COURT FILE NUMBER	2401 - 01778
COURT	COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA
JUDICIAL CENTRE	CALGARY
	IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, RSC 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED AND IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF COLLISION KINGS GROUP INC., CMD HOLDINGS INC., EAST LAKE COLLISION LTD., MAYLAND HEIGHTS COLLISION LTD., SUNRIDGE COLLISION LTD., 2199931 ALBERTA LTD., COLLISION KINGS 3 LTD., ARROW AUTO BODY LTD., CMD GLASS LTD., ROYAL VISTA COLLISION LTD., STATHKO INVESTMENTS LTD., NICK'S REPAIR SERVICE LTD., 10026923 MANITOBA LTD. and BUNZY'S AUTO BODY LTD.
APPLICANT	**FTI CONSULTING CANADA INC.,** in its capacity as Court-appointed Monitor of COLLISION KINGS GROUP INC., CMD HOLDINGS INC., EAST LAKE COLLISION LTD., MAYLAND HEIGHTS COLLISION LTD., SUNRIDGE COLLISION LTD., 2199931 ALBERTA LTD., COLLISION KINGS 3 LTD., ARROW AUTO BODY LTD., CMD GLASS LTD., ROYAL VISTA COLLISION LTD., STATHKO INVESTMENTS LTD., NICK'S REPAIR SERVICE LTD., 10026923 MANITOBA LTD. and BUNZY'S AUTO BODY LTD.
DOCUMENT	**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE MONITOR**
ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT	**Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP** 3810, Bankers Hall West 888 3 Street SW Calgary, AB T2P 5C5 **Attention: Jeffrey Oliver / Danielle Marechal** Telephone: 403 351 2920/ 403 351 2922 Facsimile: 403 648 1151 Email: joliver@cassels.com / dmarechal@cassels.com File No.: 55118-4

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

STATUTES

Tab **Authority**

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

JURISPRUDENCE

Tab **Authority**

2. *AbitibiBowater Inc. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2009 QCCS 6471, 2009 CarswellQue 14224

3. *In Re Hickman Equipment (1985) Ltd. (In Receivership)*, 2004 NLSCTD 164, 2004 CarswellNfld 263

4. *Re Nortel Networks Corporation et al*, 2014 ONSC 4777, 2014 CarswellOnt 17193

5. *Royal Bank of Canada v. Atlas Block Co. Limited*, 2014 ONSC 1531, 2014 CarswellOnt 2780

6. *Target Canada Co. (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 7574, 2015 CarswellOnt 19174

7. *Winnipeg Motor Express Inc. et al*, 2009 MBQB 204, 2009 CarswellMan 383

SECONDARY SOURCES

Tab **Authority**

8. Luc Morin & Arad Mojtahedi, "In Search of a Purpose: the Rise of Super Monitors & Creditor-Driven CCAAs" in Jill Corraini & the Honourable D Blair Nixon eds, Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2019 (Toronto: Thomson Reuters, 2020)

TAB 1

CANADA

CONSOLIDATION

CODIFICATION

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies

R.S.C., 1985, c. C-36

L.R.C. (1985), ch. C-36

Current to November 11, 2024

À jour au 11 novembre 2024

Last amended on April 27, 2023

Dernière modification le 27 avril 2023

Published by the Minister of Justice at the following address:
http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca

Publié par le ministre de la Justice à l'adresse suivante :
http://lois-laws.justice.gc.ca

(d) any further criteria, consistent with those set out in paragraphs (a) to (c), that are prescribed.

Related creditors

(3) A creditor who is related to the company may vote against, but not for, a compromise or arrangement relating to the company.

1997, c. 12, s. 126; 2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 71.

Class — creditors having equity claims

22.1 Despite subsection 22(1), creditors having equity claims are to be in the same class of creditors in relation to those claims unless the court orders otherwise and may not, as members of that class, vote at any meeting unless the court orders otherwise.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 71.

Monitors

Duties and functions

23 (1) The monitor shall

(a) except as otherwise ordered by the court, when an order is made on the initial application in respect of a debtor company,

(i) publish, without delay after the order is made, once a week for two consecutive weeks, or as otherwise directed by the court, in one or more newspapers in Canada specified by the court, a notice containing the prescribed information, and

(ii) within five days after the day on which the order is made,

(A) make the order publicly available in the prescribed manner,

(B) send, in the prescribed manner, a notice to every known creditor who has a claim against the company of more than $1,000 advising them that the order is publicly available, 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;

(b) review the company's cash-flow statement as to its reasonableness and file a report with the court on the monitor's findings;

d) tous autres critères réglementaires compatibles avec ceux énumérés aux alinéas a) à c).

Créancier lié

(3) Le créancier lié à la compagnie peut voter contre, mais non pour, l'acceptation de la transaction ou de l'arrangement.

1997, ch. 12, art. 126; 2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 71.

Catégorie de créanciers ayant des réclamations relatives à des capitaux propres

22.1 Malgré le paragraphe 22(1), les créanciers qui ont des réclamations relatives à des capitaux propres font partie d'une même catégorie de créanciers relativement à ces réclamations, sauf ordonnance contraire du tribunal, et ne peuvent à ce titre voter à aucune assemblée, sauf ordonnance contraire du tribunal.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 71.

Contrôleurs

Attributions

23 (1) Le contrôleur est tenu :

a) à moins que le tribunal n'en ordonne autrement, lorsqu'il rend une ordonnance à l'égard de la demande initiale visant une compagnie débitrice :

(i) de publier, sans délai après le prononcé de l'ordonnance, une fois par semaine pendant deux semaines consécutives, ou selon les modalités qui y sont prévues, dans le journal ou les journaux au Canada qui y sont précisés, un avis contenant les renseignements réglementaires,

(ii) dans les cinq jours suivant la date du prononcé de l'ordonnance :

(A) de rendre l'ordonnance publique selon les modalités réglementaires,

(B) d'envoyer un avis, selon les modalités réglementaires, à chaque créancier connu ayant une réclamation supérieure à mille dollars les informant que l'ordonnance a été rendue publique,

(C) d'établir la liste des nom et adresse de chacun de ces créanciers et des montants estimés des réclamations et de la rendre publique selon les modalités réglementaires;

b) de réviser l'état de l'évolution de l'encaisse de la compagnie, en ce qui a trait à sa justification, et de déposer auprès du tribunal un rapport où il présente ses conclusions;

(c) make, or cause to be made, any appraisal or investigation the monitor considers necessary to determine with reasonable accuracy the state of the company's business and financial affairs and the cause of its financial difficulties or insolvency and file a report with the court on the monitor's findings;

(d) file a report with the court on the state of the company's business and financial affairs — containing the prescribed information, if any —

(i) without delay after ascertaining a material adverse change in the company's projected cash-flow or financial circumstances,

(ii) not later than 45 days, or any longer period that the court may specify, after the day on which each of the company's fiscal quarters ends, and

(iii) at any other time that the court may order;

(d.1) file a report with the court on the state of the company's business and financial affairs — containing the monitor's opinion as to the reasonableness of a decision, if any, to include in a compromise or arrangement a provision that sections 38 and 95 to 101 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* do not apply in respect of the compromise or arrangement and containing the prescribed information, if any — at least seven days before the day on which the meeting of creditors referred to in section 4 or 5 is to be held;

(e) advise the company's creditors of the filing of the report referred to in any of paragraphs (b) to (d.1);

(f) file with the Superintendent of Bankruptcy, in the prescribed manner and at the prescribed time, a copy of the documents specified in the regulations;

(f.1) for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy incurred in performing his or her functions under this Act, pay the prescribed levy at the prescribed time to the Superintendent for deposit with the Receiver General;

(g) attend court proceedings held under this Act that relate to the company, and meetings of the company's creditors, if the monitor considers that his or her attendance is necessary for the fulfilment of his or her duties or functions;

(h) if the monitor is of the opinion that it would be more beneficial to the company's creditors if proceedings in respect of the company were taken under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, so advise the court without delay after coming to that opinion;

c) de faire ou de faire faire toute évaluation ou investigation qu'il estime nécessaire pour établir l'état des affaires financières et autres de la compagnie et les causes des difficultés financières ou de l'insolvabilité de celle-ci, et de déposer auprès du tribunal un rapport où il présente ses conclusions;

d) de déposer auprès du tribunal un rapport portant sur l'état des affaires financières et autres de la compagnie et contenant les renseignements réglementaires :

(i) dès qu'il note un changement défavorable important au chapitre des projections relatives à l'encaisse ou de la situation financière de la compagnie,

(ii) au plus tard quarante-cinq jours — ou le nombre de jours supérieur que le tribunal fixe — après la fin de chaque trimestre d'exercice,

(iii) à tout autre moment fixé par ordonnance du tribunal;

d.1) de déposer auprès du tribunal, au moins sept jours avant la date de la tenue de l'assemblée des créanciers au titre des articles 4 ou 5, un rapport portant sur l'état des affaires financières et autres de la compagnie, contenant notamment son opinion sur le caractère raisonnable de la décision d'inclure dans la transaction ou l'arrangement une disposition prévoyant la non-application à celle-ci des articles 38 et 95 à 101 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, et contenant les renseignements réglementaires;

e) d'informer les créanciers de la compagnie du dépôt du rapport visé à l'un ou l'autre des alinéas b) à d.1);

f) de déposer auprès du surintendant des faillites, selon les modalités réglementaires, de temps et autre, une copie des documents précisés par règlement;

f.1) afin de défrayer le surintendant des faillites des dépenses engagées par lui dans l'exercice de ses attributions prévues par la présente loi, de lui verser, pour dépôt auprès du receveur général, le prélèvement réglementaire, et ce au moment prévu par les règlements;

g) d'assister aux audiences du tribunal tenues dans le cadre de toute procédure intentée sous le régime de la présente loi relativement à la compagnie et aux assemblées de créanciers de celle-ci, s'il estime que sa présence est nécessaire à l'exercice de ses attributions;

h) dès qu'il conclut qu'il serait plus avantageux pour les créanciers qu'une procédure visant la compagnie

(i) advise the court on the reasonableness and fairness of any compromise or arrangement that is proposed between the company and its creditors;

(j) make the prescribed documents publicly available in the prescribed manner and at the prescribed time and provide the company's creditors with information as to how they may access those documents; and

(k) carry out any other functions in relation to the company that the court may direct.

soit intentée sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, d'en aviser le tribunal;

i) de conseiller le tribunal sur le caractère juste et équitable de toute transaction ou de tout arrangement proposés entre la compagnie et ses créanciers;

j) de rendre publics selon les modalités réglementaires, de temps et autres, les documents réglementaires et de fournir aux créanciers de la compagnie des renseignements sur les modalités d'accès à ces documents;

k) d'accomplir à l'égard de la compagnie tout ce que le tribunal lui ordonne de faire.

Monitor not liable

(2) If the monitor acts in good faith and takes reasonable care in preparing the report referred to in any of paragraphs (1)(b) to (d.1), the monitor is not liable for loss or damage to any person resulting from that person's reliance on the report.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 72.

Non-responsabilité du contrôleur

(2) S'il agit de bonne foi et prend toutes les précautions voulues pour bien établir le rapport visé à l'un ou l'autre des alinéas (1)b) à d.1), le contrôleur ne peut être tenu pour responsable des dommages ou pertes subis par la personne qui s'y fie.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 72.

Right of access

24 For the purposes of monitoring the company's business and financial affairs, the monitor shall have access to the company's property, including the premises, books, records, data, including data in electronic form, and other financial documents of the company, to the extent that is necessary to adequately assess the company's business and financial affairs.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Droit d'accès aux biens

24 Dans le cadre de la surveillance des affaires financières et autres de la compagnie et dans la mesure où cela s'impose pour lui permettre de les évaluer adéquatement, le contrôleur a accès aux biens de celle-ci, notamment les locaux, livres, données sur support électronique ou autre, registres et autres documents financiers.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Obligation to act honestly and in good faith

25 In exercising any of his or her powers or in performing any of his or her duties and functions, the monitor must act honestly and in good faith and comply with the Code of Ethics referred to in section 13.5 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Diligence

25 Le contrôleur doit, dans l'exercice de ses attributions, agir avec intégrité et de bonne foi et se conformer au code de déontologie mentionné à l'article 13.5 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Powers, Duties and Functions of Superintendent of Bankruptcy

Public records

26 (1) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy must keep, or cause to be kept, in the form that he or she considers appropriate and for the prescribed period, a public record of prescribed information relating to proceedings under this Act. On request, and on payment of the prescribed fee, the Superintendent of Bankruptcy must provide, or cause to be provided, any information contained in that public record.

Attributions du surintendant des faillites

Registres publics

26 (1) Le surintendant des faillites conserve ou fait conserver, en la forme qu'il estime indiquée et pendant la période réglementaire, un registre public contenant des renseignements réglementaires sur les procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi. Il fournit ou voit à ce qu'il soit fourni à quiconque le demande tous renseignements figurant au registre, sur paiement des droits réglementaires.

TAB 2

SUPERIOR COURT

CANADA
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTREAL

No: 500-11-036133-094

DATE: **NOVEMBER 23, 2009**

PRESENT: THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CLÉMENT GASCON, J.S.C.

IN THE MATTER OF THE PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF:

ABITIBIBOWATER INC.
And
ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED INC.
And
BOWATER CANADIAN HOLDINGS INC.
And
The other Petitioners listed on Schedules "A", "B" and "C"
Petitioners

And
ERNST & YOUNG INC.
Monitor

CORRECTED JUDGMENT
ON RE-AMENDED MOTION FOR THE APPROVAL OF A SECOND DIP FINANCING AND FOR DISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN PROCEEDS OF THE MPCo SALE TRANSACTION TO THE TRUSTEE FOR THE SENIOR SECURED NOTES (#312)

---

[1] **WHEREAS** the Abitibi Petitioners and the Term Lenders have requested the Court to issue this Corrected Judgment so as to clarify that it does not apply to Abitibi-Consolidated (U.K.) Inc., a Petitioner that was added to the schedule of Abitibi Petitioners by Order of this Court rendered on November 10, 2009, namely after the

ULC DIP Motion was argued but before the related Judgment of the Court was rendered on November 16, 2009;

[2] **WHEREAS** the request is justified to avoid any misunderstanding as to the exact scope of this Court's Judgment;

[3] **WHEREAS** a small correction to paragraph [17] of the conclusions and the addition of a new paragraph [21.1] are necessary to that end;

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT:

ULC DIP Financing

[1] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized and empowered to enter into, obtain and borrow under a credit facility provided pursuant to a loan agreement (the "**ULC DIP Agreement**") among ACI, as borrower, and 3239432 Nova Scotia Company, an unlimited liability company ("**ULC**"), as lender (the "**ULC DIP Lender**"), to be approved by Alcoa acting reasonably, which terms will be consistent with the ULC DIP Term Sheet communicated as **Exhibit R-1** in support of the ULC DIP Motion, subject to such non-material amendments and modifications as the parties may agree with a copy thereof being provided in advance to the Monitor and to modifications required by Alcoa, acting reasonably, which credit facility shall be in an aggregate principal amount outstanding at any time not exceeding **$230** million.

[2] **ORDERS** that the credit facility provided pursuant to the ULC DIP Agreement (the "**ULC DIP**") will be subject to the following draw conditions:

a) a first draw of $130 million to be advanced at closing;

b) subsequent draws for a maximum total amount of $50 million in increments of up to $25 million to be advanced upon a five (5) business day notice and in accordance with paragraph 61.11 of the Second Amended Initial Order which shall apply mutatis mutandis to advances under the ULC DIP; and

c) the balance of $50 million shall become available upon further order of the Court.

At the request of the Borrower, all undrawn amounts under the ULC DIP shall either (i) be transferred to the Monitor to be held in an interest bearing account for the benefit of the Borrower providing that any requests for advances thereafter shall continue to be made and processed in accordance herewith as if the transfer had not occurred, or (ii) be invested by ULC in an interest bearing account with all interest earned thereon being for the benefit of and remitted to the Borrower forthwith following receipt thereof.

[3] **ORDERS** the Petitioners to communicate a draft of the substantially final ULC DIP Agreement (the "**Draft ULC DIP Agreement**") to the Monitor and to any party listed on the Service List which requests a copy of same (an "**Interested Party**") no later than five (5) days prior to the anticipated closing of the MPCo Transaction, as said term is defined in the ULC DIP Motion.

[4] **ORDERS** that any Interested Party who objects to any provisions of the Draft ULC DIP Agreement as not being substantially in accordance with the terms of the ULC DIP Term Sheet, Exhibit R-1, or objectionable for any other reason, shall, before the close of business of the day following delivery of the Draft ULC DIP Agreement, make a request for a hearing before this Court stating the grounds upon which such objection is based, failing which the Draft ULC DIP Agreement shall be considered to conform to the ULC DIP Term Sheet and shall be deemed to constitute the ULC DIP Agreement for the purposes of this Order.

[5] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized and empowered to execute and deliver the ULC DIP Agreement, subject to the terms of this Order and the approval of Alcoa, acting reasonably, as well as such commitment letters, fee letters, credit agreements, mortgages, charges, hypothecs and security documents, guarantees, mandate and other definitive documents (collectively with the ULC DIP Agreement, the "**ULC DIP Documents**"), as are contemplated by the ULC DIP Agreement or as may be reasonably required by the ULC DIP Lender pursuant to the terms thereof, and the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized and directed to pay and perform all of their indebtedness, interest, fees, liabilities and obligations to the ULC DIP Lender under and pursuant to the ULC DIP Documents as and when same become due and are to be performed, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order.

[6] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners shall substantially comply with the terms and conditions set forth in the ULC DIP Documents and the 13-week cash flow forecast (the "Budget") provided to the financial advisors of the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party.

[7] **ORDERS** that, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the ULC DIP Documents, the Abitibi Petitioners shall use the proceeds of the ULC DIP substantially in compliance with the Budget, that the Monitor shall monitor the ongoing disbursements of the Abitibi Petitioners under the Budget, and that the Monitor shall forthwith advise the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party of the Monitor's understanding of any pending or anticipated substantial non-compliance with the Budget and/or any other pending or anticipated event of default or termination event under any of the ULC DIP Documents.

[8] **GIVES ACT** to the Abitibi Petitioners of their stated intention to provide a business plan to the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party by no later than 5:00 p.m. on November 27, 2009.

[9] **GIVES ACT** to the Abitibi Petitioners of their stated intention to provide a restructuring and recapitalization term sheet (the "Recapitalization Term Sheet") to the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party by no later than 5:00 p.m. on December 15, 2009.

[10] **ORDERS** that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order, the Abitibi Petitioners shall pay to the ULC DIP Lender when due all amounts owing (including principal, interest, fees and expenses, including without limitation, all fees and disbursements of counsel and all other advisers to or agents of the ULC DIP Lender on a full indemnity basis (the "**ULC DIP Expenses**") under the ULC DIP Documents and shall perform all of their other obligations to the ULC DIP Lender pursuant to the ULC DIP Documents and this Order.

[11] **ORDERS** that the claims of the ULC DIP Lender pursuant to the ULC DIP Documents shall not be compromised or arranged pursuant to the Plan or these proceedings and the ULC DIP Lender, in such capacity, shall be treated as an unaffected creditor in these proceedings and in any Plan or any proposal filed by any Abitibi Petitioner under the *BIA*.

[12] **ORDERS** that the ULC DIP Lender may, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order or the Initial Order:

a) take such steps from time to time as it may deem necessary or appropriate to register, record or perfect the ACI DIP Charge and the ULC DIP Documents in all jurisdictions where it deems it to be appropriate; and

b) upon the occurrence of a Termination Event (as each such term is defined in the ULC DIP Documents), refuse to make any advance to the Abitibi Petitioners and terminate, reduce or restrict any further commitment to the Abitibi Petitioners to the extent any such commitment remains, set off or consolidate any amounts owing by the ULC DIP Lender to the Abitibi Petitioners against any obligation of the Abitibi Petitioners to the ULC DIP Lender, make demand, accelerate payment or give other similar notices, or to apply to this Court for the appointment of a receiver, receiver and manager or interim receiver, or for a bankruptcy order against the Abitibi Petitioners and for the appointment of a trustee in bankruptcy of the Abitibi Petitioners, and upon the occurrence of an event of default under the terms of the ULC DIP Documents, the ULC DIP Lender shall be entitled to apply to the Court to seize and retain proceeds from the sale of any of the Property of the Abitibi Petitioners and the cash flow of the Abitibi Petitioners to repay amounts owing to the ULC DIP Lender in accordance with the ULC DIP Documents and the ACI DIP Charge.

[13] **ORDERS** that the foregoing rights and remedies of the ULC DIP Lender shall be enforceable against any trustee in bankruptcy, interim receiver, receiver or receiver and

manager of the Abitibi Petitioners or the Property of the Abitibi Petitioners, the whole in accordance with and to the extent provided in the ULC DIP Documents.

[14] **ORDERS** that the ULC DIP Lender shall not take any enforcement steps under the ULC DIP Documents or the ACI DIP Charge without providing five (5) business day (the "**Notice Period**") written enforcement notice of a default thereunder to the Abitibi Petitioners, the Monitor, the Senior Secured Noteholders, Alcoa, the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party. Upon expiry of such Notice Period, and notwithstanding any stay of proceedings provided herein, the ULC DIP Lender shall be entitled to take any and all steps and exercise all rights and remedies provided for under the ULC DIP Documents and the ACI DIP Charge and otherwise permitted at law, the whole in accordance with applicable provincial laws, but without having to send any notices under Section 244 of the *BIA*. For greater certainty, the ULC DIP Lender may issue a prior notice pursuant to Article 2757 *CCQ* concurrently with the written enforcement notice of a default mentioned above.

[15] **ORDERS** that, subject to further order of this Court, no order shall be made varying, rescinding, or otherwise affecting paragraphs 61.1 to 61.9 of the Initial Order, the approval of the ULC DIP Documents or the ACI DIP Charge unless either (a) notice of a motion for such order is served on the Petitioners, the Monitor, Alcoa, the Senior Secured Noteholders and the ULC DIP Lender by the moving party and returnable within seven (7) days after the party was provided with notice of this Order in accordance with paragraph 70(a) hereof or (b) each of the ULC DIP Lender and Alcoa applies for or consents to such order.

[16] **ORDERS** that 3239432 Nova Scotia Company is authorized to assign its interest in the ULC DIP to Alcoa pursuant to the security agreements and guarantees to be granted pursuant to the Implementation Agreement and this Court's Order dated September 29, 2009.

[17] **AMENDS** the Initial Order issued by this Court on April 17, 2009 (as amended and restated) by adding the following at the end of paragraph 61.3:

> "**ORDERS** further, that from and after the date of closing of the MPCo Transaction (as said term is defined in the Petitioners' ULC DIP Motion dated November 9, 2009) and provided the principal, interest and costs under the ACI DIP Agreement (as defined in the Order of this Court dated May 6, 2009), are concurrently paid in full, the ACI DIP Charge shall be increased by the aggregate amount of **$230** million (subject to the same limitations provided in the first sentence hereof in relation to the Replacement Securitization Facility) and shall be extended by a movable and immovable hypothec, mortgage, lien and security interest on all property of the Abitibi Petitioners (other than the property of Abitibi Consolidated (U.K.) Inc.) in favour of the ULC DIP Lender for all amounts owing, including principal, interest and ULC DIP Expenses and all obligations required to be performed under or in connection with the ULC

DIP Documents. The ACI DIP Charge as so increased shall continue to have the priority established by paragraphs 89 and 91 hereof provided such increased ACI DIP Charge (being the portion of the ACI DIP Charge in favour of the ULC DIP Lender) shall in all respects be subordinate (i) to the subrogation rights in favour of the Senior Secured Noteholders arising from the repayment of the ACI DIP Lender from the proceeds of the sale of the MPCo transaction as approved by this Court in its Order of September 29, 2009 and as confirmed by paragraph 11 of that Order, notwithstanding the amendment of paragraph 61.10 of this Order by the subsequent Order dated November 16, 2009, as well as the further subrogation rights, if any, in favour of the Term Lenders; and (ii) rights in favour of the Term Lenders arising from the use of cash for the payment of interest fees and accessories as determined by the Monitor. No order shall have the effect of varying or amending the priority of the ACI DIP Charge and the interest of the ULC DIP Lender therein without the consent of the Senior Secured Noteholders and Alcoa. The terms "ULC DIP Lender", "ULC DIP Documents", "ULC DIP Expenses", "Senior Secured Noteholders" and "Alcoa" shall be as defined in the Order of this Court dated November 16, 2009. Notwithstanding the subrogation rights created or confirmed herein, in no event shall the ULC DIP Lender be subordinated to more than approximately $40 million, being the aggregate of the proceeds of the MPCo Transaction paid to the ACI DIP Lender plus the interest, fees and expenses paid to the ACI DIP Lender as determined by the Monitor."

ACI DIP Agreement

[18] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized to make, execute and deliver one or more amendment agreements in connection with the ACI DIP Agreement providing for (i) an extension of the period during which any undrawn portion of the credit facility provided pursuant to the ACI DIP Agreement shall be available and (ii) the modification of the date upon which such credit facility must be repaid from November 1, 2009 to the earlier of the closing of the MPCo Transaction and December 15, 2009, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the ACI DIP Agreement, save and except for non-material amendments.

Senior Secured Notes Distribution

[19] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners are authorized and directed to make a distribution to the Trustee of the Senior Secured Notes in the amount of $200 million upon completion of the MPCo Transaction (as said term is defined in the ULC DIP Motion) from the proceeds of such sale and of the ULC DIP Facility, providing always that the ACI DIP is repaid in full upon completion of the MPCo Transaction.

[20] **ORDERS** that, subject to completion of the ULC DIP (including the initial draw of $130 million thereunder) and providing always that the ACI DIP is repaid in full upon completion of the MPCo Transaction, the distribution referred to in the preceding paragraph and the flow of funds upon completion of the MPCo Transaction and the ULC DIP shall be arranged in accordance with the following principles: (a) MPCo Proceeds shall be used, first, to fund the distribution to the Senior Secured Notes referenced in the previous paragraph and, secondly, to fund the repayment of the ACI DIP; (b) the initial draw of $130 million made under the ULC DIP shall fund any remaining balance due to repay in full the ACI DIP and this, upon completion of the MPCo Transaction. The Monitor shall be authorized to review the completion of the MPCo Transaction, the ULC DIP and the repayment of the ACI DIP and shall report to the Court regarding compliance with this provision as it deems necessary.

Amendment to the Subrogation Provision

[21] **ORDERS** that Subsection 61.10 of the Initial Order, as amended and restated, is replaced by the following:

> **Subrogation to ACI DIP Charge**
>
> [61.10] **ORDERS** that the holders of Secured Notes, the Lenders under the Term Loan Facility (collectively, the "**Secured Creditors**") and McBurney Corporation, McBurney Power Limited and MBB Power Services Inc. (collectively, the "**Lien Holder**") that hold security over assets that are subject to the ACI DIP Charge and that, as of the Effective Time, was opposable to third parties (including a trustee in bankruptcy) in accordance with the law applicable to such security (an "**Impaired Secured Creditor**" and "**Existing Security**", respectively) shall be subrogated to the ACI DIP Charge to the extent of the lesser of (i) any net proceeds from the Existing Security including from the sale or other disposition of assets, resulting from the collection of accounts receivable or other claims (other than Property subject to the Securitization Program Agreements and for greater certainty, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the ACI DIP Charge shall in no circumstances extend to any assets sold pursuant to the Securitization Program Agreements, any Replacement Securitization Facility or any assets of ACUSFC, the term "Replacement Securitization Facility" having the meaning ascribed to same in Schedule A of the ACI DIP Agreement) and/or cash that is subject to the Existing Security of such Impaired Secured Creditor that is used directly to pay (a) the ACI DIP Lender or (b) another Impaired Secured Creditor (including by any means of realization) on account of principal, interest or costs, in whole or in part, as determined by the Monitor (subject to adjudication by the Court in the event of any dispute) and (ii) the unpaid amounts due and/or becoming due and/or owing to such Impaired Secured Creditor that are secured by its Existing Security. For this

purpose "**ACI DIP Lender**" shall be read to include Bank of Montreal, IQ, the ULC DIP Lender and their successors and assigns, including any lender or lenders providing replacement DIP financing should same be approved by subsequent order of this Court. No Impaired Secured Creditor shall be able to enforce its right of subrogation to the ACI DIP Charge until all obligations to the ACI DIP Lender have been paid in full and providing that all rights of subrogation hereunder shall be postponed to the right of subrogation of IQ under the IQ Guarantee Offer, and, for greater certainty, no subrogee shall have any rights over or in respect of the IQ Guarantee Offer. In the event that, following the repayment in full of the ACI DIP Lender in circumstances where that payment is made, wholly or in part, from net proceeds of the Existing Security of an Impaired Secured Creditor (the "**First Impaired Secured Creditor**"), such Impaired Secured Creditor enforces its right of subrogation to the ACI DIP Charge and realizes net proceeds from the Existing Security of another Impaired Secured Creditor (the "**Second Impaired Secured Creditor**"), the Second Impaired Secured Creditor shall not be able to enforce its right of subrogation to the ACI DIP Charge until all obligations to the First Impaired Secured Creditor have been paid in full. In the event that more than one Impaired Secured Creditor is subrogated to the ACI DIP Charge as a result of a payment to the ACI DIP Lender, such Impaired Secured Creditors shall rank pari passu as subrogees, rateably in accordance with the extent to which each of them is subrogated to the ACI DIP Charge. The allocation of the burden of the ACI DIP Charge amongst the assets and creditors shall be determined by subsequent application to the Court if necessary."

[21.1] **DECLARES** that for the purposes of paragraphs 1, 5, 10, 12, 13, 17 and 18 of the present Order, the term "Abitibi Petitioners" shall not include Abitibi-Consolidated (U.K.) Inc. added to the schedule of Abitibi Petitioners by Order of this Court on November 10, 2009;

[22] **ORDERS** the provisional execution of this Order notwithstanding any appeal and without the necessity of furnishing any security.

[23] **WITHOUT COSTS**.

CLÉMENT GASCON, J.S.C.

Me Sean Dunphy and Me Joseph Reynaud
STIKEMAN, ELLIOTT
Attorneys for Petitioners

Me Robert Thornton

THORNTON GROUT FINNIGAN
Attorneys for the Monitor

Me Jason Dolman
FLANZ FISHMAN MELAND PAQUIN
Attorneys for the Monitor

Me Alain Riendeau
FASKEN MARTINEAU DuMOULIN
Attorneys for Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., Administrative Agent under the Credit and Guarantee Agreement Dated April 1, 2008

Me Marc Duchesne
BORDEN, LADNER, GERVAIS
Attorneys for the Ad hoc Committee of the Senior Secured Noteholders and U.S. Bank National Association, Indenture Trustee for the Senior Secured Noteholders

Me Frederick L. Myers
GOODMANS LLP
Co-Counsel for the Ad Hoc Committee of Unsecured Noteholders of AbitibiBowater Inc. and certain of its Affiliates

Me Jean-Yves Simard
LAVERY, DE BILLY
Co-Counsel for the Ad Hoc Committee of Unsecured Noteholders of AbitibiBowater Inc. and certain of its Affiliates

Me Patrice Benoît
GOWLING LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP
Attorneys for Investissement Québec

Me S. Richard Orzy
BENNETT JONES
Attorneys for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of AbitibiBowater Inc. & Al.

Me Frédéric Desmarais
McMILLAN LLP
Attorneys for Bank of Montreal

Me Anastasia Flouris
KUGLER, KANDESTIN, LLP
Attorneys for Alcoa

Date of hearing: November 23, 2009

SCHEDULE "A"

ABITIBI PETITIONERS

1. **ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED INC.**
2. **ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED COMPANY OF CANADA**
3. **3224112 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED**
4. **MARKETING DONOHUE INC.**
5. **ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED CANADIAN OFFICE PRODUCTS HOLDINGS INC.**
6. **3834328 CANADA INC.**
7. **6169678 CANADA INC.**
8. **4042140 CANADA INC.**
9. **DONOHUE RECYCLING INC.**
10. **1508756 ONTARIO INC.**
11. **3217925 NOVA SCOTIA COMPANY**
12. **LA TUQUE FOREST PRODUCTS INC.**
13. **ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED NOVA SCOTIA INCORPORATED**
14. **SAGUENAY FOREST PRODUCTS INC.**
15. **TERRA NOVA EXPLORATIONS LTD.**
16. **THE JONQUIERE PULP COMPANY**
17. **THE INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE AND TERMINAL COMPANY**
18. **SCRAMBLE MINING LTD.**
19. **9150-3383 QUÉBEC INC.**
20. **ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED (U.K.) INC.**

SCHEDULE "B"

BOWATER PETITIONERS

1. BOWATER CANADIAN HOLDINGS INC.
2. BOWATER CANADA FINANCE CORPORATION
3. BOWATER CANADIAN LIMITED
4. 3231378 NOVA SCOTIA COMPANY
5. ABITIBIBOWATER CANADA INC.
6. BOWATER CANADA TREASURY CORPORATION
7. BOWATER CANADIAN FOREST PRODUCTS INC.
8. BOWATER SHELBURNE CORPORATION
9. BOWATER LAHAVE CORPORATION
10. ST-MAURICE RIVER DRIVE COMPANY LIMITED
11. BOWATER TREATED WOOD INC.
12. CANEXEL HARDBOARD INC.
13. 9068-9050 QUÉBEC INC.
14. ALLIANCE FOREST PRODUCTS (2001) INC.
15. BOWATER BELLEDUNE SAWMILL INC.
16. BOWATER MARITIMES INC.
17. BOWATER MITIS INC.
18. BOWATER GUÉRETTE INC.
19. BOWATER COUTURIER INC.

SCHEDULE "C"

18.6 CCAA PETITIONERS

1. **ABITIBIBOWATER INC.**
2. **ABITIBIBOWATER US HOLDING 1 CORP.**
3. **BOWATER VENTURES INC.**
4. **BOWATER INCORPORATED**
5. **BOWATER NUWAY INC.**
6. **BOWATER NUWAY MID-STATES INC.**
7. **CATAWBA PROPERTY HOLDINGS LLC**
8. **BOWATER FINANCE COMPANY INC.**
9. **BOWATER SOUTH AMERICAN HOLDINGS INCORPORATED**
10. **BOWATER AMERICA INC.**
11. **LAKE SUPERIOR FOREST PRODUCTS INC.**
12. **BOWATER NEWSPRINT SOUTH LLC**
13. **BOWATER NEWSPRINT SOUTH OPERATIONS LLC**
14. **BOWATER FINANCE II, LLC**
15. **BOWATER ALABAMA LLC**
16. **COOSA PINES GOLF CLUB HOLDINGS LLC**

SUPERIOR COURT

CANADA
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTREAL

No: 500-11-036133-094

DATE: **NOVEMBER 16, 2009**

PRESENT: THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CLÉMENT GASCON, J.S.C.

IN THE MATTER OF THE PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF:

ABITIBIBOWATER INC.
And
ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED INC.
And
BOWATER CANADIAN HOLDINGS INC.
And
The other Petitioners listed on Schedules "A", "B" and "C"
Petitioners

And
ERNST & YOUNG INC.
Monitor

JUDGMENT
ON RE-AMENDED MOTION FOR THE APPROVAL OF A SECOND DIP FINANCING AND FOR DISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN PROCEEDS OF THE MPCo SALE TRANSACTION TO THE TRUSTEE FOR THE SENIOR SECURED NOTES (#312)

JG1793

INTRODUCTION

[1] In the context of their *CCAA*[1] restructuring, the Abitibi Petitioners[2] present a Motion[3] for 1) the approval of a second DIP financing and 2) the distribution of certain proceeds of the Manicouagan Power Company ("**MPCo**") sale transaction to the Senior Secured Noteholders **("SSNs").**

[2] More particularly, the Abitibi Petitioners seek:

1) Orders authorizing Abitibi Consolidated Inc. ("**ACI**") and Abitibi Consolidated Company of Canada Inc. ("**ACCC**") to enter into a Loan Agreement (the "**ULC DIP Agreement**") with 3239432 Nova Scotia Company ("**ULC**"), as lender, providing for a <u>CDN$230 million super-priority secured debtor in possession credit facility</u> (the "**ULC DIP Facility**").

   The ULC DIP Facility is to be funded from the ULC reserve of approximately CDN$282.3 million (the "**ULC Reserve**"), with terms that will be substantially in the form of the term sheet (the "**ULC DIP Term Sheet**") attached to the ULC DIP Motion;

2) Orders authorizing the distribution to the SSNs <u>of up to CDN$200 million</u> upon completion of the sale of ACCC's 60% interest in MPCo and Court approval of the ULC DIP Agreement.

   The distribution is to be paid from the net proceeds of the MPCo sale transaction after the payments, holdbacks, reserves and deductions provided for in the Implementation Agreement agreed upon in regard to that transaction; and

3) Orders amending the Second Amended Initial Order to increase the super priority charge set out in paragraph 61.3 (the "**ACI DIP Charge**") in respect of the ACI DIP Facility by an amount of CDN$230 million in favour of ULC for all amounts owing in connection with the ULC DIP Facility.

---

1 *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act,* R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the "***CCAA***").

2 In this Judgment, all capitalized terms not otherwise defined have the meaning ascribed thereto in either: 1) the *Second Amended Initial Order* issued by the Court on May 6, 2009; 2) the *Motion for the Distribution by the Monitor of Certain Proceeds of the MPCo Sale Transaction to U.S. Bank National Association, Indenture and Collateral Trustee for the Senior Secured Noteholders* (the "**Distribution Motion**") of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Senior Secured Noteholders and U.S. Bank National Association, Indenture Trustee for the Senior Secured Notes (respectively, the "**Committee**" and "**Trustee**", collectively the "**SSNs**") dated October 6, 2009; or 3) the Abitibi Petitioners' *Re-Amended Motion for the Approval of a Second DIP Financing in Respect of the Abitibi Petitioners and for the Distribution of Certain Proceeds of the MPCo Sale Transaction to the Trustee for the Senior Secured Notes* (the "**ULC DIP Motion**") dated November 9, 2009.

3 *Re-Amended Motion for the Approval of a Second DIP Financing in Respect of the Abitibi Petitioners and for the Distribution of Certain Proceeds of the MPCo Sale Transaction to the Trustee for the Senior Secured Notes* dated November 9, 2009 (the "**ULC DIP Motion**").

> This increase in the ACI DIP Charge is to still be subordinated to any and all subrogated rights in favour of the SSNs, the lenders under the ACCC Term Loan (the “**Term Lenders**”) and McBurney Corporation, McBurney Power Limited and MBB Power Services Inc. (the “**Lien Holders**”) arising under paragraph 61.10 of the Second Amended Initial Order.

[3] The SSNs and the Term Lenders, the only two secured creditor groups of the Abitibi Petitioners, do not, in the end, contest the ULC DIP Motion. Pursuant to intense negotiations and following concessions made by everyone, an acceptable wording to the orders sought was finally agreed upon on the eve of the hearing. The efforts of all parties and Counsel involved are worth mentioning; the help and guidance of the Monitor and its Counsel as well.

[4] Of the unsecured creditors and other stakeholders, only the Ad Hoc Unsecured Noteholders Committee **(**the **"Bondholders")** opposes the ULC DIP Motion, and even there, just in part. At hearing, Counsel for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors set up in the corresponding U.S. proceedings pending in the State of Delaware also voiced that his client shared some of the Bondholders' concerns.

[5] In short, while not contesting the request for approval of the second DIP financing, the Bondholders contend that the CDN$200 million immediate proposed distribution to the SSNs is inappropriate and uncalled for at this time.

[6] Before analyzing the various orders sought, an overview of the MPCo sale transaction and of the ULC DIP Facility that are the subject of the debate is necessary.

THE MPCo SALE TRANSACTION

[7] The MPCo sale transaction is central to the orders sought in the ULC DIP Motion.

[8] Under the terms of an Implementation Agreement signed in that regard, Hydro-Québec **("HQ")** agreed to pay ACCC CDN$615 million (the “**Purchase Price**”) for ACCC’s 60% interest in MPCo.

[9] Of this amount, it is expected that (i) CDN$25 million will be paid at closing to Alcoa, the owner of the other 40% interest in MPCo, for tax liabilities; (ii) approximately CDN$31 million will be held by HQ for two years to secure various indemnifications (the “**HQ Holdback**”); (iii) certain inter-party accounts will be settled; (iv) the CDN$282.3 million ULC Reserve, set up primarily to guarantee potential contingent pension liabilities and taxes resulting from the Proposed Transactions, will be held by the Monitor in trust for the ULC pending further Order of the Court; and (v) the ACI DIP Facility will be repaid.

[10] That said, until the sale, ACCC’s 60% interest in MPCo remains subject to the SSN’s first ranking security. This first ranking security interest has never been

contested by any party. In fact, after their review of same, the Monitor's Counsel concluded that it is valid and enforceable[4].

[11] Accordingly, the proceeds of the sale less adjustments, holdbacks and reserve would normally be paid to the SSNs as holders of valid first ranking security over this asset.

[12] To that end, the SSNs' claim of US$477,545,769.53 (US$413 million in principal and US$64,545,769.53 in interest as at October 1st, 2009) is not really contested except for a 0.5% to 2% additional default interest over the 13.75% original loan rate.

[13] In that context, on September 29, 2009, the Court issued an Order approving the sale of ACCC's 60% interest in MPCo on certain conditions. Amongst others, the Court:

a) Approved the terms and conditions of the Implementation Agreement;

b) Authorized and directed ACI and ACCC to implement and complete the Proposed Transactions with such non-material alterations or amendments as the parties may agree to with the consent of the Monitor;

c) Declared that (i) the proceeds from the Proposed Transactions, net of certain payments, holdbacks, reserves and deductions, and (ii) the shares of the ULC, shall constitute and be treated as proceeds of the disposition of ACCC's MPCo shares (collectively, the **"MPCo Share Proceeds"**);

d) Declared that the MPCo Share Proceeds extend to and include (a) ACCC's interest in the HQ Holdback and (b) ACCC's interest in claims arising from the satisfaction of related-party claims;

e) Declared that the MPCo Share Proceeds will be subject to a replacement charge (the **"MPCo Noteholder Charge"**) in favour of the SSNs with the same rank and priority as the security held in respect of the ACCC's MPCo shares;

f) Declared that the ULC Reserve is subject to a charge in favour of the SSNs which is subordinate to a charge in favour of Alcoa (the "**ULC Reserve Charge**"); and

g) Ordered that the cash component of the MPCo Share Proceeds and the ULC Reserve be paid to and held by the Monitor in an interest bearing account or investment grade marketable securities pending further Order of the Court.

[14] The Proposed Transactions are not expected to close until the latter part of November or early December 2009. ACI has requested and obtained an extension

4 See Monitor's 19th Report dated October 27, 2009.

from Investissement Quebec **("IQ")** to December 15, 2009 for the repayment of the ACI DIP Facility that matured on November 1st, 2009.

[15] Based on the amounts of the significant payments, holdbacks, reserves and deductions from the Purchase Price, and considering that the amount drawn under the ACI DIP Facility presently stands at CDN$54.8 million, the Net Available Proceeds after payment of the ACI DIP Facility would be approximately CDN$173.9 million.

THE ULC DIP FACILITY

[16] Pursuant to the Implementation Agreement, ULC is required to maintain the ULC Reserve. On the closing of the Proposed Transactions, ULC will hold the ULC Reserve in the amount of approximately CDN$282.3 million.

[17] This amount may be used for a limited number of purposes (the "**Permitted Investments**") that are described in the Implementation Agreement. Such Permitted Investments include making a DIP loan to either ACI or ACCC.

[18] Based on that, the ULC DIP Term Sheet provides that the ACI Group will borrow CDN$230 million from the ULC Reserve as a Permitted Investment.

[19] According to the Monitor[5], the significant terms of the ULC DIP Term Sheet are as follows:

i) **Manner of Borrowing** – Initially, the ULC DIP Facility was to be available by way of an immediate draw of CDN$230 million. After negotiations with the Term Lenders, it was rather agreed that (i) a first draw of CDN$130 million will be advanced at closing, (ii) subsequent draws for a maximum total amount of CDN$50 million in increments of up to CDN$25 million will be advanced upon a five (5) business day notice and in accordance with paragraph 61.11 of the Second Amended Initial Order, and (iii) the balance of CDN$50 million shall become available upon further order of the Court.

ii) **Interest Payments** – No interest will be payable on the ULC DIP Facility;

iii) **Fees** –No fees are payable in respect of the ULC DIP Facility;

iv) **Expenses** – The borrowers will pay all reasonable expenses incurred by ULC and Alcoa in connection with the ULC DIP Facility;

v) **Reporting** – Reporting will be similar to that provided under the ACI DIP Facility and copies of all financial information will be placed in the data room. Reporting will include notice of events of default or maturing events of default;

[5] See Monitor's 19th Report dated October 27, 2009.

vi) **Use of Proceeds** – The ULC DIP Facility will be used for general corporate purposes in material compliance with the 13-week cash flow forecasts to be provided no less frequently than the first Friday of each month (the "**Budget**");

vii) **Events of Default** – The events of default include the following:

(a) Substantial non-compliance with the Budget;

(b) Termination of the *CCAA* Stay of Proceedings;

(c) Failure to file a *CCAA* Plan with the Court by September 30, 2010; and

(d) Withdrawal of the existing Securitization Program unless replaced with a reasonably similar facility;

viii) **Rights of Alcoa** – Alcoa will receive all reporting noted above and notices of events of default. Alcoa's consent is required for any amendments or waivers;

ix) **Rights of Senior Secured Noteholders** – The Senior Secured Noteholders' rights consist of:

(a) Receiving all reporting noted above and any notice of an Event of Default;

(b) Consent of Senior Secured Noteholders holding a majority of the principal amount of the Senior Secured Notes is required for any amendments to the maximum amount of the ULC DIP Facility or any change to the Outside Maturity Date or the interest rate;

(c) Upon an Event of Default, there is no right to accelerate payment or maturity, subject to the right to apply to Court for the termination of the ULC DIP Facility, which right is without prejudice to the right of ACI, ACCC, the ULC or Alcoa to oppose such application;

(d) Entitlement to review draft of documents, but final approval of such documents is in Alcoa's sole discretion; and

(e) Entitlement to request the approval of the Court to amend any monthly cash flow budget which has been filed;

x) **Security –** Security is similar to the existing ACI DIP Facility and ranking immediately after the existing ACI DIP Charge. There are no charges on the assets of the Chapter 11 Debtors (as defined in the existing ACI DIP Facility).

[20] The Monitor notes that the ULC DIP Facility will provide the ACI Group with additional net liquidity (after the retirement of the ACI DIP Facility and after the payment of the proposed distribution to the SSNs) in the amount of some CDN$167 million.

THE QUESTIONS AT ISSUE

[21] In light of this background, the Court must answer the following questions:

1) Should the ULC DIP Facility of CDN$230 million be approved?

2) Should the proposed distribution of CDN$200 million to the SSNs be authorized?

3) Is the wording of the orders sought appropriate, notably with regard to the additions proposed by the Bondholders in terms of the future steps to be taken by the Abitibi Petitioners?

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

1) THE APPROVAL OF THE DIP FINANCING

[22] In the Court's opinion, the second DIP financing, that is, the ULC DIP Facility of CDN$230 million, should be approved on the amended terms agreed upon by the numerous parties involved.

[23] In this restructuring, the Court has already approved DIP financing in respect of both the Abitibi Petitioners and the Bowater Petitioners.

[24] On April 22, 2009, it issued a Recognition Order (U.S. Interim DIP Order) recognizing an Interim Order of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for a DIP loan of up to US$206 million to the Bowater Petitioners. On May 6, 2009, it approved the ACI DIP Facility, a US$100 million loan to the Abitibi Petitioners by Bank of Montreal (**"BMO"**), guaranteed by IQ.

[25] The jurisdiction of the Court to approve DIP financing and the requirement of the Abitibi Petitioners for such were canvassed at length in the May 6 Judgment. The requirements of the Abitibi Petitioners for liquidity and the authority of the Court to approve agreements to satisfy those requirements have already been reviewed and ruled upon.

[26] There have been no circumstances intervening since the approval of the ACI DIP Facility that can fairly be characterized as negating the requirement of the Abitibi Petitioners for DIP financing.

[27] The only issue here is whether this particular ULC DIP Facility proposal, replacing as it does the prior ACI DIP Facility, is one that the Court ought to approve. As indicated earlier, the answer is yes.

[28] At this stage in the proceedings where the phase of business stabilization is largely complete, the Court is not required to approach the subject of DIP financing from the perspective of excessive caution or parsimony.

[29] On the one hand, as highlighted notably by the Monitor[6], the Abitibi Petitioners have presented substantial reasons to support their need for liquidity by way of a DIP loan. Suffice it to note to that end that:

a) Without an adequate cushion, in view of potential adverse exchange rate fluctuations and further adverse price declines in the market, the Abitibi Petitioners' liquidity could easily be insufficient to meet the requirements of its Securitization Program (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraphs 49, 50 and chart at paragraph 61);

b) Absent a DIP loan, there is, in fact, a "high risk of default" under the Securitization Program (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraph 32);

c) Despite Abitibi Petitioners' best efforts at forecasting, weekly cash flow forecasts have varied by as much as US$26 million. Weekly disbursements have varied by 100%. Each 1¢ variation in the foreign exchange rate as against the US dollar could produce a US$17 million negative cash flow variation. The ultimate cash flow requirements will be highly dependent on variables that the Abitibi Petitioners' cannot control (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraphs 54, 60 and 61);

d) The market decline has eroded the Abitibi Petitioners' liquidity, while foreign exchange fluctuations are placing further strain on this liquidity. Even if prices increase, the resulting need for additional working capital to increase production will paradoxically put yet further strain on this liquidity;

e) Without the ULC DIP Facility, the Abitibi Petitioners would lack access to sufficient operating credit to maintain normal operations. They would be significantly impaired in their ability to operate in the ordinary course and they would face an increase in the risk of unexpected interruptions; and

f) The Abitibi Petitioners have yet to complete their business plan and it is premature to predict the length of the proceedings (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraphs 47 and 48).

[30] In fact, based upon its sensitivity analysis, the inter-month variability of the cash flows, the minimum liquidity requirements under the Securitization Program, and the requirement to repay the ACI DIP Facility, the Monitor is of the view that the Abitibi Petitioners need the new ULC DIP Facility to ensure that ACI has sufficient liquidity to complete its restructuring.

---

6 See Monitor's 19th Report dated October 27, 2009.

[31] On the other hand, the reasonableness of the amount of the ULC DIP Facility is supported by the following facts:

a) Only about CDN$168 million of incremental liquidity is being provided and post-transaction, the Abitibi Petitioners will have, at best, about CDN$335 million of liquidity (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraph 68);

b) The Bowater Petitioners, a group of the same approximate size as the Abitibi Petitioners, enjoy liquidity of approximately US$400 million (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraph 69) and a DIP facility of approximately US$200 million;

c) Even with the ULC DIP Facility, the Abitibi Petitioners will be at the low end of average relative to their peers in terms of available liquidity relative to their size;

d) The cash flow of the Abitibi Petitioners is subject to significant intra-month variations and has risks associated with pricing and currency fluctuations which are larger the longer the period examined; and

e) The Abitibi Petitioners are required by the Securitization Facility to maintain liquidity on a rolling basis above US$100 million.

[32] In addition, the Court and the stakeholders have all the means necessary at their disposal to monitor the use of liquidity without, at the same time, having to ration its access at a level far below that enjoyed by the peers with whom the Abitibi Petitioners compete.

[33] In this regard, it is important to emphasize that the ULC DIP Facility includes, after all, particularly interesting conditions in terms of interest payments and associated fees. Because ULC is the lender, none are payable.

[34] Finally, the provisions of section 11.2 of the amended *CCAA*, and in particular the factors for review listed in subsection 11.2(4), are instructive guidelines to the exercise of the Court's discretion to approve the ULC DIP Facility.

[35] Pursuant to subsection 11.2(4) of the amended *CCAA*, for restructurings undertaken after September 18, 2009, the judge is now directed to consider the following factors in determining whether to exercise his or her discretion to make an order such as this one:

a) The period during which the company is expected to be subject to *CCAA* proceedings;

b) How the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;

c) Whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;

d) Whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made;

e) The nature and value of the company's property;

f) Whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and

g) The Monitor’s report.

[36] Applying these criteria to this case, it is, first, premature to speculate how long the Abitibi Petitioners will remain subject to proceedings under the *CCAA*.

[37] The Monitor's 19th Report has considered cash flow forecasts until December 2010. The Abitibi Petitioners are hopeful of progressing to a plan outline by year-end with a view to emergence in the first or second quarter of 2010.

[38] In considering a DIP financing proposal, the Court can take note of the fact that the time and energies ought, at this stage in the proceedings, to be more usefully and profitably devoted to completing the business restructuring, raising the necessary exit financing and negotiating an appropriate restructuring plan with the stakeholders.

[39] Second, even if the ULC DIP Facility of CDN$230 million is a high, albeit reasonable, figure under the circumstances, access to the funds and use of the funds remain closely monitored.

[40] Based on the compromise reached with the Term Lenders, access to the funds will be progressive and subject to control. The initial draw is limited to CDN$130 million. Subsequent additional draws up to CDN$50 million will be in maximum increments of CDN$25 million and subject to prior notice. The final CDN$50 million will only be available with the Court's approval.

[41] As well, the use of the funds is subject to considerable safeguards as to the interests of all stakeholders. These include the following:

a) The Monitor is on site monitoring and reviewing cash flow sources and uses in real time with full access to senior management, stakeholders and the Court;

b) Stakeholders have very close to real time access to financial information regarding sources and use of cash flow by reason of the weekly cash flow forecasts provided to their financial advisors and the weekly calls with such financial advisors, participated in by senior management;

c) The Monitor provides regular reporting to the Court including as to the tracking of variances in cash use relative to forecast and as to evolution of the business environment in which the Abitibi Petitioners are operating; and

d) All stakeholders have full access to this Court to bring such motions as they see fit should a material adverse change in the business or affairs intervene.

[42] Third, there has been no suggestion that the management of the Abitibi Petitioners has lost the confidence of its major creditors. To the contrary:

a) Management has successfully negotiated a settlement of very complex and thorny issues with both the Term Lenders and the SSNs, which has enabled this ULC DIP Motion to be brought forward with their support;

b) While management does not agree with all positions taken by the Bondholders at all times, it has by and large enjoyed the support of that group throughout these proceedings;

c) Management has been attentive to the suggestions and guidance of the Monitor with the result that there have been few if any instances where the Monitor has been publicly obliged to oppose or take issue with steps taken;

d) Management has been proactive in hiring a Chief Restructuring Officer who has provided management with additional depth and strength in navigating through difficult circumstances; and

e) The Abitibi Petitioners' management conducts regular meetings with the financial advisors of their major stakeholders, in addition to having an "open door" policy.

[43] The Court is satisfied that, in requesting the approval of the ULC DIP Facility, management is doing so with a broad measure of support and the confidence of its major creditor constituencies.

[44] Fourth, with an adequate level of liquidity, the Abitibi Petitioners will be able to run their business as a going concern on as normal a basis as possible, with a view to enhancing and preserving its value while the restructuring process proceeds.

[45] By facilitating a level of financial support that is reasonable and adequate and of sufficient duration to enable them to complete the restructuring on most reasonable assumptions, the Abitibi Petitioners will have the benefit of an umbrella of stability around their core business operations.

[46] In the Court's opinion, this can only facilitate the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being found.

[47] Fifth, there are only two secured creditor groups of the Abitibi Petitioners: the SSNs and the Term Lenders. After long and difficult negotiations, they finally agreed to an acceptable wording to the orders sought. No one argues any longer that it is prejudiced in any way by the proposed security or charge.

[48] Lastly, sixth, the Monitor has carefully considered the positions of all of the stakeholders as well as the reasonableness of the Abitibi Petitioners' requirements for the proposed ULC DIP Facility. Having reviewed both the impact of the proposed ULC DIP Facility on stakeholders and its beneficial impact upon the Abitibi Petitioners, the Monitor recommends approval of the ULC DIP Facility.

[49] On the whole, in approving this ULC DIP Facility, the Court supports the very large consensus reached and the fine balance achieved between the interests of all stakeholders involved.

2) THE DISTRIBUTION TO THE SSNs

[50] The approval of the terms of the ULC DIP Facility by the SSNs is intertwined with the Abitibi Petitioners' agreement to support a distribution in their favor in the amount of CDN$200 million.

[51] The Abitibi Petitioners and the SSNs consider that since the MPCo proceeds were and are subject to the security of the SSNs, this arrangement or compromise is a reasonable one under the circumstances.

[52] They submit that the proposed distribution will be of substantial benefit to the Abitibi Petitioners. Savings of at least CDN$27.4 million per year in accruing interest costs on the CDN$200 million to be distributed will be realized based on the 13.75% interest rate payable to the SSNs.

[53] Needless to say, they maintain that the costs saved will add to the potential surplus value of SSNs' collateral that could be utilized to compensate any creditor whose security may be impaired in the future in repaying the ULC DIP Facility.

[54] The Bondholders oppose the CDN$200 million distribution to the SSNs.

[55] In their view, given the Abitibi Petitioners' need for liquidity, the proposed payment of substantial proceeds to one group of creditors raises important issues of both propriety and timing. It also brings into focus the need for the *CCAA* process to move forward efficiently and effectively towards the goal of the timely negotiation and implementation of a plan of arrangement.

[56] The Bondholders claim that the proposed distribution violates the *CCAA*. From their perspective, nothing in the statute authorizes a distribution of cash to a creditor

group prior to approval of a plan of arrangement by the requisite majorities of creditors and the Court. They maintain that the SSNs are subject to the stay of proceedings like all other creditors.

[57] By proposing a distribution to one class of creditors, the Bondholders contend that the other classes of creditors are denied the ability to negotiate a compromise with the SSNs. Instead of bringing forward their proposed plan and creating options for the creditors for negotiation and voting purposes, the Abitibi Petitioners are thus eliminating bargaining options and confiscating the other creditors' leverage and voting rights.

[58] Accordingly, the Bondholders conclude that the proposed distribution should not be considered until after the creditors have had an opportunity to negotiate a plan of arrangement or a compromise with the SSNs.

[59] In the interim, they suggest that the Abitibi Petitioners should provide a business plan to their legal and financial advisors by no later than 5:00 p.m. on November 27, 2009. They submit that a restructuring and recapitalization term sheet on terms acceptable to them and their legal and financial advisors should also be provided by no later than 5:00 p.m. on December 11, 2009.

[60] With all due respect for the views expressed by the Bondholders, the Court considers that, similarly to the ULC DIP Facility, the proposed distribution should be authorized.

[61] To begin with, the position of the Bondholders is, under the circumstances, untenable. While they support the CDN$230 million ULC DIP Facility, they still contest the CDN$200 million proposed distribution that is directly linked to the latter.

[62] The Court does not have the luxury of picking and choosing here. What is being submitted for approval is a global solution. The compromise reached must be considered as a whole. The access to additional liquidity is possible because of the corresponding distribution to the SSNs. The amounts available for both the ULC DIP Facility and the proposed distribution come from the same MPCo sale transaction.

[63] The compromise negotiated in this respect, albeit imperfect, remains the best available and viable solution to deal with the liquidity requirements of the Abitibi Petitioners. It follows a process and negotiations where the views and interests of most interested parties have been canvassed and considered.

[64] To get such diverse interest groups as the Abitibi Petitioners, the SSNs, the Term Lenders, BMO and IQ, and ULC and Alcoa to agree on an acceptable outcome is certainly not an easy task to achieve. Without surprise, it comes with certain concessions.

[65] It would be very dangerous, if not reckless, for the Court to put in jeopardy the ULC DIP Facility agreed upon by most stakeholders on the basis that, perhaps, a better

arrangement could eventually be reached in terms of distribution of proceeds that, on their face, appear to belong to the SSNs.

[66] The Court is satisfied that both aspects of the ULC DIP Motion are closely connected and should be approved together. To conclude otherwise would potentially put everything at risk, at a time where stability is most required.

[67] Secondly, it remains that ACCC's interest in MPCo is subject to the SSNs' security. As such, all proceeds of the sale less adjustments, holdbacks and reserves should normally be paid to the SSNs. Despite this, provided they receive the CDN$200 million proposed distribution, the SSNs have consented to the sale proceeds being used by the Abitibi Petitioners to pay the existing ACI DIP Facility and to the ULC Reserve being used up to CDN$230M for the ULC DIP Facility funding.

[68] It is thus fair to say that the SSNs are not depriving the Abitibi Petitioners of liquidity; they are funding part of the restructuring with their collateral and, in the end, enhancing this liquidity.

[69] The net proceeds of the MPCo transaction after payment of the ACI DIP Facility are expected to be CDN$173.9 million. Accordingly, out of a CDN$200 million distribution to the SSNs, only CDN$26.1 million could technically be said to come from the ULC DIP Facility. Contrary to what the Bondholders alluded to, if minor aspects of the claims of the SSNs are disputed by the Abitibi Petitioners, they do not concern the CDN$200 million at issue.

[70] Thirdly, the ULC DIP Facility bears no interest and is not subject to drawdown fees, while a distribution of CDN$200 million to the SSNs will create at the same time interest savings of approximately CDN$27 million per year for the ACI Group. There is, as a result, a definite economic benefit to the contemplated distribution for the global restructuring process.

[71] Despite what the Bondholders argue, it is neither unusual nor unheard of to proceed with an interim distribution of net proceeds in the context of a sale of assets in a *CCAA* reorganization. Nothing in the *CCAA* prevents similar interim distribution of monies. There are several examples of such distributions having been authorized by Courts in Canada[7].

[72] While the SSNs are certainly subject to a stay of proceedings much like the other creditors involved in the present *CCAA* reorganization, an interim distribution of net proceeds from the sale of an asset subject to the Court's approval has never been considered a breach of the stay.

[7] See *Re Windsor Machine & Stamping Ltd.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 4505 (Ont. Sup. Ct.); *Re Rol-Land Farms Limited* (October 5, 2009), Toronto 08-CL-7889 (Ont. Sup. Ct.); and *Re Pangeo Pharma Inc.,* (August 14, 2003), Montreal 500-11-021037-037 (Que. Sup. Ct.).

[73] In this regard, the Bondholders have no economic interest in the MPCo assets and resulting proceeds of sale that are subject to a first ranking security interest in favor of the SSNs. Therefore, they are not directly affected by the proposed distribution of CDN$200 million.

[74] In *Windsor Machine & Stamping Ltd. (Re)*[8], Morawetz J. dealt with the opposition of unsecured creditors to an Approval and Distribution Order as follows:

> 13 Although the outcome of this process does not result in any distribution to unsecured creditors, this does not give rise to a valid reason to withhold Court approval of these transactions. I am satisfied that the unsecured creditors have no economic interest in the assets.

[75] Finally, even though the Monitor makes no recommendation in respect of the proposed distribution to the SSNs, this can hardly be viewed as an objection on its part. In the first place, this is not an issue upon which the Monitor is expected to opine. Besides, in its 19th report, the Monitor notes the following in that regard:

a) According to its Counsel, the SSNs security on the ACCC's 60% interest in MPCo is valid and enforceable;

b) The amounts owed to the SSNs far exceed the contemplated distribution while the SSNs' collateral is sufficient for the SSNs' claim to be most likely paid in full;

c) The proposed distribution entails an economy of CDN$27 million per year in interest savings; and

d) Even taking into consideration the CDN$200 million proposed distribution, the ULC DIP Facility provides the Abitibi Petitioners with the liquidity they require for most of the coming year.

[76] All things considered, the Court disagrees with the Bondholders' assertion that the proposed distribution is against the goals and objectives of the *CCAA*. For some, it may only be a small step. However, it is a definite step in the right direction.

[77] Securing the most needed liquidity at issue here and reducing substantially the extent of the liabilities towards a key secured creditor group no doubt enhances the chances of a successful restructuring while bringing stability to the on-going business.

[78] This benefits a large community of interests that goes beyond the sole SSNs.

[79] From that standpoint, the Court is satisfied that the restructuring is moving forward properly, with reasonable diligence and in accordance with the *CCAA* ultimate goals.

---

8 *Re Windsor Machine & Stamping Ltd.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 4505 (Ont. Sup. Ct.).

[80] Abitibi Petitioners' firm intention, reiterated at the hearing, to shortly provide their stakeholders with a business plan and a restructuring and recapitalization term sheet confirms it as well.

3) THE ORDERS SOUGHT

[81] In closing, the precise wording of the orders sought has been negotiated at length between Counsel. It is the result of a difficult compromise reached between many different parties, each trying to protect distinct interests.

[82] Nonetheless, despite their best efforts, this wording certainly appears quite convoluted in some cases, to say the least. The proposed amendment to the subrogation provision of the Second Amended Initial Order is a vivid example. Still, the mechanism agreed upon, however complicated it might appear to some, remains acceptable to all affected creditors.

[83] The delicate consensus reached in this respect must not be discarded lightly. In view of the role of the Court in *CCAA* proceedings, that is, one of judicial oversight, the orders sought will thus be granted as amended, save for limited exceptions. To avoid potential misunderstandings, the Court felt necessary to slightly correct the specific wording of some conclusions. The orders granted reflect this.

[84] Turning to the conclusions proposed by the Bondholders at paragraphs 8 to 11 of the draft amended order (now paragraphs 6 to 9 of this Order), the Court considers them useful and appropriate. They assist somehow in bringing into focus the need for this *CCAA* process to continue to move forward efficiently.

[85] Minor adjustments to some of the wording are, however, required in order to give the Abitibi Petitioners some flexibility in terms of compliance with the ULC DIP documents and cash flow forecast.

[86] For the expected upcoming filing by the Abitibi Petitioners of their business plan and restructuring and recapitalization term sheet, the Court concludes that simply giving act to their stated intention is sufficient at this stage. The deadlines indicated correspond to the date agreed upon by the parties for the business plan and to the expected renewal date of the Initial Order for the restructuring and recapitalization term sheet.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT:

<u>ULC DIP Financing</u>

[87] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized and empowered to enter into, obtain and borrow under a credit facility provided pursuant to a loan agreement (the "**ULC DIP Agreement**") among ACI, as borrower, and 3239432 Nova

Scotia Company, an unlimited liability company ("**ULC**"), as lender (the "**ULC DIP Lender**"), to be approved by Alcoa acting reasonably, which terms will be consistent with the ULC DIP Term Sheet communicated as **Exhibit R-1** in support of the ULC DIP Motion, subject to such non-material amendments and modifications as the parties may agree with a copy thereof being provided in advance to the Monitor and to modifications required by Alcoa, acting reasonably, which credit facility shall be in an aggregate principal amount outstanding at any time not exceeding **$230** million.

[88] **ORDERS** that the credit facility provided pursuant to the ULC DIP Agreement (the "**ULC DIP**") will be subject to the following draw conditions:

d) a first draw of $130 million to be advanced at closing;

e) subsequent draws for a maximum total amount of $50 million in increments of up to $25 million to be advanced upon a five (5) business day notice and in accordance with paragraph 61.11 of the Second Amended Initial Order which shall apply mutatis mutandis to advances under the ULC DIP; and

f) the balance of $50 million shall become available upon further order of the Court.

At the request of the Borrower, all undrawn amounts under the ULC DIP shall either (i) be transferred to the Monitor to be held in an interest bearing account for the benefit of the Borrower providing that any requests for advances thereafter shall continue to be made and processed in accordance herewith as if the transfer had not occurred, or (ii) be invested by ULC in an interest bearing account with all interest earned thereon being for the benefit of and remitted to the Borrower forthwith following receipt thereof.

[89] **ORDERS** the Petitioners to communicate a draft of the substantially final ULC DIP Agreement (the "**Draft ULC DIP Agreement**") to the Monitor and to any party listed on the Service List which requests a copy of same (an "**Interested Party**") no later than five (5) days prior to the anticipated closing of the MPCo Transaction, as said term is defined in the ULC DIP Motion.

[90] **ORDERS** that any Interested Party who objects to any provisions of the Draft ULC DIP Agreement as not being substantially in accordance with the terms of the ULC DIP Term Sheet, Exhibit R-1, or objectionable for any other reason, shall, before the close of business of the day following delivery of the Draft ULC DIP Agreement, make a request for a hearing before this Court stating the grounds upon which such objection is based, failing which the Draft ULC DIP Agreement shall be considered to conform to the ULC DIP Term Sheet and shall be deemed to constitute the ULC DIP Agreement for the purposes of this Order.

[91] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized and empowered to execute and deliver the ULC DIP Agreement, subject to the terms of this Order and the

approval of Alcoa, acting reasonably, as well as such commitment letters, fee letters, credit agreements, mortgages, charges, hypothecs and security documents, guarantees, mandate and other definitive documents (collectively with the ULC DIP Agreement, the "**ULC DIP Documents**"), as are contemplated by the ULC DIP Agreement or as may be reasonably required by the ULC DIP Lender pursuant to the terms thereof, and the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized and directed to pay and perform all of their indebtedness, interest, fees, liabilities and obligations to the ULC DIP Lender under and pursuant to the ULC DIP Documents as and when same become due and are to be performed, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order.

[92] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners shall substantially comply with the terms and conditions set forth in the ULC DIP Documents and the 13-week cash flow forecast (the "Budget") provided to the financial advisors of the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party.

[93] **ORDERS** that, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the ULC DIP Documents, the Abitibi Petitioners shall use the proceeds of the ULC DIP substantially in compliance with the Budget, that the Monitor shall monitor the ongoing disbursements of the Abitibi Petitioners under the Budget, and that the Monitor shall forthwith advise the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party of the Monitor's understanding of any pending or anticipated substantial non-compliance with the Budget and/or any other pending or anticipated event of default or termination event under any of the ULC DIP Documents.

[94] **GIVES ACT** to the Abitibi Petitioners of their stated intention to provide a business plan to the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party by no later than 5:00 p.m. on November 27, 2009.

[95] **GIVES ACT** to the Abitibi Petitioners of their stated intention to provide a restructuring and recapitalization term sheet (the "Recapitalization Term Sheet") to the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party by no later than 5:00 p.m. on December 15, 2009.

[96] **ORDERS** that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order, the Abitibi Petitioners shall pay to the ULC DIP Lender when due all amounts owing (including principal, interest, fees and expenses, including without limitation, all fees and disbursements of counsel and all other advisers to or agents of the ULC DIP Lender on a full indemnity basis (the "**ULC DIP Expenses**") under the ULC DIP Documents and shall perform all of their other obligations to the ULC DIP Lender pursuant to the ULC DIP Documents and this Order.

[97] **ORDERS** that the claims of the ULC DIP Lender pursuant to the ULC DIP Documents shall not be compromised or arranged pursuant to the Plan or these proceedings and the ULC DIP Lender, in such capacity, shall be treated as an unaffected creditor in these proceedings and in any Plan or any proposal filed by any Abitibi Petitioner under the *BIA*.

[98] **ORDERS** that the ULC DIP Lender may, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order or the Initial Order:

c) take such steps from time to time as it may deem necessary or appropriate to register, record or perfect the ACI DIP Charge and the ULC DIP Documents in all jurisdictions where it deems it to be appropriate; and

d) upon the occurrence of a Termination Event (as each such term is defined in the ULC DIP Documents), refuse to make any advance to the Abitibi Petitioners and terminate, reduce or restrict any further commitment to the Abitibi Petitioners to the extent any such commitment remains, set off or consolidate any amounts owing by the ULC DIP Lender to the Abitibi Petitioners against any obligation of the Abitibi Petitioners to the ULC DIP Lender, make demand, accelerate payment or give other similar notices, or to apply to this Court for the appointment of a receiver, receiver and manager or interim receiver, or for a bankruptcy order against the Abitibi Petitioners and for the appointment of a trustee in bankruptcy of the Abitibi Petitioners, and upon the occurrence of an event of default under the terms of the ULC DIP Documents, the ULC DIP Lender shall be entitled to apply to the Court to seize and retain proceeds from the sale of any of the Property of the Abitibi Petitioners and the cash flow of the Abitibi Petitioners to repay amounts owing to the ULC DIP Lender in accordance with the ULC DIP Documents and the ACI DIP Charge.

[99] **ORDERS** that the foregoing rights and remedies of the ULC DIP Lender shall be enforceable against any trustee in bankruptcy, interim receiver, receiver or receiver and manager of the Abitibi Petitioners or the Property of the Abitibi Petitioners, the whole in accordance with and to the extent provided in the ULC DIP Documents.

[100] **ORDERS** that the ULC DIP Lender shall not take any enforcement steps under the ULC DIP Documents or the ACI DIP Charge without providing five (5) business day (the "**Notice Period**") written enforcement notice of a default thereunder to the Abitibi Petitioners, the Monitor, the Senior Secured Noteholders, Alcoa, the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party. Upon expiry of such Notice Period, and notwithstanding any stay of proceedings provided herein, the ULC DIP Lender shall be entitled to take any and all steps and exercise all rights and remedies provided for under the ULC DIP Documents and the ACI DIP Charge and otherwise permitted at law, the whole in accordance with applicable provincial laws, but without having to send any notices under Section 244 of the *BIA*. For greater certainty, the ULC DIP Lender may issue a prior notice pursuant to Article 2757 *CCQ* concurrently with the written enforcement notice of a default mentioned above.

[101] **ORDERS** that, subject to further order of this Court, no order shall be made varying, rescinding, or otherwise affecting paragraphs 61.1 to 61.9 of the Initial Order, the approval of the ULC DIP Documents or the ACI DIP Charge unless either (a) notice of a motion for such order is served on the Petitioners, the Monitor, Alcoa, the Senior

Secured Noteholders and the ULC DIP Lender by the moving party and returnable within seven (7) days after the party was provided with notice of this Order in accordance with paragraph 70(a) hereof or (b) each of the ULC DIP Lender and Alcoa applies for or consents to such order.

[102] **ORDERS** that 3239432 Nova Scotia Company is authorized to assign its interest in the ULC DIP to Alcoa pursuant to the security agreements and guarantees to be granted pursuant to the Implementation Agreement and this Court's Order dated September 29, 2009.

[103] **AMENDS** the Initial Order issued by this Court on April 17, 2009 (as amended and restated) by adding the following at the end of paragraph 61.3:

> "**ORDERS** further, that from and after the date of closing of the MPCo Transaction (as said term is defined in the Petitioners' ULC DIP Motion dated November 9, 2009) and provided the principal, interest and costs under the ACI DIP Agreement (as defined in the Order of this Court dated May 6, 2009), are concurrently paid in full, the ACI DIP Charge shall be increased by the aggregate amount of **$230** million (subject to the same limitations provided in the first sentence hereof in relation to the Replacement Securitization Facility) and shall be extended by a movable and immovable hypothec, mortgage, lien and security interest on all property of the Abitibi Petitioners in favour of the ULC DIP Lender for all amounts owing, including principal, interest and ULC DIP Expenses and all obligations required to be performed under or in connection with the ULC DIP Documents. The ACI DIP Charge as so increased shall continue to have the priority established by paragraphs 89 and 91 hereof provided such increased ACI DIP Charge (being the portion of the ACI DIP Charge in favour of the ULC DIP Lender) shall in all respects be subordinate (i) to the subrogation rights in favour of the Senior Secured Noteholders arising from the repayment of the ACI DIP Lender from the proceeds of the sale of the MPCo transaction as approved by this Court in its Order of September 29, 2009 and as confirmed by paragraph 11 of that Order, notwithstanding the amendment of paragraph 61.10 of this Order by the subsequent Order dated November 16, 2009, as well as the further subrogation rights, if any, in favour of the Term Lenders; and (ii) rights in favour of the Term Lenders arising from the use of cash for the payment of interest fees and accessories as determined by the Monitor. No order shall have the effect of varying or amending the priority of the ACI DIP Charge and the interest of the ULC DIP Lender therein without the consent of the Senior Secured Noteholders and Alcoa. The terms "ULC DIP Lender", "ULC DIP Documents", "ULC DIP Expenses", "Senior Secured Noteholders" and "Alcoa" shall be as defined in the Order of this Court dated November 16, 2009. Notwithstanding the subrogation rights created or confirmed herein, in no event shall the ULC DIP Lender be subordinated to more than approximately $40 million, being the aggregate

> of the proceeds of the MPCo Transaction paid to the ACI DIP Lender plus the interest, fees and expenses paid to the ACI DIP Lender as determined by the Monitor."

ACI DIP Agreement

[104] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized to make, execute and deliver one or more amendment agreements in connection with the ACI DIP Agreement providing for (i) an extension of the period during which any undrawn portion of the credit facility provided pursuant to the ACI DIP Agreement shall be available and (ii) the modification of the date upon which such credit facility must be repaid from November 1, 2009 to the earlier of the closing of the MPCo Transaction and December 15, 2009, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the ACI DIP Agreement, save and except for non-material amendments.

Senior Secured Notes Distribution

[105] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners are authorized and directed to make a distribution to the Trustee of the Senior Secured Notes in the amount of $200 million upon completion of the MPCo Transaction (as said term is defined in the ULC DIP Motion) from the proceeds of such sale and of the ULC DIP Facility, providing always that the ACI DIP is repaid in full upon completion of the MPCo Transaction.

[106] **ORDERS** that, subject to completion of the ULC DIP (including the initial draw of $130 million thereunder) and providing always that the ACI DIP is repaid in full upon completion of the MPCo Transaction, the distribution referred to in the preceding paragraph and the flow of funds upon completion of the MPCo Transaction and the ULC DIP shall be arranged in accordance with the following principles: (a) MPCo Proceeds shall be used, first, to fund the distribution to the Senior Secured Notes referenced in the previous paragraph and, secondly, to fund the repayment of the ACI DIP; (b) the initial draw of $130 million made under the ULC DIP shall fund any remaining balance due to repay in full the ACI DIP and this, upon completion of the MPCo Transaction. The Monitor shall be authorized to review the completion of the MPCo Transaction, the ULC DIP and the repayment of the ACI DIP and shall report to the Court regarding compliance with this provision as it deems necessary.

Amendment to the Subrogation Provision

[107] **ORDERS** that Subsection 61.10 of the Initial Order, as amended and restated, is replaced by the following:

Subrogation to ACI DIP Charge

[61.10] **ORDERS** that the holders of Secured Notes, the Lenders under the Term Loan Facility (collectively, the "**Secured Creditors**") and McBurney Corporation, McBurney Power Limited and MBB Power Services Inc. (collectively, the "**Lien Holder**") that hold security over assets that are subject to the ACI DIP Charge and that, as of the Effective Time, was opposable to third parties (including a trustee in bankruptcy) in accordance with the law applicable to such security (an "**Impaired Secured Creditor**" and "**Existing Security**", respectively) shall be subrogated to the ACI DIP Charge to the extent of the lesser of (i) any net proceeds from the Existing Security including from the sale or other disposition of assets, resulting from the collection of accounts receivable or other claims (other than Property subject to the Securitization Program Agreements and for greater certainty, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the ACI DIP Charge shall in no circumstances extend to any assets sold pursuant to the Securitization Program Agreements, any Replacement Securitization Facility or any assets of ACUSFC, the term "Replacement Securitization Facility" having the meaning ascribed to same in Schedule A of the ACI DIP Agreement) and/or cash that is subject to the Existing Security of such Impaired Secured Creditor that is used directly to pay (a) the ACI DIP Lender or (b) another Impaired Secured Creditor (including by any means of realization) on account of principal, interest or costs, in whole or in part, as determined by the Monitor (subject to adjudication by the Court in the event of any dispute) and (ii) the unpaid amounts due and/or becoming due and/or owing to such Impaired Secured Creditor that are secured by its Existing Security. For this purpose "**ACI DIP Lender**" shall be read to include Bank of Montreal, IQ, the ULC DIP Lender and their successors and assigns, including any lender or lenders providing replacement DIP financing should same be approved by subsequent order of this Court. No Impaired Secured Creditor shall be able to enforce its right of subrogation to the ACI DIP Charge until all obligations to the ACI DIP Lender have been paid in full and providing that all rights of subrogation hereunder shall be postponed to the right of subrogation of IQ under the IQ Guarantee Offer, and, for greater certainty, no subrogee shall have any rights over or in respect of the IQ Guarantee Offer. In the event that, following the repayment in full of the ACI DIP Lender in circumstances where that payment is made, wholly or in part, from net proceeds of the Existing Security of an Impaired Secured Creditor (the "**First Impaired Secured Creditor**"), such Impaired Secured Creditor enforces its right of subrogation to the ACI DIP Charge and realizes net proceeds from the Existing Security of another Impaired Secured Creditor (the "**Second Impaired Secured Creditor**"), the Second Impaired Secured Creditor shall not be able to enforce its right of subrogation to the ACI DIP Charge until all obligations to the First

Impaired Secured Creditor have been paid in full. In the event that more than one Impaired Secured Creditor is subrogated to the ACI DIP Charge as a result of a payment to the ACI DIP Lender, such Impaired Secured Creditors shall rank pari passu as subrogees, rateably in accordance with the extent to which each of them is subrogated to the ACI DIP Charge. The allocation of the burden of the ACI DIP Charge amongst the assets and creditors shall be determined by subsequent application to the Court if necessary."

[108] **ORDERS** the provisional execution of this Order notwithstanding any appeal and without the necessity of furnishing any security.

[109] **WITHOUT COSTS**.

CLÉMENT GASCON, J.S.C.

Me Sean Dunphy and Me Joseph Reynaud
STIKEMAN, ELLIOTT
Attorneys for Petitioners

Me Robert Thornton
THORNTON GROUT FINNIGAN
Attorneys for the Monitor

Me Jason Dolman
FLANZ FISHMAN MELAND PAQUIN
Attorneys for the Monitor

Me Alain Riendeau
FASKEN MARTINEAU DuMOULIN
Attorneys for Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., Administrative Agent under the Credit and Guarantee Agreement Dated April 1, 2008

Me Marc Duchesne
BORDEN, LADNER, GERVAIS
Attorneys for the Ad hoc Committee of the Senior Secured Noteholders and U.S. Bank National Association, Indenture Trustee for the Senior Secured Noteholders

Me Frederick L. Myers
GOODMANS LLP
Co-Counsel for the Ad Hoc Committee of Unsecured Noteholders of AbitibiBowater Inc. and certain of its Affiliates

Me Jean-Yves Simard
LAVERY, DE BILLY
Co-Counsel for the Ad Hoc Committee of Unsecured Noteholders of AbitibiBowater Inc. and certain of its Affiliates

Me Patrice Benoît
GOWLING LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP
Attorneys for Investissement Québec

Me S. Richard Orzy
BENNETT JONES
Attorneys for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of AbitibiBowater Inc. & Al.

Me Frédéric Desmarais
McMILLAN LLP
Attorneys for Bank of Montreal

Me Anastasia Flouris
KUGLER, KANDESTIN, LLP
Attorneys for Alcoa

Date of hearing: November 9, 2009

SCHEDULE "A"

ABITIBI PETITIONERS

21. **ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED INC.**

22. **ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED COMPANY OF CANADA**

23. **3224112 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED**

24. **MARKETING DONOHUE INC.**

25. **ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED CANADIAN OFFICE PRODUCTS HOLDINGS INC.**

26. **3834328 CANADA INC.**

27. **6169678 CANADA INC.**

28. **4042140 CANADA INC.**

29. **DONOHUE RECYCLING INC.**

30. **1508756 ONTARIO INC.**

31. **3217925 NOVA SCOTIA COMPANY**

32. **LA TUQUE FOREST PRODUCTS INC.**

33. **ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED NOVA SCOTIA INCORPORATED**

34. **SAGUENAY FOREST PRODUCTS INC.**

35. **TERRA NOVA EXPLORATIONS LTD.**

36. **THE JONQUIERE PULP COMPANY**

37. **THE INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE AND TERMINAL COMPANY**

38. **SCRAMBLE MINING LTD.**

39. **9150-3383 QUÉBEC INC.**

40. **ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED (U.K.) INC.**

SCHEDULE "B"

BOWATER PETITIONERS

20. **BOWATER CANADIAN HOLDINGS INC.**
21. **BOWATER CANADA FINANCE CORPORATION**
22. **BOWATER CANADIAN LIMITED**
23. **3231378 NOVA SCOTIA COMPANY**
24. **ABITIBIBOWATER CANADA INC.**
25. **BOWATER CANADA TREASURY CORPORATION**
26. **BOWATER CANADIAN FOREST PRODUCTS INC.**
27. **BOWATER SHELBURNE CORPORATION**
28. **BOWATER LAHAVE CORPORATION**
29. **ST-MAURICE RIVER DRIVE COMPANY LIMITED**
30. **BOWATER TREATED WOOD INC.**
31. **CANEXEL HARDBOARD INC.**
32. **9068-9050 QUÉBEC INC.**
33. **ALLIANCE FOREST PRODUCTS (2001) INC.**
34. **BOWATER BELLEDUNE SAWMILL INC.**
35. **BOWATER MARITIMES INC.**
36. **BOWATER MITIS INC.**
37. **BOWATER GUÉRETTE INC.**
38. **BOWATER COUTURIER INC.**

SCHEDULE "C"

18.6 CCAA PETITIONERS

17. **ABITIBIBOWATER INC.**
18. **ABITIBIBOWATER US HOLDING 1 CORP.**
19. **BOWATER VENTURES INC.**
20. **BOWATER INCORPORATED**
21. **BOWATER NUWAY INC.**
22. **BOWATER NUWAY MID-STATES INC.**
23. **CATAWBA PROPERTY HOLDINGS LLC**
24. **BOWATER FINANCE COMPANY INC.**
25. **BOWATER SOUTH AMERICAN HOLDINGS INCORPORATED**
26. **BOWATER AMERICA INC.**
27. **LAKE SUPERIOR FOREST PRODUCTS INC.**
28. **BOWATER NEWSPRINT SOUTH LLC**
29. **BOWATER NEWSPRINT SOUTH OPERATIONS LLC**
30. **BOWATER FINANCE II, LLC**
31. **BOWATER ALABAMA LLC**
32. **COOSA PINES GOLF CLUB HOLDINGS LLC**

TAB 3

Editor's Note: Corrigendum released September 2, 2004. Original judgment has been corrected, with text of corrigendum appended.

SUMMARY OF CURRENT DOCUMENT	
Name of Issuing Party or Person:	Mr. Justice Robert M. Hall
Date of Document:	2004 09 01
Statement of purpose in filing:	Reasons for Judgment on Application issued January 22, 2004 by GMAC Leaseco Ltd. for recovery from Receiver of cost allocations for units sold by Leaseco (as opposed to being sold by the Receiver) in the amount of $53,909.08.
Court Sub-File Number:	9:10 (Ref. Sub-File 7:60)

CITATION: ***In Re Hickman Equipment (1985) Ltd. (In Receivership)*, 2004 NLSCTD 164**
DATE: 2004 09 01
DOCKET: 2002 01T 0352

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
TRIAL DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF a Court ordered Receivership of Hickman Equipment (1985) Limited (“Hickman Equipment”) pursuant to Rule 25 of the **Rules of the Supreme Court, 1986**, under the **Judicature Act**, RSNL 1990, c. J-4, as amended

AND IN THE MATTER OF the **Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act**, c. B-3 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1985, as amended (the “BIA”)

Before: The Honourable Mr. Justice Robert M. Hall

Place of Hearing: St. John’s, Newfoundland and Labrador

Date of Hearing: June 8, 2004

Appearances: Thomas R. Kendell, Q.C. for the Applicant, GMAC Leaseco Ltd.
Frederick J. Constantine for the Receiver, PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc.
Geoffrey Spencer for CIBC.
Bruce Grant for John Deere Ltd. and John Deere Credit Inc.
Griffith Roberts for Hickman Motors Ltd. and Group Holdings Ltd.

Authorities Cited:

STATUTES CONSIDERED: Personal Property Security Act, SNL 1998, c. P-71

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT

Hall, J.

Background

1. On February 7, 2002, this Court issued an Order (filed on February 8, 2002) whereby Hickman Equipment (1985) Limited ("HEL") was afforded protection under the provisions of the **Companies Creditors Arrangement Act** (the "**CCAA** Order"). The **CCAA** Order essentially dealt with all assets of HEL regardless of whether those assets were in the possession of HEL as owner, or as agent for others, and whether secured or otherwise.

2. On March 14, 2002 this Court issued a Receivership Order ("the Receivership Order") which Receivership Order ordered that PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc. ("PWC") be appointed Receiver of HEL. The Receivership Order covered all of the property in the possession of HEL in the same manner and to the same extent as the **CCAA** Order. An earlier Receiving Order adjudged HEL bankrupt and also appointed PWC Trustee of the bankrupt estate. By virtue of paragraphs 10(c) and 10(e) of the Receivership Order, PWC was directed to develop a plan and procedure to govern the orderly liquidation of the assets of HEL. PWC was also directed to formulate a plan for a determination of the legal and equitable rights of creditors of and claimants against the bankrupt estate, there being many competing creditors claiming the same security. In particular, paragraphs 10(c) and (e) required the development by PWC of a Realization Plan and a Cost Allocation Plan. These

paragraphs in the Receivership Order stated:

1. "THIS COURT ORDERS that, in respect of the Assets, the Receiver is hereby empowered from time to time until further order of this Court generally to do all things which may be reasonably necessary in order to facilitate the development of a plan and procedural structure for the liquidating of the Assets or any part thereof and for the determination of the legal and equitable rights of all creditors and claimants including, without limitation:
2. ...
3. (c) to develop and recommend the optimal method for disposition of the Assets and the distribution of property or proceeds to those claimants or creditors entitled thereto and to report to the Court as soon as possible, but in any event within 45 days after this Order, with a recommended procedure to dispose of all realizable Assets, including the allocation of the costs of the entire process (the "Realization Plan"), provided that the Receiver shall only sell Assets upon further order of the Court.
4. (e) to conduct such investigations and analyses of the Assets as may in its judgement be necessary or advisable to enable it to develop a plan for the determination of the rights and entitlement of creditors to the Assets or parts thereof, and present such plan and to apply to this Court for any direction or directions with respect to the preparation, development or implementation of such pan, including the allocation of costs of the entire process (the "Claims Plan")."

3. On May 14, 2002 this Court approved the Realization Plan and Cost Allocation Plan developed by PWC and the formal Order to that effect was filed on May 17, 2002.

4. After the approval of the Realization Plan and Cost Allocation Plan PWC proceeded with and completed the liquidation of substantially all of the assets of HEL. The majority of assets were sold by public auction, although some were sold by tender and others by way of negotiated sale agreement or pursuant to Court Order. As sales were completed and assets disposed of, many of the secured creditors of HEL, including the Applicant GMAC Leasco Ltd. in this current matter, brought Interlocutory Applications seeking payment to them of proceeds arising from the sale of assets over which these creditors claimed security. As these applications were arising prior to the completion of all elements of the receivership, it was necessary for the Receiver to develop a procedure whereby it could retain a holdback from the sale of the assets as a contribution towards costs incurred in the

receivership and to be attributed to the various creditors pursuant to the Cost Allocation Plan. As a result PWC sought, and this Court granted approval to PWC to retain a holdback of 15% of the proceeds of each sale as a contribution to the Cost Allocation Plan on the understanding that the matter of the allocation of cost would be revisited upon the completion of the realization process. Paragraph 5 of the Cost Allocation Plan dealt specifically with this intended revisit by providing:

1. "Costs of the Receiver or the Trustee in implementing the Realization Plan shall be apportioned as approved by the Court on the recommendation of the Receiver, with notice to all Interested Parties after completion of the realization process. In making its recommendation, the Receiver will adjust the allocation of costs to more equitably match assigned costs to actual realization proceeds. There may be indirect costs that are not allocable, except over all Assets."

5. PWC has not as yet sought nor been granted a final Order making a final allocation of costs pursuant to paragraph 5 of the Cost Allocation Plan.

1. **<u>The Present Application.</u>**

6. GMAC Leaseco Ltd. brings this present application on the basis that no costs ought to be allotted against it with respect to the sale of 18 listed motor vehicles and that the amount of $53,909.08 held back by the Receiver from the proceeds of the sale of those vehicles ought to be paid out to GMAC Leaseco Ltd. It asserts that these 18 motor vehicles (the "Applicant's Units") were sold solely through the effort and expense of the Applicant's agent, Hickman Motors Limited, and not through any effort or expense of the Receiver. This is not largely disputed by PWC.

7. The 18 units in question were held by HEL as "equipment" as defined under the **Personal Property Security Act**, SNL 1998, c. P-71, ("**PPSA**") as opposed to "inventory" as defined in the **PPSA**. They were essentially motor vehicles used in the operation of the business of HEL. HEL was a related company to Hickman Motors Limited, a substantial General Motors dealership and the units in question were General Motors' products normally sold and serviced by Hickman Motors Limited in the course of its usual business. The Receiver agreed that having the units consigned for sale on behalf of the Receiver to Hickman Motors Limited was likely to achieve the best sale price for the individual units. This was the procedure which was followed and the units were refurbished by Hickman Motors Limited with the consent of the Receiver and ultimately sold. Unfortunately the sale prices which were generated were not sufficient to produce any equity for the receivership. Nonetheless, under the provisions of the Cost Allocation Plan, the sale proceeds were subject to the holdback for cost allocation in the amount of $53,909.08.

8. GMAC Leaseco Ltd. takes the position that, for a variety of reasons, these particular units should not be subject to any holdback at all or any Cost Allocation Plan liability. In the alternative, counsel for GMAC Leaseco Ltd, at the hearing of this application, consented to a token cost allocation in the amount of $7,500.

9. Principally GMAC Leaseco's objection to paying the 15% holdback with respect to these units was based upon:

(1) that its right to security over these vehicles as first secured creditor was clear, easily determined and unchallenged by other creditors, and therefore the receiver simply ought to have turned over the vehicles to GMAC Leaseco to be realized upon in accordance with their securities without any charge for receivership costs being asserted;

(2) the Receiver did not expend any effort on its own behalf in the refurbishing of or realization upon these units; and

(3) it is fundamentally unfair in this situation that the units should be subject to cost allocation holdback in the amount of $53,909.08 or any amount.

1. **Receiver's Position.**

10. The Receiver takes the position that, excepting some limited cases, there has been little or no distinction made by the Receiver in its securing, possessing and maintaining any of the assets of HEL that HEL had in its possession at the commencement of the receivership. The Receiver contends that the costs incurred by it in the management of the receivership have generally been incurred in relation to all the property of HEL without any distinction as to the category of property either by its possession by other parties or any other characteristic. In addition, it contends that all sales of the property have been by asset class and not by legal interest.

11. PWC contends that a principal role of PWC as a Court appointed Receiver is to assist the creditors and the Court in designing and executing a process that provides a fair opportunity to all creditors to adjudicate issues related to the receivership and that its role in this regard is defined in the Receivership Order and its mandate emanates from that Order and subsequent Orders of the Court. The duties of the Court appointed Receiver have included:

(a) the design and implementation of Investigation and Claims Plans;

(b) administrative tasks including development of a website where creditors could post and share documentation related to the receivership;

(c) seizure and cataloging of the records of HEL;

(d) regulate and required Court reporting;

(e) completion of various statutory duties;

(f) investigative and legal work associated with a potential Court action against the auditors of HEL as mandated by an Order of the Court;

(g) meetings with creditors and responding to requests for information; and

(h) working on defined tasks of the Receiver's mandate as ordered by the Court.

12. PWC therefore argues that Cost Allocation Plan issues apply to many more issues than simply the cost of realizing on any particular asset or group of assets. It contends that it alone is able to provide a neutral position with respect to costs allocation that is independent of the particular interest of any one creditor or group of creditors and that this independent approach provides a consistent, evenhanded approach to cost allocations. It contends that a consistent approach to cost allocation issues should be adopted so that all secured creditor claimants are treated fairly and equally. Nonetheless, PWC does acknowledge that the circumstances of some creditors' claims may warrant some special consideration. There have already been two applications where special consideration was given in terms of cost allocation. However, both of these related to circumstances where the goods in question, even though some came into the possession of the Receiver, were found by the Court not to be assets of HEL in that one group of assets were found to be "consigned goods" which were in fact located in the United States and had never come into the possession of HEL; and the second of which was "30 day goods" under the **Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act**, RSC, 1985, c. B-3. These two exceptions are qualitatively different from the group of assets to which the present application applies. The Applicant's units were clearly the property of HEL and in its possession and used by it.

13. The Receiver takes the position that it is irrelevant whether or not the units in question were secured as "equipment" or as "inventory". Counsel for the Receiver states that "a loan is a loan" and that the business affairs of HEL were a mess that needed to be straightened in an orderly manner under a process whereby all creditors had an opportunity to argue before an independent party, i.e. the Receiver, as to their entitlement to the various assets.

14. James A. Kirby, C.A., CIRP, Senior Vice-President of PWC, testified at the hearing of this matter. He is unable to say, without reviewing each and every individual fee invoice of PWC, what costs and fees are directly attributable to the Receiver's involvement with these particular units. His best guess with respect to these direct costs would be in the range of $5,000 – $10,000. That of course does not deal with the other indirect costs of the receivership. The Receiver takes the position that it would be reasonable to reduce the 15% holdback by 15% of that amount (i.e. a reduction of 17.25%) to reflect the reduced sales effort by the Receiver with respect to these particular assets. This would reduce the holdback amount by $9,299.32 to a holdback amount of $44,609.76.

1. **<u>Applicable Principles.</u>**

15. Paragraph 5 of the Cost Allocation Plan envisages the Court, on the recommendation of the Receiver, apportioning the costs of the receivership to the various creditors. No guidance is provided in the Cost Allocation Plan to aid the Court in deciding on what would be a fair allocation of the receivership costs. Nothing in the Cost Allocation Plan prevents a partial allocation of costs at a point in time earlier than the completion of the receivership and bankruptcy. I am therefore satisfied that it is appropriate at this time to deal with this application rather than waiting for the completion of the receivership.

16. Counsel have been unable to provide to the Court any jurisprudential guidance in this regard, nor did counsel provide much discussion of the principles they felt would be applicable to assigning costs on a different basis than a uniform percentage relative to sale proceeds received.

17. In my view the following principles apply in this matter:

(1) The allocation of costs ought to be fair and evenhanded amongst all creditors upon an objective basis of allocation;

(2) The fairest basis of allocation would be a uniform percentage of the sale price received for the asset over which the paying creditor had a realizable security interest;

(3) There must be a recognition that the Cost Allocation Plan acknowledges that costs are not limited to the cost of realization alone but relates to all receivership costs whether direct sales cost or indirect cost;

(4) Exceptions to a uniform application of cost to creditors ought not to be lightly granted. Nonetheless it must be recognized that certain activities of the Receiver in managing the affairs of the receivership may have been less intensive or less advantageous with respect to certain groups of assets as opposed to other groups of assets and that the extent of this intensity or disadvantage may not be immediately or easily determinable. To require the Receiver to calculate and determine an absolutely fair value for its services for one group of assets vis-a-vis another would likely not be cost effective, would drive up the overall receivership cost and would likely be a fool's errand in any event;

(5) Exceptions to the rule of uniform cost allocation should only be made where the requirement for such variation is reasonably articulable.

1. **Reasons for Variation.**

18. There was one clearly articulable reason for varying the allocation of the receivership cost from a uniform amount in this particular case. The reason is that the receiver had no significant involvement in the actual sale of the Applicant's units. How then do we determine what the sales costs might have been if the Receiver had conducted the sale? There is only one piece of evidence available from the Receiver to demonstrate what sales costs might have been in this regard. That information is the amount of auction commissions paid by the Receiver to the auctioneer for the sale of the bulk of the assets and equipment of HEL. That amount was $1,193,473 and was deducted from the sale proceeds. From Consent Exhibit No. 1 it would appear that the costs of the receivership including the auction commissions would be as follows:

Costs to date	$3,162,446
Forecasted costs to conclusion of receivership	$315,000

Auction commissions	$1,193,473
Total	$4,670,919

19. Of these total costs of $4,670,919 the auction commissions constitute 25.5%. Reduction of the cost allocation holdback by a rounded percentage of 25% is a reasonable reduction for the fact that the Receiver did not have to expend its efforts in the sale of this equipment.

1. **Order.**

20. The Receiver is therefore directed to refund to the Applicant the sum of $13,477.27 being 25% of the 15% holdback for cost allocation in the amount of $53,909.08. The Applicant shall additionally be entitled to its costs of the application.

Justice

SUMMARY OF CURRENT DOCUMENT	
Name of Issuing Party or Person:	Mr. Justice Robert M. Hall
Date of Document:	2004 09 02
Statement of purpose in filing:	Corrigendum to Reasons for Judgment (filed September 1, 2004) on Application issued January 22, 2004 by GMAC Leaseco Ltd. for recovery from Receiver of cost allocations for units sold by Leaseco (as opposed to being sold by the Receiver) in the amount of $53,909.08.
Court Sub-File Number:	9:10 (Ref. Sub-File 7:60)

CITATION: ***In Re Hickman Equipment (1985) Ltd. (In Receivership)*, 2004 NLSCTD 164**

DATE: 2004 09 02
DOCKET: 2002 01T 0352

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
TRIAL DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF a Court ordered Receivership of Hickman Equipment (1985) Limited ("Hickman Equipment") pursuant to Rule 25 of the **Rules of the Supreme Court, 1986**, under the **Judicature Act**, RSNL 1990, c. J-4, as amended

AND IN THE MATTER OF the **Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act**, c. B-3 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1985, as amended (the "BIA")

Before: The Honourable Mr. Justice Robert M. Hall

Appearances: Thomas R. Kendell, Q.C. for the Applicant, GMAC Leaseco Ltd.
Frederick J. Constantine for the Receiver, PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc.
Geoffrey Spencer for CIBC.
Bruce Grant for John Deere Ltd. and John Deere Credit Inc.
Griffith Roberts for Hickman Motors Ltd. and Group Holdings Ltd.

C O R R I G E N D U M

Hall, J.

[1] The text box on page 1 of the decision filed in this matter on September 1, 2004 is amended by substituting "9:10" for "7:10" in the Court Sub-File Number section.

Justice

TAB 4

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Nortel Networks Corporation et al.

Ontario Reports

Ontario Superior Court of Justice,

Newbould J.

August 19, 2014

121 O.R. (3d) 228 | 2014 ONSC 4777

[Indexed as: Nortel Networks Corp. (Re)]

Case Summary

Bankruptcy and insolvency — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Interest — "Interest stops" rule applying in Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act proceedings — Bondholders not entitled to post-filing interest — Court having jurisdiction to make declaration to that effect in absence of plan of arrangement — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36.

In proceedings under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("*CCAA*"), the court was asked to determine whether bondholders were entitled to post-filing interest.

Held, bondholders were not entitled to post-filing interest.

The "interest stops" rule applies in *CCAA* proceedings. To permit some creditors' claims to grow disproportionately to others during the stay period would not maintain the *status quo* and would encourage creditors whose interests are being disadvantaged to immediately initiate bankruptcy proceedings, threatening the objectives of the *CCAA*. While this was a liquidating *CCAA* proceeding, there is no need for there to be a liquidating *CCAA* proceeding in order for the interest stops rule to apply. The reasoning for the application of the common law insolvency rule -- that is, the desire to prevent a stay of proceedings from militating against one group of unsecured creditors over another in violation of the *pari passu* rule -- is equally applicable to a *CCAA* proceeding that is not a liquidating proceeding. The court had jurisdiction to declare that the bondholders were not entitled to post-filing interest even though a plan of arrangement or compromise had not been negotiated by the debtor and its creditors.

Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General), [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, [2010] S.C.J. No. 60, 2010 SCC 60, 2011 D.T.C. 5006, 409 N.R. 201, 296 B.C.A.C. 1, 12 B.C.L.R. (5th) 1, 326 D.L.R. (4th) 577, EYB 2010-183759, 2011EXP-9, J.E. 2011-5, 2011 G.T.C. 2006, [2011] 2 W.W.R. 383, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 170, [2010] G.S.T.C. 186; *Indalex Ltd. (Re)*, [2013] 1 S.C.R. 271, [2013] S.C.J. No. 6, 2013 SCC 6, 301 O.A.C. 1, 96 C.B.R. (5th) 171, 8 B.L.R. (5th) 1, 354 D.L.R. (4th) 581, 2013EXP-356, 2013EXPT-246, J.E. 2013-185, D.T.E. 2013T-97, EYB 2013-217414, 439 N.R. 235, 20 P.P.S.A.C. (3d) 1, 2 C.C.P.B. (2d) 1, 223 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1049, **consd**

Canada 3000 Inc. (Re); Inter-Canadian (1991) Inc. (Trustee of), [2006] 1 S.C.R. 865, [2006] S.C.J. No. 24, 2006 SCC 24, 269 D.L.R. (4th) 79, 349 N.R. 1, J.E. 2006-1215, 212 O.A.C. 338, 20 C.B.R. (5th) 1, 10 P.P.S.A.C. (3d) 66, 148 A.C.W.S. (3d) 182; *Stelco Inc. (Re)*, [2007] O.J. No. 2533, 2007 ONCA 483, 226 O.A.C. 72, 32 B.L.R. (4th) 77, 35 C.B.R. (5th) 174, 158 A.C.W.S. (3d) 877, **distd**

Other cases referred to

Abacus Cities Ltd. (Trustee of) v. AMIC Mortgage Investment Corp., [1992] A.J. No. 227, 89 D.L.R. (4th) 84, [1992] 4 W.W.R. 309, 1 Alta. L.R. (3d) 257, 125 A.R. 45, 11 C.B.R. (3d) 193, 14 W.A.C. 45, 32 A.C.W.S. (3d) 350 (C.A.); *AbitibiBowater Inc. (Re)*, [2009] Q.J. No. 19125, 2009 QCCS 6461 (Sup. Ct.); *Canada (Attorney General) v. Confederation Life Insurance Co*., [2001] O.J. No. 2610, [2001] O.T.C. 486, 106 A.C.W.S. (3d) 245 (S.C.J.); [page229] *In re Humber Ironworks and Shipbuilding Co.* (1869), L.R. 4 Ch. App. 643 (C.A.); *Indalex Ltd. (Re)*, [2009] O.J. No. 3165, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 64, 79 C.C.P.B. 104, 179 A.C.W.S. (3d) 267 (S.C.J.); *Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108, [2006] O.J. No. 4152, 275 D.L.R. (4th) 132, 26 B.L.R. (4th) 43, 25 C.B.R. (5th) 176, 56 C.C.P.B. 1, 151 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1004 (C.A.); *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd. (Re)*, [1993] O.J. No. 14, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 37 A.C.W.S. (3d) 847 (Gen. Div.); *Nortel Networks Corp. (Re)*, [2012] O.J. No. 1115, 2012 ONSC 1213, 88 C.B.R. (5th) 111, 66 C.E.L.R. (3d) 310, 213 A.C.W.S. (3d) 665 (S.C.J.); *Savin (Re)* (1872), L.R. 7 Ch. 760 (C.A.); *Shoppers Trust Corp. (Liquidator of) v. Shoppers Trust Co*. (2005), 74 O.R. (3d) 652, [2005] O.J. No. 1081, 251 D.L.R. (4th) 315, 195 O.A.C. 331, 10 C.B.R. (5th) 93, 138 A.C.W.S. (3d) 225 (C.A.); *Thibodeau v. Thibodeau* (2011), 104 O.R. (3d) 161, [2011] O.J. No. 573, 2011 ONCA 110, 277 O.A.C. 359, 87 C.C.P.B. 1, 331 D.L.R. (4th) 606, 5 R.F.L. (7th) 16, 73 C.B.R. (5th) 173, 199 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1068; *Timminco Ltd. (Re)*, [2014] O.J. No. 3270, 2014 ONSC 3393, 14 C.B.R. (6th) 113 (S.C.J.)

Statutes referred to

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 [as am.]

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 [as am.], s. 11(1)

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 [as am.]

United States Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C., c. 11

Winding-up and Restructuring Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11 [as am.]

Authorities referred to

Sarra, Janis P., *Rescue!: The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Carswell, 2013)

RULING on the entitlement of certain creditors to post-filing interest.

Benjamin Zarnett and *Graham Smith*, for monitor and Canadian debtors.

Ken Rosenberg, for Canadian Creditors' Committee.

Michael Barrack, *D.J. Miller* and *Michael Shakra*, for U.K. pension claimants.

Tracy Wynne, for EMEA debtors.

Kenneth Kraft, for Wilmington Trust, National Association.

Richard Swan, *Gavin Finlayson* and *Kevin Zych*, for *ad hoc* group of bondholders.

Shayne Kukulowicz, for U.S. Unsecured Creditors' Committee.

John D. Marshall, for Law Debenture Trust Company of New York.

Brett Harrison, for Bank of New York Mellon.

Andrew Gray and *Scott Bomhof*, for U.S. debtors.

---

[1] Endorsement of **NEWBOULD J.**: — Nortel Networks Corporation ("NNC") and other Canadian debtors filed for and were granted protection under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("*CCAA*") on January 14, 2009. On the same date, Nortel Network Inc. ("NNI") and other U.S. debtors [page230] filed petitions in Delaware under the *United States Bankruptcy Code*, 11 U.S.C., c. 11.

[2] Beginning in 1996, unsecured *pari passu* notes were issued under three separate bond indentures, first by a U.S. Nortel corporation guaranteed by Nortel Networks Limited ("NNL"), a Canadian corporation, and then by NNL in several tranches jointly and severally guaranteed by NNC and NNI (the "crossover bonds"). Thus, all of the notes are payable by Nortel entities in both Canada and the U.S., either as the maker or guarantor. Under claims procedures in both the Canadian and U.S. proceedings, claims by bondholders for principal and pre-filing interest in the amount of US$4.092 billion have been made against each of the Canadian and U.S. estates. The bondholders also claim to be entitled to post-filing interest and related claims under the terms of the bonds which, as of December 31, 2013, amounted to approximately US$1.6 billion.

[3] The total assets realized on the sale of Nortel assets worldwide which are the subject of the allocation proceedings amongst the Canadian, U.S. and European, Middle East and African estates ("EMEA") are approximately US$7.3 billion, and thus the post-filing bond interest claims of now more than US$1.6 billion represent a substantial portion of the total assets available to all three estates. While the post-filing bond interest grows at various compounded rates under the terms of the bonds, the US$7.3 billion is apparently not growing at any appreciable rate because of the very conservative nature of the investments made with it pending the outcome of the

insolvency proceedings. Apart from the bondholders, the main claimants against the Canadian debtors are Nortel disabled employees, former employees and retirees.

[4] The bond claims in the Canadian proceedings have been filed pursuant to a claims procedure order in the *CCAA* proceedings dated July 30, 2009. The order contemplated that the claims filed under it would be finally determined in accordance with further procedures to be authorized, including by a further claims resolution order. By order dated September 16, 2010, a further order was made in the *CCAA* proceedings that authorized procedures to determine claims for all purposes.

[5] By direction of June 24, 2014, it was ordered that the following issues be argued:

(a) whether the holders of the crossover bond claims are legally entitled in each jurisdiction to claim or receive any amounts under the relevant indentures above and beyond the outstanding principal debt and pre-petition interest (namely, above and beyond US$4.092 billion); and [page231]

(b) if it is determined that the crossover bondholders are so entitled, what additional amounts are such holders entitled to so claim and receive.

[6] The hearing in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court was scheduled to proceed at the same time as the hearing in this court but was adjourned due to an apparent settlement between the U.S. debtors and the U.S. Unsecured Creditors' Committee.

[7] The monitor and Canadian debtors, supported by the Canadian Creditors' Committee, the U.K. pension claimants, the EMEA debtors and the Wilmington Trust take the position that in a liquidating *CCAA* proceeding such as this, post-filing interest is not legally payable on the crossover bonds as a result of the "interest stops" rule. The *ad hoc* group of bondholders, supported by the U.S. Unsecured Creditors' Committee, Law Debenture Trust Company of New York and Bank of New York Mellon take the position that there is no "interest stops" rule in *CCAA* proceedings and that the right to interest on the crossover bonds is not lost on the filing of *CCAA* proceedings and can be the subject of negotiations regarding a *CCAA* plan of reorganization. They take the position that no distribution of Nortel's sale proceeds that fails to recognize the full amount of the crossover bondholders' claims, including post-filing interest, can be ordered under the *CCAA* except under a negotiated *CCAA* plan duly approved by the requisite majorities of creditors and sanctioned by the court.

[8] For the reasons that follow, I accept the position and hold that post-filing interest is not legally payable on the crossover bonds in this case.

The Interest Stops Rule

[9] In this case, the bondholders have a contractual right to interest. The other major claimants, being pensioners, do not. The Canadian debtors contend that the reason for the interest stops rule is one of fundamental fairness and that the rule should apply in this case.

[10] The Canadian debtors contend that the interest stops rule is a common law rule corollary to the *pari passu* rule governing rateable payments of an insolvent's debts and that while the *CCAA* is silent as to the right to post-filing interest, it does not rule out the interest stops rule.

[11] The bondholders contend that to deny them the right to post-filing interest would amount to a confiscation of a property right to interest and that absent express statutory authority the court has no ability to interfere with their contractual entitlement [page232] to interest. I do not see their claim to interest as being a property right, as the bonds are unsecured. See *Thibodeau v. Thibodeau* (2011), 104 O.R. (3d) 161, [2011] O.J. No. 573 (C.A.), at para. 43. However, the question remains as to whether their contractual rights should prevail.

[12] It is a fundamental tenet of insolvency law that all debts shall be paid *pari passu* and all unsecured creditors receive equal treatment. See *Shoppers Trust Corp. (Liquidator of) v. Shoppers Trust Co.* (2005), 74 O.R. (3d) 652, [2005] O.J. No. 1081 (C.A.), at para. 25, *per* Blair J.A.; and *Indalex Ltd. (Re)*, [2009] O.J. No. 3165, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 64 (S.C.J.), at para. 16, *per* Morawetz J. This common law principle has led to the development of the interest stops rule. In *Canada (Attorney General) v. Confederation Life Insurance Co.*, [2001] O.J. No. 2610, [2001] O.T.C. 486 (S.C.J.), Blair J. (as he then was) stated the following [at para. 20]:

> One of the governing principles of insolvency law -- including proceedings in a winding-up -- is that the assets of the insolvent debtor are to be distributed amongst classes of creditors rateably and equally, as those assets are found at the date of the insolvency. This principle has led to the development of the "interest stops rule", i.e., that no interest is payable on a debt from the date of the winding-up or bankruptcy. As Lord Justice James put it, colourfully, in *Re Savin* (1872), L.R. 7 Ch. 760 (C.A.), at p. 764:
>
> > I believe, however, that if the question now arose for the first time I should agree with the rule [i.e. the "interest stops rule"], seeing that the theory in bankruptcy is to stop all things at the date of the bankruptcy, and to divide the wreck of the man's property as it stood at that time.

[13] This rule is "judge-made" law. See *In re Humber Ironworks and Shipbuilding Co.* (1869), L.R. 4 Ch. App. 643 (C.A.), at p. 647 Ch. App., *per* Sir G. M. Giffard L.J.

[14] In *Shoppers Trust*, Blair J.A. referred to *pari passu* principles in the context of the interest stops rule and the common law understanding of those rules in liquidation proceedings. He stated [at para. 25]:

> The rationale underlying this approach rests on a fundamental principle of insolvency law, namely, that "in the case of an insolvent estate, all the money being realized as speedily as possible, should be applied equally and rateably in payment of the debts as they existed at the date of the winding-up": *Humber Ironworks*, at p. 646. Unless this is the case, the principle of *pari passu* distribution cannot be honoured. See also *Re McDougall*, [1883] O.J. No. 63, 8 O.A.R. 309, at paras. 13-15; *Principal Savings & Trust Co. v. Principal Group Ltd. (Trustee of)* (1993), 109 D.L.R. (4th) 390 at paras. 12-16 (C.A.); and *Canada (Attorney General) v. Confederation Trust Co.* (2003), 65 O.R. (3d) 519, [2003] O.J. No. 2754 (S.C.J.), at p. 525 [O.R.] While these cases were decided in the context of what is known as the "interest stops" rule, they are all premised on the common law understanding that claims for principal and interest are provable in liquidation proceedings to the date of the winding-up. [page233]

[15] The interest stops rule has been applied in winding-up cases in spite of the fact that the legislation did not provide for it. In *Shoppers Trust*, Blair J.A. stated [at para. 26]:

> Thus, it was of little moment that the provisions of the *Winding-up Act* in force at the time of the March 10, 1993 order did not contain any such term. The 1996 amendment to s. 71(1) of the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, establishing that claims against the insolvent estate are to be calculated as at the date of the winding-up, merely clarified and codified the position as it already existed in insolvency law.

[16] In *Abacus Cities Ltd. (Trustee of) v. AMIC Mortgage Investment Corp.*, [1992] A.J. No. 277, 11 C.B.R. (3d) 193 (C.A.), Kerans J.A. applied the interest stops rule in a bankruptcy proceeding under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("*BIA*") even though, in his view, the *BIA* assumed that interest was not payable after bankruptcy but did not expressly forbid it. He did so on the basis of the common law rule enunciated in *Re Savin* [*Savin (Re)* (1872), L.R. 7 Ch. 760 (C.A.)], quoted by Blair J. in *Confederation Life*. Kerans J.A. stated [at para. 19]:

> . . . I accept that *Savin* expresses the law in Canada today: claims provable in bankruptcy cannot include interest after bankruptcy.

[17] In *Confederation Life*, Blair J. was of the view that the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11 (the "*Winding-up Act*") and the *BIA* could be interpreted to permit post-filing interest. Yet he held that the common law insolvency interest stops rule applied. He stated [at paras. 22-23]:

> This common law principle has been applied consistently in Canadian bankruptcy and winding-up proceedings. This is so notwithstanding the language of subsection 71(1) of the *Winding-Up Act* and section 121 of the *BIA*, which might be read to the contrary, in my view.
> . . .
> Yet the "interest stops" principle has always applied to the payment of post-insolvency interest, and the provisions of subsection 71(1) have never been interpreted to trump the common law insolvency "interest stops rule".

[18] Thus, I see no reason to not apply the interest stops rule to a *CCAA* proceeding because the *CCAA* does not expressly provide for its application. The issue is whether the rule should apply to this *CCAA* proceeding.

Nature of the CCAA Proceeding

[19] When the Nortel entities filed for *CCAA* protection on January 14, 2009, and filed on the same date in the U.S. and the U.K., the stated purpose was to stabilize the Nortel business to maximize the chances of preserving all or a portion of the enterprise. However, that hope quickly evaporated, and on June 19, 2009, Nortel issued a news release announcing it had sold its [page234] CMDA business and LTE Access assets and that it was pursuing the sale of its other business interests. Liquidation followed, first by a sale of Nortel's eight business lines in 2009-2011 for US$2.8 billion and second by the sale of its residual patent portfolio under a stalking-

horse bid process in June 2011 for US$4.5 billion. The sale of the CMDA and LTE assets was approved on June 29, 2009.

[20] The Canadian debtors contend that this *CCAA* proceeding is a liquidating proceeding, and thus in substance the same as a bankruptcy under the *BIA*. The bondholders contend that there is no definition of a "liquidating" *CCAA* proceeding and no distinct legal category of a liquidating *CCAA*, essentially arguing that like beauty, it is in the eyes of the beholder.

[21] In this case, I think there is little doubt that this is a liquidating *CCAA* process and has been since June 2009, notwithstanding that there was some consideration given to monetizing the residual intellectual property in a new company to be formed (referred to as IPCO) before it was decided to sell the residual intellectual property that resulted in the sale to the Rockstar Consortium for US$4.5 billion. In *Nortel Networks Corp. (Re)*, [2012] O.J. No. 1115, 2012 ONSC 1213, 88 C.B.R. (5th) 111 (S.C.J.), Morawetz J. referred to his recognizing in his June 29, 2009 Nortel decision approving the sale of the CMDA and LTE assets that the *CCAA* can be applied in "a liquidating insolvency". See, also, Dr. Janis P. Sarra, *Rescue!: The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Carswell, 2013), at p. 167, in which she states, "increasingly, there are 'liquidating *CCAA*' proceedings, whereby the debtor corporation is for all intents and purposes liquidated".

[22] In *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd. (Re)*, [1993] O.J. No. 14, 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Gen. Div.), Farley J. recognized, in para. 7, that a *CCAA* proceeding might involve liquidation. He stated:

> It appears to me that the purpose of the CCAA is also to protect the interests of creditors and to enable an orderly distribution of the debtor company's affairs. This may involve a winding-up or liquidation of a company . . . provided the same is proposed in the best interests of the creditors generally.

[23] It is quite common now for there to be liquidating *CCAA* proceedings in which there is no successful restructuring of the business, but rather a sale of the assets and a distribution of the proceeds to the creditors of the business. Nortel is unfortunately one of such *CCAA* proceedings.

Can the Interest Stops Rule Apply in a CCAA Proceeding?

[24] There is no controlling authority in Canada in a case such as this in which there is a contested claim being made by bondholders for post-filing interest against an insolvent estate under [page235] the *CCAA*, let alone under a liquidating *CCAA* process, or in which the other creditors are mainly pensioners with no contractual right to post-filing interest. Accordingly, it is necessary to deal with first principles and with various cases raised by the parties.

[25] The Canadian debtors contend that the rationale for the interest stops rule is equally applicable to a liquidating *CCAA* proceeding as it is in a *BIA* or winding-up proceeding. They assert that the reason for the interest stops rule is one of fundamental fairness. An insolvency filing under the *CCAA* stays creditor enforcement. Accordingly, it is unfair to permit the bondholders with a contractual right to receive a payment on account of interest, and thus compensation for the delay in receipt of payment, while other creditors such as the pension claimants, who have been equally delayed in payment by virtue of the insolvency, receive no

compensation. They cite Sir G.M. Giffard L.J. in *Humber Ironworks*:

> . . . I do not see with what justice interest can be computed in favour of creditors whose debts carry interest, while creditors whose debts do not carry interest are stayed from recovering judgment, and so obtaining a right to interest.

[26] In *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, [2010] S.C.J. No. 60, 2010 SCC 60, Deschamps J. reaffirmed that the purpose of a *CCAA* stay of proceedings is to preserve the *status quo*. She stated, at para. 77:

> The *CCAA* creates conditions for preserving the *status quo* while attempts are made to find common ground amongst stakeholders for a reorganization that is fair to all.

[27] If post-filing interest is available to one set of creditors while the other creditors are prevented from asserting their rights and obtaining post-judgment interest, the Canadian Creditors' Committee contend that the *status quo* has not been preserved.

[28] It has long been recognized that the federal insolvency regime includes the *CCAA* and the *BIA* and that the two statutes create a complimentary and interrelated scheme for dealing with the property of insolvent companies. See *Ivaco Inc. (Re)* (2006), 83 O.R. (3d) 108, [2006] O.J. No. 4152 (C.A.), at paras. 62 and 64, *per* Laskin J.A.

[29] Recently, the Supreme Court of Canada analyzed the *CCAA* and indicated that the *BIA* and *CCAA* are to be considered parts of an integrated insolvency scheme, the court will favour interpretations that give creditors analogous entitlements under the *CCAA* and *BIA*, and the court will avoid interpretations that give creditors incentives to prefer *BIA* processes. [page236]

[30] In *Century Services*, Deschamps J. enunciated guiding principles for interpreting the *CCAA*. Deschamps J. also stated that the case was the first time that the Supreme Court was called upon to directly interpret the provisions of the *CCAA*. The case involved competing interpretations of the federal *Excise Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15 ("*ETA*") and the *CCAA* in considering a deemed trust for GST collections. The *ETA* expressly excluded the provisions in the *BIA* rendering deemed trusts ineffective, but did not exclude similar provisions in the *CCAA*. In holding in favour of a stay under the *CCAA*, Deschamps J. was guided in her interpretation of the relevant *CCAA* provision by the desire to have similar results under the *BIA* and *CCAA*.

[31] In her analysis, Deschamps J. made a number of statements, including:

> Because the *CCAA* is silent about what happens if reorganization fails, the *BIA* scheme of liquidation and distribution necessarily supplies the backdrop for what will happen if a *CCAA* reorganization is ultimately unsuccessful. [para. 23]
>
> With parallel *CCAA* and *BIA* restructuring schemes now an accepted feature of the insolvency law landscape, the contemporary thrust of legislative reform has been towards harmonizing aspects of insolvency law common to the two statutory schemes to the extent possible and encouraging reorganization over liquidation . . . . [para. 24]
>
> Moreover, a strange asymmetry would arise if the interpretation giving the *ETA* priority over the *CCAA* urged by the Crown is adopted here: the Crown would retain priority over GST claims during *CCAA* proceedings but not in bankruptcy. As courts have reflected, this can

> only encourage statute shopping by secured creditors in cases such as this one where the debtor's assets cannot satisfy both the secured creditors' and the Crown's claims (*Gauntlet*, at para. 21). If creditors' claims were better protected by liquidation under the *BIA*, creditors' incentives would lie overwhelmingly with avoiding proceedings under the *CCAA* and not risking a failed reorganization. Giving a key player in any insolvency such skewed incentives against reorganizing under the *CCAA* can only undermine that statute's remedial objectives and risk inviting the very social ills that it was enacted to avert. [para. 47]
>
> Notably, acting consistently with its goal of treating both the *BIA* and the *CCAA* as sharing the same approach to insolvency, Parliament made parallel amendments to both statutes . . . [para. 54]
> [The *CCAA* and *BIA*] are related and no "gap" exists between the two statutes which would allow the enforcement of property interests at the conclusion of *CCAA* proceedings that would be lost in bankruptcy. [para. 78]

[32] In *Indalex Ltd. (Re)*, [2013] 1 S.C.R. 271, [2013] S.C.J. No. 6, a case involving a competition between a deemed trust under provincial pension legislation and the right of a lender to security granted under the DIP lending provisions of the *CCAA*, Deschamps J. had occasion to refer to the *Century Services* case [page237] and her statement in *Century Services*, in para. 23, referred to above. She then stated [at para. 51]:

> In order to avoid a race to liquidation under the *BIA*, courts will favour an interpretation of the *CCAA* that affords creditors analogous entitlements.

[33] Thus, it is a fair comment taken the direction of the Supreme Court in *Century Services* and *Indalex* regarding the aims of insolvency law in Canada to say that if the common law principle of the interest stops rule was applicable to proceedings under the *BIA* and *Winding-Up Act* before legislative amendments to those statutes were made (or if the comments of Blair J. in *Confederation Life* are accepted that the *BIA* still might be read to prevent its application but does not trump the application of the rule), there is no reason not to apply the interest stops rule in liquidating *CCAA* proceedings. I accept this and note that there is no provision in the *CCAA* that would not permit the application of the rule.

[34] There are also policy reasons for this result, and they flow from *Century Services* and *Indalex*. I accept the argument of the Canadian Creditors' Committee that to permit some creditors' claims to grow disproportionately to others during the stay period would not maintain the *status quo* and would encourage creditors whose interests are being disadvantaged to immediately initiate bankruptcy proceedings, threatening the objectives of the *CCAA*.

[35] In my view, there is no need for there to be a "liquidating" *CCAA* proceeding in order for the interest stops rule to apply to a *CCAA* proceeding. The reasoning for the application of the common law insolvency rule, being the desire to prevent a stay of proceedings from militating against one group of unsecured creditors over another in violation of the *pari passu* rule, is equally applicable to a *CCAA* proceeding that is not a liquidating proceeding. In such a proceeding, the parties would of course be free to include post-filing interest payments in a plan of arrangement, as is sometimes done.

[36] The bondholders contend, however, that *Stelco Inc. (Re)*, [2007] O.J. No. 2533, 2007 ONCA 483, 32 B.L.R. (4th) 77 is binding authority that the interest stops rule does not apply in

any *CCAA* proceeding. I do not agree. The facts of the case were quite different and did not involve a claim for post-filing interest against the debtor. Stelco was successfully restructured under the *CCAA* by a plan of compromise and arrangement approved by the creditors. The sanctioned plan did not provide for payment of post-petition interest. As among senior unsecured debenture holders, subordinated (junior) debenture holders and ordinary unsecured creditors, the plan treated all in the same class and [page238] *pro rata* distributions were calculated on the basis that no post-filing interest was allowed. That result was not challenged.

[37] The relevant pre-filing indenture in *Stelco* provided that in the event of any insolvency, the holders of all senior debt would first be entitled to receive payment in full of the principal and interest due thereon, before the junior debenture holders would be entitled to receive any payment or distribution of any kind which might otherwise be payable in respect of their debentures. While the plan cancelled all Stelco debentures, subject to s. 6.01(2) of the plan, that section provided that the rights between the debenture holders were preserved. The plan was agreed to by the junior debenture holders. After the plan had been sanctioned, the junior debenture holders challenged the senior debt holders' right to receive the subordinated payments towards their outstanding interest.

[38] Wilton-Siegel J. rejected the argument, holding that the subordination agreement continued to operate independently of the sanctioned plan and was not affected by it. While it is not clear why, the junior note holders contended that interest stopped accruing in respect of the claims of the senior debenture holders against Stelco after the *CCAA* filing. There was no issue about a claim against Stelco for post-filing interest, as no such claim had ever been made. The issue was a contest between the two levels of debenture holders. However, Wilton-Siegel J. stated that in situations in which there was value to the equity, a *CCAA* plan could include post-filing interest. I take this statement to be *obiter*, but in any event, it is not the situation in Nortel as there is no equity at all. At the Court of Appeal, O'Connor A.C.J.O, Goudge and Blair JJ.A. agreed that the interest stops rule did not preclude the continuation of interest to the senior note holders from the subordinated payments to be made by the junior note holders under the binding inter-creditor arrangements.

[39] In the course of its reasons, the Court of Appeal stated that there was no persuasive authority that supports an interest stops rule in a *CCAA* proceeding, and referred to statements of Binnie J. in *Canada 3000 Inc. (Re); Inter-Canadian (1991) Inc. (Trustee of)*, [2006] 1 S.C.R. 865, [2006] S.C.J. No. 24, 2006 SCC 24 ("*NAV Canada*"). A number of comments can be made.

[40] First, *Stelco* did not involve proceeding or claims against the debtor for post-filing interest. Second, the decision in *Stelco* was derived from the terms of negotiated inter-creditor agreements in the note indenture that were protected by plan. There was nothing about the common law interest stops rule that precluded one creditor from being held to its agreement to subordinate its realization to that of another creditor including [page239] forgoing its right to payment until the creditor with priority received principal and interest. That is what the Court of Appeal concluded by stating "We do not accept that there is a 'Interest Stops Rule' that precludes such a result." Third, the general statements made in *Stelco* and *NAV Canada* must now be considered in light of the later direction in *Century Services* and *Indalex*. I now turn to *NAV Canada.*

[41] In *NAV Canada*, Canada 3000 Airlines filed for protection under the *CCAA*. Three days later, the monitor filed an assignment in bankruptcy on its behalf. Federal legislation gave the airport authorities a right to apply to the court authorizing the seizure of aircraft for outstanding payments owed by an airline for using an airport. The contest in the case was between the airport authorities and the owners/ lessors of the aircraft as to the extent that the owners/ lessors were liable for those payments and whether a seizure order could be made against the aircraft leased to the airline. It was ultimately held that the owners/lessors were not liable for the outstanding payments owed by the airline but that the aircraft could be seized.

[42] Interest on the arrears was raised in the first instance before Ground J. He held that the airport authorities were entitled as against the bankrupt airline to detain the aircraft until all amounts with interest were paid in full or security for such payment was posted under the provisions of the legislation, *i.e.*, interest continued to accrue and be payable after bankruptcy. The Court of Appeal did not deal with interest as in their view it was relevant only if the airport authorities had a claim against the owners/lessors of the aircraft, which the court held they did not.

[43] In the Supreme Court, which also dealt with an appeal from Quebec which dealt with the same issues, nearly the entire reasons of Binnie J. dealt with the issues as to whether the owners/lessors of the aircraft were liable for the outstanding charges and whether the aircraft could be seized by the airport authorities. It was held that the owners/lessors were not directly liable for the charges owed by the airline but that the aircraft could be seized until the charges were paid.

[44] At the end of his reasons, Binnie J. dealt with interest and held that it continued to run until the earlier of payment, the posting of security or bankruptcy. The bondholders rely on the last two sentences of the following paragraph from the reasons of Binnie J. which refer to the running of interest under the *CCAA* [at para. 96]:

> Given the authority to charge interest, my view is that interest continues to run to the first of the date of payment, the posting of security or bankruptcy. If interest were to stop accruing before payment has been made, [page240] then the airport authorities and NAV Canada would not recover the full amount owed to them in real terms. Once the owner, operator or titleholder has provided security, the interest stops accruing. The legal titleholder is then incurring the cost of the security and losing the time value of money. It should not have to pay twice. While a *CCAA* filing does not stop the accrual of interest, the unpaid charges remain an unsecured claim provable against the bankrupt airline. The claim does not accrue interest after the bankruptcy: ss. 121 and 122 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

[45] The Quebec airline in question had first filed to make a proposal under the *BIA* and when that proposal was rejected by its creditors, it was deemed to have made an assignment in bankruptcy as of the date its proposal was filed. Thus, the comments of Binnie J. regarding the *CCAA* could not have related to the Quebec airline, but only to Canada 3000, which had been under the *CCAA* for only three days before it was assigned into bankruptcy. It is by no means clear how much effort, if any, was spent in argument on the three days' interest issue. Binnie J. did not refer to any argument on the point.

[46] There was no discussion of the common law interest stops rule and whether it could apply during the three-day period in question or whether it should apply to a liquidating *CCAA* proceeding. Nor was there any discussion of the definition of claim in the *CCAA*, being a claim provable within the meaning of the *BIA*, and how that might impact a claim for post-filing interest under the *CCAA*. The statement regarding interest under the *CCAA* was simply conclusory. It may be fair to say that the statement of Binnie J. was *per incuriam*.

[47] In my view, the statement of Binnie J. should not be taken as a blanket statement that interest always accrues in a *CCAA* proceeding, regardless of whether or not it is a liquidating proceeding. The circumstances in *NAV Canada* were far different from Nortel, involving several years of compound interest in excess of US$1.6 billion out of a total worldwide asset base of US$7.3 billion. The statement of Binnie J. should now be construed in light of *Century Services* and *Indalex*.

Need for a CCAA Plan

[48] The bondholders contend that there is no authority under the *CCAA* to effect a distribution of a debtor's assets absent a plan of arrangement or compromise that must be negotiated by the debtor with its creditors, and that as a plan can include payment of post-filing interest, it is not possible for a court to conclude that the bondholders have no right to post-filing interest. They assert that there is no jurisdiction for a court to compromise a creditor's claim in a *CCAA* proceeding except in the context of approving a plan approved by the creditors. They also [page241] assert that plan negotiations cannot meaningfully take place "in earnest" until the allocation decision as to how much of the US$7.3 billion is to be allocated to each of the Canadian, U.S. or EMEA estates.

[49] One may ask what is left over in this case to negotiate. The assets have long been sold and what is left is to determine the claims against the Canadian estate and, once the amount of the assets in the Canadian estate are known, distribute the assets on a *pari passu* basis. This is not a case in which equity is exchanged for debt in a reorganization of a business such as *Stelco*.

[50] However, even if there were things to negotiate, they would involve creditors compromising some right, and bargaining against those rights. What those rights are need to be determined, and often are in *CCAA* proceedings.

[51] In this case, compensation claims procedure orders were made by Morawetz J. The order covering claims by bondholders is dated July 30, 2009. It was made without any objection by the bondholders. That order provides for a claim to be proven for the purposes of voting and distribution under a plan. The claims resolution order of Morawetz J. dated September 16, 2010 provides for a proven claim to be for all purposes, including for the purposes of voting and distribution under any plan. The determination now regarding the bondholders' claim for post-filing interest is consistent with the process of determining whether these claims by the bondholders are finally proven. Contrary to the contention of the bondholders, it is not a process in which the court is being asked to compromise the bondholders' claim for post-filing interest. It is rather a determination of whether they have a right to such interest.

[52] It is perhaps not necessary to determine at this stage how the assets will be distributed and whether a plan, or what type of plan, will be necessary. However, in light of the argument advanced on behalf of the bondholders, I will deal with this issue.

[53] I first note that the *CCAA* makes no provision as to how money is to be distributed to creditors. This is not surprising taken that plans of reorganization do not necessarily provide for payments to creditors and taken that the *CCAA* does not expressly provide for a liquidating *CCAA* process. There is no provision that requires distributions to be made under a plan of arrangement.

[54] A court has wide powers in a *CCAA* proceeding to do what is just in the circumstances. Section 11(1) provided that a court may make any order it considers appropriate in the circumstances. Although this section was provided by an amendment that came into force after Nortel filed under the *CCAA*, and [page242] therefore by the amendment the new section does not apply to Nortel, it has been held that the provision merely reflects past jurisdiction. In *Century Services*, Deschamps J. stated [at paras. 65, 67-68]:

> I agree with Justice Georgina R. Jackson and Professor Janis Sarra that the most appropriate approach is a hierarchical one in which courts rely first on an interpretation of the provisions of the *CCAA* text before turning to inherent or equitable jurisdiction to anchor measures taken in a *CCAA* proceeding (see G. R. Jackson and J. Sarra, "Selecting the Judicial Tool to get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters", in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007* (2008), 41, at p. 42). The authors conclude that when given an appropriately purposive and liberal interpretation, the *CCAA* will be sufficient in most instances to ground measures necessary to achieve its objectives (p. 94).
>
> . . . . .
>
> The initial grant of authority under the *CCAA* empowered a court "where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company . . . on the application of any person interested in the matter . . . , subject to this Act, [to] make an order under this section" (*CCAA*, s. 11(1)). The plain language of the statute was very broad.
> In this regard, though not strictly applicable to the case at bar, I note that Parliament has in recent amendments changed the wording contained in s. 11(1), making explicit the discretionary authority of the court under the *CCAA*. Thus in s. 11 of the *CCAA* as currently enacted, a court may, "subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, . . . make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances" (S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 128). <u>Parliament appears to have endorsed the broad reading of *CCAA* authority developed by the jurisprudence.</u>

(Underlining added)

[55] I note also that payments to creditors without plans of arrangement or compromises are often ordered. In *Timminco Ltd. (Re)*, [2014] O.J. No. 3270, 2014 ONSC 3393 (S.C.J.), Morawetz J. noted, at para. 38, that the assets of Timminco had been sold and distributions made to secured creditors without any plan and with no intention to advance a plan. In that case, there was a shortfall to the secured creditors and no assets available to the unsecured

creditors. The fact that the distributions went to the secured creditors rather than to an unsecured creditor makes no difference to the jurisdiction under the *CCAA* to do so.

[56] In *AbitibiBowater Inc. (Re)*, [2009] Q.J. No. 19125, 2009 QCCS 6461 (Sup. Ct.), Gascon J.C.S. (as he then was) granted a large interim distribution from the proceeds of a sale transaction to senior secured noteholders ("SSNs"). The bondholders opposed the distribution on the same grounds as advanced by the bondholders in this case [at paras. 56-58]: [page243]

> The Bondholders claim that the proposed distribution violates the *CCAA*. From their perspective, nothing in the statute authorizes a distribution of cash to a creditor group prior to approval of a plan of arrangement by the requisite majorities of creditors and the Court. They maintain that the SSNs are subject to the stay of proceedings like all other creditors.
>
> By proposing a distribution to one class of creditors, the Bondholders contend that the other classes of creditors are denied the ability to negotiate a compromise with the SSNs. Instead of bringing forward their proposed plan and creating options for the creditors for negotiation and voting purposes, the Abitibi Petitioners are thus eliminating bargaining options and confiscating the other creditors' leverage and voting rights.
> Accordingly, the Bondholders conclude that the proposed distribution should not be considered until after the creditors have had an opportunity to negotiate a plan of arrangement or a compromise with the SSNs.

[57] Justice Gascon did not accept this argument. He stated [at para. 71]:

> Despite what the Bondholders argue, it is neither unusual nor unheard of to proceed with an interim distribution of net proceeds in the context of a sale of assets in a *CCAA* reorganization. Nothing in the *CCAA* prevents similar interim distribution of monies. There are several examples of such distributions having been authorized by Courts in Canada.

(Underlining added)

[58] Justice Gascon was persuaded that the distribution should be made as it was part and parcel of a DIP loan arrangement that he approved. Whatever the particular circumstances were that led to the exercise of his discretion, he did not question that he had jurisdiction to make an order distributing proceeds without a plan of arrangement. I see no difference between an interim distribution, as in the case of *AbitibiBowater*, or a final distribution, as in the case of *Timminco*, or a distribution to an unsecured or secured creditor, so far as a jurisdiction to make the order is concerned without any plan of arrangement.

[59] There is a comment by Laskin J.A. in *Ivaco Inc. (Re)*, *supra*, that questions the right of a judge to order payment out of funds realized on the sale of assets under a *CCAA* process, in that case to pension plan administrators for funding deficiencies. He stated [at para. 60]:

> [I]n my view, absent an agreement, I doubt that the *CCAA* even authorized the motions judge to order this payment. Once restructuring was not possible and the *CCAA* proceedings were spent, as the motions judge found and all parties acknowledged, I question whether the court had any authority to order a distribution of the sale proceeds.

[60] This was an *obiter* statement. But in any event, Justice Laskin was discussing a situation in which all parties agreed that the *CCAA* proceedings "were spent". That is, there was effectively no *CCAA* proceeding any more. This is not the situation with [page244] Nortel and I do not see the *obiter* statement as being applicable. As stated by Justice Gascon, distribution orders without a plan are common in Canada.

[61] While it need not be decided, I am not persuaded that it would not be possible for a court to make an order distributing the proceeds of the Nortel sale without a plan of arrangement or compromise.

Conclusion

[62] I hold and declare that holders of the crossover bond claims are not legally entitled to claim or receive any amounts under the relevant indentures above and beyond the outstanding principal debt and pre-petition interest (namely, above and beyond US$4.092 billion).

[63] Those seeking costs may make cost submissions in writing within ten days and responding submissions may be made in writing within a further ten days. Submissions are to be brief and include a proper cost outline for costs sought.

Order accordingly.

TAB 5

CITATION: Royal Bank of Canada v. Atlas Block Co. Limited, 2014 ONSC 1531
COURT FILE NO.: CV-13-10201-00CL
DATE: 20140310

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO

COMMERCIAL LIST

RE: Royal Bank of Canada, Applicant

AND:

Atlas Block Co. Limited, Atlas Block (Brockville) Ltd. and 1035162 Ontario o/a Atlas Block Trucking, Respondents

BEFORE: D. M. Brown J.

COUNSEL: S. Babe, for the Applicant, Royal Bank of Canada

R. Fisher, for the Business Development Bank of Canada

S. Friedman, for the Receiver, KPMG Inc.

HEARD: February 13, 2014

REASONS FOR DECISION

I. Receiver's motion to allocate sales proceeds and its costs between two secured creditors

[1] By order made October 4, 2013, KPMG Inc. was appointed receiver of all of the assets and undertakings of Atlas Block Co. Limited, Atlas Block (Brockville) Ltd. and 1035162 Ontario Inc. o/a Atlas Block Trucking (the "Debtors"). Pursuant to orders of this Court the Receiver has sold most of the Debtors' assets. The Receiver moved for the approval of the distribution of the net sales proceeds from certain of the Debtors' assets between the two main secured creditors, the Royal Bank of Canada and the Business Development Bank of Canada, as well as the approval of its allocation of fees and costs as between RBC and BDC.

II. Background

[2] The Debtors manufactured a range of brick and concrete building and landscaping products for sale to industrial and commercial construction contractors. The head office of Atlas Block was located in Midland, Ontario, at what was called the Victoria Harbour Plant. Atlas operated manufacturing facilities at (i) the Victoria Harbour Plant, (ii) the Hillsdale Plant, and (iii) the Brockville Plant.

[3] The Hillsdale Plant was the major asset of Atlas Block. Its construction and equipping was financed with $17.5 million in loans from BDC, $4.8 million from the Ontario government, and $2.2 million in equipment financing from RBC.

[4] RBC and BDC provided other financing to Atlas Block.

[5] Production at the Brockville Plant ceased about two weeks prior to the appointment of the Receiver. The Receiver continued production at the Hillsdale and Victoria Habour Plants for a short period of time until the end of November, 2013.

[6] As a result of a sales and marketing process, the Receiver entered into two asset purchase agreements to sell the equipment, inventory and real estate of Atlas Block to Brampton Brick Limited ("BBL"). Those agreements received court approval on December 20, 2013. In my endorsement approving the BBL sale I wrote, in part:

> This motion is not opposed, however BDC reserves its rights with respect to distribution and my order is made subject to that reservation…

[7] The sales to BBL were completed on January 6, 2014, however they did not include the sale of the real property at the Victoria Harbour Plant. On January 14, 2014, BBL informed the Receiver it that it would not be acquiring the real property at Victoria Harbour.

III. The BBL Asset Purchase Agreement

[8] Under the November 29, 2013 Asset Purchase Agreement (the "Atlas Block APA") BBL purchased the following land and equipment:

(i) Hillsdale: (a) the Hillsdale Real Property, (b) certain molds and forklift equipment; (c) manufacturing equipment; and (d) inventory;

(ii) Victoria Harbour: (a) office furniture and equipment; (b) certain manufacturing equipment; and, (c) inventory; and,

(iii) The interest of Atlas Block in RBC Equipment Leases, which included some leased equipment at the Hillsdale Plant, as well as at the Brockville Plant.

[9] Section 2.7 of the Atlas Block stated that the purchase price would be allocated amongst the purchased assets as set forth on Schedule "K" to the APA, in part, as follows:

Asset	Allocated Amount
Hillsdale Real Property	$1,000,000
RBC Equipment Leases	$2,611,539

Hillsdale and Victoria Harbour Equipment	$7,638,458

[10] In the Atlas APA BBL agreed to assume the obligations under the RBC Equipment Leases and the allocated $2.61 million represented the remaining obligations due under those leases.

[11] Under the December 12, 2013 Asset Purchase Agreement (the "Brockville APA"), BBL agreed to purchase from the Receiver (i) the Brockville Real Property, (ii) the Brockville Equipment, (iii) the Brockville office furniture and equipment, and (iv) the Brockville Inventory. The purchase price of $600,000 was allocated pursuant to section 2.6 of the Brockville APA amongst the purchased assets, in part, as follows:

Asset	**Allocated Amount**
Brockville Real Property	$100,000
Brockville Equipment and office equipment	$100,000
Brockville Inventory	$400,00

IV. The Receiver's proposed distribution of the sales proceeds

A. The Receiver's proposal

[12] In its Third Report dated January 31, 2014 the Receiver stated that under the two APAs BBL had allocated about $8.2 million of the purchase price to assets subject to the security held by BDC. It continued:

> The Receiver has no basis on which to consider the allocation by BBL to be unreasonable and therefore has used the BBL allocation set out in the Purchase and Sale Agreements as the basis for determining the proceeds to be paid to BDC and RBC.

Observing that it had incurred certain costs and fees on behalf of BDC during the Receivership, the Receiver proposed to deduct those costs from the Gross BDC Proceeds to arrive at a net figure payable to BDC. Appendix "O" to the Third Report set out the Receiver's calculations. Based on those calculations, the Receiver proposed to distribute to BDC proceeds of $7.7 million.

[13] The Receiver reported that the majority of the remaining funds in its receivership accounts related to proceeds from RBC's security. The Receiver proposed to make a distribution to RBC of $3.46 million.

[14] RBC supported the distribution proposed by the Receiver.

B. BDC's position

[15] BDC objected to the Receiver's proposed distribution on the grounds set out in the February 5, 2014 affidavit of Lori Matson, Director, BDC Business Restructuring Unit. As of October, 2013, the Debtors owed BDC approximately $17.39 million.

[16] Matson confirmed that BDC had received from the Receiver a draft of the Atlas APA as early as November 7, 2013, some three weeks prior to its execution, and BDC had understood at that time that part of the purchase price involved BBL assuming about $2.6 million in RBC Equipment Leases. According to Matson, BDC did not take issue with the BBL purchase price, but did have concerns about the allocation of the purchase price:

(i) Matson alleged that RBC had engaged in discussions with BBL before the execution of the APAs which had influenced the allocation of the purchase price;

(ii) BDC contended that by assuming the remaining obligations under the RBC Equipment Leases, BBL was "factoring in the transaction structure (i.e.: assumption of capital leases), into its allocation rather than the value of the assets being obtained thereunder. The result is a purchase price allocation that is not reflective of the value of the various assets being acquired based upon appraisals…the allocation becomes arbitrary as it does not distinguish the financing aspect from the underlying value of the assets being acquired". BBL allocated the purchase price based on the amount of the debt being assumed which bore no relationship to the value of the underlying assets. Matson described the situation as an "over-allocation relative to the capital leased assets"; and,

(iii) BBL's allocation of the purchase price did not reflect historic appraised values of the purchased assets.

It was Matson's evidence that the Receiver should distribute $10,644,360 to BDC based upon appraised values, not the $7.7 million it proposed based on the purchase price allocation in the APAs.

[17] At my request, the Receiver filed a supplementary document which compared the calculation of its proposed distributions to the distributions proposed by BDC.

V. Analysis: Allocation of sales proceeds

A. Allegation of pre-execution discussions between BBL and RBC

[18] Matson alleged that "negotiations took place between the Purchaser and RBC as part of the Purchaser's due diligence process in advance of the bidding that had the effect of creating an opportunity for the Purchaser to finance part of this purchase and as well creating expectations relative to the allocation of the sale proceeds on the part of RBC".

[19] Matson did not disclose in her affidavit any source or basis for her allegation.

[20] Mark Swanson, a Manager in RBC's Special Loans and Advisory Services Department, deposed, in his February 6, 2014 affidavit, that RBC had no communication with BBL prior to being told by the Receiver that BBL's offer included, amongst its terms, the assumption of the RBC Equipment Leases on an undiscounted basis. Swanson stated that the Receiver had asked RBC whether it would support a motion to approve a transaction under which BBL assumed the leases, rather than paying cash for them, but Swanson deposed that there had been no discussion between RBC and the Receiver of a discount or reduction of payments under the leases.

[21] In the Second Supplement to its Third Report the Receiver responded to Matson's allegations:

> …BDC suggests that negotiations took place between BBL and RBC prior to the submission of BBL's offer. The Receiver provided all potential purchasers who signed the Receiver's confidentiality agreement with information on Atlas' various leases and fixed assets through the Receiver's online data room so that they could perform their due diligence. BDC was also provided access to the Receiver's data room and was therefore aware of the information available to all purchasers. The Receiver is not aware of any other information supplied to BBL nor any negotiations between RBC and BBL prior to the submission of BBL's offer. The Receiver notes that BDC has not provided any evidence to support their allegations.

[22] Given the failure of BDC to disclose the evidence upon which it based its allegation of the pre-execution negotiations between BBL and RBC and in light of the strong direct evidence to the contrary from the Receiver and RBC, I give no effect whatsoever to BDC's allegation that RBC had engaged in discussions with BBL before the execution of the APAs which had influenced the allocation of the purchase price. BDC's allegation was without any evidentiary foundation foundation.

B. The RBC Equipment Leases

[23] There was no dispute that part of the consideration offered by BBL under the Atlas APA was its agreement to assume the obligations of Atlas Block under the RBC Equipment Leases. The amount allocated for that consideration under the Atlas APA was the amount of the remaining obligations under those leases.

[24] I do not accept BDC's submission that such an allocation of consideration was somehow arbitrary or unfair. To the contrary, the consideration allocated for BBL's assumption of that liability corresponded exactly to the monetary amount of the remaining obligations under those leases. There was nothing arbitrary about such an allocation. The crux of BDC's complaint really related to the amount of the purchase price allocated to other assets, in particular the Hillsdale Real Property, so I turn now to that issue.

C. The relationship between allocations of the purchase price to the Hillsdale Real Property and the appraised values of that asset

C.1 The positions of the parties

[25] The crux of BDC's complaint about the proposed distribution of sales proceeds was that in the APAs BBL's allocation of the purchase price did not reflect historic appraised values of some of the purchased assets, in particular the Hillsdale Real Property.

[26] In section 1.1.7 of its Second Report dated December 12, 2013, the Receiver observed that "the construction of the Hillsdale Plant unfortunately coincided with the start of the 2008/2009 economic downturn…" Schedule "K" to the Atlas APA allocated $1 million of the purchase price to the Hillsdale Real Property. BDC submitted that $3 million should have been allocated to that property.

[27] Matson attached to her affidavit extracts from two appraisals of the Hillsdale Real Property performed in 2008 and 2011. The first extracts were from a June, 2008 appraisal that had been prepared by Katchen Appraisals Inc. for BDC. By its terms the Katchen Appraisal was intended to assist for financing purposes only and was "to serve as a benchmark for establishing the projected value of the property *as improved with a completed concrete block manufacturing facility*, in fee simple, assuming a market exposure of twelve months prior to sale under forced sale conditions on June 17, 2008…" Katchen valued the property at $4.5 million.

[28] Matson also attached extracts from a second appraisal, one prepared by Appraisers Canada Inc. with an effective date of December, 2011. The appraisal stated that it was intended only "for an accounting function and for no other use" and that its purpose was "to estimate a current hypothetical market value of the subject property, as if unimproved, as at the effective date". Appraisers estimated that value as in a range between $2.162 to $2.883 million, with a "value tendency" of $2.5 million.

[29] Pointing to the extracts from both appraisals, Matson deposed that BBL's price allocation "seriously undervalues the land and building" and "allocating $1,000,000 to the real property is not reasonable".

[30] In its Second Supplement to the Third Report the Receiver noted that the appraisals relied upon by BDC were prepared at different dates and used different appraisal assumptions:

> The Receiver does not believe that this amalgamation of estimated values is a superior method of allocating the purchase price as compared to the allocation of a third party purchaser of assets.

The Receiver also observed that the Hillsdale Plant was a special purpose asset, remotely located, which was difficult and perhaps cost prohibitive to relocate.

[31] Although RBC did not comment directly on the valuations, Swanson did depose that back in August, 2013, just after RBC had commenced this application, it had been asked by the Debtors' financial advisor to adjourn the application to enable the Debtors to work out a refinancing with BDC. A signed memorandum of understanding between the Debtors and BDC provided to RBC disclosed that BDC's existing loan in excess of $17 million would be replaced by a $5 million loan to a Newco which would acquire the Debtors' assets and business. Newco would issue preferred shares to BDC. In the result, that transaction did not proceed and a receiver was appointed. Swanson deposed:

> The history of this matter therefore shows that the Receiver, who RBC drove to appoint, successfully increased BDC's anticipated recovery by over $3 million and reduced BDC's risk by even more. The Receiver has therefore significantly reduced the shortfall that BDC was otherwise willing to incur.

C.2 Analysis

[32] In *Bank of America Canada v. Willann Investments Ltd.*[1] Farley J. commented that when examining a receiver's proposed sale of assets in light of the principles set out in *Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair*,[2] a court might well refrain from approving a sale that proposed an allocation of the purchase price which was significantly different from the latest valuation of the assets because such an allocation would not fairly consider the interests of all creditors.[3] From that it follows that the time for objecting to an allocation of the purchase price in a proposed sale is when the sale is brought before the Court for approval. If the Court agrees with the objection, it can decline to approve the sale, which may or may not result in further negotiations with the proposed purchaser, depending upon the significance to it of the purchase price allocation.

[33] Once a court approves a sale agreement, however, as occurred here, it becomes more difficult for a creditor to advance an objection about the fairness of the term of the sales agreement allocating the purchase price because such an objection, in essence, constitutes an objection to a material term of the now-approved sale agreement. Put another way, not having opposed the approval of a sales transaction, thereby securing the benefit of that sale of the

[1] 1992 CarswellOnt 1743 (Gen. Div.)
[2] (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1 (C.A.)
[3] *Bank of America Canada, supra.*, para. 5.

debtor's assets, a creditor faces difficulty in objecting subsequently to a material term of the agreement which it did not oppose.

[34] In the present case BDC did not oppose the approval of the BBL APAs – no doubt because the BBL offers were far, far superior to any other offer obtained by the Receiver – but BDC did put a "reservation of rights" on the record, without filing evidence at the time about the nature of its objections. A receiver's distribution motion should not turn into a debate about the fairness of the term in the approved sale agreement which allocates the purchase price to particular assets. The proper time for such a debate is at the hearing of the approval motion. I will consider the objections made by BDC, but their timing weakens the weight to be given to them.

[35] Turning to the submission of BDC that the allocated purchase price for the Hillsdale Real Property was far below its appraised value, I have five comments. First, any appraisal must be read in its entirety to understand the methodology used and the assumptions employed. On this motion BDC only filed portions of the reports from which it was not possible to ascertain the methodologies and information used by the appraisers to arrive at their estimates. Failing to file the entire reports significantly undermined their evidentiary value. Second, the reports gave opinion values as of June, 2008 and December, 2011. The reports therefore were quite dated, the last expressing a value some two years prior to the appointment of the Receiver. Since the actions of the Receiver must be assessed at the time taken, stale valuation reports are of little assistance in ascertaining how the market perceived the value of the Hillsdale Real Property as of November, 2013, the date of the Atlas APA.

[36] Which leads me to my third point. In the December 12, 2013 Supplement to its Second Report the Receiver stated:

> BDC also has a mortgage on the real property at Hillsdale…Both the Receiver and BDC agreed that an appraisal of the Hillsdale Real Property would not be cost beneficial as the value of the Hillsdale Real Property is intrinsic to the manufacturing plant and could not be separately assessed. It was agreed that an appraisal of the market value of the Hillsdale Real Property on a standalone basis would be theoretical at best, and not provide useful information in assessing offers.

It is difficult to understand how BDC now relies on stale valuation reports to support its submissions on the allocation of net sale proceeds in light of that agreement.

[37] Fourth, the material deficiencies in the evidentiary utility of the two appraisal reports referred to by Matson brings one back, then, to the general principle that where a receiver markets a property, appraisals cease to have much significance in the valuation process[4] – a sale

[4] *B & M Handelman Investments Ltd. v. Mass Properties Inc.* (2009), 56 C.B.R. (5th) 313 (Ont. S.C.J.), para. 13; *Bank of America Canada v. Willann Investments Ltd.*, 1992 CarswellOnt 1743 (Gen. Div.), para. 5.

is always a better indication of value of a particular property than a valuation. In the present case, the Receiver contacted 83 different interested parties, 36 of which signed confidentiality agreements, and 8 of which submitted offers. The BBL offer accepted by the Receiver was far, far superior to any other offer.

[38] Fifth, and finally, in the Second Supplement to its Third Report the Receiver provided the following evidence:

> [T]he Hillsdale building was a sole purpose building, built for the purpose of block production only. Accordingly, it is likely that the building would only have value in a going concern sale. If the assets were liquidated and removed, the building would at best have scrap value and may have been a liability for a purchaser of the real property as it would likely have to be demolished. Therefore, the allocation of the $1.0 million to the real property is likely superior to liquidation value.

I accept that evidence.

[39] Accordingly, I see no reason to interfere with the Receiver's recommendation to distribute the net sales proceeds using a methodology based on the allocation of the purchase price found in the approved Atlas APA and Brockville APA. I therefore grant the relief sought in paragraph (g) of the Receiver's February 3, 2014 notice of motion.

VI. Allocation of the Receiver's costs

[40] The Receiver sought approval of its fees and disbursements of $196,882.73 for the period December 1, 2013 to January 15, 2014, as well as for those of its counsel for the same period in the amount of $147,503.13. Recognizing the competing security interests in the receivership, the Receiver and its counsel had tracked their time and expenses in three separate categories: (i) those directly related to BDC asset realization activities; (ii) those directly related to RBC asset realization activities; and, (iii) those shared between BDC and RBC realization activities.

[41] BDC took no issue with the direct expenses attributed by the Receiver to BDC assets ($67,598). The Receiver tracked shared expenses totaling $510,782. It proposed allocating $357,159 of those expenses to BDC on the basis that BDC recovered 69.92% of the total sales proceeds. RBC supported the Receiver's proposed allocation. BDC objected to the amount of the fees and to their allocation, contending that only 50% of the shared costs should be allocated to it, or the sum of $255,391. BDC complained that "a significant portion of these costs were expended in the collection of accounts receivable and the production and sale of inventory which clearly solely benefitted RBC. In addition, there are significant Receiver and legal fees relative to the trust claims of Holcim and Tackaberry".

[42] This Court approved the Receiver's fees and legal fees for the period up to November 30, 2013 in its December 20, 2013 order. As to the fees incurred after that date, in paragraph 21 of her affidavit Matson "sought clarification" of certain work performed by the Receiver and its counsel. In section 3.1 of the Second Supplement to its Third Report the Receiver provided

detailed clarification. In light of that clarification, I conclude that the fees for which the Receiver sought approval were reasonable in the circumstances.

[43] As to the allocation of the fees, the general principles governing the allocation of receiver's costs can be briefly stated:

(i) The allocation of such costs must be done on a case-by-case basis and involves an exercise of discretion by a receiver or trustee;

(ii) Costs should be allocated in a fair and equitable manner, one which does not readjust the priorities between creditors, and one which does not ignore the benefit or detriment to any creditor;

(iii) A strict accounting to allocate such costs is neither necessary nor desirable in all cases. To require a receiver to calculate and determine an absolutely fair value for its services for one group of assets vis-à-vis another likely would not be cost-effective and would drive up the overall cost of the receivership;

(iv) A creditor need not benefit "directly" before the costs of an insolvency proceeding can be allocated against that creditor's recovery;

(v) An allocation does not require a strict cost/benefit analysis or that the costs be borne equally or on a *pro rata* basis;

(vi) Where an allocation appears *prima facie* as fair, the onus falls on an opposing creditor to satisfy the court that the proposed allocation is unfair or prejudicial.[5]

[44] The Receiver responded to BDC's complaint about the allocation of certain time by reporting that it had only charged time for accounts receivable collections and the Holcim/Tackaberry claims to RBC. That addressed that complaint.

[45] As to the allocation methodology for shared fees, the Receiver reported that as early as October 18, 2013, it had provided BDC with its allocation method for professional fees and expenses incurred in the estate. Its email to RBC of that date stated:

> The shared time will be allocated on realizations of the secured creditor assets so the exact breakdown of those fees will not be known until the assets are realized.

The Receiver provided BDC with requested weekly reports allocating those fees amongst the three time categories. The Receiver responded to periodic inquiries about the fees and their

---

[5] See the cases cited by C. Campbell J. in *Re Hunjan International Inc.* (2006), 21 C.B.R. (5th) 276 (Ont. S.C.J.) and Cameron J. in *JP Morgan Chase Bank N.A. v. UTCC United Tri-Tech Corp.* (2006), 25 C.B.R. (5th) 156 (Ont. S.C.J.).

allocation from BDC, and it was not aware that BDC took issue with the allocation until February 4, 2014.

[46] I find it difficult to place must credence in an "11th hour" objection by a creditor to the receiver's proposed allocation of fees when the Receiver disclosed the proposed methodology at the start of the administration of the receivership estate, the creditor did not object, and the Receiver provided on-going, transparent reporting to the creditor of the fees incurred.

[47] The Receiver also stated:

> The Receiver believes that BDC derived a significant benefit from the Receiver's operations and eventual sale to BBL. As discussed previously the DSL Appraisal makes it clear that the realizable values of Atlas' assets would have been significantly impaired absent a going concern sale when one compares the appraised value of $6.5 million in a going concern type sale versus a value of $1.5 million in a liquidation sale…The Receiver agrees with BDC that BBL paid more for all of the Atlas assets, and most notably the Hillsdale Equipment (as the Hillsdale plant is the only plant of the two sold in the First BBL Sale that BBL is operating), because of the Receiver's preservation of the Atlas customer base through continued operations during the receivership. This was of great benefit to BDC, perhaps more so than to RBC.

[48] The allocation methodology proposed by the Receiver for shared costs based *pro rata* on realizations was *prima facie* reasonable in the circumstances of this case. The Receiver disclosed that methodology to BDC at the start of its administration, and BDC did not object until the 11th hour. BDC has not demonstrated any unfairness in the methodology proposed by the Receiver.

[49] Consequently, I grant the orders sought by the Receiver in paragraphs (h) and (i) of its notice of motion dated February 3, 2014.

VII. Costs

[50] I would encourage the parties to try to settle the costs of this motion. If they cannot, any party seeking costs may serve and file with my office written cost submissions, together with a Bill of Costs, by March 21, 2014. Any party against whom costs are sought may serve and file with my office responding written cost submissions by March 28, 2014. The costs submissions shall not exceed three pages in length, excluding the Bill of Costs.

D. M. Brown J.

Date: March 10, 2014

TAB 6

CITATION: Target Canada Co. (Re), 2015 ONSC 7574
COURT FILE NO.: CV-15-10832-00CL
DATE: 2015-12-11

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO

RE: **IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF TARGET CANADA CO., TARGET CANADA HEALTH CO., TARGET CANADA MOBILE GP CO., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY (BC) CORP., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY (ONTARIO) CORP., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY CORP., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY (SK) CORP. AND TARGET CANADA PROPERTY LLC.**

BEFORE: Regional Senior Justice Morawetz

COUNSEL: *J. Swartz* and *Dina Milivojevic*, for the Target Corporation

Jeremy Dacks, for the Target Canada Entities

Susan Philpott, for the Employees

Richard Swan and *S. Richard Orzy*, for Rio Can Management Inc. and KingSett Capital Inc.

Jay Carfagnini and *Alan Mark*, for Alvarez & Marsal, Monitor

Jeff Carhart, for Ginsey Industries

Lauren Epstein, for the Trustee of the Employee Trust

Lou Brzezinski and Alexandra Teodescu, for Nintendo of Canada Limited, Universal Studios, Thyssenkrupp Elevator (Canada) Limited, United Cleaning Services, RPJ Consulting Inc., Blue Vista, Farmer Brothers, East End Project, Trans Source, E One Entertainment, Foxy Originals

Linda Galessiere, for Various Landlords

ENDORSEMENT

[1] Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc., in its capacity as Monitor of the Applicants (the "Monitor") seeks approval of Monitor's Reports 3-18, together with the Monitor's activities set out in each of those Reports.

[2] Such a request is not unusual. A practice has developed in proceedings under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA") whereby the Monitor will routinely bring a

motion for such approval. In most cases, there is no opposition to such requests, and the relief is routinely granted.

[3] Such is not the case in this matter.

[4] The requested relief is opposed by Rio Can Management Inc. ("Rio Can") and KingSett Capital Inc. ("KingSett"), two landlords of the Applicants (the "Target Canada Estates"). The position of these landlords was supported by Mr. Brzezinski on behalf of his client group and as agent for Mr. Solmon, who acts for ISSI Inc., as well as Ms. Galessiere, acting on behalf of another group of landlords.

[5] The essence of the opposition is that the request of the Monitor to obtain approval of its activities – particularly in these liquidation proceedings – is both premature and unnecessary and that providing such approval, in the absence of full and complete disclosure of all of the underlying facts, would be unfair to the creditors, especially if doing so might in future be asserted and relied upon by the Applicants, or any other party, seeking to limit or prejudice the rights of creditors or any steps they may wish to take.

[6] Further, the objecting parties submit that the requested relief is unnecessary, as the Monitor has the full protections provided to it in the Initial Order and subsequent orders, and under the CCAA.

[7] Alternatively, the objecting parties submit that if such approval is to be granted, it should be specifically limited by the following words:

> "provided, however, that only the Monitor, in its personal capacity and only with respect to its own personal liability, shall be entitled to rely upon or utilize in any way such approval."

[8] The CCAA mandates the appointment of a monitor to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company (section 11.7).

[9] The duties and functions of the monitor are set forth in Section 23(1). Section 23(2) provides a degree of protection to the monitor. The section reads as follows:

> (2) Monitor not liable – if the monitor acts in good faith and takes reasonable care in preparing the report referred to in any of paragraphs (1)(b) to (d.1), the monitor is not liable for loss or damage to any person resulting from that person's reliance on the report.

[10] Paragraphs 1(b) to (d.1) primarily relate to review and reporting issues on specific business and financial affairs of the debtor.

[11] In addition, paragraph 51 of the Amended and Restated Order provides that:

> … in addition to the rights, and protections afforded the Monitor under the CCAA or as an officer of the 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, including for great certainty in the Monitor's capacity as Administrator of the Employee Trust, save and except for any gross negligence or wilful misconduct on its part.

[12] The Monitor sets out a number of reasons why it believes that the requested relief is appropriate in these circumstances. Such approval

(a) allows the monitor and stakeholders to move forward confidently with the next step in the proceeding by fostering the orderly building-block nature of CCAA proceedings;

(b) brings the monitor's activities in issue before the court, allowing an opportunity for the concerns of the court or stakeholders to be addressed, and any problems to be rectified in a timely way;

(c) provides certainty and finality to processes in the CCAA proceedings and activities undertaken (eg., asset sales), all parties having been given an opportunity to raise specific objections and concerns;

(d) enables the court, tasked with supervising the CCAA process, to satisfy itself that the monitor's court-mandated activities have been conducted in a prudent and diligent manner;

(e) provides protection for the monitor, not otherwise provided by the CCAA; and

(f) protects creditors from the delay in distribution that would be caused by:

a. re-litigation of steps taken to date; and

b. potential indemnity claims by the monitor.

[13] Counsel to the Monitor also submits that the doctrine of issue estoppel applies (as do related doctrines of collateral attack and abuse of process) in respect of approval of the Monitor's activities as described in its reports. Counsel submits that given the functions that court approval serves, the availability of the doctrine (and related doctrines) is important to the CCAA process. Counsel submits that actions mandated and authorized by the court, and the activities taken by the Monitor to carry them out, are not interim measure that ought to remain open for second guessing or re-litigating down the road and there is a need for finality in a CCAA process for the benefit of all stakeholders.

[14] Prior to consideration of these arguments, it is helpful to review certain aspects of the doctrine of *res judicata* and its relationship to both issue estoppel and cause of action estoppel.

The issue was recently considered in *Forrest* v. *Vriend*, 2015 Carswell BC 2979, where Ehrcke J. stated:

> 25. "TD and Vriend point out that the doctrine of *res judicata* is not limited to issue estoppel, but includes cause of action estoppel as well. The distinction between these two related components of *res judicata* was concisely explained by Cromwell J.A., as he then was, in *Hoque* v. *Montreal Trust Co. of Canada* (1997), 162 N.S.R. (2d) 321 (C.A.) at para. 21:
>
>> 21 *Res judicata* is mainly concerned with two principles. First, there is a principle that "… prevents the contradiction of that which was determined in the previous litigation, by prohibiting the relitigation of issues already actually addressed.": see Sopinka, Lederman and Bryant, *The Law of Evidence in Canada* (1991) at p. 997. The second principle is that parties must bring forward all of the claims and defences with respect to the cause of action at issue in the first proceeding and that, if they fail to do so, they will be barred from asserting them in a subsequent action. This "… prevents fragmentation of litigation by prohibiting the litigation of matters that were never actually addressed in the previous litigation, but which properly belonged to it.": *ibid* at 998. Cause of action estoppel is usually concerned with the application of this second principle because its operation bars all of the issues properly belonging to the earlier litigation.
>
> …
>
> 30. It is salutary to keep in mind Mr. Justice Cromwell's caution against an overly broad application of cause of action estoppel. In *Hoque* at paras. 25, 30 and 37, he wrote:
>
>> 25. The appellants submit, relying on these and similar statements, that cause of action estoppel is broad in scope and inflexible in application. With respect, I think this overstates the true position. In my view, this very broad language which suggests an inflexible application of cause of action estoppel to all matters that "could" have been raised does not fully reflect the present law.
>>
>> ….
>>
>> 30. The submission that all claims that <u>could</u> have been dealt with in the main action are barred is not borne out by the Canadian cases. With respect to matter not actually raised and decided, the

> test appears to me to be that the party should have raised the matter and, in deciding whether the party should have done so, a number of factors are considered.
>
> …
>
> 37. Although many of these authorities cite with approval the broad language of *Henderson* v. *Henderson, supra*, to the effect that any matter which the parties had the opportunity to raise will be barred, I think, however, that this language is somewhat too wide. The better principle is that those issues which the parties had the opportunity to raise and, in all the circumstances, should have raised, will be barred. In determining whether the matter should have been raised, a court will consider whether proceeding constitutes a collateral attack on the earlier findings, whether it simply assets a new legal conception of facts previously litigated, whether it relies on "new" evidence that could have been discovered in the earlier proceeding with reasonable diligence, whether the two proceedings relate to separate and distinct causes of action and whether, in all the circumstances, the second proceeding constitutes an abuse of process.

[15] In this case, I accept the submission of counsel to the Monitor to the effect that the Monitor plays an integral part in balancing and protecting the various interests in the CCAA environment.

[16] Further, in this particular case, the court has specifically mandated the Monitor to undertake a number of activities, including in connection with the sale of the debtors assets. The Monitor has also, in its various Reports, provided helpful commentary to the court and to Stakeholders on the progress of the CCAA proceedings.

[17] Turning to the issue as to whether these Reports should be approved, it is important to consider how Monitor's Reports are in fact relied upon and used by the court in arriving at certain determinations.

[18] For example, if the issue before the court is to approve a sales process or to approve a sale of assets, certain findings of fact must be made before making a determination that the sale process or the sale of assets should be approved. Evidence is generally provided by way of affidavit from a representative of the applicant and supported by commentary from the monitor in its report. The approval issue is put squarely before the court and the court must, among other things conclude that the sales process or the sale of assets is, among other things, fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

[19] On motions of the type, where the evidence is considered and findings of fact are made, the resulting decision affects the rights of all stakeholders. This is recognized in the jurisprudence with the acknowledgment that res judicata and related doctrines apply to approval

of a Monitor's report in these circumstances. (See: *Toronto Dominion Bank v. Preston Spring Gardens Inc.*, [2006] O.J. No. 1834 (SCJ Comm. List); *Toronto Dominion Bank v. Preston Spring Gardens Inc.*, 2007 ONCA 145 and *Bank of America Canada v. Willann Investments Limited*, [1993] O.J. No. 3039 (SCJ Gen. Div.)).

[20] The foregoing must be contrasted with the current scenario, where the Monitor seeks a general approval of its Reports. The Monitor has in its various reports provided commentary, some based on its own observations and work product and some based on information provided to it by the Applicant or other stakeholders. Certain aspects of the information provided by the Monitor has not been scrutinized or challenged in any formal sense. In addition, for the most part, no fact-finding process has been undertaken by the court.

[21] In circumstances where the Monitor is requesting approval of its reports and activities in a general sense, it seems to me that caution should be exercised so as to avoid a broad application of res judicata and related doctrines. The benefit of any such approval of the Monitor's reports and its activities should be limited to the Monitor itself. To the extent that approvals are provided, the effect of such approvals should not extend to the Applicant or other third parties.

[22] I recognized there are good policy and practical reasons for the court to approve of Monitor's activities and providing a level of protection for Monitors during the CCAA process. These reasons are set out in paragraph [12] above. However, in my view, the protection should be limited to the Monitor in the manner suggested by counsel to Rio Can and KingSett.

[23] By proceeding in this manner, Court approval serves the purposes set out by the Monitor above. Specifically, Court approval:

(a) allows the Monitor to move forward with the next steps in the CCAA proceedings;

(b) brings the Monitor's activities before the Court;

(c) allows an opportunity for the concerns of the stakeholders to be addressed, and any problems to be rectified,

(d) enables the Court to satisfy itself that the Monitor's activities have been conducted in prudent and diligent manners;

(e) provides protection for the Monitor not otherwise provided by the CCAA; and

(f) protects the creditors from the delay and distribution that would be caused by:

(i) re-litigation of steps taken to date, and

(ii) potential indemnity claims by the Monitor.

[24] By limiting the effect of the approval, the concerns of the objecting parties are addressed as the approval of Monitor's activities do not constitute approval of the activities of parties other than the Monitor.

[25] Further, limiting the effect of the approval does not impact on prior court orders which have approved other aspects of these CCAA proceedings, including the sales process and asset sales.

[26] The Monitor's Reports 3-18 are approved, but the approval the limited by the inclusion of the wording provided by counsel to Rio Can and KingSett, referenced at paragraph [7].

Regional Senior Justice G.B. Morawetz

Date: December 11, 2015

TAB 7

Date: 20090619
Docket: CI 08-01-56696
(Winnipeg Centre)
Indexed as: Winnipeg Motor Express Inc. et al.
Cited as: 2009 MBQB 204

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF MANITOBA

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF WINNIPEG MOTOR EXPRESS INC., 4975813 MANITOBA LTD. and 5273634 MANITOBA LTD. ("the applicants")

Counsel:

DAVID R. M. JACKSON
for Ernst & Young Inc. (the "monitor")

G. BRUCE TAYLOR and JENNIFER J. BURNELL
for Winnipeg Motor Express ("WME")

HARVEY G. CHAITON
for Heller Financial Canada Holding Company ("Heller") and GE Canada Leasing Services Company ("GE")

DONALD G. DOUGLAS
for Paccar Financial Services Ltd. ("Paccar")

DOUGLAS G. WARD, Q.C.
for Alterinvest Fund L.P. (BDC)

ROBERT A. DEWAR, Q.C.
for Ramwinn Diesel, Inc. ("Ramwinn")

WILLIAM G. HAIGHT
for Key Equipment Finance Canada Ltd.

)	E. PETER AUVINEN for CIT Financial Ltd., Wells Fargo Equipment Finance Company, Capital Underwriters Inc. and Stoughton Trailers Canada Corp. ("Stoughton")
)	DONALD R. KNIGHT, Q.C. for Maxim Transportation Services Inc. ("Maxim")
)	Oral Reasons for Judgment Delivered: June 19, 2009

SUCHE J.

[1] The issue before me today is the appropriate distribution of the DIP loan and administrative charges (collectively referred to as the "Court Ordered Charges") incurred since May 15, 2008, when I granted a stay of proceedings pursuant to s. 11 of the ***CCAA***. The DIP loan represents working capital advanced to WME by Heller during the restructuring period; the administrative charges consist of the monitor's fees, its legal fees, WME's legal fees, and director's charges. The amount of these fees is not in issue and both have been paid by Heller out of receivables collected from WME's operations and sale of assets. Thus, the effect of this order will be to require other parties to reimburse Heller for some portion of the $1.8525 million in issue.

[2] The monitor, in its twelfth report dated February 12, 2009, recommends that the Court Ordered Charges be allocated among the secured creditors based on pro rata recovery, using actual or estimated recovery. Total recovery for any creditor includes its direct recovery plus allocated sale proceeds, plus any lease

payments recovered, less direct costs, which includes expenditures for such things as repairs or reconditioning.

[3] In the result, certain secured creditors will be excluded, namely:

(i) Daimler Chrysler Financial Services, as I ruled its equipment was not subject to the stay, or the Court Ordered Charges;

(ii) three secured creditors, Richard Sobey, Frontier Capital Partners, and Shaw Satellite Services, whose security is subordinate to BDC, which itself only recovered a minimal amount of WME's outstanding indebtedness.

[4] In addition, several office or non-fleet equipment lessors have been excluded on the basis of administrative efficiency because of the very small amount of their respective recoveries.

[5] In making its recommendations, the monitor indicates it relied on the following principles:

(i) all secured creditors should contribute to the cost of restructuring;

(ii) a strict accounting on a cost benefit basis is impractical and not necessary or desirable for allocation purposes;

(iii) security arrangements and priorities should not be readjusted as part of this process;

(iv) the proportion each creditor should be allocated need not be equal; and

(v) the allocation should be equitable, rather than equal.

[6] The monitor also recommends that no DIP charge should be allocated to any equipment parked and available for pickup at the date of filing, or for units that have not yet been returned to a lessor/lender.

THE PARTIES AND THEIR POSITIONS

Heller

[7] Heller provided a demand operating loan to WME margined against 85% of eligible accounts receivable. At the time of the stay, this loan was at $5,643,297, which was secured by accounts receivable of $5,868,630. During the restructuring, Heller continued to allow the operating loan to revolve. It advanced approximately $8,750,000 (Cdn.) and $2,800,000 (U.S.) under the operating loan to pay WME's ongoing business expenses. The pay down of the loan was as a result of a combination of the sale of assets and collection of receivables. In the end, Heller is projected to suffer a loss of approximately $55,000. It makes the point that it would likely have avoided this had its collateral not been used to make lease payments of approximately $394,000 to financing lessors.

[8] Heller supports the monitor's recommendation.

GE

[9] GE leased 44 tractors and 204 trailers to WME under financing leases. Despite my order of July 3, 2008 requiring WME to pay equipment lessors as of August 1, 2008, GE did not seek payment under any of its leases. Ultimately,

GE's equipment was included in the purchase by Newco, although as part of that transaction, GE wrote off approximately $250,000 in principal and unpaid interest and renegotiated its leases at an interest rate of 9.25%.

[10] In calculating GE's net recovery, the monitor used the average between the liquidation value of its equipment and the present value of the leases assumed, discounted at the rate of 9.25%. It was argued by several creditors that this discount is commercially unreasonable, and seriously understates the value of GE's recovery.

[11] GE supports the monitor's proposed allocation.

Paccar

[12] as at the date of filing, Paccar leased 83 tractors and 19 trailers to WME, pursuant to financing leases. As a result of my order of July 3, 2008, Paccar received $279,855 in lease payments between August 1 and the date on which its equipment was returned. Although Newco was amenable to including Paccar's equipment in its purchase, Paccar was not agreeable to this. Accordingly, all its equipment (save one or two units which could not be recovered) was returned.

[13] Paccar disputes the monitor's proposed allocation, arguing that GE and Heller have received the lion's share of the benefit from these proceedings and have suffered virtually no loss. It further maintains that it has been unduly prejudiced, as have all equipment lessors, by virtue of the fact that its security has been used to the benefit of WME (and the other secured creditors,

particularly Heller) during the restructuring. In contrast, Paccar's security has suffered significant deterioration.

[14] Paccar maintains that the appropriate methodology would be to recognize the net losses suffered. It points out that its loss from its dealings with WME is approximately $2.7 million, compared to Heller's loss of $55,000, on virtually the same level of debt owed. It maintains that GE should be considered to have effected 100% recovery, given that Newco has assumed the leases for its equipment.

[15] It also maintains that the benefit of an orderly return by WME was not all that significant, given that Paccar is in the business of supplying transport equipment, and is experienced in recovering vehicles in such situations.

CIT Financial Ltd., Wells Fargo Equipment Finance Company, Capital Underwriters Inc. and Stoughton

[16] These four equipment lessors collectively had 115 trailers under lease to WME at the time of filing. Stoughton maintains that its lease is not a financing lease.

[17] Collectively they argue that the monitor's methodology is not appropriate as it does not adequately reflect the relative benefit derived from the proceedings by different secured creditors. They, too, argue that Heller and GE have essentially been paid in full, which stands in contrast to their situation, each of them having incurred substantial losses. They also did not have the opportunity to have their equipment included in the Newco purchase.

[18] These creditors ask that I allocate specific expenses to the secured creditors who they say benefitted from various expenses, which they did not.

[19] When considering the issue of recovery, they say the only benefit they received from the restructuring was the orderly return of equipment. However, they maintain that several of their units should not be included in the calculation as these were recovered through their efforts, with no help from WME. They also argue that they were well equipped to pick up all units and would have happily done so.

Ramwinn

[20] Ramwinn provided mechanical services to WME. At the time of the stay, it had some vehicles in its possession and, thus, possessory lienholder rights. It also had lien claims against a significant number of other vehicles. An arrangement was made among the various equipment lessors to whom equipment was to be returned, to pay Ramwinn for the work performed in order to secure release of the equipment. Ramwinn was also granted leave to commence certain actions where the limitation dates were approaching during the restructuring period. It also recovered $4,738.12 out of the proceeds of sale of WME's redundant assets.

[21] Ramwinn argues that the money it received from the equipment lessors should not be included in its net recovery, as it was recovered from third parties, not WME. It also points out that Ramwinn's garagekeeper security was of a different kind than the other secured creditors and gave it priority ahead of all

other creditors. Thus, to include its recovery in the allocation, effectively amounts to altering the security arrangements between WME and its creditors, which is something that should not be done.

[22] Finally, Ramwinn has a claim against WME in the amount of $18,679 for an account incurred subsequent to the stay. The monitor disputes liability on the part of WME and asserts the account payable by Newco. This dispute has yet to be resolved. Ramwinn seeks payment of this account, or, at least an order requiring that this amount ought to be set aside by Heller pending the determination of the matter.

Maxim

[23] Maxim provided 15 trailers to WME under a lease which it maintains is an operating lease. It was paid its lease payments of $5,985 per month during the restructuring period, and its leases have been assumed by Newco. It says its registration in the Personal Property Registry is for purposes of giving notice that WME is in possession of its equipment, and is not a registration of a security interest.

BDC

[24] BDC was owed approximately $2.5 million plus interest as at the date of the stay. It holds security over all of WME's assets. In general terms, it was subordinate only to Heller on accounts receivable but had a first charge on all other assets. It recovered $78,998.79 plus interest from the redundant asset

sale and will recover $260,000 plus interest from the proceeds of the sale to Newco. BDC supports the monitor's methodology and its recommendation, although it argues that the application was premature given that there may be statutory creditors such as Worker's Compensation who might be entitled to be paid their claims in priority to the secured creditors who are being asked to contribute to the Court Ordered Charges. Since the date of the hearing, I have made an order of bankruptcy against WME.

[25] I turn, then, to the legal issues raised on this motion.

TRUE VERSUS FINANCING LEASES

[26] Both Stoughton and Maxim claim to be "true" lessors. The significance of this issue is twofold; s. 11.3(a) of the ***CCAA*** provides that an owner of property is entitled to require payment for its use during the restructuring. In addition, of course, the recommendation of the monitor is that only the secured lenders be included in the allocation of the Court Ordered Charges.

[27] Section 11.3(a) was added to the ***CCAA*** in 1997, apparently to clarify, or address, the point made by the British Columbia Court of Appeal in ***Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.*** (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 105, [1990] B.C.J. No. 2497 (QL), namely, that a stay under s. 11, presumably would never be used to enforce the continuous supply of goods or services without payment for current deliveries. The amendment, of course, makes good sense and also brings the ***CCAA*** into line with the ***Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act***, R.S.C.

1985, c. B-3, as amended (the "***BIA***"), which has a similar provision concerning proposals.

[28] The leading authority on the proper interpretation of s. 11.3(a) is ***Smith Brothers Contracting Ltd., Re*** (1998), 53 B.C.L.R. (3d) 264, [1998] B.C.J. No. 728 (QL) (B.C.S.C.). There, Bauman J. relied on jurisprudence arising out of personal property security legislation as a starting point in the determination of the circumstances which would bring a party within s. 11.3(a). The distinction between a true lease – that is, a contract of bailment also known as an operating lease – and a financing, or capital lease, is critical, in a variety of situations. Where a supplier of equipment retains ownership solely for the purposes of enforcing the obligations of the debtor/lessee until payment in full has been made, a security interest is created, and ownership is lost.

[29] It is worth observing that the precise legal nature of an agreement in these situations has considerable commercial significance, and seems to have generated something of an ongoing legal struggle. Purveyors of equipment, ever concerned with the legitimate business goal of minimizing risk, try to appear as owners engaging in acts of bailment, thus minimizing the risk of the failure of a debtor/lessee's business, while at the same time passing off the risks of the equipment; that is, loss, damage and defects.

[30] At the same time, it is also true that the world of commercial arrangements is increasingly diverse, complex and focused on cost recovery, so

it is very difficult to generalize about how any particular type of relationship will be structured.

[31] All of this is to say that, with the benefit of sophisticated legal advice and astute business judgment, the true nature of arrangements involving the supply of equipment can be very difficult to peg.

[32] In ***Smith Brothers***, Bauman J. concluded that s. 11.3(a) should be narrowly construed, given that it is an exception to a s. 11 stay, which in turn is of a remedial nature, and to be interpreted broadly and in a manner which supports the objectives of the ***CCAA***. He says:

> 56 What I take from all of this is that by preserving a limited remedy for lessors, that is, "payment for use", in a field of commercial transactions which, as I have shown with these leases, encompasses a variety of arrangements with much broader remedies on default, s. 11.3(a) can be interpreted as restricting itself to the type of arrangement which is characterized by the narrower bargain. More simply: this analysis suggests that s. 11.3(a) does not cover all leases. Rather, it covers traditional true leases where the essential bargain is payment for use.

[33] And further, at para. 61:

> 61 It is only payments for the use of leased property that are excepted from a s. 11 stay order under s. 11.3(a). Payments for use *and* equity are not. Similarly payments for use *and* equity *and* an option to purchase are not. This is another reason to conclude the s. 11.3(a) is not inclusive of all forms of lease.

[34] ***Smith Brothers*** has been widely accepted and applied by courts across the country. The exclusion of financing leases makes perfect sense, of course, based on the notion of ownership: if the financing lessor has given away ownership, it cannot seek the benefits of ownership. Similarly, the narrow

construction of s. 11.3 limiting it to payments for use of equipment only, is consistent with the idea that a supplier could not be expected to continue to provide its product without payment. All this being so, the result has some unintended consequences, which I address later on in these reasons.

[35] I turn, then, to the two creditors in this case, Maxim and Stoughton. I have no hesitation in concluding that the agreement between Maxim and WME is a "true" lease. The essential bargain is payment for use of Maxim's property.

[36] I say this because a review of Maxim's obligations reveal that it undertakes all the risks associated with ownership of the equipment – it is responsible for providing all parts and supplies, carrying out maintenance and repairs, providing road service for vehicles which suffer mechanical breakdown, supplies substitute vehicles to WME if there has been mechanical failure, and provides and pays for all licencing and taxes. The option to purchase is truly an option, and the purchase price is determined by a formula, which seeks to determine the true market value of the vehicle at the time the option is exercised.

[37] It was argued that the "Elective Termination" provision, which allows Maxim to require WME to purchase the equipment in accordance with the Option if a default has not been cured within seven days, changes the nature of the arrangement. I disagree. While on its face it may be an unusual remedy and probably has more bark than bite, it seems that Maxim is letting WME know that it may take tardiness very seriously.

[38] The Maxim agreement does not, in my view, create a security interest. In this regard, I prefer the analysis on ***Western Express Air Lines Inc., Re***, 2005 BCSC 53, (2005), 10 C.B.R. (5th) 154, over that in ***Paccar of Canada Ltd. v. Peterbilt of Ontario Inc.***, (2005), 18 C.B.R. (5th) 125 (Ont. Superior Court of Justice).

[39] The agreement between Stoughton and WME is a different matter. When Stoughton's agreement is viewed as a whole, I conclude that it is either a financing lease or sufficiently akin to one to fall outside the scope of s. 11.3(a). In particular, the agreement provides that WME bears the entire risk of loss from any cause and is required to make payments to Stoughton regardless of loss, or any claim against the manufacturer of the equipment. The warranties by the manufacturers are excluded. All registration, licence fees and taxes are paid by WME, as is any and all maintenance and repair costs.

[40] The lease also requires that the vehicle be returned to Stoughton in a condition that would require significant expenditure. This, combined with an option to purchase the vehicle for a stated amount, which appears to be the difference between the initial value of the equipment less payments made over the term of the lease, suggest to me that the parties intended that WME purchase the vehicle, and ownership was retained solely for the purpose of enforcing WME's obligation.

THE LAW

[41] I turn, then, to the question of principles of allocation of Court Ordered Charges under the ***CCAA***. This is a matter of discretion for the court. Each case must be judged on its facts, but fundamentally any allocation must be fair and equitable. This does not mean equal, however, as observed by the court in ***Hunters Trailer & Marine Ltd., Re***, 2001 ABQB 1094, (2001), 305 A.R. 175. While it is unfair to ignore the degree of potential benefit that each creditor might derive, it is also accepted that any means of calculating a precise percentage will be arbitrary. The nature of proceedings under the ***CCAA*** make a strict accounting on a cost benefit basis impractical and ultimately defeating. It is also accepted that the concept of potential benefit versus direct benefit be utilized, otherwise the process would dissolve into a cost benefit analysis.

[42] In ***Re Hickman Equipment (1985) Ltd. (In Receivership)***, 2004 NLSCTD 164, at para. 17, Hall J. set out the principles to be applied in allocating restructuring costs, as follows:

> (1) The allocation of costs ought to be fair and evenhanded amongst all creditors upon an objective basis of allocation;
>
> (2) The fairest basis of allocation would be a uniform percentage of the sale price received for the asset over which the paying creditor had a realizable security interest;
>
> (3) There must be a recognition that the Cost Allocation Plan acknowledges that costs are not limited to the cost of realization alone but relates to all receivership costs whether direct sales cost or indirect cost;
>
> (4) Exceptions to a uniform application of cost to creditors ought not to be lightly granted. Nonetheless it must be recognized that

certain activities of the Receiver in managing the affairs of the receivership may have been less intensive or less advantageous with respect to certain groups of assets as opposed to other groups of assets and that the extent of this intensity or disadvantage may not be immediately or easily determinable. To require the Receiver to calculate and determine an absolutely fair value for its services for one group of assets vis-a-vis another would likely not be cost effective, would drive up the overall receivership cost and would likely be a fool's errand in any event;

(5) Exceptions to the rule of uniform cost allocation should only be made where the requirement for such variation is reasonably articulable.

[43] I also agree with the decision in ***Sulphur Corp. of Canada Ltd. (Re)***, 2002 ABQB 682, (2002), 5 Alta. L.R. (4th) 251, where LoVecchio J. concluded that the court has jurisdiction to grant a charge for debtor in possession financing which ranks in priority to provincial statutory liens, in that case a builder's lien.

ANALYSIS AND DECISION

[44] I begin with the observation that the s. 11 stay in this case has accomplished exactly what the ***CCAA*** intends that it do – it allowed a company in desperate financial circumstances the opportunity to restructure so that part of its business which was viable could carry on.

[45] Having said that, good news under the ***CCAA*** is a relative thing. Substantial financial carnage occurred along the way, not just to the secured creditors, almost all of whom have recovered at least something, but more so to a long list of unsecured creditors as well as the investors. The overriding theme of the individual submissions before me was that each of the parties would have

been in a much better position had they been able to simply realize on their security. That may or may not have been so, but of course the point of the ***CCAA*** is that the collective good and the benefit to all stakeholders governs.

[46] The starting point, then, on this motion is the recommendation of the monitor to allocate the Court Ordered Charges among the secured creditors on the basis of a pro rata share using total recovery. This method, in effect, amounts to requiring the secured creditors to pay a fee to collect its outstanding receivables. This certainly is not a novel concept in debt collection.

[47] In my view, the methodology proposed by the monitor on its face is fair. It has an objective basis and is being applied uniformly. Utilizing an "outstanding indebtedness approach", which has been applied in other cases, would not be better as it ends up favouring Heller substantially at the expense of most of the secured creditors.

[48] I agree with the view expressed in ***Hunjan International Inc., Re*** (2006), 21 C.B.R. (5th) 276 (Ont. Superior Court of Justice), that where the allocation is *prima facie* fair, the onus is on an objecting creditor to demonstrate that the proposal is unfair or prejudicial. The monitor, after all, is both court appointed and is intimately familiar with the details of the restructuring, including the particular costs incurred and what has transpired within the company's business operations during the restructuring period.

[49] So, then, is there a basis to deviate from the proposal? As noted earlier, while exceptions to a uniform application of costs should not be lightly granted,

and the basis for any exception must be reasonably articulable, the court can take into account the different nature of the security held by various creditors, and the potential benefit to them when deciding if the allocation is fair and equitable. This was the focus of much of the argument raised by the secured creditors here.

[50] As I said, for the most part, each minimized the benefit or potential benefit to them of the restructuring process, and pointed to how certain expenditures or actions taken were detrimental to their interests.

[51] My conclusion is that all the secured creditors who the monitor suggests should participate in the allocation received real and meaningful benefit as a result of these proceedings. Heller's success in collecting receivables was increased and made less costly than had the company been placed in receivership. The equipment lessors' effort, cost, delay, and risk in recovering their equipment from various locations across North America was considerably reduced by virtue of WME's organized return of equipment to its yard or other agreed upon locations. Ramwinn's effort, cost and delay in having its accounts paid was substantially less than had it been required to engage in collecting from the equipment lessors, institute court proceedings, and potentially undergo the process of realizing on equipment in its possession. Those creditors, including Heller, BDC and Ramwinn, who shared in the proceeds from the sale of redundant assets or the purchase by Newco, also received real and meaningful

benefit from the efforts of WME and the monitor in conducting the sale and the purchase by Newco would not have happened without the restructuring.

[52] Who benefitted more? If a meaningful answer could be given to that question, it would require a careful accounting and cost benefit analysis of each party's circumstance. This is exactly what courts repeatedly have said should not be done. It is economically self-defeating and the cost and the time involved in finding such an answer would only serve to benefit the professionals hired to assist in the process. It is antithetical to objectives of the ***CCAA***.

[53] I am also of the view that the relative loss – the issue raised by Paccar – results more from the nature of the security and the specific business decisions made by the parties. Heller, and Ramwinn, for example, experienced very small relative losses; BDC's and Alterinvest's loss was considerable. The difference in their respective security is substantial. To make adjustments as Paccar requests would, in my view, amount to readjusting priorities among creditors.

[54] At the same time, I do not accept Ramwinn's argument that requiring it to pay the allocation recommended by the monitor is also a violation of this principle. The allocation proposed is not at all disproportionate, in my view, to the benefit accrued to Ramwinn.

[55] I also conclude that there is no basis on which I can or should direct that the funds be held to pay for the outstanding claim Ramwinn advances against WME.

[56] As to equipment obtained directly by lessors, I am of the view that regardless of how lessors recovered equipment, any equipment recovered post stay should be included in the allocation as suggested by the monitor. Self-help is not to be condoned, and a potential benefit not realized due to a creditor's actions, should not be discounted in this analysis, as to do so falls into a detailed cost benefit analysis.

[57] There is one adjustment, however, that I do feel is in order. A discount rate of 9.25% on the present value of GE's leases was used by the monitor. I am not persuaded that this is justifiable. I accept what I take to be the monitor's secondary position of 6% as being reasonable.

EQUIPMENT LEASES

[58] Much attention was paid during these proceedings to the situation of equipment lessors who hold financing leases. Paccar, in particular, but also others, advocated forcefully that they were unduly prejudiced by the stay. They maintain that not only are they not being paid while their assets are being used to the benefit of the other stakeholders, but their underlying security is being rapidly and substantially deteriorated in the process. This, they say, violates one of the fundamental objectives of preventing one creditor from obtaining an advantage over other creditors during the stay period.

[59] It strikes me that the fact that true lessors are entitled to be paid further aggravates this problem in circumstances such as WME's where it has a variety of arrangements with equipment suppliers, including some true leases. It is

clearly in a debtor company's economic interests to use financed rather than leased equipment during restructuring. This is what seems to have occurred here (although I make no criticism of WME for doing so).

[60] It is difficult to know how this situation can be remedied, given that the whole point of the ***CCAA*** is to relieve a company of ongoing financial burden to allow it the opportunity to restructure. In this case, for example, WME would not have succeeded had been obliged to pay for its equipment during the entirety of the restructuring.

[61] On the particular facts of this case, this issue became somewhat easier to address given the nature of WME's business. Equipment to a transportation company is akin to raw goods to a manufacturer, and I was of the opinion that if WME was going to be viable, at a certain point it would have to demonstrate it could pay for the essential means of production. Otherwise, there would be no purpose to continue the stay. Accordingly, I ordered that financing leases would be paid as of August 1, 2008.

[62] I say all this not to justify or revisit the basis for my earlier decision, but to get to the point that in considering what is equitable, undue prejudice is a reason to adjust what would otherwise be a uniform approach. I am satisfied that equipment lessors in a business operation such as WME's do suffer undue prejudice. In this case, however, the equipment lessors were paid as of August 1. Being financing leases, those payments were not just for use, but included some amount on account of equity. I conclude, then, that the undue prejudice

suffered has been recognized, albeit not totally, perfectly or precisely, but, in my view, in an amount sufficient amount to justify the uniform application of the methodology proposed by the monitor.

[63] The last issue is one that perhaps is more controversial. Maxim, the only true lessor, has, in my view, derived the same benefit as the financing lessors from these proceedings. Its trailers were part of WME's network which stretched across North America. As a result of WME's continued operations, its equipment was gathered in and ultimately it was able to assign its leases to Newco without any interruption. While s. 11.3(a) specifically allows for payments for use of equipment despite the stay, I do not see that there is any statutory prohibition against requiring a contribution to the Court Ordered Charges against such a party. Taking a broad and purposive approach to the ***CCAA***, which I am obliged at law to do in determining an equitable distribution of the costs of the restructuring, I conclude that Maxim should share in these charges on some basis.

[64] I do this, recognizing that the only authority on point that was provided to me, ***Western Express Air Lines***, came to a different conclusion. However, I note that there, Brenner C.J.S.C. specifically found that:

> 20 ... If costs are to be allocated in the basis of the benefit to be derived from a successful restructuring, then the lessors should arguably pay nothing. As ordinary creditors for the outstanding lease payments they will likely receive nothing. ...

. . .

> 22 Accordingly under the general equitable principles of the *CCAA* I see no basis for requiring the aircraft lessors to bear a portion of the Existing Charges.

[65] Here, I have found the situation to be otherwise. There was a real and meaningful benefit to Maxim.

[66] However, just as GE's assumed lease was discounted for the risk of non-performance by Newco, so, too, should Maxim's. Subject to hearing further submissions on the matter, the amount of Maxim's total recovery should be discounted by the same discount rate, namely, 6%.

CONCLUSION

[67] At the outset of the hearing before me, several disputes remained which concerned the value of various creditors' total recovery.

[68] I understand that through a combination of information provided during the hearing and the findings I have made this afternoon, these have all been resolved.

[69] I trust that these reasons will allow the monitor to calculate the precise allocation among the parties. However, I recognize that it may be that some aspect of my reasons require either clarification or some addition. Should that be the case, I invite the parties to let me know.

_______________________________ J.

TAB 8

2019 ANNREVINSOLV 14

Annual Review of Insolvency Law
Editor: Janis P. Sarra

14 — In Search of a Purpose: The Rise of Super Monitors & Creditor-Driven CCAAs

In Search of a Purpose: The Rise of Super Monitors & Creditor-Driven *CCAA*s

Luc Morin and Arad Mojtahedi [*]

I. — INTRODUCTION

> *"A Jedi uses the Force for knowledge and defence, never for attack."*
>
> *- Master Yoda - The Empire Strikes Back*

The title of this article was not intended to echo the upcoming final chapter of the most recent Star Wars trilogy. In fact, we came up with the title before *The Rise of Skywalker* was announced. But for some reason, we could not help but to think that this was a sign from the force. After all, the very nature of the ethereal powers of a monitor appointed under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* [1] (*CCAA* or the "Act"), were akin to those bestowed upon any Jedi knight: guardian of the peace guided by selfless morality.

Monitor's powers have been described as being supervisory in nature and its role as being those of a fiduciary towards all stakeholders of an insolvent corporation. A *CCAA* monitor is not the agent of any particular category of stakeholders, let alone a secured creditor. It serves to be the eyes and ears of the court, to monitor the restructuring process of the insolvent corporation and account for all major operations and sometimes missteps, as the case may be, and report same to the court and the overall body of stakeholders. It must maintain an over the crowd attitude aimed at ensuring that the restructuring process is being conducted in accordance with the canonical code of conduct set forth in the *CCAA*, at the behest of a variety of stakeholders.

The roots of the monastic role of the monitor stem from the importance of the ultimate objective of the *CCAA*, which is to favour the restructuring of a struggling business and limit the terrible consequences of a corporate insolvency on its stakeholders. The *CCAA* does not provide for a scheme of distribution, which is the case under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* [2] (*BIA*). It seems that failure to restructure was never an option contemplated under the *CCAA*'s purview, the legislator leaving this to be dealt with by the *BIA*.

The *CCAA* was historically aimed at *facilitating* a compromise between creditors and an insolvent corporation. *CCAA*'s historical objective is in the very title of the Act. That said, not all insolvent corporations can or should be saved, and to the extent that efforts are made to restructure their business, courts have justifiably concluded that the *CCAA*'s objective would not be thwarted by facilitating the liquidation of the insolvent corporation's assets, property and undertakings. After all, in most cases, such a liquidation would take the form of a transfer of assets allowing for the business of the insolvent corporation to continue, albeit under a new entity or structure. Comfort could be taken in the end result that enables the restructuring of a business, even if it means that this business would have to thrive under a new master and/or a different structure.

It is in this context that one must analyze the recent trend allowing for the *CCAA* process to be initiated by secured creditors while granting extended powers to the *CCAA* monitor akin to those of a *BIA* receiver. To the extent that management of an insolvent corporation fails or neglects to address the restructuring needs of the business, courts have allowed a *CCAA* process to be initiated at the request of a secured creditor. Similarly, in the event that management is conflicted, notably with its intention to sponsor or be associated with a bid within a sale and investment solicitation process (”SISP”) conducted in the context of a *CCAA* process, courts have allowed the monitor to extend its role, to overstep the supervisory nature of its duties and play an active role in the management of the business while having direct powers over the assets, property and undertakings of an insolvent corporation.

That said, the driving factor in allowing a secured creditor to take control over a typically debtor-driven *CCAA* process and for the monitor to have extended powers is that management of the insolvent corporation is either neglecting/failing to abide by its fiduciary duties or that management was simply not in a position to exercise same in an objective manner. It must be demonstrated that management is acting, be it actively or passively, in a manner that is detrimental not only to the secured creditors' interest but also to all other stakeholders of the corporation, and that the extended powers granted to the monitor at the request of the secured creditor is for the purpose of restructuring the business of the insolvent corporation.

This raises a number of questions. What if the secured creditor has simply lost confidence in the management and wants to appoint a professional to overview an orderly liquidation of the corporation's business, assets, property and undertakings? Can it rely on the *CCAA* to initiate a restructuring process? Is it still management's game? What would be the difference with a *BIA* receivership? Should the monitor be considered an agent of the secured creditor?

All of these questions merit attention. First, the Supreme Court of Canada in *Lemare Lake* [3] appropriately warned insolvency practitioners that the insolvency legislation's purpose may not be set aside lightly. Second, even if from a practical standpoint, a *CCAA* monitor and a *BIA* receiver are actually the same professional, a licensed trustee, the reality is that the role and nature of the duties associated with each of these appointments have historically been very different, and to some extent plainly incompatible. The old saying of “same professional, different hat” might be too simplistic and inappropriate when it comes to separating the *BIA* receiver from the *CCAA* monitor.

This article proposes a review of case law and authorities on the competing roles of a *CCAA* monitor and a *BIA* receiver, with a special focus on the circumstances giving rise to the creditor-driven *CCAA* processes providing for extended powers being granted to a *CCAA* monitor. We argue that the *CCAA*'s historical objective is in line with limiting the monitor's powers, and only extending the same when absolutely necessary. *CCAA* monitor should remain neutral and exercise supervisory powers over the restructuring process, driven by the debtor, unless evidence demonstrating that its management is failing or neglecting to exercise its fiduciary duties appropriately.

The *CCAA* is a debtor-driven process, the secured creditor-driven process being the *BIA* receivership. The line between these two processes should not be blurred by the overarching practicalities that has come to define our Canadian Insolvency practice.

May the force be with you, dear readers.

II. — HISTORICAL PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE *CCAA*: PRESERVATION OF GOING CONCERN

The *CCAA* was drafted with little consultation by the Conservative government of RB Bennett at the height of the Great Depression in 1933. [4] It was introduced via Bill 77 by Charles H Cahan, MP, who then stated that the economic circumstances of the time required the government to adopt a law that would allow for compromises between a debtor and its creditors without wholly destroying the company and forcing the wasteful sale of its assets:

> Mr. Speaker, at the present time any company in Canada, whether it be organized under the laws of the Dominion of Canada or under the laws of any of the provinces of Canada, which becomes bankrupt or insolvent is thereby brought under either the Bankruptcy Act or the Winding-up Act. **These acts provide for the liquidation of the company under a trustee in bankruptcy in the one case and under a liquidator in the other, and the almost inevitable result is that the organization of the company is entirely disrupted, its good-will depreciated and ultimately lost, and the balance of the assets sold by the trustees or the liquidator for whatever they will bring.** There is no mode or method under our laws whereby the creditors of a company may be brought

> into court and permitted by amicable agreement between themselves to arrange for a settlement or compromise of the debts of the company in such a way as to permit the company effectively to continue its business by its reorganization. [...]
>
> At the present time some legal method of making arrangements and compromises between creditors and companies is perhaps more necessary because of the prevailing commercial and industrial depression, and it was thought by the government that we should adopt some method whereby **compromises might be carried into effect under the supervision of the courts without utterly destroying the company or its organization, without loss of good-will and without forcing the improvident sale of its assets**. [5]
>
> [Emphasis added.]

In the Senate, the Right Honourable Arthur Meighen (Conservative) similarly stated that the *CCAA* allows for cooperation and compromises for the greater good, notably by preserving the interests of employees and security holders:

> Honourable senators, the purpose of this Bill is to enable companies which otherwise would be confronted with bankruptcy to arrange compromises by means of conferences among their various classes of security holders. [...] The depression has brought almost innumerable companies to the pass where some such arrangement is necessary in the interest of the company itself, in the interest of its employees -- because the bankruptcy of the company would throw the employees on the street -- and in the interest of the security holders, who may decide that it is much better to make some sacrifice than run the risk of losing all in the general debacle of bankruptcy. [...] As it is, the best result can be attained only by the passage by our legislatures of such co-operative measures as will enable civil rights, and companies within their purview, to be interfered with for the general advantage. [6]

The Act, at merely 20 provisions long and without a preamble or a clear policy statement, was barely debated in the Parliament and was quickly passed into law without objection. [7] Yet, it was soon beset by constitutional controversy, as for the very first time a federal law could bind secured creditors' rights, an area which was then believed to be within the exclusive power of the provincial legislatures. [8]

The reluctance of practitioners at the time to use the *CCAA* or the *Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act* [9] prompted the Bennett government to refer them to the Supreme Court of Canada in 1934 and 1936, respectively. [10] The Supreme Court held that both laws were *intra vires* of the Parliament of Canada. In essence, the Supreme Court ruled that pursuant to s 91(21) of the *Constitution* [11] the *CCAA* is valid so long as it concerns arrangements between an insolvent debtor and its creditors.

From 1950 onwards the *CCAA* fell out of favour, likely because amendments to the Act in 1953 restricted its use to companies issuing bonds, and by 1970 it was considered a dead letter law. It took another wave of economic recessions to revive the use of the Act in the 1980s and 1990s.

As a consequence of its ability to grant a broad and flexible authority to the supervising court to make the orders necessary to facilitate the reorganization, the *CCAA* rose to become the functional equivalent of the American Chapter 11 restructuring. That characterization has since influenced its judicial interpretation. [12] Ever since, the courts have significantly widened the scope of the Act. As noted by one author in this Review, "the legal setting for Canadian insolvency restructuring has evolved from a rather blunt instrument to one of the most sophisticated systems in the developed world." [13]

To this day, and after multiple amendments, the *CCAA* lacks an express purpose clause. Nonetheless, the courts, culminating in the Supreme Court's decision of *Century Services*, have time and again held that the Act has first and foremost a remedial purpose, geared at preserving the value of a company as a going concern:

> [15] As I will discuss at greater length below, the purpose of the *CCAA* -- Canada's first reorganization statute -- is to **permit the debtor to continue to carry on business and, where possible, avoid the social and economic**

> **costs of liquidating its assets**. Proposals to creditors under the *BIA* serve the same remedial purpose, though this is achieved through a rules-based mechanism that offers less flexibility. Where reorganization is impossible, the *BIA* may be employed to provide an orderly mechanism for the distribution of a debtor's assets to satisfy creditor claims according to predetermined priority rules.
>
> [16] Prior to the enactment of the *CCAA* in 1933, practice under existing commercial insolvency legislation tended heavily towards the liquidation of a debtor company. [...]
>
> [17] Parliament understood when adopting the *CCAA* that liquidation of an insolvent company was harmful for most of those it affected -- notably creditors and employees -- and that a workout which allowed the company to survive was optimal.
>
> [18] Early commentary and jurisprudence also endorsed the *CCAA*'s remedial objectives. It recognized that companies retain more value as going concerns while underscoring that intangible losses, such as the evaporation of the companies' goodwill, result from liquidation. Reorganization serves the public interest by facilitating the survival of companies supplying goods or services crucial to the health of the economy or saving large numbers of jobs. Insolvency could be so widely felt as to impact stakeholders other than creditors and employees. **Variants of these views resonate today, with reorganization justified in terms of rehabilitating companies that are key elements in a complex web of interdependent economic relationships in order to avoid the negative consequences of liquidation.** [14]
>
> [References omitted -- Emphasis added.]

In furthering this remedial objective, the *CCAA* provides the supervising judge with wide discretion, which must be exercised with care. As mentioned by the Supreme Court, the court must be cognizant of the interests of *all* stakeholders, which often extend beyond those of the debtor and creditors:

> [59] Judicial discretion must of course be exercised in furtherance of the *CCAA*'s purposes. The remedial purpose I referred to in the historical overview of the Act is recognized over and over again in the jurisprudence. To cite one early example:
>
> > The legislation is remedial in the purest sense in that it provides a means whereby the devastating social and economic effects of bankruptcy or creditor initiated termination of ongoing business operations can be avoided while a court-supervised attempt to reorganize the financial affairs of the debtor company is made.
>
> [60] Judicial decision-making under the *CCAA* takes many forms. A court must first of all provide the conditions under which the debtor can attempt to reorganize. [...] **In doing so, the court must often be cognizant of the various interests at stake in the reorganization, which can extend beyond those of the debtor and creditors to include employees, directors, shareholders, and even other parties doing business with the insolvent company.** [15]
>
> [References omitted -- Emphasis added.]

Courts and practitioners alike have had a natural tendency to resort to a comparative analysis between the *BIA* and the *CCAA* in trying to justify the objective, purpose and identity of each of those two major pieces of the Canadian insolvency legislation.

In the spirit of such a comparative analysis, one cannot disregard that, as opposed to the *BIA*, the *CCAA* does *not* provide for a scheme of distribution. Despite clear recommendations made by the *Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce* in this regard, leading to the 2009 amendments to the *BIA* and *CCAA*, [16] the legislator chose not to incorporate a scheme of distribution amongst different stakeholders of a company restructuring its affairs under the *CCAA*. This gives further weight to the consideration given by the legislator to the historical objective of the *CCAA*: to restructure an insolvent corporation's business by preserving the continuation of its going concern, thus avoiding, or at least narrowing the negative consequences attached to the pure liquidation of its assets, property and undertakings.

Increasingly the lines between liquidation and restructuring are blurred. [17] This pattern is further intensified by the increasing popularity of liquidating *CCAA*s.

Historically, liquidation was effected via *BIA* receiverships, bankruptcies, or a combination of both. Although such liquidation efforts could result in the continuation of the debtor's business for a time through a receiver or trustee in bankruptcy acting *in lieu* of the management, typically the liquidation conducted under the *BIA* would result in a piecemeal sale of the insolvent corporation's assets, property and undertakings. [18]

Generally speaking, for their fullest implementation, *BIA* processes are more rule-driven and require less discretion than the *CCAA*. The purpose of the *BIA* consists in bringing consistency to the administration and liquidation of bankrupt estates and, if possible, in facilitating restructuring under a proposal. [19] The *BIA* offers two alternatives to the remedial path of the proposal, a debtor-driven restructuring process similar in its objective to what the *CCAA* is:

- The Bankruptcy Regime: A pure liquidation process conducted under the helm of a trustee in bankruptcy having full control over the assets, property and undertakings of the insolvent debtor. Bankruptcy is triggered either voluntary, by a general assignment executed by the debtor's management in favour of the creditors, or forced upon by a creditor through an application for a bankruptcy order. Bankruptcy is used in order to shut down an insolvent debtor's business, liquidate its assets and distribute any proceeds to creditors in accordance with a statutory scheme of distribution. Once effective, management has no longer any powers over the assets, property and undertakings of the insolvent corporation; and

- Receivership: The other alternative made available under the *BIA* is the appointment of a receiver pursuant to section 243 of the *BIA*. The appointment of a receiver is reserved to secured creditors only, who must convince the court that it is "just and convenient" to appoint a licensed trustee to exercise control over the assets, property and undertakings of an insolvent corporation. What circumstances qualify as being "just and convenient" under section 243 of the *BIA* has been the subject of a significant body of case law and is beyond the purview of this article. For the purpose hereto, we will limit ourselves to saying that the appointment of a receiver under section 243 of the *BIA* usually requires a demonstration to the court that the main secured creditor has lost confidence in the management of the insolvent corporation and that there is a tangible risk that management is unjustifiably putting at risk the secured creditor's position.

To the extent that we accept that transferring the assets of an insolvent corporation required to continue the going concern of its business qualifies as restructuring, a *BIA* receivership may serve to effectively restructure a business, similar to what would be achieved under a liquidating *CCAA*. However, as previously mentioned, the major difference is that a *BIA* receivership is a secured creditor-driven process whereas the *CCAA* remains a debtor-driven process.

Receivership was crafted to allow for a secured creditor in specific circumstances to take over the management of an insolvent corporation through the appointment of a licensed trustee that it selects. The role and more specifically the beneficiary of the receiver's duties have yet to be defined by case law and authorities. Since the receiver is chosen/retained by the secured creditor, wherein the *BIA* does not provide for continuing reporting obligations to the court, let alone the debtor's management (as is the case under the *CCAA* regime), one could argue that the receiver appointed under section 243 of the *BIA* is acting as an agent of the secured creditor that has petitioned for its appointment. Undoubtedly, receivership is a secured creditor-driven process which cannot be initiated by the insolvent corporation.

In contrast, in a liquidating *CCAA* the insolvent corporation typically remains in possession and control of its assets, property and business. The monitor, who has continuous reporting obligations to the court and the stakeholders, exerts no specific power over the assets, property and business of the insolvent corporation. Management remains at the forefront of all restructuring efforts. A *CCAA* process is therefore a typically debtor-driven one. We will see from recent case law that courts have allowed secured creditors to resort to the *CCAA* to effectuate liquidating *CCAA*s, but always with a view to preserve the going concern operations of the business operated by the insolvent corporation.

Yet this remains the exception to the rule. Even in its liquidating form, a *CCAA* process is to be driven by the insolvent corporation's management. From recent cases, we have identified four scenarios in which courts have allowed a secured creditor to rely on the *CCAA* while extending the powers of the monitor, rather than proceeding with a receivership under section 243 of the *BIA*:

- **Resignation of the management body**: when all directors and officers resign after a *CCAA* process has been initiated, courts have allowed for the continuation of the *CCAA* process by extending powers to the monitor akin to those of a receiver. Commonly referred to as a "super monitor," these powers allow the monitor to have direct powers over the assets, property and undertakings of the insolvent corporation and, for all intents and purposes, to act *in lieu* of management;

- **Unfitness of management to conduct *CCAA* proceedings**: this is trickier because it requires a demonstration that management is not fit to conduct a formal *CCAA* proceedings without causing harm to the stakeholders, akin to a fiduciary duties violation;

- **Management has no plan or their plan is doomed to fail**: this requires an analysis from the Court that management has no germ of a plan or that any potential restructuring plan is doomed to fail; and

- **Management being conflicted**: in the event that management is contemplating sponsoring or being associated with a bid in respect to the company's assets, property and undertaking in the context of a SISP.

The remainder of this article will analyze a recent rise in case law of *CCAA* liquidation processes, largely influenced or driven by creditors. The article will then aim to synthesize when and under what conditions such processes are appropriate.

III. — INCREASING USE OF LIQUIDATING *CCAA*s: A PATH FOR SECURED CREDITORS

Since the 2009 amendments to the *CCAA*, courts across Canada have held that the purpose of the *CCAA* may be met where a restructuring is effected by way of a liquidation. This has facilitated the transfer of assets, property, undertakings of an insolvent corporation related to a business to allow for its going concern operations to be preserved, even if it means that such operations ought to be continued under a new entity and/or structure. Such restructurings have become commonly referred to as liquidating *CCAA*s.

The concept of liquidating *CCAA*s was broadly approached in the recommendations made in the Senate Report, leading to the adoption of section 36 as part of the 2009 *CCAA* amendments:

> During a reorganization, an insolvent company may benefit from an opportunity to sell part of its business in order to generate capital, avoid further diminution in value and/or focus better on the financially solvent aspects of its operations. In some situations, a win-win situation would be created: insolvent companies would be able to increase their chance of survival as they gain capital and focus on their solvent operations, and creditors would avoid further reductions in the value of their claims. These sales would occur outside the normal course of the organization's business. **In some cases, the best situation for stakeholders might involve the sale of the business in its entirety**. [...]
>
> The Committee also believes that there are circumstances where **all stakeholders would benefit from an opportunity for an insolvent company involved in reorganization to divest itself of all or part of its assets**, whether to raise capital, eliminate further loss for creditors or focus on the solvent operations of the business. [20]
>
> [Emphasis added.]

However, even in the most extreme cases where the debtor is "doomed to fail," the process must have a prospect for the continuation of, among other things, employment for employees, supply relationships between suppliers and trade creditors, and the credit relationships between the debtor business and creditors.[21] It cannot be a liquidation driven process without the prospect of a going concern being preserved and continued. The proper forum for such pure liquidation process being the *BIA*.

Virginia Torrie has argued that the *CCAA* is historically a lender remedy, refuting conventional views of the Act being a debtor remedy inspired by concern for stakeholder groups, such as labour.[22] Accordingly, "if the Act was intended as a lender remedy (rather than to facilitate going-concern reorganizations) there may be less reason to object to liquidating *CCAA*s on normative or policy grounds."[23]

However, and as also noted by Dr Torrie, we respectfully submit that this perspective, taken to its extreme, risks undermining the rule of law. It is generally true that insolvency laws were enacted and amended in response to the needs of major creditors. Dr Torrie notes, regarding the *CCAA*, that the "impetus for this federal statute was to help prevent large bondholders [financial institutions] from failing, by allowing them to restructure debtors (read: restructure losses) and so return these companies (read: investments) to profitability."[24] Having said this, courts should not ignore the very purpose of the *CCAA*, as repeatedly and explicitly mentioned in Parliament and confirmed by the Supreme Court (as well as implicitly acknowledged in the aforementioned quote), which is to preserve the value of the debtor companies as a going concern for the benefit of all of its stakeholders, including employees, and when possible avoid the economic consequences of a liquidation for the society at large by "returning these companies to profitability".

It is a long-standing concern that judicial discretion in insolvency matters is bound by little in terms of procedure, *stare decisis*, or appellate oversight. As noted by David Bish, while this flexibility is of great value and is a cornerstone of Canadian restructuring law, the integrity of our system (as well as the equally important appearance of integrity), depends on the practitioners and the courts following meaningful checks and balances based on the purpose of the Act, unless we (the society at large) are comfortable embracing unfettered judicial discretion:

> If the beauty of our system lies in the unrestrained freedom of judges to drive a desirable commercial outcome, we should embrace it. If, however, we are not comfortable embracing unrestrained judicial discretion, at the very least we ought to find a way to credibly define and impose meaningful limits on that discretion. Either way -- whether transparent unfettered discretion or meaningful checks and balances -- the integrity of our system depends on it.[25]

As previously noted, the *CCAA* does not benefit from a scheme of distribution for debtors' assets and was not subject to parliamentary scrutiny and debate in this regard. Arguably, a *CCAA* court is granted wide discretion because our society expects this discretion to be used in a manner that will benefit the society at large. Given the impossibility to codify and rank the innumerable considerations that could come into play when a court is tasked with maintaining the operations of an insolvent debtor as a going concern, the great flexibility provided by the *CCAA* is entirely warranted in such circumstances.

Large creditors, who often enjoy secured status, are often best placed to evaluate the benefits and consequences of debtors' risk-taking. To allow them to call the shots by freely choosing between *CCAA* liquidation, receivership or bankruptcy will lead to inappropriate risk-taking and could, in theory, aggravate the often discussed inequity between stakeholders by syphoning value from stakeholders at large to their sole advantage.

We will see from the case law that the courts' position has evolved significantly after the 2009 *CCAA* amendments, which led, *inter alia*, to the enactment of section 36.

1. — The Case Law Prior to the 2009 *CCAA* Amendments

Prior to the enactment of the 2009 amendments to the *CCAA*, appellate decisions remained wary of using *CCAA* to effect liquidations.

In 1990, the British Columbia Court of Appeal explicitly stated that the purpose of the *CCAA* is to facilitate the making of a compromise or arrangement in order to allow the debtor to continue business:

> The purpose of the C.C.A.A. is to facilitate the making of a compromise or arrangement between an insolvent debtor company and its creditors to the end that the company is able to continue business. [...] When a company has recourse to the C.C.A.A., the Court is called upon to play a kind of supervisory role to preserve the status quo and to move the process along to the point where a compromise or arrangement is approved or it is evident that the attempt is doomed to failure. [26]

Similarly, in 1991, Justice LeBel, then of the Quebec Court of Appeal, wrote that what distinguishes the *CCAA* from the *BIA* is that *CCAA* is aimed at helping the debtor company avoid bankruptcy or emerge from its insolvency:

> More so than its liquidation, this *Act* is aimed at the reorganization of the company and its protection during the intermediate period, during which the approval and the realization of the reorganization plan is sought. Conversely, the *Bankruptcy Act* (RSC 1985, chapter B-3) seeks the orderly liquidation of the property of the bankrupt and the distribution of the proceeds of such liquidation among the creditors, in the order of priority defined by the Act. **The *Arrangements Act* responds to a distinct need and purpose, at least according to the interpretation generally given to it since its adoption. We want to either to prevent bankruptcy, or to help the company emerge from this situation.** [27]
>
> [Our translation -- Emphasis added.]

In 1998, Justice Blair of the Ontario Court of Justice held that liquidation orders can be granted under the *CCAA* "if the circumstances are appropriate and the orders can be made within the framework and in the spirit of the CCAA legislation." [28]

In 1999, the Alberta Court of Appeal unanimously sided with Justice Paperny of the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench, who ruled in the first instance that the *CCAA* should not be used when the sale of the assets generates liquidity that is insufficient to be distributed to unsecured creditors and where no plan of arrangement was put to the creditors. [29] The Court of Appeal went a step further, by calling into question the use of the *CCAA* to liquidate the assets of insolvent companies:

> [w]hile we do not intend to limit the flexibility of the CCAA, we are concerned about its use to liquidate assets of insolvent companies which are not part of a plan or compromise among creditors and shareholders, resulting in some continuation of a company as a going concern. **Generally, such liquidations are inconsistent with the intent of the CCAA and should not be carried out under its protective umbrella.** [30]
>
> [Emphasis added.]

The notion that *CCAA* process could end in liquidation in exceptional situations was also recognized by the Quebec Superior Court in 2004. In *Papiers Gaspésia*, [31] Papiers Gaspésia Inc. ("Gaspésia") was a limited partnership created by the Fonds de Solidarité FTQ, SGF Rexfor and Tembec. The Chandler paper mill was subject, since 2001, to redevelopment and modernization, and Gaspésia was seeking potential partners to refinance this project.

On 30 January 2004, Gaspésia obtained an order declaring that the company was subject to the provisions of the *CCAA*, that Ernst & Young Inc was appointed as monitor, and also offered certain relief to offer Gaspésia time to prepare a plan of compromise or arrangement. During the process the three directors of Gaspésia resigned, which event changed the role of the monitor. The monitor requested that it be allowed to act in the place of the board of directors for this matter and to represent Gaspésia in litigation before court.

The Superior Court of Quebec held that it is not excluded that proceedings under the *CCAA* can result in the liquidation of the debtor's assets, but this is only possible in exceptional and appropriate circumstances. [32]

In 2008, the British Columbia Court of Appeal appeared, in *obiter*, to cast further doubt about the possibility of liquidation conducted under the *CCAA* in *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*:

> I need not decide the point on this appeal, but I query whether the court should grant a stay under the *CCAA* to permit a sale, winding up or liquidation without requiring the matter to be voted upon by the creditors if the plan of arrangement intended to be made by the debtor company will simply propose that the net proceeds from the sale, winding up or liquidation be distributed to its creditors. [33]

This line of reasoning was picked up by the Supreme Court in the above discussed 2010 decision of *Century Services*, [34] marking the last time the purpose of the Act was directly addressed on appeal. [35] Noteworthy, the *Century Services* decision was rendered on facts that occurred prior to the 2009 *CCAA* amendments and the enactment of section 36.

2. — The Case Law Since the 2009 *CCAA* Amendments

Comprehensive changes made to the *CCAA* in 2009 brought with them the addition of section 36, which now permits the sale of assets outside the ordinary course of business subject to court authorization. As nothing in this section requires the filing of a plan or a continuing entity as a condition for court's approval, courts across the nation ruled that the court has the power to allow the sale of substantially all of the debtors' assets in the absence of a plan. Following the 2009 amendments, the trend towards liquidating *CCAA*s picked up.

In 2010, Alberta's Court of Queen's Bench granted an initial order under the *CCAA* with respect to Fairmont Resort Properties Ltd, Lake Okanagan Resort Vacation (2001) Ltd, Lake Okanagan Resort (2001) Ltd and LL Developments Ltd (the "Fairmont Group"). [36] The Fairmont Group's operations were able to continue under *CCAA* protection from the date of the initial by taking certain key measures.

FRPL Finance Ltd ("FRPL") and a related corporation were major secured creditors of the Fairmont Group, and supported the *CCAA* proceedings. FRPL had issued bonds to many individual investors in order to provide capital to the group. The capital raised by FRPL, which amounted to approximately $41.5 million, was loaned to the Fairmont Group between 2005 and 2007.

On 15 April 2010, in proceedings linked to the *CCAA* process, FRPL applied for a final order in respect of a plan of arrangement pursuant to section 193 of the *Business Corporations Act*, RSA 2000, c B-9. At a bondholder meeting, FRPL proposed a reorganization plan which included the options available for recovery of FRPL's loans to the Fairmont Group.

Under the proposed plan, bondholders would exchange their bonds for trust units in the newly established Northwynd REIT. Northwynd REIT would acquire the Fairmont Group loans and security interest through a wholly-owned limited partnership, Northwynd Limited Partnership ("Northwynd"). The limited partnership would then take steps under the security to acquire ownership and control of the Fairmont Group assets.

Roughly 60 to 63% of total bondholders were represented at the meeting and a vast majority of voting bondholders voted in favour of the proposed arrangement. Justice Romaine found that the statutory procedures had been met, the application had been put forward in good faith, the arrangement had a valid business purpose and, on the basis of the strong bondholder support and the lack of opposition, the plan was fair and reasonable.

After being assigned the secured debt amounting to approximately $52 million, Northwynd applied for an order under the *CCAA* proceedings approving the acceptance by Fairmont Group of its offer to purchase all of the assets of the Fairmont Group in consideration for the discharge of the DIP financing and the crediting of $43.8 million against the secured debt owed to FRPL.

The sale of the assets under the *CCAA* proceedings was allowed. Citing *Anvil*, [37] Justice Romaine stated that "Farley, J. noted that the *CCAA* may be used to effect a sale or liquidation of a company in appropriate circumstances, most particularly where to do so would 'maximize the value of the stakeholders' pie'". [38] Justice Romaine also noted that, while the alternative of selling the assets through a receivership would be commercially equivalent, approval pursuant to the *CCAA* proceedings would be more efficient. [39]

Northwynd's plan proposed two options to bondholders: either continue under the existing *CCAA* proceedings or through the termination of the proceedings and the appointment of a receiver. Northwynd submitted that the most time-efficient and cost-effective method of proceeding was the sale pursuant to the *CCAA* proceedings. On the contrary, monitor Ernst & Young submitted that "the potential of achieving a sale price for the secured assets greater than the offer was very low and that the costs of a sales process would be significant," thus concluding that neither alternative would improve the return of creditors.

Based on precedents, Justice Romaine affirmed that a sale of substantially all of the assets of a debtor company is permitted in a *CCAA* proceeding pursuant to s 36 of the *CCAA* if certain statutory criteria are met and, in accordance with previous authority, if such a sale is consistent with the purpose and policy of the *CCAA* and in the best interests of creditors generally. [40]

Justice Romaine went on to cite Brenner CJ in *Pope & Talbot*:

> The decision by courts to extend the use of the CCAA to a liquidation is based on a recognition of the wider interests at stake in such a proceeding. **The purpose of a liquidating CCAA where the assets are to be sold on an operating basis, is to fairly have regard for the interests of not only the creditors and the stakeholders of the petitioner, but also the interests of employees, suppliers and others who will be affected by a complete shutdown. So provided that the objective is to dispose of assets on an operating basis, then even though it is a liquidation**, the exercise is not designed to effect a recovery for solely the secured lenders as submitted by Canfor. Clearly a continuation of operation will benefit a wider constituency. [41]
>
> [Emphasis added.]

Justice Romaine, pitting *BIA* receivership against *CCAA* as proper forum to effectuate a liquidation, relied heavily on the fact that the liquidating *CCAA* was aimed at preserving the going concern business of the insolvent corporation, thus finding comfort in the historical objective of the *CCAA*: to preserve going concern business while avoiding the dire impact on a variety of stakeholders resulting from the shutdown and pure liquidation of same.

Noting that s 36 of the *CCAA* does not require that a plan be filed as a condition of court approval or there be a continuing entity after liquidation, Justice Romaine concluded that it made both practical and commercial sense to allow the sale process to take place under the existing *CCAA* proceedings. In the alternative, a bankruptcy would have been less efficient and would have jeopardized the going concern business, to the detriment of all stakeholders. [42]

More recently in *Bloom Lake* (2017), [43] Justice Hamilton, then at the Superior Court of Quebec, recognized once more that liquidating *CCAA* can serve a legitimate purpose but justly ruled that creditors should have analogous entitlements in liquidations under the *CCAA* and the *BIA*. Otherwise, the debtor or creditors can choose liquidation under the *CCAA* in order to avoid their responsibilities under the *BIA*. [44]

In *Bloom Lake*, the debtors, Wabush Iron Co Limited and Wabush Resources lnc and the *mises-en-cause* Wabush Mines, Arnaud Railway Company and Wabush Lake Railway Company Limited (collectively the "Wabush CCAA Parties") filed a motion for the issuance of an initial order under the *CCAA*. The Wabush CCAA Parties had two pension plans for their employees governed by the *Newfoundland and Labrador Pension Benefit Act* ("NLPBA"). Therein, the monitor filed a motion seeking direction with respect to the priority's order of the debts. The purpose of this decision was to determine the preliminary question of whether the Court must defer to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland and Labrador for the application of certain rules concerning trusts and security interests under the NLPBA. Furthermore, the Court responded to the key issue of whether "the *CCAA* proceedings themselves, or some event within the *CCAA* proceedings, constitute a liquidation, assignment or bankruptcy" of the employer.

Recognizing its jurisdiction to interpret the provisions of NLPBA in the context of this *CCAA* proceeding, the Court concluded that this was a liquidating *CCAA* at the outset, which triggered the application of the deemed trusts under the federal *Pension Benefits Standards Act* and the NLPBA. To this end, the Court noted:

- Liquidation regime under Part XVIII of the *Canada Business Corporations Act* is only available to corporations that are solvent. [45]
- The debtor in a *CCAA* proceeding remains in possession of its assets and this is sufficient to meet the requirement of the estate in liquidation, assignment or bankruptcy. [46]
- The employer should not be allowed to avoid the priority of the deemed trust by choosing to liquidate under *CCAA* rather than the *BIA*. [47]

> [160] It is clear in the present matter that the Wabush CCAA parties have liquidated their assets. With the sale of the Wabush mine in June, the Wabush CCAA parties have now sold all or substantially all of their assets. However, they did not institute formal liquidation proceedings. **They proceeded instead under the CCAA with what has come to be known as a "liquidating CCAA" [...]** [48]
>
> [174] **The Court notes that there is nothing in any way pejorative about qualifying the CCAA as a liquidating CCAA. That is a legitimate and increasingly frequent use of CCAA proceedings. However, a liquidating CCAA should be more analogous to a BIA proceeding. One of the consequences is that the deemed trusts should be triggered.** [49]
>
> [References omitted -- Emphasis added.]

In 2014, Justice Dumas in *Lac Mégantic* insisted that the question as to whether liquidations are allowed under the *CCAA* remains an open one, as there has been no recent decision from a court of appeal on this matter in Canada, but concluded that liquidating *CCAA*s were possible, on a case-by-case basis. [50]

More recently in 2019, the same Justice Dumas rendered a decision in the matter of *MPECO Construction* [51] denying a motion seeking extension of the stay of proceedings on the basis that there were no prospect for a plan of arrangement. Justice Dumas did not cast a doubt on the possibility for an insolvent corporation to liquidate its assets under a *CCAA* process. Rather, Justice Dumas questioned whether the *CCAA* was the proper forum to allow for such a liquidation exercise to be conducted to the extent that there were no reasonable grounds suggesting that such a liquidation would lead to the preservation of the going concern and that the proceeds of such an exercise could lead to the filing of a plan of arrangement being submitted to the creditors:

> [34] The objective of the CCAA is embedded in its title.
>
> [35] The objective of the Act is to allow for a struggling company to present a plan of arrangement to its creditors with the ultimate objective to restructure its business. (...)
>
> [44] That a liquidation of a debtor's assets is possible prior to the filing of a plan of arrangement is not in litigation. Courts will exercise their discretion in this regard on a case-by-case basis. **That said, one must keep in mind that the debtor's request and acts under the CCAA should lead to the filing of a plan of arrangement submitted to the creditors**.
>
> [45] Proceedings under the CCAA ought not to be used to short circuit realization process under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act. [52]

[Our translation -- Emphasis added.]

Liquidating *CCAA* is no longer a trend. It is justly considered an efficient tool to facilitate the transfer of businesses on a going concern basis. So long as the liquidation conducted under a *CCAA* process will enhance the prospect of maintaining the going concern of the business(es) operated by an insolvent corporation, even if this going concern may ultimately be continued under a new entity/structure, courts are now relying on section 36 of the *CCAA* to allow such liquidation to proceed. [53] This is in line with the historical purpose and objective of the *CCAA*.

Prime evidence of the fact that liquidating *CCAA*s are now well accepted are Sears Canada Inc's *CCAA* proceedings, which began in 2017. In a span of less than two years, the monitor was capable of monetizing substantially all of the tangible assets of these entities while temporarily maintaining certain operations and allowing for the transfer of certain businesses formally operated under the banner of Sears, hence maximizing chances that going concern preservation is maintained. [54]

On a final note, it is interesting to note that Parliament's recent amendments to the *CCAA* via Bill C-97, which will add section 11.001 to the *CCAA* requiring initial orders to "be limited to relief that is reasonably necessary *for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period*" [emphasis added]. [55] Buried deep within the government's budget, it remains to be seen how this new provision will be interpreted by the courts and if it will serve to reaffirm the primary and historical purpose of the *CCAA*, which is to enable a restructuring of an insolvent corporation's business for the benefit of a variety of stakeholders.

Following the guidance from the above decisions, in recent years liquidations under the *CCAA* have been effected when the maintenance of the debtors' business as a going concern was shown to increase the value for stakeholders and when the complexity of the matter justified the flexibility provided under the *CCAA*, always with a view to preserve the going concern of a business operated by an insolvent corporation. With the objective of avoiding or limiting the negative impact on a variety of stakeholders that the alternative of a liquidation on a piecemeal basis would bring. This is in line with the historical objective and very purpose of the *CCAA*.

That said, who should be at the helm of a liquidating *CCAA*? In coming to accept liquidating *CCAA*s, Courts have insisted on the fact that it was for the benefit of all stakeholders of the insolvent corporation, in some cases plainly shrugging at the idea of a liquidating *CCAA*s that would serve no more than to reimburse the secured creditor. Can the debtor-driven *CCAA* process be continued or even initiated by a secured creditor? This is the question that next section seeks to address.

IV. — CREDITOR-DRIVEN *CCAA*s AND ENHANCED POWERS FOR THE MONITOR

1. — Initiating the *CCAA* Process

The *CCAA* does not prohibit creditors from bringing forth an application for an initial order. Nonetheless, given that the process is typically driven by the debtor, the courts have historically been reluctant to grant an application made by creditors. While multiple cases in recent years have allowed the creditors to initiate the *CCAA* process and enhanced the role of the monitor, *CCAA* remains first and foremost debtor-driven.

In *Crystallex* (2012), a decision which was unanimously confirmed by the Ontario Court of Appeal, Justice Newbould held that when the court is presented with competing *CCAA* applications from the debtor and from a creditor, the key consideration is which application offers the best chance for a fair balancing of the interests of all stakeholders. [56] A creditor should not be able to prevent a debtor company from undertaking restructuring efforts under the *CCAA* to maximize recovery for the benefit of all stakeholders unless it can be shown that the company's efforts are "doomed to fail."

Crystallex is a mining company whose principal focus was the exploration and development of gold projects in Venezuela. In 2004, the company issued nearly $100 million worth of senior unsecured notes due on 23 December 2011. On 22 December 2011, one day prior to the maturity of the notes, Crystallex and the noteholders filed competing *CCAA* applications. The noteholders' application contemplated that all existing common shares would be cancelled, an equity offering would be undertaken, and if, or to the extent, the equity proceeds were insufficient to pay out the noteholders, the notes would be converted to equity.

Crystallex concurrently sought authority to file a plan of compromise and arrangement, the authority to continue to pursue an arbitration in Venezuela, and the authority to pursue all avenues of interim financing or a refinancing of its business and to conduct an auction to raise financing. Crystallex had already received an unsolicited offer of financing from Tenor Capital Management. In coming to the aforementioned conclusions, Justice Newbould wrote:

> [20] The CCAA is intended to provide a structured environment for negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both. Where a debtor company **realistically plans to continue operating or to otherwise deal with its assets but it requires the protection of the court in order to do so and it is otherwise too early for the court to determine whether the debtor company will succeed, relief should be granted under the CCAA**. The benefit to a debtor company could, depending upon the circumstances, mean a benefit to its shareholders.
>
> [21] It is clear that the CCAA serves the interests of a broad constituency of investors, creditors and employees. Thus it is appropriate at this stage to consider the interests of the shareholders of Crystallex. [...]
>
> [26] In my view, what the Noteholders propose at this stage, including the cancellation of the common shares held by the shareholders of Crystallex, is not a fair balancing of the interests of all stakeholders. **To say that they will never vote in favour of any plan unless they are paid out immediately or the current management and board of Crystallex is removed is not reflective of the purposes of the CCAA at this stage.**
>
> [27] The application of Crystallex and the terms of its Initial Order are not prejudicial to the legitimate interests of the Noteholders. The Noteholders are entitled to submit any proposal they wish to the board of Crystallex who will be obliged to consider it along with any other proposals obtained. **The board of directors of Crystallex has a continuing duty to balance stakeholder interests. If the Crystallex board does not choose their proposal, the Noteholders would have their remedies, if appropriate, in the CCAA process. What the Noteholders have sought in their CCAA application is to effectively prevent Crystallex from taking steps under the CCAA to attempt to obtain a resolution for all stakeholders without the benefit of seeing what Crystallex may be able to achieve. It cannot be said at this stage that the efforts of Crystallex are doomed to fail.** [57]
>
> [References omitted -- Emphasis added.]

In *Semi-Tech* (1999), [58] the debtor ("Semi-Tech") was a holding company and its common shares traded on the Toronto Stock Exchange. Enterprise Capital Management Inc ("Enterprise"), on its own behalf and on behalf of funds managed by it, and with the support of other holders of senior secured notes, applied for an initial order under the *CCAA* and sought orders in order to restrain the management and control of Semi-Tech in its operations by, for example, prohibiting Semi-Tech to make any payments to senior officers and directors and altering any material contracts. Agreeing that the Enterprise would be able to establish that Semi-Tech had breached certain covenants under the trust indenture, Justice Ground noted that due to lack of appropriate notices, there had been no event of default as defined in the agreement. [59]

After mentioning the remedial purpose of the *CCAA*, and noting that an application by creditors is a rarity, Justice Ground held that in the absence of any indication that Enterprise proposes a plan which would consist of some compromise or arrangement between Semi-Tech and its creditors and permit the continued operation of Semi-Tech and its subsidiaries, it would be inappropriate to make any order pursuant to the *CCAA*:

> [23] It is usual on initial applications under the *CCAA* for the applicant to submit to the Court at least a general outline of the type of plan of compromise and arrangement between the company and its creditors proposed by the applicant. **The application now before this Court is somewhat of a rarity in that the application is brought by an applicant representing a group of creditors and not by the company itself as is the usual case**. Enterprise

has submitted that it is not in a position to submit an outline of a plan to the Court in that it lacks sufficient information and has been unable to obtain such information from Semi-Tech. Enterprise points out that, in the usual case, the application is brought by the company, the company has all the necessary information at hand and has usually had the assistance of a firm which is the proposed monitor and which has worked with the company in preparing an outline of a plan. [...]

[25] **In the absence of any indication that Enterprise proposes a plan which would consist of some compromise or arrangement between Semi-Tech and its creditors and permit the continued operation of Semi-Tech and its subsidiaries in some restructured form, it appears to me that it would be inappropriate to make any order pursuant to the *CCAA*. If the Noteholders intend simply to liquidate the assets of Semi-Tech** and distribute the proceeds, it would appear that **they could do so** by proceeding under the Trust Indenture on the basis of the alleged covenant defaults, accelerating the maturity date of the Notes, realizing on their security in the shares of Singer and recovering any balance due on the Notes **by the appointment of a receiver or otherwise**. [60]

[Emphasis added.]

In *SM Group* (2018), [61] the Court was presented with competing *CCAA* applications from management and secured creditors. The Quebec Superior Court chose to side with the secured creditors given the evidence submitted in respect to the loss of confidence in the management of the insolvent corporation. Serious allegations about the influence of the former president, and current main shareholder, caught in fraudulent criminal accusations and recent payments made to his benefit by management prior to the filing led the Court to side with the secured creditors' arguments that the appointment of a chief restructuring officer with powers akin to a *BIA* receiver was the best alternative to preserve going concern value of the SM Group, for the benefit of all stakeholders, including employees.

In *Taxelco* (2019), [62] the Court was presented with a motion seeking the issuance of an initial order by the main secured creditor, the National Bank of Canada, with a view to implement a SISP and preserve the going concern value of the business, while granting extended powers to the monitor, acting in lieu of management. The Court accepted the Bank's arguments, which focused on the fact that management had refused to file a motion to issue an initial order and that the directors and officers had announced their intention to resign.

In *Sural* (2019), [63] the Court was presented with a motion seeking the issuance of an initial order while granting enhanced powers to the monitor, akin to those of a *BIA* receiver, to allow for the company to implement a SISP on 28 June 2019. The motion was presented by the company and supported by its management.

In *Miniso*, the most recent decision rendered on the subject, the secured creditors of the debtor companies initiated the proceedings under the *CCAA*, and an initial order was granted on 12 July 2019. The British Columbia Supreme Court confirmed the standing for a creditor to commence *CCAA* proceedings while granting enhanced powers to the monitor: [64]

The **commencement of *CCAA* proceedings is a proper exercise of creditors' rights** where, ideally, the *CCAA* will preserve the going-concern value of the business and allow it to continue for the benefit of the "whole economic community", including the many stakeholders here. This is intended to allow stakeholders to avoid losses that would be suffered in an enforcement and liquidation scenario. [...]

A&M will have **enhanced powers as Monitor** to manage the Canadian operations and negotiate and implement a transaction, in consultation with the Migu Group ... [65]

[Emphasis added.]

That being said, contrary to *Semi-Tech* and *Crystallex* cases, the *Miniso* case proceeded on an uncontested basis and management of the insolvent debtor company did not oppose the initiation of the *CCAA* process by the secured creditor, who was also providing interim financing to allow the corporation to continue its operations and preserve value for all stakeholders:

> 52 There is no doubt that the Miniso Group has dictated the course forward, for the most part. The Miniso Group holds first ranking security over all of the Migu Group's assets. **The Miniso Group has determined that a *CCAA* process is the best means to ensure the preservation and sale of the Migu Group's business as a going concern and maintain enterprise value for the benefit of all stakeholders**, including the Miniso Group. In addition, as discussed below, the Miniso Group has agreed to provide interim financing during the course of the restructuring in order to allow that process to unfold.
>
> 53 I have no doubt that the Migu Group has asserted its wishes and wants within the context of the past and ongoing negotiations between the two Groups. **However, the Migu Group now grudgingly accepted its fate and did not oppose the relief sought here**. [66]
>
> [Emphasis added.]

Following the guidance from *Crystallex*, removing *ab initio* the management of an insolvent corporation from the driver seat in a restructuring process under *CCAA* in favour of the secured creditors ought to be considered as an extraordinary measure, and to address serious concerns with respect to the incapacity and/or inability of management to conduct such a process. It requires a demonstration that management has no plan or that such a plan is "doomed to fail," or that management has resigned, is unfit or conflicted to conduct such a process for the benefit of all stakeholders.

To the extent that management can demonstrate that it is focusing its efforts on exploring restructuring paths and that such efforts may reasonably lead to the restructuring of the insolvent corporation's business, preserving the going concern value of the business, for the benefit of all stakeholders, including but not limited to the secured creditors, management should not be stripped of its powers and duties lightly. Besides, we must be mindful that the *CCAA* provides at section 11.5 for the proper mechanism to remove a director that "is unreasonably impairing the possibility of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company or is acting or is likely to act inappropriately as a director in the circumstances."

We also find comfort in the reasoning in *Semi-Tech*, which reminds us that the *CCAA* is not to be considered as a mechanism which allows a secured creditor to liquidate the assets, unless it can be demonstrated that the proposed restructuring efforts will lead to the going concern value preservation, referring to the *BIA* receivership for such an operation to be conducted. [67] The objective sought pursuant to the *CCAA* proceedings thus remaining to favour restructuring while preserving going concern value for all stakeholders involved.

2. — Continuing the *CCAA* Process and Enhancing the Role of the Monitor

Courts have also allowed *CCAA* process initiated by the company, under certain circumstances, to be continued by the secured creditors by granting extended powers to the monitor, akin to a *BIA* receiver.

In the matter of *BioAmber*, [68] a Quebec-based company operating a succinic acid production facility in Sarnia (Ontario), the Court issued an initial order for the purpose of, *inter alia*, allowing the company to implement a SISP. When it became obvious that the SISP would not lead to the desired transaction and that management was involved/associated with a potential bidder, the Court at the request of secured creditors, issued an order granting additional powers to the monitor, akin to those of a *BIA* receiver.

In *ILTA Grain*, [69] a British Columbia-based grain producer, filed for protection under the *CCAA* on 7 July 2019. It was the company, and its management, that filed for the issuance of the Initial Order.

In its first report, filed merely eight days after the *CCAA* proceedings commenced, the monitor reported that it had become clear that certain members of the company's management did not support the company's current strategy of undertaking a SISP and pursuing transactions that may lead to the sale of the company's business and assets. [70] The Court, at the request of the company, and likely pursuant to a strong suggestion from the secured creditors, issued an order to enhance powers of the monitor, but not to the extent of what would be typical of a *BIA* receiver.

Essentially, to ensure that the secured creditors and the monitor have confidence in the company's management, the order granted the monitor with specific recommendation, providing incremental powers while giving control powers over the receipt and disbursements to the monitor. [71]

While the role of the monitor has been expanded in various files, the Quebec Court of Appeal in *Aquadis* [72] recently brought into question the limits of such expanded role in file driven *de facto* by the creditors. Notably, the Court highlighted that enhancing the powers of the monitor must not interfere with its role and neutrality. In that file, the debtor 9323-7055 Québec inc (formerly Aquadis International Inc, "Aquadis") was a wholesale seller of plumbing fixtures. Aquadis, however, suffered serious financial difficulties when hundreds of defective faucets supplied by it failed, causing significant damage to property owners whose insurers ultimately filed subrogated claims against Aquadis. The value of those claims amounted to nearly $22 million and the monitor estimated the value of potential future claims at an additional $25 million.

According to the monitor's first and second reports, Aquadis significantly reduced its operations in 2014, completely liquidated and ceased operations in 2015. As of the date of the initial order, Aquadis had no realizable assets and the near totality of its liabilities were the litigious claims of the insurers.

To maximize the value of Aquadis' assets, in December 2016, the monitor instituted legal proceedings against the Taiwanese manufacturers and distributor and their insurers. At the same time, the monitor was negotiating with the Canadian distributors and retailers. On 20 June 2018, the supervising judge authorized settlements between the monitor and the Taiwanese distributor and its insurers in the total amount of $7.2 million.

The monitor filed a plan of arrangement on 8 January 2019, and amended the plan at the meeting of the creditors on 25 April 2019. According to the amended plan, the monitor was empowered to institute legal proceedings on behalf of Aquadis' creditors against the other persons involved in the manufacture, distribution or sale of the defective faucets. It was approved by the Superior Court on 4 July 2019, over the objections of the retailers that a plan of arrangement cannot provide for the institution of legal proceedings by the monitor, on behalf of the creditors, against third parties in connection with rights that belong to the creditors and not to the debtor company. [73]

On 20 August 2019, Justice Hamilton of the Quebec Court of Appeal granted the retailer's motions for leave to appeal, noting that the matter at hand goes to the serious issue regarding the role and neutrality of the monitor and the scope of the powers that it can obtain:

> [11] The issue is not frivolous. There are a number of *CCAA* cases where the debtor is a party to significant litigation in which there are a number of third parties who may be solidarily liable with the debtor to its creditors. In those cases, in order to reach a global settlement of all of the litigation relating to the debtor, the plan may allow third parties to contribute to a litigation pool with the debtor for the benefit of the creditors and to obtain a release. However, this case goes one step further and authorizes the Monitor to sue, on behalf of the creditors, third parties who decline to contribute to the litigation pool. There does not appear to be any precedent on this issue.
>
> [12] The issue is crucial to the file because the proceedings by the Monitor against the Canadian distributors and retailers, including the Petitioners, are a key feature of the Amended Plan and the validity of those proceedings goes to the acceptance of the plan by the creditors and the approval of the plan by the judge.
>
> [13] **It is also important to the practice because it goes to the serious issue as to the role and neutrality of the monitor in *CCAA* proceedings and the scope of the powers that can be granted to a monitor**. More specifically, the issue of whether the court can approve a plan that provides for the monitor instituting legal proceedings, on behalf of the creditors, against third parties who do not owe anything to the debtor is a novel

issue and is of particular relevance in *CCAA* proceedings used to reach a global settlement of significant litigation involving third party co-defendants. [74]

[References omitted -- Emphasis added.]

3. — Filing of a *CCAA* Plan of Arrangement

More rarely, courts have also allowed secured creditors to directly file a plan of arrangement and have same submitted to other creditors.

In 2001, the Superior Court of Ontario in *Anvil* ruled that a plan submitted by the secured creditors through an interim receiver [75] appointed by them as a result of all directors and officers resigning was fair and reasonable even though it offered nothing to unsecured creditors. In coming to that decision the Court insisted on the fact that the value of the company's assets was insufficient to yield any recovery to unsecured creditors and that it is not unreasonable for a court in such circumstances to sanction a plan which is directed solely at secured creditors. [76]

Anvil Range Mining Corporation ("Anvil") was the owner of a lead and zinc mine in the Yukon Territory. In 1990, Anvil applied for and received protection from its creditors under the *CCAA*. In 1998, Deloitte & Touche Inc had been appointed as the Interim Receiver ("IR") as a result of management resigning.

The hearing dealt with the application by the IR for the sanctioning of a plan of arrangement. The plan dealt with a series of complex priority disputes both within creditor classes and among creditor classes, as well as the allocation of funds in the IR's possession. The plan had been unanimously approved by the three groups of creditors in 2001. The unsecured creditors and the major shareholders objected to the plan because they asserted that the secured debt was lower than claimed and that the value of Anvil's assets was higher than suggested.

Justice Farley approved the plan, noting that it complied with all the statutory requirements and it was also fair and reasonable. It was determined that the IR exercised its judgment in a reasoned, practical and functional way.

The mere fact that the opponents of the plan were advocating an alternative did not imply that the IR had lost its neutrality. In fact, the alternatives proposed were unrealistic. Additionally, the plan was deemed fair because the secured claims were far in excess of the value of the assets.

> [11] While it is recognized that the main thrust of the CCAA is geared at a reorganization of the insolvent company -- or enterprise, even if the company does not survive, the CCAA may be utilized to effect a sale, winding up or a liquidation of a company and its assets in appropriate circumstances. See *Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at p. 32; *Re Olympia & York Developments Ltd.* (1995), 34 C.B.R. (3d) 93 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at p. 104. **Integral to those circumstances would be where a Plan under the CCAA would maximize the value of the stakeholders' pie.**
>
> [12] The CCAA permits a debtor to propose a compromise or arrangement with its secured creditors. A **Plan proposed solely to secured creditors is not unfair where the insolvent's assets are of insufficient value to yield any recovery to unsecured creditors. It is not unreasonable for a court in such circumstances to sanction a plan which is directly solely at secured creditors.** See *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), supra at pp. 513-8; *Re Philip Services Corp*., [1999] O.J. No. 4232 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 20-1. That the plan does not include any agreement with a class a creditors does not, by virtue solely of that omission, make it unfair where that class is not being legally affected. Nothing is being imposed upon the unsecureds; none of their rights are being confiscated. See *Re Olympia & York* (1993), *supra* at pp. 508, 517-8. [...]

[18] In my view, the approval of this Plan will allow the creditors (both secured and unsecured) and the shareholders of Anvil to move on with their lives and activities while the mining properties including the mine will be under proper stewardship. [...]

[20] Mr. Aalto referred to *Royal Bank v. Fracmaster Ltd*., [1999] A.J. No. 675 (Alta. C.A.) at para. 16 with respect to the CCAA not being used to provide for a liquidation in a guise of a CCAA reorganization. But see my views above. **In any event, the IR has sought alternative relief allowing it to sell the assets, which sale would be on a commercially equivalent basis as the Plan under the CCAA contemplates. Given that the Plan would operate more efficiently in that respect, I see no reason to provide that this proceed as a sale by the IR**. [77]

[Emphasis added.]

The reasoning of Justice Farley was soon reaffirmed by the Ontario Court of Appeal in *Bob-Lo Island*. [78] On 25 June 2004, an initial order was authorized against the debtor companies and on 22 November 2004, the plan of arrangement under the *CCAA* was sanctioned by the Court. Mr Randy Oram, a shareholder of one of the debtor companies and also an unsecured creditor, requested a leave to appeal of the sanctioned order. His main objection was that "the plan of arrangement is a secured-creditor-led plan that excludes the unsecured creditors from any realistic prospect of recovery, without requiring the secured creditors to go through the formal process of enforcing their security and without exposing the secured assets to the market." [79] Accordingly, the assets of the debtor company were to be disposed and the debtor company would not continue as a going concern.

The Ontario Court of Appeal dismissed the motion for leave to appeal. Concluding that Mr Oram had failed to establish an economic interest in the assets, the Court also noted that while there may be merit to the issue that the plan was contrary to the purposes of *CCAA*, Mr Oram had also failed to demonstrate that there is sufficient merit in that issue to justify granting leave to appeal in the circumstances of this case:

[27] In this case, Randy Oram submits that there are serious and arguable grounds for suggesting that, by sanctioning Amico's Plan and granting a vesting order to a non-arm's length purchaser, the motion judge erred in the application of the legal principles for determining if a *CCAA* plan is fair and reasonable. In particular, the Randy Oram contends that the plan:

i) is contrary to the broad, remedial purpose of the *CCAA*, namely to give debtor companies an opportunity to find a way out of financial difficulties short of other drastic remedies;

ii) is a proposal by the secured creditors for the exclusive benefit of the secured creditors, designed to liquidate the property of the debtor companies **without regard to the interests** of the debtor companies, their lien claimants, **unsecured creditors** or shareholders;

iii) does not provide for the continued operation of the debtor companies as going concerns;

iv) does not provide for the marketing and sale of the property to maximize its value for all of the debtor companies' stakeholders;

v) **rather than leaving unsecured creditors as an unaffected class, releases their claims against the property, the debtor companies, Amico, and the purchaser...**

[30] [T]his is not the first time a secured-creditor-led plan, which operates exclusively for the benefit of secured creditors and under which the assets of the debtor company will be disposed of and the debtor company will not continue as a going concern, has received court approval: see *Re Anvil Range Mining Corp.* (2001), 25 C.B.R. (4th) 1 (Ont. S.C.J.), aff'd on other grounds [2002] O.J. No. 2606 (C.A.). (See also the discussion of the purposes of the *CCAA* in the cases referred to in *Re Anvil Range Mining Corp., supra* at para. 11 (S.C.J.)).

> [31] **Moreover, the fact that unsecured creditors may receive no recovery under a proposed plan of arrangement does not, of itself, negate the fairness and reasonableness of a plan of arrangement**: *Re Anvil Range Mining Corp., supra* at para. 31 (C.A.).[80]
>
> [Emphasis added.]

Bob-Lo Island and *Anvil*, while cautious in their approach, represented an arguably controversial shift in the evolution of the role of secured creditors under the *CCAA* and the use of the statute as a flexible and advantageous restructuring tool for secured creditors.[81]

V. — CONCLUSION

We can appreciate from the case law that the *CCAA* remains largely a debtor-driven process and that the monitor is to be considered, in the vast majority of cases, as the supervisory agent safeguarding the interest of a variety of stakeholders. This is in line with the historical, and dare we say, societal objective pursued by the legislator in enacting the *CCAA*.

The *CCAA* was enacted to offer an alternative to the liquidation path offered by the *BIA*; to counter the devastating consequences on a variety of stakeholders when a corporation fails and ceases its operations; and to preserve the going concern value of a business for the good of the greater pool of stakeholders. Although we have come to accept "liquidating *CCAA*s," the end result is usually a transfer of the assets required for a business to be continued, albeit under a new structure. Arguably, this is also in line with the *CCAA*'s objective, which is focused on preserving going concern operations of a struggling corporation.

To remove management from the helm of this restructuring process and extend the powers of the monitor accordingly is a measure that courts have cautiously limited to exceptional circumstances. In addition to adducing evidence that the *CCAA* process is likely to preserve going concern value of the business, it must be demonstrated to the court that either (i) management has resigned, leaving no directors and officers in place, (ii) management is unfit to conduct a restructuring process in a manner that would be in the best interest of all stakeholders, (iii) any potential restructuring path available would be doomed to fail, and/or that (iv) management is conflicted, notably because it is participating in the SISP under a *CCAA*.

Under those circumstances, courts have allowed the secured creditors to play a more active role in the restructuring process under a *CCAA*, be it through the appointment of a Chief Restructuring Officer, an interim receiver, or by the enhancement of the monitor's power to equate those of a *BIA* receiver.

As we have stated, the monitor's traditional role was not intended to exceed supervisory powers. This is also consistent with the fact that the monitor does not possess the required skill set to run a business on a long term basis -- management does. This is why we believe that courts have and continue to exercise caution in all such cases in order to ensure that the powers afforded to the monitor are absolutely necessary and justified by specific and special circumstances.

Footnotes

* Luc Morin is a partner in the Corporate Insolvency and Restructuring Group at Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP in Montreal and Arad Mojtahedi is an associate in that same group. The authors would like to thank Mareine Gervais Cloutier without whose invaluable help this article would not have been possible.

1 *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36 [*CCAA*].

2 *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985, c B-3 [*BIA*].

3 *Saskatchewan (Attorney General) v Lemare Lake Logging Ltd*, 2015 SCC 53, [2015] 3 SCR 419, 2015 CSC 53, 2015 CarswellSask 680, 2015 CarswellSask 681, 31 CBR (6th) 1, 391 DLR (4th) 383, [2016] 1 WWR 423, 477 NR 26, 467 Sask R 1, 651 WAC 1 (SCC) [*Lemare Lake*]. In *Lemare Lake*, the Supreme Court stated that delays to exercise secured rights provided by a provincial statute cannot be disregarded when appointing a receiver. The evidence showed a narrow purpose for s 243 of the *BIA*. It was determined

that a secured creditor, wishing to enforce its security against farm land, needed to wait 150 days under the provincial law, rather than the ten days imposed by the federal law: "General considerations of promptness and timeliness, no doubt a valid concern in any bankruptcy or receivership process, cannot be used to trump the specific purpose of s 243 and to artificially extend the provision's purpose to create a conflict with provincial legislation": *Lemare Lake* at para 68.

4 *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, SC 1933, c 36.

5 *House of Commons Debates*, 17-4 (20 April 1933) at 4090-4091 (Hon CH Cahan).

6 *Senate Debates*, 17-4 (9 May 1933) at 474 (Rt Hon A Meighen).

7 Virginia Erica Torrie, *Protagonists of company reorganization: A history of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada) and the role of large secured creditors* (PhD Thesis, University of Kent Law School, 2015) at 1.

8 *Ibid*.

9 *Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act*, SC 1934, c 53.

10 *Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada)*, [1934] SCR 659, [1934] 4 DLR 75, 1934 CarswellNat 1, 16 CBR 1 (SCC); *British Columbia (Attorney General) v Canada (Attorney General)*, [1936] SCR 384, 17 CBR 359, 1936 CarswellNat 1, [1936] 3 DLR 610 (SCC), affirmed [1937] AC 391, [1937] 1 DLR 695, 1937 CarswellNat 1, 18 CBR 217, [1937] 1 WWR 320 (Jud Com of Privy Coun).

11 *The Constitution Act, 1867* (UK), 30 & 31 Vict, c 3, reprinted in RSC 1985, Appendix II, No 5 [*Constitution*].

12 Torrie, *supra* note 7 at 2-3.

13 Richard B Jones, "The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring: Challenges for the Rule of Law", in Janis P Sarra, ed, *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005* (Toronto: Carswell 2006) at 481.

14 *Century Services Inc v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2010 SCC 60, 2010 CarswellBC 3419, 2010 CarswellBC 3420, [2010] 3 SCR 379, 12 BCLR (5th) 1, 72 CBR (5th) 170, 326 DLR (4th) 577, [2011] 2 WWR 383, 296 BCAC 1, 2011 DTC 5006 (Eng), [2010] GSTC 186, 2011 GTC 2006 (Eng), 409 NR 201, 503 WAC 1, [2010] SCJ No 60 (SCC) at paras 15-18 [*Century Services*]; see also *Chef Ready Foods Ltd v HongKong Bank of Canada* (1990), 51 BCLR (2d) 84, 1990 CarswellBC 394, 4 CBR (3d) 311, [1991] 2 WWR 136, [1990] BCJ No 2384 (BCCA) at paras 10, 22 [*Hongkong Bank*]: "The purpose of the C.C.A.A. is to facilitate the making of a compromise or arrangement between an insolvent debtor company and its creditors to the end that the company is able to continue in business": *Hongkong Bank* at para 10.

15 *Century Services*, *ibid* at paras 59-60.

16 Senate, Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, *Debtors And Creditors Sharing the Burden: A Review of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (November 2003) (Chair: Hon Richard H Kroft) [Senate Report]: "From the perspective of fairness, the Committee too believes that the same priority rules should govern the distribution of the proceeds of realization of the debtor's assets, regardless of the insolvency legislation under which proceedings are occurring. For this reason, the Committee recommends that: The *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* be amended to incorporate the priority rules in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*" at 153.

17 Janis Sarra, "Reflections on a Decade of Financing Insolvency Restructurings", in Janis P Sarra, ed, *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2012* (Toronto: Carswell, 2013) at 63.

18 For an in-depth comparison of liquidations under the *CCAA* and *BIA*, see Michelle Grant & Tevia R M Jeffries, "Having Jumped Off the Cliffs, When Liquidating Why Choose CCAA over Receivership (or vice versa)?", in Janis P Sarra, ed, *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2013* (Toronto: Carswell, 2014).

19 Janis Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, 2nd ed (Toronto: Carswell, 2013) at 9; *Lemare Lake*, *supra* note 3.

20 Senate Report, *supra* note 16, at 176-177.

21 Bill Kaplan, “Liquidating *CCAA*s: Discretion Gone Awry?”, in Janis P Sarra, ed, *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2008* (Toronto: Carswell, 2009) at 88.

22 Torrie, *supra* note 7 at 313, 315.

23 *Ibid* at 288.

24 *Ibid* at 5.

25 David Bish, “Judicial Discretion in Insolvency Law” (2018) 7 *J Insolvency Inst Canada* 9.

26 *Hongkong Bank*, *supra* note 14 at para 10.

27 *Banque Laurentienne du Canada c Groupe Bovac Ltée*, EYB 1991-63766, 1991 CarswellQue 39, 9 CBR (3d) 248, 44 QAC 19, [1991] RL 593, [1991] JQ No 2509 (CA Que) at para 26.

28 *Re Canadian Red Cross Society* (1998), 5 CBR (4th) 299, 1998 CarswellOnt 3346, 72 OTC 99, [1998] OJ No 3306 (Ont Gen Div [Commercial List]) at para 45, leave to appeal to ONCA refused (1998), 32 CBR (4th) 21, 1998 CarswellOnt 5967, [1998] OJ No 6562 (Ont CA).

29 *Re Fracmaster Ltd*, 1999 ABQB 379, 11 CBR (4th) 204, 1999 CarswellAlta 461, 245 AR 102, [1999] AJ No 566 (Alta QB), affirmed 1999 ABCA 178, 1999 CarswellAlta 539, 244 AR 93, 11 CBR (4th) 230, 209 WAC 93, [1999] AJ No 675 (Alta CA) at paras 40-43.

30 *Royal Bank v Fracmaster Ltd*, 1999 ABCA 178, 1999 CarswellAlta 539, 244 AR 93, 11 CBR (4th) 230, 209 WAC 93, [1999] AJ No 675 (Alta CA) at para 16.

31 *Re Papiers Gaspésia Inc (Faillite)*, 2004 CanLII 41522, 2004 CarswellQue 4113, REJB 2004-80394 (CS Que), leave to appeal refused 2004 CarswellQue 10014, REJB 2004-81503, 9 CBR (5th) 103, 42 CLR (3d) 137, [2004] JQ No 13392 (CA Que) [*Papiers Gaspésia*].

32 *Ibid* at paras 50-54.

33 *Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd v Fisgard Capital Corp*, 2008 BCCA 327, 2008 CarswellBC 1758, 83 BCLR (4th) 214, 46 CBR (5th) 7, 296 DLR (4th) 577, [2008] 10 WWR 575, 258 BCAC 187, 434 WAC 187, [2008] BCJ No 1587 (BCCA) at para 32.

34 *Century Services*, *supra* note 14.

35 As noted in *Montreal, Maine & Atlantic City Canada Co. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2014 QCCS 737, 2014 CarswellQue 1559, EYB 2014-233970 (Que Bktcy) [*Lac Mégantic*].

36 *Re Fairmont Resort Properties Ltd*, 2012 ABQB 39, 532 AR 209 (Alta QB) at para 26 [*Fairmont*].

37 *Re Anvil Range Mining Corp*, 2001 CarswellOnt 1325, [2001] OJ No 1453, 25 CBR (4th) 1 (Ont SCJ [Commercial List]), affirmed on other grounds 2002 CarswellOnt 2254, [2002] OJ No 2606, 34 CBR (4th) 157 (Ont CA), additional reasons 2002 CarswellOnt 3687, 38 CBR (4th) 5, [2002] OJ No 4176 (Ont CA), leave to appeal refused 2003 CarswellOnt 730, 2003 CarswellOnt 731, 310 NR 200 (note), 180 OAC 399 (note) (SCC) [*Anvil*].

38 *Fairmont*, *supra* note 36 at para 17, citing *ibid* at para 11.

39 *Ibid* at para 20.

40 *Ibid* at para 26.

41 *Ibid* at para 22.

42 *Ibid* at para 30.

43 *Arrangement relatif à Bloom Lake*, 2017 QCCS 4057, 2017 CarswellQue 7483, EYB 2017-284304, 52 CBR (6th) 45, 35 CCPB (2nd) 220 (CS Que), varied 2017 QCCA 1828, 2017 CarswellQue 10159, EYB 2017-287116, 54 CBR (6th) 255, 38 CCPB (2nd) 1 (CA Que), application/notice of appeal 2018 CarswellQue 1574 (SCC) [*Bloom Lake*].

44 *Ibid* at para 164.

45 *Ibid* at para 162.

46 *Ibid* at para 163.

47 *Ibid* at para 164.

48 *Ibid* at para 160.

49 *Ibid* at para 174.

50 *Lac Mégantic*, *supra* note 35 at paras 71, 104: "Bien que le soussigné aurait été porté à privilégier la thèse que la LACC et la LFI sont deux régimes distincts qui s'appliquent à deux types de situations distinctes et qui servent des objectifs distincts, les amendements apportés à la LACC et le cas particulier du présent dossier militent pour la possibilité de permettre la liquidation des actifs sous la LACC" at para 104.

51 *Arrangement de MPECO Construction Inc*, 2019 QCCS 297, 2019 CarswellQue 730, EYB 2019-306949, 67 CBR (6th) 87 (Que Bktcy) [*MPECO Construction*].

52 *Ibid* at paras 34-35, 44-45.

53 *Third Eye Capital Corporation v Ressources Dianor Inc*, 2019 ONCA 508, 2019 CarswellOnt 9683, 70 CBR (6th) 181, 435 DLR (4th) 416, 3 RPR (6th) 175 (Ont CA), additional reasons 2019 ONCA 667, 2019 CarswellOnt 13563 (Ont CA) at para 71.

54 *Re Sears Canada Inc*, Toronto, Ont SCJ [Commercial List] CV-17-11846-00CL.

55 Bill C-97, *An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on 19 March 2019 and other measures,* 1st Sess, 42nd Parl (assented to 21 June 2019), SC 2019, c 29.

56 *Re Crystallex International Corp*, 2011 ONSC 7701, 2011 CarswellOnt 15034, 89 CBR (5th) 313 (Ont SCJ [Commercial List]) at para 26, affirmed 2012 ONCA 404, 2012 CarswellOnt 7329, 4 BLR (5th) 1, 91 CBR (5th) 207, 293 OAC 102 (Ont CA), additional reasons 2012 ONCA 527, 2012 CarswellOnt 9479 (Ont CA), leave to appeal refused 2012 CarswellOnt 11931, 2012 CarswellOnt 11932, 440 NR 395 (note), 303 OAC 398 (note), [2012] SCCA No. 254 (SCC) [*Crystallex*].

57 *Ibid* at paras 20-21, 26-27.

58 *Enterprise Capital Management Inc v Semi-Tech Corp*, [1999] OJ No 5865, 1999 CarswellOnt 2213, 10 CBR (4th) 133 (Ont SCJ [Commercial List]) [*Semi-Tech*].

59 *Ibid* at para 6.

60 *Ibid* at paras 23, 25.

61 *Re Le Groupe SMI Inc, et al* (24 August 2018), Montreal, Que SC 500-11-055122-184 [*SM Group*].

62 *Re Taxelco Inc, et al* (1 February 2019), Montreal, Que SC 500-11-055956-193 [*Taxelco*].

63 *Re Sural Inc, et al* (11 February 2019), Montreal, Que SC 500-11-056018-191 [*Sural*].

64 *Miniso International Hong Kong Limited v Migu Investments Inc*, 2019 BCSC 1234, 2019 CarswellBC 2208, 71 CBR (6th) 250 (BCSC) at para 45 [*Miniso*].

65 *Ibid* at paras 47, 102.

66 *Ibid* at paras 52-53.

67 *Semi-Tech, supra* note 58 at para 25.

68 *Re BioAmber Canada Inc, et al* (31 July 2018), Montreal, Que SC 500-11-054564-188 [*BioAmber*].

69 *Re ILTA Grain Inc* (8 July 2019), Vancouver, BC SC S-197582 [*ILTA Grain*].

70 *Ibid* (16 July 2019) (Monitor's First Report).

71 *Ibid* (18 July 2019) (Order Made After Application).

72 *Arrangement relatif à 9323-7055 Québec inc (Aquadis International Inc)* (4 July 2019), Montreal, Que SC 500-11-049838-150, leave to appeal to QCCA granted (20 August 2019), Montreal, Que CA 500-09-028436-194, 500-09-028474-195, 500-09-028476-190 [*Aquadis*].

73 *Ibid* at paras 11-13.

74 *Ibid* at paras 11-13.

75 *Anvil, supra* note 37: "I would further point out that while secured creditors had the opportunity of filing a Plan, they did not so but rather they agreed amongst themselves that the authorized alternate, the IR, do so" at para 9.

76 *Ibid*.

77 *Ibid* at paras 11,12, 18, 20.

78 *Re 1078385 Ontario Ltd*, [2004] OJ No 6050, 2004 CarswellOnt 8034, 16 CBR (5th) 152, 206 OAC 17 (Ont CA) [*Bob-Lo Island*].

79 *Ibid* at para 3.

80 *Ibid* at paras 27, 30-31, 42.

81 *Caterpillar Financial Services v 360networks corporation et al*, 2007 BCCA 14, 2007 CarswellBC 29, 61 BCLR (4th) 334, 27 CBR (5th) 115, 279 DLR (4th) 701, 28 ETR (3d) 186, 235 BCAC 95, 10 PPSAC (3d) 311, 388 WAC 95, [2007] BCJ No 22 (BCCA) at para 46.

End of Document