CITATION: Laurentian University of Sudbury, 2021 ONSC 659
COURT FILE NO.: CV-21-656040-00CL
DATE: 2021-02-01

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO

RE: **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 LAURENTIAN UNIVERSITY OF SUDBURY

BEFORE: Chief Justice G.B. Morawetz

COUNSEL: *D.J. Miller*, *Mitch W. Grossell*, *Andrew Hanrahan* and *Derek Harland*, for the Applicant

Ashley John Taylor and *Elizabeth Pillon*, for the Monitor

Peter J. Osborne, for the Board of Governors

Natasha MacParland, Lender Counsel to the Applicant

Pamela L.J. Huff and *Aryo Shalviri*, for Royal Bank of Canada

Stuart Brotman and *Dylan Chochla*, for Toronto Dominion Bank

Martin R. Kaplan and *Vern W. DaRe*, for Firm Capital Mortgage Fund Inc., DIP Lender

Michael Kennedy, Labour Counsel for the Applicant

George Benchetrit, for Bank of Montreal

HEARD: February 1, 2021

ENDORSEMENT

Introduction

[1] Laurentian University of Sudbury ("LU" or the "Applicant") seeks certain relief pursuant to an order (the "Initial Order") under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (the "CCAA").[1]

[2] LU is a publicly funded, bilingual and tricultural postsecondary institution in Sudbury, Ontario. Since inception, LU has provided higher education to the community of Sudbury and Northern Ontario at large and is an integral part of the economic fabric of the Northern Ontario community.

[3] As a result of many years of recurring operational deficits in the millions of dollars, and notwithstanding LU's recent efforts to improve its financial stability, LU is experiencing a liquidity crisis and is insolvent.

[4] LU submits that it requires the protection of the Court and the relief available under the CCAA so that it can financially and operationally restructure itself in order to emerge as a financially sustainable university for the benefit of all its stakeholders.

[5] The facts with respect to this application are briefly summarized below and more fully set out in the Affidavit of Dr. Robert Haché sworn January 30, 2021, filed in support of this application (the "Haché Affidavit").[2]

[6] For the following reasons, the Interim Order is granted.

Overview of the Applicant

[7] LU is a non-share capital corporation that was incorporated pursuant to *An Act to Incorporate Laurentian University of Sudbury,* S.O. 1960, c. 151, as amended by S.O. 1961-62, c. 154 (the "LU Act") and is a registered charity pursuant to the *Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 1 (5th Supp.).

[8] The governance structure of LU is bicameral. The Board of Governors (the "Board"), the President, and the Vice-Chancellor generally have powers over the operational and financial management of LU, whereas the Senate of LU (the "Senate") is responsible for the academic policy of LU.

[9] LU primarily focuses on undergraduate programming, with approximately 8,200 total domestic and international undergraduate students (approximately 6,250 full-time equivalents) enrolled in the 2020-21 academic year. LU has five undergraduate faculties, each of which offer

---

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

[2] Capitalized terms used herein but not otherwise defined have the meanings ascribed to them in the Haché Affidavit. All references to currency in this factum are to Canadian dollars, unless otherwise noted.

programs in both English and French, and students can choose from 132 undergraduate programs to enroll in.

[10] LU also has a graduate program, with approximately 1,098 total domestic and international graduate students enrolled during the 2020-21 academic year. LU offers 43 Masters and PhD programs in a variety of disciplines.

[11] LU has a federated school structure whereby it has formal affiliations with several independent universities under the overall LU umbrella: the University of Sudbury, the University of Thorneloe, and Huntington University. The Federated Universities are integrated into LU, however, each of the Federated Universities are separate legal entities and are governed by Boards that are independent of LU.

[12] LU is one of the largest employers in the Greater Sudbury area. As at December 30, 2020, LU employed approximately 1,751 people, of which approximately 758 are full-time employees. Total salaries and benefits represent the single largest expense item for LU on an annual basis (approximately $134 million of $201 million in total expenses during fiscal year 2019-20).

[13] Approximately 612 LU employees are represented by the Laurentian University Faculty Association ("LUFA"). Approximately 268 non-faculty staff are represented by the Laurentian University Staff Union ("LUSU").

[14] LUFA and the Board of LU are parties to a Collective Agreement (the "LUFA CA"), with a three-year term that expired on June 30, 2020.

[15] Since April 2020, LU and LUFA have been engaged in bargaining with respect to a new collective bargaining agreement.

[16] On July 1, 2018, LUSU and LU entered into a Collective Agreement that was set to expire on June 30, 2021 (the "LUSU CA").

Assets and Liabilities

[17] LU does not prepare interim financial statements. The most recent audited statements for the year ended April 30, 2020, are attached to the Haché Affidavit.

[18] As at April 30, 2020, LU had assets with a book value totaling approximately $358 million, of which approximately $33 million is comprised of current assets such as cash and short-term investments, accounts receivable, and other current assets. The remaining assets of LU consist primarily of investments in LU's segregated endowment fund ($53 million) and capital assets ($272 million), comprising LU's land and buildings.

[19] As at April 30, 2020, LU had liabilities with a book value totaling approximately $322 million, comprised of: (i) approximately $43 million of current liabilities; (ii) approximately $168 million of deferred contributions; and (iii) approximately $110 million in long-term liabilities.

LU's Liquidity Crisis and Insolvency

[20] LU has experienced recurring operational deficits in the millions of dollars each year for a significant period of time. These operational deficits have led to the accumulated deficit in the operational fund of LU of approximately $20 million at the end of 2019-20 fiscal year. In the current 2020-21 fiscal year, LU projects a further operational deficit of $5.6 million.

[21] LU takes the position that it is insolvent and absent the relief sought in the Initial Order, will run out of cash to meet payroll in February.

[22] LU advises that it has a number of structural issues that are causing financial challenges and that need to be resolved to ensure long-term stability, including:

(a) The terms of the LUFA CA are above market in several respects, and that issue is exacerbated by the tenuous labour relationship between LU and LUFA;

(b) Operationally, the structure of the academic programming offered by LU and the distribution of enrollment among the programs offered is flawed and must be addressed; and

(c) With its current cost structure, it costs more for LU and the Federated Universities to educate each student than the average for all Ontario universities by approximately $2,000 per student, per year.

[23] LU submits that the financial challenges that LU faces are significant and, absent fundamental change, LU's short-term and long-term financial and operational sustainability are at risk.

Objective of CCAA Filing

[24] As part of its restructuring strategy, LU intends to implement long-term financial stability initiatives including, among other things:

(a) A review of the breadth of academic programs offered at LU and their enrollment levels;

(b) A re-evaluation of the Federated Universities model;

(c) Negotiations with LU's unions regarding what LU must look like in the future and ensuring that a restructured LU can be aligned with collective agreements that will facilitate its future sustainability;

(d) Identification of opportunities for future revenue generation;

(e) Refinement of the student experience at LU to continue providing a top-notch education; and

(f) Consideration of options for addressing current and long-term indebtedness.

Law and Analysis

[25] The CCAA applies to a "debtor company" whose liabilities exceed $5 million. A "debtor company" is defined, *inter alia*, as a "company" that is "insolvent" or that has committed an act of bankruptcy within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.[3]

[26] The CCAA defines "company" to include, among other things, a company incorporated by or under an Act of the legislature of a province.[4]

[27] The Applicant is incorporated under an act of the legislature of the Province of Ontario, the LU Act, and therefore is a "company" for the purposes of the CCAA.[5] Further, as a not-for-profit, non-share capital corporation, the Applicant falls under the *Corporations Act* (Ontario).[6]

[28] There have been several CCAA proceedings commenced in respect of not-for-profit corporations, such as *Canadian Red Cross Society*[7] and *The Land Conservancy of British Columbia*.[8]

[29] I am satisfied that the Applicant's status as a not-for-profit, non-share capital corporation does not impact the applicability of the CCAA to the Applicant.

Insolvency

[30] The insolvency of a debtor is assessed at the time of the filing of the CCAA application. While the CCAA does not define "insolvent", the definition of "insolvent person" under the BIA is commonly referenced by the Court in assessing whether an applicant is a debtor company in the context of the CCAA.[9] The BIA defines "insolvent person" as follows:[10]

> "insolvent person" means a person who is not bankrupt and who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada, whose liabilities to creditors provable as claims under this Act amount to one thousand dollars, and
>
> (i) who is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due,

---

[3] R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("BIA").
[4] CCAA, s. 2(1).
[5] S.O. 1960, c. 151, as amended by S.O. 1961-62, c. 154.
[6] R.S.O. 1990, c. C.38.
[7] *Canadian Red Cross Society*, 2000 CarswellOnt 3269 (S.C.).
[8] *TLC, The Land Conservancy of British Columbia, Re*, 2014 BCSC 97 at paras. 14-18.
[9] *Stelco Inc. (Re)*, 2004 CarswellOnt 1211 (S.C.) at paras. 21-22 [*Stelco*].
[10] BIA, s. 2.

(ii) who has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due, or

(iii) the aggregate of whose 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.

[31] The tests for "insolvent person" under the BIA are disjunctive. A company satisfying either (i), (ii) or (iii) of the test is considered insolvent for the purposes of the CCAA.[11]

[32] In addition to the foregoing tests, in *Stelco*, Farley J. held that a financially troubled corporation is insolvent if it is reasonably expected to run out of liquidity within a reasonable proximity of time as compared with the time reasonably required to implement a restructuring.[12]

[33] Based on the evidence set out in the Haché Affidavit and as summarized in the Report of Ernst & Young Inc., the Proposed Monitor, I find that the Applicant is plainly insolvent and faces a severe liquidity crisis.

[34] I also find that the Applicant is a "debtor company" to which the CCAA applies.

Stay of Proceedings

[35] Pursuant to section 11.02(1) of the CCAA, a Court may grant an order staying all proceedings in respect of a debtor company for a period of not more than ten days, provided that the Court is satisfied that circumstances exist to make the order appropriate.

[36] The Applicant submits that it is just and appropriate to grant a stay of proceedings. The Applicant submits that it requires a stay of proceedings in order to provide it with the breathing room necessary to financially and operationally restructure itself in order to emerge as a sustainable and long-term financially viable university to continue providing quality post-secondary education in Northern Ontario.

[37] The Proposed Initial Order provides for a stay of proceedings in favour of the Applicant's current and future directors and officers who may subsequently be appointed. The Applicant submits that the stay in favour of the current and future directors and officers is critical to retain the involvement of the Board and key officers who have knowledge that will assist the Applicant in negotiating with stakeholders and implementing a restructuring plan. I accept this submission.

[38] The Applicant also seeks a limited stay in respect of the Laurentian University Students General Association (the "Non-Applicant Stay Party" or "the SGA"). The stay in respect of the

---

[11] *Stelco, supra* note 9 at para. 28.
[12] *Stelco, supra* note 9 at para. 26.

Non-Applicant Stay Party is limited to preventing any person from: (i) commencing proceedings against the Non-Applicant Stay Party, (ii) terminating, repudiating, making any demand or otherwise altering any contractual relationships with the Non-Applicant Stay Party or enforcing any rights or remedies, or (iii) discontinuing or ceasing to perform any obligations under any contractual agreements with the Non-Applicant Stay Party, resulting from the commencement of this CCAA proceeding by the Applicant, the stay of proceedings granted to the Applicant and any default or cross-default arising due to the foregoing.

[39] CCAA courts have, on numerous occasions, extended the initial stay of proceedings to non-applicants.[13] The Court's authority to grant such an order is derived from its broad jurisdiction under ss. 11 and 11.02(1) of the CCAA to make an initial order on "any terms that [the Court] may impose." It is well-established that it is appropriate for the Court to extend the protection of the stay of proceedings to third party entities where such parties are integrally and closely interrelated to the debtor companies' business or where doing so furthers the primary purpose of the CCAA, being the successful restructuring of an insolvent company.[14]

[40] In particular, where the business operations of a group of entities are inextricably intertwined, such as where there are agreements among the entities, guarantees provided by certain entities in the group in respect of the obligations of other entities in the group or shared cash management systems, courts have found it necessary and appropriate to extend a stay in respect of non-applicant parties.[15]

[41] In the present circumstances, the Applicant has provided a written guarantee in respect of a credit facility obtained by the Non-Applicant Stay Party. If counterparties were to exercise remedies due to the Applicant's insolvency, it would disrupt the Non-Applicant Stay Party and have financial implications for the Applicant.

[42] In my view, it is desirable to avoid disruption to the Non-Applicant Stay Party which is particularly critical given the Applicant's status as an operating university and its overarching aim in this CCAA proceeding to avoid or minimize any disruption to students resulting from the commencement of this proceeding. In furtherance of this objective, the Non-Applicant Stay Party will be essential to ensuring students are given all of the information and resources they need to stay informed. The Non-Applicant Stay Party will play a crucial role in maintaining an open dialogue between the Applicant and the interests/concerns of all students.

---

[13] For example, *Sino-Forest Corporation (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 2063; *Canwest Global Communications Corp, Re*, 2009 CarswellOnt 6184 (S.C.) [*Canwest*]; *Cinram International Inc (Re*), 2012 ONSC 3767 [*Cinram*].
[14] *Cinram*, *ibid* at paras. 61-65.
[15] *Tamerlane Ventures Inc., Re*, 2013 ONSC 5461 at paras. 20-21; *Cinram*, *ibid* at paras. 61-65.

[43] I am satisfied that extending a limited stay of proceedings to the Non-Applicant Stay Party will allow it to continue fulfilling its intended role and providing the myriad of other key services it provides to the Applicant's students.

Pre-Filing and Post-Filing Payments

[44] The Proposed Initial Order allows the Applicant to continue to make certain pre-filing and post-filing payments, including express authorization to:

(a) pay all outstanding amounts owing in respect of the current 2020-21 academic year and future amounts owing in respect of rebates, refunds or other amounts that are owing or may be owed to students (directly, or to the student associations of the Applicant on behalf of students), in each case, subject to the policies and procedures of the Applicant; and

(b) pay all outstanding amounts owing in respect of the current 2020-21 academic year and future amounts payable to students in respect of student scholarship, bursary or grants.

[45] The Applicant intends on operating in the ordinary course during this CCAA proceeding and minimizing the disruption to students as much as possible. To facilitate this, the Applicant must be able to process certain rebates owing to students and continue to provide students with scholarship and bursary money that is critical to their ongoing studies. Some students must pay tuition prior to the receipt of funding from the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP). Upon receipt of OSAP funding, the Applicant reimburses the students who receive such funding. In many instances, scholarship, bursary and grant money has been committed and is critical to students in need of financial aid to fund their education.

[46] If the Applicant is unable to continue to process such payments, vulnerable students may be irreparably harmed. Many of these students are younger than 19 years of age, and therefore particularly vulnerable. In addition, a change to the manner in which these financial aspects are addressed by the Applicant with their students could create immediate emergencies and disruption to their ability to continue their studies.

[47] The proposed Monitor supports the inclusion of this provision and I am satisfied that it is reasonable in the circumstances.

The Administration Charge

[48] The Applicant requests that this Court grant a super-priority Administration Charge on the Property (as defined in the proposed form of the Initial Order) in favour of the Proposed Monitor, counsel to the Proposed Monitor, the Applicant's counsel and advisors, and independent counsel to the Board. At the initial hearing the Administration Charge was requested in the amount of $400,000, and the Applicant will seek to increase it to $1.25 million pursuant to a proposed Amended and Restated Initial Order on the Comeback Hearing. Section 11.52 of the CCAA provides the Court with statutory jurisdiction to grant the Administration Charge.

[49] In *Canwest Publishing*, Pepall, J. (as she then was) considered section 11.52 of the CCAA and identified the following non-exhaustive list of factors the Court may consider when granting 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 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.[16]

[50] The Applicant submits that the Administration Charge is warranted, necessary, and appropriate in the circumstances, given that:

(a) the proposed restructuring will require the extensive involvement of the professional advisors subject to the Administration Charge;

(b) the professionals subject to the Administration Charge have contributed, and will continue to contribute, to the restructuring of the Applicant;

(c) there is no unwarranted duplication of roles so the professional fees associated with these proceedings will be minimized;

(d) the Administration Charge will rank in priority to the DIP Charge and the Directors' Charge; and

(e) the Proposed Monitor believes that the proposed quantum of the Administration Charge is reasonable.

[51] Further, the Applicant has limited the quantum of the Administration Charge that it seeks approval of to what is reasonably necessary for the first ten days of the CCAA proceedings.

[52] The proposed Monitor supports the requested relief.

[53] I am satisfied that the Administrative Charge is reasonable in the circumstances.

The Directors' Charge

[54] The Applicant requests that this Court also grant a priority charge in favour of the Applicant's current and future directors and officers in the amount of $2 million (the "Directors' Charge"). The Applicant will seek to increase the Directors' Charge at the comeback hearing to

---

[16] *Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re*, 2010 ONSC 222 at para. 54; *Mountain Equipment Co-Operative (Re)*, 2020 BCSC 2037 at para. 58.

$5 million, $3 million of which will rank subordinate to the DIP Charge. The Directors' Charge protects the current and future directors and officers against obligations and liabilities they may incur as directors and officers of the Applicant after the commencement of the CCAA proceedings, except to the extent that any such claims or the obligation or liability is incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct.

[55] The Applicant has certain insurance policies in place (as defined in the Haché Affidavit); however, the Applicant is concerned that the directors and officers may be unwilling to continue in their roles with the Applicant absent the Court granting the Directors' Charge. The Directors' Charge will only be available to the extent that any claim or liability is not covered by any applicable D&O insurance and in the event that the Applicant's D&O insurance does not respond to claims against the directors and officers.

[56] Section 11.51 of the CCAA provides the Court with the express statutory jurisdiction to grant the Directors' Charge in an amount the Court considers appropriate, provided notice is given to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by it.[17]

[57] In approving a similar charge in *Canwest*, Pepall J. applied section 11.51 of the CCAA and noted the Court must be satisfied with the amount of the charge and that it is limited to obligations the directors and officers may incur after the commencement of the proceedings, so long as adequate insurance cannot be obtained at a reasonable cost.[18]

[58] The proposed Monitor supports the relief requested.

[59] I am satisfied that the Directors' Charge is reasonable in the circumstances because: (i) the Applicant will benefit from the active and committed involvement of the directors and officers, who have considerable institutional knowledge and valuable experience and whose continued participation will help facilitate an effective restructuring, (ii) the Applicant cannot be certain whether the existing insurance will be applicable or respond to any claims made, and the Applicant does not have sufficient funds available to satisfy any given indemnity should its directors and officers need to call upon such indemnities, (iii) the Directors' Charge does not secure obligations incurred by a director as a result of the directors' gross negligence or wilful misconduct, and (iv) the Proposed Monitor is of the view that the Directors' Charge is reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances.

---

[17] CCAA, section 11.51.
[18] *Canwest, supra* note 17 at paras. 46 and 48.

Sealing Provision

[60] Pursuant to the *Courts of Justice Act* (Ontario), this Court has the discretion to order that any document filed in a civil proceeding be treated as "confidential", sealed and not form part of the public record."[19]

[61] In *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, Iacobucci J. set out that a sealing order should only be granted when:

> (a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternatives measures will not prevent the risk; and
>
> (b) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh the 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.[20]

[62] The Applicant requests that, in the Initial Order, this Court seal Confidential Exhibits "FFF" and "GGG" to the Haché Affidavit. These documents relate to correspondence between the Applicant and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities (the "Ministry"). The documents contain information with respect to the Applicant and certain stakeholders of the Applicant, including various rights or positions that stakeholders of the Applicant may take either inside or outside of a CCAA proceeding, which could jeopardize the Applicant's efforts to restructure.

[63] If the Confidential Exhibits are not sealed, the Applicant submits that stakeholders may react in such a way that jeopardizes the viability of the Applicant's restructuring. As such, the salutary effects of the sealing order, which provides the Applicant with the best possible chance to effect a restructuring, far outweigh the deleterious effects of not disclosing the correspondence between the Applicant and the Ministry.

[64] I have reviewed the Confidential Exhibits and I accept the submissions of the Applicant and grant the sealing request.

---

[19] *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c C.43, s. 137(2). See also *Target Canada Corp (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 1487 at paras. 28 – 30.

[20] *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, 2002 SCC 41, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 at para. 53.

The Requested Relief Sought is Reasonably Necessary

[65] Pursuant to s. 11.001, the relief sought on an initial application is to be limited to what is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during the initial stay period.[21]

[66] The stated purpose of s. 11.001 is to "limit the decisions that can be taken at the outset of a CCAA proceeding to measures necessary to avoid the immediate liquidation of an insolvent company, thereby improving participation of all players."[22]

[67] For the purposes of relief sought on this initial hearing, I accept the facts as stated in the Haché affidavit.

[68] The financial information required pursuant to s. 10(2) of the CCAA has been provided.

[69] I am satisfied the Ernst & Young Inc. is qualified to act as Monitor.

Disposition

[70] The requested relief complies with s. 11.001 of the CCAA in that it is limited to relief that is reasonably necessary for the continued operation of the applicant in the ordinary course of business. The Initial Order is granted in the form presented and it has been signed by me.

[71] The comeback hearing is to be held by Zoom on Wednesday, February 10, 2021 at 9:00 a.m.

Court-Appointed Mediator

[72] Finally, LU is also seeking an Order for the appointment of a mediator by the Court (the "Court-Appointed Mediator") to oversee negotiations with respect to the various restructuring initiatives necessary for the Applicant to achieve a successful restructuring.

[73] If appointed, the Applicant expects the Court-Appointed Mediator to assist with (i) negotiations related to the review and restructuring of the academic programs and (ii) the collective agreement between the Applicant and LUFA.

[74] The Applicant is of the view that the need for the appointment of a mediator by the court is urgent and a high priority item.

---

[21] CCAA, s. 11.001, 11.02(1) and (3).
[22] *Lydian International Limited (Re)*, 2019 ONSC 7473 at paras. 22-26.

[75] The proposed Monitor is of the view that the appointment of a Court-Appointed Mediator is critical to ensure that LU, LUFA and the other negotiating parties have the best possible opportunity to succeed.

[76] It is the Proposed Monitor's view that it is necessary that the Court-Appointed Mediator be someone who is independent and objective, has experience in both insolvency matters as well as collective agreements and labour negotiations, someone who will appreciate the urgency with which the mediation must be conducted and have the time available to dedicate to it. Finally, in the Proposed Monitor's view, a sitting or recently retired judge meeting these characteristics would be preferable. The Proposed Monitor asks that the appointment be made by the court on an urgent basis.

[77] I appreciate and acknowledge the points put forth by counsel to both the Applicant and the Proposed Monitor. However, prior to determining this issue, in my view it is necessary to provide LUFA with an opportunity to make submissions.

[78] In recognition of the compressed timeline in these proceedings, it is desirable to determine this issue at the earliest opportunity and, in any event, not later than the comeback hearing on February 10, 2021.

[79] If LU, LUFA and the Proposed Monitor wish to address this matter prior to February 10, 2021, a case conference can be scheduled with me through the Commercial List Office.

CHIEF JUSTICE G.B. MORAWETZ

Date: February 1, 2021