

TAB 4

CITATION: Re: Tamerlane Ventures Inc. and Pine Point Holding Corp., 2013 ONSC 5461
COURT FILE NO.: CV-13-10228-00CL
DATE: 20130828

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST

2013 ONSC 5461 (CanLII)

BETWEEN:)
)
IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES') **S. Richard Orzy, Derek J. Bell and Sean H.**
CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT,) **Zweig, for the Applicants**
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED)
) **Robert J. Chadwick and Logan Willis, for**
AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF) **Duff & Phelps Canada Restructuring Inc.,**
COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF) **the proposed Monitor**
TAMERLANE VENTURES INC. and)
PINE POINT HOLDING CORP.) **Joseph Bellissimo, for Renvest Mercantile**
) **Bankcorp Inc.**
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
) **HEARD: August 23, 2013**

NEWBOULD J.

[1] The applicants applied on August 23, 2013 for protection under the CCAA, at which time an Initial Order was granted containing several provisions. These are my reasons for the granting of the order.

Tamerlane business

[2] At the time of the application, Tamerlane Ventures Inc. ("Tamerlane") was a publicly traded company whose shares were listed and posted for trading on the TSX Venture Exchange. Tamerlane and its subsidiaries (collectively, the "Tamerlane Group"), including Pine Point Holding Corp. ("Tamerlane Pine Point"), Tamerlane Ventures USA Inc. ("Tamerlane USA") and Tamerlane Ventures Peru SAC ("Tamerlane Peru") are engaged in the acquisition, exploration and development of base metal projects in Canada and Peru.

[3] The applicants' flagship property is the Pine Point Property, a project located near Hay River in the South Slave Lake area of the Northwest Territories of Canada. It at one time was an operating mine. The applicants firmly believe that there is substantial value in the Pine Point Property and have completed a NI 43-101 Technical Report which shows 10.9 million tonnes of measured and indicated resources in the "R-190" zinc-lead deposit. The project has been determined to be feasible and licences have been obtained to put the first deposit into production. All of the expensive infrastructure, such as roads, power lines and railheads, are already in place, minimizing the capital cost necessary to commence operations. The applicants only need to raise the financing necessary to be able to exploit the value of the project, a task made more difficult by, among other things, the problems experienced generally in the mining sector thus far in 2013.

[4] The Tamerlane Group's other significant assets are the Los Pinos mining concessions south of Lima in Peru, which host a historic copper resource. The Tamerlane Group acquired the Los Pinos assets in 2007 through one of its subsidiaries, Tamerlane Peru, and it currently holds the mining concessions through another of its subsidiaries, Tamerlane Minera.

[5] The Los Pinos deposit is a 790 hectare porphyry (a type of igneous rock) copper deposit. Originally investigated in the 1990s when the price of copper was a quarter of its price today, Los Pinos has historically been viewed as a valuable property. With rising copper prices, it is now viewed as being even more valuable.

[6] The exploration and development activities have been generally carried out by employees of Tamerlane USA. The applicants' management team consists of four individuals who are employees of Tamerlane USA, which provides management services by contract to the applicants.

[7] As at March 31, 2013 the Tamerlane Group had total consolidated assets with a net book value of \$24,814,433. The assets included consolidated current assets of \$2,007,406, and consolidated non-current assets with a net book value of \$22,807,027. Non-current assets included primarily the investment in the Pine Point property of \$20,729,551 and the Los Pinos property of \$1,314,936.

[8] Tamerlane has obtained valuations of Los Pinos and the Pine Point Property. The Los Pinos valuation was completed in May 2013 and indicates a preliminary valuation of \$12 to \$15 million using a 0.3% copper cut-off grade, or \$17 to \$21 million using a 0.2% copper cut-off grade. The Pine Point valuation was completed in July 2013 and indicates a valuation of \$30 to \$56 million based on market comparables, with a value as high as \$229 million considering precedent transactions.

Secured and unsecured debt

[9] Pursuant to a credit agreement between Tamerlane and Global Resource Fund, a fund managed by Renvest Mercantile Bancorp Inc. ("Global Resource Fund" or "secured lender") made as of December 16, 2010, as amended by a first amending agreement dated June 30, 2011 and a second amending agreement dated July 29, 2011, Tamerlane became indebted to the Secured Lender for USD \$10,000,000 . The secured indebtedness under the credit agreement is

guaranteed by both Tamerlane Pine Point and Tamerlane USA, and each of Tamerlane, Tamerlane Pine Point and Tamerlane USA has executed a general security agreement in favour of the secured lender in respect of the secured debt.

[10] The only other secured creditors are the applicants' counsel, the Monitor and the Monitor's counsel in respect of the fees and disbursements owing to each.

[11] The applicants' unsecured creditors are principally trade creditors. Collectively, the applicants' accounts payable were approximately CAD \$850,000 as at August 13, 2013, in addition to accrued professional fees in connection with issues related to the secured debt and this proceeding.

Events leading to filing

[12] Given that the Tamerlane Group is in the exploration stage with its assets, it does not yet generate cash flow from operations. Accordingly, its only potential source of cash is from financing activities, which have been problematic in light of the current market for junior mining companies.

[13] It was contemplated when the credit agreement with Global Resource Fund was entered into that the take-out financing would be in the form of construction financing for Pine Point. However Tamerlane was unsuccessful in arranging that. Tamerlane was successful in late 2012 in arranging a small flow-through financing from a director and in early 2013 a share issuance for \$1.7 million dollars. Negotiations with various parties for to raise more funds by debt or asset sales have so far been unsuccessful.

[14] As a result of liquidity constraints facing Tamerlane in the fall of 2012, it failed to make regularly scheduled monthly interest payments in respect of the secured debt beginning on September 25, 2012 and failed to repay the principal balance on the maturity date of October 16, 2012, each of which was an event of default under the credit agreement with the secured lender Global Resource Fund.

[15] Tamerlane and Global Resource Fund then entered into a forbearance agreement made as of December 31, 2012 in which Tamerlane agreed to make certain payments to Global Resource Fund, including a \$1,500,000 principal repayment on March 31, 2013. As a result of liquidity constraints, Tamerlane was unable to make the March 31 payment, an event of default under the credit and forbearance agreements. On May 24, 2013, Tamerlane failed to make the May interest payment, and on May 29, 2013, the applicants received a letter from Global Resource Fund's counsel enclosing a NITES notice under the BIA and a notice of intention to dispose of collateral pursuant to section 63 of the PPSA. The total secured debt was \$11,631,948.90.

[16] On June 10, 2013, Global Resource Fund and Tamerlane entered into an amendment to the forbearance agreement pursuant to which Global Resource Fund withdrew its statutory notices and agreed to capitalize the May interest payment in exchange for Tamerlane agreeing to pay certain fees to the Global Resource Fund that were capitalized and resuming making cash interest payments to the Secured Lender with the June 25, 2013 interest payment. Tamerlane was unable to make the July 25 payment, which resulted in an event of default under the credit and forbearance amendment agreements.

[17] On July 26, 2013, Global Resource Fund served a new NITES notice and a notice of intention to dispose of collateral pursuant to section 63 the PPSA, at which time the total of the secured debt was \$12,100,254.26.

[18] Thereafter the parties negotiated a consensual CCAA filing, under which Global Resource Fund has agreed to provide DIP financing and to forbear from exercising its rights until January 7, 2014. The terms of the stay of proceedings and DIP financing are unusual, to be discussed.

Discussion

[19] There is no doubt that the applicants are insolvent and qualify for filing under the CCAA and obtaining a stay of proceedings. I am satisfied from the record, including the report from the

proposed Monitor, that an Initial Order and a stay under section 11 of the CCAA should be made.

[20] The applicants request that the stay apply to Tamerlane USA and Tamerlane Peru, non-parties to this application. The business operations of the applicants, Tamerlane USA and Tamerlane Peru are intertwined, and the request to extend the stay of proceedings to Tamerlane USA and Tamerlane Peru is to maintain stability and value during the CCAA process.

[21] Courts have an inherent jurisdiction to impose stays of proceedings against non-applicant third parties where it is important to the reorganization and restructuring process, and where it is just and reasonable to do so. See Farley J. in *Re Lehndorff* (1993), 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275 and Pepall J. (as she then was) in *Re Canwest Publishing Inc.* (2010), 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115. Recently Morawetz J. has made such orders in *Cinram International Inc. (Re.)*, 2012 ONSC 3767, *Sino-Forest Corporation (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 2063 and *Skylink Aviation Inc. (Re)*, 2013 ONSC 1500. I am satisfied that it is appropriate that the stay of proceedings extend to Tamerlane USA, which has guaranteed the secured loans and to Tamerlane Peru, which holds the valuable Los Pinos assets in Peru.

[22] Under the Initial Order, PricewaterhouseCoopers Corporate Finance Inc. is to be appointed a financial advisor. PWC is under the oversight of the Monitor to implement a Sale and Solicitation Process, under which PWC will seek to identify one or more financiers or purchasers of, and/or investors in, the key entities that comprise the Tamerlane Group. The SISP will include broad marketing to all potential financiers, purchasers and investors and will consider offers for proposed financing to repay the secured debt, an investment in the applicants' business and/or a purchase of some or all of the applicants' assets. The proposed Monitor supports the SISP and is of the view that it is in the interests of the applicants' stakeholders. The SISP and its terms are appropriate and it is approved.

[23] The Initial Order contains provisions for an administration charge for the Monitor, its counsel and for counsel to the applicants in the amount of \$300,000, a financial advisor charge of

\$300,000, a directors' charge of \$45,000 to the extent the directors are not covered under their D&O policy and a subordinated administration charge subordinated to the secured loans and the proposed DIP charge for expenses not covered by the administration and financial advisor charges. These charges appear reasonable and the proposed Monitor is of the same view. They are approved.

DIP facility and charge

[24] The applicants' principal use of cash during these proceedings will consist of the payment of ongoing, but minimized, day-to-day operational expenses, such as regular remuneration for those individuals providing services to the applicants, office related expenses, and professional fees and disbursements in connection with these CCAA proceedings. The applicants will require additional borrowing to do this. It is apparent that given the lack of alternate financing, any restructuring will not be possible without DIP financing.

[25] The DIP lender is Global Resource Fund, the secured lender to the applicants. The DIP loan is for a net \$1,017,500 with simple 12% interest. It is to mature on January 7, 2014, by which time it is anticipated that the SISP process will have resulted in a successful raising of funds to repay the secured loan and the DIP facility.

[26] Section 11.2(4) of the CCAA lists factors, among other things, that the court is to consider when a request for a DIP financing charge is made. A review of those factors in this case supports the DIP facility and charge. The facility is required to continue during the CCAA process, the assets are sufficient to support the charge, the secured lender supports the applicants' management remaining in possession of the business, albeit with PWC being engaged to run the SISP, the loan is a fraction of the applicants' total assets and the proposed Monitor is of the view that the DIP facility and charge are fair and reasonable. The one factor that gives me pause is the first listed in section 11.2(4), being the period during which the applicants are expected to be subject to the CCAA proceedings. That involves the sunset clause, to which I now turn.

Sunset clause

[27] During the negotiations leading to this consensual CCAA application, Global Resource Fund, the secured lender, expressed a willingness to negotiate with the applicants but firmly stated that as a key term of consenting to any CCAA initial order, it required (i) a fixed "sunset date" of January 7, 2014 for the CCAA proceeding beyond which stay extensions could not be sought without the its consent and the consent of the Monitor unless both the outstanding secured debt and the DIP loan had been repaid in full, and (ii) a provision in the initial order directing that a receiver selected by Global Resource Fund would be appointed after that date.

[28] The Initial Order as drafted contains language preventing the applicants from seeking or obtaining any extension of the stay period beyond January 7, 2014 unless it has repaid the outstanding secured debt and the DIP loan or received the consent of Global Resource Fund and the Monitor, and that immediately following January 7, 2013 (i) the CCAA proceedings shall terminate, (ii) the Monitor shall be discharged, (iii) the Initial Order (with some exceptions) shall be of no force and effect and (iv) a receiver selected by Global Resource Fund shall be appointed.

[29] Ms. Kent, the executive chair and CFO of Tamerlane, has sworn in her affidavit that Global Resource Fund insisted on these terms and that given the financial circumstances of the applicants, there were significant cost-savings and other benefits to them and all of the stakeholders for this proceeding to be consensual rather than contentious. Accordingly, the directors of the applicants exercised their business judgment to agree to the terms. The proposed Monitor states its understanding as well is that the consent of Global Resource Fund to these CCAA proceedings is conditional on these terms.

[30] Section 11 of the CCAA authorizes a court to make any order "that it considers appropriate in the circumstances." In considering what may be appropriate, Deschamps J. stated in *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379:

70. ...Appropriateness under the *CCAA* is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the *CCAA*. The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to achieve the remedial purpose of the *CCAA* -- avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company. I would add that appropriateness extends not only to the purpose of the order, but also to the means it employs. Courts should be mindful that chances for successful reorganizations are enhanced where participants achieve common ground and all stakeholders are treated as advantageously and fairly as the circumstances permit.

[31] There is no doubt that *CCAA* proceedings can be terminated when the prospects of a restructuring are at an end. In *Century Services*, Deschamps J. recognized this in stating:

71. It is well established that efforts to reorganize under the *CCAA* can be terminated and the stay of proceedings against the debtor lifted if the reorganization is "doomed to failure" (see *Chef Ready*, at p. 88; *Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25 (B.C.C.A.), at paras. 6-7). However, when an order is sought that does realistically advance the *CCAA*'s purposes, the ability to make it is within the discretion of a *CCAA* court.

[32] The fact that the board of directors of the applicants exercised their business judgment in agreeing to the terms imposed by Global Resource Fund in order to achieve a consensual outcome is a factor I can and do take into account, with the caution that in the case of interim financing, the court must make an independent determination, and arrive at an appropriate order, having regard to the factors in s. 11.2(4). The court may consider, but not defer to or be fettered by, the recommendation of the board. See *Re Crystallex International Corp.* (2012), 91 C.B.R. (5th) 207 (Ont. C.A.) at para 85.

[33] It is apparent from looking at the history of the matter that Global Resource Fund had every intention of exercising its rights under its security to apply to court to have a receiver appointed, and with the passage of time during which there were defaults, including defaults in forbearance agreements, the result would likely have been inevitable. See *Bank of Montreal v. Carnival National Leasing Ltd.* (2011), 74 C.B.R. (5th) 300 and the authorities therein discussed. Thus it is understandable that the directors agreed to the terms required by Global Resource Fund. If Global Resource Fund had refused to fund the DIP facility or had refused to agree to

any further extension for payment of the secured loan, the prospects of financing the payout of Global Resource Fund through a SISP process would in all likelihood not been available to the applicants or its stakeholders.

[34] What is unusual in the proposed Initial Order is that the discretion of the court on January 7, 2014 to do what it considers appropriate is removed. Counsel have been unable to provide any case in which such an order has been made. I did not think it appropriate for such an order to be made. At my direction, the parties agreed to add a clause that the order was subject in all respects to the discretion of the Court. With that change, I approved the Initial Order.

Newbould J.

Released: August 28, 2013

CITATION: Re: Tamerlane Ventures Inc. and Pine Point Holding Corp., 2013 ONSC 5461
COURT FILE NO.: CV-13-10228-00CL
DATE: 20130828

ONTARIO

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

COMMERCIAL LIST

BETWEEN:

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
TAMERLANE VENTURES INC. and PINE POINT
HOLDING CORP.

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT

Newbould J.

2013 ONSC 5461 (CanLI)

Released: August 28, 2013

