

BENNETT
on
RECEIVERSHIPS

Third Edition

by

Frank Bennett

L.S.M., LL.M.

Toronto, Canada

CARSWELL®

© 2011 Thomson Reuters Canada Limited

NOTICE AND DISCLAIMER: All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher (Carswell).

Carswell and all persons involved in the preparation and sale of this publication disclaim any warranty as to accuracy or currency of the publication. This publication is provided on the understanding and basis that none of Carswell, the author/s or other persons involved in the creation of this publication shall be responsible for the accuracy or currency of the contents, or for the results of any action taken on the basis of the information contained in this publication, or for any errors or omissions contained herein.

No one involved in this publication is attempting herein to render legal, accounting, or other professional advice. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought. The analysis contained herein should in no way be construed as being either official or unofficial policy of any governmental body.

ISBN 978-0-7798-3634-5

A cataloguing record for this publication is available from Library and Archives Canada

Composition: Computer Composition of Canada Inc.



THOMSON REUTERS

CARSWELL, A DIVISION OF THOMSON REUTERS CANADA LIMITED

One Corporate Plaza
2075 Kennedy Road
Toronto, Ontario
M1T 3V4

Customer Relations
Toronto 1-416-609-3800
Elsewhere in Canada/U.S. 1-800-387-5164
Fax: 1-416-298-5082
www.carswell.com
E-mail www.carswell.com/email

contractual terms in the

ent generally provides the security document, tutorily implied power property is concerned receiver has the power appointment, the initial er into agreements for business. However, if the l assets, as opposed to ted receiver enters into court approval. While security holder should s a sale of the debtor's ate matters, the debtor ver, if the secured debt holder is prejudiced by

approval, it is common to chase and sale requiring e security under which enforceable or invalid, le until such time as the ny event, the receiver's y of the security under ed is whether the court- h the debtor and all the the debtor's business is continue with a view to Act or seeking an order

L.R. 145, 16 D.L.R. (4th) 181, *How Financial Ltd.* (1985), 64 ; *Royal Bank v. Astor Hotel Ltd.* 5 (B.C. C.A.), appeal allowed owing leave to appeal from an (1986), 3 B.C.L.R. (2d) 252, 62 intment of a receiver does not t against the debtor: *Canadian* 89, 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 151, 1985

C.A.). *hip* (2001), 198 Nfld. & P.E.I.R. the court granted an injunction is pending the disposition of the

Pending the determination of the security and its priority, the court may nevertheless order the receiver to devise a process, market, and sell the assets in such a manner that would protect security holders.⁵ The receiver should have some marketing plan prepared for court approval. In a court appointment, the receiver may first seek court approval of the method and manner of sale. Often, the receiver prepares a marketing scheme and sets it out with some particularity in seeking approval. This gives the debtor and other interested persons an opportunity to become involved in the sale of the business.⁶

To obtain court approval, the court-appointed receiver prepares a report setting out the mechanics of sale and recommends that the court approve the sale. The court has the discretion to approve the sale and obviously wants to be satisfied that the best price possible has been obtained in the circumstances. In the proper case, the court may even approve a lower offer if the receiver is subsequently unable to close the transaction.⁷ The court may also inquire into the effect of the sale with respect to the debtor and other subordinate secured creditors. In general, the receiver has the duty to obtain the highest possible price for all of the assets under receivership by selling them *en bloc* or on an individual basis. The receiver must have an unfettered right to attempt to realize the maximum value through the tender process.⁸

The receiver's sale of capital assets represents the ultimate step in terminating the debtor's business. Whether pursuant to a court order or under a security instrument, the receiver converts the assets into proceeds for distribution. Once the sale is completed, the debtor is no longer in business. At that time, subsequent secured creditors and other subordinate liens and encumbrances are usually foreclosed either by operation of law or judicially.

Prior to the sale, the receiver must decide whether to spend additional moneys to complete work in progress, repair, or restore the assets so that they are in a saleable condition. While there is no duty on the receiver to advance additional moneys, the receiver may borrow moneys to enhance the value of the assets. In so doing, the receiver must not borrow significant moneys that would impair the debtor's right to redeem.

To facilitate the sale of the debtor's business as a going concern, the receiver may consider selling the assets to a newly incorporated company without the claims of employees, trade creditors, and governments.⁹ Then the receiver will have a company without debt and obligations. This gives the receiver a saleable package with which to market. The employees remain in the company's employment and they are

5. *Royal Bank v. Ramco Sales Inc.* (2010), 16 P.P.S.A.C. (3d) 81, 64 C.B.R. (5th) 48, 2010 ABQB 1 (CanLII) (Alta. Q.B.).

6. See, for example, *Re SLMSoft Inc.* (2003), 47 C.B.R. (4th) 311, 2003 CarswellOnt 4730 (Ont. S.C.J.); *Re Produits forestiers Bellerive Ka'N'Enda inc.* (2007), 45 C.B.R. (5th) 128, 2007 CarswellQue 2731, 2007 QCCS 1530 (CanLII) (Que. S.C.).

For a suggested list of factors in selling property, see "A Creditor's Duty of Care on Realization", Frank Bennett, 1988 Law Society of Upper Canada Special Lectures, page 247, De Boo.

7. See *Alma College v. United Church of Canada* (1996), 43 C.B.R. (3d) 8, 1996 CarswellOnt 4235 (Ont. Gen. Div.), appeal dismissed (1996), 43 C.B.R. (3d) 19, 1996 CarswellOnt 4537 (Ont. C.A.).

8. *Genelcan Realty Ltd. v. Wiseman* (1986), 59 C.B.R. (N.S.) 197, 1986 CarswellOnt 187 (Ont. H.C.), leave to appeal refused (1986), 59 C.B.R. (N.S.) 284, 1986 CarswellOnt 193 (Ont. H.C.).

9. In the United Kingdom, this is called a hiving down agreement.