

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

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

**AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF AGMEDICA BIOSCIENCE INC.,
2472602 ONTARIO INC., 2642466 ONTARIO INC.,
8895309 CANADA INC., WELLWORTH HEALTH
CORP., 8050678 CANADA INC., 8326851 CANADA INC.,
TAVIVAT NATURALS INC., WORLDWIDE
BEVERAGE INNOVATIONS INC., UNIQUE
BEVERAGES (USA) INC., and ESEELA INC.**

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES
OF THE APPLICANTS**

December 11, 2019

Thornton Grout Finnigan LLP
100 Wellington Street West
Suite 3200
TD West Tower, Toronto-Dominion
Centre
Toronto, ON M5K 1K7

Rebecca L. Kennedy (LSO# 61146S)
Email: rkennedy@tgf.ca

Owen Gaffney (LSO # 75017B)
Email: ogaffney@tgf.ca

Adam Driedger (LSO# 77296F)
Email: adriedger@tgf.ca

Tel: 416-304-1616
Fax: 416-304-1313

Lawyers for the Applicants

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

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF **AGMEDICA BIOSCIENCE INC.,
2472602 ONTARIO INC., 2642466 ONTARIO INC.,
8895309 CANADA INC., WELLWORTH HEALTH
CORP., 8050678 CANADA INC., 8326851 CANADA INC.,
TAVIVAT NATURALS INC., WORLDWIDE
BEVERAGE INNOVATIONS INC., UNIQUE
BEVERAGES (USA) INC., and ESEELA INC.**

INDEX

Tab	Document
1	<i>Sunrise/Saskatoon Apartments Limited Partnership (Re)</i> , 2017 BCSC 808.
2	<i>Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)</i> , [2009] OJ No 4788 (ONSC).
3	<i>Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re</i> , 2010 ONSC 222.
4	<i>Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re</i> , [1999] OJ No 709 (ONSC – Commercial List).
5	<i>Miniso International Hong Kong Ltd v. Migu Investments Inc.</i> , 2019 BCSC 1234.
6	<i>Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re</i> , [2009] OJ No 4286 (ONSC – Commercial List).
7	<i>Jaguar Mining Inc., Re</i> , 2014 ONSC 494.
8	<i>Re Lehndorff General Partners Ltd</i> , (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (ONSC – Commercial List).
9	<i>Cinram International Inc, Re</i> , 2012 ONSC 3767.
10	<i>Nortel Networks Corp, Re</i> , [2009] OJ No 3169 (ONSC - Commercial List).

Tab 1

2017 BCSC 808
British Columbia Supreme Court

Sunrise/Saskatoon Apartments Limited Partnership, Re

2017 CarswellBC 1275, 2017 BCSC 808, [2017] B.C.W.L.D. 3765, [2017] B.C.W.L.D. 3766, 279 A.C.W.S. (3d) 464

**In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors
Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended**

And In the Matter of the Business Corporations Act, S.B.C. 2002, c. 57, as amended

And In the Matter of the Canada Business Corporations Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44, as amended

In the Matter of the Plan of Compromise and Arrangement of Sunrise/Saskatoon
Apartments Limited Partnership and Those Parties Listed on Schedule "A"

Fitzpatrick J., In Chambers

Heard: April 21, 2017

Judgment: April 21, 2017

Docket: Vancouver S1611657

Counsel: C.J. Ramsay, K.G. Mak, for Petitioners

P. Bychawski, for KingSett Mortgage Corporation

M. Buttery, for Community Trust

J.R. Sandrelli, for Monitor, PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

G.G. Plottel, for MCAP Financial Corp.

M.C. Verbrugge, for GMI Servicing Inc.

C.D. Brousson, for Timbercreek Mortgage Servicing Inc.

R.P. Wu, for Steering Committee of Limited Partners (M. Rauch, C. Duidre, C. Cumming, F. Banducci and R. Gritten)

B.R. Bennett, for New Summit Partners Corp., Oledale Management Services Inc. and H.C. Apartments LP

G.H. Dabbs, for Van Maren Group

M. Russell, for Superior Millwork Ltd., Durabuilt Windows & Doors Inc. and Adler Firestopping Ltd.

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.2 Initial application](#)

[XIX.2.b Grant of stay](#)

[XIX.2.b.vii Extension of order](#)

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.3 Arrangements](#)

[XIX.3.b Approval by court](#)

[XIX.3.b.iv Miscellaneous](#)

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Grant of stay — Extension of order

After extensive negotiations in Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) proceeding, amended and restated initial order was granted that provided general framework for dealing with properties — Order provided for various properties to be immediately put up for sale, and allowed petitioners, who were in business of acquiring and developing rental buildings, to continue with construction activities toward completing certain buildings, and once construction was completed buildings would be put up for sale — Since order was granted there had been substantial continuing efforts by all of stakeholders toward finalizing go forward path, all with involvement of monitor — Substantial construction work had been completed, and necessary financing for construction work was secured with mortgagee through syndicated process — Petitioners applied to extend stay of proceeding to August 31, 2017 — Application granted — Only two secured creditors opposed proposed extension date, and it was supported by monitor — Decision as to what appropriate extension date was required that court allow some flexibility to parties — It was exercise of court's discretion terms of what was most appropriate in circumstances — There would be further court attendances before August where opposing secured creditors would have ample opportunity to voice concerns or disagreements about process going forward — There was no need to put petitioners to extra cost of making further applications for extensions of stay — As there was ongoing oversight by monitor, it was expected that if anything untoward should happened it would be reported — Monitor appropriately analyzed various factors that were at play, and stay was extended to August 11, 2017 because it accorded with judge's roster and counsel's calendars.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Approval by court — Miscellaneous
After extensive negotiations in Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) proceeding, amended and restated initial order was granted that provided general framework for dealing with properties — Order provided for various properties to be immediately put up for sale, and allowed petitioners, who were in business of acquiring and developing rental buildings, to continue with construction activities toward completing certain buildings, and once construction was completed buildings would be put up for sale — Since order was granted there had been substantial continuing efforts by all of stakeholders toward finalizing go forward path, all with involvement of monitor — Substantial construction work had been completed, and necessary financing for construction work was secured with mortgagee through syndicated process — Mortgagee applied for order approving various loans — Application granted — There was no opposition to mortgagee's application to approve loans, and both monitor and petitioners supported order — Evidence established that relevant test under CCAA was met in circumstances.

Table of Authorities

Statutes considered:

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

Generally — referred to

APPLICATION by petitioners to extend stay of proceeding; APPLICATION by mortgagee for order approving various loans.

Fitzpatrick J., In Chambers:

1 This is a *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* proceeding. The petitioners are in the business of acquiring and developing various rental buildings in Regina and Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. The matter began with the granting of an initial order on December 19, 2016.

2 At the outset, this restructuring proceeding had all the hallmarks of being a very contested matter. This arose largely from the concerns of the extensive secured creditor group, who hold different levels of security on the various projects or buildings.

3 Fortunately, much of the stakeholders' differences were subsequently put aside as a result of extensive negotiations. Those negotiations led to the granting of the amended and restated initial order (the "ARIO") on February 3, 2017.

4 The ARIO provides a general framework for dealing with the various properties. In broad terms, the ARIO provided for various properties to be immediately put up for sale. In addition, the ARIO allowed for the petitioners to continue with their construction activities towards completing certain buildings and finalizing the leasing of the various units in those buildings. The general idea is that, once the construction was finished, those buildings would similarly be put up for sale.

5 Another circumstance which the petitioners had in mind leading up to the granting of the ARIO was that, with the exception of the phase 1 properties, which were to be put up for sale, there remained the possibility of a restructuring with respect to some or all of the other buildings.

6 A fundamental aspect of the stakeholder's intentions regarding the ARIO was to recognize and respect the various interests that applied to each individual property, which have different encumbrances (what the Monitor describes as the "capital stack"). Generally speaking, each property or building has different and different levels of lenders, beginning with the first secured creditor and continuing down to the limited partners or equity interests that apply to each of the properties. Accordingly, from the outset of these proceedings, the stakeholders have agreed to a concept of "ring fencing", which preserves the cash flows and costs associated with each of the individual properties and allows an orderly assessment of the viability of the properties on that basis.

7 Since the ARIO was granted, there have been substantial continuing efforts by all of the stakeholders toward finalizing the "go forward" path, all with the involvement of the Monitor. Those efforts are principally outlined in the Monitor's Fourth Report dated April 13, 2017, and in particular at paragraph 8 and following. The Monitor reports that five properties were put up for sale and agreements are anticipated in early May. The sixth property, being CILO, has now been added to that sales process, and definitive agreements on that property are expected on May 23, 2017.

8 In addition, substantial work has been completed on the construction front, with various budgets being prepared. Arbutus has been retained to take that process forward. The necessary financing for that construction has been secured with KingSett Mortgage Corporation through a syndicated process. Therefore, the funding is in place with respect to the construction which is anticipated to take between six to eight months, or to the end of 2017.

9 The Monitor outlines that there have been extensive discussions between the various stakeholders. Stakeholders participating in the discussions concerning the need for construction financing have included the limited partners. Even so, it appears that they have declined to provide that financing, leading to KingSett agreeing to do so.

10 I have also been assisted on this application by the Monitor's Supplemental Report dated April 19, 2017, on one particular issue, which I will address in these reasons.

11 The two applications before me today are as follows: firstly, the petitioners apply to extend the stay to August 31, 2017; secondly, KingSett applies for an order approving various loans. These loans include an initial loan of \$50,000 in respect of the CILO project. That loan was superseded by a second loan of \$502,000, which paid out the \$50,000 loan. Finally, KingSett applies for approval of a \$17.5 million loan with respect to the construction on the various Sunrise projects. To some extent, KingSett's application is brought *nunc pro tunc* because, working within the general framework under the ARIO, the petitioners have already received initial draws under that financing.

12 There is no opposition to the application by KingSett to approve the loans. In fact, the Monitor supports the order being granted, as do the petitioners. I have no hesitation in concluding that the order should be granted. I find that the evidence establishes that the relevant test under the *CCAA* is met in the circumstances.

13 Accordingly, the order as sought by KingSett in its notice of application dated April 18, 2017, is granted, with the minor amendment addressed by KingSett's counsel during submissions.

14 The petitioners' application to extend the stay of proceeding to August 31 has invited some opposition. Counsel for the petitioners has made submissions as to their reasoning for the August 31 date. In broad terms, those reasons relate to both the sales process and the construction process which are underway. It is anticipated that the sales process will bring forward applications either in June or possibly early July. In addition, the construction schedule anticipates a process of six to eight months from today, which leads us into the December 2017 time frame. Counsel also point out that there is a cost of coming back to court for further extension. Given the number of faces that I see in this courtroom, it cannot be doubted that that is a significant cost arising from every court appearance.

15 The proposed extension date of August 31 is not opposed by many of the secured creditors. These secured creditors take no position on that issue, although they all indicated that they reserved their rights in the sense that they will see how the process plays out. If matters do not proceed to their liking, they all indicate that they may apply to the Court to propose another course of action.

16 The proposed extension date is opposed by two secured creditors: Community Trust, a senior secured creditor on the Nutana property with debt of approximately \$15 million; and, the Van Maren Group, a junior secured creditor (mostly in third position) on the Sunset properties. Both creditors seek an extension date earlier than August 31.

17 Community Trust submits that the more appropriate date is the end of June. Its opposition is advanced on the basis that in the normal course a *CCAA* extension date is tied to what is called a threshold date. Further, Community Trust submits that since it is somewhat unclear in terms of how the sales and construction process will unfold, an earlier date is appropriate. Counsel for Community Trust also suggests that by granting the extension date to August, it will effectively reverse the onus by requiring any secured creditor who opposes the continuation of the proceeding to bring its own application to set a different course.

18 The Monitor has expressly addressed the issue as to extension date in its Supplemental Report at paragraph 3.3. Essentially, the Monitor says that there has been positive momentum to these proceedings and that much has been accomplished in terms of achieving consensus between the various stakeholders as to a process going forward. The Monitor also notes that the agreed upon process not only involves the sales, but also a construction process that requires some stability in terms of retaining trades without the sword of Damocles being held over people's heads and worrying about having to justify further extensions.

19 Finally, the Monitor concludes that, given the CILO sales process, which is somewhat further delayed, that sales process might well only result in a sale to be addressed in early July.

20 Accordingly, the Monitor concludes that the August 31 extension date provides a reasonable date given the overall circumstances.

21 The decision as to what an appropriate extension date is requires that the Court allow some flexibility to the parties. It remains a matter of exercising my discretion in terms of what I think is the most appropriate in the circumstances.

22 In my view, there is no doubt that there will be further court attendances between now and August, particularly given the sales process that is underway. In my view, those applications will provide more than ample opportunity for any secured creditor, including Community Trust and Van Maren, to voice any concerns or disagreement about the process going forward.

23 I agree that I see no need to put the petitioners to the extra cost of making further applications for extensions of the stay. The costs of doing so will, of course, redound to the prejudice of the overall stakeholder group given the significant costs that are involved.

24 I have in mind too that there will be ongoing oversight by the Monitor. If anything untoward should happen, I would expect that the Monitor would file a report to that effect and alert the stakeholders so that the matter can be brought back before the court to be addressed in the usual fashion.

25 Overall, I am satisfied that the Monitor has appropriately analyzed the various moving parts that are in play in this proceeding at this time. Accordingly, I grant the order allowing the extension date to August 11, 2017. I have chosen this date because it accords with my rota when I will be sitting in Vancouver and the calendars of counsel.

Applications granted.

Tab 2

Case Name:
Canwest Global Communications Corp. (Re)

**IN THE MATTER OF the Companies' Creditors Arrangement
Act, R.S.C. 1985, C-36, as amended
AND IN THE MATTER OF a Proposed Plan of Compromise or
Arrangement of Canwest Global Communications Corp. and
the other applicants listed on Schedule "A"**

[2009] O.J. No. 4788

Court File No. CV-09-8241-OOCL

Ontario Superior Court of Justice
Commercial List

S.E. Pepall J.

November 12, 2009.

(43 paras.)

Bankruptcy and insolvency law -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) matters -- Compromises and arrangements -- Applications -- Sanction by court -- Application by a group of debtor companies for approval of an agreement that would enable them to restructure their business affairs, allowed -- Applicants were under the protection of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act -- Agreement was approved because it facilitated the restructuring of the applicants to enable them to become viable and competitive industry participants and it was fair -- Related transaction regarding the transfer of the business and assets of a newspaper that the applicants had an interest in did not require Court approval under s. 36 of the Act because it was an internal corporate reorganization which was in the ordinary course of business -- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 36.

Application by a group of debtor companies and entities for an order approving a Transition and Reorganization Agreement between them and other related parties. The applicants were granted protection under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act on October 6, 2009. They were engaged in the newspaper, digital media and television business. The Agreement pertained to the restructuring of the applicants' business affairs. It was an internal reorganization transaction that was designed to realign shared services and assets within the corporate family that the applicants belonged to. The Agreement was entered into after extensive negotiations between the parties who

were affected by it. The Monitor, who was appointed under the Act, concluded that this transaction had several advantages over a liquidation.

HELD: Application allowed. Court approval under s. 36 of the Act was required if a debtor company under the protection of the Act proposed to sell or dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business. It did not apply to a transaction regarding the transfer of the assets and business of a newspaper that the applicants had an interest in because it was an internal corporate reorganization which was in the ordinary course of business. The Agreement was approved because it facilitated the restructuring of the applicants to enable them to become viable and competitive industry participants and it was fair. It also allowed a substantial number of the businesses operated by the applicants to continue as going concerns. The Agreement did not prejudice the applicants' major creditors. In the absence of the Agreement the newspaper would have to shut down and most of its employees would lose their employment. The stay that was granted under the Act was extended to enable the applicants to continue to work with their various stakeholders on the preparation and filing of a proposed plan of arrangement.

Statutes, Regulations and Rules Cited:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act,

Bulk Sales Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. B.14,

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 2(1), s. 2(1), s. 36, s. 36(1), s. 36(4), s. 36(7)

Counsel:

Lyndon Barnes and Jeremy Dacks for the Applicants.

Alan Merskey for the Special Committee of the Board of Directors of Canwest.

David Byers and Maria Konyukhova for the Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Benjamin Zarnett for the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders.

Peter J. Osborne for Proposed Management Directors of National Post.

Andrew Kent and Hilary Clarke for Bank of Nova Scotia, Agent for Senior Secured Lenders to LP Entities.

Steve Weisz for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.

Amanda Darroch for Communication Workers of America.

Alena Thouin for Superintendent of Financial Services.

REASONS FOR DECISION

S.E. PEPALL J.:--

Relief Requested

1 The CMI Entities move for an order approving the Transition and Reorganization Agreement by and among Canwest Global Communications Corporation ("Canwest Global"), Canwest Limited Partnership/Canwest Societe en Commandite (the "Limited Partnership"), Canwest Media Inc. ("CMI"), Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc ("CPI"), Canwest Television Limited Partnership ("CTLTP") and The National Post Company/La Publication National Post (the "National Post Company") dated as of October 26, 2009, and which includes the New Shared Services Agreement and the National Post Transition Agreement.

2 In addition they ask for a vesting order with respect to certain assets of the National Post Company and a stay extension order.

3 At the conclusion of oral argument, I granted the order requested with reasons to follow.

Background Facts

(a) Parties

4 The CMI Entities including Canwest Global, CMI, CTLTP, the National Post Company, and certain subsidiaries were granted *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") protection on Oct 6, 2009. Certain others including the Limited Partnership and CPI did not seek such protection. The term Canwest will be used to refer to the entire enterprise.

5 The National Post Company is a general partnership with units held by CMI and National Post Holdings Ltd. (a wholly owned subsidiary of CMI). The National Post Company carries on business publishing the National Post newspaper and operating related on line publications.

(b) History

6 To provide some context, it is helpful to briefly review the history of Canwest. In general terms, the Canwest enterprise has two business lines: newspaper and digital media on the one hand and television on the other. Prior to 2005, all of the businesses that were wholly owned by Canwest Global were operated directly or indirectly by CMI using its former name, Canwest Mediaworks Inc. As one unified business, support services were shared. This included such things as executive services, information technology, human resources and accounting and finance.

7 In October, 2005, as part of a planned income trust spin-off, the Limited Partnership was formed to acquire Canwest Global's newspaper publishing and digital media entities as well as certain of the shared services operations. The National Post Company was excluded from this acquisition due to its lack of profitability and unsuitability for inclusion in an income trust. The Limited Partnership entered into a credit agreement with a syndicate of lenders and the Bank of Nova Scotia as administrative agent. The facility was guaranteed by the Limited Partner's general partner, Canwest (Canada) Inc. ("CCI"), and its subsidiaries, CPI and Canwest Books Inc. (CBI") (collectively with the Limited Partnership, the "LP Entities"). The Limited Partnership and its subsidiaries then operated for a couple of years as an income trust.

8 In spite of the income trust spin off, there was still a need for the different entities to continue to share services. CMI and the Limited Partnership entered into various agreements to govern the provision and cost allocation of certain services between them. The following features characterized these arrangements:

- the service provider, be it CMI or the Limited Partnership, would be entitled to reimbursement for all costs and expenses incurred in the provision of services;
- shared expenses would be allocated on a commercially reasonable basis consistent with past practice; and
- neither the reimbursement of costs and expenses nor the payment of fees was intended to result in any material financial gain or loss to the service provider.

9 The multitude of operations that were provided by the LP Entities for the benefit of the National Post Company rendered the latter dependent on both the shared services arrangements and on the operational synergies that developed between the National Post Company and the newspaper and digital operations of the LP Entities.

10 In 2007, following the Federal Government's announcement on the future of income fund distributions, the Limited Partnership effected a going-private transaction of the income trust. Since July, 2007, the Limited Partnership has been a 100% wholly owned indirect subsidiary of Canwest Global. Although repatriated with the rest of the Canwest enterprise in 2007, the LP Entities have separate credit facilities from CMI and continue to participate in the shared services arrangements. In spite of this mutually beneficial interdependence between the LP Entities and the CMI Entities, given the history, there are misalignments of personnel and services.

(c) Restructuring

11 Both the CMI Entities and the LP Entities are pursuing independent but coordinated restructuring and reorganization plans. The former have proceeded with their CCAA filing and pre-packaged recapitalization transaction and the latter have entered into a forbearance agreement with certain of their senior lenders. Both the recapitalization transaction and the forbearance agreement contemplate a disentanglement and/or a realignment of the shared services arrangements. In addition, the term sheet relating to the CMI recapitalization transaction requires a transfer of the assets and business of the National Post Company to the Limited Partnership.

12 The CMI Entities and the LP Entities have now entered into the Transition and Reorganization Agreement which addresses a restructuring of these inter-entity arrangements. By agreement, it is subject to court approval. The terms were negotiated amongst the CMI Entities, the LP Entities, their financial and legal advisors, their respective chief restructuring advisors, the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders, certain of the Limited Partnership's senior lenders and their respective financial and legal advisors.

13 Schedule A to that agreement is the New Shared Services Agreement. It anticipates a cessation or renegotiation of the provision of certain services and the elimination of certain redundancies. It also addresses a realignment of certain employees who are misaligned and, subject to approval of the relevant regulator, a transfer of certain misaligned pension plan participants to pension plans

that are sponsored by the appropriate party. The LP Entities, the CMI Chief Restructuring Advisor and the Monitor have consented to the entering into of the New Shared Services Agreement.

14 Schedule B to the Transition and Reorganization Agreement is the National Post Transition Agreement.

15 The National Post Company has not generated a profit since its inception in 1998 and continues to suffer operating losses. It is projected to suffer a net loss of \$9.3 million in fiscal year ending August 31, 2009 and a net loss of \$0.9 million in September, 2009. For the past seven years these losses have been funded by CMI and as a result, the National Post Company owes CMI approximately \$139.1 million. The members of the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders had agreed to the continued funding by CMI of the National Post Company's short-term liquidity needs but advised that they were no longer prepared to do so after October 30, 2009. Absent funding, the National Post, a national newspaper, would shut down and employment would be lost for its 277 non-unionized employees. Three of its employees provide services to the LP Entities and ten of the LP Entities' employees provide services to the National Post Company. The National Post Company maintains a defined benefit pension plan registered under the Ontario Pension Benefits Act. It has a solvency deficiency as of December 31, 2006 of \$1.5 million and a wind up deficiency of \$1.6 million.

16 The National Post Company is also a guarantor of certain of CMI's and Canwest Global's secured and unsecured indebtedness as follows:

Irish Holdco Secured Note -- \$187.3 million

CIT Secured Facility -- \$10.7 million

CMI Senior Unsecured Subordinated Notes -- US\$393.2 million

Irish Holdco Unsecured Note -- \$430.6 million

17 Under the National Post Transition Agreement, the assets and business of the National Post Company will be transferred as a going concern to a new wholly-owned subsidiary of CPI (the "Transferee"). Assets excluded from the transfer include the benefit of all insurance policies, corporate charters, minute books and related materials, and amounts owing to the National Post Company by any of the CMI Entities.

18 The Transferee will assume the following liabilities: accounts payable to the extent they have not been due for more than 90 days; accrued expenses to the extent they have not been due for more than 90 days; deferred revenue; and any amounts due to employees. The Transferee will assume all liabilities and/or obligations (including any unfunded liability) under the National Post pension plan and benefit plans and the obligations of the National Post Company under contracts, licences and permits relating to the business of the National Post Company. Liabilities that are not expressly assumed are excluded from the transfer including the debt of approximately \$139.1 million owed to CMI, all liabilities of the National Post Company in respect of borrowed money including any related party or third party debt (but not including approximately \$1,148,365 owed to the LP Entities) and contingent liabilities relating to existing litigation claims.

19 CPI will cause the Transferee to offer employment to all of the National Post Company's employees on terms and conditions substantially similar to those pursuant to which the employees are currently employed.

20 The Transferee is to pay a portion of the price or cost in cash: (i) \$2 million and 50% of the National Post Company's negative cash flow during the month of October, 2009 (to a maximum of \$1 million), less (ii) a reduction equal to the amount, if any, by which the assumed liabilities estimate as defined in the National Post Transition Agreement exceeds \$6.3 million.

21 The CMI Entities were of the view that an agreement relating to the transfer of the National Post could only occur if it was associated with an agreement relating to shared services. In addition, the CMI Entities state that the transfer of the assets and business of the National Post Company to the Transferee is necessary for the survival of the National Post as a going concern. Furthermore, there are synergies between the National Post Company and the LP Entities and there is also the operational benefit of reintegrating the National Post newspaper with the other newspapers. It cannot operate independently of the services it receives from the Limited Partnership. Similarly, the LP Entities estimate that closure of the National Post would increase the LP Entities' cost burden by approximately \$14 million in the fiscal year ending August 31, 2010.

22 In its Fifth Report to the Court, the Monitor reviewed alternatives to transitioning the business of the National Post Company to the LP Entities. RBC Dominion Securities Inc. who was engaged in December, 2008 to assist in considering and evaluating recapitalization alternatives, received no expressions of interest from parties seeking to acquire the National Post Company. Similarly, the Monitor has not been contacted by anyone interested in acquiring the business even though the need to transfer the business of the National Post Company has been in the public domain since October 6, 2009, the date of the Initial Order. The Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders will only support the short term liquidity needs until October 30, 2009 and the National Post Company is precluded from borrowing without the Ad Hoc Committee's consent which the latter will not provide. The LP Entities will not advance funds until the transaction closes. Accordingly, failure to transition would likely result in the forced cessation of operations and the commencement of liquidation proceedings. The estimated net recovery from a liquidation range from a negative amount to an amount not materially higher than the transfer price before costs of liquidation. The senior secured creditors of the National Post Company, namely the CIT Facility lenders and Irish Holdco, support the transaction as do the members of the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders.

23 The Monitor has concluded that the transaction has the following advantages over a liquidation:

- it facilitates the reorganization and orderly transition and subsequent termination of the shared services arrangements between the CMI Entities and the LP Entities;
- it preserves approximately 277 jobs in an already highly distressed newspaper publishing industry;

- it will help maintain and promote competition in the national daily newspaper market for the benefit of Canadian consumers; and
- the Transferee will assume substantially all of the National Post Company's trade payables (including those owed to various suppliers) and various employment costs associated with the transferred employees.

Issues

24 The issues to consider are whether:

- (a) the transfer of the assets and business of the National Post is subject to the requirements of section 36 of the *CCAA*;
- (b) the Transition and Reorganization Agreement should be approved by the Court; and
- (c) the stay should be extended to January 22, 2010.

Discussion

(a) Section 36 of the *CCAA*

25 Section 36 of the *CCAA* was added as a result of the amendments which came into force on September 18, 2009. Counsel for the CMI Entities and the Monitor outlined their positions on the impact of the recent amendments to the *CCAA* on the motion before me. As no one challenged the order requested, no opposing arguments were made.

26 Court approval is required under section 36 if:

- (a) a debtor company under *CCAA* protection
- (b) proposes to sell or dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business.

27 Court approval under this section of the Act¹ is only required if those threshold requirements are met. If they are met, the court is provided with a list of non-exclusive factors to consider in determining whether to approve the sale or disposition. Additionally, certain mandatory criteria must be met for court approval of a sale or disposition of assets to a related party. Notice is to be given to secured creditors likely to be affected by the proposed sale or disposition. The court may only grant authorization if satisfied that the company can and will make certain pension and employee related payments.

28 Specifically, section 36 states:

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

(2) Notice to creditors -- A company that applies to the court for an authorization is to give notice of the application to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the proposed sale or disposition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(4) Additional factors -- related persons -- If the proposed sale or disposition is to a person who is related to the company, the court may, after considering the factors referred to in subsection (3), grant the authorization only if it is satisfied that

(a) good faith efforts were made to sell or otherwise dispose of the assets to persons who are not related to the company; and

(b) the consideration to be received is superior to the consideration that would be received under any other offer made in accordance with the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition.

(5) Related persons -- For the purpose of subsection (4), a person who is related to the company includes

(a) a director or officer of the company;

(b) a person who has or has had, directly or indirectly, control in fact of the company; and

(c) a person who is related to a person described in paragraph (a) or (b).

- (6) Assets may be disposed of free and clear -- The court may authorize a sale or disposition free and clear of any security, charge or other restriction and, if it does, it shall also order that other assets of the company or the proceeds of the sale or disposition be subject to a security, charge or other restriction in favour of the creditor whose security, charge or other restriction is to be affected by the order.
- (7) Restriction -- employers -- The court may grant the authorization only if the court is satisfied that the company can and will make the payments that would have been required under paragraphs 6(4)(a) and (5)(a) if the court had sanctioned the compromise or arrangement.²

29 While counsel for the CMI Entities states that the provisions of section 36 have been satisfied, he submits that section 36 is inapplicable to the circumstances of the transfer of the assets and business of the National Post Company because the threshold requirements are not met. As such, the approval requirements are not triggered. The Monitor supports this position.

30 In support, counsel for the CMI Entities and for the Monitor firstly submit that section 36(1) makes it clear that the section only applies to a debtor company. The terms "debtor company" and "company" are defined in section 2(1) of the CCAA and do not expressly include a partnership. The National Post Company is a general partnership and therefore does not fall within the definition of debtor company. While I acknowledge these facts, I do not accept this argument in the circumstances of this case. Relying on case law and exercising my inherent jurisdiction, I extended the scope of the Initial Order to encompass the National Post Company and the other partnerships such that they were granted a stay and other relief. In my view, it would be inconsistent and artificial to now exclude the business and assets of those partnerships from the ambit of the protections contained in the statute.

31 The CMI Entities' and the Monitor's second argument is that the Transition and Reorganization Agreement represents an internal corporate reorganization that is not subject to the requirements of section 36. Section 36 provides for court approval where a debtor under CCAA protection proposes to sell or otherwise dispose of assets "outside the ordinary course of business". This implies, so the argument goes, that a transaction that is in the ordinary course of business is not captured by section 36. The Transition and Reorganization Agreement is an internal corporate reorganization which is in the ordinary course of business and therefore section 36 is not triggered state counsel for the CMI Entities and for the Monitor. Counsel for the Monitor goes on to submit that the subject transaction is but one aspect of a larger transaction. Given the commitments and agreements entered into with the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders and the Bank of Nova Scotia as agent for the senior secured lenders to the LP Entities, the transfer cannot be treated as an independent sale divorced from its rightful context. In these circumstances, it is submitted that section 36 is not engaged.

32 The CCAA is remedial legislation designed to enable insolvent companies to restructure. As mentioned by me before in this case, the amendments do not detract from this objective. In discussing section 36, the Industry Canada Briefing Book³ on the amendments states that "The reform is intended to provide the debtor company with greater flexibility in dealing with its property while limiting the possibility of abuse."⁴

33 The term "ordinary course of business" is not defined in the *CCAA* or in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*⁵. As noted by Cullity J. in *Millgate Financial Corp. v. BCED Holdings Ltd.*⁶, authorities that have considered the use of the term in various statutes have not provided an exhaustive definition. As one author observed in a different context, namely the *Bulk Sales Act*⁷, courts have typically taken a common sense approach to the term "ordinary course of business" and have considered the normal business dealings of each particular seller⁸. In *Pacific Mobile Corp.*⁹, the Supreme Court of Canada stated:

It is not wise to attempt to give a comprehensive definition of the term "ordinary course of business" for all transactions. Rather, it is best to consider the circumstances of each case and to take into account the type of business carried on by the debtor and creditor.

We approve of the following passage from Monet J.A.'s reasons, [1982] C.A. 501, discussing the phrase "ordinary course of business" ...

'It is apparent from these authorities, it seems to me, that the concept we are concerned with is an abstract one and that it is the function of the courts to consider the circumstances of each case in order to determine how to characterize a given transaction. This in effect reflects the constant interplay between law and fact.'

34 In arguing that section 36 does not apply to an internal corporate reorganization, the CMI Entities rely on the commentary of Industry Canada as being a useful indicator of legislative intent and descriptive of the abuse the section was designed to prevent. That commentary suggests that section 36(4), which deals with dispositions of assets to a related party, was intended to:

... prevent the possible abuse by "phoenix corporations". Prevalent in small business, particularly in the restaurant industry, phoenix corporations are the result of owners who engage in serial bankruptcies. A person incorporates a business and proceeds to cause it to become bankrupt. The person then purchases the assets of the business at a discount out of the estate and incorporates a "new" business using the assets of the previous business. The owner continues their original business basically unaffected while creditors are left unpaid.¹⁰

35 In my view, not every internal corporate reorganization escapes the purview of section 36. Indeed, a phoenix corporation to one may be an internal corporate reorganization to another. As suggested by the decision in *Pacific Mobile Corp.*¹¹, a court should in each case examine the circumstances of the subject transaction within the context of the business carried on by the debtor.

36 In this case, the business of the National Post Company and the CP Entities are highly integrated and interdependent. The Canwest business structure predated the insolvency of the CMI Entities and reflects in part an anomaly that arose as a result of an income trust structure driven by tax considerations. The Transition and Reorganization Agreement is an internal reorganization transaction that is designed to realign shared services and assets within the Canwest corporate family so as to rationalize the business structure and to better reflect the appropriate business model. Furthermore, the realignment of the shared services and transfer of the assets and business of the National Post Company to the publishing side of the business are steps in the larger reorganization of the relationship between the CMI Entities and the LP Entities. There is no ability to proceed with either

the Shared Services Agreement or the National Post Transition Agreement alone. The Transition and Reorganization Agreement provides a framework for the CMI Entities and the LP Entities to properly restructure their inter-entity arrangements for the benefit of their respective stakeholders. It would be commercially unreasonable to require the CMI Entities to engage in the sort of third party sales process contemplated by section 36(4) and offer the National Post for sale to third parties before permitting them to realign the shared services arrangements. In these circumstances, I am prepared to accept that section 36 is inapplicable.

(b) Transition and Reorganization Agreement

37 As mentioned, the Transition and Reorganization Agreement is by its terms subject to court approval. The court has a broad jurisdiction to approve agreements that facilitate a restructuring: *Re Stelco Inc.*¹² Even though I have accepted that in this case section 36 is inapplicable, court approval should be sought in circumstances where the sale or disposition is to a related person and there is an apprehension that the sale may not be in the ordinary course of business. At that time, the court will confirm or reject the ordinary course of business characterization. If confirmed, at minimum, the court will determine whether the proposed transaction facilitates the restructuring and is fair. If rejected, the court will determine whether the proposed transaction meets the requirements of section 36. Even if the court confirms that the proposed transaction is in the ordinary course of business and therefore outside the ambit of section 36, the provisions of the section may be considered in assessing fairness.

38 I am satisfied that the proposed transaction does facilitate the restructuring and is fair and that the Transition and Reorganization Agreement should be approved. In this regard, amongst other things, I have considered the provisions of section 36. I note the following. The CMI recapitalization transaction which prompted the Transition and Reorganization Agreement is designed to facilitate the restructuring of CMI into a viable and competitive industry participant and to allow a substantial number of the businesses operated by the CMI Entities to continue as going concerns. This preserves value for stakeholders and maintains employment for as many employees of the CMI Entities as possible. The Transition and Reorganization Agreement was entered into after extensive negotiation and consultation between the CMI Entities, the LP Entities, their respective financial and legal advisers and restructuring advisers, the Ad Hoc Committee and the LP senior secured lenders and their respective financial and legal advisers. As such, while not every stakeholder was included, significant interests have been represented and in many instances, given the nature of their interest, have served as proxies for unrepresented stakeholders. As noted in the materials filed by the CMI Entities, the National Post Transition Agreement provides for the transfer of assets and certain liabilities to the publishing side of the Canwest business and the assumption of substantially all of the operating liabilities by the Transferee. Although there is no guarantee that the Transferee will ultimately be able to meet its liabilities as they come due, the liabilities are not stranded in an entity that will have materially fewer assets to satisfy them.

39 There is no prejudice to the major creditors of the CMI Entities. Indeed, the senior secured lender, Irish Holdco., supports the Transition and Reorganization Agreement as does the Ad Hoc Committee and the senior secured lenders of the LP Entities. The Monitor supports the Transition and Reorganization Agreement and has concluded that it is in the best interests of a broad range of stakeholders of the CMI Entities, the National Post Company, including its employees, suppliers and customers, and the LP Entities. Notice of this motion has been given to secured creditors likely to be affected by the order.

40 In the absence of the Transition and Reorganization Agreement, it is likely that the National Post Company would be required to shut down resulting in the consequent loss of employment for most or all the National Post Company's employees. Under the National Post Transition Agreement, all of the National Post Company employees will be offered employment and as noted in the affidavit of the moving parties, the National Post Company's obligations and liabilities under the pension plan will be assumed, subject to necessary approvals.

41 No third party has expressed any interest in acquiring the National Post Company. Indeed, at no time did RBC Dominion Securities Inc. who was assisting in evaluating recapitalization alternatives ever receive any expression of interest from parties seeking to acquire it. Similarly, while the need to transfer the National Post has been in the public domain since at least October 6, 2009, the Monitor has not been contacted by any interested party with respect to acquiring the business of the National Post Company. The Monitor has approved the process leading to the sale and also has conducted a liquidation analysis that caused it to conclude that the proposed disposition is the most beneficial outcome. There has been full consultation with creditors and as noted by the Monitor, the Ad Hoc Committee serves as a good proxy for the unsecured creditor group as a whole. I am satisfied that the consideration is reasonable and fair given the evidence on estimated liquidation value and the fact that there is no other going concern option available.

42 The remaining section 36 factor to consider is section 36(7) which provides that the court should be satisfied that the company can and will make certain pension and employee related payments that would have been required if the court had sanctioned the compromise or arrangement. In oral submissions, counsel for the CMI Entities confirmed that they had met the requirements of section 36. It is agreed that the pension and employee liabilities will be assumed by the Transferee. Although present, the representative of the Superintendent of Financial Services was unopposed to the order requested. If and when a compromise and arrangement is proposed, the Monitor is asked to make the necessary inquiries and report to the court on the status of those payments.

Stay Extension

43 The CMI Entities are continuing to work with their various stakeholders on the preparation and filing of a proposed plan of arrangement and additional time is required. An extension of the stay of proceedings is necessary to provide stability during that time. The cash flow forecast suggests that the CMI Entities have sufficient available cash resources during the requested extension period. The Monitor supports the extension and nobody was opposed. I accept the statements of the CMI Entities and the Monitor that the CMI Entities have acted, and are continuing to act, in good faith and with due diligence. In my view it is appropriate to extend the stay to January 22, 2010 as requested.

S.E. PEPALL J.

cp/e/qlrxg/qljxr/qlced/qlaxw

¹ Court approval may nonetheless be required by virtue of the terms of the Initial or other court order or at the request of a stakeholder.

2 The reference to paragraph 6(4)a should presumably be 6(6)a.

3 Industry Canada "Bill C-55: Clause by Clause Analysis-Bill Clause No. 131-CCAA Section 36".

4 Ibid.

5 *R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 as amended.*

6 (2003), 47 C.B.R. (4th) 278 at para. 52.

7 R.S.O. 1990, c. B.14, as amended.

8 D.J. Miller "Remedies under the Bulk Sales Act: (Necessary, or a Nuisance?)", Ontario Bar Association, October, 2007.

9 [1985] 1 S.C.R. 290.

10 *Supra*, note 3.

11 *Supra*, note 9.

12 (2005), 15 C.B.R. (5th) 288 (Ont. C.A.).

---- End of Request ----

Download Request: Current Document: 1

Time Of Request: Thursday, February 22, 2018 10:30:47

Tab 3

2010 ONSC 222

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Canwest Publishing Inc. / Publications Canwest Inc., Re

2010 CarswellOnt 212, 2010 ONSC 222, [2010] O.J. No. 188, 184 A.C.W.S. (3d) 684, 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT
ACT, R.S.C. 1985, C-36, AS AMENDED AND IN THE MATTER
OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT
OF CANWEST PUBLISHING INC./PUBLICATIONS CANWEST
INC., CANWEST BOOKS INC. AND CANWEST (CANADA) INC.**

Pepall J.

Judgment: January 18, 2010

Docket: CV-10-8533-00CL

Counsel: Lyndon Barnes, Alex Cobb, Duncan Ault for Applicant, LP Entities

Mario Forte for Special Committee of the Board of Directors

Andrew Kent, Hilary Clarke for Administrative Agent of the Senior Secured Lenders' Syndicate

Peter Griffin for Management Directors

Robin B. Schwill, Natalie Renner for Ad Hoc Committee of 9.25% Senior Subordinated Noteholders

David Byers, Maria Konyukhova for Proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.3 Arrangements](#)

[XIX.3.a Approval by creditors](#)

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.5 Miscellaneous](#)

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Miscellaneous

CMI, entity of C Corp., obtained protection from creditors in Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA") proceedings in October 2009 — CPI, newspaper entities related to C, sought similar protection — CPI brought application for order pursuant to CCAA and for stay of proceedings and other benefits of order to be extended to CPI — Application granted — CPI was clearly insolvent — Community served by CPI was huge — Granting of order premised on anticipated going concern sale of newspaper business, which would serve interests of CPI and stakeholders and also community at large — Order requested would provide stability and enable CPI to pursue restructuring and preserve enterprise value for stakeholders — Without benefit of stay, CPI would have been required to pay approximately \$1.45 billion and would have been unable to continue operating business.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Approval by creditors

CMI, entity of C Corp., obtained protection from creditors in Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA") proceedings in October 2009 — CPI, newspaper entities related to C, sought similar protection — CPI brought application for order pursuant to CCAA and for stay of proceedings and other benefits of order to be extended to CPI — Application granted — CPI was clearly insolvent — Community served by CPI was huge — Granting of order premised on anticipated going concern sale of newspaper business, which would serve interests of CPI and stakeholders and also community at large — Order requested would provide stability and enable CPI to pursue restructuring and preserve enterprise value for stakeholders — Without benefit of stay, CPI

would have been required to pay approximately \$1.45 billion and would have been unable to continue operating business — In circumstances, it was appropriate to allow CPI to file and present plan only to secured creditors.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Pepall J.*:

Anvil Range Mining Corp., Re (2002), 2002 CarswellOnt 2254, 34 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. C.A.) — considered
Anvil Range Mining Corp., Re (2003), 310 N.R. 200 (note), 2003 CarswellOnt 730, 2003 CarswellOnt 731, 180 O.A.C. 399 (note) (S.C.C.) — referred to
Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 6184, 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed
Grant Forest Products Inc., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4699, 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered
Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to
Muscletech Research & Development Inc., Re (2006), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 54, 2006 CarswellOnt 264 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed
Philip Services Corp., Re (1999), 13 C.B.R. (4th) 159, 1999 CarswellOnt 4673 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered
Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance) (2002), 287 N.R. 203, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 18 C.P.R. (4th) 1, 44 C.E.L.R. (N.S.) 161, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 211 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 223 F.T.R. 137 (note), 20 C.P.C. (5th) 1, 40 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, 2002 SCC 41, 2002 CarswellNat 822, 2002 CarswellNat 823, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 93 C.R.R. (2d) 219, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.) — followed

Statutes considered:

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

Generally — referred to

s. 4 — considered

s. 5 — considered

s. 11.2 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.2(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.2(4) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.4 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.4(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.4(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.7(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to

s. 11.51 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.52 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43

s. 137(2) — considered

APPLICATION by entity of company already protected under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act for similar protection.

Pepall J.:

Reasons for Decision

Introduction

1 Canwest Global Communications Corp. ("Canwest Global") is a leading Canadian media company with interests in (i) newspaper publishing and digital media; and (ii) free-to-air television stations and subscription based specialty television channels. Canwest Global, the entities in its Canadian television business (excluding CW Investments Co. and its subsidiaries) and the National Post Company (which prior to October 30, 2009 owned and published the National Post) (collectively, the "CMI Entities"), obtained protection from their creditors in a *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*¹ ("CCAA") proceeding on October 6, 2009.² Now, the Canwest Global Canadian newspaper entities with the exception of National Post Inc. seek similar protection. Specifically, Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc. ("CPI"), Canwest Books Inc. ("CBI"), and Canwest (Canada) Inc. ("CCI") apply for an order pursuant to the CCAA. They also seek to have the stay of proceedings and the other benefits of the order extend to Canwest Limited Partnership/Canwest Société en Commandite (the "Limited Partnership"). The Applicants and the Limited Partnership are referred to as the "LP Entities" throughout these reasons. The term "Canwest" will be used to refer to the Canwest enterprise as a whole. It includes the LP Entities and Canwest Global's other subsidiaries which are not applicants in this proceeding.

2 All appearing on this application supported the relief requested with the exception of the Ad Hoc Committee of 9.25% Senior Subordinated Noteholders. That Committee represents certain unsecured creditors whom I will discuss more fully later.

3 I granted the order requested with reasons to follow. These are my reasons.

4 I start with three observations. Firstly, Canwest Global, through its ownership interests in the LP Entities, is the largest publisher of daily English language newspapers in Canada. The LP Entities own and operate 12 daily newspapers across Canada. These newspapers are part of the Canadian heritage and landscape. The oldest, The Gazette, was established in Montreal in 1778. The others are the Vancouver Sun, The Province, the Ottawa Citizen, the Edmonton Journal, the Calgary Herald, The Windsor Star, the Times Colonist, The Star Phoenix, the Leader-Post, the Nanaimo Daily News and the Alberni Valley Times. These newspapers have an estimated average weekly readership that exceeds 4 million. The LP Entities also publish 23 non-daily newspapers and own and operate a number of digital media and online operations. The community served by the LP Entities is huge. In addition, based on August 31, 2009 figures, the LP Entities employ approximately 5,300 employees in Canada with approximately 1,300 of those employees working in Ontario. The granting of the order requested is premised on an anticipated going concern sale of the newspaper business of the LP Entities. This serves not just the interests of the LP Entities and their stakeholders but the Canadian community at large.

5 Secondly, the order requested may contain some shortcomings; it may not be perfect. That said, insolvency proceedings typically involve what is feasible, not what is flawless.

6 Lastly, although the builders of this insolvent business are no doubt unhappy with its fate, gratitude is not misplaced by acknowledging their role in its construction.

Background Facts

(i) Financial Difficulties

7 The LP Entities generate the majority of their revenues through the sale of advertising. In the fiscal year ended August 31, 2009, approximately 72% of the LP Entities' consolidated revenue derived from advertising. The LP Entities have been seriously affected by the economic downturn in Canada and their consolidated advertising revenues declined substantially in the latter half of 2008 and in 2009. In addition, they experienced increases in certain of their operating costs.

8 On May 29, 2009 the Limited Partnership failed, for the first time, to make certain interest and principal reduction payments and related interest and cross currency swap payments totaling approximately \$10 million in respect of its senior secured credit

facilities. On the same day, the Limited Partnership announced that, as of May 31, 2009, it would be in breach of certain financial covenants set out in the credit agreement dated as of July 10, 2007 between its predecessor, Canwest Media Works Limited Partnership, The Bank of Nova Scotia as administrative agent, a syndicate of secured lenders ("the LP Secured Lenders"), and the predecessors of CCI, CPI and CBI as guarantors. The Limited Partnership also failed to make principal, interest and fee payments due pursuant to this credit agreement on June 21, June 22, July 21, July 22 and August 21, 2009.

9 The May 29, 2009, defaults under the senior secured credit facilities triggered defaults in respect of related foreign currency and interest rate swaps. The swap counterparties (the "Hedging Secured Creditors") demanded payment of \$68.9 million. These unpaid amounts rank *pari passu* with amounts owing under the LP Secured Lenders' credit facilities.

10 On or around August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership and certain of the LP Secured Lenders entered into a forbearance agreement in order to allow the LP Entities and the LP Secured Lenders the opportunity to negotiate a pre-packaged restructuring or reorganization of the affairs of the LP Entities. On November 9, 2009, the forbearance agreement expired and since then, the LP Secured Lenders have been in a position to demand payment of approximately \$953.4 million, the amount outstanding as at August 31, 2009. Nonetheless, they continued negotiations with the LP Entities. The culmination of this process is that the LP Entities are now seeking a stay of proceedings under the CCAA in order to provide them with the necessary "breathing space" to restructure and reorganize their businesses and to preserve their enterprise value for the ultimate benefit of their broader stakeholder community.

11 The Limited Partnership released its annual consolidated financial statements for the twelve months ended August 31, 2009 and 2008 on November 26, 2009. As at August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership had total consolidated assets with a net book value of approximately \$644.9 million. This included consolidated current assets of \$182.7 million and consolidated non-current assets of approximately \$462.2 million. As at that date, the Limited Partnership had total consolidated liabilities of approximately \$1.719 billion (increased from \$1.656 billion as at August 31, 2008). These liabilities consisted of consolidated current liabilities of \$1.612 billion and consolidated non-current liabilities of \$107 million.

12 The Limited Partnership had been experiencing deteriorating financial results over the past year. For the year ended August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership's consolidated revenues decreased by \$181.7 million or 15% to \$1.021 billion as compared to \$1.203 billion for the year ended August 31, 2008. For the year ended August 31, 2009, the Limited Partnership reported a consolidated net loss of \$66 million compared to consolidated net earnings of \$143.5 million for fiscal 2008.

(ii) Indebtedness under the Credit Facilities

13 The indebtedness under the credit facilities of the LP Entities consists of the following.

(a) The LP senior secured credit facilities are the subject matter of the July 10, 2007 credit agreement already mentioned. They are guaranteed by CCI, CPI and CBI. The security held by the LP Secured Lenders has been reviewed by the solicitors for the proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc. and considered to be valid and enforceable.³ As at August 31, 2009, the amounts owing by the LP Entities totaled \$953.4 million exclusive of interest.⁴

(b) The Limited Partnership is a party to the aforementioned foreign currency and interest rate swaps with the Hedging Secured Creditors. Defaults under the LP senior secured credit facilities have triggered defaults in respect of these swap arrangements. Demand for repayment of amounts totaling \$68.9 million (exclusive of unpaid interest) has been made. These obligations are secured.

(c) Pursuant to a senior subordinated credit agreement dated as of July 10, 2007, between the Limited Partnership, The Bank of Nova Scotia as administrative agent for a syndicate of lenders, and others, certain subordinated lenders agreed to provide the Limited Partnership with access to a term credit facility of up to \$75 million. CCI, CPI, and CBI are guarantors. This facility is unsecured, guaranteed on an unsecured basis and currently fully drawn. On June 20, 2009, the Limited Partnership failed to make an interest payment resulting in an event of default under the credit

agreement. In addition, the defaults under the senior secured credit facilities resulted in a default under this facility. The senior subordinated lenders are in a position to take steps to demand payment.

(d) Pursuant to a note indenture between the Limited Partnership, The Bank of New York Trust Company of Canada as trustee, and others, the Limited Partnership issued 9.5% per annum senior subordinated unsecured notes due 2015 in the aggregate principal amount of US \$400 million. CPI and CBI are guarantors. The notes are unsecured and guaranteed on an unsecured basis. The noteholders are in a position to take steps to demand immediate payment of all amounts outstanding under the notes as a result of events of default.

14 The LP Entities use a centralized cash management system at the Bank of Nova Scotia which they propose to continue. Obligations owed pursuant to the existing cash management arrangements are secured (the "Cash Management Creditor").

(iii) LP Entities' Response to Financial Difficulties

15 The LP Entities took a number of steps to address their circumstances with a view to improving cash flow and strengthening their balance sheet. Nonetheless, they began to experience significant tightening of credit from critical suppliers and other trade creditors. The LP Entities' debt totals approximately \$1.45 billion and they do not have the liquidity required to make payment in respect of this indebtedness. They are clearly insolvent.

16 The board of directors of Canwest Global struck a special committee of directors (the "Special Committee") with a mandate to explore and consider strategic alternatives. The Special Committee has appointed Thomas Strike, the President, Corporate Development & Strategy Implementation, as Recapitalization Officer and has retained Gary Colter of CRS Inc. as Restructuring Advisor for the LP Entities (the "CRA"). The President of CPI, Dennis Skulsky, will report directly to the Special Committee.

17 Given their problems, throughout the summer and fall of 2009, the LP Entities have participated in difficult and complex negotiations with their lenders and other stakeholders to obtain forbearance and to work towards a consensual restructuring or recapitalization.

18 An ad hoc committee of the holders of the senior subordinated unsecured notes (the "Ad Hoc Committee") was formed in July, 2009 and retained Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg as counsel. Among other things, the Limited Partnership agreed to pay the Committee's legal fees up to a maximum of \$250,000. Representatives of the Limited Partnership and their advisors have had ongoing discussions with representatives of the Ad Hoc Committee and their counsel was granted access to certain confidential information following execution of a confidentiality agreement. The Ad Hoc Committee has also engaged a financial advisor who has been granted access to the LP Entities' virtual data room which contains confidential information regarding the business and affairs of the LP Entities. There is no evidence of any satisfactory proposal having been made by the noteholders. They have been in a position to demand payment since August, 2009, but they have not done so.

19 In the meantime and in order to permit the businesses of the LP Entities to continue to operate as going concerns and in an effort to preserve the greatest number of jobs and maximize value for the stakeholders of the LP Entities, the LP Entities have been engaged in negotiations with the LP Senior Lenders, the result of which is this CCAA application.

(iv) The Support Agreement, the Secured Creditors' Plan and the Solicitation Process

20 Since August 31, 2009, the LP Entities and the LP administrative agent for the LP Secured Lenders have worked together to negotiate terms for a consensual, prearranged restructuring, recapitalization or reorganization of the business and affairs of the LP Entities as a going concern. This is referred to by the parties as the Support Transaction.

21 As part of this Support Transaction, the LP Entities are seeking approval of a Support Agreement entered into by them and the administrative agent for the LP Secured Lenders. 48% of the LP Secured Lenders, the Hedging Secured Creditors, and the Cash Management Creditor (the "Secured Creditors") are party to the Support Agreement.

22 Three interrelated elements are contemplated by the Support Agreement and the Support Transaction: the credit acquisition, the Secured Creditors' plan (the "Plan"), and the sale and investor solicitation process which the parties refer to as SISP.

23 The Support Agreement contains various milestones with which the LP Entities are to comply and, subject to a successful bid arising from the solicitation process (an important caveat in my view), commits them to support a credit acquisition. The credit acquisition involves an acquisition by an entity capitalized by the Secured Creditors and described as AcquireCo. AcquireCo. would acquire substantially all of the assets of the LP Entities (including the shares in National Post Inc.) and assume certain of the liabilities of the LP Entities. It is contemplated that AcquireCo. would offer employment to all or substantially all of the employees of the LP Entities and would assume all of the LP Entities' existing pension plans and existing post-retirement and post-employment benefit plans subject to a right by AcquireCo., acting commercially reasonably and after consultation with the operational management of the LP Entities, to exclude certain specified liabilities. The credit acquisition would be the subject matter of a Plan to be voted on by the Secured Creditors on or before January 31, 2010. There would only be one class. The Plan would only compromise the LP Entities' secured claims and would not affect or compromise any other claims against any of the LP Entities ("unaffected claims"). No holders of the unaffected claims would be entitled to vote on or receive any distributions of their claims. The Secured Creditors would exchange their outstanding secured claims against the LP Entities under the LP credit agreement and the swap obligations respectively for their *pro rata* shares of the debt and equity to be issued by AcquireCo. All of the LP Entities' obligations under the LP secured claims calculated as of the date of closing less \$25 million would be deemed to be satisfied following the closing of the Acquisition Agreement. LP secured claims in the amount of \$25 million would continue to be held by AcquireCo. and constitute an outstanding unsecured claim against the LP Entities.

24 The Support Agreement contemplates that the Financial Advisor, namely RBC Dominion Securities Inc., under the supervision of the Monitor, will conduct the solicitation process. Completion of the credit acquisition process is subject to a successful bid arising from the solicitation process. In general terms, the objective of the solicitation process is to obtain a better offer (with some limitations described below) than that reflected in the credit acquisition. If none is obtained in that process, the LP Entities intend for the credit acquisition to proceed assuming approval of the Plan. Court sanction would also be required.

25 In more detailed terms, Phase I of the solicitation process is expected to last approximately 7 weeks and qualified interested parties may submit non-binding proposals to the Financial Advisor on or before February 26, 2010. Thereafter, the Monitor will assess the proposals to determine whether there is a reasonable prospect of obtaining a Superior Offer. This is in essence a cash offer that is equal to or higher than that represented by the credit acquisition. If there is such a prospect, the Monitor will recommend that the process continue into Phase II. If there is no such prospect, the Monitor will then determine whether there is a Superior Alternative Offer, that is, an offer that is not a Superior Offer but which might nonetheless receive approval from the Secured Creditors. If so, to proceed into Phase II, the Superior Alternative Offer must be supported by Secured Creditors holding more than at least 33.3% of the secured claims. If it is not so supported, the process would be terminated and the LP Entities would then apply for court sanction of the Plan.

26 Phase II is expected to last approximately 7 weeks as well. This period allows for due diligence and the submission of final binding proposals. The Monitor will then conduct an assessment akin to the Phase I process with somewhat similar attendant outcomes if there are no Superior Offers and no acceptable Alternative Superior Offers. If there were a Superior Offer or an acceptable Alternative Superior Offer, an agreement would be negotiated and the requisite approvals sought.

27 The solicitation process is designed to allow the LP Entities to test the market. One concern is that a Superior Offer that benefits the secured lenders might operate to preclude a Superior Alternative Offer that could provide a better result for the unsecured creditors. That said, the LP Entities are of the view that the solicitation process and the support transaction present the best opportunity for the businesses of the LP Entities to continue as going concerns, thereby preserving jobs as well as the economic and social benefits of their continued operation. At this stage, the alternative is a bankruptcy or liquidation which would result in significant detriment not only to the creditors and employees of the LP Entities but to the broader community that benefits from the continued operation of the LP Entities' business. I also take some comfort from the position of the Monitor which is best captured in an excerpt from its preliminary Report:

The terms of the Support Agreement and SISP were the subject of lengthy and intense arm's length negotiations between the LP Entities and the LP Administrative Agent. The Proposed Monitor supports approval of the process contemplated

therein and of the approval of those documents, but without in any way fettering the various powers and discretions of the Monitor.

28 It goes without saying that the Monitor, being a court appointed officer, may apply to the court for advice and directions and also owes reporting obligations to the court.

29 As to the objection of the Ad Hoc Committee, I make the following observations. Firstly, they represent unsecured subordinated debt. They have been in a position to take action since August, 2009. Furthermore, the LP Entities have provided up to \$250,000 for them to retain legal counsel. Meanwhile, the LP Secured Lenders have been in a position to enforce their rights through a non-consensual court proceeding and have advised the LP Entities of their abilities in that regard in the event that the LP Entities did not move forward as contemplated by the Support Agreement. With the Support Agreement and the solicitation process, there is an enhanced likelihood of the continuation of going concern operations, the preservation of jobs and the maximization of value for stakeholders of the LP Entities. It seemed to me that in the face of these facts and given that the Support Agreement expired on January 8, 2010, adjourning the proceeding was not merited in the circumstances. The Committee did receive very short notice. Without being taken as encouraging or discouraging the use of the comeback clause in the order, I disagree with the submission of counsel to the Ad Hoc Committee to the effect that it is very difficult if not impossible to stop a process relying on that provision. That provision in the order is a meaningful one as is clear from the decision in *Muscletech Research & Development Inc., Re*⁵. On a come back motion, although the positions of parties who have relied bona fide on an Initial Order should not be prejudiced, the onus is on the applicants for an Initial Order to satisfy the court that the existing terms should be upheld.

Proposed Monitor

30 The Applicants propose that FTI Consulting Canada Inc. serve as the Monitor. It currently serves as the Monitor in the CMI Entities' CCAA proceeding. It is desirable for FTI to act; it is qualified to act; and it has consented to act. It has not served in any of the incompatible capacities described in section 11.7(2) of the CCAA. The proposed Monitor has an enhanced role that is reflected in the order and which is acceptable.

Proposed Order

31 As mentioned, I granted the order requested. It is clear that the LP Entities need protection under the CCAA. The order requested will provide stability and enable the LP Entities to pursue their restructuring and preserve enterprise value for their stakeholders. Without the benefit of a stay, the LP Entities would be required to pay approximately \$1.45 billion and would be unable to continue operating their businesses.

(a) Threshold Issues

32 The chief place of business of the Applicants is Ontario. They qualify as debtor companies under the CCAA. They are affiliated companies with total claims against them that far exceed \$5 million. Demand for payment of the swap indebtedness has been made and the Applicants are in default under all of the other facilities outlined in these reasons. They do not have sufficient liquidity to satisfy their obligations. They are clearly insolvent.

(b) Limited Partnership

33 The Applicants seek to extend the stay of proceedings and the other relief requested to the Limited Partnership. The CCAA definition of a company does not include a partnership or a limited partnership but courts have exercised their inherent jurisdiction to extend the protections of an Initial CCAA Order to partnerships when it was just and convenient to do so. The relief has been held to be appropriate where the operations of the partnership are so intertwined with those of the debtor companies that irreparable harm would ensue if the requested stay were not granted: *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*⁶ and *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re*⁷.

34 In this case, the Limited Partnership is the administrative backbone of the LP Entities and is integral to and intertwined with the Applicants' ongoing operations. It owns all shared information technology assets; it provides hosting services for all Canwest properties; it holds all software licences used by the LP Entities; it is party to many of the shared services agreements involving other Canwest entities; and employs approximately 390 full-time equivalent employees who work in Canwest's shared services area. The Applicants state that failure to extend the stay to the Limited Partnership would have a profoundly negative impact on the value of the Applicants, the Limited Partnership and the Canwest Global enterprise as a whole. In addition, exposing the assets of the Limited Partnership to the demands of creditors would make it impossible for the LP Entities to successfully restructure. I am persuaded that under these circumstances it is just and convenient to grant the request.

(c) Filing of the Secured Creditors' Plan

35 The LP Entities propose to present the Plan only to the Secured Creditors. Claims of unsecured creditors will not be addressed.

36 The CCAA seems to contemplate a single creditor-class plan. Sections 4 and 5 state:

s.4 Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its unsecured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company or of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

s.5 Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its secured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company or of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

37 Case law has interpreted these provisions as authorizing a single creditor-class plan. For instance, Blair J. (as he then was) stated in *Philip Services Corp., Re*⁸ : " There is no doubt that a debtor is at liberty, under the terms of sections 4 and 5 of the CCAA, to make a proposal to secured creditors or to unsecured creditors or to both groups." ⁹ Similarly, in *Anvil Range Mining Corp., Re*¹⁰, the Court of Appeal stated: "It may also be noted that s. 5 of the CCAA contemplates a plan which is a compromise between a debtor company and its secured creditors and that by the terms of s. 6 of the Act, applied to the facts of this case, the plan is binding only on the secured creditors and the company and not on the unsecured creditors." ¹¹

38 Based on the foregoing, it is clear that a debtor has the statutory authority to present a plan to a single class of creditors. In *Anvil Range Mining Corp., Re*, the issue was raised in the context of the plan's sanction by the court and a consideration of whether the plan was fair and reasonable as it eliminated the opportunity for unsecured creditors to realize anything. The basis of the argument was that the motions judge had erred in not requiring a more complete and in depth valuation of the company's assets relative to the claims of the secured creditors.

39 In this case, I am not being asked to sanction the Plan at this stage. Furthermore, the Monitor will supervise a vigorous and lengthy solicitation process to thoroughly canvass the market for alternative transactions. The solicitation should provide a good indication of market value. In addition, as counsel for the LP Entities observed, the noteholders and the LP Entities never had any forbearance agreement. The noteholders have been in a position to take action since last summer but chose not to do so. One would expect some action on their part if they themselves believed that they "were in the money". While the process is not perfect, it is subject to the supervision of the court and the Monitor is obliged to report on its results to the court.

40 In my view it is appropriate in the circumstances to authorize the LP Entities to file and present a Plan only to the Secured Creditors.

(D) DIP Financing

41 The Applicants seek approval of a DIP facility in the amount of \$25 million which would be secured by a charge over all of the assets of the LP Entities and rank ahead of all other charges except the Administration Charge, and ahead of all other existing security interests except validly perfected purchase money security interests and certain specific statutory encumbrances.

42 Section 11.2 of the CCAA provides the statutory jurisdiction to grant a DIP charge. In *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*¹², I addressed this provision. Firstly, an applicant should address the requirements contained in section 11.2 (1) and then address the enumerated factors found in section 11.2(4) of the CCAA. As that list is not exhaustive, it may be appropriate to consider other factors as well.

43 Applying these principles to this case and dealing firstly with section 11.2(1) of the CCAA, notice either has been given to secured creditors likely to be affected by the security or charge or alternatively they are not affected by the DIP charge. While funds are not anticipated to be immediately necessary, the cash flow statements project a good likelihood that the LP Entities will require the additional liquidity afforded by the \$25 million. The ability to borrow funds that are secured by a charge will help retain the confidence of the LP Entities' trade creditors, employees and suppliers. It is expected that the DIP facility will permit the LP Entities to conduct the solicitation process and consummate a recapitalization transaction of a sale of all or some of its assets. The charge does not secure any amounts that were owing prior to the filing. As such, there has been compliance with the provisions of section 11.2 (1).

44 Turning then to a consideration of the factors found in section 11.2(4) of the Act, the LP Entities are expected to be subject to these CCAA proceedings until July 31, 2010. Their business and financial affairs will be amply managed during the proceedings. This is a consensual filing which is reflective of the confidence of the major creditors in the current management configuration. All of these factors favour the granting of the charge. The DIP loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement and would ensure the necessary stability during the CCAA process. I have already touched upon the issue of value. That said, in relative terms, the quantum of the DIP financing is not large and there is no readily apparent material prejudice to any creditor arising from the granting of the charge and approval of the financing. I also note that it is endorsed by the proposed Monitor in its report.

45 Other factors to consider in assessing whether to approve a DIP charge include the reasonableness of the financing terms and more particularly the associated fees. Ideally there should be some evidence on this issue. Prior to entering into the forbearance agreement, the LP Entities sought proposals from other third party lenders for a DIP facility. In this case, some but not all of the Secured Creditors are participating in the financing of the DIP loan. Therefore, only some would benefit from the DIP while others could bear the burden of it. While they may have opted not to participate in the DIP financing for various reasons, the concurrence of the non participating Secured Creditors is some market indicator of the appropriateness of the terms of the DIP financing.

46 Lastly, I note that the DIP lenders have indicated that they would not provide a DIP facility if the charge was not approved. In all of these circumstances, I was prepared to approve the DIP facility and grant the DIP charge.

(e) Critical Suppliers

47 The LP Entities ask that they be authorized but not required to pay pre-filing amounts owing in arrears to certain suppliers if the supplier is critical to the business and ongoing operations of the LP Entities or the potential future benefit of the payments is considerable and of value to the LP Entities as a whole. Such payments could only be made with the consent of the proposed Monitor. At present, it is contemplated that such suppliers would consist of certain newspaper suppliers, newspaper distributors, logistic suppliers and the Amex Bank of Canada. The LP Entities do not seek a charge to secure payments to any of its critical suppliers.

48 Section 11.4 of the CCAA addresses critical suppliers. It states:

11.4(1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is

satisfied that the person is a supplier of goods and services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.

(2) If the court declares the person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.

(3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied upon the terms of the order.

(4) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

49 Mr. Byers, who is counsel for the Monitor, submits that the court has always had discretion to authorize the payment of critical suppliers and that section 11.4 is not intended to address that issue. Rather, it is intended to respond to a post-filing situation where a debtor company wishes to compel a supplier to supply. In those circumstances, the court may declare a person to be a critical supplier and require the person to supply. If the court chooses to compel a person to supply, it must authorize a charge as security for the supplier. Mr. Barnes, who is counsel for the LP Entities, submits that section 11.4 is not so limited. Section 11.4 (1) gives the court general jurisdiction to declare a supplier to be a "critical supplier" where the supplier provides goods or services that are essential to the ongoing business of the debtor company. The permissive as opposed to mandatory language of section 11.4 (2) supports this interpretation.

50 Section 11.4 is not very clear. As a matter of principle, one would expect the purpose of section 11.4 to be twofold: (i) to codify the authority to permit suppliers who are critical to the continued operation of the company to be paid and (ii) to require the granting of a charge in circumstances where the court is compelling a person to supply. If no charge is proposed to be granted, there is no need to give notice to the secured creditors. I am not certain that the distinction between Mr. Byers and Mr. Barnes' interpretation is of any real significance for the purposes of this case. Either section 11.4(1) does not oust the court's inherent jurisdiction to make provision for the payment of critical suppliers where no charge is requested or it provides authority to the court to declare persons to be critical suppliers. Section 11.4(1) requires the person to be a supplier of goods and services that are critical to the companies' operation but does not impose any additional conditions or limitations.

51 The LP Entities do not seek a charge but ask that they be authorized but not required to make payments for the pre-filing provision of goods and services to certain third parties who are critical and integral to their businesses. This includes newsprint and ink suppliers. The LP Entities are dependent upon a continuous and uninterrupted supply of newsprint and ink and they have insufficient inventory on hand to meet their needs. It also includes newspaper distributors who are required to distribute the newspapers of the LP Entities; American Express whose corporate card programme and accounts are used by LP Entities employees for business related expenses; and royalty fees accrued and owing to content providers for the subscription-based online service provided by FPinfomart.ca, one of the businesses of the LP Entities. The LP Entities believe that it would be damaging to both their ongoing operations and their ability to restructure if they are unable to pay their critical suppliers. I am satisfied that the LP Entities may treat these parties and those described in Mr. Strike's affidavit as critical suppliers but none will be paid without the consent of the Monitor.

(f) Administration Charge and Financial Advisor Charge

52 The Applicants also seek a charge in the amount of \$3 million to secure the fees of the Monitor, its counsel, the LP Entities' counsel, the Special Committee's financial advisor and counsel to the Special Committee, the CRA and counsel to the CRA. These are professionals whose services are critical to the successful restructuring of the LP Entities' business. This charge is to rank in priority to all other security interests in the LP Entities' assets, with the exception of purchase money security interests and specific statutory encumbrances as provided for in the proposed order.¹³ The LP Entities also request a \$10 million charge in favour of the Financial Advisor, RBC Dominion Securities Inc. The Financial Advisor is providing investment banking

services to the LP Entities and is essential to the solicitation process. This charge would rank in third place, subsequent to the administration charge and the DIP charge.

53 In the past, an administration charge was granted pursuant to the inherent jurisdiction of the court. Section 11.52 of the amended CCAA now provides statutory jurisdiction to grant an administration charge. Section 11.52 states:

On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the debtor company is subject to a security or charge - in an amount that the court considers appropriate - in respect of the fees and expenses of

- (a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;
- (b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and
- (c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

54 I am satisfied that the issue of notice has been appropriately addressed by the LP Entities. As to whether the amounts are appropriate and whether the charges should extend to the proposed beneficiaries, the section does not contain any specific criteria for a court to consider in its assessment. It seems to me that factors that might be considered would include:

- (a) the size and complexity of the businesses being restructured;
- (b) the proposed role of the beneficiaries of the charge;
- (c) whether there is an unwarranted duplication of roles;
- (d) whether the quantum of the proposed charge appears to be fair and reasonable;
- (e) the position of the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; and
- (f) the position of the Monitor.

This is not an exhaustive list and no doubt other relevant factors will be developed in the jurisprudence.

55 There is no question that the restructuring of the LP Entities is large and highly complex and it is reasonable to expect extensive involvement by professional advisors. Each of the professionals whose fees are to be secured has played a critical role in the LP Entities restructuring activities to date and each will continue to be integral to the solicitation and restructuring process. Furthermore, there is no unwarranted duplication of roles. As to quantum of both proposed charges, I accept the Applicants' submissions that the business of the LP Entities and the tasks associated with their restructuring are of a magnitude and complexity that justify the amounts. I also take some comfort from the fact that the administrative agent for the LP Secured Lenders has agreed to them. In addition, the Monitor supports the charges requested. The quantum of the administration charge appears to be fair and reasonable. As to the quantum of the charge in favour of the Financial Advisor, it is more unusual as it involves an incentive payment but I note that the Monitor conducted its own due diligence and, as mentioned, is supportive of the request. The quantum reflects an appropriate incentive to secure a desirable alternative offer. Based on all of these factors, I concluded that the two charges should be approved.

(g) Directors and Officers

56 The Applicants also seek a directors and officers charge ("D & O charge") in the amount of \$35 million as security for their indemnification obligations for liabilities imposed upon the Applicants' directors and officers. The D & O charge will rank

after the Financial Advisor charge and will rank *pari passu* with the MIP charge discussed subsequently. Section 11.51 of the CCAA addresses a D & O charge. I have already discussed section 11.51 in *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*¹⁴ as it related to the request by the CMI Entities for a D & O charge. Firstly, the charge is essential to the successful restructuring of the LP Entities. The continued participation of the experienced Boards of Directors, management and employees of the LP Entities is critical to the restructuring. Retaining the current officers and directors will also avoid destabilization. Furthermore, a CCAA restructuring creates new risks and potential liabilities for the directors and officers. The amount of the charge appears to be appropriate in light of the obligations and liabilities that may be incurred by the directors and officers. The charge will not cover all of the directors' and officers' liabilities in a worse case scenario. While Canwest Global maintains D & O liability insurance, it has only been extended to February 28, 2009 and further extensions are unavailable. As of the date of the Initial Order, Canwest Global had been unable to obtain additional or replacement insurance coverage.

57 Understandably in my view, the directors have indicated that due to the potential for significant personal liability, they cannot continue their service and involvement in the restructuring absent a D & O charge. The charge also provides assurances to the employees of the LP Entities that obligations for accrued wages and termination and severance pay will be satisfied. All secured creditors have either been given notice or are unaffected by the D & O charge. Lastly, the Monitor supports the charge and I was satisfied that the charge should be granted as requested.

(h) Management Incentive Plan and Special Arrangements

58 The LP Entities have made amendments to employment agreements with 2 key employees and have developed certain Management Incentive Plans for 24 participants (collectively the "MIPs"). They seek a charge in the amount of \$3 million to secure these obligations. It would be subsequent to the D & O charge.

59 The CCAA is silent on charges in support of Key Employee Retention Plans ("KERPs") but they have been approved in numerous CCAA proceedings. Most recently, in *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*¹⁵, I approved the KERP requested on the basis of the factors enumerated in *Grant Forest Products Inc., Re*¹⁶ and given that the Monitor had carefully reviewed the charge and was supportive of the request as were the Board of Directors, the Special Committee of the Board of Directors, the Human Resources Committee of Canwest Global and the Adhoc Committee of Noteholders.

60 The MIPs in this case are designed to facilitate and encourage the continued participation of certain senior executives and other key employees who are required to guide the LP Entities through a successful restructuring. The participants are critical to the successful restructuring of the LP Entities. They are experienced executives and have played critical roles in the restructuring initiatives to date. They are integral to the continued operation of the business during the restructuring and the successful completion of a plan of restructuring, reorganization, compromise or arrangement.

61 In addition, it is probable that they would consider other employment opportunities in the absence of a charge securing their payments. The departure of senior management would distract from and undermine the restructuring process that is underway and it would be extremely difficult to find replacements for these employees. The MIPs provide appropriate incentives for the participants to remain in their current positions and ensures that they are properly compensated for their assistance in the reorganization process.

62 In this case, the MIPs and the MIP charge have been approved in form and substance by the Board of Directors and the Special Committee of Canwest Global. The proposed Monitor has also expressed its support for the MIPs and the MIP charge in its pre-filing report. In my view, the charge should be granted as requested.

(i) Confidential Information

63 The LP Entities request that the court seal the confidential supplement which contains individually identifiable information and compensation information including sensitive salary information about the individuals who are covered by the MIPs. It also contains an unredacted copy of the Financial Advisor's agreement. I have discretion pursuant to Section 137(2) of the *Courts*

of Justice Act¹⁷ to order that any document filed in a civil proceeding be treated as confidential, sealed and not form part of the public record. That said, public access in an important tenet of our system of justice.

64 The threshold test for sealing orders is found in the Supreme Court of Canada decision of *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*¹⁸. In that case, Iacobucci J. stated that an order should only be granted when: (i) it is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and (ii) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

65 In *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*¹⁹ I applied the *Sierra Club* test and approved a similar request by the Applicants for the sealing of a confidential supplement containing unredacted copies of KERPs for the employees of the CMI Entities. Here, with respect to the first branch of the *Sierra Club* test, the confidential supplement contains unredacted copies of the MIPs. Protecting the disclosure of sensitive personal and compensation information of this nature, the disclosure of which would cause harm to both the LP Entities and the MIP participants, is an important commercial interest that should be protected. The information would be of obvious strategic advantage to competitors. Moreover, there are legitimate personal privacy concerns in issue. The MIP participants have a reasonable expectation that their names and their salary information will be kept confidential. With respect to the second branch of the *Sierra Club* test, keeping the information confidential will not have any deleterious effects. As in the *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re* case, the aggregate amount of the MIP charge has been disclosed and the individual personal information adds nothing. The salutary effects of sealing the confidential supplement outweigh any conceivable deleterious effects. In the normal course, outside of the context of a CCAA proceeding, confidential personal and salary information would be kept confidential by an employer and would not find its way into the public domain. With respect to the unredacted Financial Advisor agreement, it contains commercially sensitive information the disclosure of which could be harmful to the solicitation process and the salutary effects of sealing it outweigh any deleterious effects. The confidential supplements should be sealed and not form part of the public record at least at this stage of the proceedings.

Conclusion

66 For all of these reasons, I was prepared to grant the order requested.

Application granted.

Footnotes

- 1 R.S.C. 1985, c. C. 36, as amended.
- 2 On October 30, 2009, substantially all of the assets and business of the National Post Company were transferred to the company now known as National Post Inc.
- 3 Subject to certain assumptions and qualifications.
- 4 Although not formally in evidence before the court, counsel for the LP Secured Lenders advised the court that currently \$382,889,000 in principal in Canadian dollars is outstanding along with \$458,042,000 in principal in American dollars.
- 5 2006 CarswellOnt 264 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).
- 6 2009 CarswellOnt 6184 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 29.
- 7 (1993), 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).
- 8 1999 CarswellOnt 4673 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).
- 9 Ibid at para. 16.

- 10 (2002), 34 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. C.A.), leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused (March 6,2003) [2003 CarswellOnt 730 (S.C.C.)].
- 11 Ibid at para. 34.
- 12 Supra, note 7 at paras. 31-35.
- 13 This exception also applies to the other charges granted.
- 14 Supra note 7 at paras. 44-48.
- 15 Supra note 7.
- 16 [2009] O.J. No. 3344 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).
- 17 R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, as amended.
- 18 [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.).
- 19 Supra, note 7 at para. 52.

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

Tab 4

Most Negative Treatment: Distinguished

Most Recent Distinguished: [8440522 Canada Inc., Re](#) | 2013 ONSC 6167, 2013 CarswellOnt 13921, 233 A.C.W.S. (3d) 286, 8 C.B.R. (6th) 86 | (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List], Oct 4, 2013)

1999 CarswellOnt 625
Ontario Court of Justice, General Division [Commercial List]

Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re

1999 CarswellOnt 625, [1999] O.J. No. 709, 6 C.B.R. (4th) 314, 96 O.T.C. 272

**In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors
Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended**

In the Matter of the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O., 1990, C. C-43, as amended

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Royal Oak Mines Inc., and others

Blair J.

Judgment: March 10, 1999

Docket: 99-CL-003278

Counsel: *David E. Baird, Q.C.*, and *Mario J. Forte*, for Applicants.

Peter H. Griffin, for Trilon Financial Corporation and Northgate Exploration Limited.

Ronald N. Robertson, Q.C., for Unofficial Senior Subordinated Noteholders' Committee.

Sean Dunphy, for Bankers Trust and Macquarrie Limited.

Hilary Clarke, for Bank of Nova Scotia.

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.2 Initial application](#)

[XIX.2.b Grant of stay](#)

[XIX.2.b.iv Length of stay](#)

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.3 Arrangements](#)

[XIX.3.b Approval by court](#)

[XIX.3.b.iv Miscellaneous](#)

Headnote

Corporations --- Arrangements and compromises — Under Companies' Creditors Arrangements Act — Arrangements — Approval by court — Miscellaneous issues

Debtor company applied for initial order pursuant to Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Relief sought included debtor-in-possession financing super-priority, stay of proceedings, and permission to conduct certain operations and take certain restructuring steps — Relief sought also included power to borrow and charge property, to impose charge as liability protection in favour of directors, to not pay creditors, permission to file plan of arrangement, appointment of monitor and inclusion of general terms, including come back clauses — Debtor was supported by two senior secured lenders and by unofficial creditors' committee of senior secured subordinated noteholders — Group of hedge lenders opposed scope and extent of relief as being

broad and overreaching — Other creditors received short notice or no notice of application — Application granted — Initial order approved but in more limited scope than requested — Relief sought extended beyond bounds of procedural fairness — Language of order not to read like trust indenture but to be clear, simple and readily understandable — Initial order to contain declaration that applicant had standing to apply, authorization to file plan of compromise, appointment of monitor and its duties and to contain comeback clause — Initial order to put in place stay provisions and operating, financing and restructuring terms reasonably necessary for continued operation of debtor during brief but realistic sorting-out period on urgent basis — Proliferation of advisory committees and extension of broad protection to directors are better left for orders other than initial order — Comeback clauses not to be used to provide answer to overreaching initial orders — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 11(3), (4).

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Blair J.*:

Bank of America Canada v. Willann Investments Ltd. (February 6, 1991), Doc. B22/91 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to
Canadian Asbestos Services Ltd. v. Bank of Montreal, 16 C.B.R. (3d) 114, [1992] G.S.T.C. 15, 11 O.R. (3d) 353, 93 D.T.C. 5001, 5 C.L.R. (2d) 54, [1993] 1 C.T.C. 48, 5 T.C.T. 4328 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to
Canadian Asbestos Services Ltd. v. Bank of Montreal, 13 O.R. (3d) 291, 10 C.L.R. (2d) 204, [1993] G.S.T.C. 23, 1 G.T.C. 6169 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to
Dylex Ltd., Re (January 23, 1995), Doc. B-4/95 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to
Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to
Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of) (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 1 O.R. (3d) 289, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 41 O.A.C. 282 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to
Quintette Coal Ltd., Re (1992), 13 C.B.R. (3d) 146, 68 B.C.L.R. (2d) 219 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

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

Generally — considered

s. 3(1) — referred to

s. 11 [rep. & sub. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11(3) [rep. & sub. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11(3)(a)-11(3)(c) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11(4) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

APPLICATION by debtor company for initial order pursuant to s. 11 of *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Blair J.:

1 These reasons are an expanded version of an endorsement made at the time of the granting of an Initial Order in favour of the Applicants under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended, on February 15, 1999. At the time, I indicated that I would release additional reasons with respect to certain of the issues raised on the Initial Application at a later date. In doing so, I propose to incorporate significant portions of the earlier handwritten endorsement.

2 Royal Oak Mines Inc. ("Royal Oak"), and a series of related corporations, applied for the protection of the Court afforded by the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (the "CCAA") while they endeavour to negotiate a restructuring of their debt with their creditors. Royal Oak is a publicly traded mining company of considerable import in the mining industry. It currently operates four gold and copper mines (two in the Timmins area of Ontario, one in Yellowknife in the North West Territories, and one (the Kemess mine) in the interior of British Columbia). The Company employs approximately 960 people (about 300 in Ontario, 280 in the North West Territories, 348 in British Columbia, 27 at its corporate headquarters in Seattle, and 5 in the Province of Newfoundland).

3 Royal Oak is supported in this CCAA Application by Trilon Financial Corporation and Northgate Exploration Limited, the senior secured lenders who are owed approximately \$180 million, and by the unofficial creditors' committee of the Senior Secured Subordinated Noteholders who are owed about \$264 million. A group of three other lenders, known in the jargon of the industry as the "Hedge Lenders", and who have advanced approximately \$50 million to Royal Oak, stands between the former two groups, in terms of priority. The three Hedge Lenders — Bankers Trust, Macquarie Limited of Australia, and Bank of Nova Scotia — did not strenuously oppose the granting of an Initial CCAA Order in principle; however, they questioned the scope and extent of some of the relief sought, arguing that it was unnecessarily broad and "overreaching", particularly where they had only been given short notice of the Application and where some creditors had been given none.

4 There are construction lien claimants in the Province of British Columbia, they point out, who have lien claims against the Kemess Mine totalling about \$18 million, and whose claims are admittedly prior to those of *any* other secured creditor in relation to that asset. Yet the lien claimants were not given notice of these proceedings. In addition, Export Development Corporation has a claim for about \$19.5 million and had not been given notice.

5 Falling world prices for gold and copper, environmental concerns with their attendant costs, and construction and start-up costs relating to the Kemess Mine in particular, have led to Royal Oak's current financial crunch. It is insolvent. I was quite satisfied on the evidence in Ms. Witte's affidavit, and on the other materials filed, that the Applicants met the statutory requirements for the granting of an Initial Order under section 11 of the CCAA, and that it was appropriate and just in the circumstances for the Court to grant the protection sought on an Initial Order basis, while the Applicants attempt to restructure their affairs and to elicit the approval and support of their creditors to such a restructuring. Accordingly, an Initial Order was granted on February 15, 1999. There have been certain adjustments and variations made to that Order since then.

6 In view of some of the important concerns raised by Mr. Dunphy and Ms. Clarke on behalf of the Hedge Lenders about the details and reach of the Order sought, however, I indicated that the Court was not prepared to approve it in its entirety at this stage. The Initial Order as granted was therefore somewhat more limited in scope than that requested. Somewhat more expanded reasons than those set out in the handwritten endorsement made at the time were to follow. These are those reasons.

Initial CCAA Orders

7 Section 11 of the CCAA is the provision of the Act embodying the broad and flexible statutory power invested in the court to "grant its protection" to an applicant by imposing a stay of proceedings against the applicant company, subject to terms, while the company attempts to negotiate a restructuring of its debt with its creditors. It is well established that the provisions of the Act are remedial in nature, and that they should be given a broad and liberal interpretation in order to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors, and to keep companies in business where that end can reasonably be achieved: see, *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101 (Ont. C.A.), per Doherty J.A.; *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), at p. 31; "Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act", Stanley E. Edwards, (1947) 25 Can. Bar Rev. 587 at p. 593 referred to with approval by Thackray J. in *Quintette Coal Ltd., Re* (1992), 13 C.B.R. (3d) 146 (B.C. S.C.) at p. 173.

8 In the utilization of the CCAA for this broad purpose a practice has developed whereby the application is "pre-packaged" to a significant extent before relief is sought from the Court. That is, the debtor company seeks to obtain the consent and support of its major creditors to a CCAA process, and to its major terms and conditions, before the application is launched. This has been my experience in the course of supervising more than a few such proceedings. The practice is a healthy and effective one in my view, and is to be commended and encouraged. Nonetheless, it has led in some ways to the problem which is the subject of these reasons.

9 The problem centers around the growing complexity of the Initial Orders sought under s. 11(3) of the Act, and the increasing tendency to attempt to incorporate into such orders provisions to meet every eventuality that might conceivably arise during the course of the CCAA process. Included in this latter category is the matter of debtor-in-possession ("DIP") financing, calling — as it frequently does — for a "super priority" position over all other secured lending then in place.

10 Initial Orders under the CCAA are almost invariably sought on short notice to many of the creditors and, not infrequently, without any notice to others. I note as well that the Court is also asked in most cases to respond on short notice and with little advance opportunity to examine the materials filed in support of the application. This is because the materials, for very practical reasons, are not usually ready for filing until just before the filing is made. I make these observations not to be critical in any way, but simply to point out the realities of the context in which the application for the Initial Order is usually determined.

11 This case falls into both the "short notice" and "no notice" categories. The Hedge Lenders, at least, received only very short notice of the Application on February 15th. Neither the Kemess Lien Claimants in British Columbia nor Export Development Corporation were given any notice. Yet the Court was asked to grant super priority funding, which would rank ahead of even the Lien Claimants (who have admitted priority over everyone), without their knowledge or consent, and which would rank ahead of the Hedge Lenders who had not yet had a reasonable opportunity to consider their position or (given an American holiday) for their counsel to obtain meaningful instructions. The Initial Order which was originally sought in the proceeding consisted of 58 paragraphs of highly complex and sophisticated language. It was 28 pages in length. In addition, it had an 11 page Term Sheet annexed as a Schedule to it. It dealt with,

- (a) the stay of proceedings (7 paragraphs, 4 ¹/₂ pages);
- (b) permitted operations by the Applicants during the CCAA period (4 paragraphs, 3 ¹/₂ pages);
- (c) restructuring steps permitted (8 paragraphs, 3 pages);
- (d) the power to borrow and the charging of property (15 paragraphs, 5 pages);
- (e) a charge to be imposed as a liability protection in favour of directors (2 elaborate paragraphs, spanning 4 pages);
- (f) non-payment of creditors (one paragraph, ¹/₃ page);
- (g) permission to file a plan of arrangement (2 paragraphs, ¹/₃ pages);
- (h) appointment and duties of the Monitor (9 paragraphs, 5 pages); and,
- (i) general terms, including the "come back" clauses (6 paragraphs, 1 ¹/₂ pages).

12 What is at issue here is not the principle of the Court granting relief of the foregoing nature in CCAA proceedings. That principle is well enough imbedded in the broad jurisdiction referred to earlier in these reasons. In particular, it is not the tenet of DIP financing itself, or super priority financing, which were being questioned. There is sufficient authority for present purposes to justify the granting of such relief in principle: see, *Canadian Asbestos Services Ltd. v. Bank of Montreal* (1992), 11 O.R. (3d) 353 (Ont. Gen. Div.), (Chadwick J.) at pp. 359-361, supplemental reasons and leave to appeal granted (1993), 13 O.R. (3d) 291 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Bank of America Canada v. Willann Investments Ltd.* (February 6, 1991), Doc. B22/91 (Ont. Gen. Div.), (Austin J); *Dylex Ltd., Re* (January 23, 1995), Doc. B-4/95 (Ont. Gen. Div.), (Houlden J.A.). It was the granting of such relief on the broad terms sought here, and the wisdom of that growing practice — without the benefit of interested persons having the opportunity to review such terms and, if so advised, to comment favourably or neutrally or unfavourably, on them — which was called into question.

13 There is justification in the call for caution, in my view. The scope and the parameters of the relief to be granted at the Initial Order stage — in conjunction with the dynamics of no notice, short notice, and the initial statutory stay period provided for in subsection 11(3) of the Act — require some consideration.

14 I have alluded to the highly complex and sophisticated nature of the Initial Order which was originally sought in this proceeding. The statutory source from which this emanation grew, however, is relatively simple and straightforward. Subsection 11(3) of the CCAA — which is the foundation of the Court's "protective" jurisdiction — states:

11(3) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a company, make an order on such terms as it may impose, effective for such period as the court deems necessary not exceeding thirty days,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection (1);

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company.

15 Conceptually, then, the applicant is provided with the protections of a stay, a restraining order and a prohibition order for a period "not exceeding 30 days" in order to give it time to muster support for and justify the relief granted in the Initial Order, all interested persons by then having received reasonable notice and having had a reasonable opportunity to consider their respective positions. The difficulties created by *ex parte* and short notice proceedings are thereby attenuated.

16 Subsection 11(4) of the Act provides for the making of additional orders in the CCAA process. The Court is granted identical powers to those set out in paragraphs (a) through (c) of subsection 11(3), except that there is no limit on the time period during which a subsection 11(4) order may remain in effect. The only other difference between the two subsections is that in respect of an Initial order under subsection 11(3) the onus on the applicant is to show that it is appropriate in the circumstances for the order to issue, whereas in respect of an order under subsection 11(4) there is an additional requirement to show that the applicant "has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence" in the CCAA process.

17 The Initial Order sought in this case was not unlike those sought -- and, indeed, those which have been granted -- in numerous other CCAA applications. While the relief granted is always a matter for the exercise of judicial discretion, based upon the statutory and inherent jurisdiction of the Court, it seems to me that considerable relief now sought at the Initial Order stage extends beyond what can appropriately be accommodated within the bounds of procedural fairness. It was at least partially for that reason that I declined to grant the Initial Order relief sought at the outset of this proceeding.

18 Upon reflection, it seems to me that the following considerations might usefully be kept in mind by those preparing for an Initial Order application, and by the Court in granting such an order.

19 First, recognition must be given to the reality that CCAA applications for the most part involve substantial corporations with large indebtedness and often complex debtor-creditor structures. Indeed, the threshold for applying for relief under the CCAA is a debt burden of at least \$5 million¹. Thus, I do not mean to suggest by anything said in these reasons that either the process itself or the corporate/commercial/financial issues which must be addressed and resolved, are simple or easily articulated. Therein lies a challenge, however.

20 CCAA orders will of necessity involve a certain complexity. Nevertheless, at least a nod in the direction of plainer language would be helpful to those having to review the draft on short notice, or to react to the order in quick fashion after it has been made on no notice. It would also be helpful to the Court, which — as I have noted — is not infrequently asked to give its approval and grant the order with very little advance opportunity for review or consideration. The language of orders should be clear and as simple and readily understandable to creditors and others affected by them as possible in the circumstances. They should not read like trust indentures. These comments are relevant to all orders, but to Initial CCAA Orders in particular.

21 The Initial Order will, of course, contain the necessary declaration that the applicant is a company to which the CCAA applies, the authorization to file a plan of compromise and arrangement, the appointment of the monitor and its duties, and such things as the "comeback" clause. In other respects, however, what the Initial Order should seek to accomplish, in my view, is to put in place the necessary stay provisions and such further operating, financing and restructuring terms as are reasonably necessary for the continued operation of the debtor company during a brief but realistic period of time, on an urgency basis. During such a period, the ongoing operations of the company will be assured, while at the same time the major affected stakeholders are able to consider their respective positions and prepare to respond.

22 Having sought only the reasonably essential minimum relief required for purposes of the Initial Order, the applicant then has the discretion as to when to ask for more extensive relief. It may well be helpful, though, if the nature of the more extensive relief to be sought is signalled in the Initial application, so that interested and affected persons will know what is in the offing in that regard.

23 Subsection 11(3) of the Act does not stipulate that the Initial Order shall be granted for a period of 30 days. It provides that the Court in its discretion may grant an order for a period *not exceeding* 30 days. Each case must be approached on the basis of its own circumstances, and an agreement in advance on the part of all affected secured creditors, at least, may create an entirely different situation. In the absence of such agreement, though, the preferable practice on applications under subsection 11(3) is to keep the Initial Order as simple and straightforward as possible, and the relief sought confined to what is essential for the continued operations of the company during a brief "sorting-out" period of the type referred to above. Further issues can then be addressed, and subsequent orders made, if appropriate, under the rubric of the subsection 11(4) jurisdiction.

24 It follows from what I have said that, in my opinion, extraordinary relief such as DIP financing with super priority status should be kept, in Initial Orders, to what is reasonably necessary to meet the debtor company's urgent needs over the sorting-out period. Such measures involve what may be a significant re-ordering of priorities from those in place before the application is made, not in the sense of altering the existing priorities as between the various secured creditors but in the sense of placing encumbrances ahead of those presently in existence. Such changes should not be imported lightly, if at all, into the creditors mix; and affected parties are entitled to a reasonable opportunity to think about their potential impact, and to consider such things as whether or not the CCAA approach to the insolvency is the appropriate one in the circumstances — as opposed, for instance, to a receivership or bankruptcy — and whether or not, or to what extent, they are prepared to have their positions affected by DIP or super priority financing. As Mr. Dunphy noted, in the context of this case, the object should be to "keep the lights [of the company] on" and enable it to keep up with appropriate preventative maintenance measures, but the Initial Order itself should approach that objective in a judicious and cautious matter.

25 For similar reasons, things like the proliferation of advisory committees and the attendant professional costs accompanying them, and the extension of broad protection to directors, are better left for orders other than the Initial order.

26 I conclude these observations with a word about the "comeback clause". The Initial Order as granted in this case contained the usual provision which is known by that description. It states:

THIS COURT ORDERS that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order, the Applicants may apply at any time to this Court to seek any further relief, *and any interested Person may apply to this Court to vary or rescind this Order or seek other relief* on seven days' notice to the Applicants, the Monitor, the CCAA Lender and to any other Person likely to be affected by the Order sought or on such other notice, if any, as this Court may order. (emphasis added)

27 The Initial Order also contained the usual clause permitting the Applicants or the Monitor to apply for directions in relation to the discharge of the Monitor's powers and duties or in relation to the proper execution of the Initial Order. This right is not afforded to others.

28 The comeback provisions are available to sort out issues as they arise during the course of the restructuring. However, they do not provide an answer to overreaching Initial Orders, in my view. There is an inherent disadvantage to a person having to rely on those provisions. By the time such a motion is brought the CCAA process has often taken on a momentum of its own,

and even if no formal "onus" is placed on the affected person in such a position, there may well be a practical one if the relief sought goes against the established momentum. On major security issues, in particular, which arise at the Initial Order stage, the occasions where a creditor is required to rely upon the comeback clause should be minimized.

29 These reasons are intended to compliment and to elaborate upon those set out in the brief endorsement made at the time the Initial Order was granted on February 15, 1999, in favour of the Royal Oak Applicants, but in a form more limited than that sought.

Application granted.

Footnotes

¹ CCAA, subsection 3(1).

Tab 5

2019 BCSC 1234
British Columbia Supreme Court

Miniso International Hong Kong Limited v. Migu Investments Inc.

2019 CarswellBC 2208, 2019 BCSC 1234, 308 A.C.W.S. (3d) 465, 71 C.B.R. (6th) 250

MINISO INTERNATIONAL HONG KONG LIMITED, MINISO INTERNATIONAL (GUANGZHOU) CO. LIMITED, MINISO LIFESTYLE CANADA INC., MIHK MANAGEMENT INC., MINISO TRADING CANADA INC., MINISO CORPORATION and GUANGDONG SALMAN INVESTMENT CO. LIMITED (Petitioners) and MIGU INVESTMENTS INC., MINISO CANADA INVESTMENTS INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE ONE INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE TWO INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE THREE INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE FOUR INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE FIVE INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE SIX INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE SEVEN INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE EIGHT INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE NINE INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE TEN INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE ELEVEN INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE TWELVE INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE THIRTEEN INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE FOURTEEN INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE FIFTEEN INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE SIXTEEN INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE SEVENTEEN INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE EIGHTEEN INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE NINETEEN INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE TWENTY INC., MINISO (CANADA) STORE TWENTY-ONE INC. and MINISO (CANADA) STORE TWENTY-TWO INC. (Respondents)

Fitzpatrick J.

Heard: July 12, 2019

Judgment: July 12, 2019

Written reasons: July 29, 2019

Docket: Vancouver S197744

Counsel: K.M. Jackson, G.P. Nesbitt, for Petitioners

V.L. Tickle, D.R. Shouldice, for Respondents

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX](#) Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

[XIX.2](#) Initial application

[XIX.2.h](#) Miscellaneous

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Miscellaneous

Petitioners, secured creditors, were owners of "M" Japanese lifestyle product brand — Respondent debtor companies were Canadian owners and operators who has licensed to use of M brand in Canada, and they also purchased products from creditors for resale in Canada — Creditors advanced US\$2.4 million demand loan to debtors, and debtors received substantial amount of M products valued at approximately \$17.5 million which were not paid for — Creditors demanded payment of amounts owing under demand loan, earlier account receivable and amounts owing for further supply of M products — Total indebtedness owing by debtors to creditors was approximately \$35.5 million, creditors terminated debtors' right to sell and market M brand in Canada

and it would not deliver further products — Creditors brought proceedings pursuant to Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) — Petition granted — Debtor companies were each "company" existing under laws of Canada or province, claims against them exceeded \$5 million, and debtors were unable to meet their liabilities as they came due and were insolvent and "debtor company" within meaning of CCAA — CCAA expressly granted standing to creditors to commence proceedings in respect of debtor company — Debtors could not proceed with their business operations without ongoing support of creditors — Stakeholders required relief sought in initial order on urgent basis in order to allow debtors to continue operating their business, and initial order was best option toward preserving debtors' enterprise value for benefit of stakeholders — It was appropriate to grant stay that temporarily enjoyed debtors' creditors from proceeding with claims against them — Proposed monitor was appropriate and was appointed — Factors set out in s. 11.2(4) of CCAA supported approval of \$2 million interim financing and granting of charge to secure amounts advanced — Intention was to develop and prepare restructuring transaction, and it was clear that financing was required to continue operations which would allow debtors to maintain value of enterprise while they pursued restructuring — Interim financing would be used only by debtors in accordance with direct supervision of monitor — Restructuring charges including maximum \$1 million administration charge and maximum \$1 million directors' and officers' charge were necessary, appropriate, fair and reasonable — Restructuring charges were ranked in priority with administration charge first, interim financing charge second, and directors' and officers' charge last.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Fitzpatrick J.*:

ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (2008), 2008 CarswellOnt 2652, 42 C.B.R. (5th) 90, 45 B.L.R. (4th) 201 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Canwest Publishing Inc. / Publications Canwest Inc., Re (2010), 2010 ONSC 222, 2010 CarswellOnt 212, 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Cinram International Inc., Re (2012), 2012 ONSC 3767, 2012 CarswellOnt 8413, 91 C.B.R. (5th) 46 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Citibank Canada v. Chase Manhattan Bank of Canada (1991), 5 C.B.R. (3d) 165, 2 P.P.S.A.C. (2d) 21, 4 B.L.R. (2d) 147, 1991 CarswellOnt 182 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered

Nortel Networks Corp., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4467, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 229 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re (1999), 1999 CarswellOnt 625, 6 C.B.R. (4th) 314, 96 O.T.C. 272 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 1211, 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299, [2004] O.T.C. 284 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 2936 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 5200, 2004 CarswellOnt 5201, 338 N.R. 196 (note) (S.C.C.) — referred to

Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re (2010), 2010 SCC 60, 2010 CarswellBC 3419, 2010 CarswellBC 3420, 12 B.C.L.R. (5th) 1, (sub nom. *Century Services Inc. v. A.G. of Canada*) 2011 D.T.C. 5006 (Eng.), (sub nom. *Century Services Inc. v. A.G. of Canada*) 2011 G.T.C. 2006 (Eng.), [2011] 2 W.W.R. 383, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 170, 409 N.R. 201, (sub nom. *Ted LeRoy Trucking Ltd., Re*) 326 D.L.R. (4th) 577, (sub nom. *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (A.G.)*) [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, [2010] G.S.T.C. 186, (sub nom. *Leroy (Ted) Trucking Ltd., Re*) 296 B.C.A.C. 1, (sub nom. *Leroy (Ted) Trucking Ltd., Re*) 503 W.A.C. 1 (S.C.C.) — considered

Timminco Ltd., Re (2012), 2012 ONSC 506, 2012 CarswellOnt 1263, 95 C.C.P.B. 48, 85 C.B.R. (5th) 169 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3

s. 2 "debtor" — considered

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

Generally — referred to

s. 2(1) "debtor company" — considered

s. 3(1) — referred to

ss. 4-5 — referred to

s. 11.2 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.02(1) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.2(1) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.2(4) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.7(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to

s. 11.51(1) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.51(3) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 11.51(4) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 11.52 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

PETITION by secured creditors seeking relief under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Fitzpatrick J.:

INTRODUCTION

1 The petitioners bring these proceedings pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the "CCAA"). Unlike the usual circumstance where the debtor companies commence the proceedings, the petitioners are the secured creditors of the respondent debtor companies, resulting in a creditor-driven CCAA proceeding.

2 The petitioners, collectively described as the "Miniso Group", are the owners of the "Miniso" Japanese lifestyle product brand. The Miniso Group manufactures products and operates a number of Miniso stores in Asia where those products are sold. The Miniso Group licenses the "Miniso" name for use in other parts of the world and sells products to those entities.

3 The respondent debtor companies, collectively described as the "Migu Group", are the Canadian owners and operators who have licensed the use of the "Miniso" brand in Canada. The Migu Group also purchases products from the Miniso Group for resale here in Canada.

4 On July 12, 2019, I granted an initial order in this matter (the "Initial Order") with reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

BACKGROUND FACTS

5 The evidence at the hearing consisted of the Affidavit #1 of Qihua Chen, an employee of one entity within the Miniso Group, sworn July 11, 2019.

6 The Miniso Group manufacture lifestyle products under the "Miniso" brand name and distribute those products, under licence, to retail outlets selling "Miniso" branded inventory to the public.

7 The Miniso Group, through a related entity, Miniso Hong Kong Limited, holds all applicable trademarks related to the "Miniso" brand (respectively, the "Miniso Trademarks" and the "Miniso Brand"), including in Canada.

8 The Migu Group are a group of corporations formed primarily to sell "Miniso" branded products in Canada under a licensing agreement with the Miniso Group.

9 The respondent Migu Investments Inc. ("Migu") is the parent company. It owns 100% of the respondents Miniso Canada Investments Inc. ("MC Investments") and Miniso (Canada) Store Inc. ("MC Store").

10 The controlling mind of the Migu Group is Tao Xu, a resident of Toronto, Ontario. Mr. Xu owns the only issued and outstanding common voting share of Migu. The only other shares of Migu are non-voting and non-participating preferred shares.

11 In 2017, the Migu Group acquired the right to use the Miniso Brand in Canada pursuant to various licensing and cooperation agreements with members of the Miniso Group. In addition, on October 7, 2016, various entities entered into a framework cooperation agreement. That agreement provided that the Miniso Group would contribute Miniso Brand products including, without limitation, inventory and standardized Miniso store fixtures (the "Miniso Products") equivalent in value to 20,000,000 RMB and that certain investments would be made to set up a company or companies to operate under the Miniso Brand in Canada.

12 The terms of these agreements, as later amended, included that:

a) The Miniso Group agreed to supply Miniso Products to the Canadian operations for sale in various stores in exchange for payment; and

b) The Canadian operations were to be conducted under the Miniso Group's standard master license agreement, which would allow the Miniso Group to control the use of the Miniso Brand (of which the Miniso Products are a part), throughout the Canadian operations.

13 Starting in 2017, the Migu Group (through MC Investments) began incorporating various subsidiaries. MC Investments owns and controls each of the other named respondent subsidiaries (the "Subsidiaries"). Although the corporate structure is somewhat unclear at this time, these Subsidiaries, either alone or through partnerships or joint ventures, have opened or are in the process of opening retail stores throughout Canada that sell Miniso Brand products (the "Outlet Stores"). Some of the Subsidiaries own more than one Outlet Store and some were incorporated in anticipation of opening additional Outlet Stores.

14 As part of the arrangements, an entity related to the Miniso Group granted to Migu (on behalf of the Migu Group) the right to use and sell Miniso Products and display the Miniso Trademarks in Canada pursuant to a trademark licence agreement dated June 1, 2018 (the "Licence Agreement"). The Licence Agreement contained the following material terms, among others:

a) The Migu Group was only permitted to sell Miniso Products via the Outlet Stores, unless otherwise agreed to by the Miniso Group;

b) The Migu Group was permitted to grant sub-licenses to sub-licensees at its discretion subject to, among others, the condition that each sub-license would require each sub-licensee to be bound by the terms of the Licence Agreement; and

c) The Miniso Group could terminate the Licence Agreement in the event that Migu became insolvent or committed an act of bankruptcy.

15 The Migu Group, through the Subsidiaries, have opened, or are in the process of opening a number of Outlet Stores across Canada (78 estimated at the time of the hearing). The Outlet Stores are located in British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario and Quebec. All Outlet Stores operate out of leased premises. There are two Miniso branded retail locations operating in Nova Scotia in which the Migu Group has an interest, but which are not operated by the Migu Group. The Migu Group also leases several warehouses, distribution centres and offices in various locations. The Migu Group's head office is located in Richmond, B.C.

16 In some cases, the Migu Group contracted with individual investors (the "Investors") to open Outlet Stores partnered with one of the Subsidiaries. It is believed that, in most instances, MC Investments (on behalf of the Migu Group) and an Investor would enter into two agreements to document their arrangement, as follows:

a) An "Investment and Cooperation Agreement", whereby MC Investments and the Investor would agree that, in exchange for the Investor's investment, MC Investments would incorporate a company (one of the Subsidiaries) to operate and manage an Outlet Store selling Miniso branded products. As part of this, MC Investments would grant to the Subsidiary a sublicense permitting it to sell Miniso branded products and to use the Miniso Trademarks under the Miniso Brand; and

b) A "Limited Partnership Agreement", whereby the Investor and MC Investments would act as limited partners and the Subsidiary (through which the Outlet Store would operate) would act as general partner.

17 The parties refer to these arrangements together as the "Joint Venture Store Agreements".

18 In cases where MC Investments entered into a Limited Partnership Agreement with respect to an Outlet Store, the Subsidiary which operated such Outlet Store either acted as general partner to the partnership formed by the Limited Partnership Agreement, or incorporated a general partner in which it held a 51% ownership interest (the "JV Store Affiliates"), with the remaining 49% being owned by the applicable Investors.

19 The Miniso Group understands that each of the Outlet Stores holds a separate bank account through the applicable Subsidiary that operates that Store (collectively, the "Deposit Accounts"), the majority of which are held at TD Canada Trust, which are used for the receipt of cash sales and credit card sales at the Outlet Stores. In addition, the Miniso Group understand that MC Investments holds a master Canadian-dollar account (the "Master Account") and that, historically, the Deposit Accounts were manually swept on a regular basis, at the Migu Group's discretion, into the Master Account.

20 The employees are all employed by MC Investments. The Migu Group currently directly employ approximately 700 people on a part-time or full-time basis. There is no union and collective bargaining agreement in place.

EVENTS LEADING TO INSOLVENCY

21 For some years now, the Miniso Group has shipped and delivered a substantial amount of Miniso Products to the Migu Group. The Miniso Group is the primary supplier of product and inventory to the Migu Group, such that it is estimated that Miniso Product accounts for 80-90% of all merchandise sold in the Outlet Stores. During that time period and until 2018, the Miniso Group shipped and sold approximately \$30 million of Miniso Products to the Migu Group, which was then distributed to the Subsidiaries for sale in the Outlet Stores.

22 In December 2017, Miniso International Hong Kong Limited, on behalf of the Miniso Group, advanced a US\$2.4 million demand loan to MC Investments (on behalf of the Migu Group) to fund the Migu Group's working capital requirements.

23 In October 2018, the Migu Group also received a substantial amount of Miniso Products valued at approximately \$17.5 million. The Miniso Group was not paid for this shipment.

24 In the fall of 2018, the Miniso Group and the Migu Group had a dispute about the demand loan and account receivable. This led to the Miniso Group making demand on the Migu Group for payment. Later still, in mid-December 2018, the Miniso Group filed an application in this Court for a bankruptcy order against the Migu Group.

25 In January 2019, the dispute was resolved when the parties entered into a forbearance agreement. The forbearance agreement provided that:

a) The Migu Group acknowledged and agreed that the demand loan and inventory receivable was due and owing to the Miniso Group;

b) By January 21, 2019, or as otherwise agreed, the parties agreed to negotiate an agreement by which the Miniso Group would acquire all of the assets of the Migu Group relating to its Canadian operations; and

c) The Miniso Group agreed to forbear for a period of time from taking steps to collect the demand loan and the account receivable. In addition, in the meantime, the Miniso Group agreed to continue to supply Miniso Products to the Migu Group, with the purchase price to be added to the outstanding indebtedness. Title to the Miniso Products remained with the Miniso Group until payment in full was made for them.

26 On January 4, 2019, as a condition to the Miniso Group's forbearance:

a) The Migu Group granted to the Miniso Group a general security agreement securing the past and future obligations owing to the Miniso Group;

b) Mr. Xu postponed the security held by him against the Migu Group to the security in favour of the Miniso Group; and

c) The Migu Group entered into a temporary licence agreement for the use of the Miniso Brand during the period of the forbearance.

27 On March 5, 2019, the Migu Group provided a further general security agreement to the Miniso Group as security for its obligations to the Miniso Group. Mr. Xu, MC Store and MC Investments also executed priority agreements in favour of the Miniso Group.

28 On February 23, 2019, various entities entered into an asset purchase agreement by which the Migu Group agreed to sell its Canadian operations Miniso Lifestyle Canada Inc. ("Miniso Lifestyle") or a designated purchaser (the "APA"). The APA provided that:

a) The Migu Group appointed Miniso Lifestyle to operate and manage the Canadian operations until the earlier of the closing of the sale under the APA or termination of the APA;

b) The Miniso Group would continue to supply the Miniso Products to MC Investments; and

c) Grant Thornton LLP would be engaged as auditor to conduct an audit of the Canadian operations of the Migu Group to determine the amount of net capital invested by the Migu Group, including Mr. Xu, for the purpose of determining the purchase price payable under the APA.

29 In addition, on March 5, 2019, the Miniso Group provided financial support to the Migu Group pending a closing or termination of the APA. Miniso Lifestyle advanced \$1.5 million to the Migu Group to be used to fund its Canadian operations. In addition, Miniso Lifestyle deposited \$1.5 million in escrow pending the closing of the transaction contemplated in the APA or the termination of the APA.

30 After completing its due diligence, the Miniso Group did not waive the conditions in the APA. Accordingly, effective June 30, 2019, the APA expired.

31 On June 25, 2019, the Miniso Group's counsel demanded payment of the amounts owing under the demand loan, the earlier account receivable and the amounts owing for the further supply of Miniso Products after January 2019. On July 3, 2019, the Miniso Group's counsel demanded the return of the deposit that had been placed in escrow and payment of the March 2019 loan.

CURRENT STATUS

32 As of July 3, 2019, the total indebtedness owing from the Migu Group to the Miniso Group was approximately \$35.5 million.

33 The Miniso Group is the primary secured creditor of the Migu Group's assets, under two general security agreements (except in Quebec where no security is held). There are other minor secured interests registered by certain equipment financiers and landlords. Mr. Xu still holds security against the assets, which is subordinated to the Miniso Group.

34 The Migu Group is current in respect of its obligations to pay employee wages and related remittances. However, it is possible that some or all employees are owed accrued and unused vacation pay. The Migu Group does not have a pension plan for their employees.

35 It is uncertain if the Migu Group's provincial sales tax remittances are current.

36 As noted, all of the premises from which the Migu Group operates across Canada are leased. The Migu Group currently remits monthly rents of approximately \$1.79 million. Some of the July rental payments (for 20 stores) have been paid; however, rent for the remainder of the premises, totalling approximately \$1.16 million, has not been paid.

37 The Migu Group owes approximately \$2 million in other accrued and unpaid unsecured liabilities, including to suppliers and service providers. It is anticipated that the Migu Group will honour outstanding gift card and credit notes during these CCAA proceedings and honour existing warranty and return policies.

38 The Migu Group's consolidated assets, as at May 31, 2019, had a book value of approximately \$53.3 million.

39 The Migu Group's value is almost entirely derived from their ability to sell and market Miniso Products under the Miniso Brand in Canada through the various agreements with the Miniso Group and importantly, their licence agreements with the Miniso Group. As of this date, the Miniso Group has terminated the Migu Group's right to sell and market the Miniso Brand in Canada and the Miniso Group will not deliver further product, save on terms acceptable to the Miniso Group. As such, the Migu Group is no longer able to market and sell the Miniso Brand. In addition, the Miniso Product in the possession of the Migu Group is the property of the Miniso Group until it is paid for.

40 The result is obvious - the Migu Group cannot operate their business and generate revenue without the cooperation and support of the Miniso Group.

CCAA ISSUES

41 I will briefly discuss the various issues that arose on this application for the Initial Order.

Statutory Requirements

42 The CCAA applies in respect of a "debtor company" or "affiliated debtor companies" where the total amount of claims against the debtor or its affiliates exceeds \$5 million: CCAA, s. 3(1). "Debtor company" is defined in s. 2 of the CCAA to include any company that is bankrupt or insolvent.

43 I am satisfied that each of the companies within the Migu Group is a "company" existing under the laws of Canada or one of the provinces and that the claims against them exceed \$5 million.

44 Further, I am satisfied that the Migu Group, either individually or collectively, are unable to meet their liabilities as they come due and are therefore insolvent, and thus each is a "debtor company" within the meaning of the CCAA: see *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, s. 2; *Stelco Inc., Re*, [2004] O.J. No. 1257 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 21-22; leave to appeal ref'd, [2004] O.J. No. 1903 (Ont. C.A.); leave to appeal to S.C.C. ref'd [2004] S.C.C.A. No. 336 (S.C.C.).

45 The CCAA expressly grants standing to creditors, such as the Miniso Group, to commence proceedings in respect of a debtor company: CCAA, ss. 4-5; *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*, [2008] O.J. No. 1818 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 34.

Objectives of the CCAA

46 In *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re*, 2010 SCC 60 (S.C.C.), the Court provided a detailed analysis of the purpose and policy behind the CCAA. Of particular note were the Court's comments that:

a) the purpose of the *CCAA* is to permit the debtor to continue to carry on business and, where possible, avoid the social and economic costs of liquidating its assets (para. 15); and

b) the *CCAA*'s distinguishing feature is a grant of broad and flexible authority to the supervising court to use its discretion to make the order necessary to facilitate the reorganization of the debtor and achieve the *CCAA*'s objectives. The courts have used its *CCAA* jurisdiction in increasingly creative and flexible ways (para. 19).

47 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: *Citibank Canada v. Chase Manhattan Bank of Canada*, [1991] O.J. No. 944 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 49; *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, [2009] O.J. No. 3169 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 33 and 40.

48 The imperatives facing both the Miniso Group and the Migu Group here are stark.

49 Without the cooperation of the Miniso Group, including access to immediate interim financing from the Miniso Group, the Migu Group will be unable to meet their liabilities as they become due and it will not be able to continue their operations and preserve their assets. The Migu Group is facing numerous claims from creditors other than the Miniso Group.

50 In addition, the Migu Group's ability to repay the indebtedness owed to the Miniso Group will be severely compromised in the event of a receivership and liquidation.

51 Simply put, the Migu Group cannot proceed with its business operations without the ongoing support of the Miniso Group.

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.

54 In addition, I was satisfied that the stakeholders require the relief sought in the Initial Order on an urgent basis in order to allow the Migu Group to continue operating their business. The need for cash was immediate and without access to interim financing and the stay of proceedings, the Migu Group was not be able to preserve the value of their business or even ensure the coordinated realization of their assets. As such, the Initial Order was the best option toward preserving the Migu Group's enterprise value for the benefit of their stakeholders.

55 After considering all of the circumstances, I am satisfied that these *CCAA* proceedings can assist in preserving value for the stakeholders, until a longer term solution is found.

The Stay of Proceedings

56 In addressing the granting of a stay of proceeding in an initial order under the *CCAA*, Justice Farley in *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re*, [1993] O.J. No. 14 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) stated:

[5] ... a judge has the discretion under the *CCAA* to make [an] order so as to effectively maintain the status quo in respect of an insolvent company while it attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for the proposed compromise or arrangement which will be to the benefit of both the company and its creditors. ...

[6] ... It has been held that the intention of the CCAA is to prevent any manoeuvres for positioning among the creditors during the period required to develop a plan and obtain the approval of creditors. Such manoeuvres could give an aggressive creditor an advantage to the prejudice of others who are less aggressive and would undermine the company's financial position making it even less likely that the plan will succeed ...

7 One of the purposes of the CCAA is to facilitate ongoing operations of a business where its assets have a greater value as part of an integrated system than individually. The CCAA facilitates reorganization of a company where the alternative, sale of the property piecemeal, is likely to yield far less satisfaction to the creditors ...

57 I was satisfied that it was appropriate to exercise my discretion under s. 11.02(1) of the *CCAA* to grant a stay that temporarily enjoins the Migu Group's creditors from proceeding with claims against the debtor companies. This stay of proceedings will prevent any creditor from gaining any advantage that might otherwise be obtained. It will also facilitate the ongoing operations of the Migu Group's business to preserve value and provide the Group with the necessary breathing room to carry out a restructuring or organized sales process.

58 The Miniso Group sought a stay not only against the Migu Group, but also with respect to other entities that are not parties to this proceeding, namely the JV Store Affiliates. The JV Store Affiliates are the general partner companies or partnerships formed to operate the Outlet Stores.

59 The Court has broad jurisdiction under s. 11.02(1) of the *CCAA* to impose stays of proceedings where it is just and reasonable to do so, including with respect to third party non-applicants.

60 In *Cinram International Inc.*, [Re](#), 2012 ONSC 3767 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), the court discussed circumstances that could justify extending the stay to third party non-applicants:

[64] The Courts have found it just and reasonable to grant a stay of proceedings against third party non-applicants in a number of circumstances, including:

- a. where it is important to the reorganization process;
- b. where the business operations of the Applicants and the third party non-applicants are intertwined and the third parties are not subject to the jurisdiction of the CCAA (such as partnerships that are not "companies" under the CCAA);
- c. against non-applicant subsidiaries of a debtor company where such subsidiaries were guarantors under the note indentures issued by the debtor company; and
- d. against non-applicant subsidiaries relating to any guarantee, contribution or indemnity obligation, liability or claim in respect of obligations and claims against the debtor companies.

61 As noted in *Cinram International Inc.*, there is specific authority to grant a stay of proceedings against entities within a limited partnership context, where the business operations of the debtor companies are intertwined within that corporate/partnership structure: *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.* at paras. 12, 16-21; *Canwest Publishing Inc. / Publications Canwest Inc.*, *Re*, 2010 ONSC 222 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 33-34.

62 I found that it was just and appropriate to extend the stay in these proceedings to include the JV Store Affiliates in the circumstances. The business operations of the Outlet Stores are intertwined with the JV Store Affiliates. There is also some intertwining of the financial obligations of the Migu Group and that of the JV Store Affiliates.

63 The draft Initial Order sought a stay for 10 days until July 22, 2019. It appears that the length of the stay was set at 10 days in light of the uncertainty with respect to amendments proposed to the *CCAA* by the *Budget Implementation Act*, 2019, No. 1 Part 4 ("Bill C-97") tabled in Parliament in March 2019.

64 With respect to initial applications under the *CCAA*, ss. 136-138 of Division 5 (Enhancing Retirement Security) of Bill C-97 contains an important amendment. Section 137 includes an amendment to s. 11.02(1), as follows:

Stays, etc. — initial application

11.02 (1) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 10 days,

[Emphasis added.]

65 Bill C-97 received Royal Assent on June 21, 2019. However, s. 152 of Bill C-97 provides that the amendments to the *CCAA* come into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council. As best the parties have discerned, no such order in Council has yet been pronounced.

66 The intent behind the new s. 11.02(1) is clear. It limits the exercise of discretion by the Court in determining the length of any stay such that the maximum amount of any stay will be 10 days, as opposed to the previous 30-day limit.

67 In any regard, I was satisfied that the relief sought here for a 10-day stay was appropriate. At this time, only the Miniso Group has been involved in this process. All parties recognize that many other stakeholders' interests are at play here. Those persons are entitled to notice as soon as possible so that they can appear and be heard in respect of the relief granted in the Initial Order and in terms of any relief that might be granted in this proceeding in the future.

68 I therefore exercised my discretion and concluded that the 10-day stay was appropriate in the circumstances.

The Monitor

69 The Miniso Group proposed that Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc. ("A&M") act as the monitor. As I will discuss below, the relief sought would vest A&M with powers greater than is usually found in a *CCAA* proceeding, giving the monitor more oversight and power to direct the business operations of the Migu Group over the course of the restructuring.

70 In the usual fashion, A&M filed a Pre-Filing Report as the proposed monitor dated July 12, 2019.

71 A&M indicated that it has no conflicts that would prevent it from acting as a monitor in this proceeding: *CCAA* s. 11.7(2). A&M have consented to act as monitor and to provide supervision and monitoring during the proceedings. In addition, in accordance with the Initial Order, A&M agreed to manage the Migu Group's business during these proceedings, including by engaging Miniso Lifestyle under a management services agreement, until the implementation of a restructuring transaction.

72 I was satisfied that A&M is an appropriate entity to be appointed as monitor in these proceedings (the "Monitor").

Interim Financing

73 The Miniso Group sought an order to approve interim financing for the Migu Group in order to allow the Migu Group to meet its obligations over the stay period granted under the Initial Order. In consultation with the Monitor, the Miniso Group agreed to advance up to \$2 million to the Migu Group under an interim credit facility agreement to allow the Migu Group to pay their ongoing business and restructuring expenses.

74 As is typically the case, it was a condition of any advance under the interim financing that the lender be granted a priority Court-ordered charge on all the assets, rights, undertakings and properties of the Migu Group as security for amounts advanced, to rank after the proposed administration charge discussed below.

75 Section 11.2(1) of the *CCAA* vests the Court with jurisdiction to grant an interim debtor-in-possession a financing charge in priority to the claim of any secured creditor of the debtor company, on notice to secured creditors who are likely to be affected

by the security or charge. Section 11.2(4) of the *CCAA* sets out the non-exhaustive factors that the Court may consider before granting such a charge:

- (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under the *CCAA*;
- (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 in respect of the company;
- (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, if any.

76 Bill C-97 is also relevant to this aspect of the relief sought in respect of the interim financing.

77 Section 136 of Bill C-97 provides for a new s. 11.001. This new section introduces, within the context of s. 11 orders generally, a restriction on the Court's discretion to not only order what is "appropriate" under s. 11, but also only what is "reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course" during the relevant stay period:

Relief reasonably necessary

11.001 An order made under section 11 at the same time as an order made under subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection with respect to an initial application shall 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.]

78 Specific amendments in respect of interim financing are also found in Bill C-97 and dovetail the above restriction in s. 11.001 as to what is "reasonably necessary". Section 138 of Bill C-97 provides for the addition of a new s. 11.2(5) of the *CCAA*, as follows:

Additional factor — initial application

(5) When an application is made under subsection (1) at the same time as an initial application referred to in subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection, no order shall be made under subsection (1) unless the court is also satisfied that the terms of the loan are limited to what is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

[Emphasis added.]

79 Accordingly, the intent of Parliament under the new s. 11.2(5) is to curtail the discretion of the Court to grant interim financing in the stay period under an initial order (i.e. up to 10 days) to only what is "reasonably necessary" during that stay period.

80 This provision is not inconsistent with the current approach of Canadian courts when exercising its discretion under s. 11.2 of the *CCAA*. Indeed, the provisions of the new s. 11.2(5) are echoed in Justice Farley's comments in *Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re* (1999), 6 C.B.R. (4th) 314 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]):

[24] It follows from what I have said that, in my opinion, extraordinary relief such as DIP financing with super priority status should be kept, in Initial Orders, to what is reasonably necessary to meet the debtor company's urgent needs over the sorting-out period. Such measures involve what may be a significant re-ordering of priorities from those in place before the application is made, not in the sense of altering the existing priorities as between the various secured creditors but in the sense of placing encumbrances ahead of those presently in existence. Such changes should not be imported lightly, if at all, into the creditors mix; and affected parties are entitled to a reasonable opportunity to think about their potential impact, and to consider such things as whether or not the CCAA approach to the insolvency is the appropriate one in the circumstances — as opposed, for instance, to a receivership or bankruptcy — and whether or not, or to what extent, they are prepared to have their positions affected by DIP or super priority financing. As Mr. Dunphy noted, in the context of this case, the object should be to "keep the lights [of the company] on" and enable it to keep up with appropriate preventative maintenance measures, but the Initial Order itself should approach that objective in a judicious and cautious matter.

[Emphasis added.]

81 A consideration of the proposal for interim financing here is very much informed by the considerable uncertainty about what financial resources are available to the Migu Group at this time.

82 The Monitor reports that the opening cash position of the Migu Group is approximately \$1.4 million as of July 12, 2019. However, certain creditors have recently filed an action against the Migu Group and, on July 9, 2019, obtained a garnishing order for \$1,040,772.50 as against MC Investments' Master Account at TD Canada Trust. It is therefore possible that TD Canada Trust has paid that amount or some of that amount into court or, at least, frozen the balance in Master Account. If that has happened, then the balance on hand is no longer available for the Migu Group's needs.

83 The cash flow indicates that payroll of approximately \$700,000 was to be due the week after the Initial Order was granted. In addition, rental payments of approximately \$800,000 were necessary in the immediate future. The cash flow projections assume ongoing sales, but that amount is also uncertain.

84 The Monitor supported the granting of the interim financing, in light of the needs of the Migu Group required during the restructuring and in light of the uncertainty about current financial resources.

85 I was satisfied that the s. 11.2(4) factors supported the approval of the \$2 million interim financing and the granting of a charge to secure the amounts advanced.

86 I accepted the submissions of the Miniso Group, supported by the Monitor, that the intention is to develop and prepare a restructuring transaction, including a restructuring and a sale of some part of the Migu Group's Canadian operations, as soon as practicable. It is obvious that financing is required to continue operations. With this financing, the Migu Group is able to continue to operate the Outlet Stores, with continued employment of their store-level employees and ongoing payment of rents, while they work with the Monitor and the Miniso Group to formulate a plan. The interim financing is therefore necessary to permit the Migu Group to maintain the value of the enterprise while they pursue a restructuring.

87 In addition, I was provided some assurance that the interim financing will be used only by the Migu Group in accordance with the direct supervision of the Monitor. The Monitor's powers include the monitoring, review and direction regarding the Migu Group's receipts and disbursements.

88 I also approached the matter of interim financing in the spirit of the new s. 11.2(5) of the CCAA. I was satisfied that, in these unique and uncertain circumstances, the \$2 million of interim financing was potentially reasonably necessary to address the needs of the Migu Group until the comeback hearing 10 days later on July 22, 2019.

89 In addition, in order to reflect the Court's clear intention in that respect, the Initial Order was amended to limit the Migu Group's use of the \$2 million interim financing by provided that:

50. ... until the Comeback Hearing, borrowings are limited to the minimum amount required to cover all expenses reasonably incurred by the Debtors in carrying on the Business in the ordinary course.

90 I also concluded that the interim financing was on commercially reasonable terms: allowing for draws of \$250,000; no standby fee; interest rate of 10% per annum; and, no prepayment penalty.

Restructuring Charges

91 The Miniso Group sought an administration charge over the Migu Group's assets, properties, and undertakings up to the maximum amount of \$1 million to secure payment of the fees and disbursements of the Monitor, and its and the Migu Group's legal counsel, incurred in connection with services rendered both before and after the commencement of these *CCAA* proceedings. The administration charge sought is to rank in priority to all other encumbrances, including all other court-ordered charges.

92 Section 11.52 of the *CCAA* expressly provides the Court with the power to grant a charge in respect of professional fees and disbursements on notice to affected secured creditors.

93 Administration charges are a usual feature of *CCAA* initial orders. As stated in *Timminco Ltd., Re*, 2012 ONSC 506 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 66, unless professional advisor fees are protected by way of a charge, the objectives of the *CCAA* would be frustrated as professionals would be unlikely to risk offering services without any assurance of ultimately being paid. Failing to provide protection for professional fees will "result in the overwhelming likelihood that the *CCAA* proceedings would come to an abrupt halt, followed, in all likelihood, by bankruptcy proceedings".

94 The basis for an administration charge is well made out here, particularly given the Miniso Group's substantial and first ranking charge over the Migu Group's assets.

95 In *Canwest Publishing Inc.* at para. 54, the court refers to certain factors that could be considered in determining the amount of an administration charge:

- (a) the size and complexity of the business being restructured;
- (b) the proposed role of the beneficiaries of the charge;
- (c) whether there is unwarranted duplication of roles;
- (d) whether the quantum of the proposed charge appears to be fair and reasonable;
- (e) the position of the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; and
- (f) the position of the Monitor.

96 I was satisfied that a \$1 million limit for the administration charge was appropriate. The amount of the administration charge was determined in consultation with the Monitor. I concluded that this amount was fair and reasonable in light of the number of stakeholders, the size and complexity of the Migu Group's business and the scope and complexity of the proposed restructuring.

97 The Miniso Group was also seeking a directors' and officers' charge (the "D&O Charge") over the Migu Group's assets, properties and undertakings to indemnify the directors and officers in respect of liabilities they may incur as directors and officers during these proceedings, up to a maximum of \$1 million.

98 Pursuant to s. 11.51(1) of the *CCAA*, the Court has jurisdiction to grant a charge to secure a directors' and officers' indemnification on a priority basis on notice to the affected secured creditors. The charge must relate to any obligations or liabilities that may be incurred after the commencement of proceedings. The court must be satisfied with the amount of the

charge, that insurance is not otherwise available (s. 11.51(3)) and that the charge will not provide coverage for wilful misconduct or gross negligence (s. 11.51(4)): *Canwest Publishing Inc.* at paras. 56-57.

99 Here, the extent to which the directors and officers of the Migu Group may be exposed is unknown to a large degree. The Miniso Group has been advised that the directors and officers of the Migu Group do not have any directors' and officers' liability insurance in place. In consultation with the Migu Group, the Monitor has recommended that the D&O Charge be limited to \$1 million.

100 I concluded that the D&O Charge was necessary and appropriate in the circumstances. The D&O Charge will ensure that the directors and officers of the Migu Group continue in their current capacities in the context of these *CCAA* proceedings. I am advised that the directors and officers of the Migu Group are prepared to continue in their roles during these proceedings.

101 I also accepted the Miniso Group's proposal that the various restructuring charges granted rank in priority, as follows:

- a) Firstly, the administration charge (maximum \$1 million);
- b) Secondly, the interim financing charge (maximum \$2 million, plus interest, costs, fees and disbursements); and
- c) Thirdly, the D&O Charge (maximum \$1 million).

Restructuring

102 At this preliminary stage, the germ of the restructuring plan has been formulated by the Miniso Group and generally provides:

- a) There will be a consensual realization process toward ensuring the preservation of the Migu Group's Canadian operations;
- b) Miniso Lifestyle will manage the Canadian operations on behalf of the Migu Group during the *CCAA* proceedings in accordance with the management services agreement;
- c) The Migu Group will not have any further communications with landlords, creditors or other stakeholders, except as approved by the Miniso Group;
- d) The Monitor will consult with the Miniso Group and, with respect to certain premises, the Migu Group, regarding which real property leases are to be terminated. Some leases are personally guaranteed by entities who want to be consulted before any disclaimer. Sales at Outlet Stores would continue during the 30-day disclaimer period and retail employees would be incentivized to continue their employment during that time;
- e) 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; and
- f) By that anticipated transaction, the Miniso Group would acquire certain assets of the Migu Group comprising some or all of the Canadian operations so as to allow continued operation of certain of the Outlet Stores.

103 The stay under the Initial Order will remain in place until July 22, 2019. By that time, the numerous other stakeholders will have been served and they will have time to enable them to consider the impact of these *CCAA* proceedings and their position, if any, in response to it.

104 At the comeback hearing, the Court and all other stakeholders will have updated information as to the status of the Migu Group. In the meantime, the stay will be in place to allow the Monitor to operate the business and maintain the *status quo* while it works with the Miniso Group and Migu Group to develop a restructuring plan. The best estimate at the time of the hearing was that such a plan may be ready to present to the creditors within a few months.

CONCLUSION

105 At the conclusion of the hearing, I granted the Initial Order, as proposed, with certain amendments that arose from a consideration of certain issues during the course of the hearing.

Petition granted.

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

Tab 6

2009 CarswellOnt 6184
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 6184, [2009] O.J. No. 4286, 181 A.C.W.S. (3d) 853, 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF CANWEST
GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS CORP. AND THE OTHER APPLICANTS LISTED ON SCHEDULE "A"

Pepall J.

Judgment: October 13, 2009

Docket: CV-09-8241-OOCL

Counsel: Lyndon Barnes, Edward Sellers, Jeremy Dacks for Applicants
Alan Merskey for Special Committee of the Board of Directors
David Byers, Maria Konyukhova for Proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.
Benjamin Zarnett, Robert Chadwick for Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders
Edmond Lamek for Asper Family
Peter H. Griffin, Peter J. Osborne for Management Directors, Royal Bank of Canada
Hilary Clarke for Bank of Nova Scotia
Steve Weisz for CIT Business Credit Canada Inc.

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.3 Arrangements](#)

[XIX.3.e Miscellaneous](#)

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Miscellaneous

Debtor companies experienced financial problems due to deteriorating economic environment in Canada — Debtor companies took steps to improve cash flow and to strengthen their balance sheets — Economic conditions did not improve nor did financial circumstances of debtor companies — They experienced significant tightening of credit from critical suppliers and trade creditors, reduction of advertising commitments, demands for reduced credit terms by newsprint and printing suppliers, and restrictions on or cancellation of credit cards for certain employees — Application was brought for relief pursuant to Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Application granted — Proposed monitor was appointed — Companies qualified as debtor companies under Act — Debtor companies were in default of their obligations — Required statement of projected cash-flow and other financial documents required under s. 11(2) were filed — Stay of proceedings was granted to create stability and allow debtor companies to pursue their restructuring — Partnerships in application carried on operations that were integral and closely interrelated to business of debtor companies — It was just and convenient to grant relief requested with respect to partnerships — Debtor-in-possession financing was approved — Administration charge was granted — Debtor companies' request for authorization to pay pre-filing amounts owed to critical suppliers was granted — Directors' and officers' charge was granted — Key employee retention plans were approved — Extension of time for calling of annual general meeting was granted.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Pepall J.*:

Cadillac Fairview Inc., Re (1995), 1995 CarswellOnt 36, 30 C.B.R. (3d) 29 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re (2006), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187, 2006 ABQB 153, 2006 CarswellAlta 446 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

General Publishing Co., Re (2003), 39 C.B.R. (4th) 216, 2003 CarswellOnt 275 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Global Light Telecommunications Inc., Re (2004), 2004 BCSC 745, 2004 CarswellBC 1249, 2 C.B.R. (5th) 210, 33 B.C.L.R. (4th) 155 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

Grant Forest Products Inc., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4699, 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance) (2002), 287 N.R. 203, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 18 C.P.R. (4th) 1, 44 C.E.L.R. (N.S.) 161, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 211 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 223 F.T.R. 137 (note), 20 C.P.C. (5th) 1, 40 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, 2002 SCC 41, 2002 CarswellNat 822, 2002 CarswellNat 823, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 93 C.R.R. (2d) 219, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.) — followed

Smurfit-Stone Container Canada Inc., Re (2009), 50 C.B.R. (5th) 71, 2009 CarswellOnt 391 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299, 2004 CarswellOnt 1211 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 2936 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3

Generally — referred to

Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C.

Chapter 15 — referred to

Canada Business Corporations Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44

Generally — referred to

s. 106(6) — referred to

s. 133(1) — referred to

s. 133(1)(b) — referred to

s. 133(3) — referred to

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

Generally — considered

s. 2 "debtor company" — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 11(2) — referred to

s. 11.2 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.2(1) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 11.2(4) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.4 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.4(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to

s. 11.4(3) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.51 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.52 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 23 — considered

Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43

s. 137(2) — considered

Rules considered:

Rules of Civil Procedure, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194

R. 38.09 — referred to

APPLICATION for relief pursuant to *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Pepall J.:

1 Canwest Global Communications Corp. ("Canwest Global"), its principal operating subsidiary, Canwest Media Inc. ("CMI"), and the other applicants listed on Schedule "A" of the Notice of Application apply for relief pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.¹ The applicants also seek to have the stay of proceedings and other provisions extend to the following partnerships: Canwest Television Limited Partnership ("CTLP"), Fox Sports World Canada Partnership and The National Post Company/La Publication National Post ("The National Post Company"). The businesses operated by the applicants and the aforementioned partnerships include (i) Canwest's free-to-air television broadcast business (ie. the Global Television Network stations); (ii) certain subscription-based specialty television channels that are wholly owned and operated by CTLP; and (iii) the National Post.

2 The Canwest Global enterprise as a whole includes the applicants, the partnerships and Canwest Global's other subsidiaries that are not applicants. The term Canwest will be used to refer to the entire enterprise. The term CMI Entities will be used to refer to the applicants and the three aforementioned partnerships. The following entities are not applicants nor is a stay sought in respect of any of them: the entities in Canwest's newspaper publishing and digital media business in Canada (other than the National Post Company) namely the Canwest Limited Partnership, Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Canwest Books Inc., and Canwest (Canada) Inc.; the Canadian subscription based specialty television channels acquired from Alliance Atlantis Communications Inc. in August, 2007 which are held jointly with Goldman Sachs Capital Partners and operated by CW Investments Co. and its subsidiaries; and subscription-based specialty television channels which are not wholly owned by CTLP.

3 No one appearing opposed the relief requested.

Background Facts

4 Canwest is a leading Canadian media company with interests in twelve free-to-air television stations comprising the Global Television Network, subscription-based specialty television channels and newspaper publishing and digital media operations.

5 As of October 1, 2009, Canwest employed the full time equivalent of approximately 7,400 employees around the world. Of that number, the full time equivalent of approximately 1,700 are employed by the CMI Entities, the vast majority of whom work in Canada and 850 of whom work in Ontario.

6 Canwest Global owns 100% of CMI. CMI has direct or indirect ownership interests in all of the other CMI Entities. Ontario is the chief place of business of the CMI Entities.

7 Canwest Global is a public company continued under the *Canada Business Corporations Act*.² It has authorized capital consisting of an unlimited number of preference shares, multiple voting shares, subordinate voting shares, and non-voting shares. It is a "constrained-share company" which means that at least 66 2/3% of its voting shares must be beneficially owned

by Canadians. The Asper family built the Canwest enterprise and family members hold various classes of shares. In April and May, 2009, corporate decision making was consolidated and streamlined.

8 The CMI Entities generate the majority of their revenue from the sale of advertising (approximately 77% on a consolidated basis). Fuelled by a deteriorating economic environment in Canada and elsewhere, in 2008 and 2009, they experienced a decline in their advertising revenues. This caused problems with cash flow and circumstances were exacerbated by their high fixed operating costs. In response to these conditions, the CMI Entities took steps to improve cash flow and to strengthen their balance sheets. They commenced workforce reductions and cost saving measures, sold certain interests and assets, and engaged in discussions with the CRTC and the Federal government on issues of concern.

9 Economic conditions did not improve nor did the financial circumstances of the CMI Entities. They experienced significant tightening of credit from critical suppliers and trade creditors, a further reduction of advertising commitments, demands for reduced credit terms by newsprint and printing suppliers, and restrictions on or cancellation of credit cards for certain employees.

10 In February, 2009, CMI breached certain of the financial covenants in its secured credit facility. It subsequently received waivers of the borrowing conditions on six occasions. On March 15, 2009, it failed to make an interest payment of US\$30.4 million due on 8% senior subordinated notes. CMI entered into negotiations with an ad hoc committee of the 8% senior subordinated noteholders holding approximately 72% of the notes (the "Ad Hoc Committee"). An agreement was reached wherein CMI and its subsidiary CTLP agreed to issue US\$105 million in 12% secured notes to members of the Ad Hoc Committee. At the same time, CMI entered into an agreement with CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. ("CIT") in which CIT agreed to provide a senior secured revolving asset based loan facility of up to \$75 million. CMI used the funds generated for operations and to repay amounts owing on the senior credit facility with a syndicate of lenders of which the Bank of Nova Scotia was the administrative agent. These funds were also used to settle related swap obligations.

11 Canwest Global reports its financial results on a consolidated basis. As at May 31, 2009, it had total consolidated assets with a net book value of \$4.855 billion and total consolidated liabilities of \$5.846 billion. The subsidiaries of Canwest Global that are not applicants or partnerships in this proceeding had short and long term debt totalling \$2.742 billion as at May 31, 2009 and the CMI Entities had indebtedness of approximately \$954 million. For the 9 months ended May 31, 2009, Canwest Global's consolidated revenues decreased by \$272 million or 11% compared to the same period in 2008. In addition, operating income before amortization decreased by \$253 million or 47%. It reported a consolidated net loss of \$1.578 billion compared to \$22 million for the same period in 2008. CMI reported that revenues for the Canadian television operations decreased by \$8 million or 4% in the third quarter of 2009 and operating profit was \$21 million compared to \$39 million in the same period in 2008.

12 The board of directors of Canwest Global struck a special committee of the board ("the Special Committee") with a mandate to explore and consider strategic alternatives in order to maximize value. That committee appointed Thomas Strike, who is the President, Corporate Development and Strategy Implementation of Canwest Global, as Recapitalization Officer and retained Hap Stephen, who is the Chairman and CEO of Stonecrest Capital Inc., as a Restructuring Advisor ("CRA").

13 On September 15, 2009, CMI failed to pay US\$30.4 million in interest payments due on the 8% senior subordinated notes.

14 On September 22, 2009, the board of directors of Canwest Global authorized the sale of all of the shares of Ten Network Holdings Limited (Australia) ("Ten Holdings") held by its subsidiary, Canwest Mediaworks Ireland Holdings ("CMIH"). Prior to the sale, the CMI Entities had consolidated indebtedness totalling US\$939.9 million pursuant to three facilities. CMI had issued 8% unsecured notes in an aggregate principal amount of US\$761,054,211. They were guaranteed by all of the CMI Entities except Canwest Global, and 30109, LLC. CMI had also issued 12% secured notes in an aggregate principal amount of US\$94 million. They were guaranteed by the CMI Entities. Amongst others, Canwest's subsidiary, CMIH, was a guarantor of both of these facilities. The 12% notes were secured by first ranking charges against all of the property of CMI, CTLP and the guarantors. In addition, pursuant to a credit agreement dated May 22, 2009 and subsequently amended, CMI has a senior secured revolving asset-based loan facility in the maximum amount of \$75 million with CIT Business Credit Canada Inc. ("CIT"). Prior to the sale, the debt amounted to \$23.4 million not including certain letters of credit. The facility is guaranteed by CTLP, CMIH and others and secured by first ranking charges against all of the property of CMI, CTLP, CMIH and other

guarantors. Significant terms of the credit agreement are described in paragraph 37 of the proposed Monitor's report. Upon a CCAA filing by CMI and commencement of proceedings under Chapter 15 of the Bankruptcy Code, the CIT facility converts into a DIP financing arrangement and increases to a maximum of \$100 million.

15 Consents from a majority of the 8% senior subordinated noteholders were necessary to allow the sale of the Ten Holdings shares. A Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement was entered into by CMI, CMIH, certain consenting noteholders and others wherein CMIH was allowed to lend the proceeds of sale to CMI.

16 The sale of CMIH's interest in Ten Holdings was settled on October 1, 2009. Gross proceeds of approximately \$634 million were realized. The proceeds were applied to fund general liquidity and operating costs of CMI, pay all amounts owing under the 12% secured notes and all amounts outstanding under the CIT facility except for certain letters of credit in an aggregate face amount of \$10.7 million. In addition, a portion of the proceeds was used to reduce the amount outstanding with respect to the 8% senior subordinated notes leaving an outstanding indebtedness thereunder of US\$393.25 million.

17 In consideration for the loan provided by CMIH to CMI, CMI issued a secured intercompany note in favour of CMIH in the principal amount of \$187.3 million and an unsecured promissory note in the principal amount of \$430.6 million. The secured note is subordinated to the CIT facility and is secured by a first ranking charge on the property of CMI and the guarantors. The payment of all amounts owing under the unsecured promissory note are subordinated and postponed in favour of amounts owing under the CIT facility. Canwest Global, CTLP and others have guaranteed the notes. It is contemplated that the debt that is the subject matter of the unsecured note will be compromised.

18 Without the funds advanced under the intercompany notes, the CMI Entities would be unable to meet their liabilities as they come due. The consent of the noteholders to the use of the Ten Holdings proceeds was predicated on the CMI Entities making this application for an Initial Order under the CCAA. Failure to do so and to take certain other steps constitute an event of default under the Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement, the CIT facility and other agreements. The CMI Entities have insufficient funds to satisfy their obligations including those under the intercompany notes and the 8% senior subordinated notes.

19 The stay of proceedings under the CCAA is sought so as to allow the CMI Entities to proceed to develop a plan of arrangement or compromise to implement a consensual "pre-packaged" recapitalization transaction. The CMI Entities and the Ad Hoc Committee of noteholders have agreed on the terms of a going concern recapitalization transaction which is intended to form the basis of the plan. The terms are reflected in a support agreement and term sheet. The recapitalization transaction contemplates amongst other things, a significant reduction of debt and a debt for equity restructuring. The applicants anticipate that a substantial number of the businesses operated by the CMI Entities will continue as going concerns thereby preserving enterprise value for stakeholders and maintaining employment for as many as possible. As mentioned, certain steps designed to implement the recapitalization transaction have already been taken prior to the commencement of these proceedings.

20 CMI has agreed to maintain not more than \$2.5 million as cash collateral in a deposit account with the Bank of Nova Scotia to secure cash management obligations owed to BNS. BNS holds first ranking security against those funds and no court ordered charge attaches to the funds in the account.

21 The CMI Entities maintain eleven defined benefit pension plans and four defined contribution pension plans. There is an aggregate solvency deficiency of \$13.3 million as at the last valuation date and a wind up deficiency of \$32.8 million. There are twelve television collective agreements eleven of which are negotiated with the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada. The Canadian Union of Public Employees negotiated the twelfth television collective agreement. It expires on December 31, 2010. The other collective agreements are in expired status. None of the approximately 250 employees of the National Post Company are unionized. The CMI Entities propose to honour their payroll obligations to their employees, including all pre-filing wages and employee benefits outstanding as at the date of the commencement of the CCAA proceedings and payments in connection with their pension obligations.

Proposed Monitor

22 The applicants propose that FTI Consulting Canada Inc. serve as the Monitor in these proceedings. It is clearly qualified to act and has provided the Court with its consent to act. Neither FTI nor any of its representatives have served in any of the capacities prohibited by section of the amendments to the CCAA.

Proposed Order

23 I have reviewed in some detail the history that preceded this application. It culminated in the presentation of the within application and proposed order. Having reviewed the materials and heard submissions, I was satisfied that the relief requested should be granted.

24 This case involves a consideration of the amendments to the CCAA that were proclaimed in force on September 18, 2009. While these were long awaited, in many instances they reflect practices and principles that have been adopted by insolvency practitioners and developed in the jurisprudence and academic writings on the subject of the CCAA. In no way do the amendments change or detract from the underlying purpose of the CCAA, namely to provide debtor companies with the opportunity to extract themselves from financial difficulties notwithstanding insolvency and to reorganize their affairs for the benefit of stakeholders. In my view, the amendments should be interpreted and applied with that objective in mind.

(a) Threshold Issues

25 Firstly, the applicants qualify as debtor companies under the CCAA. Their chief place of business is in Ontario. The applicants are affiliated debtor companies with total claims against them exceeding \$5 million. The CMI Entities are in default of their obligations. CMI does not have the necessary liquidity to make an interest payment in the amount of US\$30.4 million that was due on September 15, 2009 and none of the other CMI Entities who are all guarantors are able to make such a payment either. The assets of the CMI Entities are insufficient to discharge all of the liabilities. The CMI Entities are unable to satisfy their debts as they come due and they are insolvent. They are insolvent both under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*³ definition and under the more expansive definition of insolvency used in *Stelco Inc., Re*⁴. Absent these CCAA proceedings, the applicants would lack liquidity and would be unable to continue as going concerns. The CMI Entities have acknowledged their insolvency in the affidavit filed in support of the application.

26 Secondly, the required statement of projected cash-flow and other financial documents required under section 11(2) of the CCAA have been filed.

(b) Stay of Proceedings

27 Under section 11 of the CCAA, the Court has broad jurisdiction to grant a stay of proceedings and to give a debtor company a chance to develop a plan of compromise or arrangement. In my view, given the facts outlined, a stay is necessary to create stability and to allow the CMI Entities to pursue their restructuring.

(b) Partnerships and Foreign Subsidiaries

28 The applicants seek to extend the stay of proceedings and other relief to the aforementioned partnerships. The partnerships are intertwined with the applicants' ongoing operations. They own the National Post daily newspaper and Canadian free-to-air television assets and certain of its specialty television channels and some other television assets. These businesses constitute a significant portion of the overall enterprise value of the CMI Entities. The partnerships are also guarantors of the 8% senior subordinated notes.

29 While the CCAA definition of a company does not include a partnership or limited partnership, courts have repeatedly exercised their inherent jurisdiction to extend the scope of CCAA proceedings to encompass them. See for example *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re*⁵; *Smurfit-Stone Container Canada Inc., Re*⁶; and *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re*⁷. In this case, the partnerships carry on operations that are integral and closely interrelated to the business of the applicants. The operations and

obligations of the partnerships are so intertwined with those of the applicants that irreparable harm would ensue if the requested stay were not granted. In my view, it is just and convenient to grant the relief requested with respect to the partnerships.

30 Certain applicants are foreign subsidiaries of CMI. Each is a guarantor under the 8% senior subordinated notes, the CIT credit agreement (and therefore the DIP facility), the intercompany notes and is party to the support agreement and the Use of Cash Collateral and Consent Agreement. If the stay of proceedings was not extended to these entities, creditors could seek to enforce their guarantees. I am persuaded that the foreign subsidiary applicants as that term is defined in the affidavit filed are debtor companies within the meaning of section 2 of the CCAA and that I have jurisdiction and ought to grant the order requested as it relates to them. In this regard, I note that they are insolvent and each holds assets in Ontario in that they each maintain funds on deposit at the Bank of Nova Scotia in Toronto. See in this regard *Cadillac Fairview Inc., Re*⁸ and *Global Light Telecommunications Inc., Re*⁹

(C) DIP Financing

31 Turning to the DIP financing, the premise underlying approval of DIP financing is that it is a benefit to all stakeholders as it allows the debtors to protect going-concern value while they attempt to devise a plan acceptable to creditors. While in the past, courts relied on inherent jurisdiction to approve the terms of a DIP financing charge, the September 18, 2009 amendments to the CCAA now expressly provide jurisdiction to grant a DIP financing charge. Section 11.2 of the Act states:

- (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.
- (2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.
- (3) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.
- (4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,
 - (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
 - (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 in respect of the company;
 - (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 referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

32 In light of the language of section 11.2(1), the first issue to consider is whether notice has been given to secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge. Paragraph 57 of the proposed order affords priority to the DIP charge, the administration charge, the Directors' and Officers' charge and the KERP charge with the following exception: "any validly perfected purchase money security interest in favour of a secured creditor or any statutory encumbrance existing on the date of this order in favour of any person which is a "secured creditor" as defined in the CCAA in respect of any of source deductions from wages, employer health tax, workers compensation, GST/QST, PST payables, vacation pay and banked overtime for

employees, and amounts under the Wage Earners' Protection Program that are subject to a super priority claim under the BIA". This provision coupled with the notice that was provided satisfied me that secured creditors either were served or are unaffected by the DIP charge. This approach is both consistent with the legislation and practical.

33 Secondly, the Court must determine that the amount of the DIP is appropriate and required having regard to the debtors' cash-flow statement. The DIP charge is for up to \$100 million. Prior to entering into the CIT facility, the CMI Entities sought proposals from other third party lenders for a credit facility that would convert to a DIP facility should the CMI Entities be required to file for protection under the CCAA. The CIT facility was the best proposal submitted. In this case, it is contemplated that implementation of the plan will occur no later than April 15, 2010. The total amount of cash on hand is expected to be down to approximately \$10 million by late December, 2009 based on the cash flow forecast. The applicants state that this is an insufficient cushion for an enterprise of this magnitude. The cash-flow statements project the need for the liquidity provided by the DIP facility for the recapitalization transaction to be finalized. The facility is to accommodate additional liquidity requirements during the CCAA proceedings. It will enable the CMI Entities to operate as going concerns while pursuing the implementation and completion of a viable plan and will provide creditors with assurances of same. I also note that the proposed facility is simply a conversion of the pre-existing CIT facility and as such, it is expected that there would be no material prejudice to any of the creditors of the CMI Entities that arises from the granting of the DIP charge. I am persuaded that the amount is appropriate and required.

34 Thirdly, the DIP charge must not and does not secure an obligation that existed before the order was made. The only amount outstanding on the CIT facility is \$10.7 in outstanding letters of credit. These letters of credit are secured by existing security and it is proposed that that security rank ahead of the DIP charge.

35 Lastly, I must consider amongst others, the enumerated factors in paragraph 11.2(4) of the Act. I have already addressed some of them. The Management Directors of the applicants as that term is used in the materials filed will continue to manage the CMI Entities during the CCAA proceedings. It would appear that management has the confidence of its major creditors. The CMI Entities have appointed a CRA and a Restructuring Officer to negotiate and implement the recapitalization transaction and the aforementioned directors will continue to manage the CMI Entities during the CCAA proceedings. The DIP facility will enhance the prospects of a completed restructuring. CIT has stated that it will not convert the CIT facility into a DIP facility if the DIP charge is not approved. In its report, the proposed Monitor observes that the ability to borrow funds from a court approved DIP facility secured by the DIP charge is crucial to retain the confidence of the CMI Entities' creditors, employees and suppliers and would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made. The proposed Monitor is supportive of the DIP facility and charge.

36 For all of these reasons, I was prepared to approve the DIP facility and charge.

(d) Administration Charge

37 While an administration charge was customarily granted by courts to secure the fees and disbursements of the professional advisors who guided a debtor company through the CCAA process, as a result of the amendments to the CCAA, there is now statutory authority to grant such a charge. Section 11.52 of the CCAA states:

(1) On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in respect of the fees and expenses of

(a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;

(b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and

(c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

38 I must therefore be convinced that (1) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; (2) the amount is appropriate; and (3) the charge should extend to all of the proposed beneficiaries.

39 As with the DIP charge, the issue relating to notice to affected secured creditors has been addressed appropriately by the applicants. The amount requested is up to \$15 million. The beneficiaries of the charge are: the Monitor and its counsel; counsel to the CMI Entities; the financial advisor to the Special Committee and its counsel; counsel to the Management Directors; the CRA; the financial advisor to the Ad Hoc Committee; and RBC Capital Markets and its counsel. The proposed Monitor supports the aforementioned charge and considers it to be required and reasonable in the circumstances in order to preserve the going concern operations of the CMI Entities. The applicants submit that the above-note professionals who have played a necessary and integral role in the restructuring activities to date are necessary to implement the recapitalization transaction.

40 Estimating quantum is an inexact exercise but I am prepared to accept the amount as being appropriate. There has obviously been extensive negotiation by stakeholders and the restructuring is of considerable magnitude and complexity. I was prepared to accept the submissions relating to the administration charge. I have not included any requirement that all of these professionals be required to have their accounts scrutinized and approved by the Court but they should not preclude this possibility.

(e) Critical Suppliers

41 The next issue to consider is the applicants' request for authorization to pay pre-filing amounts owed to critical suppliers. In recognition that one of the purposes of the CCAA is to permit an insolvent corporation to remain in business, typically courts exercised their inherent jurisdiction to grant such authorization and a charge with respect to the provision of essential goods and services. In the recent amendments, Parliament codified the practice of permitting the payment of pre-filing amounts to critical suppliers and the provision of a charge. Specifically, section 11.4 provides:

(1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is satisfied that the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.

(2) If the court declares a person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.

(3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied under the terms of the order.

(4) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

42 Under these provisions, the Court must be satisfied that there has been notice to creditors likely to be affected by the charge, the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company, and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation. While one might interpret section 11.4 (3) as requiring a charge any time a person is declared to be a critical supplier, in my view, this provision only applies when a court is compelling a person to supply. The charge then provides protection to the unwilling supplier.

43 In this case, no charge is requested and no additional notice is therefore required. Indeed, there is an issue as to whether in the absence of a request for a charge, section 11.4 is even applicable and the Court is left to rely on inherent jurisdiction. The section seems to be primarily directed to the conditions surrounding the granting of a charge to secure critical suppliers. That said, even if it is applicable, I am satisfied that the applicants have met the requirements. The CMI Entities seek authorization to make certain payments to third parties that provide goods and services integral to their business. These include television

programming suppliers given the need for continuous and undisturbed flow of programming, newsprint suppliers given the dependency of the National Post on a continuous and uninterrupted supply of newsprint to enable it to publish and on newspaper distributors, and the American Express Corporate Card Program and Central Billed Accounts that are required for CMI Entity employees to perform their job functions. No payment would be made without the consent of the Monitor. I accept that these suppliers are critical in nature. The CMI Entities also seek more general authorization allowing them to pay other suppliers if in the opinion of the CMI Entities, the supplier is critical. Again, no payment would be made without the consent of the Monitor. In addition, again no charge securing any payments is sought. This is not contrary to the language of section 11.4 (1) or to its purpose. The CMI Entities seek the ability to pay other suppliers if in their opinion the supplier is critical to their business and ongoing operations. The order requested is facilitative and practical in nature. The proposed Monitor supports the applicants' request and states that it will work to ensure that payments to suppliers in respect of pre-filing liabilities are minimized. The Monitor is of course an officer of the Court and is always able to seek direction from the Court if necessary. In addition, it will report on any such additional payments when it files its reports for Court approval. In the circumstances outlined, I am prepared to grant the relief requested in this regard.

(f) Directors' and Officers' Charge

44 The applicants also seek a directors' and officers' ("D &O") charge in the amount of \$20 million. The proposed charge would rank after the administration charge, the existing CIT security, and the DIP charge. It would rank *pari passu* with the KERP charge discussed subsequently in this endorsement but postponed in right of payment to the extent of the first \$85 million payable under the secured intercompany note.

45 Again, the recent amendments to the CCAA allow for such a charge. Section 11.51 provides that:

(1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

(3) The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.

(4) The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

46 I have already addressed the issue of notice to affected secured creditors. I must also be satisfied with the amount and that the charge is for obligations and liabilities the directors and officers may incur after the commencement of proceedings. It is not to extend to coverage of wilful misconduct or gross negligence and no order should be granted if adequate insurance at a reasonable cost could be obtained.

47 The proposed Monitor reports that the amount of \$20 million was estimated taking into consideration the existing D&O insurance and the potential liabilities which may attach including certain employee related and tax related obligations. The amount was negotiated with the DIP lender and the Ad Hoc Committee. The order proposed speaks of indemnification relating to the failure of any of the CMI Entities, after the date of the order, to make certain payments. It also excludes gross negligence and wilful misconduct. The D&O insurance provides for \$30 million in coverage and \$10 million in excess coverage for a total of \$40 million. It will expire in a matter of weeks and Canwest Global has been unable to obtain additional or replacement coverage. I am advised that it also extends to others in the Canwest enterprise and not just to the CMI Entities. The directors and senior management are described as highly experienced, fully functional and qualified. The directors have indicated that they cannot continue in the restructuring effort unless the order includes the requested directors' charge.

48 The purpose of such a charge is to keep the directors and officers in place during the restructuring by providing them with protection against liabilities they could incur during the restructuring: *General Publishing Co., Re*¹⁰ Retaining the current directors and officers of the applicants would avoid destabilization and would assist in the restructuring. The proposed charge would enable the applicants to keep the experienced board of directors supported by experienced senior management. The proposed Monitor believes that the charge is required and is reasonable in the circumstances and also observes that it will not cover all of the directors' and officers' liabilities in the worst case scenario. In all of these circumstances, I approved the request.

(g) Key Employee Retention Plans

49 Approval of a KERP and a KERP charge are matters of discretion. In this case, the CMI Entities have developed KERPs that are designed to facilitate and encourage the continued participation of certain of the CMI Entities' senior executives and other key employees who are required to guide the CMI Entities through a successful restructuring with a view to preserving enterprise value. There are 20 KERP participants all of whom are described by the applicants as being critical to the successful restructuring of the CMI Entities. Details of the KERPs are outlined in the materials and the proposed Monitor's report. A charge of \$5.9 million is requested. The three Management Directors are seasoned executives with extensive experience in the broadcasting and publishing industries. They have played critical roles in the restructuring initiatives taken to date. The applicants state that it is probable that they would consider other employment opportunities if the KERPs were not secured by a KERP charge. The other proposed participants are also described as being crucial to the restructuring and it would be extremely difficult to find replacements for them

50 Significantly in my view, the Monitor who has scrutinized the proposed KERPs and charge is supportive. Furthermore, they have been approved by the Board, the Special Committee, the Human Resources Committee of Canwest Global and the Ad Hoc Committee. The factors enumerated in *Grant Forest Products Inc., Re*¹¹ have all been met and I am persuaded that the relief in this regard should be granted.

51 The applicants ask that the Confidential Supplement containing unredacted copies of the KERPs that reveal individually identifiable information and compensation information be sealed. Generally speaking, judges are most reluctant to grant sealing orders. An open court and public access are fundamental to our system of justice. Section 137(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act* provides authority to grant a sealing order and the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*¹² provides guidance on the appropriate legal principles to be applied. Firstly, the Court must be satisfied that the order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk. Secondly, the salutary effects of the order should outweigh its deleterious effects including the effects on the right to free expression which includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

52 In this case, the unredacted KERPs reveal individually identifiable information including compensation information. Protection of sensitive personal and compensation information the disclosure of which could cause harm to the individuals and to the CMI Entities is an important commercial interest that should be protected. The KERP participants have a reasonable expectation that their personal information would be kept confidential. As to the second branch of the test, the aggregate amount of the KERPs has been disclosed and the individual personal information adds nothing. It seems to me that this second branch of the test has been met. The relief requested is granted.

Annual Meeting

53 The CMI Entities seek an order postponing the annual general meeting of shareholders of Canwest Global. Pursuant to section 133 (1)(b) of the CBCA, a corporation is required to call an annual meeting by no later than February 28, 2010, being six months after the end of its preceding financial year which ended on August 31, 2009. Pursuant to section 133 (3), despite subsection (1), the corporation may apply to the court for an order extending the time for calling an annual meeting.

54 CCAA courts have commonly granted extensions of time for the calling of an annual general meeting. In this case, the CMI Entities including Canwest Global are devoting their time to stabilizing business and implementing a plan. Time and resources would be diverted if the time was not extended as requested and the preparation for and the holding of the annual meeting would likely impede the timely and desirable restructuring of the CMI Entities. Under section 106(6) of the CBCA, if directors of a corporation are not elected, the incumbent directors continue. Financial and other information will be available on the proposed Monitor's website. An extension is properly granted.

Other

55 The applicants request authorization to commence Chapter 15 proceedings in the U.S. Continued timely supply of U.S. network and other programming is necessary to preserve going concern value. Commencement of Chapter 15 proceedings to have the CCAA proceedings recognized as "foreign main proceedings" is a prerequisite to the conversion of the CIT facility into the DIP facility. Authorization is granted.

56 Canwest's various corporate and other entities share certain business services. They are seeking to continue to provide and receive inter-company services in the ordinary course during the CCAA proceedings. This is supported by the proposed Monitor and FTI will monitor and report to the Court on matters pertaining to the provision of inter-company services.

57 Section 23 of the amended CCAA now addresses certain duties and functions of the Monitor including the provision of notice of an Initial Order although the Court may order otherwise. Here the financial threshold for notice to creditors has been increased from \$1000 to \$5000 so as to reduce the burden and cost of such a process. The proceedings will be widely published in the media and the Initial Order is to be posted on the Monitor's website. Other meritorious adjustments were also made to the notice provisions.

58 This is a "pre-packaged" restructuring and as such, stakeholders have negotiated and agreed on the terms of the requested order. That said, not every stakeholder was before me. For this reason, interested parties are reminded that the order includes the usual come back provision. The return date of any motion to vary, rescind or affect the provisions relating to the CIT credit agreement or the CMI DIP must be no later than November 5, 2009.

59 I have obviously not addressed every provision in the order but have attempted to address some key provisions. In support of the requested relief, the applicants filed a factum and the proposed Monitor filed a report. These were most helpful. A factum is required under Rule 38.09 of the Rules of Civil Procedure. Both a factum and a proposed Monitor's report should customarily be filed with a request for an Initial Order under the CCAA.

Conclusion

60 Weak economic conditions and a high debt load do not a happy couple make but clearly many of the stakeholders have been working hard to produce as desirable an outcome as possible in the circumstances. Hopefully the cooperation will persist.
Application granted.

Footnotes

1 R.S.C. 1985, c. C. 36, as amended

2 R.S.C. 1985, c.C.44.

3 R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, as amended.

4 (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); leave to appeal refused 2004 CarswellOnt 2936 (Ont. C.A.).

5 (1993), 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

- 6 [\[2009\] O.J. No. 349](#) (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).
- 7 [\(2006\), 19 C.B.R. \(5th\) 187](#) (Alta. Q.B.).
- 8 [\(1995\), 30 C.B.R. \(3d\) 29](#) (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).
- 9 [\(2004\), 33 B.C.L.R. \(4th\) 155](#) (B.C. S.C.).
- 10 [\(2003\), 39 C.B.R. \(4th\) 216](#) (Ont. S.C.J.).
- 11 [\[2009\] O.J. No. 3344](#) (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]). That said, given the nature of the relationship between a board of directors and senior management, it may not always be appropriate to give undue consideration to the principle of business judgment.
- 12 [\[2002\] 2 S.C.R. 522](#) (S.C.C.).

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

Tab 7

2014 ONSC 494
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Jaguar Mining Inc., Re

2013 CarswellOnt 18630, 2014 ONSC 494, 12 C.B.R. (6th) 290, 236 A.C.W.S. (3d) 820

**In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors
Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as Amended**

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Jaguar Mining Inc., Applicant

Morawetz R.S.J.

Heard: December 23, 2013
Judgment: December 23, 2013
Written reasons: January 16, 2014
Docket: CV-13-10383-00CL

Counsel: Tony Reyes, Evan Cobb for Applicant, Jaguar Mining Inc.
Robert J. Chadwick, Caroline Descours for Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders
Joseph Bellissimo for Secured Lender, Global Resource Fund
Jeremy Dacks for Proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.
Robin B. Schwill for Special Committee of the Board of Directors

Subject: Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.2 Initial application](#)

[XIX.2.b Grant of stay](#)

[XIX.2.b.viii Miscellaneous](#)

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Grant of stay — Miscellaneous
Effect of stay on subsidiaries — Debtor company was holding company for gold mining business Debtor brought application
for protection under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act for itself and subsidiaries Application granted — Debtor wished
to affect recapitalization — Recapitalization was supported by 93 per cent of noteholders, which formed bulk of debt — Debtor
was insolvent and facing liquidity crisis — Extending stay to subsidiaries was reasonable as debtor was dependant on them
for income — Director's charge granted .

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by Morawetz J.:

Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re (2006), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187, 2006 ABQB 153, 2006 CarswellAlta 446 (Alta. Q.B.) —
referred to

Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re (2010), 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115, 2010 CarswellOnt 212, 2010 ONSC
222 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div.
[Commercial List]) — referred to

SkyLink Aviation Inc., Re (2013), 2013 CarswellOnt 2785, 2013 ONSC 1500, 3 C.B.R. (6th) 150 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial
List]) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Business Corporations Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. B.16

Generally — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

s. 10(2) — considered

s. 11.51 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.52 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 22(2) — considered

APPLICATION by debtor for protection under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Morawetz J. (orally):

1 On December 23, 2013, I heard the CCAA application of Jaguar Mining Inc. ("Jaguar") and made the following three endorsements:

1. CCAA protection granted. Initial Order signed. Reasons will follow. It is expected that parties will utilize the e-Service Protocol which can be confirmed on comeback motion. Sealing Order of confidential exhibits granted.

2. Meeting Order granted in form submitted.

3. Claims Procedure Order granted in form submitted.

2 These are my reasons.

3 Jaguar sought protection from its creditors under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") and requested authorization to commence a process for the approval and implementation of a plan of compromise and arrangement affecting its unsecured creditors.

4 Jaguar also requested certain protections in favour of its wholly-owned subsidiaries that are not applicants (the "Subsidiaries" and, together with the Applicant, the "Jaguar Group").

5 Counsel to Jaguar submits that the principal objective of these proceedings is to effect a recapitalization and financing transaction (the "Recapitalization") on an expedited basis through a plan of compromise and arrangement (the "Plan") to provide a financial foundation for the Jaguar Group going forward and additional liquidity to allow the Jaguar Group to continue to work towards its operational and financial goals. The Recapitalization, if implemented, is expected to result in a reduction of over \$268 million of debt and new liquidity upon exit of approximately \$50 million.

6 Jaguar's senior unsecured convertible notes (the "Notes") are the primary liabilities affected by the Recapitalization. Any other affected liabilities of Jaguar, which is a holding company with no active business operations, are limited and identifiable.

7 The Recapitalization is supported by an Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders of the Notes (the "Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders") and other Consenting Noteholders, who collectively represent approximately 93% of the Notes.

8 The background facts are set out in the affidavit of David M. Petrov sworn December 23, 2013 (the "Petrov Affidavit"), the important points of which are summarized below.

9 Jaguar is a corporation existing under the *Business Corporations Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c. B.16, with a registered office in Toronto, Ontario. Jaguar has assets in Canada.

10 Jaguar is the public parent corporation of other corporations in the Jaguar Group that carry on active gold mining and exploration in Brazil, employing in excess of 1,000 people. Jaguar itself does not carry on active gold mining operations.

11 Jaguar has three wholly-owned Brazilian operating subsidiaries: MCT Mineração Ltda. ("MCT"), Mineração Serras do Oeste Ltda. ("MSOL") and Mineração Turmalina Ltda. ("MTL") (and, together with MCT and MSOL, the "Subsidiaries"), all incorporated in Brazil.

12 The Subsidiaries' assets include properties in the development stage and in the production stage.

13 Jaguar has been the main corporate vehicle through which financing has been raised for the operations of the Jaguar Group. The Subsidiaries have guaranteed repayment of certain funds borrowed by Jaguar.

14 Jaguar has raised debt financing by (a) issuing notes, and (b) borrowing from Renvest Mercantile Bank Corp. Inc., through its global resource fund ("Renvest").

15 In aggregate, Jaguar has issued a principal amount of \$268.5 million of Notes through two transactions, known as the "2014 Notes" and the "2016 Notes".

16 Interest is paid semi-annually on the 2014 Notes and the 2016 Notes. Jaguar has not paid the last interest payment due on November 1, 2013. Under the 2014 Notes, the grace period has lapsed and an event of default has occurred.

17 Jaguar is also the borrower under a fully drawn \$30 million secured facility (the "Renvest Facility") with Renvest. The obligations under the Renvest Facility are secured by a general security agreement from Jaguar as well as guarantees and collateral security granted by each of the Subsidiaries.

18 Jaguar has identified another potential liability. Mr. Daniel Titcomb, former chief executive officer of Jaguar, and certain other associated parties, have instituted a legal proceeding against Jaguar and certain of its current and former directors that is currently proceeding in the United States Federal Court. Counsel to Jaguar submits that this lawsuit alleges certain employment-related claims and other claims in respect of equity interests in Jaguar that are held by Mr. Titcomb and others. Counsel to Jaguar advises that Jaguar and its board of directors believe this lawsuit to be without merit.

19 Counsel also advises that, aside from the lawsuit and professional service fees incurred by Jaguar, the unsecured liabilities of Jaguar are not material.

20 The Jaguar Group's mines are not low-cost gold producers and the recent decline in the price of gold has negatively impacted the Jaguar Group.

21 Based on current world prices and Jaguar Group's current level of expenditures, the Jaguar Group is expected to cease to have sufficient cash resources to continue operations early in the first quarter of 2014.

22 Counsel also submits that, as a result of Jaguar's event of default under the 2014 Notes, certain remedies have become available, including the possible acceleration of the principal amount and accrued and unpaid interest on the 2014 Notes. As of November 13, 2013, that principal and accrued interest totalled approximately \$169.3 million.

23 Jaguar's unaudited consolidated financial statements for the nine months ending September 30, 2013 show that Jaguar had an accumulated deficit of over \$317 million and a net loss of over \$82 million for the nine months ending September 30, 2013. Jaguar's current liabilities (at book value) exceed Jaguar's current assets (at book value) by approximately \$40 million.

24 I accept that Jaguar faces a liquidity crisis and is insolvent.

25 Jaguar has been involved in a strategic review over the past two years. Counsel submits that the efforts of Jaguar and its advisors have shown that a comprehensive restructuring plan involving a debt-to-equity exchange and an investment of new money is the best available alternative to address Jaguar's financial issues.

26 Counsel to Jaguar advises that the board of directors of Jaguar has determined that the Recapitalization is the best available option to Jaguar and, further, that the plan cannot be implemented outside of a CCAA proceeding. Counsel emphasizes that without the protection of the CCAA, Jaguar is exposed to the immediate risk that enforcement steps may be taken under a variety of debt instruments. Further, Jaguar is not in a position to satisfy obligations that may result from such enforcement steps.

27 Jaguar requests a stay of proceedings in favour of non-applicant Subsidiaries contending that, because of Jaguar's dependence upon its Subsidiaries for their value generating capacity, the commencement of any proceedings or the exercise of rights or remedies against these Subsidiaries would be detrimental to Jaguar's restructuring efforts and would undermine a process that would otherwise benefit Jaguar Group's stakeholders as a whole.

28 Jaguar also seeks a charge on its current and future assets (the "Property") in the maximum amount of \$5 million (a \$500,000 first-ranking charge (the "Primary Administration Charge") and a \$4.5 million fourth-ranking charge (the "Subordinated Administration Charge") (together, the "Administration Charge")). The purpose of the charge is to secure the fees and disbursements incurred in connection with services rendered both before and after the commencement of the CCAA proceedings by various professionals, as well as Canaccord Genuity and Houlihan Lokey, as financial advisors to the Ad Hoc Committee (collectively, the "Financial Advisors").

29 Counsel advises that the Financial Advisors' monthly work fees (but not their success fees) will be secured by the Primary Administration Charge, while the Financial Advisors' success fees will be secured solely by the Subordinated Administration Charge.

30 Counsel further advises that the Proposed Initial Order contemplates the establishment of a charge on Jaguar's Property in the amount of \$150,000 (the "Director's Charge") to protect the directors and officers. Counsel further advises that the benefit of the Director's Charge will only be available to the extent that a liability is not covered by existing directors and officers insurance. The directors and officers have indicated that, due to the potential for personal liability, they may not continue their service in this restructuring unless the Initial Order grants the Director's Charge.

31 Counsel to Jaguar further advises that the proposed monitor is of the view that the Director's Charge and the Administration Charge are reasonable in these circumstances.

32 Jaguar is unaware of any secured creditors, other than those who have received notice of the application, who are likely to be affected by the court-ordered charges.

33 In addition to the Initial Order, Jaguar also seeks a Claims Procedure Order and a Meeting Order, submitting that it must complete the Recapitalization on an expedited timeline.

34 Each of the Claims Procedure Order and Meeting Order include a comeback provision.

35 Having reviewed the record and upon hearing submissions, I am satisfied the Applicant is a company to which the CCAA applies. It is insolvent and faces a looming liquidity crisis. The Applicant is subject to claims in excess of \$5 million and has assets in Canada. I am also satisfied that the application is properly before me as the Applicant's registered office and certain of its assets are situated in Toronto, Ontario.

36 I am also satisfied that the Applicant has complied with the obligations of s. 10(2) of the CCAA.

37 I am also satisfied that an extension of the stay of proceedings to the Subsidiaries of Jaguar is appropriate in the circumstances. Further, I am also satisfied that it is reasonable and appropriate to grant the Administration Charge and the Director's Charge over the Property of the Applicant. In these circumstances, I am also prepared to approve the Engagement Letters and to seal the terms of the Engagement Letters. In deciding on the sealing provision, I have taken into account that the Engagement Letters contain sensitive commercial information, the disclosure of which could be harmful to the parties at issue. However, as I indicated at the hearing, this issue should be revisited at the comeback hearing.

38 I am also satisfied that Jaguar should be authorized to comply with the pre-filing obligations to the extent provided in the Initial Order.

39 In arriving at the foregoing conclusions, I reviewed the argument submitted by counsel to Jaguar that the stay of proceedings against non-applicants is appropriate. The Jaguar Group operates in a fully integrated manner and depends upon its Subsidiaries for their value generating capacity. Absent a stay of proceedings not only in favour of Jaguar but also in favour of the Subsidiaries, various creditors would be in a position to take enforcement steps which could conceivably lead to a failed restructuring, which would not be in the best interests of Jaguar's stakeholders.

40 The court has jurisdiction to extend the stay in favour of Jaguar's Subsidiaries. See *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]); *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re*, 2006 ABQB 153, 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187 (Alta. Q.B.); *SkyLink Aviation Inc., Re*, 2013 ONSC 1500, 3 C.B.R. (6th) 150 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

41 The authority to grant the court-ordered Administration Charge and Director's Charge is contained in ss. 11.51 and 11.52 of the CCAA.

42 In granting the Administration Charge, I am satisfied that:

- (i) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge;
- (ii) the amount is appropriate; and
- (iii) the charges should extend to all of the proposed beneficiaries.

43 In considering both the amount of the Administration Charge and who should be entitled to its benefit, the following factors can also be considered:

- (a) the size and complexity of the business being restructured; and
- (b) whether there is an unwarranted duplication of roles.

See *Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re*, 2010 ONSC 222, 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

44 In this case, the proposed restructuring involves the proposed beneficiaries of the charge. I accept that many have played a significant role in the negotiation of the Recapitalization to date and will continue to play a role in the implementation of the Recapitalization. I am satisfied that there is no unwarranted duplication of roles among those who benefit from the proposed Administration Charge.

45 With respect to the Director's Charge, the court must be satisfied that:

- (i) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge;
- (ii) the amount is appropriate;
- (iii) the applicant could not obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost; and
- (iv) the charge does not apply in respect of any obligation incurred by a director or officer as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct.

46 A review of the evidence satisfies me that it is appropriate to grant the Director's Charge as requested.

47 Jaguar requested that the Initial Order authorize it to perform certain pre-filing obligations in respect of professional service providers and third parties who provide services in respect of Jaguar's public listing agreement. In the circumstances, I find it to be reasonable that Jaguar be authorized to perform these pre-filing obligations.

48 In view of Jaguar's desire to move quickly to implement the Recapitalization, I have also been persuaded that it is both necessary and appropriate to grant the Claims Procedure Order and the Meeting Order at this time. These are procedural steps in the CCAA process and do not require any assessment by the court as to the fairness and reasonableness of the Plan at this stage.

49 Counsel to Jaguar submits that Jaguar's approach to classification of the affected unsecured creditors is appropriate in these circumstances, citing a commonality of interest. Counsel also references s. 22(2) of the CCAA. For the purposes of today's motion, I am prepared to accept this argument. However, this is an issue that can, if raised, be reviewed at the comeback hearing.

50 In the result, an Initial Order is granted together with a Meeting Order and Claims Procedure Order. All orders have been signed in the form presented.

Application granted.

Tab 8

Most Negative Treatment: Distinguished

Most Recent Distinguished: [Bauscher-Grant Farms Inc. v. Lake Diefenbaker Potato Corp.](#) | 1998 CarswellSask 335, 167 Sask. R. 14, [1998] S.J. No. 344, 80 A.C.W.S. (3d) 62, [1998] 8 W.W.R. 751 | (Sask. Q.B., May 11, 1998)

1993 CarswellOnt 183

Ontario Court of Justice (General Division — Commercial List)

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re

1993 CarswellOnt 183, [1993] O.J. No. 14, 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 37 A.C.W.S. (3d) 847, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275

Re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36; Re Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C-43; Re plan of compromise in respect of LEHNDORFF GENERAL PARTNER LTD. (in its own capacity and in its capacity as general partner of LEHNDORFF UNITED PROPERTIES (CANADA), LEHNDORFF PROPERTIES (CANADA) and LEHNDORFF PROPERTIES (CANADA) II) and in respect of certain of their nominees LEHNDORFF UNITED PROPERTIES (CANADA) LTD., LEHNDORFF CANADIAN HOLDINGS LTD., LEHNDORFF CANADIAN HOLDINGS II LTD., BAYTEMP PROPERTIES LIMITED and 102 BLOOR STREET WEST LIMITED and in respect of THG LEHNDORFF VERMÖGENSVERWALTUNG GmbH (in its capacity as limited partner of LEHNDORFF UNITED PROPERTIES (CANADA))

Farley J.

Heard: December 24, 1992

Judgment: January 6, 1993

Docket: Doc. B366/92

Counsel: *Alfred Apps, Robert Harrison and Melissa J. Kennedy*, for applicants.

L. Crozier, for Royal Bank of Canada.

R.C. Heintzman, for Bank of Montreal.

J. Hodgson, Susan Lundy and James Hilton, for Canada Trustco Mortgage Corporation.

Jay Schwartz, for Citibank Canada.

Stephen Golick, for Peat Marwick Thorne^{*} Inc., proposed monitor.

John Teolis, for Fuji Bank Canada.

Robert Thorton, for certain of the advisory boards.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.2 Initial application](#)

[XIX.2.b Grant of stay](#)

[XIX.2.b.i General principles](#)

Headnote

Corporations --- Arrangements and compromises — Under Companies' Creditors Arrangements Act — Arrangements — Effect of arrangement — Stay of proceedings

Corporations — Arrangements and compromises — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Stay of proceedings — Stay being granted even where it would affect non-applicants that were not companies within meaning of Act — Business operations of applicants and non-applicants being so intertwined as to make stay appropriate.

The applicant companies were involved in property development and management and sought the protection of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") in order that they could present a plan of compromise. They also sought a stay of all proceedings against the individual company applicants either in their own capacities or because of their interest in a larger group of companies. Each of the applicant companies was insolvent and had outstanding debentures issued under trust deeds. They proposed a plan of compromise among themselves and the holders of the debentures as well as those others of their secured and unsecured creditors deemed appropriate in the circumstances.

A question arose as to whether the court had the power to grant a stay of proceedings against non-applicants that were not companies and, therefore, not within the express provisions of the CCAA.

Held:

The application was allowed.

It was appropriate, given the significant financial intertwining of the applicant companies, that a consolidated plan be approved. Further, each of the applicant companies had a realistic possibility of being able to continue operating even though each was currently unable to meet all of its expenses. This was precisely the sort of situation in which all of the creditors would likely benefit from the application of the CCAA and in which it was appropriate to grant an order staying proceedings.

The inherent power of the court to grant stays can be used to supplement s. 11 of the CCAA when it is just and reasonable to do so. Clearly, the court had the jurisdiction to grant a stay in respect of any of the applicants that were companies fitting the criteria in the CCAA. However, the stay requested also involved limited partnerships where (1) the applicant companies acted on behalf of the limited partnerships, or (2) the stay would be effective against any proceedings taken by any party against the property assets and undertakings of the limited partnerships in which they held a direct interest. The business operations of the applicant companies were so intertwined with the limited partnerships that it would be impossible for a stay to be granted to the applicant companies that would affect their business without affecting the undivided interest of the limited partnerships in the business. As a result, it was just and reasonable to supplement s. 11 and grant the stay.

While the provisions of the CCAA allow for a cramdown of a creditor's claim, as well as the interest of any other person, anyone wishing to start or continue proceedings against the applicant companies could use the comeback clause in the order to persuade the court that it would not be just and reasonable to maintain the stay. In such a motion, the onus would be on the applicant companies to show that it was appropriate in the circumstances to continue the stay.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered:

Amirault Fish Co., Re, 32 C.B.R. 186, [1951] 4 D.L.R. 203 (N.S. T.D.) — referred to
Associated Investors of Canada Ltd., Re, 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237, Alta. L.R. (2d) 259, [1988] 2 W.W.R. 211, 38 B.L.R. 148, (sub nom. *Re First Investors Corp.*) 46 D.L.R. (4th) 669 (Q.B.), reversed (1988), 71 C.B.R. 71, 60 Alta. L.R. (2d) 242, 89 A.R. 344 (C.A.) — referred to
Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to
Canada Systems Group (EST) v. Allen-Dale Mutual Insurance Co. (1982), 29 C.P.C. 60, 137 D.L.R. (3d) 287 (Ont. H.C.) [affirmed (1983), 41 O.R. (2d) 135, 33 C.P.C. 210, 145 D.L.R. (3d) 266 (C.A.)] — referred to
Empire-Universal Films Ltd. v. Rank, [1947] O.R. 775 [H.C.] — referred to
Feifer v. Frame Manufacturing Corp., Re, 28 C.B.R. 124, [1947] Que. K.B. 348 (C.A.) — referred to
Fine's Flowers Ltd. v. Fine's Flowers (Creditors of) (1992), 10 C.B.R. (3d) 87, 4 B.L.R. (2d) 293, 87 D.L.R. (4th) 391, 7 O.R. (3d) 193 (Gen. Div.) — referred to
Gaz Métropolitain v. Wynden Canada Inc. (1982), 44 C.B.R. (N.S.) 285 (C.S. Que.) [affirmed (1982), 45 C.B.R. (N.S.) 11 (Que. C.A.)] — referred to
Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd. (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136 (C.A.) — referred to
Inducon Development Corp. Re (1992), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to
International Donut Corp. v. 050863 N.B. Ltd. (1992), 127 N.B.R. (2d) 290, 319 A.P.R. 290 (Q.B.) — considered
Keppoch Development Ltd., Re (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 95 (N.S. T.D.) — referred to

Langley's Ltd., Re, [1938] O.R. 123, [1938] 3 D.L.R. 230 (C.A.) — referred to
McCordic v. Bosanquet (1974), 5 O.R. (2d) 53 (H.C.) — referred to
Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank, 52 C.B.R. (N.S.) 109, [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215, 32 Alta. L.R. (2d) 150, 53 A.R. 39, 11 D.L.R. (4th) 576 (Q.B.) — referred to
Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd. (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361, 92 A.R. 1 (Q.B.) — referred to
Northland Properties Ltd., Re (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to
Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of) (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 41 O.A.C. 282, 1 O.R. (3d) 289 (C.A.) — referred to
Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp. (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 303, 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 105 (C.A.) , affirming (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 291, 47 B.C.L.R. (2d) 193 (S.C.) , leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 164 (note), 55 B.C.L.R. (2d) xxxiii (note), 135 N.R. 317 (note) — referred to
Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada), [1934] S.C.R. 659, 16 C.B.R. 1, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75 — referred to
Seven Mile Dam Contractors v. R. (1979), 13 B.C.L.R. 137, 104 D.L.R. (3d) 274 (S.C.) , affirmed (1980), 25 B.C.L.R. 183 (C.A.) — referred to
Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 312, 86 D.L.R. (4th) 621 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to
Slavik, Re (1992), 12 C.B.R. (3d) 157 (B.C. S.C.) — considered
Stephanie's Fashions Ltd., Re (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 248 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to
Ultracare Management Inc. v. Zevenberger (Trustee of) (1990), 3 C.B.R. (3d) 151, (sub nom. *Ultracare Management Inc. v. Gammon*) 1 O.R. (3d) 321 (Gen. Div.) — referred to
United Maritime Fishermen Co-operative, Re (1988), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 44, 84 N.B.R. (2d) 415, 214 A.P.R. 415 (Q.B.) , varied on reconsideration (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 170, 87 N.B.R. (2d) 333, 221 A.P.R. 333 (Q.B.) , reversed (1988), 69 C.B.R. (N.S.) 161, 88 N.B.R. (2d) 253, 224 A.P.R. 253, (sub nom. *Cdn. Co-op. Leasing Services v. United Maritime Fishermen Co-op.*) 51 D.L.R. (4th) 618 (C.A.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 —

s. 85

s. 142

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 — preamble

s. 2

s. 3

s. 4

s. 5

s. 6

s. 7

s. 8

s. 11

Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43.

Judicature Act, The, R.S.O. 1937, c. 100.

Limited Partnerships Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. L.16 —

s. 2(2)

s. 3(1)

s. 8

s. 9

s. 11

s. 12(1)

s. 13

s. 15(2)

s. 24

Partnership Act, R.S.A. 1980, c.P-2 — Pt. 2

s. 75

Rules considered:

Ontario, Rules of Civil Procedure —

r. 8.01

r. 8.02

Application under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act to file consolidated plan of compromise and for stay of proceedings.

Farley J.:

1 These are my written reasons relating to the relief granted the applicants on December 24, 1992 pursuant to their application under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA") and the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43 ("CJA"). The relief sought was as follows:

- (a) short service of the notice of application;
- (b) a declaration that the applicants were companies to which the CCAA applies;
- (c) authorization for the applicants to file a consolidated plan of compromise;
- (d) authorization for the applicants to call meetings of their secured and unsecured creditors to approve the consolidated plan of compromise;
- (e) a stay of all proceedings taken or that might be taken either in respect of the applicants in their own capacity or on account of their interest in Lehndorff United Properties (Canada) ("LUPC"), Lehndorff Properties (Canada) ("LPC") and Lehndorff Properties (Canada) II ("LPC II") and collectively (the "Limited Partnerships") whether as limited partner, as general partner or as registered titleholder to certain of their assets as bare trustee and nominee; and
- (f) certain other ancillary relief.

2 The applicants are a number of companies within the larger Lehndorff group ("Group") which operates in Canada and elsewhere. The group appears to have suffered in the same way that a number of other property developers and managers which have also sought protection under the CCAA in recent years. The applicants are insolvent; they each have outstanding debentures issues under trust deeds; and they propose a plan of compromise among themselves and the holders of these debentures as well as those others of their secured and unsecured creditors as they deemed appropriate in the circumstances. Each applicant except THG Lehndorff Vermögensverwaltung GmbH ("GmbH") is an Ontario corporation. GmbH is a company incorporated under the laws of Germany. Each of the applicants has assets or does business in Canada. Therefore each is a "company" within the definition of s. 2 of the CCAA. The applicant Lehndorff General Partner Ltd. ("General Partner Company") is the sole general partner of the Limited Partnerships. The General Partner Company has sole control over the property and businesses of the Limited Partnerships. All major decisions concerning the applicants (and the Limited Partnerships) are made by management operating out of the Lehndorff Toronto Office. The applicants aside from the General Partner Company have as their sole purpose the holding of title to properties as bare trustee or nominee on behalf of the Limited Partnerships. LUPC is a limited partnership registered under the *Limited Partnership Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. L.16 ("Ontario LPA"). LPC and LPC II are limited partnerships registered under Part 2 of the *Partnership Act*, R.S.A. 1980, c. P-2 ("Alberta PA") and each is registered in Ontario as an extra provincial limited partnership. LUPC has over 2,000 beneficial limited partners, LPC over 500 and LPC II over 250, most of whom are residents of Germany. As at March 31, 1992 LUPC had outstanding indebtedness of approximately \$370 million, LPC \$45 million and LPC II \$7 million. Not all of the members of the Group are making an application under the CCAA. Taken together the Group's indebtedness as to Canadian matters (including that of the applicants) was approximately \$543 million. In the summer of 1992 various creditors (Canada Trustco Mortgage Company, Bank of Montreal, Royal Bank of Canada, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce and the Bank of Tokyo Canada) made demands for repayment of their loans. On November 6, 1992 Funtanua Investments Limited, a minor secured lender also made a demand. An interim standstill agreement was worked out following a meeting of July 7, 1992. In conjunction with Peat Marwick Thorne Inc. which has been acting as an informal monitor to date and Fasken Campbell Godfrey the applicants have held multiple meetings with their senior secured creditors over the past half year and worked on a restructuring plan. The business affairs of the applicants (and the Limited Partnerships) are significantly intertwined as there are multiple instances of intercorporate debt, cross-default provisions and guarantees and they operated a centralized cash management system.

3 This process has now evolved to a point where management has developed a consolidated restructuring plan which plan addresses the following issues:

- (a) The compromise of existing conventional, term and operating indebtedness, both secured and unsecured.
- (b) The restructuring of existing project financing commitments.
- (c) New financing, by way of equity or subordinated debt.
- (d) Elimination or reduction of certain overhead.
- (e) Viability of existing businesses of entities in the Lehndorff Group.
- (f) Restructuring of income flows from the limited partnerships.
- (g) Disposition of further real property assets aside from those disposed of earlier in the process.
- (h) Consolidation of entities in the Group; and
- (i) Rationalization of the existing debt and security structure in the continuing entities in the Group.

Formal meetings of the beneficial limited partners of the Limited Partnerships are scheduled for January 20 and 21, 1993 in Germany and an information circular has been prepared and at the time of hearing was being translated into German. This application was brought on for hearing at this time for two general reasons: (a) it had now ripened to the stage of proceeding with what had been distilled out of the strategic and consultative meetings; and (b) there were creditors other than senior secured

lenders who were in a position to enforce their rights against assets of some of the applicants (and Limited Partnerships) which if such enforcement did take place would result in an undermining of the overall plan. Notice of this hearing was given to various creditors: Barclays Bank of Canada, Barclays Bank PLC, Bank of Montreal, Citibank Canada, Canada Trustco Mortgage Corporation, Royal Trust Corporation of Canada, Royal Bank of Canada, the Bank of Tokyo Canada, Funtauna Investments Limited, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, Fuji Bank Canada and First City Trust Company. In this respect the applicants have recognized that although the initial application under the CCAA may be made on an ex parte basis (s. 11 of the CCAA; *Re Langley's Ltd.*, [1938] O.R. 123, [1938] 3 D.L.R. 230 (C.A.) ; *Re Keppoch Development Ltd.* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 95 (N.S. T.D.) . The court will be concerned when major creditors have not been alerted even in the most minimal fashion (*Re Inducon Development Corp.* (1992), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p. 310). The application was either supported or not opposed.

4 "Instant" debentures are now well recognized and respected by the courts: see *Re United Maritime Fishermen Co-operative* (1988), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 44 (N.B. Q.B.) , at pp. 55-56, varied on reconsideration (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 170 (N.B. Q.B.) , reversed on different grounds (1988), 69 C.B.R. (N.S.) 161 (N.B. C.A.) , at pp. 165-166; *Re Stephanie's Fashions Ltd.* (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 248 (B.C. S.C.) at pp. 250-251; *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289, 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101 (C.A.) per Doherty J.A., dissenting on another point, at pp. 306-310 (O.R.); *Ultracare Management Inc. v. Zevenberger (Trustee of)* (sub nom. *Ultracare Management Inc. v. Gammon*) (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 321 (Gen. Div.) at p. 327. The applicants would appear to me to have met the technical hurdle of s. 3 and as defined s. 2) of the CCAA in that they are debtor companies since they are insolvent, they have outstanding an issue of debentures under a trust deed and the compromise or arrangement that is proposed includes that compromise between the applicants and the holders of those trust deed debentures. I am also satisfied that because of the significant intertwining of the applicants it would be appropriate to have a consolidated plan. I would also understand that this court (Ontario Court of Justice (General Division)) is the appropriate court to hear this application since all the applicants except GmbH have their head office or their chief place of business in Ontario and GmbH, although it does not have a place of business within Canada, does have assets located within Ontario.

5 The CCAA is intended to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors as an alternative to bankruptcy and, as such, is remedial legislation entitled to a liberal interpretation. It seems to me that the purpose of the statute is to enable insolvent companies to carry on business in the ordinary course or otherwise deal with their assets so as to enable plan of compromise or arrangement to be prepared, filed and considered by their creditors and the court. In the interim, a judge has great discretion under the CCAA to make order so as to effectively maintain the status quo in respect of an insolvent company while it attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for the proposed compromise or arrangement which will be to the benefit of both the company and its creditors. See the preamble to and sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11 of the CCAA; *Reference re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, [1934] S.C.R. 659 at p. 661, 16 C.B.R. 1, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75 ; *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank*, [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215 (Alta. Q.B.) at pp. 219-220; *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleum Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361 (Q.B.) , at pp. 12-13 (C.B.R.); *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (B.C. C.A.) , at pp. 310-311, affirming (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 291, 47 B.C.L.R. (2d) 193 (S.C.) , leave to appeal to S.C.C. dismissed (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 164 (S.C.C.) .; *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* , supra at p. 307 (O.R.); *Fine's Flowers v. Fine's Flowers (Creditors of)* (1992), 7 O.R. (3d) 193 (Gen. Div.) , at p. 199 and "Reorganizations Under The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act", Stanley E. Edwards (1947) 25 Can. Bar Rev. 587 at p. 592.

6 The CCAA is intended to provide a structured environment for the 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. see *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* , supra at pp. 297 and 316; *Re Stephanie's Fashions Ltd.* , supra, at pp. 251-252 and *Ultracare Management Inc. v. Zevenberger (Trustee of)* , supra, at p. 328 and p. 330. It has been held that the intention of the CCAA is to prevent any manoeuvres for positioning among the creditors during the period required to develop a plan and obtain approval of creditors. Such manoeuvres could give an aggressive creditor an advantage to the prejudice of others who are less aggressive and would undermine the company's financial position making it even less likely that the plan will succeed: see *Meridian Developments*

Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank, supra, at p. 220 (W.W.R.). The possibility that one or more creditors may be prejudiced should not affect the court's exercise of its authority to grant a stay of proceedings under the CCAA because this affect is offset by the benefit to all creditors and to the company of facilitating a reorganization. The court's primary concerns under the CCAA must be for the debtor and *all* of the creditors: see *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.*, supra, at pp. 108-110; *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84 (C.A.), at pp. 315-318 (C.B.R.) and *Re Stephanie's Fashions Ltd.*, supra, at pp. 251-252.

7 One of the purposes of the CCAA is to facilitate ongoing operations of a business where its assets have a greater value as part of an integrated system than individually. The CCAA facilitates reorganization of a company where the alternative, sale of the property piecemeal, is likely to yield far less satisfaction to the creditors. Unlike the *Bankruptcy Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, before the amendments effective November 30, 1992 to transform it into the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ("BIA"), it is possible under the CCAA to bind secured creditors it has been generally speculated that the CCAA will be resorted to by companies that are generally larger and have a more complicated capital structure and that those companies which make an application under the BIA will be generally smaller and have a less complicated structure. Reorganization may include partial liquidation where it is intended as part of the process of a return to long term viability and profitability. See *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.*, supra, at p. 318 and *Re Associated Investors of Canada Ltd.* (1987), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 (Alta. Q.B.) at pp. 245, reversed on other grounds at (1988), 71 C.B.R. (N.S.) 71 (Alta. C.A.). 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 or simply a substantial downsizing of its business operations, provided the same is proposed in the best interests of the creditors generally. See *Re Associated Investors of Canada Ltd.*, supra, at p. 318; *Re Amirault Fish Co.*, 32 C.B.R. 186, [1951] 4 D.L.R. 203 (N.S. T.D.) at pp. 187-188 (C.B.R.).

8 It strikes me that each of the applicants in this case has a realistic possibility of being able to continue operating, although each is currently unable to meet all of its expenses albeit on a reduced scale. This is precisely the sort of circumstance in which all of the creditors are likely to benefit from the application of the CCAA and in which it is appropriate to grant an order staying proceedings so as to allow the applicant to finalize preparation of and file a plan of compromise and arrangement.

9 Let me now review the aspect of the stay of proceedings. Section 11 of the CCAA provides as follows:

11. Notwithstanding anything in the *Bankruptcy Act* or the *Winding-up Act*, whenever an application has been made under this Act in respect of any company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit,

(a) make an order staying, until such time as the court may prescribe or until any further order, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy Act* and the *Winding-up Act* or either of them;

(b) restrain further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company on such terms as the court sees fit; and

(c) make an order that no suit, action or other proceeding shall be proceeded with or commenced against the company except with the leave of the court and subject to such terms as the court imposes.

10 The power to grant a stay of proceeding should be construed broadly in order to permit the CCAA to accomplish its legislative purpose and in particular to enable continuance of the company seeking CCAA protection. The power to grant a stay therefore extends to a stay which affected the position not only of the company's secured and unsecured creditors, but also all non-creditors and other parties who could potentially jeopardize the success of the plan and thereby the continuance of the company. See *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleum Ltd.*, supra, at pp. 12-17 (C.B.R.) and *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.*, supra, at pp. 296-298 (B.C. S.C.) and pp. 312-314 (B.C. C.A.) and *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank*, supra, at pp. 219 ff. Further the court has the power to order a stay that is effective in respect of the rights arising in favour of secured creditors under all forms of commercial security: see *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.*, supra, at p. 320 where Gibbs J.A. for the court stated:

The trend which emerges from this sampling will be given effect here by holding that where the word "security" occurs in the C.C.A.A., it includes s. 178 security and, where the word creditor occurs, it includes a bank holding s. 178 security. To the extent that there may be conflict between the two statutes, therefore, the broad scope of the C.C.A.A. prevails.

11 The power to grant a stay may also extend to preventing persons seeking to terminate or cancel executory contracts, including, without limitation agreements with the applying companies for the supply of goods or services, from doing so: see *Gaz Métropolitain v. Wynden Canada Inc.* (1982), 44 C.B.R. (N.S.) 285 (C.S. Que.) at pp. 290-291 and *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.*, supra, at pp. 311-312 (B.C. C.A.). The stay may also extend to prevent a mortgagee from proceeding with foreclosure proceedings (see *Re Northland Properties Ltd.* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141 (B.C. S.C.) or to prevent landlords from terminating leases, or otherwise enforcing their rights thereunder (see *Feifer v. Frame Manufacturing Corp.* (1947), 28 C.B.R. 124 (C.A. Que.)). Amounts owing to landlords in respect of arrears of rent or unpaid rent for the unexpired portion of lease terms are properly dealt with in a plan of compromise or arrangement: see *Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 312 (Ont. Gen. Div.) especially at p. 318. The jurisdiction of the court to make orders under the CCAA in the interest of protecting the debtor company so as to enable it to prepare and file a plan is effective notwithstanding the terms of any contract or instrument to which the debtor company is a party. Section 8 of the CCAA provides:

8. This Act extends and does not limit the provisions of any instrument now or hereafter existing that governs the rights of creditors or any class of them and has full force and effect notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in that instrument.

The power to grant a stay may also extend to prevent persons from exercising any right of set off in respect of the amounts owed by such a person to the debtor company, irrespective of whether the debtor company has commenced any action in respect of which the defense of set off might be formally asserted: see *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.*, supra, at pp. 312-314 (B.C.C.A.).

12 It was submitted by the applicants that the power to grant a stay of proceedings may also extend to a stay of proceedings against non-applicants who are not companies and accordingly do not come within the express provisions of the CCAA. In support thereof they cited a CCAA order which was granted staying proceedings against individuals who guaranteed the obligations of a debtor-applicant which was a qualifying company under the terms of the CCAA: see *Re Slavik*, unreported, [1992] B.C.J. No. 341 [now reported at 12 C.B.R. (3d) 157 (B.C. S.C.)]. However in the *Slavik* situation the individual guarantors were officers and shareholders of two companies which had sought and obtained CCAA protection. Vickers J. in that case indicated that the facts of that case included the following unexplained and unamplified fact [at p. 159]:

5. The order provided further that all creditors of Norvik Timber Inc. be enjoined from making demand for payment upon that firm or upon any guarantor of an obligation of the firm until further order of the court.

The CCAA reorganization plan involved an assignment of the claims of the creditors to "Newco" in exchange for cash and shares. However the basis of the stay order originally granted was not set forth in this decision.

13 It appears to me that Dickson J. in *International Donut Corp. v. 050863 N.D. Ltd.*, unreported, [1992] N.B.J. No. 339 (N.B. Q.B.) [now reported at 127 N.B.R. (2d) 290, 319 A.P.R. 290] was focusing only on the stay arrangements of the CCAA when concerning a limited partnership situation he indicated [at p. 295 N.B.R.]:

In August 1991 the limited partnership, through its general partner the plaintiff, applied to the Court under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C., c. C-36 for an order delaying the assertion of claims by creditors until an opportunity could be gained to work out with the numerous and sizable creditors a compromise of their claims. An order was obtained but it in due course expired without success having been achieved in arranging with creditors a compromise. *That effort may have been wasted, because it seems questionable that the federal Act could have any application to a limited partnership in circumstances such as these.* (Emphasis added.)

14 I am not persuaded that the words of s. 11 which are quite specific as relating as to a *company* can be enlarged to encompass something other than that. However it appears to me that Blair J. was clearly in the right channel in his analysis in *Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.* unreported, [1992] O.J. No. 1946 [now reported at 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (Ont. Gen. Div.)] at pp. 4-7 [at pp. 308-310 C.B.R.].

The Power to Stay

The court has always had an inherent jurisdiction to grant a stay of proceedings whenever it is just and convenient to do so, in order to control its process or prevent an abuse of that process: see *Canada Systems Group (EST) Ltd. v. Allendale Mutual Insurance Co.* (1982), 29 C.P.C. 60, 137 D.L.R. (3d) 287 (Ont. H.C.) , and cases referred to therein. In the civil context, this general power is also embodied in the very broad terms of s. 106 of the *Courts of Justice Act* , R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, which provides as follows:

106. A court, on its own initiative or on motion by any person, whether or not a party, may stay any proceeding in the court on such terms as are considered just.

Recently, Mr. Justice O'Connell has observed that this discretionary power is "highly dependent on the facts of each particular case": *Arab Monetary Fund v. Hashim* (unreported) [(June 25, 1992), Doc. 24127/88 (Ont. Gen. Div.)], [1992] O.J. No. 1330.

Apart from this inherent and general jurisdiction to stay proceedings, there are many instances where the court is specifically granted the power to stay in a particular context, by virtue of statute or under the *Rules of Civil Procedure* . The authority to prevent multiplicity of proceedings in the same court, under r. 6.01(1), is an example of the latter. The power to stay judicial and extra-judicial proceedings under s. 11 of the C.C.A.A., is an example of the former. Section 11 of the C.C.A.A. provides as follows.

The Power to Stay in the Context of C.C.A.A. Proceedings

By its formal title the C.C.A.A. is known as "An Act to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors". To ensure the effective nature of such a "facilitative" process it is essential that the debtor company be afforded a respite from the litigious and other rights being exercised by creditors, while it attempts to carry on as a going concern and to negotiate an acceptable corporate restructuring arrangement with such creditors.

In this respect it has been observed that the C.C.A.A. is "to be used as a practical and effective way of restructuring corporate indebtedness": see the case comment following the report of *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleum Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361, 92 A.R. 81 (Q.B.) , and the approval of that remark as "a perceptive observation about the attitude of the courts" by Gibbs J.A. in *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 105 (C.A.) at p. 113 [B.C.L.R.].

Gibbs J.A. continued with this comment:

To the extent that a general principle can be extracted from the few cases directly on point, and the others in which there is persuasive obiter, it would appear to be that the courts have concluded that under s. 11 there is a *discretionary power to restrain judicial or extra-judicial conduct* against the debtor company *the effect of which is, or would be, seriously to impair the ability of the debtor company to continue in business during the compromise or arrangement negotiating period* .

(emphasis added)

I agree with those sentiments and would simply add that, in my view, the restraining power extends as well to conduct which could seriously impair the debtor's ability to focus and concentrate its efforts on the business purpose of negotiating

the compromise or arrangement. [In this respect, see also *Sairex GmbH v. Prudential Steel Ltd.* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 62 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p. 77.]

I must have regard to these foregoing factors while I consider, as well, the general principles which have historically governed the court's exercise of its power to stay proceedings. These principles were reviewed by Mr. Justice Montgomery in *Canada Systems Group (EST) Ltd. v. Allendale Mutual Insurance*, supra (a "Mississauga Derailment" case), at pp. 65-66 [C.P.C.]. The balance of convenience must weigh significantly in favour of granting the stay, as a party's right to have access to the courts must not be lightly interfered with. The court must be satisfied that a continuance of the proceeding would serve as an injustice to the party seeking the stay, in the sense that it would be oppressive or vexatious or an abuse of the process of the court in some other way. The stay must not cause an injustice to the plaintiff.

It is quite clear from *Empire-Universal Films Limited v. Rank*, [1947] O.R. 775 (H.C.) that McRuer C.J.H.C. considered that *The Judicature Act* [R.S.O. 1937, c. 100] then [and now the CJA] merely confirmed a statutory right that previously had been considered inherent in the jurisdiction of the court with respect to its authority to grant a stay of proceedings. See also *McCordic v. Bosanquet* (1974), 5 O.R. (2d) 53 (H.C.) and *Canada Systems Group (EST) Ltd. v. Allen-Dale Mutual Insurance Co.* (1982), 29 C.P.C. 60 (H.C.) at pp. 65-66.

15 Montgomery J. in *Canada Systems*, supra, at pp. 65-66 indicated:

Goodman J. (as he then was) in *McCordic v. Bosanquet* (1974), 5 O.R. (2d) 53 in granting a stay reviewed the authorities and concluded that the inherent jurisdiction of the Court to grant a stay of proceedings may be made whenever it is just and reasonable to do so. "This court has ample jurisdiction to grant a stay whenever it is just and reasonable to do so." (Per Lord Denning M.R. in *Edmeades v. Thames Board Mills Ltd.*, [1969] 2 Q.B. 67 at 71, [1969] 2 All E.R. 127 (C.A.)). Lord Denning's decision in *Edmeades* was approved by Lord Justice Davies in *Lane v. Willis; Lane v. Beach (Executor of Estate of George William Willis)*, [1972] 1 All E.R. 430, (sub nom. *Lane v. Willis; Lane v. Beach*) [1972] 1 W.L.R. 326 (C.A.).

.....
In *Weight Watchers Int. Inc. v. Weight Watchers of Ont. Ltd.* (1972), 25 D.L.R. (3d) 419, 5 C.P.R. (2d) 122, appeal allowed by consent without costs (sub nom. *Weight Watchers of Ont. Ltd. v. Weight Watchers Inc. Inc.*) 42 D.L.R. (3d) 320n, 10 C.P.R. (2d) 96n (Fed. C.A.), Mr. Justice Heald on an application for stay said at p. 426 [25 D.L.R.]:

The principles which must govern in these matters are clearly stated in the case of *Empire Universal Films Ltd. et al. v. Rank et al.*, [1947] O.R. 775 at p. 779, as follows [quoting *St. Pierre et al. v. South American Stores (Gath & Chaves), Ltd. et al.*, [1936] 1 K.B. 382 at p. 398]:

(1.) A mere balance of convenience is not a sufficient ground for depriving a plaintiff of the advantages of prosecuting his action in an English Court if it is otherwise properly brought. The right of access to the King's Court must not be lightly refused. (2.) In order to justify a stay two conditions must be satisfied, one positive and the other negative: (a) the defendant must satisfy the Court that the continuance of the action would work an injustice because it would be oppressive or vexatious to him or would be an abuse of the process of the Court in some other way; and (b) the stay must not cause an injustice to the plaintiff. On both the burden of proof is on the defendant.

16 Thus it appears to me that the inherent power of this court to grant stays can be used to supplement s. 11 of the CCAA when it is just and reasonable to do so. Is it appropriate to do so in the circumstances? Clearly there is jurisdiction under s. 11 of the CCAA to grant a stay in respect of any of the applicants which are all companies which fit the criteria of the CCAA. However the stay requested also involved the limited partnerships to some degree either (i) with respect to the applicants acting on behalf of the Limited Partnerships or (ii) the stays being effective vis-à-vis any proceedings taken by any party against the property assets and undertaking of the Limited Partnerships in respect of which they hold a direct interest (collectively the "Property") as set out in the terms of the stay provisions of the order paragraphs 4 through 18 inclusive attached as an appendix to these reasons. [Appendix omitted.] I believe that an analysis of the operations of a limited partnership in this context would be beneficial to an understanding of how there is a close inter-relationship to the applicants involved in this CCAA proceedings and

how the Limited Partnerships and their Property are an integral part of the operations previously conducted and the proposed restructuring.

17 A limited partnership is a creation of statute, consisting of one or more general partners and one or more limited partners. The limited partnership is an investment vehicle for passive investment by limited partners. It in essence combines the flow through concept of tax depreciation or credits available to "ordinary" partners under general partnership law with limited liability available to shareholders under corporate law. See Ontario LPA sections 2(2) and 3(1) and Lyle R. Hepburn, *Limited Partnerships*, (Toronto: De Boo, 1991), at p. 1-2 and p. 1-12. I would note here that the limited partnership provisions of the Alberta PA are roughly equivalent to those found in the Ontario LPA with the interesting side aspect that the Alberta legislation in s. 75 does allow for judgment against a limited partner to be charged against the limited partner's interest in the limited partnership. A general partner has all the rights and powers and is subject to all the restrictions and liabilities of a partner in a partnership. In particular a general partner is fully liable to each creditor of the business of the limited partnership. The general partner has sole control over the property and business of the limited partnership: see Ontario LPA ss. 8 and 13. Limited partners have no liability to the creditors of the limited partnership's business; the limited partners' financial exposure is limited to their contribution. The limited partners do not have any "independent" ownership rights in the property of the limited partnership. The entitlement of the limited partners is limited to their contribution plus any profits thereon, after satisfaction of claims of the creditors. See Ontario LPA sections 9, 11, 12(1), 13, 15(2) and 24. The process of debtor and creditor relationships associated with the limited partnership's business are between the general partner and the creditors of the business. In the event of the creditors collecting on debt and enforcing security, the creditors can only look to the assets of the limited partnership together with the assets of the general partner including the general partner's interest in the limited partnership. This relationship is recognized under the *Bankruptcy Act* (now the BIA) sections 85 and 142.

18 A general partner is responsible to defend proceedings against the limited partnership in the firm name, so in procedural law and in practical effect, a proceeding against a limited partnership is a proceeding against the general partner. See Ontario *Rules of Civil Procedure*, O. Reg. 560/84, Rules 8.01 and 8.02.

19 It appears that the preponderance of case law supports the contention that a partnership including a limited partnership is not a separate legal entity. See *Lindley on Partnership*, 15th ed. (London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1984), at pp. 33-35; *Seven Mile Dam Contractors v. R.* (1979), 13 B.C.L.R. 137 (S.C.), affirmed (1980), 25 B.C.L.R. 183 (C.A.) and "Extra-Provincial Liability of the Limited Partner", Brad A. Milne, (1985) 23 Alta. L. Rev. 345, at pp. 350-351. Milne in that article made the following observations:

The preponderance of case law therefore supports the contention that a limited partnership is not a separate legal entity. It appears, nevertheless, that the distinction made in *Re Thorne* between partnerships and trade unions could not be applied to limited partnerships which, like trade unions, must rely on statute for their validity. The mere fact that limited partnerships owe their existence to the statutory provision is probably not sufficient to endow the limited partnership with the attribute of legal personality as suggested in *Ruzicks* unless it appeared that the Legislature clearly intended that the limited partnership should have a separate legal existence. A review of the various provincial statutes does not reveal any procedural advantages, rights or powers that are fundamentally different from those advantages enjoyed by ordinary partnerships. The legislation does not contain any provision resembling section 15 of the *Canada Business Corporation Act* [S.C. 1974-75, c. 33, as am.] which expressly states that a corporation has the capacity, both in and outside of Canada, of a natural person. It is therefore difficult to imagine that the Legislature intended to create a new category of legal entity.

20 It appears to me that the operations of a limited partnership in the ordinary course are that the limited partners take a completely passive role (they must or they will otherwise lose their limited liability protection which would have been their sole reason for choosing a limited partnership vehicle as opposed to an "ordinary" partnership vehicle). For a lively discussion of the question of "control" in a limited partnership as contrasted with shareholders in a corporation, see R. Flannigan, "The Control Test of Investor Liability in Limited Partnerships" (1983) 21 Alta. L. Rev. 303; E. Apps, "Limited Partnerships and the 'Control' Prohibition: Assessing the Liability of Limited Partners" (1991) 70 Can. Bar Rev. 611; R. Flannigan, "Limited Partner Liability: A Response" (1992) 71 Can. Bar Rev. 552. The limited partners leave the running of the business to the general partner and in that respect the care, custody and the maintenance of the property, assets and undertaking of the limited

partnership in which the limited partners and the general partner hold an interest. The ownership of this limited partnership property, assets and undertaking is an undivided interest which cannot be segregated for the purpose of legal process. It seems to me that there must be afforded a protection of the whole since the applicants' individual interest therein cannot be segregated without in effect dissolving the partnership arrangement. The limited partners have two courses of action to take if they are dissatisfied with the general partner or the operation of the limited partnership as carried on by the general partner — the limited partners can vote to (a) remove the general partner and replace it with another or (b) dissolve the limited partnership. However Flannigan strongly argues that an unfettered right to remove the general partner would attach general liability for the limited partners (and especially as to the question of continued enjoyment of favourable tax deductions) so that it is prudent to provide this as a conditional right: *Control Test*, (1992), supra, at pp. 524-525. Since the applicants are being afforded the protection of a stay of proceedings in respect to allowing them time to advance a reorganization plan and complete it if the plan finds favour, there should be a stay of proceedings (vis-à-vis any action which the limited partners may wish to take as to replacement or dissolution) through the period of allowing the limited partners to vote on the reorganization plan itself.

21 It seems to me that using the inherent jurisdiction of this court to supplement the statutory stay provisions of s. 11 of the CCAA would be appropriate in the circumstances; it would be just and reasonable to do so. The business operations of the applicants are so intertwined with the limited partnerships that it would be impossible for relief as to a stay to be granted to the applicants which would affect their business without at the same time extending that stay to the undivided interests of the limited partners in such. It also appears that the applicants are well on their way to presenting a reorganization plan for consideration and a vote; this is scheduled to happen within the month so there would not appear to be any significant time inconvenience to any person interested in pursuing proceedings. While it is true that the provisions of the CCAA allow for a cramdown of a creditor's claim (as well as an interest of any other person), those who wish to be able to initiate or continue proceedings against the applicants may utilize the comeback clause in the order to persuade the court that it would not be just and reasonable to maintain that particular stay. It seems to me that in such a comeback motion the onus would be upon the applicants to show that in the circumstances it was appropriate to continue the stay.

22 The order is therefore granted as to the relief requested including the proposed stay provisions.

Application allowed.

Footnotes

* As amended by the court.

Tab 9

2012 ONSC 3767
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Cinram International Inc., Re

2012 CarswellOnt 8413, 2012 ONSC 3767, 217 A.C.W.S. (3d) 11, 91 C.B.R. (5th) 46

**In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors
Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as Amended**

And In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Cinram International Inc., Cinram
International Income Fund, CII Trust and The Companies Listed in Schedule "A" (Applicants)

Morawetz J.

Heard: June 25, 2012
Judgment: June 26, 2012
Docket: CV-12-9767-00CL

Counsel: Robert J. Chadwick, Melaney Wagner, Caroline Descours for Applicants
Steven Golick for Warner Electra-Atlantic Corp.
Steven Weisz for Pre-Petition First Lien Agent, Pre-Petition Second Lien Agent and DIP Agent
Tracy Sandler for Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation
David Byers for Proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Inc.

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.2 Initial application](#)

[XIX.2.a Procedure](#)

[XIX.2.a.iv Miscellaneous](#)

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.2 Initial application](#)

[XIX.2.b Grant of stay](#)

[XIX.2.b.viii Miscellaneous](#)

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act](#)

[XIX.2 Initial application](#)

[XIX.2.h Miscellaneous](#)

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Miscellaneous

C group of companies was replicator and distributor of CDs and DVDs with operational footprint across North America and Europe — C group experienced significant declines in revenue and EBITDA, and had insufficient funds to meet their immediate cash requirements as result of liquidity challenges — C group sought protection of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — C group brought application seeking initial order under Act, and relief including stay of proceedings against third party non-applicant; authorization to make pre-filing payments; and approval of certain Court-ordered charges over their assets relating to their DIP Financing, administrative costs, indemnification of their trustees, directors and officers, Key Employee Retention Plan, and consent consideration — Application granted — Applicants met all qualifications established for relief under Act

— Charges referenced in initial order were approved — Relief requested in initial order was extensive and went beyond what court usually considers on initial hearing; however, in circumstances, requested relief was appropriate — Applicants spent considerable time reviewing their alternatives and did so in consultative manner with their senior secured lenders — Senior secured lenders supported application, notwithstanding that it was clear that they would suffer significant shortfall on their positions.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Procedure — Miscellaneous
C group of companies was replicator and distributor of CDs and DVDs with operational footprint across North America and Europe — C group experienced significant declines in revenue and EBITDA, and had insufficient funds to meet their immediate cash requirements as result of liquidity challenges — C group brought application seeking initial order under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and other relief, including authorization for C International to act as foreign representative in within proceedings to seek recognition order under Chapter 15 of U.S. Bankruptcy Code on basis that Ontario, Canada was Centre of Main Interest (COMI) of applicants — Application granted on other grounds — It is function of receiving court, in this case, U.S. Bankruptcy Court for District of Delaware, to make determination on location of COMI and to determine whether present proceeding is foreign main proceeding for purposes of Chapter 15.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Grant of stay — Miscellaneous
Stay against third party non-applicant — C group of companies was replicator and distributor of CDs and DVDs with operational footprint across North America and Europe — C group experienced significant declines in revenue and EBITDA, and had insufficient funds to meet their immediate cash requirements as result of liquidity challenges — C group sought protection of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — C LP was not applicant in proceedings; however, C LP formed part of C group's income trust structure with C Fund, ultimate parent of C group — C group brought application seeking initial order under Act, including stay of proceedings against C LP — Application granted — Applicants met all qualifications established for relief under Act — Charges referenced in initial order were approved — Relief requested in initial order was extensive and went beyond what court usually considers on initial hearing; however, in circumstances, requested relief was appropriate.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Morawetz J.*:

Brainhunter Inc., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 7627 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to
Cadillac Fairview Inc., Re (1995), 1995 CarswellOnt 36, 30 C.B.R. (3d) 29 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to
Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 6184, 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered
Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re (2010), 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115, 2010 CarswellOnt 212, 2010 ONSC 222 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered
Fraser Papers Inc., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 3658, 56 C.B.R. (5th) 194 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to
Global Light Telecommunications Inc., Re (2004), 2004 BCSC 745, 2004 CarswellBC 1249, 2 C.B.R. (5th) 210, 33 B.C.L.R. (4th) 155 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to
Grant Forest Products Inc., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4699, 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered
Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd. (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, 1990 CarswellBC 394, 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, (sub nom. *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada*) [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to
Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to
Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of) (1990), 1990 CarswellOnt 139, 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 1 O.R. (3d) 289, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 41 O.A.C. 282 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to
Prizm Income Fund, Re (2011), 2011 ONSC 2061, 2011 CarswellOnt 2258, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 213 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to
Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance) (2002), 287 N.R. 203, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 18 C.P.R. (4th) 1, 44 C.E.L.R. (N.S.) 161, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 211 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 223 F.T.R. 137 (note), 20 C.P.C. (5th) 1, 40 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, 2002 SCC 41, 2002 CarswellNat 822, 2002 CarswellNat 823, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 93 C.R.R. (2d) 219, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.) — considered

Sino-Forest Corp., Re (2012), 2012 CarswellOnt 4117, 2012 ONSC 2063 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered
Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299, 2004 CarswellOnt 1211 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to
Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 2936 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to
Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 338 N.R. 196 (note), 2004 CarswellOnt 5200, 2004 CarswellOnt 5201 (S.C.C.) — referred to
Sulphur Corp. of Canada Ltd., Re (2002), 2002 CarswellAlta 896, 2002 ABQB 682, [2002] 10 W.W.R. 491, 5 Alta. L.R. (4th) 251, 319 A.R. 152, 35 C.B.R. (4th) 304 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to
T. Eaton Co., Re (1997), 1997 CarswellOnt 1914, 46 C.B.R. (3d) 293 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to
Timminco Ltd., Re (2012), 2012 CarswellOnt 1466, 2012 ONSC 948, 95 C.C.P.B. 222, 86 C.B.R. (5th) 171 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to
Timminco Ltd., Re (2012), 2012 ONSC 106, 2012 CarswellOnt 1059, 89 C.B.R. (5th) 127 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered
Timminco Ltd., Re (2012), 2012 ONSC 506, 95 C.C.P.B. 48, 2012 CarswellOnt 1263, 85 C.B.R. (5th) 169 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered
Woodward's Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 236, 79 B.C.L.R. (2d) 257, 1993 CarswellBC 530 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3

Generally — referred to

s. 2 "insolvent person" — considered

Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. 1982

Chapter 15 — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

s. 2(1) "company" — considered

s. 2(1) "debtor company" — considered

s. 3(1) — considered

s. 3(2) — considered

s. 11 — considered

s. 11.2 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.2(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.2(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.2(4) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.4 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.51 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.52 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

APPLICATION by group of debtor companies for initial order and other relief under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Morawetz J.:

1 Cinram International Inc. ("CII"), Cinram International Income Fund ("Cinram Fund"), CII Trust and the Companies listed in Schedule "A" (collectively, the "Applicants") brought this application seeking an initial order (the "Initial Order") pursuant

to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA"). The Applicants also request that the court exercise its jurisdiction to extend a stay of proceedings and other benefits under the Initial Order to Cinram International Limited Partnership ("Cinram LP", collectively with the Applicants, the "CCAA Parties").

2 Cinram Fund, together with its direct and indirect subsidiaries (collectively, "Cinram" or the "Cinram Group") is a replicator and distributor of CDs and DVDs. Cinram has a diversified operational footprint across North America and Europe that enables it to meet the replication and logistics demands of its customers.

3 The evidentiary record establishes that Cinram has experienced significant declines in revenue and EBITDA, which, according to Cinram, are a result of the economic downturn in Cinram's primary markets of North America and Europe, which impacted consumers' discretionary spending and adversely affected the entire industry.

4 Cinram advises that over the past several years it has continued to evaluate its strategic alternatives and rationalize its operating footprint in order to attempt to balance its ongoing operations and financial challenges with its existing debt levels. However, despite cost reductions and recapitalized initiatives and the implementation of a variety of restructuring alternatives, the Cinram Group has experienced a number of challenges that has led to it seeking protection under the CCAA.

5 Counsel to Cinram outlined the principal objectives of these CCAA proceedings as:

- (i) to ensure the ongoing operations of the Cinram Group;
- (ii) to ensure the CCAA Parties have the necessary availability of working capital funds to maximize the ongoing business of the Cinram Group for the benefit of its stakeholders; and
- (iii) to complete the sale and transfer of substantially all of the Cinram Group's business as a going concern (the "Proposed Transaction").

6 Cinram contemplates that these CCAA proceedings will be the primary court supervised restructuring of the CCAA Parties. Cinram has operations in the United States and certain of the Applicants are incorporated under the laws of the United States. Cinram, however, takes the position that Canada is the nerve centre of the Cinram Group.

7 The Applicants also seek authorization for Cinram International ULC ("Cinram ULC") to act as "foreign representative" in the within proceedings to seek a recognition order under Chapter 15 of the United States Bankruptcy Code ("Chapter 15"). Cinram advises that the proceedings under Chapter 15 are intended to ensure that the CCAA Parties are protected from creditor actions in the United States and to assist with the global implementation of the Proposed Transaction to be undertaken pursuant to these CCAA proceedings.

8 Counsel to the Applicants submits that the CCAA Parties are part of a consolidated business in Canada, the United States and Europe that is headquartered in Canada and operationally and functionally integrated in many significant respects. Cinram is one of the world's largest providers of pre-recorded multi-media products and related logistics services. It has facilities in North America and Europe, and it:

- (i) manufactures DVDs, blue ray disks and CDs, and provides distribution services for motion picture studios, music labels, video game publishers, computer software companies, telecommunication companies and retailers around the world;
- (ii) provides various digital media services through One K Studios, LLC; and
- (iii) provides retail inventory control and forecasting services through Cinram Retail Services LLC (collectively, the "Cinram Business").

9 Cinram contemplates that the Proposed Transaction could allow it to restore itself as a market leader in the industry. Cinram takes the position that it requires CCAA protection to provide stability to its operations and to complete the Proposed Transaction.

10 The Proposed Transaction has the support of the lenders forming the steering committee with respect to Cinram's First Lien Credit Facilities (the "Steering Committee"), the members of which have been subject to confidentiality agreements and represent 40% of the loans under Cinram's First Lien Credit Facilities (the "Initial Consenting Lenders"). Cinram also anticipates further support of the Proposed Transaction from additional lenders under its credit facilities following the public announcement of the Proposed Transaction.

11 Cinram Fund is the direct or indirect parent and sole shareholder of all of the subsidiaries in Cinram's corporate structure. A simplified corporate structure of the Cinram Group showing all of the CCAA Parties, including the designation of the CCAA Parties' business segments and certain non-filing entities, is set out in the Pre-Filing Report of FTI Consulting Inc. (the "Monitor") at paragraph 13. A copy is attached as Schedule "B".

12 Cinram Fund, CII, Cinram International General Partner Inc. ("Cinram GP"), CII Trust, Cinram ULC and 1362806 Ontario Limited are the Canadian entities in the Cinram Group that are Applicants in these proceedings (collectively, the "Canadian Applicants"). Cinram Fund and CII Trust are both open-ended limited purpose trusts, established under the laws of Ontario, and each of the remaining Canadian Applicants is incorporated pursuant to Federal or Provincial legislation.

13 Cinram (US) Holdings Inc. ("CUSH"), Cinram Inc., IHC Corporation ("IHC"), Cinram Manufacturing, LLC ("Cinram Manufacturing"), Cinram Distribution, LLC ("Cinram Distribution"), Cinram Wireless, LLC ("Cinram Wireless"), Cinram Retail Services, LLC ("Cinram Retail") and One K Studios, LLC ("One K") are the U.S. entities in the Cinram Group that are Applicants in these proceedings (collectively, the "U.S. Applicants"). Each of the U.S. Applicants is incorporated under the laws of Delaware, with the exception of One K, which is incorporated under the laws of California. On May 25, 2012, each of the U.S. Applicants opened a new Canadian-based bank account with J.P. Morgan.

14 Cinram LP is not an Applicant in these proceedings. However, the Applicants seek to have a stay of proceedings and other relief under the CCAA extended to Cinram LP as it forms part of Cinram's income trust structure with Cinram Fund, the ultimate parent of the Cinram Group.

15 Cinram's European entities are not part of these proceedings and it is not intended that any insolvency proceedings will be commenced with respect to Cinram's European entities, except for Cinram Optical Discs SAC, which has commenced insolvency proceedings in France.

16 The Cinram Group's principal source of long-term debt is the senior secured credit facilities provided under credit agreements known as the "First-Lien Credit Agreement" and the "Second-Lien Credit Agreement" (together with the First-Lien Credit Agreement, the "Credit Agreements").

17 All of the CCAA Parties, with the exception of Cinram Fund, Cinram GP, CII Trust and Cinram LP (collectively, the "Fund Entities"), are borrowers and/or guarantors under the Credit Agreements. The obligations under the Credit Agreements are secured by substantially all of the assets of the Applicants and certain of their European subsidiaries.

18 As at March 31, 2012, there was approximately \$233 million outstanding under the First-Lien Term Loan Facility; \$19 million outstanding under the First-Lien Revolving Credit Facilities; approximately \$12 million of letter of credit exposure under the First-Lien Credit Agreement; and approximately \$12 million outstanding under the Second-Lien Credit Agreement.

19 Cinram advises that in light of the financial circumstances of the Cinram Group, it is not possible to obtain additional financing that could be used to repay the amounts owing under the Credit Agreements.

20 Mr. John Bell, Chief Financial Officer of CII, stated in his affidavit that in connection with certain defaults under the Credit Agreements, a series of waivers was extended from December 2011 to June 30, 2012 and that upon expiry of the waivers,

the lenders have the ability to demand immediate repayment of the outstanding amounts under the Credit Agreements and the borrowers and the other Applicants that are guarantors under the Credit Agreements would be unable to meet their debt obligations. Mr. Bell further stated that there is no reasonable expectation that Cinram would be able to service its debt load in the short to medium term given forecasted net revenues and EBITDA for the remainder of fiscal 2012, fiscal 2013, and fiscal 2014. The cash flow forecast attached to his affidavit indicates that, without additional funding, the Applicants will exhaust their available cash resources and will thus be unable to meet their obligations as they become due.

21 The Applicants request a stay of proceedings. They take the position that in light of their financial circumstances, there could be a vast and significant erosion of value to the detriment of all stakeholders. In particular, the Applicants are concerned about the following risks, which, because of the integration of the Cinram business, also apply to the Applicants' subsidiaries, including Cinram LP:

- (a) the lenders demanding payment in full for money owing under the Credit Agreements;
- (b) potential termination of contracts by key suppliers; and
- (c) potential termination of contracts by customers.

22 As indicated in the cash flow forecast, the Applicants do not have sufficient funds available to meet their immediate cash requirements as a result of their current liquidity challenges. Mr. Bell states in his affidavit that the Applicants require access to Debtor-In-Possession ("DIP") Financing in the amount of \$15 millions to continue operations while they implement their restructuring, including the Proposed Transaction. Cinram has negotiated a DIP Credit Agreement with the lenders forming the Steering Committee (the "DIP Lenders") through J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, NA as Administrative Agent (the "DIP Agent") whereby the DIP Lenders agree to provide the DIP Financing in the form of a term loan in the amount of \$15 million.

23 The Applicants also indicate that during the course of the CCAA proceedings, the CCAA Parties intend to generally make payments to ensure their ongoing business operations for the benefit of their stakeholders, including obligations incurred prior to, on, or after the commencement of these proceedings relating to:

- (a) the active employment of employees in the ordinary course;
- (b) suppliers and service providers the CCAA Parties and the Monitor have determined to be critical to the continued operation of the Cinram business;
- (c) certain customer programs in place pursuant to existing contracts or arrangements with customers; and
- (d) inter-company payments among the CCAA Parties in respect of, among other things, shared services.

24 Mr. Bell states that the ability to make these payments relating to critical suppliers and customer programs is subject to a consultation and approval process agreed to among the Monitor, the DIP Agent and the CCAA Parties.

25 The Applicants also request an Administration Charge for the benefit of the Monitor and Moelis and Company, LLC ("Moelis"), an investment bank engaged to assist Cinram in a comprehensive and thorough review of its strategic alternatives.

26 In addition, the directors (and in the case of Cinram Fund and CII Trust, the Trustees, referred to collectively with the directors as the "Directors/Trustees") requested a Director's Charge to provide certainty with respect to potential personal liability if they continue in their current capacities. Mr. Bell states that in order to complete a successful restructuring, including the Proposed Transaction, the Applicants require the active and committed involvement of their Directors/Trustees and officers. Further, Cinram's insurers have advised that if Cinram was to file for CCAA protection, and the insurers agreed to renew the existing D&O policies, there would be a significant increase in the premium for that insurance.

27 Cinram has also developed a key employee retention program (the "KERP") with the principal purpose of providing an incentive for eligible employees, including eligible officers, to remain with the Cinram Group despite its financial difficulties.

The KERP has been reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees of the Cinram Fund. The KERP includes retention payments (the "KERP Retention Payments") to certain existing employees, including certain officers employed at Canadian and U.S. Entities, who are critical to the preservation of Cinram's enterprise value.

28 Cinram also advises that on June 22, 2012, Cinram Fund, the borrowers under the Credit Agreements, and the Initial Consenting Lenders entered into a support agreement pursuant to which the Initial Consenting Lenders agreed to support the Proposed Transaction to be pursued through these CCAA proceedings (the "Support Agreement").

29 Pursuant to the Support Agreement, lenders under the First-Lien Credit Agreement who execute the Support Agreement or Consent Agreement prior to July 10, 2012 (the "Consent Date") are entitled to receive consent consideration (the "Early Consent Consideration") equal to 4% of the principal amount of loans under the First-Lien Credit Agreement held by such consenting lenders as of the Consent Date, payable in cash from the net sale proceeds of the Proposed Transaction upon distribution of such proceeds in the CCAA proceedings.

30 Mr. Bell states that it is contemplated that the CCAA proceedings will be the primary court-supervised restructuring of the CCAA Parties. He states that the CCAA Parties are part of a consolidated business in Canada, the United States and Europe that is headquartered in Canada and operationally and functionally integrated in many significant respects. Mr. Bell further states that although Cinram has operations in the United States, and certain of the Applicants are incorporated under the laws of the United States, it is Ontario that is Cinram's home jurisdiction and the nerve centre of the CCAA Parties' management, business and operations.

31 The CCAA Parties have advised that they will be seeking a recognition order under Chapter 15 to ensure that they are protected from creditor actions in the United States and to assist with the global implementation of the Proposed Transaction. Thus, the Applicants seek authorization in the Proposed Initial Order for:

Cinram ULC to seek recognition of these proceedings as "foreign main proceedings" and to seek such additional relief required in connection with the prosecution of any sale transaction, including the Proposed Transaction, as well as authorization for the Monitor, as a court-appointed officer, to assist the CCAA Parties with any matters relating to any of the CCAA Parties' subsidiaries and any foreign proceedings commenced in relation thereto.

32 Mr. Bell further states that the Monitor will be actively involved in assisting Cinram ULC as the foreign representative of the Applicants in the Chapter 15 proceedings and will assist in keeping this court informed of developments in the Chapter 15 proceedings.

33 The facts relating to the CCAA Parties, the Cinram business, and the requested relief are fully set out in Mr. Bell's affidavit.

34 Counsel to the Applicants filed a comprehensive factum in support of the requested relief in the Initial Order. Part III of the factum sets out the issues and the law.

35 The relief requested in the form of the Initial Order is extensive. It goes beyond what this court usually considers on an initial hearing. However, in the circumstances of this case, I have been persuaded that the requested relief is appropriate.

36 In making this determination, I have taken into account that the Applicants have spent a considerable period of time reviewing their alternatives and have done so in a consultative manner with their senior secured lenders. The senior secured lenders support this application, notwithstanding that it is clear that they will suffer a significant shortfall on their positions. It is also noted that the Early Consent Consideration will be available to lenders under the First-Lien Credit Agreement who execute the Support Agreement prior to July 10, 2012. Thus, all of these lenders will have the opportunity to participate in this arrangement.

37 As previously indicated, the Applicants' factum is comprehensive. The submissions on the law are extensive and cover all of the outstanding issues. It provides a fulsome review of the jurisprudence in the area, which for purposes of this application, I accept. For this reason, paragraphs 41-96 of the factum are attached as Schedule "C" for reference purposes.

38 The Applicants have also requested that the confidential supplement — which contains the KERP summary listing the individual KERP Payments and certain DIP Schedules — be sealed. I am satisfied that the KERP summary contains individually identifiable information and compensation information, including sensitive salary information, about the individuals who are covered by the KERP and that the DIP schedules contain sensitive competitive information of the CCAA Parties which should also be treated as being confidential. Having considered the principals of *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.), I accept the Applicants' submission on this issue and grant the requested sealing order in respect of the confidential supplement.

39 Finally, the Applicants have advised that they intend to proceed with a Chapter 15 application on June 26, 2012 before the United States Bankruptcy Court in the District of Delaware. I am given to understand that Cinram ULC, as proposed foreign representative, will be seeking recognition of the CCAA proceedings as "foreign main proceedings" on the basis that Ontario, Canada is the Centre of Main Interest or "COMI" of the CCAA Applicants.

40 In his affidavit at paragraph 195, Mr. Bell states that the CCAA Parties are part of a consolidated business that is headquartered in Canada and operationally and functionally integrated in many significant respects and that, as a result of the following factors, the Applicants submit the COMI of the CCAA Parties is Ontario, Canada:

- (a) the Cinram Group is managed on a consolidated basis out of the corporate headquarters in Toronto, Ontario, where corporate-level decision-making and corporate administrative functions are centralized;
- (b) key contracts, including, among others, major customer service agreements, are negotiated at the corporate level and created in Canada;
- (c) the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer of CII, who are also directors, trustees and/or officers of other entities in the Cinram Group, are based in Canada;
- (d) meetings of the board of trustees and board of directors typically take place in Canada;
- (e) pricing decisions for entities in the Cinram Group are ultimately made by the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer in Toronto, Ontario;
- (f) cash management functions for Cinram's North American entities, including the administration of Cinram's accounts receivable and accounts payable, are managed from Cinram's head office in Toronto, Ontario;
- (g) although certain bookkeeping, invoicing and accounting functions are performed locally, corporate accounting, treasury, financial reporting, financial planning, tax planning and compliance, insurance procurement services and internal audits are managed at a consolidated level in Toronto, Ontario;
- (h) information technology, marketing, and real estate services are provided by CII at the head office in Toronto, Ontario;
- (i) with the exception of routine maintenance expenditures, all capital expenditure decisions affecting the Cinram Group are managed in Toronto, Ontario;
- (j) new business development initiatives are centralized and managed from Toronto, Ontario; and
- (k) research and development functions for the Cinram Group are corporate-level activities centralized at Toronto, Ontario, including the Cinram Group's corporate-level research and development budget and strategy.

41 Counsel submits that the CCAA Parties are highly dependent upon the critical business functions performed on their behalf from Cinram's head office in Toronto and would not be able to function independently without significant disruptions to their operations.

42 The above comments with respect to the COMI are provided for informational purposes only. This court clearly recognizes that it is the function of the receiving court — in this case, the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware — to make the determination on the location of the COMI and to determine whether this CCAA proceeding is a "foreign main proceeding" for the purposes of Chapter 15.

43 In the result, I am satisfied that the Applicants meet all of the qualifications established for relief under the CCAA and I have signed the Initial Order in the form submitted, which includes approvals of the Charges referenced in the Initial Order.

Schedule "A"

Additional Applicants

Cinram International General Partner Inc.

Cinram International ULC

1362806 Ontario Limited

Cinram (U.S.) Holdings Inc.

Cinram, Inc.

IHC Corporation

Cinram Manufacturing LLC


Cinram Distribution LLC

Cinram Wireless LLC

Cinram Retail Services, LLC

One K Studios, LLC

Schedule "B"



Graphic 1

Schedule "C"

A. The Applicants Are "Debtor Companies" to Which the CCAA Applies

41. The CCAA applies in respect of a "debtor company" (including a foreign company having assets or doing business in Canada) or "affiliated debtor companies" where the total of claims against such company or companies exceeds \$5 million.

CCAA, Section 3(1).

42. The Applicants are eligible for protection under the CCAA because each is a "debtor company" and the total of the claims against the Applicants exceeds \$5 million.

(1) The Applicants are Debtor Companies

43. The terms "company" and "debtor company" are defined in Section 2 of the CCAA as follows:

"company" means any company, corporation or legal person incorporated by or under an Act of Parliament or of the legislature of a province and any incorporated company having assets or doing business in Canada, wherever incorporated, and any income trust, but does not include banks, authorized foreign banks within the meaning of section 2 of the *Bank Act*, railway or telegraph companies, insurance companies and companies to which the *Trust and Loan Companies Act* applies.

"debtor company" means any company that:

(a) is bankrupt or insolvent;

(b) has committed an act of bankruptcy within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or is deemed insolvent within the meaning of the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act*, whether or not proceedings in respect of the company have been taken under either of those Acts;

(c) has made an authorized assignment or against which a receiving order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*; or

(d) is in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-Up and Restructuring Act* because the company is insolvent.

CCAA, Section 2 ("company" and "debtor company").

44. The Applicants are debtor companies within the meaning of these definitions.

(2) The Applicants are "companies"

45. The Applicants are "companies" because:

a. with respect to the Canadian Applicants, each is incorporated pursuant to federal or provincial legislation or, in the case of Cinram Fund and CII Trust, is an income trust; and

b. with respect to the U.S. Applicants, each is an incorporated company with certain funds in bank accounts in Canada opened in May 2012 and therefore each is a company having assets or doing business in Canada.

Bell Affidavit at paras. 4, 80, 84, 86, 91, 94, 98, 102, 105, 108, 111, 114, 117, 120, 123, 212; Application Record, Tab 2.

46. The test for "having assets or doing business in Canada" is disjunctive, such that either "having assets" in Canada or "doing business in Canada" is sufficient to qualify an incorporated company as a "company" within the meaning of the CCAA.

47. Having only nominal assets in Canada, such as funds on deposit in a Canadian bank account, brings a foreign corporation within the definition of "company". In order to meet the threshold statutory requirements of the CCAA, an applicant need only be in technical compliance with the plain words of the CCAA.

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re (2009), 59 C.B.R. (5th) 72 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 30 [*Canwest Global*]; Book of Authorities of the Applicants ("*Book of Authorities*"), Tab 1.

Global Light Telecommunications Inc., Re (2004), 2 C.B.R. (5th) 210 (B.C. S.C.) at para. 17 [*Global Light*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 2.

48. The Courts do not engage in a quantitative or qualitative analysis of the assets or the circumstances in which the assets were created. Accordingly, the use of "instant" transactions immediately preceding a CCAA application, such as the creation of "instant debts" or "instant assets" for the purposes of bringing an entity within the scope of the CCAA, has received judicial approval as a legitimate device to bring a debtor within technical requirements of the CCAA.

Global Light Telecommunications Inc., Re, supra at para. 17; Book of Authorities, Tab 2.

Cadillac Fairview Inc., Re (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 29 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at paras. 5-6; Book of Authorities, Tab 3.

Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of) (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289 (Ont. C.A.) at paras. 74, 83; Book of Authorities, Tab 4.

(3) The Applicants are insolvent

49. The Applicants are "debtor companies" as defined in the CCAA because they are companies (as set out above) and they are insolvent.

50. The insolvency of the debtor is assessed as of the time of filing the CCAA application. The CCAA does not define insolvency. Accordingly, in interpreting the meaning of "insolvent", courts have taken guidance from the definition of "insolvent person" in Section 2(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (the "BIA"), which defines an "insolvent person" as a person (i) who is

not bankrupt; and (ii) who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada; (iii) whose liabilities to creditors provable as claims under the BIA amount to one thousand dollars; and (iv) who is "insolvent" under one of the following tests:

- a. is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due;
- b. has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due; or
- c. the aggregate of his property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due.

BIA, Section 2 ("insolvent person").

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); leave to appeal to C.A. refused [2004] O.J. No. 1903 (Ont. C.A.); leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused [2004] S.C.C.A. No. 336 (S.C.C.), at para.4 [*Stelco*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 5.

51. These tests for insolvency are disjunctive. A company satisfying any one of these tests is considered insolvent for the purposes of the CCAA.

Stelco Inc., Re, *supra* at paras. 26 and 28; Book of Authorities, Tab 5.

52. A company is also insolvent for the purposes of the CCAA if, at the time of filing, there is a reasonably foreseeable expectation that there is a looming liquidity condition or crisis that would result in the company being unable to pay its debts as they generally become due if a stay of proceedings and ancillary protection are not granted by the court.

Stelco Inc., Re, *supra* at para. 40; Book of Authorities, Tab 5.

53. The Applicants meet both the traditional test for insolvency under the BIA and the expanded test for insolvency based on a looming liquidity condition as a result of the following:

- a. The Applicants are unable to comply with certain financial covenants under the Credit Agreements and have entered into a series of waivers with their lenders from December 2011 to June 30, 2012.
- b. Were the Lenders to accelerate the amounts owing under the Credit Agreements, the Borrowers and the other Applicants that are Guarantors under the Credit Agreements would be unable to meet their debt obligations. Cinram Fund would be the ultimate parent of an insolvent business.
- d. The Applicants have been unable to repay or refinance the amounts owing under the Credit Agreements or find an out-of-court transaction for the sale of the Cinram Business with proceeds that equal or exceed the amounts owing under the Credit Agreements.
- e. Reduced revenues and EBITDA and increased borrowing costs have significantly impaired Cinram's ability to service its debt obligations. There is no reasonable expectation that Cinram will be able to service its debt load in the short to medium term given forecasted net revenues and EBITDA for the remainder of fiscal 2012 and for fiscal 2013 and 2014.
- f. The decline in revenues and EBITDA generated by the Cinram Business has caused the value of the Cinram Business to decline. As a result, the aggregate value of the Property, taken at fair value, is not sufficient to allow for payment of all of the Applicants' obligations due and accruing due.
- g. The Cash Flow Forecast indicates that without additional funding the Applicants will exhaust their available cash resources and will thus be unable to meet their obligations as they become due.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 23, 179-181, 183, 197-199; Application Record, Tab 2.

(4) The Applicants are affiliated companies with claims outstanding in excess of \$5 million

54. The Applicants are affiliated debtor companies with total claims exceeding 5 million dollars. Therefore, the CCAA applies to the Applicants in accordance with Section 3(1).

55. Affiliated companies are defined in Section 3(2) of the CCAA as follows:

- a. companies are affiliated companies if one of them is the subsidiary of the other or both are subsidiaries of the same company or each is controlled by the same person; and
- b. two companies are affiliated with the same company at the same time are deemed to be affiliated with each other.

CCAA, Section 3(2).

56. CII, CII Trust and all of the entities listed in Schedule "A" hereto are indirect, wholly owned subsidiaries of Cinram Fund; thus, the Applicants are "affiliated companies" for the purpose of the CCAA.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 3, 71; Application Record, Tab 2.

57. All of the CCAA Parties (except for the Fund Entities) are each a Borrower and/or Guarantor under the Credit Agreements. As at March 31, 2012 there was approximately \$252 million of aggregate principal amount outstanding under the First Lien Credit Agreement (plus approximately \$12 million in letter of credit exposure) and approximately \$12 million of aggregate principal amount outstanding under the Second Lien Credit Agreement. The total claims against the Applicants far exceed \$5 million.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 75; Application Record, Tab 2.

B. The Relief is Available under The CCAA and Consistent with the Purpose and Policy of the CCAA**(1) The CCAA is Flexible, Remedial Legislation**

58. The CCAA is remedial legislation, intended to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors as an alternative to bankruptcy. In particular during periods of financial hardship, debtors turn to the Court so that the Court may apply the CCAA in a flexible manner in order to accomplish the statute's goals. The Court should give the CCAA a broad and liberal interpretation so as to encourage and facilitate successful restructurings whenever possible.

Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of), *supra* at paras. 22 and 56-60; Book of Authorities, Tab 4. *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at para. 5; Book of Authorities, Tab 6.

Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd. (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 (B.C. C.A.), at pp. 4 and 7; Book of Authorities, Tab 7.

59. On numerous occasions, courts have held that Section 11 of the CCAA provides the courts with a broad and liberal power, which is at their disposal in order to achieve the overall objective of the CCAA. Accordingly, an interpretation of the CCAA that facilitates restructurings accords with its purpose.

Sulphur Corp. of Canada Ltd., Re (2002), 35 C.B.R. (4th) 304 (Alta. Q.B.) ("*Sulphur*") at para. 26; Book of Authorities, Tab 8.

60. Given the nature and purpose of the CCAA, this Honourable Court has the authority and jurisdiction to depart from the Model Order as is reasonable and necessary in order to achieve a successful restructuring.

(2) The Stay of Proceedings Against Non-Applicants is Appropriate

61. The relief sought in this application includes a stay of proceedings in favour of Cinram LP and the Applicants' direct and indirect subsidiaries that are also party to an agreement with an Applicant (whether as surety, guarantor or otherwise) (each, a "Subsidiary Counterparty"), including any contract or credit agreement. It is just and reasonable to grant the requested stay of proceedings because:

- a. the Cinram Business is integrated among the Applicants, Cinram LP and the Subsidiary Counterparties;
- b. if any proceedings were commenced against Cinram LP, or if any of the third parties to such agreements were to commence proceedings or exercise rights and remedies against the Subsidiary Counterparties, this would have a detrimental effect on the Applicants' ability to restructure and implement the Proposed Transaction and would lead to an erosion of value of the Cinram Business; and
- c. a stay of proceedings that extends to Cinram LP and the Subsidiary Counterparties is necessary in order to maintain stability with respect to the Cinram Business and maintain value for the benefit of the Applicants' stakeholders.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 185-186; Application Record, Tab 2.

62. The purpose of the CCAA is to preserve the *status quo* to enable a plan of compromise to be prepared, filed and considered by the creditors:

In the interim, a judge has great discretion under the CCAA to make order so as to effectively maintain the status quo in respect of an insolvent company while it attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for the proposed compromise or arrangement which will be to the benefit of both the company and its creditors.

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re, supra at para. 5; Book of Authorities, Tab 6. *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re, supra* at para. 27; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

CCAA, Section 11.

63. The Court has broad inherent jurisdiction to impose stays of proceedings that supplement the statutory provisions of Section 11 of the CCAA, providing the Court with the power to grant a stay of proceedings where it is just and reasonable to do so, including with respect to non-applicant parties.

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re, supra at paras. 5 and 16; Book of Authorities, Tab 6.

T. Eaton Co., Re (1997), 46 C.B.R. (3d) 293 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 6; Book of Authorities, Tab 9.

64. The Courts have found it just and reasonable to grant a stay of proceedings against third party non-applicants in a number of circumstances, including:

- a. where it is important to the reorganization process;
- b. where the business operations of the Applicants and the third party non-applicants are intertwined and the third parties are not subject to the jurisdiction of the CCAA, such as partnerships that do not qualify as "companies" within the meaning of the CCAA;
- c. against non-applicant subsidiaries of a debtor company where such subsidiaries were guarantors under the note indentures issued by the debtor company; and
- d. against non-applicant subsidiaries relating to any guarantee, contribution or indemnity obligation, liability or claim in respect of obligations and claims against the debtor companies.

Woodward's Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 236 (B.C. S.C.) at para. 31; Book of Authorities, Tab 10. *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re*, *supra* at para. 21; Book of Authorities, Tab 6.

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re, *supra* at paras. 28 and 29; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Sino-Forest Corp., Re, 2012 ONSC 2063 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 5, 18, and 31; Book of Authorities, Tab 11.

Re MAAX Corp., Initial Order granted June 12, 2008, Montreal 500-11-033561-081, (Que. Sup. Ct. [Commercial Division]) at para. 7; Book of Authorities, Tab 12.

65. The Applicants submit the balance of convenience favours extending the relief in the proposed Initial Order to Cinram LP and the Subsidiary Counterparties. The business operations of the Applicants, Cinram LP and the Subsidiary Counterparties are intertwined and the stay of proceedings is necessary to maintain stability and value for the benefit of the Applicants' stakeholders, as well as allow an orderly, going-concern sale of the Cinram Business as an important component of its reorganization process.

(3) Entitlement to Make Pre-Filing Payments

66. To ensure the continued operation of the CCAA Parties' business and maximization of value in the interests of Cinram's stakeholders, the Applicants seek authorization (but not a requirement) for the CCAA Parties to make certain pre-filing payments, including: (a) payments to employees in respect of wages, benefits, and related amounts; (b) payments to suppliers and service providers critical to the ongoing operation of the business; (c) payments and the application of credits in connection with certain existing customer programs; and (d) intercompany payments among the Applicants related to intercompany loans and shared services. Payments will be made with the consent of the Monitor and, in certain circumstances, with the consent of the Agent.

67. There is ample authority supporting the Court's general jurisdiction to permit payment of pre-filing obligations to persons whose services are critical to the ongoing operations of the debtor companies. This jurisdiction of the Court is not ousted by Section 11.4 of the CCAA, which became effective as part of the 2009 amendments to the CCAA and codified the Court's practice of declaring a person to be a critical supplier and granting a charge on the debtor's property in favour of such critical supplier. As noted by Pepall J. in *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*, the recent amendments, including Section 11.4, do not detract from the inherently flexible nature of the CCAA or the Court's broad and inherent jurisdiction to make such orders that will facilitate the debtor's restructuring of its business as a going concern.

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re supra, at paras. 41 and 43; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

68. There are many cases since the 2009 amendments where the Courts have authorized the applicants to pay certain pre-filing amounts where the applicants were not seeking a charge in respect of critical suppliers. In granting this authority, the Courts considered a number of factors, including:

- a. whether the goods and services were integral to the business of the applicants;
- b. the applicants' dependency on the uninterrupted supply of the goods or services;
- c. the fact that no payments would be made without the consent of the Monitor;
- d. the Monitor's support and willingness to work with the applicants to ensure that payments to suppliers in respect of pre-filing liabilities are minimized;
- e. whether the applicants had sufficient inventory of the goods on hand to meet their needs; and
- f. the effect on the debtors' ongoing operations and ability to restructure if they were unable to make pre-filing payments to their critical suppliers.

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re supra, at para. 43; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Brainhunter Inc., Re, [2009] O.J. No. 5207 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 21 [*Brainhunter*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 13.

Prizm Income Fund, Re (2011), 75 C.B.R. (5th) 213 (Ont. S.C.J.) at paras. 29-34; Book of Authorities, Tab 14.

69. The CCAA Parties rely on the efficient and expedited supply of products and services from their suppliers and service providers in order to ensure that their operations continue in an efficient manner so that they can satisfy customer requirements. The CCAA Parties operate in a highly competitive environment where the timely provision of their products and services is essential in order for the company to remain a successful player in the industry and to ensure the continuance of the Cinram Business. The CCAA Parties require flexibility to ensure adequate and timely supply of required products and to attempt to obtain and negotiate credit terms with its suppliers and service providers. In order to accomplish this, the CCAA Parties require the ability to pay certain pre-filing amounts and post-filing payables to those suppliers they consider essential to the Cinram Business, as approved by the Monitor. The Monitor, in determining whether to approve pre-filing payments as critical to the ongoing business operations, will consider various factors, including the above factors derived from the caselaw.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 226, 228, 230; Application Record, Tab 2.

70. In addition, the CCAA Parties' continued compliance with their existing customer programs, as described in the Bell Affidavit, including the payment of certain pre-filing amounts owing under certain customer programs and the application of certain credits granted to customers pre-filing to post-filing receivables, is essential in order for the CCAA Parties to maintain their customer relationships as part of the CCAA Parties' going concern business.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 234; Application Record, Tab 2.

71. Further, due to the operational integration of the businesses of the CCAA Parties, as described above, there is a significant volume of financial transactions between and among the Applicants, including, among others, charges by an Applicant providing shared services to another Applicant of intercompany accounts due from the recipients of those services, and charges by a Applicant that manufactures and furnishes products to another Applicant of inter-company accounts due from the receiving entity.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 225; Application Record, Tab 2.

72. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that it is appropriate in the present circumstances for this Honourable Court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the CCAA Parties the authority to make the pre-filing payments described in the proposed Initial Order subject to the terms therein.

(4) The Charges Are Appropriate

73. The Applicants seek approval of certain Court-ordered charges over their assets relating to their DIP Financing (defined below), administrative costs, indemnification of their trustees, directors and officers, KERP and Support Agreement. The Lenders and the Administrative Agent under the Credit Agreements, the senior secured facilities that will be primed by the charges, have been provided with notice of the within Application. The proposed Initial Order does not purport to give the Court-ordered charges priority over any other validly perfected security interests.

(A) DIP Lenders' Charge

74. In the proposed Initial Order, the Applicants seek approval of the DIP Credit Agreement providing a debtor-in-possession term facility in the principal amount of \$15 million (the "DIP Financing"), to be secured by a charge over all of the assets and property of the Applicants that are Borrowers and/or Guarantors under the Credit Agreements (the "Charged Property") ranking ahead of all other charges except the Administration Charge.

75. Section 11.2 of the CCAA expressly provides the Court the statutory jurisdiction to grant a debtor-in-possession ("DIP") financing charge:

11.2(1) *Interim financing* - On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

11.2(2) *Priority* — secured creditors — The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

Timminco Ltd., Re, 211 A.C.W.S. (3d) 881 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) [2012 CarswellOnt 1466] at para. 31; Book of Authorities, Tab 15. CCAA, Section 11.2(1) and (2).

76. Section 11.2 of the CCAA sets out the following factors to be considered by the Court in deciding whether to grant a DIP financing charge:

- 11.2(4) Factors to be considered — In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,
- (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
 - (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 in respect of the company;
 - (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 referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

CCAA, Section 11.2(4).

77. The above list of factors is not exhaustive, and it may be appropriate for the Court to consider additional factors in determining whether to grant a DIP financing charge. For example, in circumstances where funds to be borrowed pursuant to a DIP facility were not expected to be immediately necessary, but applicants' cash flow statements projected the need for additional liquidity, the Court in granting the requested DIP charge considered the fact that the applicants' ability to borrow funds that would be secured by a charge would help retain the confidence of their trade creditors, employees and suppliers.

Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re (2010), 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 42-43 [*Canwest Publishing*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 16.

78. Courts in recent cross-border cases have exercised their broad power to grant charges to DIP lenders over the assets of foreign applicants. In many of these cases, the debtors have commenced recognition proceedings under Chapter 15.

Re Catalyst Paper Corporation, Initial Order granted on January 31, 2012, Court File No. S-120712 (B.C.S.C.) [*Catalyst Paper*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 17.

Angiotech, supra, Initial Order granted on January 28, 2011, Court File No. S-110587; Book of Authorities, Tab 18

Fraser Papers Inc., Re [2009 CarswellOnt 3658 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])], Initial Order granted on June 18, 2009, Court File No. CV-09-8241-00CL; Book of Authorities, Tab 19.

79. As noted above, pursuant to Section 11.2(1) of the CCAA, a DIP financing charge may not secure an obligation that existed before the order was made. The requested DIP Lenders' Charge will not secure any pre-filing obligations.

80. The following factors support the granting of the DIP Lenders' Charge, many of which incorporate the considerations enumerated in Section 11.2(4) listed above:

- a. the Cash Flow Forecast indicates the Applicants will need additional liquidity afforded by the DIP Financing in order to continue operations through the duration of these proposed CCAA Proceedings;
- b. the Cinram Business is intended to continue to operate on a going concern basis during these CCAA Proceedings under the direction of the current management with the assistance of the Applicants' advisors and the Monitor;
- c. the DIP Financing is expected to provide the Applicants with sufficient liquidity to implement the Proposed Transaction through these CCAA Proceedings and implement certain operational restructuring initiatives, which will materially enhance the likelihood of a going concern outcome for the Cinram Business;
- d. the nature and the value of the Applicants' assets as set out in their consolidated financial statements can support the requested DIP Lenders' Charge;
- e. members of the Steering Committee under the First Lien Credit Agreement, who are senior secured creditors of the Applicants, have agreed to provide the DIP Financing;
- f. the proposed DIP Lenders have indicated that they will not provide the DIP Financing if the DIP Lenders' Charge is not approved;
- g. the DIP Lenders' Charge will not secure any pre-filing obligations;
- h. the senior secured lenders under the Credit Agreements affected by the charge have been provided with notice of these CCAA Proceedings; and
- i. the proposed Monitor is supportive of the DIP Facility, including the DIP Lenders' Charge.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 199-202, 205-208; Application Record, Tab 2.

(B) Administration Charge

81. The Applicants seek a charge over the Charged Property in the amount of CAD\$3.5 million to secure the fees of the Monitor and its counsel, the Applicants' Canadian and U.S. counsel, the Applicants' Investment Banker, the Canadian and U.S. Counsel to the DIP Agent, the DIP Lenders, the Administrative Agent and the Lenders under the Credit Agreements, and the financial advisor to the DIP Lenders and the Lenders under the Credit Agreements (the "Administration Charge"). This charge is to rank in priority to all of the other charges set out in the proposed Initial Order.

82. Prior to the 2009 amendments, administration charges were granted pursuant to the inherent jurisdiction of the Court. Section 11.52 of the CCAA now expressly provides the court with the jurisdiction to grant an administration charge:

11.52(1) *Court may order security or charge to cover certain costs*

On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in respect of the fees and expenses of

- (a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;
- (b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and
- (c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

11.52(2) *Priority*

The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

CCAA, Section 11.52(1) and (2).

82. Administration charges were granted pursuant to Section 11.52 in, among other cases, *Timminco Ltd., Re, Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re* and *Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re*.

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re, supra; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Canwest Publishing, supra; Book of Authorities, Tab 16.

Timminco Ltd., Re, 2012 ONSC 106 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) [*Timminco*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 20.

84. In *Canwest Publishing*, the Court noted Section 11.52 does not contain any specific criteria for a court to consider in granting an administration charge and provided a list of non-exhaustive factors to consider in making such an assessment. These factors were also considered by the Court in *Timminco*. The list of factors to consider in approving an administration charge include:

- a. the size and complexity of the business being restructured;
- b. the proposed role of the beneficiaries of the charge;
- c. whether there is unwarranted duplication of roles;
- d. whether the quantum of the proposed charge appears to be fair and reasonable;
- e. the position of the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge; and
- f. the position of the Monitor.

Canwest Publishing supra, at para. 54; Book of Authorities, Tab 16.

Timminco, supra, at paras. 26-29; Book of Authorities, Tab 20.

85. The Applicants submit that the Administration Charge is warranted and necessary, and that it is appropriate in the present circumstances for this Honourable Court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the Administration Charge, given:

- a. the proposed restructuring of the Cinram Business is large and complex, spanning several jurisdictions across North America and Europe, and will require the extensive involvement of professional advisors;
- b. the professionals that are to be beneficiaries of the Administration Charge have each played a critical role in the CCAA Parties' restructuring efforts to date and will continue to be pivotal to the CCAA Parties' ability to pursue a successful restructuring going forward, including the Investment Banker's involvement in the completion of the Proposed Transaction;
- c. there is no unwarranted duplication of roles;

- d. the senior secured creditors affected by the charge have been provided with notice of these CCAA Proceedings; and
- e. the Monitor is in support of the proposed Administration Charge.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 188, 190; Application Record, Tab 2.

(C) Directors' Charge

86. The Applicants seek a Directors' Charge in an amount of CAD\$13 over the Charged Property to secure their respective indemnification obligations for liabilities imposed on the Applicants' trustees, directors and officers (the "Directors and Officers"). The Directors' Charge is to be subordinate to the Administration Charge and the DIP Lenders' Charge but in priority to the KERP Charge and the Consent Consideration Charge.

87. Section 11.51 of the CCAA affords the Court the jurisdiction to grant a charge relating to directors' and officers' indemnification on a priority basis:

11.51(1) Security or charge relating to director's indemnification

On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company after the commencement of proceedings under this Act.

11.51(2) Priority

The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditors of the company

11.51(3) Restriction — indemnification insurance

The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.

11.51(4) Negligence, misconduct or fault

The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

CCAA, Section 11.51.

88. The Court has granted director and officer charges pursuant to Section 11.51 in a number of cases. In *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*, the Court outlined the test for granting such a charge:

I have already addressed the issue of notice to affected secured creditors. I must also be satisfied with the amount and that the charge is for obligations and liabilities the directors and officers may incur after the commencement of proceedings. It is not to extend to coverage of wilful misconduct or gross negligence and no order should be granted if adequate insurance at a reasonable cost could be obtained.

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re, supra at paras 46-48; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Canwest Publishing, supra at paras. 56-57; Book of Authorities, Tab 16.

Timminco, supra at paras. 30-36; Book of Authorities, Tab 20.

89. The Applicants submit that the D&O Charge is warranted and necessary, and that it is appropriate in the present circumstances for this Honourable Court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the D&O Charge in the amount of CAD\$13 million, given:

- a. the Directors and Officers of the Applicants may be subject to potential liabilities in connection with these CCAA proceedings with respect to which the Directors and Officers have expressed their desire for certainty with respect to potential personal liability if they continue in their current capacities;
- b. renewal of coverage to protect the Directors and Officers is at a significantly increased cost due to the imminent commencement of these CCAA proceedings;
- c. the Directors' Charge would cover obligations and liabilities that the Directors and Officers, as applicable, may incur after the commencement of these CCAA Proceedings and is not intended to cover wilful misconduct or gross negligence;
- d. the Applicants require the continued support and involvement of their Directors and Officers who have been instrumental in the restructuring efforts of the CCAA Parties to date;
- e. the senior secured creditors affected by the charge have been provided with notice of these CCAA proceedings; and
- f. the Monitor is in support of the proposed Directors' Charge.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 249, 250, 254-257; Application Record, Tab 2.

(D) KERP Charge

90. The Applicants seek a KERP Charge in an amount of CAD\$3 million over the Charged Property to secure the KERP Retention Payments, KERP Transaction Payments and Aurora KERP Payments payable to certain key employees of the CCAA Parties crucial for the CCAA Parties' successful restructuring.

91. The CCAA is silent with respect to the granting of KERP charges. Approval of a KERP and a KERP charge are matters within the discretion of the Court. The Court in *Grant Forest Products Inc., Re* [2009 CarswellOnt 4699 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])] considered a number of factors in determining whether to grant a KERP and a KERP charge, including:

- a. whether the Monitor supports the KERP agreement and charge (to which great weight was attributed);
- b. whether the employees to which the KERP applies would consider other employment options if the KERP agreement were not secured by the KERP charge;
- c. whether the continued employment of the employees to which the KERP applies is important for the stability of the business and to enhance the effectiveness of the marketing process;
- d. the employees' history with and knowledge of the debtor;
- e. the difficulty in finding a replacement to fulfill the responsibilities of the employees to which the KERP applies;
- f. whether the KERP agreement and charge were approved by the board of directors, including the independent directors, as the business judgment of the board should not be ignored;
- g. whether the KERP agreement and charge are supported or consented to by secured creditors of the debtor; and
- h. whether the payments under the KERP are payable upon the completion of the restructuring process.

Grant Forest Products Inc., Re, 57 C.B.R. (5th) 128 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 8-24 [*Grant Forest*]; Book of Authorities, Tab 21.

Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re supra, at paras 59; Book of Authorities, Tab 16.

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re supra, at para. 49; Book of Authorities, Tab 1.

Timminco Ltd., Re (2012), 95 C.C.P.B. 48 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 72-75; Book of Authorities, Tab 22.

92. The purpose of a KERP arrangement is to retain key personnel for the duration of the debtor's restructuring process and it is logical for compensation under a KERP arrangement to be deferred until after the restructuring process has been completed, with "staged bonuses" being acceptable. KERP arrangements that do not defer retention payments to completion of the restructuring may also be just and fair in the circumstances.

Grant Forest Products Inc., Re, supra at para. 22-23; Book of Authorities, Tab 21.

93. The Applicants submit that the KERP Charge is warranted and necessary, and that it is appropriate in the present circumstances for this Honourable Court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the KERP Charge in the amount of CAD\$3 million, given:

- a. the KERP was developed by Cinram with the principal purpose of providing an incentive to the Eligible Employees, the Eligible Officers, and the Aurora Employees to remain with the Cinram Group while the company pursued its restructuring efforts;
- b. the Eligible Employees and the Eligible Officers are essential for a restructuring of the Cinram Group and the preservation of Cinram's value during the restructuring process;
- c. the Aurora Employees are essential for an orderly transition of Cinram Distribution's business operations from the Aurora facility to its Nashville facility;
- d. it would be detrimental to the restructuring process if Cinram were required to find replacements for the Eligible Employees, the Eligible Officers and/or the Aurora Employees during this critical period;
- e. the KERP, including the KERP Retention Payments, the KERP Transaction Payments and the Aurora KERP Payments payable thereunder, not only provides appropriate incentives for the Eligible Employees, the Eligible Officers and the Aurora Employees to remain in their current positions, but also ensures that they are properly compensated for their assistance in Cinram's restructuring process;
- f. the senior secured creditors affected by the charge have been provided with notice of these CCAA proceedings; and
- g. the KERP has been reviewed and approved by the board of trustees of Cinram Fund and is supported by the Monitor.

Bell Affidavit, paras. 236-239, 245-247; Application Record, Tab 2.

(E) Consent Consideration Charge

94. The Applicants request the Consent Consideration Charge over the Charged Property to secure the Early Consent Consideration. The Consent Consideration Charge is to be subordinate in priority to the Administration Charge, the DIP Lenders' Charge, the Directors' Charge and the KERP Charge.

95. The Courts have permitted the opportunity to receive consideration for early consent to a restructuring transaction in the context of CCAA proceedings payable upon implementation of such restructuring transaction. In *Sino-Forest Corp., Re*, the Court ordered that any noteholder wishing to become a consenting noteholder under the support agreement and entitled to early consent consideration was required to execute a joinder agreement to the support agreement prior to the applicable consent deadline. Similarly, in these proceedings, lenders under the First Lien Credit Agreement who execute the Support Agreement

(or a joinder thereto) and thereby agree to support the Proposed Transaction on or before July 10, 2012, are entitled to Early Consent Consideration earned on consummation of the Proposed Transaction to be paid from the net sale proceeds.

Sino-Forest Corp., Re, supra, Initial Order granted on March 30, 2012, Court File No. CV-12-9667-00CL at para. 15; Book of Authorities, Tab 23. Bell Affidavit, para. 176; Application Record, Tab 2.

96. The Applicants submit it is appropriate in the present circumstances for this Honourable Court to exercise its jurisdiction and grant the Consent Consideration Charge, given:

- a. the Proposed Transaction will enable the Cinram Business to continue as a going concern and return to a market leader in the industry;
- b. Consenting Lenders are only entitled to the Early Consent Consideration if the Proposed Transaction is consummated; and
- c. the Early Consent Consideration is to be paid from the net sale proceeds upon distribution of same in these proceedings.

Bell Affidavit, para. 176; Application Record, Tab 2.

Application granted.

Tab 10

2009 CarswellOnt 4467
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Nortel Networks Corp., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 4467, [2009] O.J. No. 3169, 179 A.C.W.S. (3d) 265, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 229

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF
NORTEL NETWORKS CORPORATION, NORTEL NETWORKS LIMITED, NORTEL
NETWORKS GLOBAL CORPORATION, NORTEL NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL
CORPORATION AND NORTEL NETWORKS TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION (Applicants)

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

Morawetz J.

Heard: June 29, 2009

Written reasons: July 23, 2009

Docket: 09-CL-7950

Counsel: Derrick Tay, Jennifer Stam for Nortel Networks Corporation, et al

Lyndon Barnes, Adam Hirsh for Board of Directors of Nortel Networks Corporation, Nortel Networks Limited

J. Carfagnini, J. Pasquariello for Monitor, Ernst & Young Inc.

M. Starnino for Superintendent of Financial Services, Administrator of PBGF

S. Philpott for Former Employees

K. Zych for Noteholders

Pamela Huff, Craig Thorburn for MatlinPatterson Global Advisors LLC, MatlinPatterson Global Opportunities Partners III L.P.,
Matlin Patterson Opportunities Partners (Cayman) III L.P.

David Ward for UK Pension Protection Fund

Leanne Williams for Flextronics Inc.

Alex MacFarlane for Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors

Arthur O. Jacques, Tom McRae for Felske & Sylvain (de facto Continuing Employees' Committee)

Robin B. Schwill, Matthew P. Gottlieb for Nortel Networks UK Limited

A. Kauffman for Export Development Canada

D. Ullman for Verizon Communications Inc.

G. Benchetrit for IBM

Subject: Insolvency; Estates and Trusts

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIV](#) Administration of estate

[XIV.6](#) Sale of assets

[XIV.6.f](#) Jurisdiction of court to approve sale

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[XIX](#) Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

[XIX.1](#) General principles

[XIX.1.e Jurisdiction](#)[XIX.1.e.i Court](#)**Headnote**

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Proposal — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Miscellaneous issues

Telecommunication company entered protection under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("Act") — Company decided to pursue "going concern" sales for various business units — Company entered into sale agreement with respect to assets in Code Division Multiple Access business and Long-Term Evolution Access assets — Company was pursuing sale of its other business units — Company brought motion for approval of bidding procedures and asset sale agreement — Motion granted — Court has jurisdiction to authorize sales process under Act in absence of formal plan of compromise or arrangement and creditor vote — Sale by company which preserved its business as going concern was consistent with objectives of Act — Unless sale was undertaken at this time, long-term viability of business would be in jeopardy.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Administration of estate — Sale of assets — Jurisdiction of court to approve sale

Telecommunication company entered protection under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("Act") — Company decided to pursue "going concern" sales for various business units — Company entered into sale agreement with respect to assets in Code Division Multiple Access business and Long-Term Evolution Access assets — Company was pursuing sale of its other business units — Company brought motion for approval of bidding procedures and asset sale agreement — Motion granted — Court has jurisdiction to authorize sales process under Act in absence of formal plan of compromise or arrangement and creditor vote — Sale by company which preserved its business as going concern was consistent with objectives of Act — Unless sale was undertaken at this time, long-term viability of business would be in jeopardy.

Table of Authorities**Cases considered by *Morawetz J.*:**

Asset Engineering LP v. Forest & Marine Financial Ltd. Partnership (2009), 2009 BCCA 319, 2009 CarswellBC 1738 (B.C. C.A.) — followed

ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (2008), 2008 ONCA 587, 2008 CarswellOnt 4811, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 240 O.A.C. 245, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 296 D.L.R. (4th) 135, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re*) 92 O.R. (3d) 513, 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163, 47 B.L.R. (4th) 123 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp. (2008), 2008 CarswellOnt 5432, 2008 CarswellOnt 5433 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Boutiques San Francisco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellQue 10918, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 189 (C.S. Que.) — referred to
Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re (2007), 2007 CarswellAlta 1050, 2007 ABQB 504, 35 C.B.R. (5th) 1, 415 A.R. 196, 33 B.L.R. (4th) 68 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re (1998), 1998 CarswellOnt 3346, 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299, 72 O.T.C. 99 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered

Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. v. Hard-Rock Paving Co. (2008), 2008 CarswellOnt 4046, 45 C.B.R. (5th) 87 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fiskard Capital Corp. (2008), 2008 BCCA 327, 2008 CarswellBC 1758, 83 B.C.L.R. (4th) 214, 296 D.L.R. (4th) 577, 434 W.A.C. 187, 258 B.C.A.C. 187, 46 C.B.R. (5th) 7, [2008] 10 W.W.R. 575 (B.C. C.A.) — distinguished

Consumers Packaging Inc., Re (2001), 150 O.A.C. 384, 27 C.B.R. (4th) 197, 2001 CarswellOnt 3482, 12 C.P.C. (5th) 208 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

PSINET Ltd., Re (2001), 28 C.B.R. (4th) 95, 2001 CarswellOnt 3405 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Residential Warranty Co. of Canada Inc., Re (2006), 2006 ABQB 236, 2006 CarswellAlta 383, (sub nom. *Residential Warranty Co. of Canada Inc. (Bankrupt), Re*) 393 A.R. 340, 62 Alta. L.R. (4th) 168, 21 C.B.R. (5th) 57 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp. (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 83 D.L.R. (4th) 76, 46 O.A.C. 321, 4 O.R. (3d) 1, 1991 CarswellOnt 205 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 4084, 6 C.B.R. (5th) 316 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to
Tiger Brand Knitting Co., Re (2005), 2005 CarswellOnt 1240, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 315 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to
Winnipeg Motor Express Inc., Re (2008), 2008 CarswellMan 560, 2008 MBQB 297, 49 C.B.R. (5th) 302 (Man. Q.B.)
— referred to

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C.

s. 363 — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — referred to

s. 11(4) — considered

MOTION by company for approval of bidding procedures for sale of business and asset sale agreement.

Morawetz J.:

Introduction

1 On June 29, 2009, I granted the motion of the Applicants and approved the bidding procedures (the "Bidding Procedures") described in the affidavit of Mr. Riedel sworn June 23, 2009 (the "Riedel Affidavit") and the Fourteenth Report of Ernst & Young, Inc., in its capacity as Monitor (the "Monitor") (the "Fourteenth Report"). The order was granted immediately after His Honour Judge Gross of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware (the "U.S. Court") approved the Bidding Procedures in the Chapter 11 proceedings.

2 I also approved the Asset Sale Agreement dated as of June 19, 2009 (the "Sale Agreement") among Nokia Siemens Networks B.V. ("Nokia Siemens Networks" or the "Purchaser"), as buyer, and Nortel Networks Corporation ("NNC"), Nortel Networks Limited ("NNL"), Nortel Networks, Inc. ("NNI") and certain of their affiliates, as vendors (collectively the "Sellers") in the form attached as Appendix "A" to the Fourteenth Report and I also approved and accepted the Sale Agreement for the purposes of conducting the "stalking horse" bidding process in accordance with the Bidding Procedures including, the Break-Up Fee and the Expense Reimbursement (as both terms are defined in the Sale Agreement).

3 An order was also granted sealing confidential Appendix "B" to the Fourteenth Report containing the schedules and exhibits to the Sale Agreement pending further order of this court.

4 The following are my reasons for granting these orders.

5 The hearing on June 29, 2009 (the "Joint Hearing") was conducted by way of video conference with a similar motion being heard by the U.S. Court. His Honor Judge Gross presided over the hearing in the U.S. Court. The Joint Hearing was conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Cross-Border Protocol, which had previously been approved by both the U.S. Court and this court.

6 The Sale Agreement relates to the Code Division Multiple Access ("CDMA") business Long-Term Evolution ("LTE") Access assets.

7 The Sale Agreement is not insignificant. The Monitor reports that revenues from CDMA comprised over 21% of Nortel's 2008 revenue. The CDMA business employs approximately 3,100 people (approximately 500 in Canada) and the LTE business employs approximately 1,000 people (approximately 500 in Canada). The purchase price under the Sale Agreement is \$650 million.

Background

8 The Applicants were granted CCAA protection on January 14, 2009. Insolvency proceedings have also been commenced in the United States, the United Kingdom, Israel and France.

9 At the time the proceedings were commenced, Nortel's business operated through 143 subsidiaries, with approximately 30,000 employees globally. As of January 2009, Nortel employed approximately 6,000 people in Canada alone.

10 The stated purpose of Nortel's filing under the CCAA was to stabilize the Nortel business to maximize the chances of preserving all or a portion of the enterprise. The Monitor reported that a thorough strategic review of the company's assets and operations would have to be undertaken in consultation with various stakeholder groups.

11 In April 2009, the Monitor updated the court and noted that various restructuring alternatives were being considered.

12 On June 19, 2009, Nortel announced that it had entered into the Sale Agreement with respect to its assets in its CMDA business and LTE Access assets (collectively, the "Business") and that it was pursuing the sale of its other business units. Mr. Riedel in his affidavit states that Nortel has spent many months considering various restructuring alternatives before determining in its business judgment to pursue "going concern" sales for Nortel's various business units.

13 In deciding to pursue specific sales processes, Mr. Riedel also stated that Nortel's management considered:

(a) the impact of the filings on Nortel's various businesses, including deterioration in sales; and

(b) the best way to maximize the value of its operations, to preserve jobs and to continue businesses in Canada and the U.S.

14 Mr. Riedel notes that while the Business possesses significant value, Nortel was faced with the reality that:

(a) the Business operates in a highly competitive environment;

(b) full value cannot be realized by continuing to operate the Business through a restructuring; and

(c) in the absence of continued investment, the long-term viability of the Business would be put into jeopardy.

15 Mr. Riedel concluded that the proposed process for the sale of the Business pursuant to an auction process provided the best way to preserve the Business as a going concern and to maximize value and preserve the jobs of Nortel employees.

16 In addition to the assets covered by the Sale Agreement, certain liabilities are to be assumed by the Purchaser. This issue is covered in a comprehensive manner at paragraph 34 of the Fourteenth Report. Certain liabilities to employees are included on this list. The assumption of these liabilities is consistent with the provisions of the Sale Agreement that requires the Purchaser to extend written offers of employment to at least 2,500 employees in the Business.

17 The Monitor also reports that given that certain of the U.S. Debtors are parties to the Sale Agreement and given the desire to maximize value for the benefit of stakeholders, Nortel determined and it has agreed with the Purchaser that the Sale Agreement is subject to higher or better offers being obtained pursuant to a sale process under s. 363 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code and that the Sale Agreement shall serve as a "stalking horse" bid pursuant to that process.

18 The Bidding Procedures provide that all bids must be received by the Seller by no later than July 21, 2009 and that the Sellers will conduct an auction of the purchased assets on July 24, 2009. It is anticipated that Nortel will ultimately seek a final sales order from the U.S. Court on or about July 28, 2009 and an approval and vesting order from this court in respect of the Sale Agreement and purchased assets on or about July 30, 2009.

19 The Monitor recognizes the expeditious nature of the sale process but the Monitor has been advised that given the nature of the Business and the consolidation occurring in the global market, there are likely to be a limited number of parties interested in acquiring the Business.

20 The Monitor also reports that Nortel has consulted with, among others, the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the "UCC") and the bondholder group regarding the Bidding Procedures and is of the view that both are supportive of the timing of this sale process. (It is noted that the UCC did file a limited objection to the motion relating to certain aspects of the Bidding Procedures.)

21 Given the sale efforts made to date by Nortel, the Monitor supports the sale process outlined in the Fourteenth Report and more particularly described in the Bidding Procedures.

22 Objections to the motion were filed in the U.S. Court and this court by MatlinPatterson Global Advisors LLC, MatlinPatterson Global Opportunities Partners III L.P. and Matlin Patterson Opportunities Partners (Cayman) III L.P. (collectively, "MatlinPatterson") as well the UCC.

23 The objections were considered in the hearing before Judge Gross and, with certain limited exceptions, the objections were overruled.

Issues and Discussion

24 The threshold issue being raised on this motion by the Applicants is whether the CCAA affords this court the jurisdiction to approve a sales process in the absence of a formal plan of compromise or arrangement and a creditor vote. If the question is answered in the affirmative, the secondary issue is whether this sale should authorize the Applicants to sell the Business.

25 The Applicants submit that it is well established in the jurisprudence that this court has the jurisdiction under the CCAA to approve the sales process and that the requested order should be granted in these circumstances.

26 Counsel to the Applicants submitted a detailed factum which covered both issues.

27 Counsel to the Applicants submits that one of the purposes of the CCAA is to preserve the going concern value of debtors companies and that the court's jurisdiction extends to authorizing sale of the debtor's business, even in the absence of a plan or creditor vote.

28 The CCAA is a flexible statute and it is particularly useful in complex insolvency cases in which the court is required to balance numerous constituents and a myriad of interests.

29 The CCAA has been described as "skeletal in nature". It has also been described as a "sketch, an outline, a supporting framework for the resolution of corporate insolvencies in the public interest". *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163 (Ont. C.A.) at paras. 44, 61, leave to appeal refused [2008] S.C.C.A. No. 337 (S.C.C.). ("ATB Financial").

30 The jurisprudence has identified as sources of the court's discretionary jurisdiction, *inter alia*:

(a) the power of the court to impose terms and conditions on the granting of a stay under s. 11(4) of the CCAA;

(b) the specific provision of s. 11(4) of the CCAA which provides that the court may make an order "on such terms as it may impose"; and

(c) the inherent jurisdiction of the court to "fill in the gaps" of the CCAA in order to give effect to its objects. *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at para. 43; *PSINET Ltd., Re* (2001), 28 C.B.R. (4th) 95 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 5, *ATB Financial*, *supra*, at paras. 43-52.

31 However, counsel to the Applicants acknowledges that the discretionary authority of the court under s. 11 must be informed by the purpose of the CCAA.

Its exercise must be guided by the scheme and object of the Act and by the legal principles that govern corporate law issues. *Re Stelco Inc.* (2005), 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 44.

32 In support of the court's jurisdiction to grant the order sought in this case, counsel to the Applicants submits that Nortel seeks to invoke the "overarching policy" of the CCAA, namely, to preserve the going concern. *Residential Warranty Co. of Canada Inc., Re* (2006), 21 C.B.R. (5th) 57 (Alta. Q.B.) at para. 78.

33 Counsel to the Applicants further submits that CCAA courts have repeatedly noted that the purpose of the CCAA is to preserve the benefit of a going concern business for all stakeholders, or "the whole economic community":

The purpose of the CCAA is to facilitate arrangements that might avoid liquidation of the company and allow it to continue in business to the benefit of the whole economic community, including the shareholders, the creditors (both secured and unsecured) and the employees. *Citibank Canada v. Chase Manhattan Bank of Canada* (1991), 5 C.B.R. (3rd) 167 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 29. *Re Consumers Packaging Inc.* (2001) 27 C.B.R. (4th) 197 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 5.

34 Counsel to the Applicants further submits that the CCAA should be given a broad and liberal interpretation to facilitate its underlying purpose, including the preservation of the going concern for the benefit of all stakeholders and further that it should not matter whether the business continues as a going concern under the debtor's stewardship or under new ownership, for as long as the business continues as a going concern, a primary goal of the CCAA will be met.

35 Counsel to the Applicants makes reference to a number of cases where courts in Ontario, in appropriate cases, have exercised their jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets, even in the absence of a plan of arrangement being tendered to stakeholders for a vote. In doing so, counsel to the Applicants submits that the courts have repeatedly recognized that they have jurisdiction under the CCAA to approve asset sales in the absence of a plan of arrangement, where such sale is in the best interests of stakeholders generally. *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re, supra, Re PSINet, supra, Consumers Packaging Inc., Re* [2001 CarswellOnt 3482 (Ont. C.A.)], *supra, Stelco Inc., Re* (2004), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 316 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 1, *Tiger Brand Knitting Co., Re* (2005), 9 C.B.R. (5th) 315 (Ont. S.C.J.), *Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. v. Hard-Rock Paving Co.* (2008), 45 C.B.R. (5th) 87 (Ont. S.C.J.) and *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

36 In *Re Consumers Packaging, supra*, the Court of Appeal for Ontario specifically held that a sale of a business as a going concern during a CCAA proceeding is consistent with the purposes of the CCAA:

The sale of Consumers' Canadian glass operations as a going concern pursuant to the Owens-Illinois bid allows the preservation of Consumers' business (albeit under new ownership), and is therefore consistent with the purposes of the CCAA.

...we cannot refrain from commenting that Farley J.'s decision to approve the Owens-Illinois bid is consistent with previous decisions in Ontario and elsewhere that have emphasized the broad remedial purpose of flexibility of the CCAA and have approved the sale and disposition of assets during CCAA proceedings prior to a formal plan being tendered. *Re Consumers Packaging, supra, at paras. 5, 9.*

37 Similarly, in *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re, supra*, Blair J. (as he then was) expressly affirmed the court's jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets in the course of a CCAA proceeding before a plan of arrangement had been approved by creditors. *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re, supra*, at paras. 43, 45.

38 Similarly, in *PSINet Limited, supra*, the court approved a going concern sale in a CCAA proceeding where no plan was presented to creditors and a substantial portion of the debtor's Canadian assets were to be sold. Farley J. noted as follows:

[If the sale was not approved,] there would be a liquidation scenario ensuing which would realize far less than this going concern sale (which appears to me to have involved a transparent process with appropriate exposure designed to maximize the proceeds), thus impacting upon the rest of the creditors, especially as to the unsecured, together with the material enlarging of the unsecured claims by the disruption claims of approximately 8,600 customers (who will be materially disadvantaged by an interrupted transition) plus the job losses for approximately 200 employees. *Re PSINet Limited, supra*, at para. 3.

39 In *Re Stelco Inc., supra*, in 2004, Farley J. again addressed the issue of the feasibility of selling the operations as a going concern:

I would observe that usually it is the creditor side which wishes to terminate CCAA proceedings and that when the creditors threaten to take action, there is a realization that a liquidation scenario will not only have a negative effect upon a CCAA applicant, but also upon its workforce. Hence, the CCAA may be employed to provide stability during a period of necessary financial and operational restructuring - and if a restructuring of the "old company" is not feasible, then there is the exploration of the feasibility of the sale of the operations/enterprise as a going concern (with continued employment) in whole or in part. *Re Stelco Inc, supra*, at para. 1.

40 I accept these submissions as being general statements of the law in Ontario. The value of equity in an insolvent debtor is dubious, at best, and, in my view, it follows that the determining factor should not be whether the business continues under the debtor's stewardship or under a structure that recognizes a new equity structure. An equally important factor to consider is whether the case can be made to continue the business as a going concern.

41 Counsel to the Applicants also referred to decisions from the courts in Quebec, Manitoba and Alberta which have similarly recognized the court's jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets during the course of a CCAA proceeding. *Boutiques San Francisco Inc., Re* (2004), 7 C.B.R. (5th) 189 (C.S. Que.), *Winnipeg Motor Express Inc., Re* (2008), 49 C.B.R. (5th) 302 (Man. Q.B.) at paras. 41, 44, and *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re* (2007), 35 C.B.R. (5th) 1 (Alta. Q.B.) at para. 75.

42 Counsel to the Applicants also directed the court's attention to a recent decision of the British Columbia Court of Appeal which questioned whether the court should authorize the sale of substantially all of the debtor's assets where the debtor's plan "will simply propose that the net proceeds from the sale...be distributed to its creditors". In *Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp.* (2008), 46 C.B.R. (5th) 7 (B.C. C.A.) ("*Cliffs Over Maple Bay*"), the court was faced with a debtor who had no active business but who nonetheless sought to stave off its secured creditor indefinitely. The case did not involve any type of sale transaction but the Court of Appeal questioned whether a court should authorize the sale under the CCAA without requiring the matter to be voted upon by creditors.

43 In addressing this matter, it appears to me that the British Columbia Court of Appeal focussed on whether the court should grant the requested relief and not on the question of whether a CCAA court has the jurisdiction to grant the requested relief.

44 I do not disagree with the decision in *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*. However, it involved a situation where the debtor had no active business and did not have the support of its stakeholders. That is not the case with these Applicants.

45 The *Cliffs Over Maple Bay* decision has recently been the subject of further comment by the British Columbia Court of Appeal in *Asset Engineering LP v. Forest & Marine Financial Ltd. Partnership*, 2009 BCCA 319 (B.C. C.A.).

46 At paragraphs 24 - 26 of the *Forest and Marine* decision, Newbury J.A. stated:

24. In *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*, the debtor company was a real estate developer whose one project had failed. The company had been dormant for some time. It applied for CCAA protection but described its proposal for restructuring in vague terms that amounted essentially to a plan to "secure sufficient funds" to complete the stalled project (Para. 34). This court, per Tysoe J.A., ruled that although the Act can apply to single-project companies, its purposes are unlikely to be engaged in such instances, since mortgage priorities are fully straight forward and there will be little incentive for

senior secured creditors to compromise their interests (Para. 36). Further, the Court stated, the granting of a stay under s. 11 is "not a free standing remedy that the court may grant whenever an insolvent company wishes to undertake a "restructuring" ...Rather, s. 11 is ancillary to the fundamental purpose of the CCAA, and a stay of proceedings freezing the rights of creditors should only be granted in furtherance of the CCAA's fundamental purpose". That purpose has been described in *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank* (1984) 11 D.L.R. (4th) 576 (Alta. Q.B.):

The legislation is intended to have wide scope and allow a judge to make orders which will effectively maintain the status quo for a period while the insolvent company attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for a proposed arrangement which will enable the company to remain in operation for what is, hopefully, the future benefit of both the company and its creditors. [at 580]

25. The Court was not satisfied in *Cliffs Over Maple Bay* that the "restructuring" contemplated by the debtor would do anything other than distribute the net proceeds from the sale, winding up or liquidation of its business. The debtor had no intention of proposing a plan of arrangement, and its business would not continue following the execution of its proposal - thus it could not be said the purposes of the statute would be engaged...

26. In my view, however, the case at bar is quite different from *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*. Here, the main debtor, the Partnership, is at the centre of a complicated corporate group and carries on an active financing business that it hopes to save notwithstanding the current economic cycle. (The business itself which fills a "niche" in the market, has been carried on in one form or another since 1983.) The CCAA is appropriate for situations such as this where it is unknown whether the "restructuring" will ultimately take the form of a refinancing or will involve a reorganization of the corporate entity or entities and a true compromise of the rights of one or more parties. The "fundamental purpose" of the Act - to preserve the *status quo* while the debtor prepares a plan that will enable it to remain in business to the benefit of all concerned - will be furthered by granting a stay so that the means contemplated by the Act - a compromise or arrangement - can be developed, negotiated and voted on if necessary...

47 It seems to me that the foregoing views expressed in *Forest and Marine* are not inconsistent with the views previously expressed by the courts in Ontario. The CCAA is intended to be flexible and must be given a broad and liberal interpretation to achieve its objectives and a sale by the debtor which preserves its business as a going concern is, in my view, consistent with those objectives.

48 I therefore conclude that the court does have the jurisdiction to authorize a sale under the CCAA in the absence of a plan.

49 I now turn to a consideration of whether it is appropriate, in this case, to approve this sales process. Counsel to the Applicants submits that the court should consider the following factors in determining whether to authorize a sale under the CCAA in the absence of a plan:

- (a) is a sale transaction warranted at this time?
- (b) will the sale benefit the whole "economic community"?
- (c) do any of the debtors' creditors have a *bona fide* reason to object to a sale of the business?
- (d) is there a better viable alternative?

I accept this submission.

50 It is the position of the Applicants that Nortel's proposed sale of the Business should be approved as this decision is to the benefit of stakeholders and no creditor is prejudiced. Further, counsel submits that in the absence of a sale, the prospects for the Business are a loss of competitiveness, a loss of value and a loss of jobs.

51 Counsel to the Applicants summarized the facts in support of the argument that the Sale Transaction should be approved, namely:

- (a) Nortel has been working diligently for many months on a plan to reorganize its business;
- (b) in the exercise of its business judgment, Nortel has concluded that it cannot continue to operate the Business successfully within the CCAA framework;
- (c) unless a sale is undertaken at this time, the long-term viability of the Business will be in jeopardy;
- (d) the Sale Agreement continues the Business as a going concern, will save at least 2,500 jobs and constitutes the best and most valuable proposal for the Business;
- (e) the auction process will serve to ensure Nortel receives the highest possible value for the Business;
- (f) the sale of the Business at this time is in the best interests of Nortel and its stakeholders; and
- (g) the value of the Business is likely to decline over time.

52 The objections of MatlinPatterson and the UCC have been considered. I am satisfied that the issues raised in these objections have been addressed in a satisfactory manner by the ruling of Judge Gross and no useful purpose would be served by adding additional comment.

53 Counsel to the Applicants also emphasize that Nortel will return to court to seek approval of the most favourable transaction to emerge from the auction process and will aim to satisfy the elements established by the court for approval as set out in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 16.

Disposition

54 The Applicants are part of a complicated corporate group. They carry on an active international business. I have accepted that an important factor to consider in a CCAA process is whether the case can be made to continue the business as a going concern. I am satisfied having considered the factors referenced at [49], as well as the facts summarized at [51], that the Applicants have met this test. I am therefore satisfied that this motion should be granted.

55 Accordingly, I approve the Bidding Procedures as described in the Riedel Affidavit and the Fourteenth Report of the Monitor, which procedures have been approved by the U.S. Court.

56 I am also satisfied that the Sale Agreement should be approved and further that the Sale Agreement be approved and accepted for the purposes of conducting the "stalking horse" bidding process in accordance with the Bidding Procedures including, without limitation the Break-Up Fee and the Expense Reimbursement (as both terms are defined in the Sale Agreement).

57 Further, I have also been satisfied that Appendix B to the Fourteenth Report contains information which is commercially sensitive, the dissemination of which could be detrimental to the stakeholders and, accordingly, I order that this document be sealed, pending further order of the court.

58 In approving the Bidding Procedures, I have also taken into account that the auction will be conducted prior to the sale approval motion. This process is consistent with the practice of this court.

59 Finally, it is the expectation of this court that the Monitor will continue to review ongoing issues in respect of the Bidding Procedures. The Bidding Procedures permit the Applicants to waive certain components of qualified bids without the consent of the UCC, the bondholder group and the Monitor. However, it is the expectation of this court that, if this situation arises, the Applicants will provide advance notice to the Monitor of its intention to do so.

Motion granted.

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF **AGMEDICA BIOSCIENCE INC., 2472602 ONTARIO INC., 2642466 ONTARIO INC., 8895309 CANADA INC., WELLWORTH HEALTH CORP., 8050678 CANADA INC., 8326851 CANADA INC., TAVIVAT NATURALS INC., WORLDWIDE BEVERAGE INNOVATIONS INC., UNIQUE BEVERAGES (USA) INC., and ESEELA INC.**

Court File No.: 19-V-00632052-00CL

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

Proceedings commenced at Toronto

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES

Thornton Grout Finnigan LLP

100 Wellington Street West

Suite 3200

TD West Tower, Toronto-Dominion Centre

Toronto, ON M5K 1K7

Rebecca L. Kennedy (LSO# 61146S)

Email: rkennedy@tgf.ca

Owen Gaffney (LSO# 75017B)

Email: ogaffney@tgf.ca

Adam Driedger (LSO# 77296F)

Email: adriedger@tgf.ca

Tel: 416-304-1616

Fax: 416-304-1313

Lawyers for the Applicants