

Court of Appeal File Number: M42404
Superior Court File No. CV-12-9667-00CL

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

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

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

Court of Appeal File Number: M42404
Superior Court File No. CV-11-431153-00CP

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

B E T W E E N:

THE TRUSTEES OF THE LABOURERS' PENSION FUND OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN
CANADA and THE TRUSTEES OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING
ENGINEERS LOCAL 793 PENSION PLAN FOR OPERATING ENGINEERS IN ONTARIO

Plaintiffs

-and-

SINO-FOREST CORPORATION, ERNST & YOUNG LLP, ALLEN T.Y. CHAN, W.
JUDSON MARTIN, KAI KIT POON, DAVID J. HORSLEY, WILLIAM E. ARDELL, JAMES
P. BOWLAND, JAMES M.E. HYDE, EDMUN MAK, SIMON MURRAY, PETER WANG,
GARRY J. WEST, PÖYRY (BEIJING) CONSULTING COMPANY LIMITED, CREDIT
SUISSE SECURITIES (CANADA), INC., TD SECURITIES INC., DUNDEE SECURITIES
CORPORATION, RBC DOMINION SECURITIES INC., SCOTIA CAPITAL INC., CIBC
WORLD MARKETS INC., MERRILL LYNCH CANADA INC., CANACCORD FINANCIAL
LTD. and MAISON PLACEMENTS CANADA INC.

Defendants

Proceeding under the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

**RESPONDING MOTION RECORD OF
SINO-FOREST CORPORATION**

(Motion for Directions)

Dated: April 25, 2013

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

Robert W. Staley (LSUC #27115J)
Derek J. Bell (LSUC #43420J)
Jonathan Bell (LSUC #55457P)

Tel: 416-863-1200
Fax: 416-863-1716

Lawyers for Sino-Forest Corporation

TO: THE APPEALS SERVICE LIST

Index

INDEX

Tab	Document	Page
1.	Affidavit of Elizabeth Fimio sworn April 24, 2013	1
A.	Exhibit "A" – Initial Order of Justice Morawetz dated March 30, 2012	3
B.	Exhibit "B" – Affidavit of W. Judson Martin sworn November 29, 2012 (without exhibits)	34
C.	Exhibit "C" – Affidavit of W. Judson Martin sworn January 11, 2013 (without exhibits)	84
D.	Exhibit "D" – Notice of Motion for Leave to Appeal dated April 9, 2013	94

Tab 1

Court of Appeal File Numbers: M42404
Superior Court File No. CV-12-9667-00CL

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

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

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

Court of Appeal File Number: M42404
Superior Court File No. CV-11-431153-00CP

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

B E T W E E N:

THE TRUSTEES OF THE LABOURERS' PENSION FUND OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN
CANADA and THE TRUSTEES OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING
ENGINEERS LOCAL 793 PENSION PLAN FOR OPERATING ENGINEERS IN ONTARIO

Plaintiffs

-and-

SINO-FOREST CORPORATION, ERNST & YOUNG LLP, ALLEN T.Y. CHAN, W.
JUDSON MARTIN, KAI KIT POON, DAVID J. HORSLEY, WILLIAM E. ARDELL, JAMES
P. BOWLAND, JAMES M.E. HYDE, EDMUN MAK, SIMON MURRAY, PETER WANG,
GARRY J. WEST, PÖYRY (BEIJING) CONSULTING COMPANY LIMITED, CREDIT
SUISSE SECURITIES (CANADA), INC., TD SECURITIES INC., DUNDEE SECURITIES
CORPORATION, RBC DOMINION SECURITIES INC., SCOTIA CAPITAL INC., CIBC
WORLD MARKETS INC., MERRILL LYNCH CANADA INC., CANACCORD FINANCIAL
LTD. and MAISON PLACEMENTS CANADA INC.


Defendants


Proceeding under the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

AFFIDAVIT OF ELIZABETH FIMIO
(Sworn April 24, 2013)

I, **ELIZABETH FIMIO**, of the City of Burlington, in the Regional Municipality of Halton, **MAKE OATH AND SAY:**

1. I am an assistant at Bennett Jones LLP, counsel for Sino-Forest Corporation, and as such, have personal knowledge of the matters set out below, except where otherwise stated. Where I do not possess personal knowledge, I have stated the source of my information and I believe such information to be true.
2. Attached as Exhibit "A" is a copy of the Initial Order of Justice Morawetz dated March 30, 2012.
3. Attached as Exhibit "B" is a copy of the affidavit of W. Judson Martin, sworn November 29, 2012, without exhibits.
4. Attached as Exhibit "C" is a copy of the affidavit of W. Judson Martin, sworn January 11, 2013, without exhibits.
5. Attached as Exhibit "D" is a copy of appellants' Notice of Motion for Leave to Appeal the Ernst & Young Settlement Approval Order and the Representative Dismissal Order, dated April 9, 2013.

SWORN BEFORE ME at the City of)
 Toronto, in the Province of Ontario this 24th)
 day of April, 2013)
 _____)


_____)

Elizabeth Fimio

Tab A

THIS IS EXHIBIT "A" TO
THE AFFIDAVIT OF ELIZABETH FIMIO
SWORN APRIL 24, 2013



A Commissioner, etc.

Court File No CV-12-9667-00CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST

THE HONOURABLE MR.
JUSTICE MORAWETZ

)
)
)

FRIDAY, THE 30th
DAY OF MARCH, 2012

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

INITIAL ORDER

THIS APPLICATION, made by Sino-Forest Corporation (the "Applicant"), pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the "CCAA") was heard this day at 330 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.

ON READING the affidavit of W. Judson Martin sworn March 30, 2012 and the Exhibits thereto (the "Martin Affidavit") and the Pre-Filing Report of the Proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc. ("FTI") (the "Monitor's Pre-Filing Report"), and on being advised that there are no secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the charges created herein, and on hearing the submissions of counsel for the Applicant, the Applicant's directors, FTI, the *ad hoc* committee of holders of notes issued by the Applicant (the "Ad Hoc Noteholders"), and no one else appearing for any other party, and on reading the consent of FTI to act as the Monitor,

SERVICE

1. THIS COURT ORDERS that the time for service of the Notice of Application, the Application Record and the Monitor's Pre-Filing Report is hereby abridged and validated so that this Application is properly returnable today and hereby dispenses with further service thereof.

APPLICATION

2. THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES that the Applicant is a company to which the CCAA applies.

PLAN OF ARRANGEMENT

3. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicant shall have the authority to file and may, subject to further order of this Court, file with this Court a plan of compromise or arrangement (hereinafter referred to as the "Plan").

4. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicant shall be entitled to seek any ancillary or other relief from this Court in respect of any of its subsidiaries in connection with the Plan or otherwise in respect of these proceedings.

POSSESSION OF PROPERTY AND OPERATIONS

5. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicant shall remain in possession and control of its current and future assets, undertakings and properties of every nature and kind whatsoever, and wherever situate including all proceeds thereof (the "Property"). Subject to further Order of this Court, the Applicant shall continue to carry on business in a manner consistent with the preservation of its business (the "Business") and Property. The Applicant shall be authorized and empowered to continue to retain and employ the employees, consultants, agents, experts, accountants, counsel and such other persons (collectively "Assistants") currently retained or employed by it, with liberty to retain such further Assistants as it deems reasonably necessary or desirable in the ordinary course of business or for the carrying out of the terms of this Order.

6. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicant shall be entitled but not required to pay the following expenses, whether incurred prior to or after this Order:

- (a) all outstanding and future wages, salaries, employee and pension benefits, vacation pay and expenses payable on or after the date of this Order, in each case incurred in the ordinary course of business and consistent with existing compensation policies and arrangements;
- (b) the fees and disbursements of any Assistants retained or employed by the Applicant in respect of these proceedings, at their standard rates and charges;
- (c) the fees and disbursements of the directors and counsel to the directors, at their standard rates and charges; and
- (d) such other amounts as are set out in the March 29 Forecast (as defined in the Monitor's Pre-Filing Report and attached as Exhibit "DD" to the Martin Affidavit).

7. THIS COURT ORDERS that, except as otherwise provided to the contrary herein, the Applicant shall be entitled but not required to pay all reasonable expenses incurred by the Applicant in carrying on the Business in the ordinary course after this Order, and in carrying out the provisions of this Order, which expenses shall include, without limitation:

- (a) all expenses and capital expenditures reasonably necessary for the preservation of the Property or the Business including, without limitation, payments on account of insurance (including directors and officers insurance), maintenance and security services; and
- (b) payment for goods or services actually supplied to the Applicant following the date of this Order.

8. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicant shall remit, in accordance with legal requirements, or pay:

- (a) any statutory deemed trust amounts in favour of the Crown in right of Canada or of any Province thereof or any other taxation authority which are required to be deducted from employees' wages, including, without limitation, amounts in respect of (i) employment insurance, (ii) Canada Pension Plan, (iii) Quebec Pension Plan, and (iv) income taxes;

- (b) all goods and services or other applicable sales taxes (collectively, "Sales Taxes") required to be remitted by the Applicant in connection with the sale of goods and services by the Applicant, but only where such Sales Taxes are accrued or collected after the date of this Order, or where such Sales Taxes were accrued or collected prior to the date of this Order but not required to be remitted until on or after the date of this Order; and
- (c) any amount payable to the Crown in right of Canada or of any Province thereof or any political subdivision thereof or any other taxation authority in respect of municipal realty, municipal business or other taxes, assessments or levies of any nature or kind which are entitled at law to be paid in priority to claims of secured creditors and which are attributable to or in respect of the carrying on of the Business by the Applicant.

9. THIS COURT ORDERS that until a real property lease is disclaimed or resiliated in accordance with the CCAA, the Applicant shall pay all amounts constituting rent or payable as rent under real property leases (including, for greater certainty, common area maintenance charges, utilities and realty taxes and any other amounts payable to the landlord under the lease) or as otherwise may be negotiated between the Applicant and the landlord from time to time ("Rent"), for the period commencing from and including the date of this Order, twice-monthly in equal payments on the first and fifteenth day of each month, in advance (but not in arrears). On the date of the first of such payments, any Rent relating to the period commencing from and including the date of this Order shall also be paid.

10. THIS COURT ORDERS that, except as specifically permitted herein, the Applicant is hereby directed, until further Order of this Court: (a) to make no payments of principal, interest thereon or otherwise on account of amounts owing by the Applicant to any of its creditors as of this date; (b) to grant no security interests, trust, liens, charges or encumbrances upon or in respect of any of its Property; and (c) to not grant credit or incur liabilities except in the ordinary course of the Business.

RESTRUCTURING

11. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicant shall, subject to such requirements as are imposed by the CCAA and such covenants as may be contained in the Support Agreement (as defined below), have the right to:

- (a) permanently or temporarily cease, downsize or shut down any of its business or operations, and to dispose of redundant or non-material assets not exceeding US\$500,000 in any one transaction or US\$1,000,000 in the aggregate;
- (b) terminate the employment of such of its employees or temporarily lay off such of its employees as it deems appropriate; and
- (c) pursue all avenues of refinancing of its Business or Property, in whole or part, subject to prior approval of this Court being obtained before any material refinancing

all of the foregoing to permit the Applicant to proceed with an orderly restructuring of the Business.

12. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicant shall provide each of the relevant landlords with notice of the Applicant's intention to remove any fixtures from any leased premises at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the intended removal. The relevant landlord shall be entitled to have a representative present in the leased premises to observe such removal and, if the landlord disputes the Applicant's entitlement to remove any such fixture under the provisions of the lease, such fixture shall remain on the premises and shall be dealt with as agreed between any applicable secured creditors, such landlord and the Applicant, or by further Order of this Court upon application by the Applicant on at least two (2) days notice to such landlord and any such secured creditors. If the Applicant disclaims or resiliates the lease governing such leased premises in accordance with Section 32 of the CCAA, it shall not be required to pay Rent under such lease pending resolution of any such dispute (other than Rent payable for the notice period provided for in Section 32(5) of the CCAA), and the disclaimer or resiliation of the lease shall be without prejudice to the Applicant's claim to the fixtures in dispute.

13. THIS COURT ORDERS that if a notice of disclaimer or resiliation is delivered pursuant to Section 32 of the CCAA, then (a) during the notice period prior to the effective time of the

disclaimer or resiliation, the landlord may show the affected leased premises to prospective tenants during normal business hours, on giving the Applicant and the Monitor 24 hours' prior written notice, and (b) at the effective time of the disclaimer or resiliation, the relevant landlord shall be entitled to take possession of any such leased premises without waiver of or prejudice to any claims or rights such landlord may have against the Applicant in respect of such lease or leased premises and such landlord shall be entitled to notify the Applicant of the basis on which it is taking possession and to gain possession of and re-lease such leased premises to any third party or parties on such terms as such landlord considers advisable, provided that nothing herein shall relieve such landlord of its obligation to mitigate any damages claimed in connection therewith.

RESTRUCTURING SUPPORT AGREEMENT

14. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicant and the Monitor are authorized and directed to engage in the following procedures to notify noteholders of the restructuring support agreement dated as of March 30, 2012 (the "Support Agreement") between, among others, the Applicant and certain noteholders (the "Initial Consenting Noteholders"), appended as Exhibit "B" to the Martin Affidavit, to enable any additional noteholders to execute a Joinder Agreement in the form attached as Schedule "C" to the Support Agreement and to become bound thereby as Consenting Noteholders (as defined in the Support Agreement):

- (a) the Monitor shall without delay post a copy of the Support Agreement on its website at <http://ofcanada.fticonsulting.com/sfo> (the "Monitor's Website"); and
- (b) the notice to be published by the Monitor pursuant to paragraph 51 of this Order shall include a statement in form and substance acceptable to the Applicant, the Monitor and counsel to the Ad Hoc Noteholders, each acting reasonably, notifying noteholders of the Support Agreement and of the deadline of 5:00 p.m. (Toronto time) on May 15, 2012 (the "Consent Date") by which any noteholder (other than an Initial Consenting Noteholder) who wishes to become entitled to the Early Consent Consideration pursuant to the Support Agreement (if such Early Consent Consideration becomes payable pursuant to the terms thereof) must execute and return the Joinder Agreement to the Applicant, and shall direct noteholders to the Monitor's Website where a copy of the Support Agreement (including the Joinder Agreement) can be obtained.

15. THIS COURT ORDERS that any noteholder (other than an Initial Consenting Noteholder) who wishes to become a Consenting Noteholder and become entitled to the Early Consent Consideration (if such Early Consent Consideration becomes payable pursuant to the terms thereof, and subject to such noteholder demonstrating its holdings to the Monitor in accordance with the Support Agreement) must execute a Joinder Agreement and return it to the Applicant and the Noteholder Advisors (as defined below) in accordance with the instructions set out in the Support Agreement such that it is received by the Applicant and the Noteholder Advisors prior to the Consent Deadline and, upon so doing, such noteholder shall become a Consenting Noteholder and shall be bound by the terms of the Support Agreement.

16. THIS COURT ORDERS that as soon as practicable after the Consent Deadline, the Applicant shall provide to the Monitor copies of all executed Joinder Agreements received from noteholders prior to the Consent Deadline.

NO PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE APPLICANT OR THE PROPERTY

17. THIS COURT ORDERS that until and including April 29, 2012, or such later date as this Court may order (the "Stay Period"), no proceeding or enforcement process in any court or tribunal (each, a "Proceeding") shall be commenced or continued against or in respect of the Applicant or the Monitor, or affecting the Business or the Property, except with the written consent of the Applicant and the Monitor, or with leave of this Court, and any and all Proceedings currently under way against or in respect of the Applicant or affecting the Business or the Property are hereby stayed and suspended pending further Order of this Court.

18. THIS COURT ORDERS that until and including the Stay Period, no Proceeding shall be commenced or continued by any noteholder, indenture trustee or security trustee (each in respect of the notes issued by the Applicant, collectively, the "Noteholders") against or in respect of any of the Applicant's subsidiaries listed on Schedule "A" (each a "Subsidiary Guarantor", and collectively, the "Subsidiary Guarantors"), except with the written consent of the Applicant and the Monitor, or with leave of this Court, and any and all Proceedings currently under way by a Noteholder against or in respect of any Subsidiary Guarantors are hereby stayed and suspended pending further Order of this Court.

NO EXERCISE OF RIGHTS OR REMEDIES

19. THIS COURT ORDERS that during the Stay Period, all rights and remedies of any individual, firm, corporation, governmental body or agency, or any other entities (all of the foregoing, collectively being "Persons" and each being a "Person") against or in respect of the Applicant or the Monitor, or affecting the Business or the Property, are hereby stayed and suspended and shall not be commenced, proceeded with or continued, except with the written consent of the Applicant and the Monitor, or leave of this Court, provided that nothing in this Order shall (i) empower the Applicant to carry on any business which the Applicant is not lawfully entitled to carry on, (ii) affect such investigations, actions, suits or proceedings by a regulatory body as are permitted by Section 11.1 of the CCAA, (iii) prevent the filing of any registration to preserve or perfect a security interest, (iv) prevent the registration of a claim for lien, or (v) prevent the exercise of any termination rights of the Consenting Noteholders under the Support Agreement.

20. THIS COURT ORDERS that during the Stay Period, all rights and remedies of the Noteholders against or in respect of the Subsidiary Guarantors are hereby stayed and suspended and shall not be commenced, proceeded with or continued, except with the written consent of the Applicant and the Monitor, or leave of this Court, provided that nothing in this Order shall (i) empower any Subsidiary Guarantor to carry on any business which such Subsidiary Guarantor is not lawfully entitled to carry on, (ii) affect such investigations, actions, suits or proceedings by a regulatory body as are permitted by Section 11.1 of the CCAA, (iii) prevent the filing of any registration to preserve or perfect a security interest, or (iv) prevent the registration of a claim for lien.

NO INTERFERENCE WITH RIGHTS

21. THIS COURT ORDERS that during the Stay Period, no Person shall discontinue, fail to honour, alter, interfere with, repudiate, terminate or cease to perform any right, renewal right, contract, agreement, licence or permit in favour of or held by the Applicant, except with the written consent of the Applicant and the Monitor, or leave of this Court.

CONTINUATION OF SERVICES

22. THIS COURT ORDERS that during the Stay Period, all Persons having oral or written agreements with the Applicant or statutory or regulatory mandates for the supply of goods and/or services, including without limitation all computer software, communication and other data services, centralized banking services, payroll services, insurance, transportation services, utility or other services to the Business or the Applicant, are hereby restrained until further Order of this Court from discontinuing, altering, interfering with or terminating the supply of such goods or services as may be required by the Applicant or exercising any other remedy provided under such agreement or arrangements, and that the Applicant shall be entitled to the continued use of its current premises, telephone numbers, facsimile numbers, internet addresses and domain names, provided in each case that the normal prices or charges for all such goods or services received after the date of this Order are paid by the Applicant in accordance with normal payment practices of the Applicant or such other practices as may be agreed upon by the supplier or service provider and each of the Applicant and the Monitor, or as may be ordered by this Court.

NON-DEROGATION OF RIGHTS

23. THIS COURT ORDERS that, notwithstanding anything else in this Order, no Person shall be prohibited from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of lease or licensed property or other valuable consideration provided on or after the date of this Order, nor shall any Person be under any obligation on or after the date of this Order to advance or re-advance any monies or otherwise extend any credit to the Applicant. Nothing in this Order shall derogate from the rights conferred and obligations imposed by the CCAA.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

24. THIS COURT ORDERS that during the Stay Period, and except as permitted by subsection 11.03(2) of the CCAA, no Proceeding may be commenced or continued against any of the former, current or future directors or officers of the Applicant with respect to any claim against the directors or officers that arose before the date hereof and that relates to any obligations of the Applicant whereby the directors or officers are alleged under any law to be liable in their capacity as directors or officers for the payment or performance of such

obligations, until a compromise or arrangement in respect of the Applicant, if one is filed, is sanctioned by this Court or is refused by the affected creditors of the Applicant or this Court.

DIRECTORS' AND OFFICERS' INDEMNIFICATION AND CHARGE

25. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicant shall (i) indemnify its directors and officers against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as directors or officers of the Applicant after the commencement of the within proceedings, and (ii) make payments of amounts for which its directors and officers may be liable as obligations they may incur as directors or officers of the Applicant after the commencement of the within proceedings, except to the extent that, with respect to any officer or director, the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct.

26. THIS COURT ORDERS that the directors and officers of the Applicant shall be entitled to the benefit of and are hereby granted a charge (the "Directors' Charge") on the Property (other than the Applicant's assets which are subject to the Personal Property Security Act registrations on Schedule "B" hereto (the "Excluded Property")), which charge shall not exceed an aggregate amount of \$3,200,000, as security for the indemnity provided in paragraph 25 of this Order. The Directors' Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 38 and 40 herein.

27. THIS COURT ORDERS that, notwithstanding any language in any applicable insurance policy to the contrary, (a) no insurer shall be entitled to be subrogated to or claim the benefit of the Directors' Charge, and (b) the Applicant's directors and officers shall only be entitled to the benefit of the Directors' Charge to the extent that they do not have coverage under any directors' and officers' insurance policy, or to the extent that such coverage is insufficient to pay amounts indemnified in accordance with paragraph 25 of this Order.

APPOINTMENT OF MONITOR

28. THIS COURT ORDERS that FTI is hereby appointed pursuant to the CCAA as the Monitor, an officer of this Court, to monitor the business and financial affairs of the Applicant with the powers and obligations set out in the CCAA or set forth herein and that the Applicant and its shareholders, officers, directors, and Assistants shall advise the Monitor of all material steps taken by the Applicant pursuant to this Order, and shall co-operate fully with the Monitor

in the exercise of its powers and discharge of its obligations and provide the Monitor with the assistance that is necessary to enable the Monitor to adequately carry out the Monitor's functions.

29. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Monitor, in addition to its prescribed rights and obligations under the CCAA, is hereby directed and empowered to:

- (a) monitor the Applicant's receipts and disbursements;
- (b) report to this Court at such times and intervals as the Monitor may deem appropriate with respect to matters relating to the Property, the Business, and such other matters as may be relevant to the proceedings herein;
- (c) advise the Applicant in its preparation of the Applicant's cash flow statements, as required from time to time;
- (d) advise the Applicant in its development of the Plan and any amendments to the Plan;
- (e) assist the Applicant, to the extent required by the Applicant, with the holding and administering of creditors' or shareholders' meetings for voting on the Plan, as applicable;
- (f) have full and complete access to the Property, including the premises, books, records, data, including data in electronic form, and other financial documents of the Applicant to the extent that is necessary to adequately assess the Applicant's business and financial affairs or to perform its duties arising under this Order;
- (g) be at liberty to engage independent legal counsel or such other persons as the Monitor deems necessary or advisable respecting the exercise of its powers and performance of its obligations under this Order;
- (h) carry out and fulfill its obligations under the Support Agreement in accordance with its terms; and
- (i) perform such other duties as are required by this Order or by this Court from time to time.

30. THIS COURT ORDERS that without limiting paragraph 29 above, in carrying out its rights and obligations in connection with this Order, the Monitor shall be entitled to take such reasonable steps and use such services as it deems necessary in discharging its powers and obligations, including, without limitation, utilizing the services of FTI Consulting (Hong Kong) Limited ("FTI HK").

31. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Monitor shall not take possession of the Property (or any property or assets of the Applicant's subsidiaries) and shall take no part whatsoever in the management or supervision of the management of the Business (or any business of the Applicant's subsidiaries) and shall not, by fulfilling its obligations hereunder, be deemed to have taken or maintained possession or control of the Business or Property, or any part thereof (or of any business, property or assets, or any part thereof, of any subsidiary of the Applicant).

32. THIS COURT ORDERS that nothing herein contained shall require the Monitor to occupy or to take control, care, charge, possession or management (separately and/or collectively, "Possession") of any of the Property (or any property of any subsidiary of the Applicant) that might be environmentally contaminated, might be a pollutant or a contaminant, or might cause or contribute to a spill, discharge, release or deposit of a substance contrary to any federal, provincial or other law respecting the protection, conservation, enhancement, remediation or rehabilitation of the environment or relating to the disposal of waste or other contamination including, without limitation, the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act*, the *Ontario Environmental Protection Act*, the *Ontario Water Resources Act*, or the *Ontario Occupational Health and Safety Act* and regulations thereunder (the "Environmental Legislation"), provided however that nothing herein shall exempt the Monitor from any duty to report or make disclosure imposed by applicable Environmental Legislation. The Monitor shall not, as a result of this Order or anything done in pursuance of the Monitor's duties and powers under this Order, be deemed to be in Possession of any of the Property (or of any property of any subsidiary of the Applicant) within the meaning of any Environmental Legislation, unless it is actually in possession.

33. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Monitor shall provide any creditor of the Applicant with information provided by the Applicant in response to reasonable requests for information made in writing by such creditor addressed to the Monitor. The Monitor shall not have any

responsibility or liability with respect to the information disseminated by it pursuant to this paragraph. In the case of information that the Monitor has been advised by the Applicant is confidential, the Monitor shall not provide such information to creditors unless otherwise directed by this Court or on such terms as the Monitor and the Applicant may agree.

34. THIS COURT ORDERS that, in addition to the rights and protections afforded the Monitor under the CCAA or as an officer of this Court, the Monitor shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of its appointment or the carrying out of the provisions of this Order, save and except for any gross negligence or wilful misconduct on its part. Nothing in this Order shall derogate from the protections afforded the Monitor by the CCAA or any applicable legislation.

35. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Monitor, counsel to the Monitor, counsel to the Applicant, counsel to the directors, Houlhan Lokey Capital Inc. (the "Financial Advisor"), FTI HK, counsel to the Ad Hoc Noteholders and the financial advisor to the Ad Hoc Noteholders (together with counsel to the Ad Hoc Noteholders, the "Noteholder Advisors") shall be paid their reasonable fees and disbursements, in each case at their standard rates and charges, by the Applicant, whether incurred prior to or subsequent to the date of this Order, as part of the costs of these proceedings. The Applicant is hereby authorized and directed to pay the accounts of the Monitor, counsel for the Monitor, counsel for the Applicant, counsel to the directors, the Financial Advisor, FTI HK, and the Noteholder Advisors on a weekly basis or otherwise in accordance with the terms of their engagement letters.

36. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Monitor and its legal counsel shall pass their accounts from time to time, and for this purpose the accounts of the Monitor and its legal counsel are hereby referred to a judge of the Commercial List of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice.

37. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Monitor, counsel to the Monitor, the Applicant's counsel, counsel to the directors, the Financial Advisor, FTI HK, and the Noteholder Advisors shall be entitled to the benefit of and are hereby granted a charge (the "Administration Charge") on the Property (other than the Excluded Property), which charge shall not exceed an aggregate amount of \$15,000,000 as security for their professional fees and disbursements incurred at their respective standard rates and charges in respect of such services, both before and after the making of this Order in respect of these proceedings. The Administration Charge shall have the priority set out in paragraphs 38 and 40 hereof.

VALIDITY AND PRIORITY OF CHARGES CREATED BY THIS ORDER

38. THIS COURT ORDERS that the priorities of the Directors' Charge and the Administration Charge, as between them, shall be as follows:

First -- Administration Charge (to the maximum amount of \$15,000,000); and

Second -- Directors' Charge (to the maximum amount of \$3,200,000).

39. THIS COURT ORDERS that the filing, registration or perfection of the Directors' Charge or the Administration Charge (collectively, the "Charges") shall not be required, and that the Charges shall be valid and enforceable for all purposes, including as against any right, title or interest filed, registered, recorded or perfected subsequent to the Charges coming into existence, notwithstanding any such failure to file, register, record or perfect.

40. THIS COURT ORDERS that each of the Charges shall constitute a charge on the Property (other than the Excluded Property) and shall rank in priority to all other security interests, trusts, liens, charges and encumbrances, claims of secured creditors, statutory or otherwise (collectively, "Encumbrances") in favour of any Person.

41. THIS COURT ORDERS that except as otherwise expressly provided for herein, or as may be approved by this Court, the Applicant shall not grant any Encumbrances over any Property that rank in priority to, or *pari passu* with, any of the Charges, unless the Applicant also obtains the prior written consent of the Monitor, the beneficiaries of the Directors' Charge and the beneficiaries of the Administration Charge, or further Order of this Court.

42. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Charges shall not be rendered invalid or unenforceable and the rights and remedies of the chargees entitled to the benefit of the Charges (collectively, the "Chargees"), shall not otherwise be limited or impaired in any way by (a) the pendency of these proceedings and the declarations of insolvency made herein; (b) any application(s) for bankruptcy order(s) issued pursuant to the BIA, or any bankruptcy order made pursuant to such applications; (c) the filing of any assignments for the general benefit of creditors made pursuant to the BIA; (d) the provisions of any federal or provincial statutes; or (e) any negative covenants, prohibitions or other similar provisions with respect to borrowings, incurring debt or the creation of Encumbrances, contained in any existing loan documents, lease, sublease, offer to lease or

other agreement (collectively, an "Agreement") which binds the Applicant, and notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in any Agreement:

- (a) neither the creation of the Charges nor the execution, delivery, perfection, registration or performance of any documents in respect thereof shall create or be deemed to constitute a breach by the Applicant of any Agreement to which it is a party;
- (b) none of the Chargees shall have any liability to any Person whatsoever as a result of any breach of any Agreement caused by or resulting from the creation of the Charges; and
- (c) the payments made by the Applicant pursuant to this Order and the granting of the Charges, do not and will not constitute preferences, fraudulent conveyances, transfers at undervalue, oppressive conduct, or other challengeable or voidable transactions under any applicable law.

43. THIS COURT ORDERS that any Charge created by this Order over leases of real property in Canada shall only be a Charge in the Applicant's interest in such real property leases.

APPROVAL OF FINANCIAL ADVISOR AGREEMENT

44. THIS COURT ORDERS that the letter agreement dated as of December 22, 2012 with respect to the Financial Advisor in the form attached as Exhibit "CC" to the Martin Affidavit (the "Financial Advisor Agreement") and the retention of the Financial Advisor under the terms thereof, including the payments to be made to the Financial Advisor thereunder, are hereby approved.

45. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicant is authorized and directed to make the payments contemplated in the Financial Advisor Agreement in accordance with the terms and conditions thereof.

POSTPONEMENT OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

46. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicant be and is hereby relieved of any obligation to call and hold an annual meeting of its shareholders until further Order of this Court.

FOREIGN PROCEEDINGS

47. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Monitor is hereby authorized and empowered to act as the foreign representative in respect of the within proceedings for the purpose of having these proceedings recognized in a jurisdiction outside of Canada.

48. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Monitor is hereby authorized, as the foreign representative of the Applicant and of the within proceedings, to apply for foreign recognition of these proceedings, as necessary, in any jurisdiction outside of Canada, including as "Foreign Main Proceedings" in the United States pursuant to Chapter 15 of the *U.S. Bankruptcy Code*.

49. THIS COURT HEREBY REQUESTS the aid and recognition of any court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body having jurisdiction in Canada, the United States, Barbados, the British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Hong Kong, the People's Republic of China or in any other foreign jurisdiction, to give effect to this Order and to assist the Applicant, the Monitor and their respective agents in carrying out the terms of this Order. All courts, tribunals, regulatory and administrative bodies are hereby respectfully requested to make such orders and to provide such assistance to the Applicant and to the Monitor, as an officer of this Court, as may be necessary or desirable to give effect to this Order, to grant representative status to the Monitor in any foreign proceeding, or to assist the Applicant and the Monitor and their respective agents in carrying out the terms of this Order.

50. THIS COURT ORDERS that each of the Applicant and the Monitor be at liberty and is hereby authorized and empowered to apply to any court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body, wherever located, for the recognition of this Order and for assistance in carrying out the terms of this Order and any other Order issued in these proceedings.

SERVICE AND NOTICE

51. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Monitor shall (i) without delay, publish in the Globe and Mail and the Wall Street Journal a notice containing the information prescribed under the CCAA, (ii) within seven days after the date of this Order, (A) make this Order publicly available in the manner prescribed under the CCAA, (B) send, in the prescribed manner, a notice to every known creditor who has a claim against the Applicant of more than \$1,000, and (C) prepare a list showing the names and addresses of those creditors and the estimated amounts of those claims, and make it publicly available in the prescribed manner, all in accordance with Section 23(1)(a) of the CCAA and the regulations made thereunder.

52. THIS COURT ORDERS that each of the Applicant and the Monitor be at liberty to serve this Order, any other materials and orders in these proceedings, any notices or other correspondence, by forwarding true copies thereof by prepaid ordinary mail, courier, personal delivery, facsimile transmission or email to the Applicant's creditors or other interested parties at their respective addresses as last shown on the records of the Applicant and that any such service or notice by courier, personal delivery or electronic transmission shall be deemed to be received on the next business day following the date of forwarding thereof, or if sent by ordinary mail, on the third business day after mailing.

53. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicant, the Monitor, and any party who has filed a Notice of Appearance may serve any court materials in these proceedings by e-mailing a PDF or other electronic copy of such materials to counsels' email addresses as recorded on the Service List from time to time, and the Monitor may post a copy of any or all such materials on the Monitor's Website.

GENERAL

54. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Applicant or the Monitor may from time to time apply to this Court for advice and directions in the discharge of its powers and duties hereunder.

55. THIS COURT ORDERS that nothing in this Order shall prevent the Monitor from acting as an interim receiver, a receiver, a receiver and manager, or a trustee in bankruptcy of the Applicant, the Business or the Property.

56. THIS COURT ORDERS that any interested party (including the Applicant and the Monitor) may apply to this Court to vary or amend this Order on not less than seven (7) days notice to any other party or parties likely to be affected by the order sought or upon such other notice, if any, as this Court may order.

57. THIS COURT ORDERS that this Order and all of its provisions are effective as of 12:01 a.m. Eastern Standard/Daylight Time on the date of this Order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. J. Rawlinson", is written over a horizontal line.

ENTERED AT / INSCRIT A TORONTO
ON / BOOK NO:
LE / DANS LE REGISTRE NO.:

APR 2 - 2012

Handwritten initials, possibly "NM", in black ink.

Schedule "A"

1. Sino-Panel Holdings Limited (BVI)
2. Sino-Global Holdings Inc. (BVI)
3. Sino-Wood Partners, Limited (HK)
4. Grandeur Winway Limited (BVI)
5. Sinowin Investments Limited (BVI)
6. Sinowood Limited (Cayman Islands)
7. Sino-Forest Bio-Science Limited (BVI)
8. Sino-Forest Resources Inc. (BVI)
9. Sino-Plantation Limited (HK)
10. Suri-Wood Inc. (BVI)
11. Sino-Forest Investments Limited (BVI)
12. Sino-Wood (Guangxi) Limited (HK)
13. Sino-Wood (Jiangxi) Limited (HK)
14. Sino-Wood (Guangdong) Limited (HK)
15. Sino-Wood (Fujian) Limited (HK)
16. Sino-Panel (Asia) Inc. (BVI)
17. Sino-Panel (Guangxi) Limited (BVI)
18. Sino-Panel (Yunnan) Limited (BVI)
19. Sino-Panel (North East China) Limited (BVI)
20. Sino-Panel [Xiangxi] Limited (BVI)
21. Sino-Panel [Hunan] Limited (BVI)
22. SFR (China) Inc. (BVI)
23. Sino-Panel [Suzhou] Limited (BVI)
24. Sino-Panel (Caoyao) Ltd. (BVI)
25. Sino-Panel (Guangzhou) Limited (BVI)
26. Sino-Panel (North Sea) Limited (BVI)
27. Sino-Panel (Guizhou) Limited (BVI)
28. Sino-Panel (Huailhua) Limited (BVI)
29. Sino-Panel (Qinzhou) Limited (BVI)
30. Sino-Panel (Yongzhou) Limited (BVI)
31. Sino-Panel (Fujian) Limited (BVI)
32. Sino-Panel (Shaoyang) Limited (BVI)
33. Amplemax Worldwide Limited (BVI)
34. Ace Supreme International Limited (BVI)
35. Express Point Holdings Limited (BVI)
36. Glory Billion International Limited (BVI)
37. Smart Sure Enterprises Limited (BVI)
38. Expert Bonus Investment Limited (BVI)
39. Dynamic Profit Holdings Limited (BVI)
40. Alliance Max Limited (BVI)
41. Brain Force Limited (BVI)
42. General Excel Limited (BVI)
43. Poly Market Limited (BVI)
44. Prime Kinetic Limited (BVI)
45. Trillion Edge Limited (BVI)
46. Sino-Panel (China) Nursery Limited (BVI)

47. Sino-Wood Trading Limited (BVI)
48. Homix Limited (BVI)
49. Sino-Panel Trading Limited (BVI)
50. Sino-Panel (Russia) Limited (BVI)
51. Sino-Global Management Consulting Inc. (BVI)
52. Value quest International Limited (BVI)
53. Well Keen Worldwide Limited (BVI)
54. Harvest Wonder Worldwide Limited (BVI)
55. Cheer Gold Worldwide Limited (BVI)
56. Regal Win Capital Limited (BVI)
57. Rich Choice Worldwide Limited (BVI)
58. Sino-Forest International (Barbados) Corporation
59. Mandra Forestry Holdings Limited (BVI)
60. Mandra Forestry Finance Limited (BVI)
61. Mandra Forestry Anhui Limited (BVI)
62. Mandra Forestry Hubel Limited (BVI)
63. Sino-Capital Global Inc. (BVI)
64. Elite Legacy Limited (BVI)

PERSONAL PROPERTY SECURITY REGISTRATION SYSTEM
SEARCH RESULTS

Date Search Conducted: 3/29/2012
File Currency Date: 03/28/2012
Family(ies): 6
Page(s): 8

SEARCH : Business Debtor : SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

The attached report has been created based on the data received by Cyberbahn, a Thomson Reuters business from the Province of Ontario, Ministry of Government Services. No liability is assumed by Cyberbahn regarding its correctness, timeliness, completeness or the interpretation and use of the report. Use of the Cyberbahn service, including this report is subject to the terms and conditions of Cyberbahn's subscription agreement.

PERSONAL PROPERTY SECURITY REGISTRATION SYSTEM
SEARCH RESULTS

Date Search Conducted: 3/29/2012
File Currency Date: 03/28/2012
Family(ies): 6
Page(s): 8

SEARCH : Business Debtor : SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

FAMILY : 1 OF 6 ENQUIRY PAGE : 1 OF 8
SEARCH : BD : SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

00 FILE NUMBER : 609324408 EXPIRY DATE : 27SEP 2015 STATUS :
01 CAUTION FILING : PAGE : 001 OF 1 MV SCHEDULE ATTACHED :
REG NUM : 20040927 1631 1793 0430 REG TYP: P PPSA REG PERIOD: 10
02 IND DOB : IND NAME:
03 BUS NAME: SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

OCN :
04 ADDRESS : 90 BURNHAMTHORPE ROAD WEST, SUITE 1208
CITY : MISSISSAUGA PROV: ON POSTAL CODE: L5B3C3
05 IND DOB : IND NAME:
06 BUS NAME:

OCN :
07 ADDRESS :
CITY : PROV: POSTAL CODE:

08 SECURED PARTY/LIEN CLAIMANT :
LAW DEBENTURE TRUST COMPANY OF NEW YORK

09 ADDRESS : 767 THIRD AVENUE, 31ST FLOOR
CITY : NEW YORK PROV: NY POSTAL CODE: 10017
CONS. MV DATE OF OR NO FIXED
GOODS INVTY. EQUIP ACCTS OTHER INCL AMOUNT MATURITY MAT DATE
10 YEAR MAKE X X MODEL V.I.N.

11
12

GENERAL COLLATERAL DESCRIPTION

13 PLEDGE OF SHARES OF CERTAIN SUBSIDIARIES OF THE DEBTOR PURSUANT TO
14 A PLEDGE AGREEMENT AND SHARE CHARGE.
15

16 AGENT: AIRD & BERLIS LLP #2

17 ADDRESS : 181 BAY STREET, SUITE 1800
CITY : TORONTO PROV: ON POSTAL CODE: M5J2T9

FAMILY : 1 OF 6 ENQUIRY PAGE : 2 OF 8
 SEARCH ; BD : SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

FILE NUMBER 609324408
 REGISTRATION NUM REG TYPE
 01 CAUTION : PAGE TOT 20090720 1614 1793 6085
 001 OF 1 MV SCHED:
 21 REFERENCE FILE NUMBER : 609324408
 22 AMEND PAGE; NO PAGE; CHANGE: A AMNDMNT REN YEARS; CORR PER:
 23 REFERENCE DEBTOR/ IND NAME;
 24 TRANSFEROR: BUS NAME: SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

25 OTHER CHANGE;
 26 REASON: TO AMEND SECURED PARTY ADDRESS AND TO AMEND GENERAL COLLATERAL
 27 /DESCR: DESCRIPTION TO DELETE THE WORDS "PURSUANT TO A PLEDGE AGREEMENT AND
 28 : SHARE CHARGE"
 02/05 IND/TRANSFEEE:
 03/06 BUS NAME/TRFEE:

OCN:

04/07 ADDRESS:
 CITY: PROV: POSTAL CODE:
 29 ASSIGNOR:

08 SECURED PARTY/LIEN CLAIMANT/ASSIGNEE :
 LAW DEBENTURE TRUST COMPANY OF NEW YORK
 09 ADDRESS : 400 MADISON AVENUE, 4TH FLOOR
 CITY : NEW YORK PROV : NY POSTAL CODE : 10017
 CONS. MV DATE OF NO FIXED
 GOODS INVTRY EQUIP ACCTS OTHER INCL AMOUNT MATURITY OR MAT DATE

10

11

12

13 PLEDGE OF SHARES OF CERTAIN SUBSIDIARIES OF THE DEBTOR

14

15

16 NAME : AIRD & BERLIS LLP

17 ADDRESS : 181 BAY STREET, SUITE 1800, BOX# 754

CITY : TORONTO PROV : ON POSTAL CODE : M5J2T9

FAMILY : 1 OF 6
SEARCH : BD : SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

ENQUIRY PAGE : 3 OF 8

01 CAUTION : PAGE TOT REGISTRATION NUM REG TYPE
001 OF 1 MV SCHED: 20090720 1616 1793 6087
21 REFERENCE FILE NUMBER : 609324408
22 AMEND PAGE: NO PAGE; CHANGE: B RENEWAL REN YEARS: 1 CORR PER;
23 REFERENCE DEBTOR/ IND NAME;
24 TRANSFEROR: BUS NAME: SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

25 OTHER CHANGE:
26 REASON:
27 /DESCR;
28 :
02/05 IND/TRANSFEE:
03/06 BUS NAME/TRFEE:

OCN:

04/07 ADDRESS:
CITY: PROV: POSTAL CODE:
29 ASSIGNOR:

08 SECURED PARTY/LIEN CLAIMANT/ASSIGNEE :

09 ADDRESS :
CITY ; PROV : POSTAL CODE ;
CONS, MV DATE OF NO FIXED
GOODS INVTRY EQUIP ACCTS OTHER INCL AMOUNT MATURITY OR MAT DATE

10
11
12
13
14
15

16 NAME : AIRD & BERLIS LLP
17 ADDRESS : 181 BAY STREET, SUITE 1800, BOX# 754
CITY ; TORONTO PROV : ON POSTAL CODE : M5J2T9

FAMILY : 2 OF 6 ENQUIRY PAGE : 4 OF 8
SEARCH : BD : SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

00 FILE NUMBER : 650314305 EXPIRY DATE : 03DEC 2013 STATUS :
01 CAUTION FILING : PAGE : 001 OF 1 MV SCHEDULE ATTACHED :
REG NUM : 20081203 1055 1793 9576 REG TYP: P PPSA REG PERIOD: 5
02 IND DOB : IND NAME:
03 BUS NAME: SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

04 ADDRESS : 1208-90 BURNHAMTHORPE RD W OCN :
CITY : MISSISSAUGA PROV: ON POSTAL CODE: L5B3C3
05 IND DOB : IND NAME:
06 BUS NAME:

07 ADDRESS : OCN :
CITY : PROV: POSTAL CODE:

08 SECURED PARTY/LIEN CLAIMANT :
XEROX CANADA LTD

09 ADDRESS : 33 BLOOR ST. E. 3RD FLOOR
CITY : TORONTO PROV: ON POSTAL CODE: M4W3H1
CONS. MV DATE OF OR NO FIXED
GOODS INVTRY. EQUIP ACCTS OTHER INCL AMOUNT MATURITY MAT DATE
10 YEAR MAKE X X MODEL V.I.N. X

11
12
GENERAL COLLATERAL DESCRIPTION
13

14
15
16 AGENT: XEROX CANADA LTD
17 ADDRESS : 33 BLOOR ST. E. 3RD FLOOR
CITY : TORONTO PROV: ON POSTAL CODE: M4W3H1

FAMILY : 3 OF 6 ENQUIRY PAGE : 5 OF 8
SEARCH : BD : SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

00 FILE NUMBER : 655022304 EXPIRY DATE : 20JUL 2015 STATUS :
01 CAUTION FILING : PAGE : 001 OF 1 MV SCHEDULE ATTACHED :
REG NUM : 20090720 1615 1793 6086 REG TYP: P PPSA REG PERIOD: 6
02 IND DOB : IND NAME:
03 BUS NAME: SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

OCN :
04 ADDRESS : 90 BURNHAMTHORPE ROAD WEST, SUITE 1208
CITY : MISSISSAUGA PROV: ON POSTAL CODE: L5B3C3
05 IND DOB : IND NAME:
06 BUS NAME:

OCN :
07 ADDRESS :
CITY : PROV: POSTAL CODE:

08 SECURED PARTY/LIEN CLAIMANT :
LAW DEBENTURE TRUST COMPANY OF NEW YORK

09 ADDRESS : 400 MADISON AVENUE, 4TH FLOOR
CITY : NEW YORK PROV: NY POSTAL CODE: 10017
CONS. MV DATE OF OR NO FIXED
GOODS INVTRY. EQUIP ACCTS OTHER INCL AMOUNT MATURITY MAT DATE
10 YEAR MAKE X X MODEL V.I.N.

11
12

GENERAL COLLATERAL DESCRIPTION

13 PLEDGE OF SHARES OF CERTAIN SUBSIDIARIES OF THE DEBTOR

14
15

16 AGENT: AIRD & BERLIS LLP - SUSAN PAK

17 ADDRESS : 181 BAY STREET, SUITE 1800
CITY : TORONTO PROV: ON POSTAL CODE: M5J2T9

FAMILY : 4 OF 6 ENQUIRY PAGE : 6 OF 8
SEARCH : BD : SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

00 FILE NUMBER : 659079036 EXPIRY DATE : 03FEB 2016 STATUS ;
01 CAUTION FILING : PAGE : 001 OF 1 MV SCHEDULE ATTACHED :
REG NUM : 20100203 1535 1793 2023 REG TYP: P PPSA REG PERIOD: 6
02 IND DOB : IND NAME:
03 BUS NAME: SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

OCN :
04 ADDRESS : 90 BURNHAMTHORPE ROAD WEST, SUITE 1208
CITY : MISSISSAUGA PROV: ON POSTAL CODE: L5B3C3
05 IND DOB : IND NAME:
06 BUS NAME:

OCN :
07 ADDRESS :
CITY : PROV: POSTAL CODE:

08 SECURED PARTY/LIEN CLAIMANT :
LAW DEBENTURE TRUST COMPANY OF NEW YORK

09 ADDRESS : 400 MADISON AVENUE, 4TH FLOOR
CITY : NEW YORK PROV: NY POSTAL CODE: 10017
CONS. MV DATE OF OR NO FIXED
GOODS INVTRY. EQUIP ACCTS OTHER INCL AMOUNT MATURITY MAT DATE
10 YEAR MAKE X X MODEL V.I.N.

11
12

GENERAL COLLATERAL DESCRIPTION

13 PLEDGE OF SHARES OF CERTAIN SUBSIDIARIES OF THE DEBTOR

14
15

16 AGENT: AIRD & BERLIS LLP (SPAK - 102288)

17 ADDRESS : 181 BAY STREET, SUITE 1800
CITY : TORONTO PROV: ON POSTAL CODE: M5J2T9

FAMILY : 5 OF 6 ENQUIRY PAGE : 7 OF 8
SEARCH : BD : SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

00 FILE NUMBER : 665186985 EXPIRY DATE : 15OCT 2020 STATUS :
01 CAUTION FILING : PAGE : 001 OF 1 MV SCHEDULE ATTACHED :
REG NUM : 20101015 1215 1793 1245 REG TYP: P PPSA REG PERIOD: 10
02 IND DOB : IND NAME:
03 BUS NAME: SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

OCN :
04 ADDRESS : 90 BURNHAMTHORPE ROAD WEST, SUITE 1208
CITY : MISSISSAUGA PROV: ON POSTAL CODE: L5B3C3
05 IND DOB : IND NAME:
06 BUS NAME:

OCN :
07 ADDRESS :
CITY : PROV: POSTAL CODE:

08 SECURED PARTY/LIEN CLAIMANT :
LAW DEBENTURE TRUST COMPANY OF NEW YORK

09 ADDRESS : 400 MADISON AVENUE, 4TH FLOOR
CITY : NEW YORK PROV: NY POSTAL CODE: 10017
CONS. MV DATE OF OR NO FIXED
GOODS INVTRY. EQUIP ACCTS OTHER INCL AMOUNT MATURITY MAT DATE
10 YEAR MAKE X X MODEL V.I.N.

11
12

GENERAL COLLATERAL DESCRIPTION

13 PLEDGE OF SHARES OF CERTAIN SUBSIDIARIES OF THE DEBTOR.

14
15

16 AGENT: AIRD & BERLIS LLP (RMK-106760)
17 ADDRESS : 181 BAY STREET, SUITE 1800
CITY : TORONTO PROV: ON POSTAL CODE: M5J2T9

FAMILY : 6 OF 6 ENQUIRY PAGE : 8 OF 8
 SEARCH : BD : SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

00 FILE NUMBER : 665928963 EXPIRY DATE : 17NOV 2016 STATUS :
 01 CAUTION FILING : PAGE : 01 OF 001 MV SCHEDULE ATTACHED :
 REG NUM : 20101117 1007 1462 0113 REG TYP: P PPSA REG PERIOD: 6
 02 IND DOB : IND NAME:
 03 BUS NAME: SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

OCN :
 04 ADDRESS : 1208-90 BURNHAMTHORPE RD W
 CITY : MISSISSAUGA PROV: ON POSTAL CODE: L5B3C3
 05 IND DOB : IND NAME:
 06 BUS NAME:

OCN :
 07 ADDRESS :
 CITY : PROV: POSTAL CODE:

08 SECURED PARTY/LIEN CLAIMANT :
 XEROX CANADA LTD

09 ADDRESS : 33 BLOOR ST. E. 3RD FLOOR
 CITY : TORONTO PROV: ON POSTAL CODE: M4W3H1
 CONS. MV DATE OF OR NO FIXED
 GOODS INVTY. EQUIP ACCTS OTHER INCL AMOUNT MATURITY MAT DATE
 10 YEAR MAKE X X V.I.N. X

11
 12
 GENERAL COLLATERAL DESCRIPTION

13
 14
 15
 16 AGENT: PPSA CANADA INC. - (3992)
 17 ADDRESS : 110 SHEPPARD AVE EAST, SUITE 303
 CITY : TORONTO PROV: ON POSTAL CODE: M2N6Y8

Schedule "A"

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

Court File No.

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

Proceedings commenced in Toronto

INITIAL ORDER


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

Robert W. Staley (LSUC #27115J)
Kevin Zych (LSUC #33129T)
Derek J. Bell (LSUC #43420J)
Jonathan Bell (LSUC #55457P)
Tel: 416-863-1200
Fax: 416-863-1716

Lawyers for the Applicant

Tab B

THIS IS EXHIBIT "B" TO
THE AFFIDAVIT OF ELIZABETH FIMIO
SWORN APRIL 24, 2013

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "A. M. Keller", written over a horizontal line.

A Commissioner, etc.

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

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

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

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

**AFFIDAVIT OF W. JUDSON MARTIN
(Sworn November 29, 2012)**

I, W. Judson Martin, of the City of Hong Kong, Special Administrative Region, People's Republic of China, **MAKE OATH AND SAY:**

1. I am the Vice-Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Sino-Forest Corporation ("SFC"). I therefore have personal knowledge of the matters set out below, except where otherwise stated. Where I do not possess personal knowledge, I have stated the source of my information and I believe such information to be true. Where I indicate that I have been advised by counsel, that advice has been provided by Bennett Jones LLP, counsel for SFC in this proceeding.
2. Capitalized terms not defined in this affidavit are as defined in my affidavit sworn March 30, 2012 (the "Initial Order Affidavit") and the Thirteenth Report of the Monitor dated November 22, 2012 (the "Monitor's Thirteenth Report"). A copy of my Initial Order Affidavit (without exhibits) is attached as Exhibit "A".

3. All currency references in this affidavit refer to U.S. Dollars unless otherwise indicated.
4. This affidavit is sworn in support of a motion by SFC for an order (the "Sanction Order") under section 6(1) of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the "CCAA") sanctioning an amended plan of compromise and reorganization (the "Plan") between SFC and its creditors. I understand that a draft of the form of Sanction Order being sought was included in the Plan Supplement filed by SFC on November 21, 2012, and any further changes to the form of Sanction Order will be filed prior to the hearing.
5. This affidavit identifies a number of affidavits I have previously sworn along with Monitor's reports and other materials that SFC is relying on in support of the Sanction Order motion. Such materials will be filed in a separate brief prior to the hearing.
6. I am advised by counsel that if the Plan is approved, SFC and Newco (defined below) intend to rely on the Sanction Order for the purposes of relying on the exemption from the registration requirements of the United States Securities Act of 1933, as amended, pursuant to section 3(a)(10) thereof for the issuance of the Newco Shares, Newco Notes, and to the extent they may be deemed to be securities, the Litigation Trust Interest, and any other securities to be issued pursuant to the Plan.

I. BACKGROUND

7. As I explained in greater detail in the Initial Order Affidavit, SFC is an integrated forest plantation operator and forest products company, with most of its assets and the majority of its business operations located in the southern and eastern regions of the People's Republic of China

(the "PRC"). SFC's registered office is in Toronto and its principal business office is in Hong Kong.

A. Muddy Waters and SFC's Independent Committee

8. As a result of a report issued by short-seller Muddy Waters LLC ("Muddy Waters") on June 2, 2011, which alleged that SFC was a "near total fraud" and a "Ponzi scheme", SFC found itself embroiled in multiple class actions across Canada and in the U.S., investigations and regulatory proceedings with the Ontario Securities Commission (the "OSC"), the Hong Kong Securities and Futures Commission and the RCMP.

9. As I have described in prior affidavits filed with the Court and above, immediately after the allegations were made by Muddy Waters, the Board appointed an independent committee (the "IC") of the Board, which in turn engaged professionals in Ontario, Hong Kong and in the PRC to assist in investigating the allegations. The IC retained Osler Hoskin & Harcourt LLP in Canada, Mallesons (an international law firm with offices in Beijing, Shanghai and Hong Kong) and Jun He Law Offices (a PRC law firm). The IC also appointed PricewaterhouseCoopers to assist with the investigations.

10. The Board also retained new company counsel, Bennett Jones LLP, to assist and work with the IC and the IC's advisors, to assist management, to respond to class action claims against SFC and to respond on behalf of SFC to inquiries and demands from securities regulators.

11. The IC was active and met frequently to supervise professionals and receive reports about their progress.

12. The IC and its advisors worked to compile and analyze the vast amount of data required for their review of Sino-Forest's operations and business, the relationships between Sino-Forest and other entities, and Sino-Forest's ownership of assets. The IC supervised the investigation and preparation of three reports that addressed those aspects, described the extensive work of the IC and its advisors and the conclusions that could be reached from the work undertaken by them. Redacted versions of the IC reports were publicly disclosed.

13. The IC set out to address the issues raised by Muddy Waters in three core areas: (i) the verification of timber assets reported by Sino-Forest, (ii) the value of the timber assets held by Sino-Forest, and (iii) revenue recognition. In addition, in its First Interim Report, the IC's accounting advisors confirmed SFC's cash balances in specific account as at June 13, 2011, for accounts located inside and outside of the PRC. The results of the IC's efforts are described in greater detail in my Initial Order Affidavit.

B. Efforts to Obtain Audit Opinions

14. In late August 2011 the IC's efforts uncovered information that raised conduct issues about certain members of former management of Sino-Forest. This information was shared by the IC with staff of the OSC. This information resulted in the OSC imposing a temporary cease trade order (the "TCTO") on the securities of SFC on August 26, 2011, which order was later continued and continues in force.

15. Arising from these developments, certain former members of management were placed on administrative leave. The Board appointed me as Chief Executive Officer of SFC after Allen Chan resigned as Chairman, CEO and a Director, on August 28, 2011.

16. Following the events of late August, 2011, the IC continued its investigative work. From late August 2011 onward, under the Board's oversight, considerable effort was directed at determining if the issues identified by Muddy Waters and by investigative work to date could be resolved with sufficient time to allow SFC to become current in its financial reporting, and to obtain an audit opinion for 2011. Failure to issue quarterly results or to issue audited annual financial results could lead to the possible acceleration and enforcement of approximately \$1.8 billion in notes issued by SFC and guaranteed by many of its Subsidiaries.

17. Notwithstanding considerable efforts by the Board, the IC, management and advisors, in mid-November 2011, SFC's Audit Committee recommended, and the Board agreed, that SFC should defer the release of SFC's third quarter 2011 financial statements until certain conduct issues could be resolved to the satisfaction of the Board and SFC's external auditor.

18. By December 2011, it appeared that it would not be possible to obtain an audit opinion for 2011 in sufficient time to avoid defaults under SFC's Note Indentures, nor would it be possible to issue third quarter 2011 financial results.

19. On December 16, 2011, the Board established a Special Restructuring Committee ("RC") of the Board, comprised exclusively of directors independent of management of SFC, for the purpose of supervising, analyzing and managing the strategic options available to SFC. Subsequent to its appointment, the RC has been fully engaged and active in supervising and supporting SFC's restructuring efforts.

C. Defaults under the Indentures and the Support Agreement

20. SFC's inability to file its third quarter 2011 financial statements ultimately resulted in a default under its note indentures. After extensive discussions with an ad hoc committee of Noteholders (the "Ad Hoc Noteholders"), Noteholders representing a majority in principal amount of SFC's senior notes agreed to waive the default arising from the failure to release the SFC 2011 third quarter results. While the waiver agreements prevented an acceleration of the note indebtedness as a result of SFC's failure to file its 2011 third quarter results, the waiver agreements would have expired on April 30, 2012 (or any earlier termination of the waiver agreements in accordance with their terms). In addition, SFC's pending failure to file its audited financial statements for its fiscal year ended December 31, 2011 by March 30, 2012, would have caused another potential acceleration and enforcement event, creating additional uncertainty around SFC's business.

21. Following extensive arm's length negotiations between SFC and the Ad Hoc Noteholders, the parties agreed on a framework for a consensual resolution of SFC's defaults under its note indentures and the restructuring of its business, and entered into a restructuring support agreement (the "Support Agreement") on March 30, 2012, which was initially executed by holders of SFC's Notes holding approximately 40% of the aggregate principal amount of the Notes.

22. As further discussed below, additional Consenting Noteholders subsequently executed joinder agreements to the Support Agreement, resulting in Noteholders representing more than 72% of the aggregate principal amount of the Notes agreeing to support the restructuring contemplated by the Support Agreement.

23. Throughout this process, the Board and certain members of SFC management engaged with the Ad Hoc Noteholders, both through counsel and directly on a principal-to-principal basis, to assist them in understanding the restructuring challenges faced by SFC and its stakeholders, and to provide information to the Ad Hoc Noteholders in connection with their due diligence efforts.

24. From a commercial perspective, the restructuring contemplated by the Support Agreement was intended to separate Sino-Forest's business operations from the problems facing the parent holding company outside of the PRC, with the intention of saving and preserving the value of SFC's underlying business. To this end, two possible transactions were contemplated:

- (a) First, a court-supervised Sale Process being undertaken to determine if any person or group of persons would purchase SFC's business operations for an amount in excess of a threshold amount of consideration (which was set at 85% of the amount outstanding under the Notes at the CCAA filing date), with the potential for excess above such threshold amount being directed to stakeholders subordinate to the Noteholders. The Sale Process was intended to ensure that SFC pursued all avenues available to it to maximize value for its stakeholders;
- (b) Second, if the Sale Process was not successful, a transfer of the six immediate holding companies that own SFC's business to the Affected Creditors in compromise of their claims against SFC and the creation of a litigation trust (including funding) that would enable SFC's litigation claims against any Person not otherwise released within the CCAA proceedings to be preserved and pursued

for the benefit of SFC's stakeholders in accordance with the Support Agreement (the "Restructuring Transaction").

25. The decision to enter into the Support Agreement was given careful consideration by the Board of SFC. But for the negotiation and execution of the Support Agreement, SFC would have been unable to prevent the acceleration and enforcement of the rights of the Noteholders as soon as April 30, 2012, in which case SFC and Sino-Forest would have been unable to continue as a going concern.

26. The Support Agreement provided that SFC would make an application under the CCAA in order to implement the Sale Process and, failing receipt of a qualified bid, to implement the Restructuring Transaction.

27. Quite apart from the provisions of the Support Agreement, the circumstances facing SFC and its Subsidiaries (as described above and in the Initial Order Affidavit) necessitated the commencement of these CCAA proceedings in order to attempt to separate the business operations of Sino-Forest from the challenges facing the holding company parent in order to allow the business to be saved.

28. SFC applied to this Honourable Court and obtained an Initial Order under the CCAA on March 30, 2012 (the "Initial Order"), pursuant to which a limited stay of proceedings was also granted in respect of the Subsidiaries. The stay of proceedings provided for in the Initial Order was subsequently extended by Orders dated May 31, September 28, October 10, and November 23, 2012, and unless further extended by the Court, will expire on February 1, 2013.

II. THE NATURE OF SFC'S ASSETS AND SFC'S EFFORTS TO MARKET THEM

A. SFC's Assets

29. As described in the Initial Order Affidavit, SFC is a holding company with six direct subsidiaries of SFC (the place of incorporation is indicated in parentheses): Sino-Panel Holdings Limited (BVI); Sino-Global Holdings Inc. (BVI); Sino-Panel Corporation (Canada); Sino-Wood Partners Limited (Hong Kong); Sino-Capital Global Inc. (BVI) and Sino-Forest International (Barbados) Corporation (Barbados) (collectively, the "Direct Subsidiaries"). SFC also holds all of the preference shares of Sino-Forest Resources Inc. (BVI).

30. In addition, SFC holds an indirect majority interest in Greenheart Group Limited (Bermuda), an investment holding company whose shares are listed on the Hong Kong Stock Exchange. Together with its subsidiaries, Greenheart owns certain rights and manages hardwood forest concessions in the Republic of Suriname and a radiata pine plantation on freehold land in New Zealand. Greenheart has its own distinct operations and financing arrangements and is not party to or a guarantor of the notes issued by SFC. Greenheart and SFC operate out of separate office buildings in Hong Kong.

31. Including SFC, Sino-Forest Resources Inc. and the Direct Subsidiaries, there are 137 entities that make up the Sino-Forest companies: 67 companies incorporated in the PRC (with 11 branch companies), 58 BVI incorporated entities, 7 Hong Kong incorporated entities, 2 Canadian entities and 3 entities incorporated in other jurisdictions. Greenheart and its subsidiaries are not included in the foregoing. A list of all of the SFC subsidiaries (the "Subsidiaries") is attached as Exhibit "B" (which does not include subsidiaries of Greenheart, but does contain SFC branch companies). The term "Sino-Forest" is used herein to refer to the global enterprise as a whole.

32. I understand that in addition to claims against SFC, numerous stakeholders have asserted claims against the Subsidiaries in respect of their claims against SFC. As has been apparent from the outset of these proceedings, in order to achieve the commercial objective of separating the Sino-Forest business from the parent holding company, any successful resolution to these proceedings must provide a "clean break" between SFC and the Subsidiaries. Accordingly, as further described below, the Plan provides for the transfer of SFC's assets, including the Direct Subsidiaries, to Newco for the benefit of all of SFC's Affected Creditors as well as a release of the Subsidiaries in respect of such claims.

B. The Sale Process

33. As discussed above, the Support Agreement contemplated the sale of the assets of SFC (i.e. its Subsidiaries) through a court-supervised sale process in which the assets of SFC were offered for an amount of consideration equal to a minimum required threshold as set out in the Support Agreement, which was set at 85% of the outstanding amount of the Notes as of the CCAA filing date.

34. SFC applied for and obtained an order from this Court on March 30, 2012 (the "Sale Process Order") approving the sale process procedures (the "Sale Process Procedures") and authorizing and directing SFC, the Monitor, and SFC's financial advisor, Houlihan Lokey ("Houlihan"), to do all things reasonably necessary to perform each of their obligations under the Sale Process Order.

35. Pursuant to the Sale Process Procedures, SFC, through Houlihan sought out potential qualified strategic and financial purchasers (including existing shareholders and noteholders) of

SFC's assets on a global basis and attempted to engage such potential purchasers in the Sale Process.

36. The Sale Process Procedures approved in the Sale Process Order were carried out by the applicable parties. In particular, as described in the Fourth Report of the Monitor:

- (a) a notice was published in the Globe & Mail and the Wall Street Journal with respect to the Sale Process;
- (b) a teaser letter was sent to 85 potentially interested parties; and
- (c) fourteen confidentiality agreements were negotiated with parties who indicated an interest in the business.

37. The Sale Process Procedures provided SFC with up to 90 days from the day of the Sale Process Order to solicit letters of intent and, if qualified letters of intent were received within the required time period, a further 90 days to solicit qualified bids. As set out in the Sale Process Order, to constitute a Qualified Letter of Intent, the letter of intent must have, among other things, indicated that the bidder was offering to acquire SFC's assets for consideration not less than the Qualified Consideration. Qualified Consideration was defined in the Sale Process Procedures as:

"Qualified Consideration" means cash consideration payable to SFC (or such other form of consideration as may be acceptable to SFC and the Initial Consenting Noteholders) in an amount equal to 85% of the aggregate principal amount of the Notes, plus all accrued and unpaid interest on Notes, at the regular rates provided therefor pursuant to the Note indentures, up to and including March 30, 2012.

38. A number of letters of intent were received by SFC on or about the June 28, 2012 deadline set out in the Sale Process Procedures. However, in accordance with the Sale Process Order, SFC, Houlihan and the Monitor determined that none of the letters of intent constituted a Qualified Letter of Intent, because none of them offered to acquire the assets of SFC for the Qualified Consideration. As such, on July 10, 2012, SFC announced the termination of the Sale Process and SFC's intention to proceed with the Restructuring Transaction.

III. SINO-FOREST'S STAKEHOLDERS

39. In order to move forward with its restructuring efforts in a timely manner, it was critical for SFC to ascertain all claims against SFC, its Subsidiaries and its directors and officers in order to assess what impact such claims may have with respect to its restructuring. Accordingly, SFC, in consultation with the Monitor, developed a claims process, which was approved by Order of this Honourable Court on May 14, 2012 (the "Claims Process Order"). The Claims Process Order was not appealed.

40. Under the Claims Process Order, Proofs of Claim and D&O Proofs of Claim were required to be filed with the Monitor on or before the Claims Bar Date (June 20, 2012), while Restructuring Claims were required to be filed on or before the Restructuring Claims Bar Date (the later of the Claims Bar Date and 30 days after a Person is deemed to receive a Proof of Claim Document Package). D&O Indemnity Proofs of Claim were also required to be filed with the Monitor on a date that was relative to when the director or officer received notice of a D&O Proof of Claim.

41. In order to identify the nature and extent of claims asserted against the Subsidiaries, the Claims Process Order required any claimant that had or intended to assert a right or claim against

one or more Subsidiaries relating to a purported claim made against SFC to so indicate on their Proof of Claim.

42. In its Thirteenth Report, the Monitor described the claims submitted pursuant to the Claims Process Order, certain of which are also discussed below.

A. The Noteholders

43. As indicated, at the date of filing, Sino-Forest had approximately \$1.8 billion of principal amount of debt owing under the Notes, plus accrued and unpaid interest. There are four series of Notes issued and outstanding, as follows:

- (a) *2017 Senior Notes:* There are \$600 million in principal amount of guaranteed senior notes that were issued on October 21, 2010, bearing interest at a rate of 6.25% per annum, payable semi-annually (the "2017 Senior Notes"). These are supported by guarantees from 60 Subsidiaries and share pledges from ten of those same Subsidiaries.
- (b) *2016 Convertible Notes:* There are \$460 million in principal amount of convertible guaranteed notes that were issued on December 17, 2009, bearing interest at a rate of 4.25% payable semi-annually (the "2016 Convertible Notes"). These notes are supported by guarantees from 64 Subsidiaries.
- (c) *2014 Convertible Notes:* There are \$399,517,000 in principal amount of senior notes that were issued on July 27, 2009, bearing interest at a rate of 10.25% per annum, payable semi-annually (the "2014 Senior Notes"). These notes are

supported by guarantees from 60 Subsidiaries and share pledges from ten of those same Subsidiaries.

- (d) *2013 Convertible Notes:* There are \$345 million in principal amount of convertible guaranteed notes that were issued on July 23, 2008, bearing interest at a rate of 5% per annum, payable semi-annually (the "2013 Convertible Notes"). These notes are supported by guarantees from 64 Subsidiaries.

The 2017 Senior Notes, 2016 Convertible Notes, 2014 Senior Notes and 2013 Convertible Notes are collectively referred to herein as the "Notes" and holders of the Notes, the "Noteholders".

44. As of the date of the Support Agreement, the Initial Consenting Noteholders held approximately 40% of the aggregate principal amount of the four series of Notes. Pursuant to certain notice provisions established in the Initial Order, SFC continued to solicit additional Noteholder support and all Noteholders who wished to become Consenting Noteholders and participate in the Early Consent Consideration, (each as defined in the Support Agreement and described below) were given the opportunity to do so by the early consent deadline of May 15, 2012. As of May 15, 2012, Noteholders (including the Initial Consenting Noteholders) holding in aggregate approximately 72% of the principal amount of the Notes, and representing more than 66.67% of the principal amount of each of the four series of Notes, agreed to support the Plan.

B. Shareholders / Former Noteholders

45. As I explained in the Initial Order Affidavit, SFC and certain of its officers, directors and employees, along with SFC's former auditors, technical consultants and the Underwriters

(defined below) involved in prior equity and debt offerings, have been named as defendants in eight class action lawsuits.

46. Five of these class action lawsuits, commenced by three separate groups of counsel, were filed in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice on June 8, 2011, June 20, 2011, July 20, 2011, September 26, 2011 and November 14, 2011. A carriage motion in relation to these actions was heard on December 20 and 21, 2011, and by Order dated January 6, 2012, Justice Perell appointed Koskie Minsky LLP and Siskinds LLP as class counsel. As a result, Koskie Minsky LLP and Siskinds LLP discontinued their earliest action, and their other two actions have been consolidated and will move forward as one proceeding. The other two Ontario actions, commenced by other counsel, have been stayed.

47. Pursuant to Justice Perell's January 6, 2012 Order, Koskie Minsky LLP and Siskinds LLP have filed a fresh as amended Statement of Claim in the consolidated proceeding. A copy of that amended Statement of Claim is attached as Exhibit "C". The plaintiffs in the Ontario Class Action (the "Ontario Class Action Plaintiffs"), on behalf of current and former shareholders of SFC, seek damages against SFC and the other defendants in the Ontario Class Action in the amount of \$6.5 billion for general damages, \$174.8 million in connection with a prospectus issued in June 2007, \$330 million in relation to a prospectus issued in June 2009, and \$319.2 million in relation to a prospectus issued in December 2009. The market cap for SFC during the times of the alleged misrepresentations ranged from \$546.5 million to \$6.15 billion.

48. The Ontario Class Action Plaintiffs also assert claims on behalf of former holders of SFC's Notes in the amounts of \$345 million for the 2013 Convertible Notes, \$400 million for the 2014 Senior Notes, \$460 million for the 2016 Convertible Notes, and \$600 million for the 2017 Senior

Notes, for a total claim of approximately \$1.8 billion. The first class action claim that asserted any claims on behalf of Noteholders was issued on September 26, 2011. The Noteholder component of this claim asserts, among other things, damages for loss of value in the Notes. In the months following the Muddy Waters report, the relevant Notes traded at a range of \$53 to \$64 per \$100 amount of principal owing.

49. A similar class action was filed in Quebec. Attached as Exhibit "D" is a copy of the Quebec pleading. A third class action was filed in Saskatchewan. Attached as Exhibit "E" is a copy of the Saskatchewan Statement of Claim. While a Proof of Claim was filed by the plaintiffs in the Quebec class action, no Proof of Claim was filed by the plaintiffs in the Saskatchewan class action.

50. Additionally, on January 27, 2012, a class action was commenced against SFC and other defendants in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, U.S.A. The complaint alleges that the action is brought on behalf of persons who purchased SFC shares on the over-the-counter market and on behalf of non-Canadian purchasers of SFC debt securities. The quantum of damages sought is not specified in the complaint. Attached as Exhibit "F" is a copy of the most recent version of the Complaint in the New York proceeding. The plaintiffs in the New York proceeding have filed a Proof of Claim in this proceeding.

51. In this proceeding, an "Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities" (the "Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee") has appeared to represent the interests of shareholders and noteholders who have asserted class action claims against SFC and others. The Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee is represented in this proceeding by Siskinds LLP, Koskie Minsky, and Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP. As indicated above, two of these

firms won the right to represent the plaintiffs in the Ontario class action, and the Siskind firm is plaintiff counsel in the Quebec class action.

52. On June 26, 2012, SFC brought a motion for an order directing that claims against SFC that arise in connection with the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest in SFC and related indemnity claims are "equity claims" as defined in section 2 of the CCAA, including the claims by or on behalf of current or former shareholders asserted in class action proceedings commenced against SFC. The equity claims motion did not purport to deal with the component of the class action proceedings that relate to debt claims.

53. The Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee did not oppose the relief requested. The relief was opposed only by SFC's former auditors and the Underwriters.

54. In reasons released on July 27, 2012, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit "G", this Honourable Court granted the relief sought by SFC (the "Equity Claims Decision"), finding at paragraph 77 that "the claims advanced in the Shareholder Claims are clearly equity claims."

55. The Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee did not appeal this decision. I am advised by counsel that none of the parties who later appealed the decision suggested that the Court's determination on the characterization of the shareholder claims against SFC was incorrect. As further discussed below, the Equity Claims Decision was affirmed by the Court of Appeal for Ontario on November 23, 2012.

56. Consistent with the Equity Claims Decision, shareholder claims against SFC are subordinated and not entitled to vote or receive distributions under the Plan.

57. On October 26, 2012, the Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee stated that they would not directly or indirectly oppose the Plan, so long as no amendment is made to the Plan that in the opinion of the Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee, in the good faith exercise of its discretion, would be materially prejudicial to the interests of the Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee.

58. The Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee will not oppose a Plan which provides that: (i) all shareholder claims against SFC will be subordinated as "Equity Claims" and released without consideration under the Plan; (ii) all former noteholder claims against SFC will be released without consideration under the Plan (other than a 25% interest in the Litigation Trust); and (iii) the quantum of the "Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit" in the Plan (as further discussed below) will be set at \$150 million.

59. As discussed below, the Plan preserves all of the aforementioned claims against defendants to the Class Action Claims (present or future) other than SFC, the Subsidiaries, the Named Directors and Officers or the Trustees under the Notes (the "Third Party Defendants"), subject in the case of any Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Claims to the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit.

60. SFC's existing shares will be cancelled pursuant to the Plan and the Plan Sanction Order.

C. Auditors

61. Since 2000 SFC has had two auditors: Ernst & Young LLP ("E&Y"), who acted as auditor from 2000 to 2004 and 2007 to 2012, and BDO Limited ("BDO"), who acted as auditor from 2005 to 2006.

62. I understand from counsel to SFC that the auditors have asserted claims against SFC for contribution and indemnity for any amounts paid or payable in respect of the shareholder class actions, with each of the auditors having asserted claims in excess of \$6.5 billion. In addition the auditors have asserted claims for payment of professional fees associated with SFC after the release of the Muddy Waters report, and generalized claims for damage to reputation. A summary extract from E&Y's Proof of Claim is attached as Exhibit "H". A summary extract from BDO's Proof of Claim is attached as Exhibit "I".

63. In the Equity Claims Decision, the Court stated at paragraph 84 that "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."

64. The auditors and Underwriters appealed the decision to the Court of Appeal for Ontario. The hearing of that appeal was held on November 13, 2012. On November 23, 2012, the Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. Attached as Exhibit "J" is a copy of the reasons of the Court of Appeal.

65. Consistent with the Equity Claims Decision and the Court of Appeal's dismissal of the appeal, the claims of the auditors for indemnity in respect of the shareholder class action claims are subordinated and are not entitled to vote or receive any distributions under the Plan. The auditors' claims for defence costs relating to the defence of shareholder class actions (which have not yet been determined to be equity or debt claims) are treated as Unresolved Claims under the Plan.

66. The auditors have also asserted indemnification claims in respect of the class action claims against them by the former Noteholders. As these indemnification claims have not been determined to be "equity claims", the Plan provides for these claims by placing Plan consideration in respect of the amount of these claims into the Unresolved Claims Reserve, to be distributed to the defendants if any of these claims become non-contingent Proven Claims. The amount of these potential indemnification claims has been limited to a global limit of \$150 million by operation of the "Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Claim Limit" under the Plan, which limits the amount of the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Claims against the Third Party Defendants to \$150 million in the first instance. The Plan preserves the right to contest these indemnity claims, including the right to seek an order of the CCAA Court that these indemnification claims in respect of claims by former noteholders should be subordinated in the same manner as the indemnification claims in respect of the shareholders actions have been.

67. The auditors have also asserted claims against the Subsidiaries for, among other things, indemnification in connection with the shareholder class actions. Those claims have tended to treat SFC and the Subsidiaries interchangeably or as one collective entity. These claims are released under the Plan in the same manner as the Noteholders' guarantee claims against the Subsidiaries are released under the Plan.

D. Underwriters

68. In each instance where SFC has had a debt or equity public offering, such offering has been underwritten. The following firms have acted as SFC's underwriters and also have been named as defendants in the Ontario Class Action: Credit Suisse Securities (Canada) Inc., Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC, TD Securities Inc., Dundee Securities Corporation, RBC

Dominion Securities Inc., Scotia Capital Inc., CIBC World Markets Inc., Merrill Lynch Canada Inc., Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Incorporated, Cannacord Financial Ltd and Maison Placements Canada Inc. (the "Underwriters"). Certain of the Underwriters also are defendants in the New York class action.

69. Like the auditors, the Underwriters have filed claims against SFC seeking contribution and indemnity for the shareholder class actions. A copy of a representative sample of a proof of claim filed by one of the Underwriters is attached as Exhibit "K".

70. The Equity Claims Decision discussed above, upheld by the Court of Appeal for Ontario, applies equally to the Underwriters as it does to the auditors. Accordingly, the Underwriters' indemnity claims in respect of shareholder claims have been subordinated and are not entitled to vote or receive any distributions under the Plan. The Underwriters' claims for defence costs relating to the defence of shareholder class action, together with such claims of the auditors, are treated as Unresolved Claims under the Plan.

71. The Underwriters have also asserted indemnification claims in respect of the class action claims against them by the former Noteholders. For the same reasons and subject to the same terms as described above with respect to the auditors' indemnification claims, the Plan provides for these claims by placing Plan consideration in respect of the amount of these claims into the Unresolved Claims Reserve, limited to a global limit of \$150 million by operation of the Plan.

72. Certain of the Underwriters have also asserted claims against the Subsidiaries in connection with the four Note offerings. Like all other SFC-related claims against the Subsidiaries, these claims are released under the Plan.

E. Ontario Securities Commission

73. On June 8, 2011, six days after the Muddy Waters report was released and the Board of SFC appointed the IC to investigate the allegations contained in that report, the OSC publicly announced that it was investigating matters related to SFC.

74. SFC believes that it has cooperated with the OSC. Under the supervision of the Board, SFC has made extensive production of documents, including documents sourced from jurisdictions outside of the OSC's power to compel production. Under the supervision of the Board, SFC also has facilitated interviews by the OSC with SFC and other Sino-Forest personnel. In circumstances where OSC staff sought to examine Sino-Forest personnel resident in the PRC, outside the OSC's jurisdiction to compel attendance at examination, SFC arranged to bring individuals to Hong Kong to be examined.

75. Absent cooperation from SFC, SFC was at risk that the OSC would seek to exercise additional powers in relation to SFC beyond imposing the TCTO. These additional powers could have extended to the appointment of a receiver over SFC. The Board's decision to inform the OSC of the results of the IC's investigative work, and to cooperate with the OSC's investigation, was important to preserving stakeholder value.

76. SFC has responded to extensive inquiries and has provided periodic oral briefings to OSC staff. The three reports prepared by the IC were provided to OSC staff on an unredacted basis. A significant portion of the professional costs incurred by SFC subsequent to June 2, 2011 relates to the production of documents and other information to OSC staff, and to producing Sino-Forest personnel for interviews with OSC staff.

77. In April 2012, SFC received an Enforcement Notice from OSC staff. Enforcement Notices typically are issued by OSC staff at or near the end of an investigation, identify issues that have been the subject of investigation, and advise that staff contemplate commencing formal proceedings in relation to those issues. Enforcement Notices afford recipients an opportunity to make representations before a decision is taken by staff of the OSC to commence formal proceedings. OSC staff asserted that the Enforcement Notice was protected from disclosure pursuant to sections 16 and 17 of the Ontario *Securities Act*.

78. On May 22, 2012, a Notice of Hearing and Statement of Allegations was issued by OSC staff against SFC, Allen Chan, Albert Ip, Alfred C.T. Hung, George Ho, Simon Yeung, and David Horsley. A copy of the Statement of Allegations is attached as Exhibit "L". OSC staff alleged in the Statement of Allegations that SFC and the other respondents, except David Horsley, had engaged in a complex fraudulent scheme to inflate the assets and revenue of SFC and made materially misleading statements in SFC's public disclosure record. It is further alleged by OSC staff that such conduct was contrary to the Ontario *Securities Act* and contrary to the public interest. No date has been set for a hearing on the merits.

79. On September 25, 2012, SFC received a second "Enforcement Notice" from OSC staff, which OSC staff again asserted was protected from disclosure. SFC issued a press release announcing the receipt of this Enforcement Notice on September 26, 2012, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit "M". The press release describes how the second Enforcement Notice includes a further allegation, which is similar in nature to the allegations in the Statement of Allegations discussed above.

80. By letter dated September 13, 2012, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit "N", counsel for OSC staff advised that OSC staff would not be seeking any monetary sanctions against SFC, and that they would not seek monetary sanctions against any of the directors and officers of SFC in excess of CAD\$100 million. This amount was later reduced to CAD\$84 million, as set out in a further letter dated October 25, 2012, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit "O".

F. Trade Creditors and Other Creditors

81. As SFC is a holding company whose business is substantially carried out through its subsidiaries in the PRC and Hong Kong, SFC has very few trade creditors. The Monitor's Thirteenth Report explains that only three trade claims have been filed pursuant to the Claims Process Order. Other than a claim filed by the former Chief Financial Officer of SFC arising from the termination of his employment, I am not aware of any other creditors of significance that have filed claims pursuant to the Claims Process Order.

IV. EFFORTS AND ACHIEVEMENTS IN ARRIVING AT A NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

82. The fundamental component of SFC's proposed restructuring, being a complete separation of the Subsidiaries and the Sino-Forest business from SFC in compromise of the claims asserted against SFC, has not changed since the commencement of these proceedings.

83. As indicated above, SFC obtained the support of 72% of the Noteholders to its proposed restructuring at an early stage of this proceeding. On October 26, 2012, SFC also obtained the non-objection to the Plan of the Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee. Significant efforts have been made to arrive at a consensual resolution with the other stakeholders described above.

84. On July 25, 2012, this Honourable Court issued a mediation order (the "Mediation Order"), on the consent of all parties, directing that a mediation take place on September 4 and 5, 2012.

85. In advance of the mediation, SFC established a confidential data room, as contemplated by the Mediation Order. That data room made available to those parties to the mediation who signed non-disclosure agreements with SFC approximately 18,000 documents that had been assembled in order to potentially make them available to participants in the Sale Process and additional documents that were requested by the Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee.

86. The mediation took place on September 4 and 5, 2012. Justice Newbould acted as the mediator. While the mediation did not result in a global resolution, it is my understanding from counsel that all parties appeared to participate in good faith with a view to arriving at a consensual resolution. I am advised by counsel that there have been further discussions continuing among certain of the parties since the conclusion of the mediation, but those discussions have not resulted in a further settlement as at the date of the swearing of this affidavit. I am not aware of the specifics of the matters which may have been discussed by other parties to the mediation.

87. Following the mediation, SFC conducted extensive negotiations with the Ad Hoc Noteholders, with the participation of the Monitor and its counsel, to produce the draft plan that was filed with the Court on October 19, 2012 (the "October 19 Draft Plan"). On October 26, 2012, the Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee confirmed that they would not object to the October 19 Draft Plan.

88. As discussed above, SFC's main creditors consist of (i) the Noteholders and (ii) the Third Party Defendants who claim indemnity from SFC and its subsidiaries on a contingent basis, the

contingency being whether or not they are ultimately found to be liable in the shareholder and noteholder class actions that are pending against them.

89. As a result of the Equity Claims Decision, the Third Party Defendants' indemnity claims in respect of shareholder class action claims are subordinated equity claims (leaving aside that they are contingent and contested in any event). With respect to the Third Party Defendants' indemnity claims in respect of the noteholder class action claims against them, these claims have now been limited to \$150 million, collectively and in the aggregate for all Third Party Defendants, by operation of the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit, which has limited the underlying claims by former noteholders against the Third Party Defendants to \$150 million. As discussed, the Plan provides for these contingent, unresolved claims through the creation of the Unresolved Claims Reserve.

V. THE PLAN

A. Background and Overview

90. On August 28, 2012, SFC brought a motion for an order approving the filing of the Plan (the "Plan Filing and Meeting Order") and for calling a meeting of creditors to vote on the Plan. I swore an affidavit in connection with that motion, a copy of which is attached without exhibits as Exhibit "P".

91. On August 31, 2012, this Honourable Court issued the Plan Filing and Meeting Order as well as an endorsement stating that the Plan Filing and Meeting Order was made without any determination of (a) the test for approval of the Plan; (b) the validity or quantum of any claims; and (c) the classification of creditors for voting purposes. The endorsement also stated that the

Plan Filing and Meeting Order did not prevent or restrict any party from opposing the Sanction Order now being sought. A copy of the endorsement is attached as Exhibit "Q".

92. The Plan sets out to achieve the following purposes:

- (a) to effect a full, final and irrevocable compromise, release, discharge, cancellation and bar of all Affected Claims;
- (b) to effect the distribution of the consideration provided for herein in respect of Proven Claims;
- (c) to transfer ownership of the Sino-Forest business to Newco and then to Newco II, in each case free and clear of all claims against SFC and certain related claims against the Subsidiaries, so as to enable the SFC Business to continue on a viable, going concern basis for the benefit of the Affected Creditors; and
- (d) to allow Affected Creditors and Noteholder Class Action Claimants to benefit from contingent value that may be derived from litigation claims to be advanced by the Litigation Trustee.

93. SFC believes that the Plan represents the best available outcome in the circumstances and that those with an economic interest in SFC, when considered as a whole, will derive a greater benefit from the implementation of the Plan and the continuation of the business of Sino-Forest as a going concern than would result from a bankruptcy or liquidation of SFC and Sino-Forest. SFC also believes that the Plan reasonably takes into account the interests of the Third Party Defendants, who seek indemnity and contribution from SFC and its Subsidiaries on a contingent basis, in the event that they are found to be liable to SFC's stakeholders.

94. Given that the Sale Process was not successful, the Plan contemplates that a new company and a further subsidiary ("Newco" and "Newco II", respectively) will be incorporated and SFC will transfer substantially all of its assets to Newco in compromise and satisfaction of all claims made against it. The result will be that Newco will own, directly or indirectly, all of SFC's Subsidiaries and SFC's interest in Greenheart and its subsidiaries as well as any intercompany debts owed by the Subsidiaries to SFC. Pursuant to the Plan, as explained in further detail below, the shares of Newco will be distributed to the Affected Creditors.

95. The terms of the October 19 Draft Plan were described in greater detail in the Monitor's Thirteenth Report. This Plan was amended on November 28, 2012. Attached as Exhibit "R" is a copy of the Plan, as amended. Attached as Exhibit "S" is a blackline comparison of the Plan to the October 19 Draft Plan filed with the Court. Attached as Exhibit "T" is a copy of the Plan Supplement dated November 21, 2012 (the "Plan Supplement").

B. Distributions Under the Plan

96. The Plan contemplates the distribution of (1) Newco Shares, (2) Newco Notes, and (3) Litigation Trust Interests, each as further described below.

I. Newco Shares

97. Pursuant to the terms of the Plan, Affected Creditors with Proven Claims are entitled to their pro-rata share of 92.5% of the Newco Shares and Early Consenting Noteholders also entitled to their pro-rata share of 7.5% of the Newco Shares.

98. As set out in Exhibit C to the Plan Supplement, Newco will be incorporated as an exempt company under the laws of the Cayman Islands pursuant to the Plan. It will have a single class of voting shares, being the Newco Shares. Newco is not, and there is no current intention for

Newco to become, a reporting issuer in any jurisdiction of Canada or elsewhere and the Newco Shares will not be listed on any stock exchange or quotation service on the Plan Implementation Date. The board of directors of Newco will initially consist of up to five directors that will be satisfactory to the Initial Consenting Noteholders. Thereafter, directors will be elected by shareholders on an annual basis at Newco's annual general meeting. Certain shareholders holding large blocks of shares will be entitled to elect directors.

99. As set out in Exhibit C to the Plan Supplement, prior to the Plan Implementation Date, it is intended that Newco will organize Newco II as a wholly-owned subsidiary and an exempt company under the laws of the Cayman Islands, for the purpose of acquiring from Newco the SFC assets to be transferred by SFC to Newco on the implementation of the Plan. The purpose of this step is to organize Newco (namely, Newco II) in a tax and jurisdictionally efficient manner for purposes of any subsequent sale of all or substantially all of Newco's assets (for example, Newco II will own all of the Direct Subsidiaries in a single jurisdiction, rather than in four separate jurisdictions).

100. Newco will be named Evergreen China Holdings Ltd. and Newco II will be named Evergreen China Holdings II Ltd.

2. *Newco Notes*

101. Pursuant to the terms of the Plan, Affected Creditors with Proven Claims are entitled to their pro-rata share of the Newco Notes.

102. As set out in Exhibit D to the Plan Supplement (which defines the capitalized terms used in this paragraph), Newco Notes in the aggregate principal amount of US\$300 million will be issued under an Indenture. They will be guaranteed by the Subsidiary Guarantors and secured by

pledges, mortgages and/or charges of the Collateral as described in Exhibit D to the Plan Supplement. Interest may be paid in cash or in PIK notes at rates prescribed in the Indenture and described in Exhibit D to the Plan Supplement. The Newco Notes will mature seven (7) years after the Original Issue Date, unless earlier redeemed pursuant to the terms thereof and the Indenture.

3. *Litigation Trust Interests*

103. Pursuant to the terms of the Plan, Affected Creditors with Proven Claims are entitled to their pro-rata share of 75% of the Litigation Trust Interests and the Noteholder Class Action Claimants are entitled to their pro-rata share of 25% of the Litigation Trust Interests.

104. The Litigation Trust will hold the Litigation Trust Claims (each as defined in the Plan), which include all claims and actions that have been or may be asserted by or on behalf of (i) SFC against any and all third parties, and (ii) the Note Indenture Trustees (on behalf of the Noteholders) against any and all persons in connection with the Notes; provided that Litigation Trust Claims will not include claims released under the Plan or claims advanced in the Class Actions.

105. The Litigation Trust will be governed by a Litigation Trust Agreement, a draft form of which was attached as Exhibit B to the Plan Supplement. The Litigation Trust will be funded by SFC with the Litigation Funding Amount, \$1 million. Pursuant to the Plan, Newco may subsequently elect to advance additional funding to the Litigation Trust. The Litigation Trustee (who has not yet been selected) will be charged with the responsibility to preserve and enhance the value of the Litigation Trust Assets (as defined in the Litigation Trust Agreement), through the prosecution, compromise and settlement, abandonment or dismissal of all claims held by the

Litigation Trust. In addition, the Plan contemplates that, prior to the Plan Implementation Date, SFC and the Initial Consenting Noteholders may agree to exclude one or more claims from being transferred to the Litigation Trust in which case such claims will be released on the Plan Implementation Date.

106. I am advised by counsel that the Litigation Trust Claims will be transferred to the Litigation Trust subject to the equities, limitation defences and other defences that otherwise may be asserted against SFC, and none of those equities, litigation defences and other defences are purported to be compromised by the Plan.

107. SFC will also be transferring all respective rights, title and interests in and to any lawyer-client privilege, work product privilege or other privilege or immunity attaching to any documents or communications associated with the Litigation Trust Claims to the Litigation Trust for the benefit of the beneficiaries of the Litigation Trust.

C. Reserves Established Under the Plan

108. The Plan contemplates the establishment of the Administration Charge Reserve, the Unaffected Claims Reserve, the Unresolved Claims Reserve, and the Monitor's Post-Implementation Reserve. Notwithstanding that the Initial Order created a Directors' Charge of \$3.2 million, the Named Directors and Officers have agreed to stand back from making any claims against the Directors' Charge as part of the comprehensive arrangements inherent in the Plan agreed to by the Initial Consenting Noteholders such that the Plan no longer provides for a Directors' Charge Reserve. The Monitor's Thirteenth Report also describes the purpose of each of these Reserves.

109. The amount of the Administration Charge Reserve is \$500,000 or such other amount as may be agreed to by the Monitor and the Initial Consenting Noteholders. The amount of the Unaffected Claims Reserve will be established on the Plan Implementation Date and is estimated to be \$1,800,000. The amount of the Monitor's Post-Implementation Reserve will initially be \$5,000,000 or such other amount as may be agreed by SFC, the Monitor and the Initial Consenting Noteholders.

110. Any funds remaining in the Administration Charge Reserve or the Unaffected Claims Reserve will be transferred to the Monitor's Post-Implementation Reserve. The Monitor may, in its discretion, release excess cash from the Monitor's Post-Implementation Reserve to Newco. Once the Monitor determines that the cash remaining in the Monitor's Post-Implementation Reserve is no longer necessary for administering SFC, the Monitor shall transfer the remaining funds to Newco.

111. The Unresolved Claims Reserve will contain Newco Shares, Newco Notes, and Litigation Trust Interests in respect of any Unresolved Claims. It is expected that the Unresolved Claims as at the Plan Implementation Date will consist primarily of the contingent and unresolved indemnity claims against SFC by the Third Party Defendants in respect of (a) Class Action Indemnity Claims relating to the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Claims, which have been limited to \$150 million collectively and in the aggregate by operation of the consensual Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit; (b) \$30 million in respect of unresolved claims for reimbursement of Defence Claim Costs; and (c) \$500,000 in respect of unresolved claims filed by certain trade and other creditors, some of which have been accepted for voting purposes but not yet for distribution purposes.

112. Pursuant to the Plan and the Sanction Order, each of SFC, the Monitor, and the Initial Consenting Noteholders have reserved all rights to seek or obtain an Order at any time directing that any Unresolved Claims should be disallowed in whole or in part or should receive the same treatment as Equity Claims. The Plan and the Sanction Order provide that all parties with Unresolved Claims will have standing in respect of any proceeding to determine whether or not an Unresolved Claim constitutes a Proven Claim (in whole or in part) entitled to consideration under the Plan.

113. The Plan Supplement also describes the establishment of SFC Escrow Co., which will act as the Unresolved Claims Escrow Agent. Subject to the terms of the Plan, SFC Escrow Co. will hold distributions in respect of any Unresolved Claim in existence at the Plan Implementation Date in escrow until settlement or final determination of the Unresolved Claim in accordance with the Claims Process Order, the Meeting order, the Plan or otherwise, as applicable.

1. Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Claims

114. As I discussed above, there is a component of the class action claims that relates to the debt issuances and, in some respect, some of the class action plaintiffs are former noteholders. Section 4.4(a) of the Plan makes clear that those claims, as against SFC, the Subsidiaries or the Named Directors and Officers (other than those claims that are Section 5.1(2) D&O Claims, Conspiracy Claims or Non-Released D&O Claims) are fully, finally, irrevocably and forever compromised and released. However, these Noteholder Class Action Claims against Third Party Defendants are not compromised or released and may continue to proceed against the Third Party Defendants, provided that the Class Action Plaintiffs have agreed that the aggregate amount of such claims that may be asserted against Third Party Defendants in respect of

Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Claims shall not exceed the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit, which has been established at a global amount of \$150 million in the aggregate for all Third Party Defendants.

115. The Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit was established after extensive and difficult negotiations and discussion spanning many months among the Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee, the Ad Hoc Noteholders and SFC. As a result of the limit, the maximum exposure of the Third Party Defendants with respect to Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Claims is, in the aggregate, \$150 million. Accordingly, the maximum potential indemnity claims of such Third Party Defendants against SFC are likewise limited to \$150 million in the aggregate. Such contingent indemnity claims are treated as Unresolved Claims under the Plan, and the potential Plan consideration that could be distributed in respect of any such indemnity claims that could become Proven Claims will be held in escrow in the Unresolved Claims Reserve.

2. Defence Costs

116. The Equity Claims Decision, as affirmed by the Court of Appeal, did not determine whether Defence Cost Claims of the auditors and Underwriters would be treated in the same manner as their indemnity claims against the company. Accordingly, the Plan treats Defence Cost Claims as Unresolved Claims, with the potential Plan consideration that could be distributed in respect of any such claims that could become Proven Claims to be held in the Unresolved Claims Reserve.

D. Releases Under the Plan

117. The Plan includes releases for certain parties (the "Released Parties"), including certain current and former directors and officers of SFC (collectively, the "Named Directors and Officers"). The identification of the Named Directors and Officers and the scope of the releases were heavily negotiated among various constituents as part of the negotiation of the Plan and form a fundamental element of the commercial deal embodied in the Plan.

118. There are four main categories of claims against the Named Directors and Officers that will not be released pursuant to the Plan:

- (a) Non-Released D&O Claims, being claims for fraud or criminal conduct;
- (b) Conspiracy Claims;
- (c) Section 5.1(2) D&O Claims; and
- (d) Non-monetary remedies of the OSC.

119. The Plan contemplates that recovery in respect of claims against the Named Directors and Officers of SFC in respect of any Section 5.1(2) D&O Claims and any Conspiracy Claims shall be directed to insurance proceeds available from the insurance policies maintained by SFC.

120. SFC maintained director and officer insurance coverage in 2011 providing for a total of \$60 million of coverage, which applies to both defence costs and any damages or settlements. The primary policy is provided by ACE INA Insurance with a policy limit of \$15 million, with excess layers provided by Chubb, ERIS (Lloyds) and Travelers (collectively, the "2011 Insurance Policies"). Slightly in excess of \$10 million of the \$60 million limit has been paid out

on account of insured costs incurred by SFC and by other insured persons under the 2012 policies.

121. When the 2011 policies were not renewed after their expiry on December 31, 2011, SFC obtained coverage from other providers totalling \$55 million for 2012 (the "2012 Insurance Policies"). The 2012 Insurance Policies contain a "prior acts" exclusion, and therefore are not available to respond to claims arising from the Muddy Waters allegations.

122. Both the 2011 Insurance Policies and 2012 Insurance Policies provide for three types of coverage: (a) director and officer liability; (b) corporate liability for indemnifiable loss; and (c) corporate liability arising from securities claims. The insurance policies are subject to a number of exclusions, and contain coverage and claims limits.

123. In addition to the release of the Named Directors and Officers, and advisors involved in these proceedings, the Plan provides for releases of all claims relating to claims against SFC that may be made against the Subsidiaries. As I explained in my Initial Order Affidavit, while SFC is a holding company, the "business" of SFC is conducted through the Subsidiaries (which are not CCAA applicants).

124. There can be no effective restructuring of SFC's business and separation from its Canadian parent (which SFC has said from the outset was the objective of the commencement of these proceedings) if the claims asserted against the Subsidiaries arising out of or connected to claims against SFC remain outstanding. Just as the claims of the Noteholders against the Subsidiaries are to be released under the Plan upon implementation, so are the other claims against the Subsidiaries which relate to claims asserted against SFC (as well as any claims that the Subsidiaries have against SFC).

VI. THE MEETING

125. The Plan Filing and Meeting Order sets out the procedure for the calling and conduct of the meeting of creditors to vote in respect of the Plan.

A. Meeting Materials, Notice, and Mailing

126. The Plan Filing and Meeting Order approved the forms of Information Circular, Notice to Affected Creditors, Ordinary Affected Creditors' Proxy, Noteholders' Proxy, Instructions to Ordinary Affected Creditors, Instructions to Registered Noteholders, Instructions to Unregistered Noteholders and Instructions to Participant Holders (collectively, the "Meeting Materials"). A copy of the Meeting Materials is attached as Exhibit "U".

127. The Mailing Date set out in the Plan Filing and Meeting Order was to be no later than September 20, 2012, provided that such date could be extended by the Monitor with the consent of SFC and the Initial Consenting Noteholders. The Mailing Date was ultimately set as October 24, 2012.

128. A separate order was obtained by the Monitor on October 24, 2012 (the "Revised Noteholder Mailing Process Order") to effect a more efficient process for the mailing of the Meeting Materials to the Noteholders. A copy of the Revised Noteholder Mailing Process Order is attached as Exhibit "V".

129. The Monitor has set out in its Thirteenth Report how the Plan Filing and Meeting Order was complied with and how notice was effected as required.

130. The Plan Filing and Meeting Order permits SFC, with the consent of the Monitor to amend, restate, modify and/or supplement any of such materials, subject to the terms of the Plan, provided that the Monitor, SFC or the Chair shall communicate the details of any such amendments, restatements, modifications and/or supplements to Affected Creditors present at the Meeting prior to any vote being taken at the meeting, among other things.

131. The Plan Supplement was distributed in accordance with the terms of the Plan Filing and Meeting Order to Affected Creditors. The Plan (as amended on November 28, 2012) was provided to the CCAA service list as well as posted on the Monitor's website on November 28, 2012.

132. Based on information provided to me by counsel and by the Monitor in its Thirteenth Report, I believe that SFC has complied with all requirements in the Plan Filing and Meeting Order with respect to the mailing of the Meeting Materials.

B. The Meeting

133. The Plan Filing and Meeting Order authorized SFC to call the Meeting and to hold and conduct the Meeting on the Meeting Date at the offices of Bennett Jones LLP, 3400 One First Canadian Place, Toronto, Ontario, for the purpose of seeking approval of the Plan by the Affected Creditors with Voting Claims at the Meeting in the manner set forth in the Plan Filing and Meeting Order.

134. The Meeting Date was set to be November 29, 2012, and this was communicated to Affected Creditors in the Meeting Materials. Further changes to the Plan resulted in the Meeting Date being extended to November 30, 2012. SFC issued a press release announcing this

extension, and the Monitor's counsel also communicated the fact of the extension by way of email to the Service List. The location of the Meeting was moved to the offices of Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP, counsel to the Monitor, at 1 First Canadian Place, 100 King Street West, 16th Floor, Toronto, Ontario.

135. The outcome of the Meeting will be reported in a further report by the Monitor prior to the Sanction Order hearing.

C. Entitlement to Vote and Classification of Creditors

136. The voting process is described in some detail in the Monitor's Thirteenth Report. By way of general overview only, the Plan Filing and Meeting Order provides that the only Persons entitled to vote at the Meeting are the Beneficial Noteholders with Voting Claims that have beneficial ownership of one or more Notes as at the Voting Record Date (August 31, 2012), and Ordinary Affected Creditors with Voting Claims as at the Voting Record Date.

137. The Plan Filing and Meeting Order provides that each Affected Creditor with an Unresolved Claim could also attend the Meeting and is entitled to one vote at the Meeting in respect of such Unresolved Claim. The Monitor is required to keep a separate record of votes cast by Affected Creditors with Unresolved Claims and to report on such vote at the Sanction Hearing.

138. The Plan Filing and Meeting Order provides that each of the Third Party Defendants is entitled to vote as a member of the Affected Creditors Class in respect of any Class Action Indemnity Claim that it has properly filed in respect of the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Claims, provided that the aggregate value of all such claims shall, for voting purposes, be

deemed to be limited to the amount of the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit. The Monitor is required to keep a separate record of votes cast by the Third Party Defendants in respect of such Class Action Indemnity Claims and to report to the Court with respect thereto at the Sanction Hearing.

139. The Plan Filing and Meeting Order provides that the following Persons do not have the right to vote at the Meeting: Unaffected Creditors; Noteholder Class Action Claimants; Equity Claimants; any Person with a D&O Claim; any Person with a D&O Indemnity Claim (other than a D&O Indemnity Claim in respect of Defence Costs Claims or in respect of the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Claims); any Person with a Subsidiary Intercompany Claim; and any other Person asserting Claims against SFC whose Claims do not constitute Affected Creditor Claims on the Voting Record Date.

VII. STEPS TAKEN AT THE OSC WITH RESPECT TO PLAN STEPS

140. The mailing of the Meeting Materials, the holding of the Meeting, and the steps contemplated to implement the Plan could have individually or collectively constituted an act in furtherance of a trade, which would have been contrary to the TCTO first made by the OSC on August 26, 2011.

141. To avoid that result, SFC sought and obtained two orders of the OSC to vary the TCTO. First, on September 18, 2012, the OSC issued an order varying the TCTO to permit the distribution of the Meeting Materials as contemplated by the Plan Filing and Meeting Order. A copy of the September 18, 2012 order is attached as Exhibit "W".

142. Second, on October 26, 2012, the OSC issued an order varying the TCTO to permit: (a) the holding of the Meeting; and (b) the CCAA Plan Trades and all acts in furtherance thereof, other than CCAA Plan Trades required to give effect to an Alternative Sale Transaction, provided that the requisite creditor approval is obtained, this Honourable Court issues a sanction order, and SFC has complied and is in compliance with the terms of all CCAA court orders. A copy of the October 26, 2012 order is attached as Exhibit "X".

143. As a result, except in the circumstances where an Alternative Sale Transaction was being pursued, there are no further regulatory requirements that relate to the OSC that are needed to effectuate the transactions contemplated in the Plan, other than an order from the OSC and other provincial securities regulators for a decision that SFC is not a reporting issuer effective as of the implementation date of the Plan. If granted, that order would result in SFC and Newco not being reporting issuers in Ontario or any other province in Canada following the implementation date of the Plan.

VIII. PLAN SANCTION

A. SFC Has Complied with the CCAA and the Orders Granted in these Proceedings

144. As I explained in my Initial Order Affidavit and as was found by this Honourable Court in its endorsement on the Initial Order, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit "Y", SFC is a "debtor company" under section 2 of the CCAA. It is a "company" continued under the CBCA that has debts far in excess of the CDN \$5 million statutory requirement, and is insolvent with liabilities to creditors far exceeding CDN \$1,000.

145. Since the commencement of these proceedings, SFC has complied with the provisions of the CCAA, the Initial Order and all subsequent Orders of the Court granted in these proceedings. I am not aware, and I am advised by counsel that they are unaware, of any steps taken by SFC that are not authorized by the CCAA.

146. This Honourable Court has been kept up to date with regular updates provided in affidavits that I have sworn and in reports of the Monitor that have been filed with the Court. In particular, SFC made full and timely disclosure of, among other things: (a) developments occurring at the OSC and with OSC Staff; (b) steps taken by SFC in response to various developments in SFC's business, including a number of departures of senior management personnel at SFC; (c) the efforts to negotiate a global resolution of issues among all stakeholders; (d) the efforts to market the assets of SFC pursuant to the Sale Process Order; and (e) developments in SFC's business, including the difficulties SFC has experienced in realizing upon and recovering receivables from third parties.

147. Accordingly, after consulting with counsel and reviewing the documents described above, I believe that all steps taken by SFC since the inception of this proceeding have been authorized by the CCAA.

B. The Plan is Fair and Reasonable

148. Since the Muddy Waters report was issued on June 2, 2011, SFC has expended considerable efforts and resources examining alternatives to find the best possible resolution to the issues facing the company described above.

149. Prior to filing for the protection under the CCAA, SFC did everything within its power to avoid the defaults that ultimately forced it to commence insolvency proceedings. However, as described above and in my Initial Order Affidavit, SFC was in default under certain of the Notes as a result of being unable to issue 2011 third quarter financial statements. While waivers of such defaults were obtained for a period of time, those waivers were set to expire at the end of April, 2012 and the Noteholders, with the guarantees and share pledges described above, would have been in a position to enforce their rights under the Note Indentures. Any alternative to the commencement of CCAA proceedings would have risked the immediate cessation of the Sino-Forest business resulting in significant detriment to SFC's stakeholders.

150. As previously discussed, following the commencement of these CCAA proceedings, SFC conducted a court supervised Sale Process to determine whether there was a potential purchaser willing to purchase the assets of SFC for the Qualified Consideration. With the assistance of Houlihan, the market was thoroughly canvassed and no such bidder could be found. In accordance with the Sale Process Procedures, SFC terminated the Sale Process and proceeded towards developing the Plan to implement the Restructuring Transaction.

151. The Plan that will ultimately be put to Affected Creditors at the Meeting was the subject of significant and extensive negotiations. In negotiating the Plan, the Board of SFC considered the interests of all stakeholders of SFC. Alternatives were explored throughout the negotiations, and the Plan was the product of such negotiations. I do not believe that there are other viable alternatives that would have been acceptable to SFC and its creditors. The Plan represents the best available alternative remaining in these proceedings, and provides a better result for SFC's creditors than could be achieved through a bankruptcy or liquidation.

152. As discussed above, SFC is a holding company and the Sino-Forest business is held through the Subsidiaries. To recover any value in a bankruptcy or liquidation scenario, creditors would need to realize upon the assets where they are resident. The majority of SFC's business operations are located in the PRC, and the majority of SFC's forest plantations are located in the southern and eastern regions of the PRC, primarily in inland regions suitable for large-scale replanting. Other jurisdictions where bankruptcy or liquidations would need to take place would be in Hong Kong or the British Virgin Islands (the "BVI").

153. Beyond the legal hurdles of effecting any bankruptcy or liquidation in these various jurisdictions, any of SFC's creditors seeking a liquidation in the PRC, Hong Kong or BVI, will be confronted with significant difficulties in collecting receivables as has been detailed by the Monitor in its earlier reports and which I described during my cross-examination on an earlier report and in dealing with the substantial claims that have been asserted against the Subsidiaries as identified in the claims process. Significant efforts have been expended by Sino-Forest over the past several months to recover its receivables, and notwithstanding long-standing relationships with many of the parties owing such amounts, SFC has largely been unsuccessful. The ability of third party creditors of a Canadian parent company (or a liquidator appointed outside of the PRC in respect of the Subsidiaries) to collect such receivables in these various regions is speculative, at best.

154. Any creditors in a bankruptcy or liquidation scenario in these various jurisdictions would also have significant challenges in monetizing any of the assets of the Subsidiaries, given the challenges in establishing title capable of being transferred to a buyer that have been described in the reports of the Independent Committee, my earlier affidavits and certain reports of the Monitor. Even if such assets were successfully monetized, insofar as such assets are located in

the PRC, creditors would be faced with the numerous legal and regulatory issues associated with removing funds from the PRC.

155. Any liquidation or bankruptcy of SFC, through its Subsidiaries, would result in loss of value to the creditors of SFC and its Subsidiaries as a going concern. As I have testified on a number of occasions, significantly greater value can be obtained through the Sino-Forest business continuing as a going concern than could be obtained through piecemeal dismantling of the enterprise through a bankruptcy or liquidation.

156. In developing the Plan, I do not believe that SFC or the Board has acted in a manner that unfairly disregards, or is unfairly prejudicial to, or oppresses the interests of any stakeholders. It is not unfair for shareholders to not receive any distribution under the Plan given that there are insufficient funds to satisfy the claims of SFC's creditors. The treatment of shareholder claims and related indemnity claims is fair and consistent with the Equity Claims Decision, as affirmed by the Court of Appeal. As I have described above, a sizeable majority of the Noteholders have agreed to support the Plan, and the Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee and the Quebec Class Action Plaintiffs have stated that they will not oppose it. To the extent that certain claims are Unresolved Claims at the time of the Plan's implementation, such claims are provided for through the creation of the Unresolved Claims Reserve, which will preserve the potential Plan Consideration in respect of such claims, to the extent that any of them (or any part of any of them) becomes a Proven Claim.

157. SFC has stated from the outset of these proceedings that it is necessary to have a clean break for the Subsidiaries from SFC in order for these proceedings to be successful. The primary purpose of the CCAA proceeding was to extricate the business of Sino-Forest, through the

operation of SFC's Subsidiaries, from the cloud of uncertainty surrounding SFC. Accordingly, there is a clear and rational connection between the release of the Subsidiaries and the Plan and it is difficult to see how any viable plan could be made that does not cleanse the Subsidiaries of the claims made against SFC. The Subsidiaries are effectively contributing their assets to SFC to satisfy SFC's obligations under their guarantees of SFC's Note indebtedness, for the benefit of the Affected Creditors (the Subsidiaries are not asserting against SFC for doing so, and in fact are releasing SFC from any such claims and guaranteeing the Newco Notes).

158. The Plan will enable SFC to achieve a going concern outcome for the business of Sino-Forest that fully and finally deals with debt issues and will extract the business of Sino-Forest from the uncertainties surrounding SFC. The Plan will provide stability for Sino-Forest's employees, suppliers, customers and other stakeholders, and provide a path for recovery of the debt owed to SFC's non-subordinated creditors.

159. The Plan preserves the rights of aggrieved parties, including SFC, to pursue those parties that are alleged to share some or all of the responsibility for the problems that caused SFC to file for CCAA protection in the first place. Releases are not being granted to individuals who have been charged by OSC staff, or to other individuals against whom the Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee wishes to preserve litigation claims.

160. The Named Directors and Officers group consists principally of Board members and members of management who have been important to efforts to avoid note defaults and later to facilitate SFC's restructuring efforts. It also included some individuals formerly associated with SFC who, to SFC's knowledge, are not implicated in any conduct issues. The Named Directors and Officers are Andrew Agnew, William E. Ardell, James Bowland, Leslie Chan, Michael

Cheng, Lawrence Hon, James M.E. Hyde, Richard M. Kimel, R. John (Jack) Lawrence, Jay A. Lefton, Edmund Mak, Tom Maradin, Simon Murray, James F. O'Donnell, William P. Rosenfeld, Peter Donghong Wang, Garry West, Kee Y. Wong, and me.

161. I have described above the steps taken to investigate conduct issues, avoid note defaults and ultimately to facilitate the restructuring efforts. These efforts would not have been possible without the active participation of the Board and members of remaining management.

162. In addition to these positive efforts, the Board also dealt with conduct issues as facts came to light. As described above, certain individuals were placed on administrative leave following late August 2011. As described in prior affidavits, since the commencement of these CCAA proceedings, Allen Chan, Alfred Hung, George Ho, Simon Yeung, Albert Ip, and David Horsley have ceased to be employed by Sino-Forest. Other less senior employees also have ceased to be employed by Sino-Forest.

163. Finally, a release of the Named Directors and Officers is necessary to effect a greater recovery for SFC's creditors, rather than preserve indemnification rights and dilutive participation entitlements for the Named Directors and Officers.

164. For the reasons discussed above, SFC believes that the Plan provides a fair and reasonable balance among its stakeholders while providing the ability for the Sino-Forest to continue as a going concern for the benefit of stakeholders.

165. As I have explained in several prior affidavits, to achieve a going concern outcome for the business of Sino-Forest, SFC cannot remain in CCAA for much longer. There have already been considerable strains on Sino-Forest's business relationships and the company's ability to


collect very sizable accounts receivable have been significantly constrained by the fact of these insolvency proceedings. Moreover, as indicated by the Monitor's Thirteenth Report and the proposed cash flow forecast in the Monitor's Twelfth Report, while SFC has sufficient cash to exist to February 1, 2013, SFC's cash position is being rapidly depleted and SFC will likely have insufficient funds to continue operating in these CCAA proceedings for any extended period of time beyond February 1, 2013.

166. Subject to obtaining approval of the Plan by the requisite majority of Affected Creditors with Proven Claims at the Meeting, for the reasons stated above, I believe that the Plan is appropriate and should be sanctioned by this Honourable Court.

SWORN BEFORE ME at the City of Hong
Kong, Special Administrative Region,
People's Republic of China, this 29th day of
November, 2012


Chan Ching Yee
Solicitor

A Commissioner of Oaths **Reed Smith
Richards Butler
20/F Alexandra House
Hong Kong SAR**


W. Judson Martin

**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 OR COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF SINO-FOREST CORPORATION**

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

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)**

Proceedings commenced in Toronto

**AFFIDAVIT OF W. JUDSON MARTIN
(Sworn November 29, 2012)**

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

Robert W. Staley (LSUC #27115J)
Kevin Zych (LSUC #33129T)
Derek J. Bell (LSUC #43420J)
Jonathan Bell (LSUC #55457P)
Tel: 416-863-1200
Fax: 416-863-1716

Lawyers for the Applicant

Tab C

THIS IS EXHIBIT "C" TO
THE AFFIDAVIT OF ELIZABETH FIMIO
SWORN APRIL 24, 2013

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "A. M. ...", is written above a horizontal line.

A Commissioner, etc.

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

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

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

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

Applicant

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

**AFFIDAVIT OF W. JUDSON MARTIN
(Sworn January 11, 2013)**

I, **W. JUDSON MARTIN**, of the City of Hong Kong, Special Administrative Region, People's Republic of China, **MAKE OATH AND SAY:**

1. I am the Vice-Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Sino-Forest Corporation ("Sino-Forest" or the "Applicant"). I therefore have personal knowledge of the matters set out below, except where otherwise stated. Where I do not possess personal knowledge, I have stated the source of my information and I believe such information to be true.

2. This affidavit is made in support of a motion brought by the Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities, including the representative plaintiffs in the Ontario Class Action (collectively, the "Ontario Plaintiffs"), for approval of a settlement (the "Ernst & Young Settlement"), as further defined in the Plan of Compromise and Reorganization of Sino-Forest dated December 3, 2012 (the "Plan"), with Ernst & Young LLP and the release of claims

-2-

against Ernst & Young LLP (the “Ernst & Young Release”, the “Ernst & Young Claims” and “Ernst & Young”, all as those terms are defined in the Plan).

3. Terms not defined in this affidavit are as defined in my affidavit sworn March 30, 2012 in support of the application for the initial order made in this proceeding, my affidavit sworn August 14, 2012 in support of the filing of a draft plan of compromise and arrangement, and/or my affidavit sworn November 29, 2012 in support of a motion for sanction of the Plan. I adopt and repeat for the purposes of this motion the statements I made in my earlier affidavits. Copies of these three affidavits are attached hereto (without exhibits) as Exhibits “A,” “B,” and “C” respectively.

4. I have sworn numerous affidavits in this CCAA Proceeding, in my capacity as Vice Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Applicant including those referred to above. In addition to my responsibility for the operational and financial affairs of the Applicant, I have been intimately involved in this restructuring, instructing Applicant’s counsel (Bennett Jones LLP) and have worked with FTI Consulting Inc. in its capacity as court-appointed Monitor as well as with the Ad Hoc Committee of Sino-Forest Noteholders (the “Noteholders”), and their respective counsel.

5. In addition, I was involved in the formulation and finalization of the Plan ultimately sanctioned by this Court on December 10, 2012 (the “Sanction Order”).

6. As I have explained previously, Sino-Forest itself has no operating assets, and its business in standing timber is conducted through its direct and indirect subsidiaries (collectively the “Sino-Forest Subsidiaries”). All of the standing timber assets of the Sino-Forest companies (of which there are many) are held through the Sino-Forest Subsidiaries, as a result of which

(and notwithstanding that Sino-Forest is the sole CCAA Applicant), the Sino-Forest Subsidiaries and the business they conduct have been central to this restructuring.

7. As I described in my affidavit sworn November 29, 2012, the Plan provides (for the reasons expressed) that substantially all of Sino-Forest's assets, including the shares in the Sino-Forest Subsidiaries, will be transferred (according to the terms of the Plan) to Newco for the benefit of Affected Creditors.

8. This necessarily required that the claims filed pursuant to the Claims Procedure Order made in this CCAA Proceeding be identified and addressed. That is one reason why Sino-Forest requested, and this Court granted, the term of the Claims Procedure Order requiring claimants to identify potential claims against the Sino-Forest Subsidiaries, notwithstanding that Sino-Forest itself was the sole Applicant.

9. I am generally familiar with the most significant claims filed against the Applicant and the directors and officers of Sino-Forest, and in particular the claims of Ernst & Young, the syndicate of underwriters involved in the various debt and equity offerings of Sino-Forest (the "Underwriters") and BDO Limited ("BDO"). Those claims, advanced against Sino-Forest and the Sino-Forest Subsidiaries, individually and in the aggregate, total in the billions of dollars. Those claims had to be addressed as part of this restructuring.

10. As I stated at paragraph 124 of my affidavit sworn November 29, 2012, there could be no effective restructuring of Sino-Forest's business and separation from the Canadian parent (which Sino-Forest has said from the outset was the objective at the commencement of these proceedings) if the claims asserted against the Sino-Forest Subsidiaries arising out of, or

-4-

connected to, claims against Sino-Forest remained outstanding. The Plan provides for the release of claims against the Sino-Forest Subsidiaries.

11. In addition, and as counsel for Sino-Forest has previously submitted to this Court and as has been observed by the court-appointed Monitor, timing and delay were critical factors in this restructuring. I believe that delays and the passage of time negatively impact on the value of Sino-Forest assets and the recovery by stakeholders, and I certainly understand this to be the view of the Noteholders, as has been expressed to me and to Sino-Forest by the Noteholders and their counsel on numerous occasions.

12. Accordingly, it was and remains critical to the success of this restructuring, to the maximization of value and to the preservation of assets that:

- (a) the claims against Sino-Forest and the Sino-Forest Subsidiaries be determined or resolved such that the assets held by the Sino-Forest Subsidiaries were not subject to these contingent claims; and
- (b) that this be achieved as quickly as possible.

13. It was for these reasons, among others, that Sino-Forest, supported by the Noteholders, has continued its efforts to advance this restructuring as soon as possible. Sino-Forest welcomed the initiative by the supervising CCAA Judge, Justice Morawetz, to urge and encourage the principal stakeholders to engage in a constructive dialogue with a view to attempting to resolve disputes on a consensual basis, including the claims against Sino-Forest and the Sino-Forest Subsidiaries.

-5-

14. For these reasons, Sino-Forest welcomed the Mediation Order made in these proceedings and the ensuing mediation, described in my earlier affidavits. As stated above, the Court-ordered mediation involving the parties to the Ontario Class Action, the Noteholders and the Monitor was consistent with the direction and encouragement from the supervising CCAA Judge that the principal stakeholders should focus their efforts on the resolution of claims. As I understand it, this was a continuing theme in these proceedings.

15. While the global mediation conducted by Justice Newbould did not resolve all litigation claims at that time, it did represent the genesis of a substantive dialogue among the key stakeholders and was, I believe, the catalyst for discussions that continued after the conclusion of the formal mediation. Both the global mediation and the subsequent settlement discussions were consistent with the objectives of the Applicant in this restructuring.

16. I understand that Ernst & Young continued discussions with the Ontario Plaintiffs, ultimately resulting in the Minutes of Settlement which define the terms of the Ernst & Young Settlement.

17. Sino-Forest was and remains of the view that the Ernst & Young Settlement is a positive development in this restructuring for the reasons expressed below. As a result, the Applicant was amenable to amending the draft Plan to provide for the mechanics and framework for the Ernst & Young Settlement and the Ernst & Young Release in order that it could be voted on at the meeting of creditors and sanctioned by this Court.

18. In my affidavit sworn November 29, 2012, I discussed the Equity Claims Decision (as defined in that affidavit). Notwithstanding the Equity Claims Decision, I am advised by my counsel, Bennett Jones LLP, and believe that, absent a resolution on terms acceptable to Ernst &

Young, it could and likely would have continued to assert all appeal and other rights in respect of the Equity Claims Decision and in respect of the Sanction Order.

19. The Ernst & Young Settlement provides significant benefit to these CCAA Proceedings:

(a) Ernst & Young agreed to support the Plan, including the Plan provisions that deal with the Ernst & Young Settlement;

(b) Ernst & Young's support simplified and accelerated the Plan process:

(i) Ernst & Young agreed that its claims against Sino-Forest and the Sino-Forest Subsidiaries are released, which claims were significant as stated above;

(ii) The proofs of claim filed by Ernst & Young in these proceedings set out extensive claims that could be asserted directly against the Sino-Forest Subsidiaries. Components of those claims were not expressly addressed in the Equity Claims Decision made by this Court;

(iii) Ernst & Young agreed not to seek leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada in respect of the dismissal by the Court of Appeal for Ontario of Ernst & Young's appeal of the Equity Claims Decision;

(iv) By agreeing to release all of its claims, Ernst & Young has eliminated:

a. The expense and management time otherwise to be incurred in litigating its claims;

b. Dilution of the recovery by other creditors if Ernst & Young's

-7-

claims were ultimately resolved in its favour and not subordinated;
and

- c. Potentially extending the timelines to complete the restructuring of Sino-Forest;
- (c) Ernst & Young has agreed not to receive any distributions of any kind under the Plan in respect of Noteholder Class Action Claims, as have the other Third Party Defendants. Without that agreement, the Unresolved Claims Reserve would have materially increased, with the potential for a corresponding dilution of consideration paid to the Affected Creditors; and
- (d) Although the allocation of the settlement funds has yet to be determined, any portion allocated to the equity holders of Sino-Forest will significantly increase the recovery to a class of stakeholders that would not otherwise receive any amount under the Plan.

20. Sino-Forest, the only Applicant in the CCAA Proceeding, is a holding company and its only material assets are the shares of the Sino-Forest Subsidiaries. The release of claims by Ernst & Young assisted in allowing the Sino-Forest Subsidiaries to contribute, unencumbered by claims totalling billions of dollars, their assets to the overall restructuring.

21. For these reasons among others, I believe that the Ernst & Young Settlement contributed in a significant and positive way to the timeliness of the Sanction Order, and ultimately to the implementation of the Plan.

22. I understand that the terms of the Ernst & Young Settlement include the provision of a release in favour of Ernst & Young in respect of all claims related to Sino-Forest. The Plan (as


-8-

sanctioned) already includes third party releases in respect of other non-Applicant entities and individuals who have made material contributions to the success of the restructuring, including present and former directors and officers, and the Sino-Forest Subsidiaries.


23. The Plan provides for the mechanics and framework for other third party settlements, should those occur in the future. The inclusion of these provisions in the Plan facilitated the support of the Plan by the Underwriters and withdrawal of objections to the Plan by BDO. From the course of the negotiations over the relevant period I believe that the Ernst & Young Settlement was a catalyst to those other parties withdrawing their objections to the Plan. Ultimately, except for the group of securities holders now opposing the Ernst & Young Settlement, the Plan was approved without opposition.

24. In conclusion, for the reasons described above, the Applicant believes that the Ernst & Young Settlement represented a significant contribution to the Plan and to a successful restructuring, and the Applicant supports the motion for approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement.

SWORN BEFORE ME at the City of Hong Kong, Special Administrative Region, People's Republic of China this day of January, 2013



Chan Ching Yee
Solicitor
Reed Smith
Richards Butler
20/F Alexandra House
Hong Kong SAR



W. JUDSON MARTIN

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 COMPRISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

Plaintiffs

ERNST & YOUNG LLP, et al

Defendants

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

Court File No. CV-11-431153-00-CP

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT TORONTO

AFFIDAVIT OF W. JUDSON MARTIN, SWORN THIS
11TH DAY OF JANUARY, 2013

BENNETT JONES LLP
3400 One First Canadian Place
PO Box 130
Toronto, ON M5X 1A4

Robert W. Staley (LSUC #27115J)
Kevin Zych (LSUC #33129T)
Raj Sahni (LSUC #42942U)
Derek J. Bell (LSUC #424320J)
Jonathan Bell (LSUC #55457P)

Tel: 416-863-2200
Fax: 416-863-1716

Lawyers the Applicant

Tab D

THIS IS EXHIBIT "D" TO
THE AFFIDAVIT OF ELIZABETH FIMIO
SWORN APRIL 24, 2013

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "M. Cook", is written above a horizontal line.

A Commissioner, etc.

Court of Appeal File No.:
S.C.J. Court File No.: CV-12-9667-00CL

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

**IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*,
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED, AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF
COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF SINO-FOREST CORPORATION**

Court of Appeal File No.:
S.C.J. Court File No.: CV-11-431153-00CP

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

B E T W E E N :

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

Plaintiffs

- and -

**SINO-FOREST CORPORATION, ERNST & YOUNG LLP, BDO LIMITED
(formerly known as BDO MCCABE LO LIMITED), ALLEN T.Y. CHAN, W.
JUDSON MARTIN, KAI KIT POON, DAVID J. HORSLEY, WILLIAM E.
ARDELL, JAMES P. BOWLAND, JAMES M.E. HYDE, EDMUND MAK, SIMON
MURRAY, PETER WANG, GARRY J. WEST, PÖYRY (BEIJING) CONSULTING
COMPANY LIMITED, CREDIT SUISSE SECURITIES (CANADA), INC., TD
SECURITIES INC., DUNDEE SECURITIES
CORPORATION, RBC DOMINION SECURITIES INC., SCOTIA CAPITAL INC.,
CIBC WORLD MARKETS INC., MERRILL LYNCH CANADA INC.,
CANACCORD FINANCIAL LTD., MAISON PLACEMENTS CANADA INC.,
CREDIT SUISSE SECURITIES (USA) LLC and MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE,
FENNER & SMITH INCORPORATED (successor by merger to Banc of America
Securities LLC)**

Defendants

Proceeding under the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

NOTICE OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL

THE APPELLANTS, Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments
L.P., Comité Syndical National de Retraite Bâtirente Inc., Matrix Asset Management Inc.,

Gestion Férique and Montrusco Bolton Investments Inc. (“Appellants”), seek leave to appeal to a Panel of three judges of the Court of Appeal from the order dated March 20, 2013 (“Settlement Approval Order”) of the Honourable Mr. Justice Morawetz approving the Ernst & Young LLP Settlement (“E&Y Settlement”) and third party release of Ernst & Young LLP (“E&Y Release”).

The Appellants also seek leave to appeal to a Panel of three judges of the Court of Appeal from the order dated March 20, 2013 (“Representation Dismissal Order”) of Justice Morawetz dismissing the Appellants’ motion for a representation order and dismissing their request for relief from the binding effect of the representation order appointing certain other persons (the Ontario Plaintiffs) as representatives, as part of the restructuring proceedings of Sino-Forest Corporation (“Sino-Forest” or the “applicant”).

THE APPELLANTS ASK:

- a) that leave be granted to appeal from the Settlement Approval Order;
- b) that leave be granted to appeal from the Representation Dismissal Order;
- c) if this Court permits proposed non-debtor third-party settlements and releases to be heard in the Sino-Forest *CCAA* proceedings, that the Appellants be appointed as representatives of all equity claimants and/or all objectors;
- d) for an order consolidating the present motions for leave to appeal, should leave be granted, with the pending motion for leave to appeal from the order dated December 10, 2012 of the Honourable Mr. Justice Morawetz, Court of Appeal File No.: M42068 (“Sanction Order”), and all related appeals;
- e) for an order directing that the hearings of the motions for leave to appeal and the appeals of the Sanction Order, Settlement Approval Order, and Representation

Dismissal Order be consolidated and heard together before a panel of three judges, orally; and

- f) for an order expediting the hearing of all such motions for leave to appeal and all such appeals of the Sanction Order, Settlement Approval Order, and Representation Dismissal Order.

PROPOSED METHOD OF HEARING:

The motion will be heard in writing, 36 days after service of the moving parties' motion record, factum and transcripts, if any, or on the filing of the moving parties' reply factum, if any, whichever is earlier, pursuant to Rule 61.03.1(1) of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*, or if the Court so directs, orally together with the appeal.

THE GROUNDS FOR THE MOTION ARE:

1. Justice Morawetz erred in entering the Settlement Approval Order approving the E&Y Settlement and E&Y Release under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA") in connection with the Plan of Compromise and Reorganization of Sino-Forest Corporation (the "Plan"), and the appeal is therefore meritorious, particularly in that:

(a) as a matter of law and fact, the E&Y Settlement and the E&Y Release were not and are not reasonably connected and necessary to the restructuring of the applicant, and do not meet the requirements for third-party non-debtor releases set forth in *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe and Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*, 2008 ONCA 587;

(b) the CCAA does not provide jurisdiction for the court supervising a CCAA restructuring plan to release claims asserted against a person other than the applicant,

its subsidiaries, or its directors or officers, when the persons whose claims are being released are not creditors of the applicant who voted on the plan;

(c) the Ontario Plaintiffs did not appropriately and adequately represent the members of the class whose claims against E&Y are proposed to be settled and released;

(d) the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*, S.O. 1992, c. 6, provides an adequate and appropriate alternative framework for the proposed settlement of the class action claims asserted against E&Y;

(e) the terms of the E&Y Settlement do not provide any assurance that settlement consideration would flow to the parties whose claims are proposed to be settled and released;

(f) the terms of the E&Y Settlement were construed by the Court not to provide opt out rights to the members of the class whose claims against E&Y are proposed to be settled and released; and

(g) the Court did not address or decide whether the amount of consideration in the proposed E&Y Settlement was fair, reasonable, and adequate;

2. Justice Morawetz erred in entering the Representation Dismissal Order, particularly in that the Appellants would have appropriately and adequately represented the interests of the members of the class who are equity claimants and/or the members who objected to the proposed E&Y Settlement, without any conflict of interest, and the interests of justice would have been served thereby;

3. The point on the proposed appeal is of significance to the practice, in that the circumstances in which non-debtor third-party releases are properly available in

connection with *CCAA* restructuring plans, particularly concerning class action claims asserted against auditor and underwriter defendants in securities litigations, has the potential to affect many future cases if the releases are made available as a matter of routine practice, as was the case here;

4. The appropriateness of the E&Y Settlement and E&Y Release is of significance to the action, both as they affect the Appellants' ability to pursue separate claims after opting out, and as they affect claims against the 15 other defendants in the Ontario Class Action who are positioning themselves in the *CCAA* proceeding to enter into settlements and receive releases similar to the E&Y Release;

5. The Plan has been implemented and the *CCAA* litigation stay has expired. The proposed appeal will not unduly hinder the progress of the *CCAA* proceeding;

6. This motion and the motion for leave to appeal the Sanction Order, pending in Court of Appeal File No.: M42068, concern a common principal issue: under what circumstances are non-debtor third-party releases available in *CCAA* restructuring plans;

7. The present motions for leave, the motion for leave to appeal the Sanction Order, and the appeals of the Sanction Order, Settlement Approval Order, and Representation Dismissal Order should be heard together as soon as possible by this Court;

8. The *CCAA*, in particular, sections 6, 13, and 14 thereof;

9. Sections 6 and 134 of the *Courts of Justice Act*;

10. Sections 30(3) and 30(5) of the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*;

11. Rules 6.01, 10, and 61 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*; and

12. such further and other grounds as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court may permit.

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS WILL BE USED AT THE HEARING OF THE MOTION:

1. The motion materials filed below on the hearing before Justice Morawetz and orders made and the Monitor's reports filed in the *CCAA* proceedings; and
2. such other documents as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court may permit.

April 9, 2012

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

Michael C. Spencer (LSUC #59637F)
Won J. Kim (LSUC #32918H)
Megan B. McPhee (LSUC #48351G)

Tel: (416) 596-1414
Fax: (416) 598-0601

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

TO: THE SERVICE LIST

Court of Appeal File No.:
Commercial Court File No.: CV-12-9667-00CL

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

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

Court of Appeal File No.:
Superior Court File No.: CV-10-414302CP

THE TRUSTEES OF THE LABOURERS' PENSION FUND OF CENTRAL AND
EASTERN CANADA, et al.
Plaintiffs

-and- SINO-FOREST CORPORATION, et al.
Defendants

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

(Proceeding Commenced at Toronto)

NOTICE OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL

KIM ORR BARRISTERS P.C.

19 Mercer Street, 4th Floor
Toronto, Ontario M5V 1H2

Michael C. Spencer (LSUC #59637F)

Won J. Kim (LSUC #32918H)

Megan B. McPhee (LSUC #48351G)

Tel: (416) 596-1414

Fax: (416) 598-0601

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

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 OR COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF SINO-FOREST CORPORATION

Court of Appeal File Number: M42404
Court File No. CV-12-9667-00CL

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

AFFIDAVIT OF ELIZABETH FIMIO
(Sworn April 24, 2013)

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

Robert W. Staley (LSUC #27115J)
Derek J. Bell (LSUC #43420J)
Jonathan Bell (LSUC #55457P)

Tel: 416-777-4857
Fax: 416-863-1716

Lawyers for Sino-Forest Corporation

**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 OR COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF SINO-FOREST CORPORATION**

Court of Appeal File Number: M42404
Court File No. CV-12-9667-00CL

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

**RESPONDING MOTION RECORD OF
SINO-FOREST CORPORATION
(Motion for Directions)**

BENNETT JONES LLP

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

Robert W. Staley (LSUC #27115J)
Derek J. Bell (LSUC #43420J)
Jonathan Bell (LSUC #55457P)

Tel: 416-777-4857
Fax: 416-863-1716

Lawyers for Sino-Forest Corporation