



Clerk's stamp:

COURT FILE NUMBER

2103 04643

COURT

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

JUDICIAL CENTRE

EDMONTON

PLAINTIFF

ROYAL BANK OF CANADA

DEFENDANTS

1465770 ALBERTA LTD., IRUM AFZAL, AND
SHAHID MUGHAL

DOCUMENT

BENCH BRIEF OF ROYAL BANK OF CANADA

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND
CONTACT INFORMATION OF
PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT

Dentons Canada LLP
Bankers Court
15th Floor, 850 - 2nd Street S.W.
Calgary, Alberta T2P 0R8
Attn: Sam Gabor
Ph. (403) 268-3048 Fx. (403) 268-3100
File No.: 125665-9058

BENCH BRIEF OF THE APPLICANT ROYAL BANK OF CANADA

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	FACTS.....	1
III.	ISSUES	3
IV.	LAW AND ARGUMENT.....	3
V.	CONCLUSION.....	6
VI.	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	7

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This Brief of Law and Argument is submitted on behalf of Royal Bank of Canada (“**RBC**”), in support of its application seeking an Order for the following relief:
 - (a) declaring that the time for service of this application be abridged, that this application is properly returnable, and that further service of this application be dispensed with;
 - (b) appointing Ernst & Young Inc. (“**EY**”), as receiver and manager (the “**Receiver**”) of all of the assets, undertakings, and properties of 1465770 Alberta Ltd. (“**146**”) pursuant to section 243 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985 c B-3 (“**BIA**”), section 13 of the *Judicature Act*, RSA 2000 c J-2 (“**JA**”) and section 49(1) of the *Law of Property Act*, R.S.A. 2000, c.L-7; and
 - (c) granting costs of this application to RBC on a solicitor and client, full indemnity basis; and
 - (d) such further and other relief as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court may permit.

II. FACTS

2. 146 is a corporation operating a Husky gas station in Lloydminster, Alberta (“**Gas Station**”).¹
3. RBC extended four credit facilities to 146 (the “**Credit Facilities**”) pursuant to a RBC credit agreement dated January 25, 2021 (the “**Credit Agreement**”) and RBC Royal Bank Visa Business Card Agreement dated November 22, 2019 (the “**Visa Agreement**”, together with the Credit Agreement, the “**Loan Agreements**”).²
4. 146 has further received a \$60,000 CEBA loan facilitated by RBC.³
5. In support of the indebtedness owing to RBC under the Credit Agreement 146 provided among other things, a general security agreement dated October 15, 2019 charging all of its present and after acquired personal property, and a floating land charge against all real property (the “**GSA**”) and a mortgage dated October 15, 2019 in the principal sum of \$985,000 over lands located in Alberta (the “**Mortgage**” and together with the GSA, the “**Security**”).⁴

¹ Affidavit of Debra Cerny, sworn March 18, 2021 (the “**Cerny Affidavit**”) at para 6.

² *Ibid* at paras 8, 9, 10 & 11.

³ *Ibid* at para 12.

⁴ *Ibid* at para 13.

6. 146 is in default of the Loan Agreements, and Security for, among other reasons:

- a) Failing to pay municipal property taxes to the Town of Lloydminster, Alberta for the 2020 calendar year with respect to the Lands;
- b) Suffering a material adverse change in its financial condition and operations, the particulars of which include:
 - i. advising RBC on or around March 2, 2021 that 146 will only be able to remain in business for a further month;
 - ii. advising RBC on or around March 2, 2021 that 146 will be unable to pay its 2021 municipal property taxes;
 - iii. advising RBC on or around March 16, 2021 that 146 will be handing over the keys to the Husky gas station to RBC;
 - iv. advising RBC on or around March 16, 2021 that its principal Irum Afzal will be filing for bankruptcy on March 17, 2021;
 - v. suffering numerous insufficient fund returns related to cheques, payroll and other accounts regarding its business;
 - vi. being required to fund operating expenses using the personal credit cards of the Personal Defendants due to the lack of cash flow from the operations of its business;
 - vii. being placed into another secured creditor's (Loop Funding Inc.) collections department.
- c) Being unable to meet its financial covenants on its revolving demand facility in the amount of \$50,000;
- d) Threatening to cease carrying on its business operations; and
- e) Entering into an Agreement for the Purchase and Sale of Future Receivables with Merchant Opportunities Fund Limited Partnership ("**Merchant**") dated January 20, 2020, whereby 146 sold certain accounts receivables to Merchant and encumbered all of the 146's present and after acquired personal property, including future debit/credit card receivables, by granting security therein to Merchant. The transaction with Merchant occurred without the prior written consent of RBC.⁵

⁵ *Ibid* at paras 19 & 20.

7. RBC's legal counsel served 146 a formal demand letter and the applicable Notice of Intention to enforce RBC's Security (collectively the "**Demands**").⁶
8. 146 has consented and waived the 10 day notice period under the section 244(1) allowing RBC to immediately enforce its security. RBC has moved to appoint a Ernst & Young Inc. as private receiver to safeguard and secure the Gas Station pending RBC moving to appoint a Court appointed receiver and manager over the property, assets and undertaking of 146.⁷
9. As at March 17, 2021, the indebtedness owing to RBC by 146 under the Loan Agreement is \$1,175,917.36 (which includes its \$60,000 CEBA Loan facilitated by RBC), plus accrued and accruing interest, costs and expenses (including legal costs) (the "**Indebtedness**").⁸
10. RBC has lost faith that 146 can repay the Indebtedness, given that it had advised it would be ceasing operations of the Gas Station.⁹
11. The appointment of a receiver and manager over the assets, properties, and undertakings of 146 is necessary, just and convenient in order to protect the interests of RBC and to preserve and realize upon the assets in order to recover the indebtedness owing.
12. Without a receiver, RBC has no other means to preserve the remaining assets of 146 to adequately reduce its credit exposure and realize on its collateral.¹⁰
13. Furthermore, as a result of RBC's collateral being primarily the Gas Station, real and significant environmental, safety and regulatory risks exist if a receiver or receiver and manager is not appointed to take care and control of the Gas Station. A receiver is necessary to minimize any environmental, safety and regulatory issues from arising with respect to the Gas Station.¹¹
14. A few other secured creditors are also registered in Alberta PPR and Alberta Land Titles. A Court appointed receiver will be in a position to engage with the various stakeholders in the proceeding to ensure all stakeholders rights are considered.¹²

⁶ *Ibid* at para 21.

⁷ *Ibid* at para 23.

⁸ *Ibid* at para 25.

⁹ *Ibid* at para 27.

¹⁰ *Ibid* at para 29.

¹¹ *Ibid* at para 30.

¹² *Ibid* at paras 15, 16, 17 & 31.

III. ISSUE

15. Is it just and convenient to appoint a receiver and manger over the assets, undertakings and properties of 146?

IV. LAW AND ARGUMENT

16. Each of section 243 of the BIA, as amended and section 13(2) of the JAvest in this Honourable Court, authority to appoint a Receiver where it is just and convenient to do so.

17. In *Paragon Capital Corporation Ltd. v. Merchants & Traders Assurance Co.*, 2002 ABQB 430, Justice Romaine held that the following factors may be considered by the court in determining whether it is just or convenient to appoint a receiver:

27 The factors a court may consider in determining whether it is appropriate to appoint a Receiver include the following:

a) whether irreparable harm might be caused if no order were made, although it is not essential for a creditor to establish irreparable harm if a receiver is not appointed, particularly where the appointment of a receiver is authorized by the security documentation;

b) the risk to the security holder taking into consideration the size of the debtor's equity in the assets and the need for protection or safeguarding of the assets while litigation takes place;

c) the nature of the property;

d) the apprehended or actual waste of the debtor's assets;

e) the preservation and protection of the property pending judicial resolution;

f) the balance of convenience to the parties;

g) the fact that the creditor has the right to appoint a receiver under the documentation provided for the loan;

h) the enforcement of rights under a security instrument where the security-holder encounters or expects to encounter difficulty with the debtor and others;

- i) the principle that the appointment of a receiver is extraordinary relief which should be granted cautiously and sparingly;
- j) the consideration of whether a court appointment is necessary to enable the receiver to carry out its' duties more efficiently;
- k) the effect of the order upon the parties;
- l) the conduct of the parties;
- m) the length of time that a receiver may be in place;
- n) the cost to the parties;
- o) the likelihood of maximizing return to the parties;
- p) the goal of facilitating the duties of the receiver.

Bennett, Frank, *Bennett on Receiverships*, 2nd edition, (1995), Thompson Canada Ltd., page 130 (cited from various cases)¹³

18. Where the security instrument governing the relationship between a debtor and secured creditor provides for a right to appoint a receiver upon default, this has the effect of relaxing the burden on the moving party seeking to have the receiver appointed. While the receiver is generally regarded as an extraordinary equitable remedy, courts do not regard the nature of the remedy as extraordinary or equitable where the relevant security document permits the appointment of a receiver. This is because the moving party is merely seeking to enforce a term of an agreement that was assented to by both parties.¹⁴

19. RBC respectfully submits that this Honourable Court ought to exercise its discretion to appoint EY as Receiver by reason of it being just, convenient and otherwise appropriate that a receiver and manager of the undertaking, property and assets of 146 be appointed.

20. Having regard to the factors listed in *Paragon*, RBC notes that:

- a) the Security granted by 146 authorizes the appointment of a receiver and manager;
- b) the risk to RBC is significant with the cumulative indebtedness in excess of \$1,175,917.36;

¹³ *Paragon Capital Corporation Ltd. v. Merchants & Traders Assurance Co* ("Paragon"), 2002 ABQB 430 at para 27 [Tab 1]; *Lindsey Estate v Strategic Metals Corp*, 2010 ABQB 242 at para 32 aff'd by 2010 ABCA 191 [Tab 2]; *Re Schendel Management Ltd*, 2019 ABQB 545 at para 44 [Tab 3].

¹⁴ *Textron Financial Canada Ltd v Chetwynd Motels Ltd*, 2010 CarswellBC 855 at paras 55 and 75 [TAB 4]; *Enterprise Cape Breton Corp v Crown Jewel Resort Ranch Inc*, 2014 NSSC 128 at para 27 citing *Bank of Montreal v Sherco Properties Inc*, 2013 ONSC 7023 [TAB 5].

- c) the appointment of a Receiver is necessary for the preservation and protection of the Gas Station;
 - d) the appointment of a Receiver is necessary to minimize any safety, regulatory or environmental issues from arising with respect to the Gas Station.
 - e) the balance of convenience is clearly in favour of RBC, 146 is indebted to RBC and is in default of its obligations to RBC.
 - f) as noted above, RBC has the right under its security documentation to appoint a Receiver;
 - g) RBC had/has lost confidence in the ability of the management of 146 to continue to operate the its business or repay the indebtedness since they previously advised they would be walking away from the business;
 - h) while the appointment of a Receiver is extraordinary relief and should be granted cautiously and sparingly, as noted previously, the granting of a receivership order is not so extraordinary where the relevant security document permits the appointment of a receiver like the case at hand;
 - i) a court appointment is necessary to enable the Receiver to carry out its duties more efficiently as it will provide the necessary protections the Receiver requires to take care and control of the Gas Station;
 - j) a Receivership Order would place all creditors and stakeholders of 146 on a level and transparent playing field under the administration of this Honourable Court to ensure the consistent and lawful treatment of all stakeholders;
 - k) RBC respectfully submits that the conduct of the parties is supportive of the granting of the Order requested;
 - l) the duration of the appointment of a Receiver is at this juncture incapable of being determined with specificity;
 - m) it is likely that the value of the property of 146 will be maximized by establishing a level and transparent sales process of the entire business administered by this Honourable Court as opposed to commencing foreclosure proceedings against only the lands in which the Gas Station is situated thereon; and
 - n) having regard to the nature of the property, being a Gas Station, that will be under the administration of the Receiver, a Receivership Order is necessary to facilitate the duties of the Receiver, including any safety, regulatory and environmental regulations which must be maintained.
21. RBC respectfully submits that there are no other remedies short of the appointment of a Receiver available to RBC that will adequately protect its interests and the interest of other stakeholders. The security granted by 146 to RBC allows for the appointment of a Receiver. The balancing of the interests of the parties favours RBC and the appointment of a Receiver.

V. **CONCLUSION**

22. RBC respectfully submits having regard to the circumstances it is just and convenient to appoint EY, as receiver and manager of the undertaking, property and assets of 146.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED at Calgary, Alberta this 18th day of March, 2021.

DENTONS CANADA LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SG', is written over a horizontal line.

Per:

Sam Gabor

Counsel for Royal Bank of Canada

VI. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Tab</u>	<u>Authority</u>
1.	<i>Paragon Capital Corporation Ltd. v. Merchants & Traders Assurance Co</i> , 2002 ABQB 430
2.	<i>Lindsey Estate v Strategic Metals Corp</i> , 2010 ABQB 242
3.	<i>Re Schendel Management Ltd</i> , 2019 ABQB 545
4.	<i>Textron Financial Canada Ltd v Chetwynd Motels Ltd</i> , 2010 CarswellBC 855
5.	<i>Enterprise Cape Breton Corp v Crown Jewel Resort Ranch Inc</i> , 2014 NSSC 128

TAB 1

Most Negative Treatment: Recently added (treatment not yet designated)

Most Recent Recently added (treatment not yet designated): [CWB Maxium Financial Inc v. 2026998 Alberta Ltd](#) | 2021 ABQB 137, 2021 CarswellAlta 392 | (Alta. Q.B., Feb 23, 2021)

2002 ABQB 430

Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Paragon Capital Corp. v. Merchants & Traders Assurance Co.

2002 CarswellAlta 1531, 2002 ABQB 430, 316 A.R. 128, 46 C.B.R. (4th) 95

**PARAGON CAPITAL CORPORATION LTD. (Plaintiff) and
MERCHANTS & TRADERS ASSURANCE COMPANY, INSURCOM
FINANCIAL CORPORATION, 782640 ALBERTA LTD., 586335
BRITISH COLUMBIA LTD. AND GARRY TIGHE (Defendants)**

Romaine J.

Judgment: April 29, 2002

Docket: Calgary 0101-05444

Counsel: Judy D. Burke for Plaintiff

Robert W. Hladun, Q.C. for Defendants

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Debtors and creditors

[VII](#) Receivers

[VII.3](#) Appointment

[VII.3.a](#) General principles

Headnote

Receivers --- Appointment — General

Ex parte order was granted in 2001 appointing receiver and manager of property and assets of two of defendant companies, including certain assets pledged by those companies to plaintiff creditor — Defendants brought application to set aside, vary or stay that order — Application dismissed — Evidence at time of ex parte application provided grounds for believing that delay caused by proceeding by notice of motion might entail serious mischief — Evidence existed that assets that had been pledged to plaintiff as security for loan were at risk of disappearance or dissipation — Plaintiff did not fail to make full and candid disclosure of relevant facts in ex parte application — Security agreement provided for appointment of receiver — Conduct of primary representative of defendants contributed to apprehension that certain assets were of less value than was originally represented to plaintiff or that they did not in fact exist — Balance of convenience favoured plaintiff.

Annotation

This decision canvasses the difficult issue of the appropriateness of granting *ex parte* court orders in an insolvency context. Specifically, the facts of this case revolve around the proper exercise of Romaine J.'s jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 387 of the *Alberta Rules of Court* ¹ to grant an *ex parte*, without notice, order appointing a receiver over the assets of two debtor companies. This rule provides that an order can be made on an *ex parte* basis in cases where the evidence indicates "serious mischief". Such jurisdiction is also granted to courts in Ontario ² and in the context of interim receivership orders under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*. ³ The guiding principles that govern the granting of *ex parte* orders generally were summarized in *B. (M.A.), Re* ⁴ where it was concluded that the court's discretion to grant such orders should only be exercised in cases where it is found

that an emergency exists and where full disclosure has been provided to the court by the applicant. It is generally considered that an emergency is a circumstance where the consequences that the applicant is attempting to avoid are immediate⁵ and that such consequences would have irreparable harm.⁶ Insolvency situations are, by their very nature, crisis oriented. Debtors and creditors alike are typically faced with urgent circumstances and must move quickly to preserve value for all stakeholders. The special circumstances encountered in insolvency proceedings have been acknowledged by the Ontario Court of Appeal in *Algoma Steel Inc., Re*⁷ where it was recognized that *ex parte* court orders and the lack of adequate notice is often justified in an insolvency context due to the often "urgent, complex and dynamic" nature of the proceedings. However, there is nonetheless a recognition that despite the "real time" nature of insolvency proceedings, the remedy of appointing a receiver is so drastic that doing so without notice to the debtor is to be considered only in extreme cases. In *Royal Bank v. W. Got & Associates Electric Ltd.*,⁸ the Alberta Court of Appeal cited the following passage from *Huggins v. Green Top Dairy Farms*⁹ with approval:

Appointment of a receiver is a drastic remedy, and while an application for a receiver is addressed in the first instance to the discretion of the court, the appointment *ex parte* and without notice to take over one's property, or property which is *prima facie* his, is one of the most drastic actions known to law or equity. It should be exercised with extreme caution and only where emergency or imperative necessity requires it. Except in extreme cases and where the necessity is plainly shown, a court of equity has no power or right to condemn a man unheard, and to dispossess him of property *prima facie* his and hand the same over to another on an *ex parte* claim.

The courts in Ontario have also been mindful of this need to be extra vigilant in granting *ex parte* orders in an insolvency context. It is generally recognized that in cases where rights are being displaced or affected, short of urgency, applicants should be given advance notice. In *Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re*,¹⁰ Farley J. stated the following:

I appreciate that everyone is under immense pressure and have concerns in a CCAA application. However, as much advance notice as possible should be given to all interested parties ... At a minimum, absent an emergency, there should be enough time to digest material, consult with one's client and discuss the matter with those allied in interest — and also helpfully with those opposed in interest so as to see if a compromise can be negotiated ... I am not talking of a leisurely process over weeks here; but I am talking of the necessary few days in which the dedicated practitioners in this field have traditionally responded. Frequently those who do not have familiarity with real time litigation have difficulty appreciating that, in order to preserve value for everyone involved, Herculean tasks have to be successfully completed in head spinning short times. All the same everyone is entitled the opportunity to advance their interests. This too is a balancing question.

In light of this balancing of interests, the practice in Ontario has developed to a point that, short of exceptional circumstances, the parties affected by the applicant's proposed order, whether an order pursuant to *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*¹¹ or receivership orders, are typically given some advance notice of the pending application. This is particularly true in cases where there is a known solicitor of record for the interested party. In the present case, it is difficult to say whether sufficient and adequate evidence was proffered to demonstrate that urgent circumstances and a real risk of dissipation of assets existed. As Romaine J. indicated in her reasons, "...it [was] regrettable that the application did not take place in open chambers so that a record would be available."¹² Accordingly, in such circumstances, deference is accorded to the trier of fact. Romaine J. was in the best position to determine whether the test to grant an *ex parte* receivership order was met. Also, it is not clear from Romaine J.'s reasons why given the existence of a solicitor of record for the debtors that prior notice, of any kind, was not given to the debtors in this case. The granting of a receivership order is a serious remedy and those subject to it should, to the extent possible, have a right to due process.

Marc Lavigne *

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by Romaine J.:

Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek, 40 C.B.R. (3d) 274, 1996 CarswellOnt 2328 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Canadian Urban Equities Ltd. v. Direct Action for Life, 73 Alta. L.R. (2d) 367, 68 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 104 A.R. 358, 1990 CarswellAlta 60 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Edmonton Northlands v. Edmonton Oilers Hockey Corp., 147 A.R. 113, 23 C.P.C. (3d) 49, 15 Alta. L.R. (3d) 179, 1993 CarswellAlta 224 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Hover v. Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., (sub nom. *Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. v. Hover*) 237 A.R. 30, (sub nom. *Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. v. Hover*) 197 W.A.C. 30, 1999 CarswellAlta 338, 46 C.P.C. (4th) 213, 91 Alta. L.R. (3d) 226 (Alta. C.A.) — referred to

RJR-MacDonald Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General), 54 C.P.R. (3d) 114, (sub nom. *RJR-MacDonald Inc. c. Canada (Procureur général)*) 164 N.R. 1, (sub nom. *RJR-MacDonald Inc. c. Canada (Procureur général)*) 60 Q.A.C. 241, 111 D.L.R. (4th) 385, 1994 CarswellQue 120F, [1994] 1 S.C.R. 311, 1994 CarswellQue 120 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Royal Bank v. W. Got & Associates Electric Ltd., 17 Alta. L.R. (3d) 23, 150 A.R. 93, [1994] 5 W.W.R. 337, 1994 CarswellAlta 34 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Royal Bank v. W. Got & Associates Electric Ltd., 1997 CarswellAlta 235, 196 A.R. 241, 141 W.A.C. 241, [1997] 6 W.W.R. 715, 47 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Alta. C.A.) — referred to

Royal Bank v. W. Got & Associates Electric Ltd. (1997), 224 N.R. 397 (note), 216 A.R. 392 (note), 175 W.A.C. 392 (note) (S.C.C.) — referred to

Schacher v. National Bailiff Services, 1999 CarswellAlta 32 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Swiss Bank Corp. (Canada) v. Odyssey Industries Inc., 30 C.B.R. (3d) 49, 1995 CarswellOnt 39 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3
s. 244 — referred to

Rules considered:

Alberta Rules of Court, Alta. Reg. 390/68
Generally — referred to

R. 387 — considered

APPLICATION by defendants to set aside, vary or stay order appointing receiver.

Romaine J.:

INTRODUCTION

1 On March 20, 2001, I granted an *ex parte* order appointing a receiver and manager of the property and assets of Merchants & Traders Assurance Company ("MTAC") and 586335 British Columbia Ltd. ("586335"), including certain assets pledged by MTAC and 586335 to Paragon Capital Corporation Ltd. MTAC, 586335 and the other defendants in this action brought an application to set aside this *ex parte* order. I declined to set aside, vary or stay the *ex parte* order and these are my written reasons for that decision.

SUMMARY

2 The *ex parte* order should not be set aside on any of the grounds submitted by the Defendants, including an alleged failure to establish emergent circumstances, a lack of candour or any kind of non-disclosure or misleading disclosure by Paragon. Hearing the motion to appoint a receiver and manager *de novo*, I am satisfied that the receivership should continue on the terms originally ordered, and that the Defendants have not established that a stay of that receivership should be granted.

FACTS

3 On March 15, 2000, Paragon loaned MTAC \$2.4 million. The loan was for a term of six months with an interest rate of 3% per month, and matured on September 15, 2000. MTAC was to make interest-only payments to Paragon in the amount of \$72,000.00 per month.

4 The purpose of the loan was to allow MTAC to acquire 76% of the shares of Georgia Pacific Securities Corporation ("Georgia Pacific"), a Vancouver-based brokerage business. That transaction was completed. As security for the loan, MTAC pledged the following:

- a) an assignment of all of the property of MTAC and 586335, including the Georgia Pacific shares;
- b) a general hypothecation of the shares of Georgia Pacific owned by MTAC;
- c) a power of attorney granted by MTAC to Paragon appointing an agent of Paragon to be the attorney of MTAC with the right to sell and dispose of any shares held by MTAC;
- d) an assignment of mortgage-backed debentures;
- e) an assignment of a \$200,000 US term deposit, which was stated to be held in the trust account of a lawyer by the name of Jamie Patterson;
- f) \$250,000 to be held in trust by Paragon's counsel; and
- g) \$986,000 in an Investment Cash Account at Georgia Pacific.

Paragon filed a General Security Agreement executed by MTAC by way of a financing statement at the Personal Property Registry on March 15, 2000. In addition, Paragon obtained personal guarantees of the loan from Garry Tighe, Insurcom Financial Corporation, 586335 and 782640 Alberta Ltd.

5 The loan was not repaid and, pursuant to the terms of the General Security Agreement, Paragon appointed a private receiver in January, 2001.

6 Subsequently, the parties entered into discussions resulting in a written Extension Agreement. The Extension Agreement acknowledged the balance outstanding under the loan on January 9, 2001 of \$2,629,129.99 with a then per diem rate of \$2,528.28 and acknowledged delivery of numerous demands and a Notice of Intention to Enforce Security pursuant to Section 244 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c.B-3, as amended

7 MTAC agreed pursuant to the Extension Agreement that all monies due and outstanding would be repaid by February 22, 2001. If the funds were not repaid, Paragon would be at liberty to enforce its security and take all steps it deemed necessary to collect the debt. MTAC agreed it would not oppose Paragon's realization of its security, including the appointment of a receiver over its assets, and that it would, if requested, work with Paragon and any person designated by Paragon to attempt to realize on the value of the Georgia Pacific shares in a commercially reasonable manner.

8 Pursuant to the terms of the Extension Agreement, the shares of Georgia Pacific owned by MTAC were delivered to counsel for Paragon.

9 It was also a term of the Extension Agreement that a discontinuance of the pending action would be filed and the appointment of the private receiver would be revoked. Both of these actions were undertaken by Paragon.

10 The loan was not repaid by February 22, 2001. As of June 26, 2001, \$2,850,192.62 was outstanding. Paragon issued a new Statement of Claim on March 2, 2001. On March 16, 2001 counsel for MTAC, Insurcom, 782640, 586335, and Tighe filed a Statement of Defence and served it upon Paragon's counsel.

11 On March 20, 2001, Paragon applied for and was granted an *ex parte* order appointing Hudson & Company as receiver and manager of all of the assets and property of MTAC and 586335, including, specifically, the mortgage-backed debentures, \$986,000 in a cash account, \$200,000 in trust with a lawyer, the \$250,000 paid to Paragon's counsel and the Georgia Pacific shares. The application was made in private chambers, and no court reporter was present. However, counsel for Paragon made his application based on affidavit evidence of Mr. Hudson and others and supported by a written "Bench Brief", all of which

has been disclosed to the Defendants. All of the above-noted facts and additional information contained in the affidavits and Bench Brief were disclosed to me at the time of the *ex parte* application.

ANALYSIS

Should the ex parte receivership order have been granted?

12 Rule 387 of the *Alberta Rules of Court* provides that the court may make an *ex parte* order if it is satisfied that the delay caused by proceeding by notice of motion might entail serious mischief. The applicant must act in good faith and make full, fair, and candid disclosure of the facts, including those that are adverse to his position: *Hover v. Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.* (1999), 237 A.R. 30 (Alta. C.A.) at paragraph 23, referring to *Royal Bank v. W. Got & Associates Electric Ltd.* (1994), 150 A.R. 93 (Alta. Q.B.), at 102-3; (1997), 196 A.R. 241 (Alta. C.A.); leave to appeal granted (S.C.C.).

13 The Defendants submit that there was no urgency requiring an *ex parte* application. There was, however, affidavit evidence that led me to believe that the assets of MTAC and 586335 that had been pledged as security for the loan to Paragon were at risk, and that mischief could occur if an *ex parte* order was not granted.

14 There was, by way of example, evidence that the mortgage-backed debentures were not what they seemed.

15 There was evidence that Mr. Hudson had been advised by Mr. Tighe that his intention was to pay out the Paragon loan by transactions involving Georgia Pacific. Without elaborating on the status of Georgia Pacific at the time, as it is not a party to this litigation, the evidence with respect to potential activities involving this company was troubling, and justified a concern that the shares that comprised this asset may be at risk.

16 Further, Mr. Hudson deposed that Mr. Tighe was at first agreeable to Mr. Hudson and Paragon's counsel speaking to various parties, including officers of Georgia Pacific and Deloitte & Touche, to gather information. However, he withdrew that consent when Mr. Hudson and Paragon's counsel were actually in Vancouver, intending to speak to those parties.

17 There were also concerns arising over whether or not there actually was \$200,000 held in trust by Mr. Patterson, who had ceased practising law and left the country.

18 There was evidence that the shares of Insurcom Financial Corporation, one of the guarantors of the Paragon loan, had been halted in trading and that the \$986,000 that was supposed to be held in a Georgia Pacific cash account as security for the Paragon loan was missing.

19 The Defendants also submit that Paragon and its counsel and the proposed receiver failed to be candid and make full disclosure of the facts in the application. However, it is clear from the affidavits filed and from the Bench Brief that the disclosure given at the time of the *ex parte* order was extensive. It included reference to the fact that the proposed receiver, Mr. Hudson, had previously been appointed a private receiver for Paragon under the loan documentation, and that he and Paragon's counsel had been involved in negotiating and finalizing the Extension Agreement. In addition, counsel to Paragon disclosed that a defence to the Statement of Claim had been filed by counsel for the Defendants, and described the nature of the defences. I cannot find that there was any breach by the applicant for the *ex parte* order of its obligation of candour and frankness.

20 In hindsight, it is regrettable that the application did not take place in open chambers so that a record would be available. However, on the basis of the strength of the evidence before me, including evidence of the loan documentation and events that had transpired since the loan was put in place, together with the extensive affidavits and Bench Brief, I was satisfied that there was a reasonable basis on which I could hear the application on an *ex parte* basis. I was satisfied that there was reasonable apprehension of serious mischief and risk of disappearance or dissipation of assets. These concerns included the concern of interference with the activities of a regulated firm in a sensitive industry, where third party rights may well be affected. I therefore chose to exercise my discretion to grant the order *ex parte*, as is "within the prerogative of a judge to do in Alberta under our rules": *Canadian Urban Equities Ltd. v. Direct Action for Life*, [1990] A.J. No. 253 (Alta. Q.B.) at pages 7 and 8.

21 The *ex parte* order contains the usual provision allowing any party to apply on two clear days notice for a further or other order. The Defendants' right to bring their position before the court on very short notice was therefore reasonably protected. The Notices of Motion seeking orders to set aside or stay the *ex parte* order were not filed until May 8, 2001, and the motions were heard on their merits at the earliest time available to counsel to the parties and the court.

Should the receiver and manager appointed under the ex parte order been precluded from acting in this case due to conflict?

22 This issue is moot, given that on June 8, 2001 an order was granted replacing Hudson & Company as receiver and manager with Richter Allen and Taylor Inc. This was done with the consent of all parties other than the Defendants, who objected to the replacement, while continuing to maintain that Hudson & Company had a conflict. The Defendants make the same complaint about counsel to the former receiver and manager, who did not continue as counsel for the new receiver.

23 Despite the complaint of conflict of interest, the Defendants have not raised any evidence that the former receiver and manager or its counsel preferred Paragon to other creditors, or failed in a receiver's duty as a fiduciary or its duty of care, other than to submit that the receiver should not have been granted the power in the *ex parte* order to sell the assets covered by the order. This power of sale was, of course, subject to court approval, and also subject to review at the time the application was heard on its merits. It was not exercised during the time the *ex parte* order was in place, and representations were heard on its propriety for inclusion in the affirmed receivership order. While there may have been a potential for conflict in Hudson & Company's appointment, there is no evidence that Hudson & Company showed any undue preference to Paragon while serving as a receiver, or failed in its duties as receiver in any way.

24 The Defendants also submit that the Bench Brief used by Paragon's counsel in making the application for the *ex parte* order showed that such counsel was not impartial, but acted as an advocate on this application. Paragon's counsel did indeed advocate that a receiver should be appointed by the court, as he was retained to do, and there was nothing improper in him doing so. I have already said that full disclosure was made of the material facts in that application, including the previous involvement of both the proposed receiver and Paragon's counsel in this matter.

25 I therefore find that there was nothing wrong or improper in the appointment of Hudson & Company as receiver or in Paragon's previous counsel acting as receiver's counsel, or in their administration of the receivership. It may be preferable to avoid an appearance of conflict in these situations, but a finding of conflict or improper preference requires more than just the appearance of it. In situations where it is highly possible that the creditors will not be paid out in full, the use of a party already familiar with the facts to act as receiver may be attractive to all creditors. I note that it is not the creditors who raise the issue of conflict in this case, but the debtors.

Should the ex parte order now be set aside?

26 The general rule is that when an application to set aside an *ex parte* order is made, the reviewing court should hear the motion *de novo* as to both the law and the facts involved. Even if the order should not have been granted *ex parte*, which is not the case here, I may refuse to set it aside if from the material I am of the view that the application would have succeeded on notice: *Edmonton Northlands v. Edmonton Oilers Hockey Corp.* (1993), 15 Alta. L.R. (3d) 179 (Alta. Q.B.) (paragraphs 30 and 31).

27 The factors a court may consider in determining whether it is appropriate to appoint a receiver include the following:

- a) whether irreparable harm might be caused if no order were made, although it is not essential for a creditor to establish irreparable harm if a receiver is not appointed, particularly where the appointment of a receiver is authorized by the security documentation;
- b) the risk to the security holder taking into consideration the size of the debtor's equity in the assets and the need for protection or safeguarding of the assets while litigation takes place;
- c) the nature of the property;

- d) the apprehended or actual waste of the debtor's assets;
- e) the preservation and protection of the property pending judicial resolution;
- f) the balance of convenience to the parties;
- g) the fact that the creditor has the right to appoint a receiver under the documentation provided for the loan;
- h) the enforcement of rights under a security instrument where the security-holder encounters or expects to encounter difficulty with the debtor and others;
- i) the principle that the appointment of a receiver is extraordinary relief which should be granted cautiously and sparingly;
- j) the consideration of whether a court appointment is necessary to enable the receiver to carry out its' duties more efficiently;
- k) the effect of the order upon the parties;
- l) the conduct of the parties;
- m) the length of time that a receiver may be in place;
- n) the cost to the parties;
- o) the likelihood of maximizing return to the parties;
- p) the goal of facilitating the duties of the receiver.

Bennett, Frank, *Bennett on Receiverships*, 2nd edition, (1995), Thompson Canada Ltd., page 130 (cited from various cases)

28 In cases where the security documentation provides for the appointment of a receiver, which is the case here with respect to the General Security Agreement and the Extension Agreement, the extraordinary nature of the remedy sought is less essential to the inquiry: *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek*, [1996] O.J. No. 5088 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), paragraph 12.

29 It appears from the evidence before me that the Georgia Pacific shares may be the only asset of real value pledged on this loan. Shares are by their nature vulnerable assets. These shares are in a business that is itself highly sensitive to variations in value. At the time of the application, the business appeared to have been suffering certain financial constraints. The business is situated in British Columbia, and regulated by the Investment Dealers Association of Canada and other entities, giving additional force to the argument of the necessity of a court-appointed receiver. I also note the possibility that there will be a sizeable deficiency in relation to the loan, increasing the risk to Paragon as security holder.

30 The conduct of Mr. Tighe, the primary representative of the Defendants, supports the appointment of a receiver. Although the Defendants submit that the assets that are the subject of the order are secure, there is troubling evidence that the mortgage-backed debentures appear to have questionable value, that the \$200,000 that was supposed to be in Mr. Patterson's trust account does not exist, that the Georgia Pacific cash account that was supposed to contain \$986,000 is not actually a cash account at all, but rather a trading account. Mr. Tighe's affidavits and cross-examination on affidavits do little to clear-up these matters, and instead add to the apprehension that these assets are of less value than represented to Paragon or that they in fact do not exist.

31 The balance of convenience in these circumstances rests with Paragon, which is owed nearly \$3 million. There is no plan to repay any of this indebtedness, and no persuasive evidence that the appointment would cause undue hardship to the Defendants. As stated by Ground, J. in *Swiss Bank Corp. (Canada) v. Odyssey Industries Inc.*, [1995] O.J. No. 144 (Ont. Gen.

Div. [Commercial List]) at paragraph 31, the appointment of a receiver always causes some hardship to a debtor who loses control of its assets and risks their sale. Undue hardship that would prevent the appointment of a receiver must be more than this usual unfortunate consequence. Here, any proposed sale of an asset by the receiver must be brought before the court for approval and its propriety and necessity will be fully canvassed on its merits.

32 I am satisfied that the order appointing a receiver and manager should continue to stand on the same terms as the initial order.

Should the order be stayed?

33 To be granted a stay of an order pending appeal, an applicant must establish:

- a) that there is a serious issue to be tried on appeal;
- b) that the applicant would suffer irreparable harm and no fair or reasonable redress would be available if the stay is not granted; and
- c) that the balance of convenience is in favour of granting the stay after taking into consideration all of the relevant factors.

RJR-MacDonald Inc. v Canada (Attorney General) (1994), [1994] S.C.J. No. 17 (S.C.C.); *Schacher v. National Bailiff Services*, [1999] A.J. No. 599 (Alta. Q.B.).

34 On the issue of whether there is a serious issue to be tried, the Defendants have filed a defence to the claim raising several issues, the major one being that the effective rate of interest under the loan exceeds 60% and is therefore usurious. Affidavit evidence purporting to indicate such an illegal rate of interest was filed and served on Paragon the day before this application was heard. Counsel for Paragon submitted that the evidence is defective on its face, but I was not able to make a determination of that question on the basis of the sworn evidence before me. Another factor affecting this issue is that Paragon has brought an application for summary judgment, which had not been heard at the time of this application. Given my decision on the second and third parts of the test, I have assumed that there is a triable issue relating to the loan and, therefore, to the appointment of a receiver, despite the uncertainty existing at the time of the application.

35 With respect to irreparable harm, the Defendants submit that company assets are being tied up while the order is in force, and that therefore no payments are being made, allowing liabilities to inflate. The main assets that are the subject of this order are assets that were already pledged as security for the loan to Paragon and therefore no irreparable harm can be said to arise from this factor. The Defendants also submit that irreparable harm has been, and continues to be done to, Georgia Pacific's assets as a result of the order. The order affects only the Defendants' shares in Georgia Pacific, and counsel for the Defendants does not represent Georgia Pacific. No objection to the order has been taken by Georgia Pacific itself, although management for Georgia Pacific is aware of the receivership. There is no evidence that the order is responsible for any harm to Georgia Pacific, aside from harm that may have arisen from the Defendants' precarious financial situation and the current status of this regulated business with the IDA.

36 The balance of convenience in this case favours Paragon. The only asset that appears to have any real value at this stage in the proceedings is the shares in Georgia Pacific, an asset that is vulnerable by its nature, in a highly regulated business carried on in another jurisdiction. The order serves to maintain the status quo of that asset and prevent mischief caused by the possibility of illegal or imprudent manipulation or interference with the affairs of Georgia Pacific.

37 Finally, the Defendants submit that, if a stay is not granted, the order be varied to maintain the status quo of the three major assets. By requiring court approval of a sale of any of the assets, the right of the Defendants to argue their position on a sale at an appropriate time is reasonably protected.

38 I therefore decline to grant a stay, or to vary the order as granted.

39 If the parties are unable to agree on the matter of costs, they may be spoken to.

Application dismissed.

Footnotes

1 Alta. Reg. 390/68.

2 See rule 37.07(3) of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194.

3 R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3. See rule 77 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Rules*, C.R.C. 1978, c. 368.

4 (1992), 126 A.R. 276 (Alta. Prov. Ct.) at 286.

5 *John Doe v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1993] B.C.J. No. 1875 (B.C. S.C.).

6 *Imperial Broadloom Co., Re* (1978), 22 O.R. (2d) 129 (Ont. Bkcty.).

7 (2001), 25 C.B.R. (4th) 194 (Ont. C.A.) at 196.

8 (1997), [1997] A.J. No. 373 (Alta. C.A.) at para. 21.

9 (1954), 273 P.2d 399 (Id. S.C.) at 404.

10 [1999] O.J. No. 864 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at para. 6.

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

12 Para. 20.

* Associate in the Insolvency and Restructuring Group of Torys LLP. The author wishes to thank Sean Keating, student-at-law, for his invaluable research assistance in the preparation of this annotation.

TAB 2

2010 ABQB 242

Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Lindsey Estate v. Strategic Metals Corp.

2010 CarswellAlta 641, 2010 ABQB 242, [2010] A.W.L.D. 2495,
[2010] A.W.L.D. 2496, 186 A.C.W.S. (3d) 988, 67 C.B.R. (5th) 88

Ann Nosratieh as Executrix on behalf of the Estate of Robert Laird Lindsey, and Helmut and Eugenie Vollmer, as Representative Plaintiffs (Applicants) and Strategic Metals Corp., Capital Alternatives Inc., The Institute for Financial Learning, Group of Companies Inc., Milowe Allen Brost, Gary Sorenson, Graham Blaikie, Heinz Weiss, True North Productions LLC, Merendon de Honduras S.A. de C.V., Merendon Mining (Nevada) Inc., Merendon Mining (Colorado) Inc., Merendon de Venezuela C.A., Merendon de Peru S.A., Merendon de Ecuador S.A., Arbour Energy Inc., Syndicated Gold Depository S.A., Base Metals Corporation, Evergreen Management Services LLC, 3Sixty Earth Resources Ltd., Ward Capstick, Thayer Jackson, Kristina Katayama, Quatro Communication Corporation, ABC Corp 1 to 9 and John Doe 1 to 9 and Jane Doe 1 to 9 and other entities and individuals known to the Defendants (Respondents)

G.C. Hawco J.

Heard: December 14, 2009

Judgment: April 9, 2010 *

Docket: Calgary 0801-08351

Counsel: Frank R. Dearlove, Michael D. Mysak for Applicants

Kenneth J. Warren, Q.C., Tanya A. Fizzell for Respondents, Gary Sorenson, Merendon Mining Corporation Ltd., Merendon de Honduras S.A. de C.V., Merendon de Venezuela C.A., Merendon de Peru S.A., Merendon de Ecuador S.A.

Victor C. "Dick" Olson, Christopher Archer for Respondent, Arbour Energy Inc.

Richard Glenn for Respondent, Milowe Brost

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Securities; Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

Related Abridgment Classifications

Debtors and creditors

[III Garnishment](#)

[III.5 Attachability](#)

[III.5.a Prejudgment attachment orders](#)

Debtors and creditors

[VII Receivers](#)

[VII.3 Appointment](#)

[VII.3.b Application for appointment](#)

[VII.3.b.iii Grounds](#)

[VII.3.b.iii.D Irreparable harm](#)

Headnote

Debtors and creditors --- Receivers — Appointment — Application for appointment — Grounds

Securities commission held hearing against B and others with respect to allegations of misrepresentations and fraud relating to S Corp. — Commission found that S Corp. and its representatives were responsible for false or misleading statements in offering

memoranda and they engaged in course of conduct that amounted to fraud on shareholders of S Corp. — B and associates received \$500 million but none was recovered — Commission found that S Corp. was shell of company whose main but undisclosed function was to finance S's mining ventures — Investors alleged that S and his companies and A Inc. were complicit in fraud perpetrated by B — S Corp. was placed into receivership — Investors brought application to have same receiver appointed over assets and undertakings of A Inc. and companies owned by B and S — Application granted — Although S was not involved directly in proceedings before commission, his companies and A Inc. were subject of investigation in view of flow of monies — B's companies, S's companies and A Inc. were involved in receipt and transfer of tens of millions of dollars which flowed freely between B's companies and S's companies — There was no evidence put forward by S to lend any credence to position that he was conducting legitimate business at arm's length with B — There was evidence which suggested contrary — S and his companies received over \$50 million directly or indirectly from B and his companies and there was no accounting for any of these monies — B was directing mind of A Inc. and A Inc. shared address and director with S Corp. — There was real risk of irreparable harm in wasting of proposed receivership companies' assets if no order was made — Appointment of receiver would allow assets to be preserved which was essential given nature of claim — Balance of convenience favoured placement of receiver — Receiver would be able to preserve assets and further investigate whereabouts of any other assets — There was no evidence of any harm to companies by placement of receiver.

Debtors and creditors --- Garnishment — Attachability — Prejudgment attachment orders

Securities commission held hearing against B and others with respect to allegations of misrepresentations and fraud relating to S Corp. — Commission found that S Corp. and its representatives were responsible for false or misleading statements in offering memoranda and they engaged in course of conduct that amounted to fraud on shareholders of S Corp. — B and associates received \$500 million but none was recovered — Commission found that S Corp. was shell of company whose main but undisclosed function was to finance S's mining ventures — Investors alleged that S and his companies were complicit in fraud perpetrated by B — Investors brought application for attachment order against S — Application granted — In order to obtain attachment order, investors had to show that there was reasonable likelihood of success at trial — S and his companies received between \$50 and 80 million in investor funds — There had been no accounting with respect to these funds — S had to do more than simply say he never had contact with investors and that he did not solicit funds from them directly — Looking at conclusions of commission, there was little doubt that S and his companies were key element in raising and dissipation of funds — S appeared to have been key element in fraud perpetrated by B.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *G.C. Hawco J.*:

Alberta (Securities Commission) v. Brost (2008), 2008 ABCA 326, 2 Alta. L.R. (5th) 102, 2008 CarswellAlta 1325, 440 A.R. 7, 438 W.A.C. 7 (Alta. C.A.) — considered

APPLICATION by investors for receivership and attachment orders.

G.C. Hawco J.:

Introduction

1 This is another episode in the efforts of the Applicants (and others) to attempt to locate and salvage assets acquired by a number of the Respondents using monies obtained from the Applicants and other investors.

2 On September 25, 2008, I appointed Michael J. Quilling as Receiver of Strategic Metals Corp. ("Strategic"). The Applicants now seek to have the same Receiver appointed over the assets and undertakings of The Institute for Financial Learning, Group of Companies Inc. ("IFFL"), Arbour Energy Inc. ("Arbour"), Merendon Mining Corporation Ltd. ("MMCL") and Syndicated Gold Depository S.A. ("SGD"). In addition, the Applicants seek an order granting the Receiver an Attachment Order or Mereva Injunction against Gary Sorenson ("Sorenson").

3 Mr. Quilling is appointed Receiver over all of the above named companies.

4 Mr. Quilling is granted an Attachment Order against Mr. Sorenson.

Background

5 By way of brief background, in May and June of 2006, a hearing took place before the Alberta Securities Commission ("ASC") against Milowe Allen Brost, one of two Respondents, and others, with respect to allegations of misrepresentations and fraud, relating to Strategic and investors in Strategic. On February 16, 2007, the ASC found that Strategic and a number of their representatives, specifically Edna Forrest, Carol Weeks, Bradley Regier and Mr. Brost, were responsible for false or misleading statements in an Offering Memoranda and that all of those parties engaged in a course of conduct that amounted to a fraud on the shareholders of Strategic. Mr. Sorenson was not a named party to the ASC hearing and did not appear, but was featured prominently in the deliberations and findings of the ASC.

6 What appears to be fairly clear from the ASC hearings is that Mr. Brost and Strategic were involved in a massive fraudulent scheme whereby the Applicants and other investors were induced to trust Mr. Brost and his associates with large amounts of money to be invested on their behalf. The information which was provided to the investors has been determined to be false. The total amount of money received by Mr. Brost and his associates was upward of \$500 million. None has been recovered.

7 The decision of the ASC was appealed to our Alberta Court of Appeal. On October 3, 2008, the Court dismissed the appeals by Mr. Brost, Strategic and others. *Alberta (Securities Commission) v. Brost*, 2008 ABCA 326 (Alta. C.A.).

8 In paragraph 20 and 21 of the Court of Appeal's decision, it stated:

20. The Commission summarized the fraudulent scheme, and the roles of each of the Appellants played in that scheme as follows (at para. 13 of the *Sanctions Decision*):

... Brost was at the centre of the activities of Strategic and alternatives and ... when he developed Strategic and his business plan, he had in mind the involvement of Gary Sorenson ("Sorenson") and Art (Arthur) Wigmore ("Wigmore") [neither of whom were involved in the proceedings before the Commission] and the funding of mining ventures of either or both of them (as indeed incurred in respect of ventures within the Merendon orbit).... [The] plan was to lure public investor (with promises of high returns and safety along with tantalizing references to gold) into putting money into securities of Strategic - essentially a shell of a company whose main (but undisclosed) function was to finance Sorenson's mining ventures. ...

21. The Commission described the materials that Alternatives put out to market Strategic shares as "highly promotional", "factually weak" and "clearly designed to entice investors." It noted blatant untruths and misrepresentations in those materials. For example, it noted that Strategic's shares were touted as being secured by precious metals when that clearly was not the case. The Commission was convinced that Strategic investors would not see the returns they expected to realize on their investments and was doubtful that they would recover much of the money they paid.

9 In paragraph 42, the Court concluded that it was reasonable for the ASC to conclude that each of the Appellants engaged in conduct that amounted to regulatory fraud. It went on to say, at para. 47:

We are of the view that there was evidence upon which the Commission could reasonably conclude, on a balance of probabilities, that Brost was responsible for making false and misleading statements to, and participating in a fraud on, investors.

The Court went on to dismiss the Appeals.

10 Pursuant to a Notice of Hearing dated May 17, 2009, the ASC has commenced proceedings against Arbour, Brost, IFFL, Sorenson, MMCL and a number of additional parties. The Notice of Hearing alleges, among other things, that the Respondents engaged in a course of conduct relating to the securities of Arbour that perpetrated a fraud on Alberta investors. That hearing is on-going.

Receivership

11 As mentioned, Strategic has been placed into receivership. Mr. Quilling has delivered two reports. The Applicants and others are, or were, investors who allege that the Respondents conspired and acted jointly together to defraud them of funds through the use of an investment scheme that operated in the same way as the investment scheme alleged and referred to in the ASC hearing in 2006 and in the Strategic action.

12 The hearing before the ASC and the matters heard by this Court and our Court of Appeal concerned Strategic and Mr. Brost. Mr. Sorenson and his companies (collectively referred to as the Merendon Companies) were not parties to those proceedings. Neither was Arbour a party.

13 The Applicants allege that Mr. Sorenson, the Merendon companies and Arbour are complicit in the fraud perpetrated by Mr. Brost. They seek to have Mr. Quilling appointed as Receiver of the Respondent companies and seek to have an injunction or attachment order against Mr. Sorenson.

14 Mr. Sorenson states that he was not a party to the original ASC hearings and denies even having anything to do with Mr. Brost's investment schemes. He admits to having been involved in "arm's length business dealings with Mr. Brost and certain of his corporate entities" but denies having been in business with Mr. Brost. I must assume he means that he has not conducted any nefarious business with Mr. Brost.

15 Mr. Sorenson objects to the evidence of Mr. Quilling being received because Mr. Quilling relies upon certain findings of the ASC. He argues that the ASC was not bound by the rules of evidence. Contrary to those rules, the ASC received and relied upon hearsay evidence. As neither Mr. Sorenson nor his companies were parties to that proceeding, the evidence ought not be relied upon. Nor should any of the ASC reasoning or findings be relied upon.

16 The argument of the Applicants is that their case is not founded upon any hearsay evidence which may be found in Mr. Quilling's affidavit, but rather upon the evidence of the financial documents which had been placed before the ASC and which have been examined by Mr. Quilling, as well as the affidavit of Mr. Sorenson and his cross-examination upon that affidavit.

17 What must be born in mind is that the Court of Appeal of this province has considered the decisions of the ASC in some detail and has upheld those decisions with respect to its findings relating to false and misleading statements and misrepresentations of Mr. Brost and others involved with Strategic and the related corporate vehicles. The ASC found that the Offering Memoranda "conveyed a thoroughly misleading picture of what investors were buying into and what was happening with their money". The ASC further found that fraud had been perpetrated on the investors, who include the Applicants.

18 The Court considered the grounds of appeal of Mr. Brost and the others and, in its analysis referred to the arguments of the Appellants which included the objection to the admission of the hearsay evidence. In paragraph 34, the Court stated: "The Commission acknowledged that transcripts of investigative interviews are not the same as live testimony in that hearsay evidence can be problematic. It treated the impugned hearsay evidence with caution when assessing its value and reliability." In paragraph 36, the Court concluded that the Appellant's arguments (including its arguments to exclude the hearsay evidence) were without merit.

19 Clearly, Mr. Sorenson was not involved directly, as a party, in the previous proceedings before the ASC. Just as clearly, however, his Merendon companies and Arbour were the subject of investigation in view of the flow of monies that went through Mr. Brost, Strategic and his related companies including IFFL and Capital Alternatives. Mr. Brost was the principle of Strategic, Capital Alternatives, IFFL and Merendon Mining (Colorado). These companies and Mr. Sorenson's Merendon companies, and Arbour were involved in the receipt and transfer of tens of millions of dollars which flowed freely between Mr. Brost's companies and Mr. Sorenson's companies.

20 MMCL received over \$26 million from Mr. Brost's company - IFFL. MMCL purchased a mine in Tulameen, British Columbia for \$1 million and sold it shortly after to Strategic for \$9.6 million. That mine was held out by Strategic to be a

prime property. It was information and belief of Sgt. Fuller that it was a sham. That appears to be confirmed from Mr. Quilling's investigation.

21 Arbour went from an insolvent company to one loaning \$39 million in investors funds in a matter of months to MMCL. Mr. Sorenson claims that MMCL extinguished its obligation to Arbour by selling back to Arbour 25% interest in Tar Sand Recovery Limited. Nothing has been presented by Mr. Sorenson to justify Tar Sand's worth.

22 SGD was another Brost/Sorenson company which received money from Strategic and then directed huge sums of money (over \$50 million) to MMCL. Again, no accounting is offered by Mr. Sorenson. Mr. Sorenson simply says that these were monies lent to MMCL and that the debt was retired. The documentation as to how it was retired and the documentation with respect to the value of any assets transferred is sadly lacking. There is simply no evidence put forward by Mr. Sorenson to lend any credence to his position that he was conducting a legitimate business at arm's length with Mr. Brost. There is evidence which suggests the contrary.

23 Mr. Quilling's report of August 26, 2008 states that as a result of information he has received, the Merendon Mining operation in Honduras is a sham as well. I have already determined that the Tulameen mine is basically a sham.

24 Both Mr. Brost and Mr. Sorenson were shareholders of SGD which provided funds to MMCL. Mr. Sorenson was aware that funds were being provided to MMCL through SGD and that they were being sourced from IFFL.

25 SGD existed for the sole purpose of channelling tens of millions of dollars of IFFL members' money to MMCL in exchange for no discernable value.

26 Mr. Sorenson argues he is being tarred by Mr. Brost's brush yet says that he does not have to disprove what is alleged. He continues to argue that he had no involvement in Strategic. Yet, it was Mr. Brost's evidence that Mr. Sorenson initially agreed to, and did become, a director of Strategic.

27 Mr. Sorenson continues to assert that the Honduran mine is continuing to produce gold while the evidence of Mr. Quilling, as fully set out in his report, is that the mine is a sham.

28 Serious allegations have been made against Mr. Sorenson and his companies in these proceedings. Mr. Sorenson has filed an affidavit and has been cross-examined on it. However, he has failed to produce any documentation which would speak to the value of any companies owned by him or that would answer in any manner the allegations of either fraud or dissipation of assets within the companies. Indeed, neither Mr. Sorenson nor MMCL have put forth any independent or reliable evidence of legitimate operations or value in MMCL or any of its subsidiaries or to account for any of the tens of millions of dollars of investors funds that Mr. Sorenson admits that his companies received. His position is that "only" \$26 million went to his companies through Mr. Brost and that these were arm's length transactions which were legitimately retired.

29 I am satisfied that Mr. Sorenson and his companies have indeed received over \$50 million directly or indirectly from Mr. Brost and his companies. There is no accounting for any of these monies. Mr. Sorenson's explanation of repaying the \$26 million loan lacks credibility.

30 With respect to Arbour, Mr. Brost was its directing mind. Arbour and Strategic shared an address and had at least one common director. Arbour received \$820,000.00 from Strategic and has accounted for none of it. Arbour was used as a flow-through to send investment funds to Mr. Sorenson's company, MMCL. Arbour appears to be insolvent at this time. It is not carrying on business presently. It has been the recipient of at least \$28 million from the Applicants and other investors. It gave that to MMCL. I have already referred to the transfer by MMCL to Arbour of an interest in Tar Sands Recovery Limited. This is another example of failure to document or establish in any manner a value. There has been no accounting for funds received.

31 The only assets which Mr. Sorenson claims to have comprises mining properties in Honduras and Equator which, according to Mr. Quilling's report, have no value. He claims that his house in Honduras is in his wife's name. He had been receiving

\$50,000 per month from MMCL until September 2009. However, he refuses to disclose any bank accounts or any information relating to any assets which he might have anywhere.

32 In determining whether it is just and convenient to appoint a Receiver, a Court should consider various factors such as:

- a. whether irreparable harm might be caused if no order is made;
- b. the risk to the parties;
- c. the risk of waste debtor's assets;
- d. the preservation and protection of property pending judicial resolution; and
- e. the balance of convenience.

33 There is a real risk of irreparable harm in the wasting of the proposed receivership companies' assets. The proposed receivership companies are experienced at transferring money. The Applicants' evidence is that over \$80 million was transferred to corporations controlled by Mr. Brost, Mr. Sorenson and others. None of the companies has accounted for any of the monies received. None of the companies has given this Court assurances that assets will not be transferred. All of the assets of MMCL and the Merendon companies are in Central and South America, outside the ability of this Court to supervise absentee appointment of a Receiver. The purpose of this action is the recovery of funds for investors. Without protection in place, I am satisfied that the ability to manage the affairs of and further investigate the proposed companies, there is a real risk that very little, if any, recovery will be possible.

34 The appointment of a Receiver will allow assets to be preserved. Given the nature of the claim, the preservation of the assets is essential. On Mr. Sorenson's evidence, neither MMCL nor any of the Merendon companies have any operations or assets in North America. Absent Court supervision through a Receiver, they may freely dissipate and shield assets from the investors/creditors.

35 With respect to the balance of convenience, I am of the view that it favours the placement of a Receiver. The Receiver will be able to preserve assets and further investigate the whereabouts of any other assets. His investigative power is essential. Tens of millions of dollars have been raised from investors. The whereabouts of the money is unknown. Large flows of funds between a number of the companies have been identified but the ultimate uses to which those funds have been put have not been identified.

36 I am simply not satisfied that any of the on-going business activities which the companies might be involved will be thwarted by the appointment of a Receiver. I see no evidence of any harm to these companies by the placement of a Receiver. A receivership order will therefore issue, appointing Mr. Quilling as the Receiver.

Attachment Order/Mereva Injunction

37 In order to obtain an Attachment Order, the Applicants must show that there is a reasonable likelihood of success at trial.

38 Mr. Sorenson appears to have gone to great lengths to make himself judgment-proof. He claims that he has not dissipated assets yet refuses to answer specific questions on his cross-examination with respect to asset dissipation or the presence of any bank accounts he may have.

39 I am satisfied that Mr. Sorenson and his companies have received somewhere between \$50-80 million in investor funds from SGD, Strategic, Arbour and IFFL. There has been no accounting with respect to those funds. Mr. Sorenson simply denies that he was a cohort of Mr. Brost and argues that he has to prove nothing. He is correct with respect to the latter statement, but when forced with rather over-whelming evidence of Mr. Quilling and the conclusions of the ASC, together with the statements of Mr. Brost, Mr. Sorenson must do more than simply say that he never had any contact with these Applicants and that he did not solicit funds from them directly. When I looked at the conclusions of the ASC there is little doubt but that Mr. Sorenson

and his companies were a key element in the raising and dissipation of those funds. He appears to have been a key element in the fraud perpetrated by Mr. Brost.

40 In the end result, I am satisfied that an Attachment Order is appropriate and such Order will issue together with the Receivership Order as indicated.

Application granted.

Footnotes

* Affirmed at *Lindsey Estate v. Strategic Metals Corp.* (2010), 2010 CarswellAlta 1049, 2010 ABCA 191 (Alta. C.A.).

TAB 3

2019 ABQB 545
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Schendel Management Ltd., Re

2019 CarswellAlta 1457, 2019 ABQB 545, [2019] A.W.L.D. 3043, [2019] A.W.L.D. 3044,
[2020] 10 W.W.R. 443, 1 Alta. L.R. (7th) 385, 308 A.C.W.S. (3d) 472, 73 C.B.R. (6th) 13

In the Matter of the Notice of Intention to Make a Proposal of Schendel Mechanical Contracting Ltd

the Notice of Intention To Make a Proposal of Schendel Management Ltd.

the Notice of Intention To Make a Proposal of 687772 Alberta Ltd.

M.J. Lema J.

Heard: July 16, 2019

Judgment: July 19, 2019

Docket: Edmonton BK03-115990, BK03-115991

Counsel: Jim Schmidt, Katherine J. Fisher, for Debtor Companies

Dana M. Nowak, for Proposal Trustee

Pantelis Kyriakakis, Walker MacLeod, for Applicant, ATB

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[IV Receivers](#)

[IV.1 Appointment](#)

Bankruptcy and insolvency

[VI Proposal](#)

[VI.1 General principles](#)

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Proposal — General principles

Three related companies, major construction conglomerate, hit rough patch when work on one of their major projects was halted — Work stoppage affected companies' profitability, and eventually caused it to default on amounts owing to Alberta Treasury Branches (ATB), its principal lender, and ATB issued demand letters to companies and notices of intention to enforce security — Companies filed notice of intention to file proposal under s. 50.4(1) of Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA), triggering stay of enforcement of action by ATB and other creditors — Companies filed proposal — ATB applied for orders deeming joint proposal refused, lifting proposal stay of proceedings, and appointing receiver and manager — Application granted — Pursuant to s. 50(12) of BIA, proposal would not likely be accepted by creditors, and was deemed refused — ATB had true veto, it intended to vote no, and proposal would necessarily fail — ATB would vote no because it regarded proposal as unsatisfactory — Focus was on existing proposal — None of identified ATB steps showed absence of good faith or showed commercial unreasonableness — ATB was not attempting to pursue improper purpose, and was pursuing its interests and asserting its rights within bounds of and for purposes squarely within Canadian insolvency system — Given its secured position, BIA provisions governing secured creditors and approval of proposals, and proposal itself, and ATB was entitled to oppose proposal and seek deemed refused ruling — ATB believed, on reasonable or defensible or arguable grounds, that it would fare better by receivership than under proposal — ATB was not acting perversely or vindictively or otherwise than in its own economic interests, and it was

not pursuing any ulterior purposes — ATB established that proposal was unlikely to be approved and that, in circumstances, proposal should be deemed refused.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Receivers — Appointment

Three related companies, major construction conglomerate, hit rough patch when work on one of their major projects was halted — Work stoppage affected companies' profitability, and eventually caused it to default on amounts owing to Alberta Treasury Branches (ATB), its principal lender, and ATB issued demand letters to companies and notices of intention to enforce security — Companies filed notice of intention to file proposal under s. 50.4(1) of Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA), triggering stay of enforcement of action by ATB and other creditors — Companies filed proposal — ATB applied for orders deeming joint proposal refused, lifting proposal stay of proceedings, and appointing receiver and manager — Application granted — Appointing receiver and manager was warranted — Companies were large enterprise with complex construction projects underway — Coordinating and managing pursuit of receivables required expertise and resources of experienced receiver-manager, and recovery that way was likely to be more efficient and effective — ATB's security documents contemplated court appointing receiver-manager on companies' default, companies had defaulted, and ATB was almost certain to experience shortfall — ATB's affidavit evidence clearly outlined extent of companies' default, state of its various projects, and complex nature of work required to complete, collect or otherwise harvest its receivables — ATB's conduct did not reflect commercial unreasonableness or absence of good faith.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *M.J. Lema J.*:

Enirgi Group Corp. v. Andover Mining Corp. (2013), 2013 BCSC 1833, 2013 CarswellBC 3026, 6 C.B.R. (6th) 32 (B.C. S.C.) — distinguished

Hypnotic Clubs Inc., Re (2010), 2010 ONSC 2987, 2010 CarswellOnt 3463, 68 C.B.R. (5th) 267 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Laserworks Computer Services Inc., Re (1998), 1998 CarswellINS 38, (sub nom. *Laserworks Computer Services Inc. (Bankrupt), Re*) 165 N.S.R. (2d) 297, (sub nom. *Laserworks Computer Services Inc. (Bankrupt), Re*) 495 A.P.R. 297, 6 C.B.R. (4th) 69, 37 B.L.R. (2d) 226, 1998 NSCA 42, 165 N.S.R. (2d) 296 (N.S. C.A.) — considered

Marine Drive Properties Ltd., Re (2009), 2009 BCSC 145, 2009 CarswellBC 285, 52 C.B.R. (5th) 47 (B.C. S.C.) — considered

Murphy v. Cahill (2013), 2013 ABQB 335, 2013 CarswellAlta 1490, 88 Alta. L.R. (5th) 69, 568 A.R. 80 (Alta. Q.B.) — considered

Paragon Capital Corp. v. Merchants & Traders Assurance Co. (2002), 2002 ABQB 430, 2002 CarswellAlta 1531, 316 A.R. 128, 46 C.B.R. (4th) 95 (Alta. Q.B.) — followed

Promax Energy Inc. v. Lorne H. Reed & Associates Ltd. (2002), 2002 ABCA 239, 2002 CarswellAlta 1241 (Alta. C.A.) — considered

Sport Maska Inc. v. RBI Plastique Inc./RBI Plastic Inc. (2005), 2005 NBQB 394, 2005 CarswellNB 635, (sub nom. *RBI Plastic Inc. (Bankrupt), Re*) 290 N.B.R. (2d) 278, (sub nom. *RBI Plastic Inc. (Bankrupt), Re*) 755 A.P.R. 278, 17 C.B.R. (5th) 244 (N.B. Q.B.) — considered

The Bank of Nova Scotia v. 1934047 Ontario Inc. (2018), 2018 ONSC 4669, 2018 CarswellOnt 12568 (Ont. S.C.J.) — considered

Toronto-Dominion Bank v. Rismani (2015), 2015 BCSC 596, 2015 CarswellBC 991, 25 C.B.R. (6th) 127 (B.C. S.C.) — considered

West Coast Logistics Ltd. (Re) (2017), 2017 BCSC 1970, 2017 CarswellBC 3014, 53 C.B.R. (6th) 68 (B.C. S.C.) — considered

Statutes considered:

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

Generally — referred to

s. 50(4) — referred to

s. 50(12) — considered

s. 50.4(1) [en. 1992, c. 27, s. 19] — considered

s. 62(2)(b) — considered

s. 69.1 [en. 1992, c. 27, s. 36(1)] — considered

s. 69.4 [en. 1992, c. 27, s. 36(1)] — considered

s. 243 — considered

s. 244 — considered

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

Generally — referred to

Judicature Act, R.S.A. 2000, c. J-2

s. 13(2) — considered

Personal Property Security Act, R.S.A. 2000, c. P-7

s. 66 — considered

APPLICATION by secured creditor for orders deeming refused joint proposal made by three related corporations, lifting proposal stay of proceedings, and appointing receiver and manager.

M.J. Lema J.:

A. Introduction

1 A secured creditor applies under ss. 50(12) and s. 69.4 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (*BIA*) for orders deeming refused a joint proposal made by three related corporations, lifting the proposal stay of proceedings, and appointing a receiver and manager. The corporations oppose all aspects. The proposal trustee provided stage-setting submissions but did not take a position.

2 I find, under ss. 50(12) *BIA*, that the application is not likely to be accepted by the creditors (and is thus deemed refused), that the corporations are bankrupt as a result, and that Pricewaterhousecoopers (PwC) should be appointed as receiver and manager of them. My reasoning follows.

B. Facts

3 The key facts for the purpose of this application are that:

- Schendel Mechanical Contracting Ltd, Schendel Management Ltd and 687772 Alberta Ltd (collectively Schendel) is a major construction conglomerate in Alberta;
- after decades of business success, Schendel hit a rough patch in fall 2018, when work on one of its major projects (the Grande Prairie Regional Hospital) was halted by Alberta;
- the work stoppage affected Schendel's profitability, eventually causing it to default on amounts owing to Alberta Treasury Branches, its principal lender since 2016. That prompted ATB to conduct an up-close review of Schendel's financial affairs, culminating in a meeting between Schendel and ATB officials on March 13, 2019;
- Schendel's takeaway from the meeting was that, while ATB had some concerns, they were not pressing, and that Schendel would have between three and six months to formulate a plan to address its financial strains;
- however, later that day, ATB issued to Schendel demand letters and notices of intention to enforce security effective March 23, 2019;

also properly defined the purpose of the legislation: to provide the orderly and fair distribution of the property of a bankrupt. *Finally, he found that the collateral purpose was "to get out from under the royalties encumbering this production."*

[4] This finding, mindful of the standard of review applicable by this Court, must result in the dismissal of the appeal. [emphasis added]

34 Those cases are distinguishable. They deal with creditors attempting to use the insolvency system for an improper purpose e.g. attempting to drive a competitor out of business or escaping from a royalty regime.

35 No evidence here showed that ATB was attempting to pursue an improper purpose, whether within the meaning of those cases or otherwise. Instead, ATB was pursuing its interests and asserting its rights *within the bounds of, and for purposes squaring with, the Canadian insolvency system* i.e. recovering its loans.

36 In *Hypnotic Clubs Inc., Re*¹¹, Cumming J. held:

The intent and policy underlying the BIA is that *creditors* should consider and *vote* upon a *proposal* advanced pursuant to a NOI as they see fit in their own *self interest*. . . .

. . .

. . . the underlying policy of the BIA [includes] letting creditors *vote* as they choose in respect of accepting or rejecting a *proposal* [emphasis added]

37 Given its secured position, the *BIA* provisions governing secured creditors and the approval of proposals, and the proposal itself, ATB is entitled to oppose the proposal and, on the basis of that opposition, seek a "deemed refused" ruling.

38 By ATB's calculations it foresees materially greater recoveries in a bankruptcy or receiver than via the proposal. The proposal trustee is currently reviewing the "bankruptcy versus proposal" outcomes and is due to report shortly on that. Schendel does not agree with ATB; it filed the proposal on the basis it would produce a more favourable outcome for all the creditors, including ATB, than bankruptcy. It points to recovery estimates showing that ATB may fare better under the proposal than its low-end estimate of receivership recovery and may even recovery (slightly) more than its high-end estimate.

39 I make no ruling on the respective anticipated recoveries i.e. what is the likely better avenue recovery-wise. I simply note that ATB believes, on reasonable, or at least defensible, or at least arguable, grounds, that it will fare better by a receivership than under the proposal i.e. ATB is not acting perversely or vindictively or otherwise than in its own economic interests i.e. it is not pursuing any ulterior purposes.

40 To summarize here, I find that ATB has been acting in good faith and in a commercially reasonable way, including in deciding to oppose the proposal and seek a "deemed refused" ruling.

Enirgi Group Corp. v. Andover Mining Corp. also distinguishable

41 Schendel also cited this decision.¹² It too is distinguishable, concerning a clash between a request for more time to file a proposal and a creditor seeking to terminate the proposal proceedings. Steeves J. found that the debtor should have more time to assemble its proposal and that the creditors should wait for it i.e. not effectively vote it down "sight unseen."

42 In the current case, ATB has seen the proposal and rejects it. The wait-and-see dimension of *Andover* provides no guidance here.

Conclusion on "proposal deemed refused" application

[new para] For these reasons, I find that ATB has established that the proposal is unlikely to be approved and that, in the circumstances here, the proposal should be deemed refused.

E. Appointment of receiver

43 ATB also applied to have PwC appointed as receiver and manager of Schendel. It invokes s. 243 *BIA* and s. 13(2) of the *Judicature Act*. Schendel opposes.

Test for appointing a receiver

44 In *Paragon Capital Corp. v. Merchants & Traders Assurance Co.*¹³, Romaine J held:

The factors a court may consider in determining whether it is appropriate to appoint a receiver include the following:

- a) whether irreparable harm might be caused if no order were made, although it is not essential for a creditor to establish irreparable harm if a receiver is not appointed, particularly where the appointment of a receiver is authorized by the security documentation;
- b) the risk to the security holder taking into consideration the size of the debtor's equity in the assets and the need for protection or safeguarding of the assets while litigation takes place;
- c) the nature of the property;
- d) the apprehended or actual waste of the debtor's assets;
- e) the preservation and protection of the property pending judicial resolution;
- f) the balance of convenience to the parties;
- g) the fact that the creditor has the right to appoint a receiver under the documentation provided for the loan;
- h) the enforcement of rights under a security instrument where the security-holder encounters or expects to encounter difficulty with the debtor and others;
- i) the principle that the appointment of a receiver is extraordinary relief which should be granted cautiously and sparingly;
- j) the consideration of whether a court appointment is necessary to enable the receiver to carry out its' duties more efficiently;
- k) the effect of the order upon the parties;
- l) the conduct of the parties;
- m) the length of time that a receiver may be in place;
- n) the cost to the parties;
- o) the likelihood of maximizing return to the parties;
- p) the goal of facilitating the duties of the receiver.

Bennett, Frank, *Bennett on Receiverships*, 2nd edition, (1995), Thompson Canada Ltd., page 130 (cited from various cases).

In cases where the security documentation provides for the appointment of a receiver, which is the case here with respect to the General Security Agreement and the Extension Agreement, the extraordinary nature of the remedy sought is less essential to the inquiry [authority omitted].

45 In *Murphy v. Cahill*¹⁴, Veit J updated that factor list, noting that:

. . . the current [2011] edition of Bennett emphasizes, in relation to the second factor, the risk to the security holder, that *"the court may not consider this factor to be important if there is no danger or jeopardy to the security holder or in other words, there is a substantial equity that will protect the security holder"*. . . One factor which is not mentioned in the *Paragon* list is "the rights of the parties [to the property]". Similarly, in relation to the factor of the effect of the order on the parties, the current edition of Bennett adds "If a receiver is appointed, its effect may be devastating upon the parties and their business and, where the business has to be sold, the appointment of a receiver may have a detrimental effect upon the price". Along the same lines, in relation to the length of the order, the current edition of Bennett adds " . . . where a claimant moves for an order appointing a receiver for a short period, say six weeks, the court is reluctant to make such an appointment as it has devastating effects on the parties". Finally, the current edition of Bennett adds the following factor: "(18) the secured creditor's good faith, commercial reasonableness of the proposed appointment and any questions of equity." [emphasis added]

Arguments

46 ATB argues that appointing a receiver-manager is warranted because:

- "the debtors are unable to continue as viable entities or continue operations as
 - the Proposal is not viable;
 - the Debtors operate at a loss;
 - the Proposal will not be approved by [ATB]; and
 - the Proposal cannot, even by its own terms, be implemented;
- [ATB] is the Debtors' senior secured and fulcrum creditor;
- [ATB] has lost all confidence in management of the Debtors and does not support the Proposal;
- [ATB] has valid and serious concerns regarding the preservation and protection of the Property, especially following the determination and undeniable conclusion that the Debtors' NOI Proceedings and the Proposal are doomed to fail";
- a receiver-manager is needed to take charge of Schendel's affairs and to coordinate and manage the pursuit of Schendel's construction (and any other) receivables arising out of multiple projects and involving multiple competing parties;
- a receiver-manager will be better able to preserve, and maximize the recovery out of, Schendel's assets overall, compared to ATB enforcing via actions on its individual security elements (general security agreement, mortgage, and so on); and
- ATB's security documents contemplate the appointment of a court-appointed receiver on default;

47 Schendel opposes, arguing that:

- a receiver should be appointed only where it is "just and equitable in the circumstances";
- "jurisdiction to appoint a receiver ought to be exercised sparingly";

- per s. 66 *PPSA*, security-agreement rights "shall be exercised or discharged in good faith and in a commercially reasonable manner";
- ATB has not provided evidence to support its receiver-related arguments; and
- more fundamentally, "ATB is estopped and precluded from its conduct, particularized [in its application brief and as summarized above], from seeking the appointment of a receiver. Its position is "manifestly unreasonable from a commercial perspective, and it ought not to be permitted to take further steps to enforce its security."

Applying the "appointment of receiver" factors here

48 I find that appointing a receiver and manager (collectively "receiver" below) is warranted here. I first note that many of the factors identified above do not apply here, where Schendel is now bankrupt i.e. has lost the capacity to run its affairs.

In any case, I rely on these factors:

- Schendel is a large enterprise with complex construction projects underway;
- coordinating and managing the pursuit of its receivables, including determining whether further resources should be invested to complete any unfinished projects, requires the expertise and resources of an experienced receiver-manager;
- recovery that way is likely to be more efficient and effective than via enforcing ATB's individual security elements;
- ATB's security documents contemplate the Court appointing a receiver-manager on Schendel's default;
- Schendel has defaulted, and to the extent that ATB is almost certain to experience a shortfall;
- ATB's affidavit evidence plainly outlines the extent of Schendel's default, the state of its various projects, and the complex nature of the work required to complete, collect or otherwise harvest its receivables; and
- as for Schendel's fundamental objection, I have already found that ATB's conduct does not reflect commercial unreasonableness or an absence of good faith.

F. Conclusion

49 Schendel has worked extremely hard to find a lifeline that would allow it to make peace with ATB and continue in business. Unfortunately, those efforts did not succeed.

50 Canadian insolvency law recognizes that, in circumstances where a proposal or arrangement is likely doomed to fail, a veto creditor or group of creditors can accelerate the restructuring process to recognize that reality.

51 That applies here. ATB has established that Schendel's proposal is unlikely to be approved and that, in the circumstances, a "deemed refused" order is warranted, and also that a receiver-manager should be appointed.

52 ATB has nominated PwC to serve as receiver-manager. Schendel did not propose anyone else.

53 ATB seeks PwC's appointment on what it described as the template, or standard, receiver-manager order. I have reviewed the draft order attached to ATB's application and find it to be in order.

54 I note that, under section 33 of the draft order, "any interested party may apply to this Court to vary or amend this Order on not less than 7 days' notice to the Receiver . . . "

G. Closing note

TAB 4

2010 BCSC 477

British Columbia Supreme Court [In Chambers]

Textron Financial Canada Ltd. v. Chetwynd Motels Ltd.

2010 CarswellBC 855, 2010 BCSC 477, [2010] B.C.W.L.D. 4567, [2010]
B.C.W.L.D. 4568, [2010] B.C.J. No. 635, 67 C.B.R. (5th) 97, 91 C.P.C. (6th) 171

Textron Financial Canada Limited (Plaintiff) and Chetwynd Motels Ltd., Northern Hotels Limited Partnership, Northern Hotels GP Ltd., Pomeroy Enterprises Ltd., 711970 Alberta Ltd., William Robert Pomeroy and Carrie Langstroth (Defendants)

Willcock J.

Heard: February 10, 2010

Judgment: April 9, 2010

Docket: Vancouver S100268

Counsel: W.E.J. Skelly, B. La Borie for Plaintiff

A. Brown for Defendants

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Debtors and creditors

[VII Receivers](#)

[VII.3 Appointment](#)

[VII.3.a General principles](#)

Debtors and creditors

[VII Receivers](#)

[VII.3 Appointment](#)

[VII.3.b Application for appointment](#)

[VII.3.b.iii Grounds](#)

[VII.3.b.iii.A Just and convenient](#)

Headnote

Debtors and creditors --- Receivers — Appointment — General principles

Defendants C Ltd. and NHLP built, owned, and operated hotel — Plaintiff lent money to C Ltd. for development and construction of hotel on terms in loan agreement — C Ltd. executed promissory note — Other transactions were executed as additional security — Default occurred — Plaintiff demanded payment from C Ltd. and NHLP, issued notice of intention to enforce security under s. 244 of Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, and made demand upon defendant guarantors — Plaintiff brought action — Plaintiff brought application for, inter alia, order appointing receiver — Application granted in part — Just and convenient to grant receivership order — As parties stipulated in their contracts that plaintiff would be entitled to appoint receiver or apply for court-appointed receiver in event of default, relief sought not extraordinary — Defendants owed plaintiff significant sum, and had not reduced principal debt — No dispute as to amount of debt, nor that defendants were in default — No imminent prospect of repayment of principal from operations — There had not been full disclosure of defendants' refinancing plans — Interim plan to make partial payments would not indemnify plaintiff against interest accumulating in interim — No assurance interim payments could be made — There was risk to plaintiff's equity and doubt regarding prospect of recovery of principal — Defendants' plans did not provide for indemnity to plaintiff for losses incurred on ongoing basis — There was inadequate provision to minimize irreparable losses lender would incur — No persuasive evidence appointment of receiver would cause defendants undue hardship — Plaintiff should not have to leave its interests in hands of defendants.

Debtors and creditors --- Receivers — Order appointing receiver

- l) the conduct of the parties;
- m) the length of time that a receiver may be in place;
- n) the cost to the parties;
- o) the likelihood of maximizing return to the parties;
- p) the goal of facilitating the duties of the receiver.

51 Weighing these factors, Masuhara J. dismissed the application for the appointment of a receiver. The Court enjoined the defendant from disposing of assets, ordered the defendant repay the principal and non-default interest on a schedule, to provide financial statements to the plaintiff and to deliver certain shares as security for the debt. Upon default in payment, a receiver would immediately be appointed on the terms of the application. Leave was given to renew the application for appointment of a receiver in the event of any material adverse change in circumstances.

52 The criteria described in *Bennett on Receivership*, 2d ed. (Toronto: Carswell, 1999) ("Bennett") set out by Masuhara J. have been applied in Alberta subsequent to the decision in *Citibank Canada* to which Burnyeat J. referred in *United Saving*. In *Paragon*, the Court of Queen's Bench considered an appeal from an *ex parte* order appointing a receiver. Upon concluding that the *ex parte* order ought not to have been issued the Court went on to consider the appointment of a receiver *de novo*. At para. 27 the Court outlined the factors that may be considered on an application (those set out in Bennett) and then added, at paras. 28 and 31:

In cases where the security documentation provides for the appointment of a receiver, which is the case here with respect to the General Security Agreement and the Extension Agreement, the extraordinary nature of the remedy sought is less essential to the inquiry: *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek*, [1996] O.J. No. 5088(Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), paragraph 12.

....

The balance of convenience in these circumstances rests with *Paragon*, which is owed nearly \$3 million. There is no plan to repay any of this indebtedness, and no persuasive evidence that the appointment would cause undue hardship to the defendants. As stated by Ground J. in *Swiss Bank Corp. (Canada) v. Odyssey Industries Inc.*, [1995] O.J. No. 144 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at paragraph 31, the appointment of a receiver always causes some hardship to a debtor who loses control of its assets and risks their sale. Undue hardship that would prevent the appointment of a receiver must be more than this usual unfortunate consequence. Here, any proposed sale of an asset by the receiver must be brought before the court for approval and its propriety and necessity will be fully canvassed on its merits.

53 The Alberta Court of Appeal has more recently applied the criteria described in Bennett and commented on the extent to which there should be consideration of the hardship arising from the appointment of a receiver. In *BG International*, at para. 17, the Court held:

[T]he chambers judge must carefully balance the rights of both the applicant and the respondent. The mere appointment of a receiver can have devastating effects. The respondent referred us to the statement in *Swiss Bank Corp. (Canada) v. Odyssey Industries Inc.* (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 49 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at para. 31:

... With respect to the hardship to Odyssey and Weston should a receiver be appointed, I am unable to find any evidence of undue or extreme hardship. Obviously the appointment of a receiver always causes hardship to the debtor in that the debtor loses control of its assets and business and may risk having its assets and business sold. The situation in this case is no different.

This quotation does not reflect the law of Alberta. Under the *Judicature Act*, it must be "just and convenient" to grant a receivership order. Justice and convenience can only be established by considering and balancing the position of both parties. The onus is on the applicant. The respondent does not have to prove any special hardship, much less "undue

hardship" to resist such an application. The effect of the mere granting of the receivership order must always be considered, and if possible a remedy short of receivership should be used.

54 In restating the rule that the onus rests upon the applicant in every case to discharge the burden of establishing that the balance of convenience favours the appointment of a receiver, the Alberta Court of Appeal appears now to have rejected the presumption described by McDonald J. in *Citibank Canada*.

55 In light of these authorities, I conclude that the statutory requirement that the appointment of a receiver be just and convenient does not permit or require me to begin my assessment of the material with the presumption that the plaintiff is entitled to a court-appointed receiver unless the defendant can demonstrate a compelling commercial or other reason why the order should not be made. Of the considered judgments on the issue from this Court, I prefer the approach taken by Masuhara J. in *Maple Trade Finance*. That approach permits the court, when it is appropriate to do so, to place considerable weight upon the fact that the creditor has the right to instrument-appoint a receiver. It also permits the court to engage in that analysis described by Taylor J. in *[Cal Glass* when considering whether the applicant has established that it is appropriate and necessary for the court to lend its aid to a party who may appoint a receiver without a court order.

Order for Sale Before Judgment

56 Section 15 of *The Law and Equity Act* describes the jurisdiction to grant an order for sale before judgment:

15 The court may, before or after judgment in a proceeding

(a) by a mortgagee, for the foreclosure of the equity of redemption in mortgaged property, or

(b) by a vendor of land, where a claim for the cancellation of the agreement is made, with or without a claim for the forfeiture of money paid on account of the purchase price,

on the application of a person who has an interest in the property or land, direct a sale of the property or land on the terms the court considers just.

57 A party foreclosing on a mortgage must afford the borrower an opportunity to redeem the property in all but exceptional circumstances. In *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Mrazek* (1985), 64 B.C.L.R. 282 (B.C. C.A.), the Court considered an appeal from an order granting the foreclosing bank immediate and exclusive right to sell a mortgagor's property, with the proviso that the order would not be entered for one month and the mortgagor would have the right to redeem the property prior to court approval of the sale. The Court, referring to *Devany v. Brackpool* (1981), 31 B.C.L.R. 256 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) and *Canlan Investment Corp. v. Gibbons* (1983), 42 B.C.L.R. 199 (B.C. S.C.), held that the law is clear that an immediate order for sale or an immediate order absolute can only be made on proof by the mortgagee of exceptional circumstances, because the mortgagor loses the right to redeem and is personally liable for the shortfall, if any, on the sale. The court will look to the amount of the shortfall, whether the asset is wasting and whether the market is worsening, among other factors, in determining whether the circumstances are exceptional.

58 In *Devany*, the petitioners sought an immediate order for sale without having obtained judgment or an order *nisi* of foreclosure. They took the position that the *Rules of Court* permit an application for sale of secured property before or after judgment. In response to the concern that the respondents would lose their right to redeem, the petitioners took the position that the respondents could seek an order permitting them to redeem the property at the hearing of the application to approve the sale. Mr. Justice Taylor said the following at p. 258 in describing the applicant's position:

That would, of course, tend to defeat a fundamental rule of law which has become very well established in England and in this province in proceedings for the realization of mortgage security. The equitable principle on which the courts have long proceeded is that a mortgagor in default shall not lose his land without first having a clear opportunity to redeem.

59 With respect to the suggestion that redemption be considered at the application to approve a sale, Taylor J. held (at p. 259): "I think it would leave the mortgagors in a state of uncertainty as to how and when they may redeem which significantly

impairs their equity of redemption." Assuming, for the purposes of argument, that an order for sale could be granted before an order *nisi* of foreclosure, he held:

But I am satisfied that the granting of an order for sale at that stage would be as much a matter of discretion as the granting of an order for sale after decree nisi and I do not accept the proposition that a mortgagee who thus obtained an order for sale in lieu of a decree nisi would be relieved of the normal obligation to account and the setting of a period within which the mortgagor may redeem.

60 The court could only contemplate departure from the normal requirements to account for the amount which must be paid and establish an appropriate redemption period - where the applicant could establish a "very special reason" for doing so.

61 The right to redeem is inconsistent with the granting of an order for sale to the mortgagee: *Canlan*, citing *Pope v. Roberts* (1979), 10 B.C.L.R. 50 (B.C. C.A.) and *First Western Capital Ltd. v. Wardle*, [1982] B.C.J. No. 770 (B.C. S.C.).

62 In *Canlan*, the petitioner had not brought a foreclosure petition on for hearing but applied for and obtained an order declaring a mortgage to be in default and an order for sale. An application came on before Van Der Hoop L.J.S.C. for approval of the sale. The court held:

In this file, the order for sale was sought and obtained against principle and authority. At the time the order was given no accounting was made and no time for redemption fixed, no judgment had been given on the personal covenant, and there was no evidence that the security of the applicant was in jeopardy.

63 That being the general rule in foreclosure actions, the question before me is whether the receiver of a business ought to be empowered to sell the real property of that business without affording the debtor an opportunity to redeem. The plaintiff says the receiver acquires the full range of powers to acquire and dispose of assets formerly enjoyed by the debtor, including the power to sell real estate in the ordinary course of business in order to discharge corporate debt.

64 The defendants say that the power to appoint a receiver is a remedy commonly afforded by security instruments and, at least where the debtor's principal asset is real estate, the lender cannot be permitted to use the power to appoint a receiver as a means of avoiding the usual redemption period.

65 There is the further question, in this case, whether that power ought to be granted to the receiver before judgment. The defendants say that neither the plaintiff nor a receiver should be entitled to offer the property for sale until after the plaintiff has been granted judgment and a redemption period has expired. In support of this proposition, the defendant relies on *South West Marine Estates Ltd. v. Bank of British Columbia* (1985), 65 B.C.L.R. 328 (B.C. C.A.) at para. 21; *Royal Bank v. Astor Hotel Ltd.* (1986), 3 B.C.L.R. (2d) 252, 62 C.B.R. (N.S.) 257 (B.C. C.A.) [*Astor Hotel*], at para. 47; and *First Pacific Credit Union v. Grimwood Sports Inc.* (1984), 16 D.L.R. (4th) 181, 59 B.C.L.R. 145 (B.C. C.A.).

66 There appears to be no doubt that if a party seeks a court-appointed receiver, the powers to be granted to the receiver are in the discretion of the court regardless of the broad powers which the parties might have consented to grant the receiver by contract. Bennett notes, at p. 244: "The court has the discretion to grant the receiver the power of sale even though the security instrument contains a power of sale." The author there expresses the view that the security holder should justify to the court as to why a power of sale is required. At p. 244 he notes: "In fact the receiver should have no authority to sell the debtor's assets out of the ordinary course of business until the security holder obtains judgment against the debtor".

67 At p. 234:

While the court has the power to authorize a sale at any time, the security holder should have judgment against the debtor before the court authorizes a sale of the debtor's business, especially where real estate is involved. In real estate matters, the debtor would normally be entitled to a redemption period.

68 Further, Bennett notes at p. 245:

In the case of real property the court generally protects the debtor's equity of redemption for a period of time before it authorizes a sale. Where there are no meritorious defences, the security holder should obtain judgment first and then give the debtor an opportunity to redeem before the assets are sold.

69 In support of that proposition, Bennett cites the cases to which I have been referred to by the defendant: *First Pacific; Vista Homes Ltd. v. Taplow Financial Ltd.* (1985), 64 B.C.L.R. 291, 56 C.B.R. (N.S.) 225 (B.C. S.C.); and *Astor Hotel*.

70 In *First Pacific*, Esson J.A. describes the appropriate role of a receiver appointed under a debenture. He considers the application for sale at p. 153:

What seems often to be lost sight of is that there is no necessary connection between the appointment of a receiver-manager and the remedy of a sale; and that it is the plaintiff, i.e. the debenture holder, not the receiver manager who seeks the remedy. It is the plaintiff who has the right and opportunity to prosecute the action and it is the plaintiff who, if judgment is granted in his favour, is given the remedy of sale. The order for sale before judgment is an extraordinary remedy which should be granted only in special circumstances.

71 At p. 154 he added:

In many cases, orders have been made giving to the receiver-manager at the outset power to offer assets for sale subject to court approval. The power to make such an order as a matter of course is, in my view, doubtful. There is power to make such an order in an application expressly raising the issue whether there should be a sale before judgment. Such a power is given by Rule 43(2) upon a finding by the court that "there eventually must be a sale". The power under s. 16 of the *Law and Equity Act* to order a sale before judgment may apply in some debenture holders' actions. There may be other sources of jurisdiction but I know of none that authorizes an order for sale before judgment as a matter of course.

72 In *Vista Homes*, McLachlin J. (as she then was), considered an application brought by a court-appointed receiver with a power to sell assets for an order for conduct of sale of a property held in joint tenancy by the debtor and another company. The application was dismissed as premature. The court held at p. 294:

The creditor at whose instance the receiver manager was appointed is not entitled to realize on the debt which it alleges to be owing before judgment by having the receiver manager sell the alleged debtor's property. It follows that there should not be a sale before judgment unless special circumstances are made out: *First Pac. Credit Union*

[citation omitted].

73 In *Astor Hotel*, the Court appointed a receiver under a debenture on September 18, 1985 and granted the receiver exclusive conduct of sale effective November 10, 1985. On the application for leave to appeal that order it was argued that the order for conduct of sale should not have been made without an accounting of the debt and a redemption period. The application for leave was dismissed on the basis that the chambers judge, by delaying the power of sale for two months had implicitly recognized and afforded to the debtor a redemption period. Taggart J.A. cited, apparently with approval *First Pacific, Vista Homes, Bank of Montreal v. Appcon Ltd.* (1981), 33 O.R. (2d) 97, 123 D.L.R. (3d) 394 (Ont. H.C.); *Royal Bank v. Camex Canada Corp.* (1985), 63 B.C.L.R. 125 (B.C. S.C.); and *South West Marine Estates Ltd. v. Bank of British Columbia* (1985), 65 B.C.L.R. 328 (B.C. C.A.). The latter two cases were cited as authority for the proposition that "the trend is to treat the issues arising in mortgage foreclosure proceedings and in debenture holders' actions in similar ways".

74 In considering the plaintiff's application I bear in mind that there may be advantages to all parties in giving a receiver the conduct of sale of real property. Among those are the factors considered in by Burnyeat J. in *United Saving*, at paras. 32-34, in granting the receiver power to offer the hotel for sale in that case.

Discussion

Appointment of a Receiver

75 The parties in this case stipulated in their contracts that the plaintiff would be entitled to appoint a receiver or to apply for a court-appointed receiver in the event of default. The relief sought by the plaintiff is not, therefore, extraordinary.

76 The defendants owe a significant sum of money to the plaintiff and have not reduced the principal debt since inception of the loan. There does not appear to be a dispute with respect to the amount of the debt. Nor does there appear to be a dispute that the defendants are in default.

77 There is no imminent prospect of repayment of principal from operations. There is some evidence of refinancing efforts but there is no suggestion that those efforts will lead to repayment of even the principal loan in its entirety.

78 There has not been full disclosure of the defendants' refinancing plans. The plaintiff has not been involved in refinancing efforts and has not received particulars of the proposed plan.

79 The interim plan to make partial payments to the plaintiff will not indemnify the plaintiff against interest accumulating on the principal and arrears in the interim.

80 If payments are to come from operating revenues, the defendants estimates of those revenues are optimistic and there is no assurance that those interim payments can be made.

81 In the case at bar, unlike *Korion and Maple Trade Finance*, there is a real risk to the plaintiff's equity and real doubt with respect to the prospect of recovery of principal. The defendants' plans do not provide for indemnity to the plaintiff for the losses incurred on an ongoing basis. There is inadequate provision to minimize the irreparable losses that will be incurred by the lender.

82 The defendants say that it would not be just and equitable to appoint a receiver in the circumstances of this case. The defendants say that the overriding consideration for the court is the protection and preservation of the property pending judgment and that operation of the hotel by experienced managers will minimize interim losses and maximize the potential sale value. They say they can most effectively market the property while operating it without any risk or further jeopardy to the plaintiff. The defendants say the appointment of a receiver will be detrimental to all parties.

83 The defendants further say appointment of a receiver will so damage the hotel's reputation that its value will be substantially affected. There is, however, no persuasive evidence that the appointment would cause undue hardship to the defendants. I conclude, as did the Court in *Royal Trust Corp.*, that it would be naive to think that those with whom the defendants do business would be unaware of the foreclosure proceedings presently underway.

84 The defendants seek to have the reins of the debtor company while the risk of profit and loss in the interim remains almost entirely in the hands of the plaintiff. The liability of the guarantors is limited. While there does not appear to be any basis to conclude that the asset will be wasted, the budget does call for management fees to be paid by the defendant to related companies owned by the Pomeroy Group. The Pomeroy Group operates other hotels and businesses. There is some risk to the plaintiff in permitting the defendants to manage the operations of the Hotel when it may be in the defendants' interests to earn their profits elsewhere. The Plaintiff is suffering losses in the interim. I am of the view that it should not be required to leave its interests in the hands of the defendants.

85 Balancing the rights of the parties I find it is just and convenient to grant a receivership order.

Order for Sale

86 The plaintiff does not seek an order permitting the receiver to receive to sell the real property without court approval but, rather seeks the conduct of sale, subject to court approval. The order sought by the plaintiff would require court approval of transactions with a value in excess of \$200,000 and aggregate transactions in excess of \$500,000. As conduct of sale precludes redemption, the order sought by the plaintiff is inconsistent with affording the defendants a redemption period.

87 The defendant says that it is in the best position to refinance or market the Hotel and that there is no reason why it should not be afforded the usual redemption period when the plaintiff has not obtained judgment.

88 It is acknowledged that business operations of the Hotel will generate insufficient revenue to permit Chetwynd and NHLP to pay interest as it accrues on the loan. The defendants will certainly make no headway in repaying the arrears that have accumulated to date. The plaintiff says there is no reasonable prospect that refinancing will make the plaintiff whole. It seeks to protect its interest by selling the assets that are the subject of the security.

89 I cannot find on the evidence that such special circumstances exist that the plaintiff should have an order for sale before judgment and consideration of an appropriate redemption period. It is not clear that the value of the security is diminishing. To the contrary there is some evidence that the profitability and therefore the value of the Hotel is likely to increase in the interim. Some net income is being generated from operations. The order appointing the receiver shall not therefore authorize the receiver to have conduct of the sale of the Hotel. The receiver will be authorized to engage only in such sales as would occur in the ordinary course of business of the Hotel.

90 The plaintiff shall have leave to renew the application for conduct of sale in the event of a material change in circumstances, in the event the receiver discovers a financial situation substantially different from that known to the plaintiff on this application or on obtaining judgment.

91 The form of the order appointing the receiver, subject to the limitation set out in these reasons, will be in the form provided to the Court by the plaintiff on the application.

92 The parties have leave to apply for further directions if necessary.

Application granted in part.

TAB 5

2014 NSSC 128
Nova Scotia Supreme Court

Enterprise Cape Breton Corp. v. Crown Jewel Resort Ranch Inc.

2014 CarswellNS 263, 2014 NSSC 128, 1084 A.P.R. 108, 12
C.B.R. (6th) 181, 239 A.C.W.S. (3d) 363, 343 N.S.R. (2d) 108

Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, a body corporate, incorporated pursuant to the Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation Act, enacted as Part II to the Government Organization Act, Atlantic Canada, 1987, R.S., 1985, c. 41 (4th Supp.) ("ECBC"), Applicant v. Crown Jewel Resort Ranch, Inc., a body corporate incorporated under the laws of Nova Scotia ("Crown Jewel") And I.N.K. Real Estate Inc., a body corporate incorporated Under the laws of Nova Scotia ("I.N.K."), Together the Respondents

Frank Edwards J.

Heard: March 5, 2014
Judgment: April 10, 2014
Docket: SYDJC 423486

Counsel: Robert Risk for Applicant
Nahman Korem for Respondent, Companies

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Debtors and creditors

[VII Receivers](#)

[VII.3 Appointment](#)

[VII.3.b Application for appointment](#)

[VII.3.b.i General principles](#)

Headnote

Debtors and creditors --- Receivers — Appointment — Application for appointment — General principles

Respondent was indebted to applicant for mortgage and loans — Respondents defaulted on payments — Two principals of respondent were embroiled in divorce proceedings and resort ceased to function — Applicant decided not to enforce security until divorce outcome was known — Respondents were in serious arrears on loans — Applicant sought order appointing MGM as receiver and manager of all assets of respondents — Respondents objected asserting mortgage was not valid, one of companies was capable of making payments and it was not just and convenient to appoint receiver — Application granted; receiver appointed — Respondents' obligations and applicant's rights under mortgage remained in full force and effect — Mortgage was properly executed and duly recorded — Mortgage was given as security for promissory note — Applicant's lawyer was satisfied with promissory note and authorized applicant to disburse funds — There was realistic prospect that respondents would not ever be able to address their debts — Applicant extended respondents every opportunity to turn business around — Business became insolvent and was not in operation for some time — Applicant had no option but to enforce security — Respondents did not make any reasonable progress in obtaining alternate financing with view to paying out applicant's indebtedness — Other than cost of receiver there was no existing or imminent harm beyond potential future risk of receiver obtaining court approval of improvident sale — It was premature to argue irreparable harm.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Frank Edwards J.*:

Bank of Montreal v. Sherco Properties Inc. (2013), 2013 ONSC 7023, 2013 CarswellOnt 16848 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek (1996), 1996 CarswellOnt 2328, 40 C.B.R. (3d) 274 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered

Romspen Investment Corp. v. 1514904 Ontario Ltd. (2010), 67 C.B.R. (5th) 231, 2010 CarswellOnt 2951, 2010 ONSC 1339 (Ont. S.C.J.) — considered

Statutes considered:

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

s. 243(1) — considered

s. 244 — pursuant to

Judicature Act, R.S.N.S. 1989, c. 240

s. 43(9) — considered

APPLICATION by corporation for order appointing receiver, in bankruptcy of respondent companies.

Frank Edwards J.:

1 The applicant is applying for an order appointing Greg MacKenzie of MacKenzie, Gillis, MacDougall Inc. ("MGM") as receiver and manager of all of the undertakings, property and assets of Crown Jewel and I.N.K. pursuant to Section 243(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, and/or Section 43(9) of the *Judicature Act*, R.S.N.S. 1989, c. 240

2 *Grounds for Order:* The applicant is applying for the order on the following grounds:

1. A General Security Agreement made between Crown Jewel Resort Ranch, Inc. and the Cape Breton Growth Fund Corporation dated on or about February 3, 2005 and registered in the Nova Scotia Personal Property Registry as Registration No. 9213736 on February 8, 2005, as amended by Registration No. 21915103 on October 11, 2013.

2. A Mortgage made between I.N.K. Real Estate Inc. and the Cape Breton Growth Fund Corporation dated February 4, 2005 registered at the Victoria County Registry of Deeds on February 8, 2005 as Document No. 81337157 (PID Nos. 85017614, 85079127 and 85155281), said Mortgage having been assigned to Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation pursuant to a General Conveyance, Assignment and Assumption of Liabilities Agreement dated March 31, 2008 and registered at the Victoria County Registry of Deeds on May 30, 2008 as Document No. 90774226;

3. A General Security Agreement made between I.N.K. Real Estate Inc. and the Cape Breton Growth Fund Corporation dated on or about February 3, 2005 and registered in the Nova Scotia Personal Property Registry as Registration No. 9213692 on February 8, 2005, as amended by Registration No. 13924725 on May 23, 2008 (together with the above the "Security")

4. The Respondent Companies (RC's) have defaulted on their payments and failed to honour their obligations pursuant to a Letter of Offer made between Crown Jewel, I.N.K. and ECBC dated on or about October 2, 2003 with respect to Project No. 8600338-1 (the "Letter of Offer").

5. The total amount of indebtedness secured by the Security is \$226,134.00 as at October 8, 2013 together with overdue interest on arrears in the amount of \$1,738.19 and interest thereafter at a per diem rate of \$37.17.

6. The RC's were provided with respective Notices of Intention to Enforce Security pursuant to section 244 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* on October 24, 2013.

7. Greg MacKenzie of MGM has agreed to act as the court-appointed receiver and manager of all of the undertakings, property and assets of both Crown Jewel and I.N.K. and the Applicant consents to his appointment.

8. The Applicant, ECBC relies on Section 243(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, which reads:

243. (1) Subject to subsection (1.1), on application by a secured creditor, a court may appoint a receiver to do any or all of the following if it considers it to be just or convenient to do so:

(a) take possession of all or substantially all of the inventory, accounts receivable or other property of an insolvent person or bankrupt that was acquired for or used in relation to a business carried on by the insolvent person or bankrupt;

(b) exercise any control that the court considers advisable over that property and over the insolvent person's or bankrupt's business; or

(c) take any other action that the court considers advisable.

9. The Applicant, ECBC relies on Section 43(9) of the *Judicature Act*, R.S.N.S. 1989, c. 240, which reads:

43. (9) A mandamus or an injunction may be granted or a receiver appointed by an interlocutory order of the Supreme Court, in all cases in which it appears to the Supreme Court to be just or convenient that such order should be made, and any such order may be made either unconditionally or upon such terms and conditions as the Supreme Court thinks just, and if an injunction is asked, either before or at or after the hearing of any cause or matter, to prevent any threatened or apprehended waste or trespass, such injunction may be granted if the Supreme Court thinks fit, whether the person against whom such injunction is sought is, or is not, in possession under any claim of title or otherwise or, if out of possession, does or does not claim a right to do the act sought to be restrained, under any colour of title, and whether the estates claimed by both or by either of the parties are legal or equitable.

3 *Background:* The RC's had obtained financing from the Cape Breton Growth Fund Corporation (CBGF), the Atlantic Canada Opportunity Agency (ACOA), and the Applicant, Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation (ECBC).

4 ECBC succeeded CBGF when the latter wound up in 2008. ECBC delivers and administers all programs offered by ACOA.

5 The RC's' intent was to establish an upscale, four-season, fly-in active vacation resort near Baddeck, Nova Scotia. Operations commenced in 2006 but struggled financially from the outset. The financial problems multiplied when the two principals in the RC's, Nahman Korem (Korem) and Iris Kedmi (Kedmi) became embroiled in protracted divorce proceedings. These continued between 2010 and December, 2012 when the Nova Scotia Court of Appeal dismissed Kedmi's appeal. The resort essentially ceased to function as of the start of the domestic trouble between Korem and Kedmi in 2010.

6 By October 8, 2013, the RC's were in serious arrears on their loans. By that date, the total amount of indebtedness was as follows:

1. *ECBC Secured Letter of Offer:* \$226,134.00 with overdue interest on arrears of \$1,738.19 plus interest of \$37.17 per day.

2. *ECBC Unsecured Letter of Offer:* \$268,254.86 with overdue interest on arrears of \$1,738.19 plus interest of \$44.10 per day.

3. *ACOA Unsecured Loan:* \$256,642.00 plus arrears of \$4,425.80.

7 Throughout the period of 2005-2009 the RC's were able to make their regular scheduled payments on the ACOA Unsecured Loan, having repaid approximately \$234,360.00 of the initial \$500,000.00 loan disbursement. (Lane affidavit para. 22)

8 The RC's have, however, paid only approximately \$6,000.00 toward the outstanding principal on the ACOA Unsecured Loan since 2009. Further, no repayments at all have been made on this loan within the 12 month period from December of 2012 to December of 2013. (Lane Affidavit para. 23)

9 With respect to both the ECBC Secured and Unsecured Letters of Offer, the RC's have to date made only a combined repayment in the approximate amount of \$9,235.00. As noted above, these loans are in significant arrears. Furthermore, overdue interest is due and owing and is accruing daily. (Lane affidavit para. 24)

10 The Applicant gave the RC's Notices of Intention to Enforce Security on October 24, 2013. Korem knew by November 2013 at the latest that ECBC intended to apply to have a receiver/manager appointed by the Court. A General Security Agreement given to CBGF/ECBC by the RC's provided for the appointment of a private receiver upon default.

11 Despite the fact that the loans were already overdue, ECBC took a hands-off approach during the divorce proceedings. Korem and Kedmi were making competing claims regarding the assets of the RC's. ECBC thus decided not to enforce its security until the divorce outcome was known. After dismissal of the Kedmi Appeal in December, 2012, Korem became the effective owner of all the assets and liabilities of the RC's.

12 Korem insists that ECBC is partially responsible for the present situation because it allowed Kedmi to liquidate some of the assets. I reject any such notion. During the 2010 - 2012 period, the resort was clearly in survival mode. The two principals were locked in a particularly acrimonious marital dispute. The resort was generating no revenue. Kedmi was living on the resort property and was assuring ECBC that she was doing her best to maintain it.

13 It was in that context that ECBC allowed Kedmi to liquidate some assets that were not essential to the survival of the resort. ECBC also allowed her to liquidate assets which in fact had actually become liabilities. These included the horses which were very expensive to maintain but had no foreseeable prospect of generating revenue. Korem's grievance with ECBC is misplaced.

14 Korem now rests his hopes of financial recovery on the possibility of operating a timber cutting business. He presented ECBC with an appraisal of the timber resources on the resort property. The appraisal indicated that the value of the standing timber was 1.5 to 2 million dollars less harvesting costs.

15 ECBC gave Korem permission to do some limited wood harvesting but insisted upon the presentation of a business plan by July, 2013. The business plan Korem provided did not address how the RC's intended to service the ECBC and ACOA debts. Nor did it indicate how the RC's would finance the start-up of the timber business.

16 In October, 2013, ECBC again reviewed proposals put forward by Korem. Incidentally, ECBC learned that property taxes for the resort were \$80,000.00 in arrears (Korem says it's now \$75,000.00) and that a tax sale was imminent. ECBC decided it was time to apply to have a Receiver/Manager appointed.

17 *RC's' Objections to Appointment of Receiver/Manager:* Korem acted for the RC's without legal counsel. He put forward three objections to the appointment of a Receiver/Manager:

1. That the Mortgage dated February 4, 2005 is not valid;
2. That I.N.K. Real Estate Inc. is capable of making payments;
3. That it is not "just and convenient" to appoint a receiver.

18 I will deal with the objections in turn:

19 *1. The Mortgage is Valid:* It was properly executed by Korem and was duly recorded. Its repayment terms reflect those agreed to by Korem when he signed as president of I.N.K. Real Estate Inc. on October 2, 2003. Those repayment terms were

subsequently modified (in I.N.K.'s favor) on March 23, 2005 and October 30, 2010. On both occasions, Korem signed. (See Lane Affidavit Tabs A & B).

20 The Mortgage was given as security for a Promissory Note dated January 21, 2005. Korem's objection seems to be based upon his view that ECBC's counsel at the time questioned the promissory note. On the contrary, the record shows that the lawyer was satisfied with the promissory note and authorized ECBC to disburse funds.

21 The RC's obligations and ECBC's rights under the Mortgage remain in full force and effect.

22 *2. The RC's are not Capable of Making Payments:* As an aside, Korem seeks to claim that he cannot speak for Crown Jewel Resort Ranch Inc. (CJRR) because Kedmi still owns that company. At the same time Korem acknowledges that all CJRR's assets and liabilities have been transferred to him. Korem is the effective principal of both companies.

23 To service their debts to ECBC and ACOA, the RC's would have to make monthly payments of just under \$19,000.00 per month. (To say nothing of the arrears). As noted they are also in substantial arrears regarding property taxes (\$75,000.00) and owe contractor D.W. Matheson about \$35,000.00.

24 Korem has provided no details to show how he can finance the start-up of the timber business. By his own estimate, he would need one to two years just to pay off the ECBC Secured debt. He give no indication of how much longer it would take to pay off the Unsecured debts. Korem has been given ample opportunity to seek re-financing with another lender. He admits that commercial lenders will not go near him. There is no realistic prospect that the RC's will ever be able to address their debts.

25 *It is Just and Convenient that a Receiver/Manager be Appointed:* What follows, I adopt, in large measure from the Applicant's Brief.

26 In *The 2013-2014 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, Lloyd W. Houlden, Geoffrey B. Morawetz & Janis P. Sarra (Carswell:Toronto, Ontario 2013-2014) the authors set out at p. 1018 the factors I consider in determining whether it is appropriate to appoint a receiver. These are:

- (a) whether irreparable harm might be caused if no order were made, although it is not essential for a creditor to establish irreparable harm if a receiver is not appointed;
- (b) the risk to the security holder taking into consideration the size of the debtor's equity in the assets and the need for protection or safeguarding of the assets while litigation takes place;
- (c) the nature of the property;
- (d) the apprehended or actual waste of the debtor's assets;
- (e) the preservation and protection of the property pending judicial resolution;
- (f) the balance of convenience to the parties;
- (g) the fact that the creditor has the right to appoint a receiver under the documentation provided for in the loan;
- (h) the enforcement of rights under a security instrument where the security holder encounters or expects to encounter difficulty with the debtor and others;
- (i) the principle that the appointment of a receiver is extraordinary relief that should be granted cautiously and sparingly;
- (j) the consideration of whether a court appointment is necessary to enable the receiver to carry out its duties more efficiently;

- (k) the effect of the order on the parties;
- (l) the conduct of the parties;
- (m) the length of time that a receiver may be in place;
- (n) the cost to the parties;
- (o) the likelihood of maximizing return to the parties; and
- (p) the goal of facilitating the duties of the receiver.

27 The authors further note that a court can, when it is appropriate to do so, place considerable weight on the fact that the creditor has the right to instrument - appoint a receiver. In *Bank of Montreal v. Sherco Properties Inc.*, 2013 ONSC 7023 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) the court granted the application of the Bank of Montreal for the court-appointment of a receiver over the assets of Sherco Properties Inc., finding at paragraph 42 that:

[42] Where the security instrument governing the relationship between the debtor and the secured creditor provides for a right to appoint a receiver upon default, this has the effect of relaxing the burden on the applicant seeking to have the receiver appointed. While the appointment of a receiver is generally regarded as an extraordinary equitable remedy, courts do not regard the nature of the remedy as extraordinary or equitable where the relevant security document permits the appointment of a receiver. This is because the applicant is merely seeking to enforce a term of an agreement that was assented to by both parties. See *Textron Financial Canada Limited v. Chetwynd Motels Limited*, 2010 BCSC 477; Freure Village, supra; *Canadian Tire Corp. v. Healy*, 2011 ONSC 4616 and *Bank of Montreal v. Carnivale National Leasing Ltd. and Carnivale Automobile Ltd.*, 2011 ONSC 1007.

28 The court in *Bank of Montreal v. Sherco Properties Inc.* offered the following reasons for its decision at paragraph 47 below:

[47] I have reached this conclusion for the following reasons:

- (a) the terms of the security held by the Bank in respect of Sherco and Farm permit the appointment of a receiver;
- (b) the terms of the mortgages permit the appointment of a receiver upon default;
- (c) the value of the security continues to erode as interest and tax arrears continue to accrue;
- (d) Mr. Sherk contends that, with his assistance and knowledge, the Bank will get the highest and most value from the sale of the lands. It has been demonstrated over the past two years that Mr. Sherk has not been able to accomplish a refinancing or a sale.

29 As noted at paragraph 33 of the Affidavit of Steve Lane, the General Security Agreement entered into by Crown Jewel provides ECBC with the specific authority to appoint by instrument a receiver or receiver and manager of the assets of the company upon default. The RC's are in default of the obligations owed to ECBC pursuant to the Secured Letter of Offer as referenced in paragraph 4 of the Affidavit of Steve Lane.

30 Certain other factors to be considered in determining whether it is just and convenient to appoint a receiver are particularly relevant to the case at Bar. These are:

(b) the risk to the security holder taking into consideration the size of the debtor's equity in the assets and the need for protection or safeguarding of the assets while litigation takes place;

31 Mr. Lane states at paragraphs 50 and 51 of his Affidavit that the RC's owe outstanding property taxes to Victoria County, Cape Breton in the approximate amount of \$80,000.00 as of October, 2013 and that, failing payment, Victoria County intends

to put the lands up for tax sale in March of 2014. Permitting this situation to continue will undoubtedly place ECBC's security interest at risk.

32 Paragraphs 58 and 59 of the Affidavit of Steve Lane sets out the concerns ECBC has with the alleged lease agreements entered into by Korem. Clearly Korem did not have, on behalf of the RC's, any authority to enter into these lease agreements without the consent of ECBC. Further, the lease agreements appear to have been made by the RC's under a different business name, notwithstanding the fact that this entity has no legal standing. Clearly the RC's can no longer be entrusted with protecting and safeguarding their assets and the actions they have taken with respect to these alleged lease agreements clearly places ECBC's security interest at risk.

(d) the apprehended or actual waste of the debtor's assets;

33 It is apparent that Korem intends to continue with timber harvesting on the lands of the RC's that are subject to the ECBC security interest. Although limited timber harvesting was permitted by ECBC while Korem attempted to resolve the outstanding matrimonial property dispute, ECBC is understandably not confident that Korem will seek such consent in future. Given what appears to be an increasingly desperate financial situation of the RC's, ECBC holds a reasonable apprehension that the assets of the RC's, and in particular the timber resources, may be depleted or wasted.

(e) the preservation and protection of the property pending judicial resolution;

34 Crown Jewel Resort is no longer in operation and has been closed down for quite some time. ECBC remains concerned as to whether the assets of the resort are being adequately preserved and protected. For instance, ECBC has no way of ensuring that Korem will continue to properly maintain the resort property. Further, ECBC is concerned as to whether the assets of the resort will be properly insured on a continuing basis.

(g) the fact that the creditor has the right to appoint a receiver under the documentation provided for in the loan;

35 As noted above, ECBC has the right to appoint a receiver by instrument under the General Security Agreement entered into by the Respondent, Crown Jewel. ECBC advised the RC's of its intention to appoint a private receiver with respect to this matter during the November 20, 2013 negotiation referenced at paragraph 53 of Mr. Lane's Affidavit.

(j) the consideration of whether a court appointment is necessary to enable the receiver to carry out its duties more efficiently;

36 In *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek* (1996), 40 C.B.R. (3d) 274 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) granted the motion for appointment by the court of a receiver-manager, holding at paragraph 13:

[13] Here I am satisfied on balance it is just and convenient for the order sought to be made. The Defendants have been attempting to refinance the properties for 1 ¹/₂ years without success, although a letter from Mutual Trust dated yesterday suggests (again) the possibility of a refinancing in the near future. The Bank and the debtors are deadlocked and I infer from the history and evidence that the Bank's attempts to enforce its security privately will only lead to more litigation. Indeed, the debtor's solicitors themselves refer to the prospect of "costly, protracted and unproductive" litigation in a letter dated March 21st of this year, should the Bank seek to pursue its remedies. More significantly, the parties cannot agree on the proper approach to be taken to marketing the properties which everyone agrees must be sold. Should it be on a unit by unit conversion condominium basis (as the debtor proposes) or on an en bloc basis as the Bank would prefer? A Court appointed receiver with a mandate to develop a marketing plan can resolve that impasse, subject to the Court's approval, whereas a privately appointed receiver in all likelihood could not, at least without further litigious skirmishing. In the end, I am satisfied the interests of the debtors themselves, along with those of the creditors (and the tenants, who will be caught in the middle) and the orderly disposition of the property are all better served by the appointment of the receiver-manager as requested.

37 Mr. Lane, at paragraph 60 of his Affidavit, notes the concerns ECBC has with the ability of MGM to carry out its duties. It is clear from the email stream of correspondences referenced at paragraph 59 of the Affidavit that Korem intends to set up as many road blocks as he can with respect to both the appointment of the receiver and the subsequent carrying out of its duties. As in *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek* above, it appears inevitable that Korem will continue to bring costly, protracted and unproductive litigation against both ECBC and its privately appointed receiver. Further, it appears clear that Korem will not agree on the proper approach to be taken to marketing and selling the assets of the RC's subject to the ECBC security interest. Certainly any such attempts to dispose of the property by the privately appointed receiver would be met with further litigious skirmishing.

(l) the conduct of the parties;

38 It is clear from a reading of Mr. Lane's Affidavit that ECBC has extended the RC's with every opportunity to turn the resort business around. Unfortunately, the business became insolvent and has not been in operation for some time. Ultimately, ECBC had no option other than to enforce its security in an attempt to recover some of the losses it incurred in relation to the loans granted to the RC's. Despite the personal investment Korem has made in the resort, as well as the arduous and extremely adversarial divorce proceedings with Kedmi in regard to the assets of the RC's, Korem has not, despite being given ample opportunity to do so, made any reasonable progress in obtaining alternate financing with a view to paying out the ECBC indebtedness. Further, Korem has yet to provide ECBC with a meaningful business plan outlining the timely repayment of the ECBC debt.

(o) the likelihood of maximizing return to the parties;

39 The most practical and prudent approach to maximizing the return to the parties, including the unsecured debt, would be to proceed with a sale of the resort as soon as possible. In the interim, it remains open to Korem, while the receiver is in place, to obtain alternate financing with a view to paying out the ECBC debt.

40 The authors of *The 2013-2014 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* comment at page 1018 that there is an important distinction between the duties and obligations of a receiver and manager privately appointed under the provisions of a security document and those of a receiver and manager appointed by court order. A privately appointed receiver and manager is not acting in a fiduciary capacity; it need only ensure that a fair sale is conducted of the assets covered by the security documents and that a proper accounting is made to the debtor. A court-appointed receiver and manager, on the other hand, is an officer of the Court and acts in a fiduciary capacity with respect to all interested parties. Further, a court-appointed receiver derives its powers and authority wholly from the order of the court appointing it. It is not subject to the control and direction of the parties who had it appointed, or of anyone, except the Court. Given the significant unsecured debt owed to both ECBC and the Atlantic Canada Opportunity Agency, as set out at paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Affidavit of Steve Lane, a court-appointed receiver will more adequately and appropriately consider the interests of these, as well as potentially other, unsecured creditors and therefore the appointment by way of a court order is more appropriate in these particular circumstances.

41 The appointment of a receiver is, generally speaking, an extraordinary relief that should be granted cautiously and sparingly. However, in Houlden, Morawetz and Sarra at p. 1024 below:

The court has held that while generally, the appointment of a receiver is an extraordinary remedy, where the security instrument permits the appointment of a private receiver, and/or contemplates the secured creditor seeking a court-appointed receiver, and where the circumstances of default justify the appointment of a private receiver, the "extraordinary" nature of the remedy sought is less essential to the inquiry. Rather, the "just or convenient" question becomes one of the court determining whether or not it is more in the interests of all concerned to have the receiver appointed by the court: *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek* (1996), 1996 CarswellOnt 2328, 40 C.B.R. (3d) 274 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

42 Finally, the authors note at p. 1024 of *The 2013-2014 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* that the court's appointment of a receiver does not necessarily dictate the financial end of the debtor. In *Romspen Investment Corp. v. 1514904 Ontario Ltd.*, 2010 CarswellOnt 2951, 67 C.B.R. (5th) 231 (Ont. S.C.J.) the court commented at paragraph 32:

[32] The court's appointment of the Receiver does not dictate the end of this development nor the financial end necessarily of the Debtors. Some receiverships are terminated upon presentation of an acceptable plan of refinancing or after a sale of some but not all assets. Time will be necessary for the Receiver to determine value and appropriately market the subject properties. During this time, the Debtors are entitled to continue to seek out prospective lenders or identify potential purchasers, with the qualification that they cannot usurp the role of the Receiver. Other than the cost of the Receiver, there is no existing or imminent harm beyond the potential future risk of the Receiver obtaining court approval of an improvident sale. Market value versus a proposed sale price will form the very argument on the approval motion. It is premature to argue irreparable harm at this time.

Conclusion

43 I therefore order the appointment of Greg MacKenzie of MacKenzie, Gillis, MacDougall Inc. as the receiver and/or manager of all of the undertakings, property and assets of the RC's, Crown Jewel Resort Ranch, Inc. and I.N.K. Real Estate Inc. The Applicant shall also have its costs in the amount of \$1500.00 payable forthwith.

Application granted; receiver appointed.