

SUPERIOR COURT
Commercial Division

CANADA
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTREAL

No: 500-11-048114-157

DATE: April 27, 2015

PRESIDED BY: THE HONOURABLE STEPHEN W. HAMILTON, J.S.C.

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

**BLOOM LAKE GENERAL PARTNER LIMITED
QUINTO MINING CORPORATION
8568391 CANADA LIMITED
CLIFFS QUÉBEC IRON MINING ULC**
Petitioners

And

**THE BLOOM LAKE IRON ORE MINE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
BLOOM LAKE RAILWAY COMPANY LIMITED**
Mises-en-cause

And

FTI CONSULTING CANANDA INC.
Monitor

And

9201955 CANADA INC.
Mise-en-cause

And

**EABAMETOONG FIRST NATION
GINOOGAMING FIRST NATION
CONSTANCE LAKE FIRST NATION and
LONG LAKE # 58 FIRST NATION
AROLAND FIRST NATION
MARTEN FALLS FIRST NATION**
Objectors

And
8901341 CANADA INC.
CANADIAN DEVELOPMENT AND MARKETING CORPORATION
Intervenors

JUDGMENT ON PETITIONERS' AMENDED MOTION FOR THE ISSUANCE OF AN
APPROVAL AND VESTING ORDER WITH RESPECT TO THE SALE OF THE
CHROMITE SHARES (#82)

INTRODUCTION

[1] The Petitioners have made an Amended Motion for the Issuance of an Approval and Vesting Order with respect to the Sale of the Chromite Shares (#82 on the plume; the original motion was #65). Objections were filed by (1) six First Nation bands (#85, as amended at the hearing) and (2) 8901341 Canada Inc. and Canadian Development and Marketing Corporation (together, CDM) (#87).

CONTEXT

[2] On January 27, 2015, Mr. Justice Castonguay issued an Initial Order placing the Petitioners and the Mises-en-cause under the protection of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.¹ The ultimate parent of the Petitioners and the Mises-en-cause is Cliffs Natural Resources Inc. (Cliffs), which is neither a Petitioner nor a Mises-en-cause.

[3] The Petitioner Cliffs Québec Iron Mining ULC (CQIM) owns, through two subsidiaries, a 100% interest in the Black Thor and Black Label chromite mining projects and a 70% interest in the Big Daddy chromite mining project. All three projects form part of the Ring of Fire, a mining district in northern Ontario.

[4] Other entities related to Cliffs but which are not parties to the CCAA proceedings own other mining interests in the Ring of Fire.

[5] The proposed transaction with respect to which the Petitioners are seeking an approval and vesting order involves the sale of those various interests, including in particular the sale of CQIM's shares in the subsidiaries described above.

[6] Cliffs and its affiliates paid approximately US\$350 million to acquire their interests in the Ring of Fire projects, and invested a further US\$200 million in developing these projects.

[7] By 2013, Cliffs had suspended all activities related to the Ring of Fire and began making general inquiries with potential interested parties with a view to selling its interests in the Ring of Fire. No material interest resulted from these efforts.

¹ R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended.

[8] By September 2014, Cliffs's desire to sell its interests in the Ring of Fire was publicly known.² It hired Moelis & Company LLC to assist with the sale process for various assets including the Ring of Fire in October 2014.³

[9] The sale process will be described in greater detail below. It resulted in the execution of a letter of intent with Noront on February 13, 2015.⁴

[10] While the sellers were negotiating the Share Purchase Agreement with Noront, CDM sent an unsolicited letter of intent to acquire the Ring of Fire interests on March 14, 2015.⁵ That letter of intent was analyzed by the sellers, Moelis and the Monitor and was rejected.⁶ Two revised letters of intent followed and were also rejected.⁷

[11] The sellers executed the initial Share Purchase Agreement with Noront on March 22, 2015, which provided for a price of US \$20 million.⁸ Noront issued a press release describing the transaction on March 23, 2015.⁹

[12] The initial SPA provided in Section 7.1 a "Superior Proposal" mechanism that allowed the sellers to accept an unsolicited and superior offer from a third party.

[13] On April 2, 2015, the Petitioners made a motion for the issuance of an approval and vesting order with respect to the initial SPA. Four First Nations bands who live and exercise their Aboriginal and treaty rights in and on the land and territories surrounding the Ring of Fire filed an objection to the motion. CDM did not. Instead, on April 13, 2015, CDM made an unsolicited offer for the interests in the Ring of Fire which included a purchase price of US \$23 million.¹⁰

[14] CDM's offer was considered by the sellers, Moelis and the Monitor to be a "Superior Proposal" as defined in Section 7.1 of the initial SPA. As a result, they advised Noront,¹¹ which expressed an interest in making a new offer.

[15] The sellers, after consulting Moelis and the Monitor, developed the Supplemental Bid Process to give each party the chance to submit its best and final offer.¹²

[16] Both Noront and CDM participated in the Supplemental Bid Process and submitted new offers, with Noront's offer at US \$27.5 million and CDM's at US \$25.275 million.¹³

² An article from the Globe & Mail dated September 17, 2014 was produced as Exhibit R-7.

³ The CCAA Parties formally engaged Moelis by engagement letter dated March 23, 2015, and the Court approved the engagement of Moelis by order dated April 17, 2015.

⁴ Exhibit R-9.

⁵ Exhibit R-17.

⁶ Exhibit R-18.

⁷ Exhibits R-19 to R-22.

⁸ Exhibit R-3 (redacted) and R-4 (unredacted).

⁹ The press release was provided to the Court during argument and was not given an exhibit number.

¹⁰ Exhibit R-23.

¹¹ Exhibit R-24.

¹² Exhibits R-25 and R-26.

¹³ Exhibits R-29 and R-30.

[17] The sellers accepted the Noront offer and entered into a revised SPA with Noront on April 17, 2015.¹⁴ The Petitioners then amended their motion to allege the additional facts since April 2, 2015 and to seek the issuance of an approval and vesting order with respect to the revised SPA.

[18] The First Nation bands maintained their objection (#85)¹⁵ and CDM filed a Declaration of Intervention and Contestation with respect to the amended motion (#87).

POSITION OF THE PARTIES

[19] The Petitioners argue that the revised SPA should be approved because:

1. the marketing and sales process was fair, reasonable, transparent and efficient;
2. the price offered by Noront was the highest binding offer received in the process;
3. CQIM exercised its commercial and business judgment with assistance from Moelis;
4. the Monitor assisted and advised CQIM throughout the process and recommends the approval of the motion.

[20] Moreover, they argue that no creditor has opposed the motion, and that the First Nations bands and CDM do not have legal standing to oppose the motion.

[21] The Monitor and Noront supported the position put forward by the Petitioners.

[22] The First Nations bands argued the following points:

1. they have a legitimate interest and standing to contest the motion as an “other interested party” under Section 36 of the CCAA, because they have Aboriginal and treaty rights that are affected by the change in control of the Ring of Fire interests;
2. there was a duty on the part of the sellers and their advisers to consult with and advise the First Nations bands about the sale process. Instead, the First Nations bands were ignored and did not even learn of the existence of the sale process until March 23, 2015;
3. the sale process was not open, fair or transparent and did not recognize the rights of the First Nations bands;
4. there was no sales process order; and
5. there is no urgency and they should be given the opportunity to present an offer.

[23] Finally, CDM argued as follows:

¹⁴ Exhibit R-11 (redacted) and R-12 (unredacted).

¹⁵ It was amended at the hearing to add two First Nations bands as objectors.

1. the sellers were required to accept the "Superior Proposal" made by CDM on April 13, 2015;
2. the Supplemental Bid Process did not treat the two parties fairly;
3. the Monitor's support of the process is not determinative;
4. it had the necessary interest to intervene in the CCAA proceedings and contest the motion.

ISSUES

[24] The Court will analyze the following issues:

1. Was the sale process "fair, reasonable, transparent and efficient"?

In the context of the analysis of this issue, the Court will consider various sub-issues, including the business judgement rule, the importance of the Monitor's recommendation, and the interpretation of Section 7.1 of the initial SPA.

2. Do the First Nations bands have other grounds on which to object to the proposed transaction?
3. Do the First Nations bands and CDM have legal standing to raise these issues?

ANALYSIS

1. **Was the sale process "fair, reasonable, transparent and efficient"?**

[25] Section 36 of the CCAA provides in part as follows:

36. (1) A debtor company in respect of which an order has been made under this Act may not sell or otherwise dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business unless authorized to do so by a court. Despite any requirement for shareholder approval, including one under federal or provincial law, the court may authorize the sale or disposition even if shareholder approval was not obtained.

...

(3) In deciding whether to grant the authorization, the court is to consider, among other things,

(a) whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances;

(b) whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition;

(c) whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in their opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;

(d) the extent to which the creditors were consulted;

(e) the effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties; and

(f) whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.

(6) The court may authorize a sale or disposition free and clear of any security, charge or other restriction and, if it does, it shall also order that other assets of the company or the proceeds of the sale or disposition be subject to a security, charge or other restriction in favour of the creditor whose security, charge or other restriction is to be affected by the order.

...

[26] The criteria in Section 36(3) of the CCAA have been held not to be cumulative or exhaustive. The Court must look at the proposed transaction as a whole and decide whether it is appropriate, fair and reasonable:

[48] The elements which can be found in Section 36 CCAA are, first of all, not limitative and secondly they need not to be all fulfilled in order to grant or not grant an order under this section.

[49] The Court has to look at the transaction as a whole and essentially decide whether or not the sale is appropriate, fair and reasonable. In other words, the Court could grant the process for reasons others than those mentioned in Section 36 CCAA or refuse to grant it for reasons which are not mentioned in Section 36 CCAA.¹⁶

[27] Further, in the context of one of the asset sales in *AbitibiBowater*, Mr. Justice Gascon, then of this Court, adopted the following list of relevant factors:

[36] The Court has jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets in the course of CCAA proceedings, notably when such a sale of assets is in the best interest of the stakeholders generally.

[37] In determining whether to authorize a sale of assets under the CCAA, the Court should consider, amongst others, the following key factors:

- have sufficient efforts to get the best price been made and have the parties acted providently;
- the efficacy and integrity of the process followed;
- the interests of the parties; and
- whether any unfairness resulted from the working out process.

¹⁶ *White Birch Paper Holding Company (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2010 QCCS 4915 (leave to appeal refused: 2010 QCCA 1950), par. 48-49.

[38] These principles were enunciated in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* They are equally applicable in a CCAA sale situation.¹⁷

[28] The Court must give due consideration to two further elements in assessing whether the sale should be approved under Section 36 CCAA:

1. the business judgment rule:

[70] That being so, it is not for this Court to second-guess the commercial and business judgment properly exercised by the Petitioners and the Monitor.

[71] A court will not lightly interfere with the exercise of this commercial and business judgment in the context of an asset sale where the marketing and sale process was fair, reasonable, transparent and efficient. This is certainly not a case where it should.¹⁸

2. the weight to be given to the recommendation of the Monitor:

The recommendation of the Monitor, a court-appointed officer experienced in the insolvency field, carries great weight with the Court in any approval process. Absent some compelling, exceptional factor to the contrary, a Court should accept an applicant's proposed sale process where it is recommended by the Monitor and supported by the stakeholders.¹⁹

[29] Debtors often ask the Court to authorize the sale process in advance. This has the advantage of ensuring that the process is clear and of reducing the likelihood of a subsequent challenge. In the present matter, the Petitioners did seek the Court's authorization with respect to a sale process for their other assets, but they did not seek the Court's authorization with respect to the sale process for the Ring of Fire interests because that sale process was already well under way before the CCAA filing. There is no legal requirement that the sale process be approved in advance, but it creates the potential for the process being challenged after the fact, as in this case.

[30] The Court will therefore review the sale process in light of these factors.

(1) From October 2014 to the execution of the Noront letter of intent on February 13, 2015

[31] The sale process began in earnest in October 2014 when Cliffs engaged Moelis.

[32] Moelis identified a group of eighteen potential buyers and strategic partners, with the assistance of CQIM and Cliffs. The group included traders, resource buyers,

¹⁷ *AbitibiBowater inc. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2009 QCCS 6460, par. 36-38. See also *White Birch*, *supra* note 16, par. 53-54, and *Aveos Fleet Performance Inc. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2012 QCCS 4074, par. 50.

¹⁸ *AbitibiBowater inc. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2010 QCCS 1742, par. 70-71. See also *White Birch Paper Holding Company (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2011 QCCS 7304, par. 68-70.

¹⁹ *AbitibiBowater*, *supra* note 17, par. 59. See also *White Birch*, *supra* note 18, par. 73-74.

financial sector participants, local strategic partners, and market participants, as well as parties who had previously expressed an interest in the Ring of Fire.

[33] Moelis began contacting the potential interested parties to solicit interest in purchasing the Ring of Fire project. It sent a form of non-disclosure agreement to fifteen parties. Fourteen executed the agreement and were given access to certain confidential information.

[34] Negotiations ensued with seven of the interested parties, and six were given access to the data room that was established in November 2014.

[35] By January 21, 2015, non-binding letters of intent were received from Noront and from a third party. There were also two verbal expressions of interest, but neither resulted in a letter of intent.

[36] The Noront letter of intent was determined by the sellers in consultation with Moelis and the Monitor to be the better offer. Moelis then contacted all parties who had indicated a preliminary level of interest to give them the opportunity to submit a letter of intent in a price range superior to the Noront letter of intent, but no such letter was received.

[37] Negotiations continued with Noront and a letter of intent was executed with Noront on February 13, 2015.²⁰

[38] With respect to this portion of the process, CDM does not raise any issue but the First Nations bands complain that they were not included in the list of potential interested parties and were not otherwise consulted.

[39] The Court will discuss the special status of the First Nations bands in the next section of this judgment. At this stage, it is sufficient to note that the sale process must be reasonable, but is not required to be perfect. Even if the initial list of eighteen potential buyers and strategic partners omitted some potential buyers, this is not a basis for the Court to intervene, provided that the sellers, with Moelis and the Monitor, took reasonable steps.²¹ The Court is satisfied that this test was met.

(2) From letter of intent to initial SPA

[40] Between February 13, 2015 and March 22, 2015, the sellers negotiated the SPA with Noront and signed the initial SPA. In that same period, CDM expressed an interest in the Ring of Fire interests and sent three separate offers, all of which were refused by the sellers.

[41] CDM does not contest the reasonability of the sellers' actions in this period. In fact, CDM did not contest the original motion to approve the initial SPA, but chose instead to make a new offer.

(3) The initial SPA and the "Superior Proposal"

[42] The initial SPA with Noront dated March 22, 2015 provided for a purchase price of US \$20 million.

²⁰ Exhibit R-9.

²¹ *Terrace Bay Pulp Inc. (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 4247, par. 48.

[43] Section 7.1 of the initial SPA allowed the sellers to pursue a “Superior Proposal”, defined as an unsolicited offer from a third party which appeared to be more favourable to the sellers. In that eventuality, the sellers had the right to terminate the initial SPA upon reimbursing Noront’s expenses up to \$250,000.

[44] CDM made a new offer on April 13, 2015.²² The sellers, in consultation with their advisers and the Monitor, concluded that it was a Superior Proposal.

[45] CDM argues that in those circumstances, the sellers had the obligation to terminate the initial SPA and to accept the CDM offer.

[46] The Court does not agree.

[47] On its face, the language in Section 7.1 is permissive and not mandatory. It says that the sellers “may” terminate the initial SPA and enter into an agreement with the new offeror. It does not require them to do so.

[48] CDM argued that Section 7.1 does not provide for a right to match, which is found in other agreements of this nature. That may be true, but a right to match is different. Specific language would be necessary to contractually require the sellers to accept an offer from Noront that matched the new offer. No language was required to give Noront the right to make a new offer. Further, specific language would be required to remove the possibility of Noront making a new offer. There is no such language. It would be surprising to find such language: why would Noront give up the right to make another offer, and why would the sellers prevent Noront from making another offer? Any such language would be to the detriment of the two contracting parties and for the exclusive benefit of an unknown third party. As the Monitor pointed out, Section 12.2 of the initial SPA specifies that the SPA is for the sole benefit of the parties and is not intended to give any rights, benefits or remedies to a third party.

[49] As a result, the sellers had no obligation to accept the April 13 offer from CDM.

(4) The Supplemental Bid Process

[50] Once the sellers, their advisers and the Monitor determined that the April 13 offer from CDM was a Superior Proposal, they had to decide how to manage the process. They had two interested parties and they decided to give them both the chance to make their best and final offer through a process that they created for the purpose, which is referred to as the Supplemental Bid Process. This was a very reasonable decision, in the best interests of the creditors, although probably not one that either offeror was very happy with.

[51] The sellers, their advisers and the Monitor established a series of rules, and they sent the rules to the two offerors at the same time:

1. Each of the Bidders’ best and final offer is to be delivered in the form of an executed Share Purchase Agreement (the “Final Bid”), together with a blackline mark-up against the March 22 SPA to show proposed changes.

²² Exhibit R-23.

2. Final Bids can remove section 7.1(d) and the related provisions of the March 22 SPA.
3. Final bids are to be received by Moelis by no later than 5:00 p.m. (Toronto time) on Wednesday, April 15, 2015 in accordance with paragraph 7 below.
4. Final Bids may be accompanied by a cover letter setting any additional considerations that the Bidder wishes to be considered in connection with its Final Bid but such cover letter should not amend or modify any of the terms and conditions contained in the executed SPA.
5. Final Bids will be reviewed by the Sellers in consultation with moelis and the Monitor. A determination of the Superior Proposal will be made as soon as practicable and communicated to the Bidders.
6. Any clarifications or other communications with respect to this process should be made in writing to the Sale Advisor, with a copy to the Monitor.
7. Final Bids are to be submitted to the Sale Advisor c/o Carlo De Giroloamo by email at carlo.degirolamo@moelis.com.
8. All initially capitalized terms used herein unless otherwise defined shall have the meanings given to them in the March 22 SPA.²³

[52] They declined a request from Noront to modify the rules.²⁴

[53] Both Noront and CDM decided to participate in the Supplemental Bid Process and both submitted offers.

[54] All parties agree that the CDM offer was in compliance with the rules of the Supplemental Bid Process.

[55] Noront's offer was received at 5:00 p.m. on April 15.²⁵ CDM argues that the offer was not in compliance with the rules:

- The cover email states that final approvals are still required (presumably from Franco-Nevada which was advancing the funds for the transaction and Resource Capital Fund (RCF) which was the principal lender to Noront) and that Noront expected to receive them within the next hour;
- The cover letter was not signed;
- The cover letter stated that the revised offer was effective only if the sellers received another offer; and
- The email did not include an executed SPA, but only a blackline mark-up of the SPA.

[56] Subsequent to 5:00 p.m., Noront completed the requirements:

²³ Exhibits R-25 and R-26.

²⁴ Exhibit CDM-1.

²⁵ Exhibit R-30A.

- At 5:34 p.m., Noront sent a signed cover letter. A paragraph was added to explain that “certain representations and warranties and conditions to the advance of the loan with Franco-Nevada have been reduced in order to provide certainty on Noront’s financing” and that the signature pages for the SPA and the fully executed loan agreement would be sent separately;²⁶
- At 8:50 p.m., Noront’s counsel sent the executed SPA and the amended and restated loan agreement. The executed SPA included some changes described as “cleanup” and “not substantive” since 5:00 p.m. Among those changes, Noront deleted RCF from Exhibit C (Required Consents), suggesting that it had obtained that consent;²⁷
- At 10:00 p.m., Moelis asked Noront for confirmation of the RCF consent and an executed copy of it, an explanation for the source of the additional funds, and clarification of the deadline for the vesting order;²⁸
- At 10:35 p.m., Noront provided the executed RCF consent and an explanation of the funding;²⁹ and
- At 1:25 p.m. on April 16, Noront agreed to extend the date for the vesting order from April 20 to April 27.³⁰

[57] The Noront offer was the higher of the two offers in terms of the purchase price. The issue is whether these issues are such as to invalidate the process such that the Court should require the sellers to start over.

[58] The Court considers that these issues are relatively minor and that they do not invalidate the process:

- Noront submitted its offer on time;
- The offer was not amended in any substantive way after 5:00 p.m. In particular, the purchase price was not amended;
- The lack of a signature on the cover letter was irrelevant;
- The condition that the revised offer was effective only if the sellers received another offer had already been fulfilled before Noront submitted its offer. Noront did not know this, but the sellers, Moelis and the Monitor did;
- The missing third party consents were not within Noront’s control. Noront said at 5:00 p.m. that it expected to receive them within the next hour. In fact, it provided the consents to Moelis at 8:50 p.m.;

²⁶ Exhibit CDM-3.

²⁷ Exhibit CDM-4.

²⁸ Exhibit CDM-4.

²⁹ Exhibit CDM-4.

³⁰ Exhibit CDM-4.

- The executed SPA was provided at 8:50 p.m. The delay appears to be related to the missing consents. There is no evidence that Noront was using this as a means to preserve an out from the offer; and
- The questions with respect to the source of the funding and the date were clarifications requested by Moelis for its evaluation of the offer and were not elements missing from the offer.

[59] This is not a case where there is a fundamental flaw in the process, such as the parties having unequal access to information or one party seeking to amend its offer after it had knowledge of the other offers. The process was fair. It was not perfect, but the Courts do not require perfection.

(5) Conclusion

[60] As a result, the Court concludes that the sale process was reasonable within Section 36(3)(a) of the CCAA. Moreover, the other factors in Section 36(3) favour the approval of the sale:

- The monitor approved the process and was involved throughout;
- The monitor filed a report with the Court in which he recommends the approval of the sale;
- The creditors were not consulted, but the motion and amended motion were served on the service list and no creditor has objected to the sale;
- The consideration appears to be fair, given that it is the result of a reasonable process. The Court gives weight to the business judgment of the sellers and their advisers.

[61] For all of these reasons, the Court dismisses CDM's contestation of the motion.

[62] There remain the issues raised by the First Nations bands.

2. Do the First Nations bands have other grounds on which to object to the transaction?

[63] The First Nations bands raise issues of two natures.

[64] First, they argue that they were denied the opportunity to participate in the sale process and they ask for time to examine the possibility of presenting an offer for the Ring of Fire interests.

[65] Second, they argue that the transaction has an impact on their Aboriginal and treaty rights protected under Section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*.

[66] The Court has already concluded that the process of identifying potential buyers and strategic partners was reasonable.

[67] Further, it is not clear to what extent the First Nations bands had knowledge of the sale process and could have participated. The September 17, 2014 newspaper article says that Cliffs is exploring alternatives including the possibility of selling its

Ring of Fire interests.³¹ That article refers to a letter which was sent to the First Nations bands in the area which again would have referred to a possible sale.

[68] At the very latest, they knew about the potential sale when a press release was published on March 23, 2015.

[69] Moreover, in its materials, CDM alleged that its final offer on April 15 “had the support of two of the most impacted First Nations communities”,³² which suggests that the First Nations bands had at least some involvement in the sale process.

[70] Nevertheless, the interest of the First Nations bands remains at a very preliminary level. Although the First Nations bands say that they have hired a financial adviser and that they want a delay to analyze the possibility of making an offer for the Ring of Fire interests, whether on their own or with a partner, there is no evidence to suggest that the bands on their own would make a serious offer, or that they would partner with a party that was not already identified by Moelis and included in the process. It is pure speculation as to whether they will ever present an offer in excess of the Noront offer. The Courts have rejected firm offers for greater amounts received after the sale process has concluded.³³ The Courts should also refuse to stop the sale process because a party arriving late might be interested in presenting an offer which might be better than the offer on the table.

[71] The First Nations bands also plead that they have a special interest in this transaction because they live and exercise their Aboriginal and treaty rights guaranteed by the Constitution on the land and territories surrounding the Ring of Fire.

[72] For the purposes of this motion, the Court will assume that to be true. It is nevertheless unclear to what extent a change of control of the corporations which own the interests in the Ring of Fire project impacts on those rights. The identity of the shareholders of the corporations does not change the rights of the First Nations bands or the obligations of the corporations in relation to the development of the project.

[73] The First Nations bands pointed to two specific issues.

[74] First, they argued that there was a duty to consult which was not respected. It is clear that as a matter of constitutional law, there is a duty to consult. It is equally clear that this duty lies on the Crown, not on private parties.³⁴ As a result, the Crown has a duty to consult when it acts, including when it sells shares in a corporation with interests that impact on the rights of the First Nations.³⁵ However, a sale of shares from one private party to another does not trigger the duty to consult. The First Nations bands also produced the Regional Framework Agreement between nine First Nation bands in the Ring of Fire area, including the six objectors, and the Ontario Crown.³⁶ Cliffs was not a party to this agreement, and the sale of the sellers’ interests

³¹ Exhibit R-7.

³² Declaration of Intervention and Contestation (#87), par. 30.

³³ See, for example, *Boutiques San Francisco inc. (Arrangement relatif aux)*, [2004] R.J.Q. 965 (C.S.), par. 11-25; *AbitibiBowater*, *supra* note 18, par. 72-73.

³⁴ *Haida Nation v. British Columbia (Minister of Forests)*, 2004 SCC 73, par. 35, 56; *Rio Tinto Alcan Inc. v. Carrier Sekani Tribal Council*, 2010 SCC 43, par. 79..

³⁵ *In the Matter of CCAA and Skeena Cellulose Inc.*, 2002 BCSC 597, par. 14.

³⁶ Exhibit O-1.

in the Ring of Fire project does not affect any party's rights and obligations under the agreement. It is indeed unfortunate that the First Nations bands were not included in the sale process, because they will have an important role to play in the development of the Ring of Fire. But the failure to include them was not a breach of the duty to consult or of the Regional Framework Agreement.

[75] Second, the First Nations bands gave as an example of how the proposed transaction might prejudice their rights a royalty arrangement which Noront appears to have entered into with Franco-Nevada as part of the financing for the proposed transaction. The press release announcing the initial transaction on March 23, 2015 provided:

Franco-Nevada will receive a 3% royalty over the Black Thor chromite deposit and a 2% royalty over all of Noront's property in the region with the exception of Eagle's Nest, which is excluded.³⁷

[76] Assuming that the financing arrangements for the final transaction include a similar provision, which seems likely, the Court is unconvinced that it should refuse the approval of the transaction for this reason.

[77] It is difficult to see how granting a 2 or 3% royalty impacts the rights of the First Nations bands, unless it is their position that they are entitled to a royalty of more than 97%. They did not advance such an argument during the hearing.

[78] Further, the Court is not being asked to approve the financing arrangements between Noront and Franco-Nevada. If there is something in those financing arrangements that infringes on the rights of the First Nations bands, their rights and their remedies are not affected by the order that the Court is being asked to issue today.

[79] For all of these reasons, the Court dismisses the objection made by the First Nations bands.

3. Interest or Standing

[80] For the reasons set out above, the Court will dismiss CDM's contestation and the objection made by the First Nations bands. In principle, it is not necessary to deal with the issue of interest or standing. Also, given that the Court was given only a short delay to draft this judgment, it might not be wise to get too far into the issue.

[81] However, all parties pleaded the question at length and the Court will therefore deal with it.

[82] The Ontario authorities supporting the position that the "bitter bidder" has no interest or standing to challenge the approval motion are clear³⁸ and they have been followed in Québec.³⁹

³⁷ *Supra*, note 9.

³⁸ *Crown Trust v. Rosenberg*, 1986 CanLII 2760 (ON SC), p. 43; *Skyepharmaceutical plc v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp.*, [2000] O.J. No 467 (ON CA), par. 24-26, 30; *Consumers Packaging Inc. (Re)*, 2001 CanLII 6708 (ON CA), par. 7; *BDC Venture Capital Inc. v. Natural Convergence Inc.*, 2009 ONCA 665, par. 7-8.

[83] However, the issues which the Court must consider before approving a sale include the reasonableness of the sale process, which involves questions of the fairness and the integrity of the process.

[84] A losing bidder is not seeking to promote the best interests of the creditors, but is looking to promote its own interest. It will seek to raise these issues, not because it has any particular interest in fairness or integrity, but because it lost and it wants a second kick at the proverbial can. The narrow technical ground on which the losing bidder is found to have no interest is that it has no legal or proprietary right in the property being sold.⁴⁰ The underlying policy reason is that the losing bidder is a distraction, with the potential for delay and additional expense.

[85] However, if the losing bidder is excluded from the process, who will raise the issues of fairness and integrity? The creditors will not do so, because their interest is limited to getting the best price. Where there is a subsequent higher bid, their interest will be in direct conflict with the integrity of the sale process.

[86] Perhaps the way to reconcile all of this is to exclude the losing bidder from the Court approval process and instead require the losing bidder to make its complaints and objections to the monitor. The monitor would then be required to report to the Court on any such complaints and objections. In this case, the Monitor's Fourth Report deals with the objection of the First Nations bands in fair and objective manner. However, because CDM filed its intervention after the Monitor filed his report, the Monitor's Fourth Report does not deal with the issues raised by CDM. In that sense, the CDM intervention was useful to the Court in exercising its jurisdiction under Section 36 of the CCAA.

[87] The objection of the First Nations bands went beyond their status as losing bidders or excluded bidders, and included issues related to their Aboriginal and treaty rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

[88] The case law on the interest or standing of the "bitter bidder" and the policy considerations underlying that case law have no application to these issues. The interest of the First Nations bands is closer to the interest of "social stakeholders" that have been recognized in a number of cases.⁴¹

[89] Although the Court will dismiss the objections raised by the First Nations bands and CDM, it will not do so on grounds of a lack of interest or standing.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT HEREBY:

[90] **GRANTS** the Petitioners' Amended Motion for the Issuance of an Approval and Vesting Order (#82).

³⁹ *AbitibiBowater*, *supra* note 18, par. 81-88; *White Birch*, *supra* note 16, par. 55-56.

⁴⁰ Purchasers generally do not have a proprietary interest in the property they are buying.

⁴¹ *Re Canadian Airlines Corporation*, 2000 ABQB 442, par. 95; *Canadian Red Cross Society*, *Re*, 1998 CanLII 14907 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), par. 50; *Anvil Range Mining Corp.*, *Re*, 1998 CarswellOnt 5319 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), par. 9; *Skydome Corp.*, *Re*, 1998 CarswellOnt 5922 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), par. 6-7.

[91] **ORDERS** that all capitalized terms in this Order shall have the meaning given to them in the Share Purchase Agreement dated as of March 22, 2015, as amended and restated as of April 17, 2015 (the "**Share Purchase Agreement**") by and among Petitioner Cliffs Québec Iron Mining ULC ("**CQIM**"), Cliffs Greene B.V., Cliffs Netherlands B.V. and the Additional Sellers, as vendors, Noront Resources Ltd., as parent, and 9201955 Canada Inc., as purchaser (the "**Purchaser**"), a redacted copy of which was filed as Exhibit R-11 to the Motion, unless otherwise indicated herein.

SERVICE

[92] **ORDERS** that any prior delay for the presentation of this Motion is hereby abridged and validated so that this Motion is properly returnable today and hereby dispenses with further service thereof.

[93] **PERMITS** service of this Order at any time and place and by any means whatsoever.

SALE APPROVAL

[94] **ORDERS and DECLARES** that the transaction (the "**Transaction**") contemplated by the Share Purchase Agreement is hereby approved, and the execution of the Share Purchase Agreement by CQIM is hereby authorized and approved, *nunc pro tunc*, with such non-material alterations, changes, amendments, deletions or additions thereto as may be agreed to but only with the consent of the Monitor.

[95] **AUTHORIZES and DIRECTS** the Monitor to hold the Deposit, *nunc pro tunc*, and to apply, disburse and/or deliver the Deposit or the applicable portions thereof in accordance with the provisions of the Share Purchase Agreement.

EXECUTION OF DOCUMENTATION

[96] **AUTHORIZES and DIRECTS** CQIM and the Monitor to perform all acts, sign all documents and take any necessary action to execute any agreement, contract, deed, provision, transaction or undertaking stipulated in or contemplated by the Share Purchase Agreement (Exhibit R-12) and any other ancillary document which could be required or useful to give full and complete effect thereto.

AUTHORIZATION

[97] **ORDERS and DECLARES** that this Order shall constitute the only authorization required by CQIM to proceed with the Transaction and that no shareholder approval, if applicable, shall be required in connection therewith.

VESTING OF THE AMALCO SHARES

[98] **ORDERS and DECLARES** that upon the issuance of a Monitor's certificate substantially in the form appended as **Schedule "A"** hereto (the "**Certificate**"), all of CQIM's right, title and interest in and to the Amalco Shares shall vest absolutely and exclusively in and with the Purchaser, free and clear of and from any and all right, title,

benefits, priorities, claims (including claims provable in bankruptcy in the event that CQIM should be adjudged bankrupt), liabilities (direct, indirect, absolute or contingent), obligations, interests, prior claims, security interests (whether contractual, statutory or otherwise), liens, charges, hypothecs, mortgages, pledges, trusts, deemed trusts (whether contractual, statutory, or otherwise), assignments, judgments, executions, writs of seizure or execution, notices of sale, options, agreements, rights of distress, legal, equitable or contractual setoff, adverse claims, levies, taxes, disputes, debts, charges, rights of first refusal or other pre-emptive rights in favour of third parties, restrictions on transfer of title, or other claims or encumbrances, whether or not they have attached or been perfected, registered, published or filed and whether secured, unsecured or otherwise (collectively, the “**Encumbrances**”) by or of any and all persons or entities of any kind whatsoever, including without limiting the generality of the foregoing (i) any Encumbrances created by the Initial Order of this Court dated January 27, 2015 (as amended on February 20, 2015 and as may be further amended from time to time), and (ii) all charges, security interests or charges evidenced by registration, publication or filing pursuant to the Civil Code of Québec, the Ontario Personal Property Security Act, the British Columbia Personal Property Security Act or any other applicable legislation providing for a security interest in personal or movable property, and, for greater certainty, **ORDERS** that all of the Encumbrances affecting or relating to the Amalco Shares be expunged and discharged as against the Amalco Shares, in each case effective as of the applicable time and date of the Certificate.

[99] **ORDERS and DIRECTS** the Monitor to file with the Court a copy of the Certificate, forthwith after issuance thereof.

[100] **DECLARES** that the Monitor shall be at liberty to rely exclusively on the Conditions Certificates in issuing the Certificate, without any obligation to independently confirm or verify the waiver or satisfaction of the applicable conditions.

[101] **AUTHORIZES and DIRECTS** the Monitor to receive and hold the Purchase Price and to remit the Purchase Price in accordance with the provisions of this Order.

[102] **AUTHORIZES and DIRECTS** the Monitor to remit, following closing of the Transaction, that portion of the Purchase Price payable to the Non-Filing Sellers, to the Non-Filing Sellers in accordance with the Purchase Price Allocation described under Exhibit D of the Share Purchase Agreement (Exhibit R-12), as it may be amended by the Non-Filing Sellers, or as the Non-Filing Sellers may otherwise direct.

CANCELLATION OF SECURITY REGISTRATIONS

[103] **ORDERS** the Québec Personal and Movable Real Rights Registrar, upon presentation of the required form with a true copy of this Order and the Certificate, to reduce the scope of or strike the registrations in connection with the Amalco Shares, listed in **Schedule “B”** hereto, in order to allow the transfer to the Purchaser of the Amalco Shares free and clear of such registrations.

[104] **ORDERS** that upon the issuance of the Certificate, CQIM shall be authorized and directed to take all such steps as may be necessary to effect the discharge of all Encumbrances registered against the Amalco Shares, including filing such financing

change statements in the Ontario Personal Property Registry (“**OPPR**”) as may be necessary, from any registration filed against CQIM in the OPPR, provided that CQIM shall not be authorized or directed to effect any discharge that would have the effect of releasing any collateral other than the Amalco Shares, and CQIM shall be authorized to take any further steps by way of further application to this Court.

[105] **ORDERS** that upon the issuance of the Certificate, CQIM shall be authorized and directed to take all such steps as may be necessary to effect the discharge of all Encumbrances registered against the Amalco Shares, including filing such financing change statements in the British Columbia Personal Property Security Registry (the “**BCPPR**”) as may be necessary, from any registration filed against CQIM in the BCPPR, provided that CQIM shall not be authorized or directed to effect any discharge that would have the effect of releasing any collateral other than the Amalco Shares, and CQIM shall be authorized to take any further steps by way of further application to this Court.

CQIM NET PROCEEDS

[106] **ORDERS** that the proportion of the Purchase Price payable to CQIM in accordance with the Share Purchase Agreement (the “**CQIM Net Proceeds**”) shall be remitted to the Monitor and shall be held by the Monitor pending further order of the Court.

[107] **ORDERS** that for the purposes of determining the nature and priority of the Encumbrances, the CQIM Net Proceeds shall stand in the place and stead of the Amalco Shares, and that upon payment of the Purchase Price by the Purchaser, all Encumbrances shall attach to the CQIM Net Proceeds with the same priority as they had with respect to the Amalco Shares immediately prior to the sale, as if the Amalco Shares had not been sold and remained in the possession or control of the person having that possession or control immediately prior to the sale.

VALIDITY OF THE TRANSACTION

[108] **ORDERS** that notwithstanding:

- a) the pendency of these proceedings;
- b) any petition for a receiving order now or hereafter issued pursuant to the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (“**BIA**”) and any order issued pursuant to any such petition; or
- c) the provisions of any federal or provincial legislation;

the vesting of the Amalco Shares contemplated in this Order, as well as the execution of the Share Purchase Agreement pursuant to this Order, are to be binding on any trustee in bankruptcy that may be appointed, and shall not be void or voidable nor deemed to be a preference, assignment, fraudulent conveyance, transfer at undervalue or other reviewable transaction under the BIA or any other applicable federal or provincial legislation, as against CQIM,

the Purchaser or the Monitor, and shall not constitute oppressive or unfairly prejudicial conduct pursuant to any applicable federal or provincial legislation.

LIMITATION OF LIABILITY

[109] **DECLARES** that, subject to other orders of this Court, nothing herein contained shall require the Monitor to take control, or to otherwise manage all or any part of the Purchased Shares. The Monitor shall not, as a result of this Order, be deemed to be in possession of any of the Purchased Shares within the meaning of environmental legislation, the whole pursuant to the terms of the CCAA.

[110] **DECLARES** that no action lies against the Monitor by reason of this Order or the performance of any act authorized by this Order, except by leave of the Court. The entities related to the Monitor or belonging to the same group as the Monitor shall benefit from the protection arising under the present paragraph.

CONFIDENTIALITY

[111] **ORDERS** that the unredacted Initial Purchase Agreement filed with the Court as Exhibit R-3, the summary of the two LOIs filed with the Court as Exhibit R-8, the unredacted Share Purchase Agreement filed with the Court as Exhibit R-12 and the unredacted blackline of the Share Purchase Agreement showing changes from the Initial Purchase Agreement filed with the Court as Exhibit R-16 shall be sealed, kept confidential and not form part of the public record, but rather shall be placed, separate and apart from all other contents of the Court file, in a sealed envelope attached to a notice that sets out the title of these proceedings and a statement that the contents are subject to a sealing order and shall only be opened upon further Order of the Court.

GENERAL

[112] **DECLARES** that this Order shall have full force and effect in all provinces and territories in Canada.

[113] **DECLARES** that the Monitor shall be authorized to apply as it may consider necessary or desirable, with or without notice, to any other court or administrative body, whether in Canada, the United States of America or elsewhere, for orders which aid and complement this Order and, without limitation to the foregoing, an order under Chapter 15 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code, for which the Monitor shall be the foreign representative of the Petitioners and Mises-en-cause. All courts and administrative bodies of all such jurisdictions are hereby respectfully requested to make such orders and to provide such assistance to the Monitor as may be deemed necessary or appropriate for that purpose.

[114] **REQUESTS** the aid and recognition of any court or administrative body in any Province of Canada and any Canadian federal court or administrative body and any federal or state court or administrative body in the United States of America and any court or administrative body elsewhere, to act in aid of and to be complementary to this Court in carrying out the terms of this Order.

[115] **ORDERS** the provisional execution of the present Order notwithstanding any appeal and without the requirement to provide any security or provision for costs whatsoever.

[116] **THE WHOLE WITHOUT COSTS.**


STEPHEN W. HAMILTON J.S.C.

Me Bernard Boucher
Me Sébastien Guy
Me Steven J. Weisz
BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON, S.E.N.C.R.L.

for:

Bloom Lake General Partner Limited
Quinto Mining Corporation
8568391 Canada Limited
Cliffs Quebec Iron Mining ULC
The Bloom Lake Iron Ore Mine Limited Partnership
Bloom Lake Railway Company Limited

Me Sylvain Rigaud
Me Chrystal Ashby
NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT CANADA S.E.N.C.R.L.

for:

FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Me Jean-Yves Simard
LAVERY DE BILLY, S.E.N.C.R.L.

Me Sean Zweig
BENNETT JONES

for:

9201955 CANADA INC.

Me Stéphane Hébert
Me Maurice Fleming
MILLER THOMSON, S.E.N.C.R.L./LLP

for:

Eabametoong First Nation
Ginoogaming First Nation
Constance Lake First Nation and
Long Lake # 58 First Nation
Aroland First Nation
Marten Falls First Nation

Me Sandra Abitan
Me Éric Préfontaine
Me Julien Morissette
OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT, S.E.N.C.R.L./S.R.L.

for:

8901341 Canada inc.
Canadian Development and Marketing Corporation

Date of hearing: April 24, 2015

SCHEDULE "A"
FORM OF CERTIFICATE OF THE MONITOR
SUPERIOR COURT
(Commercial Division)

C A N A D A
PROVINCE OF QUÉBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTRÉAL
File: No: 500-11-048114-157

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

BLOOM LAKE GENERAL PARTNER LIMITED

QUINTO MINING CORPORATION

8568391 CANADA LIMITED

CLIFFS QUEBEC IRON MINING ULC

Petitioners

-and-

THE BLOOM LAKE IRON ORE MINE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

BLOOM LAKE RAILWAY COMPANY LIMITED

Mises-en-cause

-and-

9201955 CANADA INC.

Mise-en-cause

-and-

THE REGISTRAR OF THE REGISTER OF PERSONAL AND MOVABLE REAL RIGHTS

Mise-en-cause

-and-

FTI CONSULTING CANADA INC.

Monitor

CERTIFICATE OF THE MONITOR

RECITALS

- A.** Pursuant to an initial order rendered by the Honourable Mr. Justice Martin Catonguay, J.S.C., of the Superior Court of Québec, [Commercial Division] (the "**Court**") on January 27, 2015 (as amended on February 20, 2015 and as may be further amended from time to time, the "**Initial Order**"), FTI Consulting Canada Inc. (the "**Monitor**") was appointed to monitor the business and financial affairs of the Petitioners and the Mises-en-cause (together with the Petitioners, the "**CCAA Parties**").

- B.** Pursuant to an order (the “**Approval and Vesting Order**”) rendered by the Court on [REDACTED], 2015, the transaction contemplated by the Share Purchase Agreement dated as of March 22, 2015, as amended and restated as of April 17, 2015 (the “**Share Purchase Agreement**”) by and among Petitioner Cliffs Québec Iron Mining ULC (“**CQIM**”), Cliffs Greene B.V., Cliffs Netherlands B.V. and the Additional Sellers (as defined therein), as vendors, Noront Resources Ltd., as parent, and 9201955 Canada Inc., as purchaser (the “**Purchaser**”) was authorized and approved, with a view, *inter alia*, to vest in and to the Purchaser, all of CQIM’s right, title and interest in and to the Amalco Shares.
- C.** Each capitalized term used and not defined herein has the meaning given to such term in the Share Purchase Agreement.
- D.** The Approval and Vesting Order provides for the vesting of all of CQIM’s right, title and interest in and to the Amalco Shares in the Purchaser, in accordance with the terms of the Approval and Vesting Order and upon the delivery of a certificate (the “**Certificate**”) issued by the Monitor confirming that the Sellers and the Purchaser have each delivered Conditions Certificates to the Monitor.
- E.** In accordance with the Approval and Vesting Order, the Monitor has the power to authorize, execute and deliver this Certificate.
- F.** The Approval and Vesting Order also directed the Monitor to file with the Court, a copy of this Certificate forthwith after issuance thereof.

THEREFORE, THE MONITOR CERTIFIES THE FOLLOWING:

- A.** The Sellers and the Purchaser have each delivered to the Monitor the Conditions Certificates evidencing that all applicable conditions under the Share Purchase Agreement have been satisfied and/or waived, as applicable.
- B.** The Closing Time is deemed to have occurred on at [REDACTED] on [REDACTED], 2015.

THIS CERTIFICATE was issued by the Monitor at [REDACTED] on [REDACTED], 2015.

FTI Consulting Canada Inc., in its capacity as Monitor of the CCAA Parties, and not in its personal capacity.

By: _____

Name Nigel Meakin

:

SCHEDULE "B"
REGISTRATIONS TO BE REDUCED OR STRICKEN

Nil.

[NTD: Updated searches will be run before motion is heard to confirm no registrations in Quebec.]

8453339.6