the court's finding that the debtor did not intend to negotiate a plan with its creditors.

90 While Mr. Fung initially indicated that Crystallex's plan was to stay creditors' claims until the arbitration was settled or realized, his more recent evidence was that approval of the Tenor DIP Loan does not preclude further discussions about a plan with the creditors. In submissions before the supervising judge, and again before this court, counsel for Crystallex reiterated that Crystallex intended to exit from CCAA protection as soon as a plan was negotiated with the creditors and approved, and that Crystallex intended to negotiate a plan by the expiry of the stay on July 30, 2012. The supervising judge found that Crystallex intended to negotiate a plan with its creditors. There is some basis in the record for such a conclusion.

(5) The Tenor DIP Loan is not an arrangement

91 An arrangement or compromise cannot be imposed on creditors unless it has been approved by a majority in number representing two thirds in value of the creditors: see s. 6(1) of the CCAA.

92 The supervising judge rejected the argument that the Tenor DIP Loan was a plan of arrangement or compromise and therefore required the approval of the creditors. He held, at para. 50 of the DIP Financing Reasons:

A "plan of arrangement" or a "compromise" is not defined in the CCAA. It is, however, to be an arrangement or compromise between a debtor and its creditors. The Tenor DIP facility is not on its face such an arrangement or compromise between Crystallex and its creditors. Importantly the rights of the noteholders are not taken away from them by the Tenor DIP facility. The noteholders are unsecured creditors. Their rights are to sue to judgment and enforce the judgment. If not paid, they have a right to apply for a bankruptcy order under the BIA. Under the CCAA, they have the right to vote on a plan of arrangement or compromise. None of these rights are taken away by the Tenor DIP.

93 I agree. While the approval of the Tenor DIP Loan affected the Noteholders' leverage in negotiating a plan, and has made the negotiation of a plan more complex, it did not compromise the terms of their indebtedness or take away any of their legal rights. It is accordingly not an arrangement, and a creditor vote was not required. In this case it was within the discretion of the supervising judge to approve the Tenor DIP Loan.

C. The Appeal from the Management Incentive Plan Approval Order

94 In my view, the supervising judge did not err in principle or unreasonably exercise his discretion in approving the MIP. I see no basis for this court to intervene.

95 As the supervising judge noted, employee retention provisions are frequently authorized before a plan is negotiated. The supervising judge was alive to the exceptionally large amounts that might be paid to beneficiaries of the MIP (including Mr. Fung) in this case. The supervising judge took specific note of the issues that the Noteholders had raised in the past regarding the extent to which the independent committee of the board that recommended the MIP was truly independent, and the steps taken by that committee to address those concerns.

96 The recommendation of an independent committee of the board that has obtained expert advice is entitled to more weight in the consideration of a MIP than is the recommendation of the board in the consideration of whether financing should be approved under s. 11.2 of the CCAA. The CCAA does not list specific factors to be considered by the court in the case of a MIP. Moreover, the board would have the best sense of which employees were essential to the success of its restructuring efforts.

97 In addition to considering the recommendation of the independent committee of the board and Mr. Swartz, the supervising judge also reviewed the evidence to consider whether any persons had been included in the MIP who should not have been. He did not rely solely on the board's recommendation.

VII. DISPOSITION

98 Accordingly, I would dismiss the appeals of the CCAA Bridge Financing Order, the CCAA Financing Order, and the Management Incentive Plan Approval Order.

VIII. COSTS

99 If the parties cannot agree, I would order that Crystallex and Tenor provide their submissions on the issue of costs within 14 days, and that the Noteholders, if so advised, provide their submissions in response within 10 days thereafter. No reply submissions are to be provided without leave.

A. HOY J.A.

D.R. O'CONNOR A.C.J.O.:-- I agree.

R.A. BLAIR J.A.:-- I agree.

cp/e/qlacx/qlpmg/qlmll/qlgpr/qlced/qljac

1 Paragraph 23(1)(b) provides that the monitor shall "review the company's cash-flow statement as to its reasonableness and file a report with the court on the monitor's findings".

2 The MIP was approved subject to an amendment (agreed to by Crystallex) to provide that the value of any stock options ultimately realized by participants of the MIP would be deducted from the amount of any bonus awarded under the MIP on a tax neutral basis.

3 The full text of section 11 is as follows: 11. Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

4 In *Air Canada*, Farley J. approved a "global restructuring agreement" which included a commitment of an existing creditor to provide exit financing of approximately US \$585 million on the company's emergence from CCAA. DIP financing was in place; the financing at issue was clearly recognized as exit financing. The restructuring agreement was not opposed by substantially all of the creditors. Nor was it argued that it adversely affected the ability of the creditors and the debtor to negotiate a compromise or arrangement.

5 The Noteholders proposed that they receive 22.9 per cent of the equity for the \$36 million needed for the arbitration and 58 per cent of the equity in return for giving up their Notes, for a total of approximately 81 per cent of the equity. Assuming that the Noteholders sought a maximum total entitlement of 81 per cent, if they advanced the \$36 million on the terms of the Tenor DIP Loan, as they now seek to do, the amount of equity on conversion of their notes would be 46 per cent. See the DIP Financing Reasons, at para. 77.

6 An incorrect citation for *Stelco* was given in the DIP Financing Reasons, at para. 33.

TAB 11

Indexed as:
Sammi Atlas Inc. (Re)

**IN THE MATTER OF the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act,
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36
IN THE MATTER OF the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990,
c. C-43
IN THE MATTER OF a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Sammi
Atlas Inc.**

[1998] O.J. No. 1089

59 O.T.C. 153

3 C.B.R. (4th) 171

78 A.C.W.S. (3d) 10

Commercial List Nos. 97-BK-000219 and B230/97

Ontario Court of Justice (General Division)
Commercial List

Farley J.

Heard: February 27, 1998.
Judgment: February 27, 1998.

(7 pp.)

Creditors and debtors -- Debtors' relief legislation -- Companies' creditors arrangement legislation -- Arrangement, judicial approval -- Arrangement, judicial approval -- Amendment of Plan.

Application by Sammi Atlas to approve its Plan of compromise and arrangement as amended and approved by its secured creditors. It was also a motion by Argo Partners for an order to direct that a person who held unsecured claims was entitled to elect treatment for each unsecured claim held by it on an individual basis, and not on an aggregate basis as provided for in the Plan. The Plan provided for a sliding scale of distribution. Claims of \$7,500 were entitled to receive the highest amount, namely cash of 95 per cent of the proven claim. Argo had acquired 40 claims. Each claim was under \$100,000, but the aggregate of the claims was over \$100,000. Argo wanted to treat its

claims separately because it could have kept the individual claims separate by having them held by a different person.

HELD: Sammi's application was allowed. Argo's motion was denied. Sammi was a corporation to which the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act applied. The Plan complied with the requirements of the Act. The Plan was fair and reasonable as no one opposed it being approved. Argo merely wanted the Plan amended to accommodate its particular concerns. Argo wanted to amend the Plan after it was voted upon. It wanted a substantive change, which the court lacked jurisdiction to grant under the Act. Argo's change was also not allowed because it was treated fairly and reasonably as a creditor as were all the unsecured creditors. An aggregation clause was not inherently unfair and the sliding scale provisions, which were intended to protect small investors, were reasonable.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

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

Counsel:

Norman J. Emblem, for the applicant, Sammi Atlas Inc.
James Grout, for Argo Partners, Inc.
Thomas Matz, for the Bank of Nova Scotia.
Jay Carfagnini and Ben Zarnett, for Investors' Committee.
Geoffrey Morawetz, for the Trade Creditors' committee.
Clifton Prophet, for Duk Lee.

1 FARLEY J. (endorsement):-- This endorsement deals with two of the motions before me today:

- 1) Applicant's motion for an order approving and sanctioning the Applicant's Plan of Compromise and Arrangement, as amended and approved by the Applicant's unsecured creditors on February 25, 1998; and
- 2) A motion by Argo Partners, Inc. ("Argo"), a creditor by way of assignment, for an order directing that the Plan be amended to provide that a person who, on the record date, held unsecured claims shall be entitled to elect treatment with respect to each unsecured claim held by it on a claim by claim basis (and not on an aggregate basis as provided for in the Plan).

2 As to the Applicant's sanction motion, the general principles to be applied in the exercise of the court's discretion are:

- 1) there must be strict compliance with all statutory requirements and adherence to the previous orders of the court;

- 2) all materials filed and procedures carried out must be examined to determine if anything has been done or purported to be done which is not authorized by the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA"); and
- 3) the Plan must be fair and reasonable.

See *Re Northland Properties Limited* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 175 (B.C.S.C.), affirmed (1989), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 195 (B.C.C.A.) at p. 201; *Re Olympia & York Developments Ltd.* (1993), 12 O.R. (3d) 500 (Gen. Div.) at p. 506.

3 I am satisfied on the material before me that the Applicant was held to be a corporation as to which the CCAA applies, that the Plan was filed with the court in accordance with the previous orders, that notices were appropriately given and published as to claims and meetings, that the meetings were held in accordance with the directions of the court and that the Plan was approved by the requisite majority (in fact it was approved 98.74% in number of the proven claims of creditors voting and by 96.79% dollar value, with Argo abstaining). Thus it would appear that items one and two are met.

4 What of item 3 - is the Plan fair and reasonable? A Plan under the CCAA is a compromise; it cannot be expected to be perfect. It should be approved if it is fair, reasonable and equitable. Equitable treatment is not necessarily equal treatment. Equal treatment may be contrary to equitable treatment. One must look at the creditors as a whole (i.e. generally) and to the objecting creditors (specifically) and see if rights are compromised in an attempt to balance interests (and have the pain of the compromise equitably shared) as opposed to a confiscation of rights: see *Re Campeau Corp.* (1992), 10 C.B.R. (3d) 104 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p. 109. It is recognized that the CCAA contemplates that a minority of creditors is bound by the Plan which a majority have approved - subject only to the court determining that the Plan is fair and reasonable: see *Northland* at p. 201; *Olympia & York* at p. 509. In the present case no one appeared today to oppose the Plan being sanctioned; Argo merely wished that the Plan be amended to accommodate its particular concerns. Of course, to the extent that Argo would be benefited by such an amendment, the other creditors would in effect be disadvantaged since the pot in this case is based on a zero sum game.

5 Those voting on the Plan (and I note there was a very significant "quorum" present at the meeting) do so on a business basis. As Blair J. said at p. 510 of *Olympia & York*:

As the other courts have done, I observe that it is not my function to second guess the business people with respect to the "business" aspects of the Plan, descending into the negotiating arena and substituting my own view of what is a fair and reasonable compromise or arrangement for that of the business judgment of the participants. The parties themselves know best what is in their interests in those areas.

The court should be appropriately reluctant to interfere with the business decisions of creditors reached as a body. There was no suggestion that these creditors were unsophisticated or unable to look out for their own best interests. The vote in the present case is even higher than in *Re Central Guaranty Trustco Ltd.* (1993), 21 C.B.R. (3d) 139 (Ont. Gen. Div.) where I observed at p. 141:

... This on either basis is well beyond the specific majority requirement of CCAA. Clearly there is a very heavy burden on parties seeking to upset a plan that the required majority have found that they could vote for; given the over-

whelming majority this burden is no lighter. This vote by sophisticated lenders speaks volumes as to fairness and reasonableness.

The Courts should not second guess business people who have gone along with the Plan ...

6 Argo's motion is to amend the Plan - after it has been voted on. However I do not see any exceptional circumstances which would support such a motion being brought now. In *Algoma Steel Corp. v. Royal Bank* (1992), 11 C.B.R. (3d) 11 (Ont. C.A.) the Court of Appeal observed at p. 15 that the court's jurisdiction to amend a plan should "be exercised sparingly and in exceptional circumstances only" even if the amendment were merely technical and did not prejudice the interests of the corporation or its creditors and then only where there is jurisdiction under the CCAA to make the amendment requested. I was advised that Argo had considered bringing the motion on earlier but had not done so in the face of "veto" opposition from the major creditors. I am puzzled by this since the creditor or any other appropriate party can always move in court before the Plan is voted on to amend the Plan; voting does not have anything to do with the court granting or dismissing the motion. The court can always determine a matter which may impinge directly and materially upon the fairness and reasonableness of a plan. I note in passing that it would be inappropriate to attempt to obtain a preview of the court's views as to sanctioning by bringing on such a motion. See my views in *Central Guaranty* at p. 143:

... In *Algoma Steel Corp. v. Royal Bank* (1992), 8 O.R. (3d) 449, the Court of Appeal determined that there were exceptional circumstances (unrelated to the Plan) which allowed it to adjust where no interest was adversely affected. The same cannot be said here. FSTQ aside from s. 11(c) of the CCAA also raised s. 7. I am of the view that s. 7 allows an amendment after an adjournment - but not after a vote has been taken. (Emphasis in original)

What Argo wants is a substantive change; I do not see the jurisdiction to grant same under the CCAA.

7 In the subject Plan creditors are to be dealt with on a sliding scale for distribution purposes only; with this scale being on an aggregate basis of all claims held by one claimant:

- i) \$7,500 or less to receive cash of 95% of the proven claim;
- ii) \$7,501 - \$100,000 to receive cash of 90% of the first \$7,500 and 55% of balance; and;
- iii) in excess of \$100,000 to receive shares on a formula basis (subject to creditor agreeing to limit claims to \$100,000 so as to obtain cash as per the previous formula).

8 Such a sliding scale arrangement has been present in many proposals over the years. Argo has not been singled out for special treatment; others who acquired claims by assignment have also been affected. Argo has acquired 40 claims; all under \$100,000 but in the aggregate well over \$100,000. Argo submitted that it could have achieved the result that it wished if it had kept the individual claims it acquired separate by having them held by a different "person"; this is true under the Plan as worded. Conceivably if this type of separation in the face of an aggregation provision were perceived to be inappropriate by a CCAA applicant, then I suppose the language of such a plan could

be "tightened" to eliminate what the applicant perceived as a loophole. I appreciate Argo's position that by buying up the small claims it was providing the original creditors with liquidity but this should not be a determinative factor. I would note that the sliding scale provided here does recognize (albeit imperfectly) that small claims may be equated with small creditors who would more likely wish cash as opposed to non-board lots of shares which would not be as liquidate as cash; the high percentage cash for those proven claims of \$7,500 or under illustrates the desire not to have the "little person" hurt - at least any more than is necessary. The question will come down to balance - the plan must be efficient and attractive enough for it to be brought forward by an applicant with the realistic chance of its succeeding (and perhaps in that regard be "sponsored" by significant creditors) and while not being too generous so that the future of the applicant on an ongoing basis would be in jeopardy; at the same time it must gain enough support amongst the creditor body for it to gain the requisite majority. New creditors by assignment may provide not only liquidity but also a benefit in providing a block of support for a plan which may not have been forthcoming as a small creditor may not think it important to do so. Argo of course has not claimed it is a "little person" in the context of this CCAA proceeding.

9 In my view Argo is being treated fairly and reasonably as a creditor as are all the unsecured creditors. An aggregation clause is not inherently unfair and the sliding scale provisions would appear to me to be aimed at "protecting (or helping out) the little guy" which would appear to be a reasonable policy.

10 The Plan is sanctioned and approved; Argo's aggregation motion is dismissed.

POSTSCRIPT

11 I reviewed with the insolvency practitioners (legal counsel and accountants) the aspect that industrial and commercial concerns in a CCAA setting should be distinguished from "bricks and mortgage" corporations. In their reorganization it is important to maintain the goodwill attributable to employee experience and customer (and supplier) loyalty; this may very quickly erode with uncertainty. Therefore it would, to my mind, be desirable to get down to brass tacks as quickly as possible and perhaps a reasonable target (subject to adjustment up or down according to the circumstances including complexity) would be for a six month period from application to Plan sanction.

FARLEY J.

qp/d/mii/DRS/DRS

**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**

ONTARIO

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COURT OF APPEAL**

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

**BRIEF OF AUTHORITIES OF THE AD HOC
COMMITTEE OF PURCHASERS OF THE APPLICANT'S
SECURITIES, INCLUDING THE REPRESENTATIVE
PLAINTIFFS IN THE ONTARIO CLASS ACTION**

PALIARE ROLAND ROSENBERG ROTHSTEIN LLP

155 Wellington Street West, 35th Floor
Toronto, ON M5V 3H1

Ken Rosenberg / Massimo Starnino
Tel: 416-646-4300 Fax: 416-646-4301

KOSKIE MINSKY LLP

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

Kirk Baert / Jonathan Bida
Tel: 416-977-8353 Fax: 416-977-3316

SISKINDS LLP

680 Waterloo Street
London, ON N6A 3V8

A. Dimitri Lascaris / Charles M. Wright
Tel: 519-672-2121 Fax: 519-672-6065

Lawyers for the Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the
Applicant's Securities, including the Representative Plaintiffs in
the Ontario Class Action and the Quebec Class Action against the
Applicant