

COURT FILE NUMBER 2201-08920

COURT COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

JUDICIAL CENTRE CALGARY

Clerk's stamp

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF
COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF
NORTH AMERICAN LAMB COMPANY LTD.,
CANADA SHEEP AND LAMB FARMS LTD.,
CANADA SHEEP HOLDINGS LTD., LAMB
CLUB MARKETING LIMITED, CANADA LAMB
GROWERS LTD., CANADA LAMB
PROCESSORS LTD. and CANINE FAIR LTD.

PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT ERNST & YOUNG INC., IN ITS CAPACITY AS
COURT-APPOINTED MONITOR OF THE
DEBTOR COMPANIES

DOCUMENT **BENCH BRIEF**

Re: Stay Extension and Sale Approval

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND
CONTACT INFORMATION OF
PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP
400 3rd Avenue SW, Suite 3700
Calgary, Alberta T2P 4H2 CANADA

Howard A. Gorman, K.C. / Meghan L. Parker
howard.gorman@nortonrosefulbright.com
meghan.parker@nortonrosefulbright.com
Tel: +1 403.267.8222
Fax: +1 403.264.5973

Lawyers for the Monitor, Ernst & Young Inc.
File no.: 1001221818

I. INTRODUCTION

1 This Bench Brief is submitted on behalf of Ernst & Young Inc., in its capacity as Court-appointed Monitor (**EY** or the **Monitor**) of North American Lamb Company Ltd., Canada Sheep and Lamb Farms Ltd., Canada Sheep Holdings Ltd., Lamb Club Marketing Limited, Canada Lamb Growers Ltd., Canada Lamb Processors Ltd., and Canine Fair Ltd. (the **Debtor Companies** or the **NALCO Group**). It is submitted in support of the Monitor's application for sale approval and

vesting orders (the **SAVOs**) in respect of certain properties located in Alberta and Manitoba, an order extending the stay of proceedings (the **Stay Extension Order**), an order authorizing the Monitor to make an interim distribution or distributions to certain secured parties (the **Interim Distribution Order**), and a sealing order in respect of the Confidential Supplement (the **Confidential Supplement**) to the Monitor's Second Report, dated November 29, 2022 (the **Second Report**) (the **Sealing Order**).

2 The Monitor relies on the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36, as amended (the **CCAA**)¹ in support of the relief sought in this application, which is scheduled to be heard via Webex on December 6, 2022.

3 Capitalized terms used herein and not otherwise defined have the same meanings as indicated in the Second Report.

II. FACTS

A. Background.

4 The NALCO Group is a privately held lamb producer and processor carrying on its business operations at facilities located in Alberta and Manitoba. Its operations are vertically integrated, and include accelerated sheep breeding facilities, lamb growing facilities, a lamb feedlot, and a lamb processing plant. The NALCO Group currently has the capacity to finish approximately 80,000 lambs annually and processes lambs both from independent lamb producers throughout Western Canada and from its own breeding facilities.²

5 The NALCO Group's shareholders are Fresh Canada Meats Ltd. (58.6%) (**FCM**), who was the applicant for the Initial Order, and 2079468 Alberta Ltd. (41.4%).³ The senior secured lenders of the NALCO Group are Bank of Nova Scotia and Farm Credit Canada (the **Senior Secured Lenders**).⁴

6 EY was appointed as Monitor of the NALCO Group with enhanced powers pursuant to an Initial Order granted on August 8, 2022, by the Honourable Justice Horner, as amended and restated by an Order of the Honourable Justice Neufeld. A sale and investment solicitation Order

¹ *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36 (**CCAA**) [Tab 1].

² Second Report.

³ Pre-Filing Report of the Monitor, dated August 5, 2022, at paras 11-12 (**Pre-Filing Report**).

⁴ Pre-Filing Report at para 15.

(the **SISP Order**) was granted by Justice Neufeld concurrently with the Amended and Restated Initial Order, on August 17, 2022.

B. Activities of the Monitor.

7 Since the First Report, the activities of the Monitor have included:

- (a) monitoring the NALCO Group's operations and financial affairs and, due to the departure of NALCO's financial controller, establishing enhanced financial controls over company disbursements;
- (b) due to the stronger than initially forecast cash position of the NALCO Group, overseeing the payment of all borrowings on the \$1.5M Amended Financing Facility, which occurred during the week ending September 24, 2022;
- (c) assisting the NALCO Group with the preparation of weekly: (a) forecast-to-actual variance reports, (b) livestock movement schedules, and (c) revised cash flow statements;
- (d) coordinating the sale of Livestock Assets to third party purchasers, which included entering into a Processing Agreement and a Finishing Agreement to facilitate a bulk sale of livestock;
- (e) coordinating with the Chief Veterinary Officer of Manitoba and a third-party veterinarian to address and respond to various animal welfare matters and to ensure the well-being of the NALCO Group's livestock;
- (f) assisting the NALCO Group with the wind down of all farming operations in Manitoba;
- (g) disclaiming certain real property leases for agricultural land in Manitoba in accordance with para 10(c) of the Amended and Restated Initial Order and section 32 of the CCAA;
- (h) compiling information and responding to various trust exams conducted by the Canada Revenue Agency;
- (i) coordinating with the Selling Agent to advance the SISP;

- (j) coordinating with operations and human resources staff to address and respond to all aspects of human resource management;
- (k) working with the NALCO Group's existing insurers to ensure continued post filing insurance coverage;
- (l) developing a revised cash flow in consultation with NALCO's operations and finance departments;
- (m) participating in discussions with certain large creditors and suppliers of the NALCO Group to ensure continuity of supplies and services during the course of the CCAA proceedings; and
- (n) updating and providing information to the Senior Secured Lenders with respect to the status of the CCAA proceedings generally, the SISP, and other matters of interest.⁵

C. The Sale Process.

8 Since the filing of the First Report, the Monitor has been working with the Selling Agent and key stakeholders in respect of the SISP.

9 Following the issuance of the SISP Order, the Selling Agent undertook extensive marketing activities to solicit offers to purchase the SISP Assets, which include each of the following properties (including all buildings and fixtures attached), assumed contracts tied to the properties, and all chattels located on site, excluding leased assets: the Innisfail Property, the Iron Springs Property, the Lundar Property, the Stony Mountain Property, the Rockwood Property and the Sarto Property.⁶

10 The marketing activities of the Selling Agent included:

- (a) developing comprehensive marketing materials, including a teaser and confidential information memorandum;

⁵ Second Report at para 14.

⁶ Second Report at para 32.

- (b) establishing a data room with key information about the Debtor Companies and making the same available to any prospective purchaser that signed a standard non-disclosure agreement;
- (c) placing advertisements about the SISP opportunity in relevant media platforms including the National Post, the Calgary Herald, the Lethbridge Herald, and the Winnipeg Free Press; and
- (d) contacting 271 targeted investors, including domestic and international companies in the lamb industry, other similar meat producers and processors, brokers, and private equity firms, as well as local real estate brokers specializing in farmland sales in Alberta and Manitoba, and members of the Canadian Sheep Federation to discuss the SISP opportunity.⁷

11 Due to the marketing efforts of the Selling Agent, 23 prospective purchasers executed non-disclosure agreements and accessed the data room, 10 prospective purchasers performed site visits, and 14 Letters of Intent (**LOI**) were received from prospective purchasers confirming an interest in certain of the SISP Assets, including five LOIs for the Alberta-based assets and nine for the Manitoba-based assets.

12 In total, the Selling Agent received 10 separate purchase and sale agreements (individually, a **PSA**) from prospective purchasers which, collectively, resulted in an offer to purchase each of the SISP Assets. All PSAs received were based on template agreements (the **Template PSA**) prepared by the Monitor and were, where necessary, accompanied by a blackline against the Template PSA agreement.⁸

13 In accordance with the SISP Order, the Monitor reviewed and consulted with the Selling Agent and the Senior Secured Lenders about each of the 10 PSAs received. Based on that consultation, the Monitor negotiated and settled the terms and conditions of six PSAs for the purchase of the SISP Assets.⁹

⁷ Second Report at para 33.

⁸ Copies of the Template PSAs, one for the Alberta based SISP Assets, and one for the Manitoba based SISP Assets, are included as Appendices "B" and "C" of the Monitor's Second Report. A summary of the PSAs received is included within the Confidential Supplement.

⁹ A summary of the non-confidential terms of the PSAs is included at paragraphs 38-42 of the Second Report. Unredacted copies of the PSAs are included as Appendices "B" through "G" of the Confidential Supplement.

II. LAW AND ARGUMENT

A. The SAVOs are fair, reasonable, and protect the interests of all parties.

14 The SAVOs sought by the Monitor include:

- (a) the SAVO in respect of two Alberta properties, being the Innisfail Property and Iron Springs Property, pursuant to an agreement of purchase and sale between the Monitor, as vendor, and the West Group, as purchaser, dated November 29, 2022; and
- (b) three SAVOs in respect of Manitoba properties, being:
 - i. the Stony, Lunder and Rockwood Properties, pursuant to the agreements of purchase and sale between the Monitor, as vendor, and ABAS, as purchaser, dated November 22, 2022 (Lunder & Stony) and November 24, 2022 (Rockwood);
 - ii. a certain central land parcel of the Sarto Property, pursuant to the agreement of purchase and sale between the Monitor, as vendor, and Sheldon Harms, as purchaser, dated November 24, 2022; and
 - iii. certain outer land parcels and buildings of the Sarto Property, pursuant to the agreement of purchase and sale between the Monitor, as vendor, and 2Flag, as purchaser, dated November 24, 2022.

15 In considering whether or not to authorize the disposition of assets of a debtor company outside the ordinary course of business, a court must consider the factors first set out by the Court of Appeal in *Royal Bank of Canada v Soundair Corp.*¹⁰ The principles articulated by the Court in *Soundair* are as follows:

- (a) whether there has been a sufficient effort made to get the best price, and the receiver has not acted improvidently;
- (b) the interests of all parties;

¹⁰ *Royal Bank of Canada v Soundair Corp.*, 4 OR (3d) 1, 1991 CarswellOnt 205 at para 16 (*Soundair*) [TAB 2].

- (c) the efficacy and integrity of the process; and
- (d) whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process.¹¹

16 As the Honourable Justice Romaine of this Court held in *Sanjel Corporation (Re)*, due consideration should be given to two further factors:

- (a) the business judgment rule, in that a court will not lightly interfere with the exercise of the commercial and business judgment of the debtor company and the monitor in the context of an asset sale where the marketing and sale process was fair, reasonable, transparent and efficient; and
- (b) the weight to be given to the recommendation of the monitor.¹²

17 These factors largely overlap with and are set out in subsection 36(3) of the CCAA and are analyzed under the framework set out by subsection 36(3).¹³ The section 36(3) factors are:

- (a) whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances;
- (b) whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or distribution;
- (c) whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in their opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;
- (d) the extent to which the creditors were consulted;
- (e) the effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties; and

¹¹ *Soundair* at para 16 [TAB 2].

¹² *Re Sanjel Corp*, 2016 ABQB 257 at para 57 [TAB 3].

¹³ *Grafton-Fraser v Cadillac*, 2017 ONSC 2496 at para 19 [TAB 4]; *Canwest Global Communications Corp.*, 2010 ONSC 2870 at para 13 [TAB 5].

- (f) whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.¹⁴

18 The transactions contemplated by the SISP PSAs satisfy the requirements of the CCAA for the disposition of assets outside the ordinary course of business, and common law principles for the same. In particular, these transactions should be approved as being in the best interests of all stakeholders because:

- (a) the SISP was carried out in good faith and with due diligence;
- (b) there was a broad marketing of the SISP Assets over a reasonable timeframe and in accordance with the SISP Order;
- (c) the PSAs were negotiated between the various parties at arm's length, in good faith, and are commercially reasonable;
- (d) the PSAs are supported by the Senior Secured Lenders, which hold valid and enforceable security over the SISP Assets;
- (e) the consideration offered under each PSA is commercially reasonable, in the best interest of the NALCO Group's creditors, and will maximize the available recovery to creditors; and
- (f) in the case of the PSA with the West Group, the proposed assumption of the Assumed Contracts would allow the West Group to continue operations immediately and would ensure the continued viability of the leases for the benefit of the lessors.

19 The Monitor believes the proposed PSAs are supported by the Senior Secured Lenders.

B. The Sealing Order is Necessary Appropriate in the Circumstances

20 The Monitor also seeks the Sealing Order in respect of the Confidential Supplement.

¹⁴ CCAA at s 36(3) [TAB 1].

21 The leading authority for restricted court access orders is *Sierra Club*,¹⁵ as recently reviewed by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Sherman Estate*.¹⁶ The two-fold test is as follows:

- (a) such an order is necessary to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and
- (b) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.¹⁷

22 With respect to the first branch of the test, the following elements are to be considered:

- (a) the risk must be real and substantial, well grounded in evidence, posing a serious threat to the commercial interest in question;
- (b) the important commercial interest must be one which can be expressed in terms of a public interest in confidentiality, where there is a general principle at stake; and
- (c) the judge is required to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives are available to such an order but also to restrict the order as much as is reasonably possible while preserving the commercial interest in question.¹⁸

23 The Confidential Supplement contains sensitive commercial information, including unredacted copies of the PSAs and detail regarding purchase price, among other things.

24 A sealing order is necessary to prevent the Confidential Supplement from being publicly disclosed and jeopardizing the proposed sales. The dissemination of this information could be prejudicial to the SISP and the successful completion of any future SISP Asset sale in the event an approved sale does not close. Disclosure of such material would therefore cause a serious risk of harm to an important public interest. The proposed sealing order is the least restrictive

¹⁵ *Sierra Club of Canada v Canada (Minister of Finance)*, 2002 SCC 41 (***Sierra Club***) [Tab 6].

¹⁶ *Sherman Estate v Donovan*, 2021 SCC 25 at para 38 (***Sherman Estate***) [Tab 7].

¹⁷ *Sierra Club* at para 53 [Tab 6].

¹⁸ *Ibid* at paras 54-57 [Tab 6].

means to prevent disclosure of the confidential and commercially sensitive information in the Confidential Supplement.

C. The Stay Extension Order is Necessary and Appropriate in the Circumstances

25 Section 11.02(2) of the CCAA empowers a court to extend the stay of proceedings granted to a debtor company. In considering whether to grant a stay extension, the Court should consider whether it is appropriate in the circumstances and whether the applicant has been acting in good faith and with due diligence.¹⁹ These considerations underpin any exercise of the Court's discretionary authority under the CCAA.²⁰

26 Appropriateness is assessed by examining whether the order sought advances the remedial policy objectives underlying the CCAA designed to mitigate the potentially catastrophic impacts of insolvency. These objectives include: (a) the timely, efficient and impartial resolution of a debtor's insolvency; (b) preserving and maximizing value of the debtor's assets for the benefit of its stakeholders; (c) ensuring the fair and equitable treatment of claims against the debtor; and (d) the preservation of jobs and communities affected by the company's financial distress.²¹

27 The possibility that one or more creditors may be prejudiced as a result of a stay should not affect the Court's exercise of its authority to grant one. Prejudice to one or more stakeholders must be balanced against, and offset by, the benefit to all stakeholders impacted by the company facilitating a reorganization. Thus, the Court's primary concerns under the CCAA are not for one stakeholder, but for the debtor and all of its stakeholders.²²

28 Pursuant to the Amended and Rested Initial Order, the stay of proceedings is currently set to expire on December 9, 2022. The Application seeks an extension of the stay period up to and including March 4, 2023 (the **Proposed Stay Extension Date**).

29 The Proposed Stay Extension Date is supported by the Monitor's latest cash flow analysis and provides the time necessary for the Monitor to close the SISP PSAs, described above, in the event they are approved by this Honourable Court. This will also provide the Monitor with the sufficient time to fully wind down the NALCO Group's operations, address any outstanding

¹⁹ CCAA, s 11.02(3) [Tab 1].

²⁰ 9354-9186 Québec Inc v Callidus Capital Corp, 2020 SCC 10 at para 49 [Callidus] [TAB 8].

²¹ Callidus at paras 40, 42 and 50 [TAB 8].

²² Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd, 17 CBR (3d) 24, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 at paras 5-6 [TAB 9].

amounts owing from the NALCO Group, coordinate with the Senior Secured Lenders on residual CCAA matters, and analyze final distributions, if any, to be made to creditors.

30 As set out in the Second Report, it is the Monitor's view that the NALCO Group has and continues to act in good faith and with due diligence and is complying with its obligations as set out in the Amended and Restated Initial Order. The Monitor does not believe that any creditor will be materially prejudiced if the stay of proceedings is extended to the Proposed Stay Extension Date.

D. The Interim Distribution Order is Appropriate in the Circumstances

31 Courts have considered several factors when determining whether to grant an interim distribution, including whether the security is valid and enforceable; whether there would be sufficient remaining liquidity after the distribution is made; and whether the distribution would enable interest savings.²³

32 In this case, the Monitor's legal counsel has prepared a Security Opinion, which confirms that the Senior Secured Lenders, together, hold valid and enforceable first charge security on the Debtor Companies' assets that have or are proposed to be realized upon. The Monitor is not currently aware of any material claim that could rank in priority to the Senior Secured Lenders' claim to the cash held by the Monitor or to the anticipated proceeds from any completed PSA transaction. Further, based on the Monitor's analysis of anticipated proceeds, the Monitor is of the view that insufficient proceeds will be generated to pay the full balance of the Senior Secured Lenders' respective claims.

33 In the event this Honourable Court grants the SAVOs and the transactions described above close as anticipated, the Monitor would hold significant cash reserves for which it does not have any immediate requirement due to the wind down or transfer of effectively all of the Debtor Companies' assets and operations.

34 Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that it would be appropriate to distribute the proceeds generated from the sale of the NALCO Group's assets to the Senior Secured Lenders, based on their relative entitlement to those proceeds, subject only to a reasonable holdback, as

²³ *Re AbitibiBowater Inc.*, 2009 QCCS 6461 at para 75 [TAB 10].

determined by the Monitor, sufficient to enable the NALCO Group to continue meeting their obligations during the course of the CCAA proceedings.

CONCLUSION

35 The Monitor seeks a Stay Extension Order, Second Sealing Order, and six SAVOs substantially in the forms attached to the within Application.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED THIS 6TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2022

Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP



Per: _____
Howard A. Gorman, K.C., and Meghan Parker
Counsel for the Monitor, Ernst & Young Inc.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Tab 1	<i>Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act</i> , RSC 1985, c C-36
Tab 2	<i>Royal Bank of Canada v Soundair Corp</i> , 4 OR (3d) 1, 1991 CarswellOnt 205
Tab 3	<i>Re Sanjel Corp</i> , 2016 ABQB 257
Tab 4	<i>Grafton-Fraser v Cadillac</i> , 2017 ONSC 2496
Tab 5	<i>Canwest Global Communications Corp</i> , 2010 ONSC 2870
Tab 6	<i>Sierra Club of Canada v Canada (Minister of Finance)</i> , 2002 SCC 41
Tab 7	<i>Sherman Estate v Donovan</i> , 2021 SCC 25
Tab 8	<i>9354-9186 Québec Inc v Callidus Capital Corp</i> , 2020 SCC
Tab 9	<i>Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd</i> , 17 CBR (3d) 24, 1993 CarswellOnt 183
Tab 10	<i>Re AbitibiBowater Inc</i> , 2009 QCCS 6461



CANADA

CONSOLIDATION

CODIFICATION

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies

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

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

Current to November 16, 2022

À jour au 16 novembre 2022

Last amended on November 1, 2019

Dernière modification le 1 novembre 2019

available to any person specified in the order on any terms or conditions that the court considers appropriate.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 10; 2005, c. 47, s. 127.

General power of court

11 Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 11; 1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Relief reasonably necessary

11.001 An order made under section 11 at the same time as an order made under subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection with respect to an initial application shall be limited to relief that is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

2019, c. 29, s. 136.

Rights of suppliers

11.01 No order made under section 11 or 11.02 has the effect of

(a) prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration provided after the order is made; or

(b) requiring the further advance of money or credit.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Stays, etc. — initial application

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

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;

peut être communiqué, aux conditions qu'il estime indiquées, à la personne qu'il nomme.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 10; 2005, ch. 47, art. 127.

Pouvoir général du tribunal

11 Malgré toute disposition de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, le tribunal peut, dans le cas de toute demande sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard d'une compagnie débitrice, rendre, sur demande d'un intéressé, mais sous réserve des restrictions prévues par la présente loi et avec ou sans avis, toute ordonnance qu'il estime indiquée.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 11; 1992, ch. 27, art. 90; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Redressements normalement nécessaires

11.001 L'ordonnance rendue au titre de l'article 11 en même temps que l'ordonnance rendue au titre du paragraphe 11.02(1) ou pendant la période visée dans l'ordonnance rendue au titre de ce paragraphe relativement à la demande initiale n'est limitée qu'aux redressements normalement nécessaires à la continuation de l'exploitation de la compagnie débitrice dans le cours ordinaire de ses affaires durant cette période.

2019, ch. 29, art. 136.

Droits des fournisseurs

11.01 L'ordonnance prévue aux articles 11 ou 11.02 ne peut avoir pour effet :

a) d'empêcher une personne d'exiger que soient effectués sans délai les paiements relatifs à la fourniture de marchandises ou de services, à l'utilisation de biens loués ou faisant l'objet d'une licence ou à la fourniture de toute autre contrepartie de valeur qui ont lieu après l'ordonnance;

b) d'exiger le versement de nouvelles avances de fonds ou de nouveaux crédits.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Suspension : demande initiale

11.02 (1) Dans le cas d'une demande initiale visant une compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période maximale de dix jours qu'il estime nécessaire :

a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*;

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

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

Stays, etc. — other than initial application

(2) A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

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

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

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

Burden of proof on application

(3) The court shall not make the order unless

(a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

Restriction

(4) Orders doing anything referred to in subsection (1) or (2) may only be made under this section.

2005, c. 47, s. 128, 2007, c. 36, s. 62(F); 2019, c. 29, s. 137.

Stays — directors

11.03 (1) An order made under section 11.02 may provide that no person may commence or continue any action against a director of the company on any claim against directors that arose before the commencement of proceedings under this Act and that relates to obligations of the company if directors are under any law liable in their capacity as directors for the payment of those obligations, until a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company, if one is filed, is sanctioned by the court or is refused by the creditors or the court.

(b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

(c) interdire, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, l'introduction de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

Suspension : demandes autres qu'initiales

(2) Dans le cas d'une demande, autre qu'une demande initiale, visant une compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période qu'il estime nécessaire :

(a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime des lois mentionnées à l'alinéa (1)a);

(b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

(c) interdire, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, l'introduction de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

Preuve

(3) Le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance que si :

(a) le demandeur le convainc que la mesure est opportune;

(b) dans le cas de l'ordonnance visée au paragraphe (2), le demandeur le convainc en outre qu'il a agi et continue d'agir de bonne foi et avec la diligence voulue.

Restriction

(4) L'ordonnance qui prévoit l'une des mesures visées aux paragraphes (1) ou (2) ne peut être rendue qu'en vertu du présent article.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128, 2007, ch. 36, art. 62(F); 2019, ch. 29, art. 137.

Suspension — administrateurs

11.03 (1) L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 peut interdire l'introduction ou la continuation de toute action contre les administrateurs de la compagnie relativement aux réclamations qui sont antérieures aux procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi et visent des obligations de la compagnie dont ils peuvent être, ès qualités, responsables en droit, tant que la transaction ou l'arrangement, le cas échéant, n'a pas été homologué par le tribunal ou rejeté par celui-ci ou les créanciers.

Exception

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of an action against a director on a guarantee given by the director relating to the company's obligations or an action seeking injunctive relief against a director in relation to the company.

Persons deemed to be directors

(3) If all of the directors have resigned or have been removed by the shareholders without replacement, any person who manages or supervises the management of the business and affairs of the company is deemed to be a director for the purposes of this section.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Persons obligated under letter of credit or guarantee

11.04 No order made under section 11.02 has effect on any action, suit or proceeding against a person, other than the company in respect of whom the order is made, who is obligated under a letter of credit or guarantee in relation to the company.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

11.05 [Repealed, 2007, c. 29, s. 105]

Member of the Canadian Payments Association

11.06 No order may be made under this Act that has the effect of preventing a member of the Canadian Payments Association from ceasing to act as a clearing agent or group clearer for a company in accordance with the *Canadian Payments Act* or the by-laws or rules of that Association.

2005, c. 47, s. 128, 2007, c. 36, s. 64.

11.07 [Repealed, 2012, c. 31, s. 420]

Restriction — certain powers, duties and functions

11.08 No order may be made under section 11.02 that affects

(a) the exercise or performance by the Minister of Finance or the Superintendent of Financial Institutions of any power, duty or function assigned to them by the *Bank Act*, the *Cooperative Credit Associations Act*, the *Insurance Companies Act* or the *Trust and Loan Companies Act*;

(b) the exercise or performance by the Governor in Council, the Minister of Finance or the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation of any power, duty or function assigned to them by the *Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act*; or

Exclusion

(2) La suspension ne s'applique toutefois pas aux actions contre les administrateurs pour les garanties qu'ils ont données relativement aux obligations de la compagnie ni aux mesures de la nature d'une injonction les visant au sujet de celle-ci.

Présomption : administrateurs

(3) Si tous les administrateurs démissionnent ou sont destitués par les actionnaires sans être remplacés, quiconque dirige ou supervise les activités commerciales et les affaires internes de la compagnie est réputé un administrateur pour l'application du présent article.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Suspension — lettres de crédit ou garanties

11.04 L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 est sans effet sur toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la personne — autre que la compagnie visée par l'ordonnance — qui a des obligations au titre de lettres de crédit ou de garanties se rapportant à la compagnie.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

11.05 [Abrogé, 2007, ch. 29, art. 105]

Membre de l'Association canadienne des paiements

11.06 Aucune ordonnance prévue par la présente loi ne peut avoir pour effet d'empêcher un membre de l'Association canadienne des paiements de cesser d'agir, pour une compagnie, à titre d'agent de compensation ou d'adhérent correspondant de groupe conformément à la *Loi canadienne sur les paiements* et aux règles et règlements administratifs de l'Association.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 64.

11.07 [Abrogé, 2012, ch. 31, art. 420]

Restrictions : exercice de certaines attributions

11.08 L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 ne peut avoir d'effet sur :

a) l'exercice par le ministre des Finances ou par le surintendant des institutions financières des attributions qui leur sont conférées par la *Loi sur les banques*, la *Loi sur les associations coopératives de crédit*, la *Loi sur les sociétés d'assurances* ou la *Loi sur les sociétés de fiducie et de prêt*;

b) l'exercice par le gouverneur en conseil, le ministre des Finances ou la Société d'assurance-dépôts du Canada des attributions qui leur sont conférées par la *Loi sur la Société d'assurance-dépôts du Canada*;

Decision

(8) The decision of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy after the hearing, together with the reasons for the decision, must be given in writing to the monitor not later than three months after the conclusion of the hearing, and is public.

Review by Federal Court

(9) A decision of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy given under subsection (8) is deemed to be a decision of a federal board, commission or other tribunal that may be reviewed and set aside under the *Federal Courts Act*.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 75.

Delegation

31 (1) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy may, in writing, authorize any person to exercise or perform, subject to any terms and conditions that he or she may specify in the authorization, any of the powers, duties or functions of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy under sections 29 and 30.

Notification to monitor

(2) If the Superintendent of Bankruptcy delegates in accordance with subsection (1), the Superintendent or the delegate must give notice of the delegation in the prescribed manner to any monitor who may be affected by the delegation.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Agreements

Disclaimer or resiliation of agreements

32 (1) Subject to subsections (2) and (3), a debtor company may — on notice given in the prescribed form and manner to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor — disclaim or resiliate any agreement to which the company is a party on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act. The company may not give notice unless the monitor approves the proposed disclaimer or resiliation.

Court may prohibit disclaimer or resiliation

(2) Within 15 days after the day on which the company gives notice under subsection (1), a party to the agreement may, on notice to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor, apply to a court for an order that the agreement is not to be disclaimed or resiliated.

Court-ordered disclaimer or resiliation

(3) If the monitor does not approve the proposed disclaimer or resiliation, the company may, on notice to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor, apply to

Décision

(8) La décision du surintendant des faillites est rendue par écrit, motivée et remise au contrôleur dans les trois mois suivant la clôture de l'audition, et elle est publique.

Examen de la Cour fédérale

(9) La décision du surintendant, rendue et remise conformément au paragraphe (8), est assimilée à celle d'un office fédéral et est soumise au pouvoir d'examen et d'annulation prévu par la *Loi sur les Cours fédérales*.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 75.

Pouvoir de délégation

31 (1) Le surintendant des faillites peut, par écrit, selon les modalités qu'il précise, déléguer les attributions que lui confèrent les articles 29 et 30.

Notification

(2) En cas de délégation, le surintendant des faillites ou le délégué en avise, de la manière réglementaire, tout contrôleur qui pourrait être touché par cette mesure.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Contrats et conventions collectives

Résiliation de contrats

32 (1) Sous réserve des paragraphes (2) et (3), la compagnie débitrice peut — sur préavis donné en la forme et de la manière réglementaires aux autres parties au contrat et au contrôleur et après avoir obtenu l'acquiescement de celui-ci relativement au projet de résiliation — résilier tout contrat auquel elle est partie à la date à laquelle une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi.

Contestation

(2) Dans les quinze jours suivant la date à laquelle la compagnie donne le préavis mentionné au paragraphe (1), toute partie au contrat peut, sur préavis aux autres parties au contrat et au contrôleur, demander au tribunal d'ordonner que le contrat ne soit pas résilié.

Absence d'acquiescement du contrôleur

(3) Si le contrôleur n'acquiesce pas au projet de résiliation, la compagnie peut, sur préavis aux autres parties au

a court for an order that the agreement be disclaimed or resiliated.

Factors to be considered

(4) In deciding whether to make the order, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a)** whether the monitor approved the proposed disclaimer or resiliation;
- (b)** whether the disclaimer or resiliation would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company; and
- (c)** whether the disclaimer or resiliation would likely cause significant financial hardship to a party to the agreement.

Date of disclaimer or resiliation

(5) An agreement is disclaimed or resiliated

- (a)** if no application is made under subsection (2), on the day that is 30 days after the day on which the company gives notice under subsection (1);
- (b)** if the court dismisses the application made under subsection (2), on the day that is 30 days after the day on which the company gives notice under subsection (1) or on any later day fixed by the court; or
- (c)** if the court orders that the agreement is disclaimed or resiliated under subsection (3), on the day that is 30 days after the day on which the company gives notice or on any later day fixed by the court.

Intellectual property

(6) If the company has granted a right to use intellectual property to a party to an agreement, the disclaimer or resiliation does not affect the party's right to use the intellectual property — including the party's right to enforce an exclusive use — during the term of the agreement, including any period for which the party extends the agreement as of right, as long as the party continues to perform its obligations under the agreement in relation to the use of the intellectual property.

Loss related to disclaimer or resiliation

(7) If an agreement is disclaimed or resiliated, a party to the agreement who suffers a loss in relation to the disclaimer or resiliation is considered to have a provable claim.

contrat et au contrôleur, demander au tribunal d'ordonner la résiliation du contrat.

Facteurs à prendre en considération

(4) Pour décider s'il rend l'ordonnance, le tribunal prend en considération, entre autres, les facteurs suivants :

- a)** l'acquiescement du contrôleur au projet de résiliation, le cas échéant;
- b)** la question de savoir si la résiliation favorisera la conclusion d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie;
- c)** le risque que la résiliation puisse vraisemblablement causer de sérieuses difficultés financières à une partie au contrat.

Résiliation

(5) Le contrat est résilié :

- a)** trente jours après la date à laquelle la compagnie donne le préavis mentionné au paragraphe (1), si aucune demande n'est présentée en vertu du paragraphe (2);
- b)** trente jours après la date à laquelle la compagnie donne le préavis mentionné au paragraphe (1) ou à la date postérieure fixée par le tribunal, si ce dernier rejette la demande présentée en vertu du paragraphe (2);
- c)** trente jours après la date à laquelle la compagnie donne le préavis mentionné au paragraphe (3) ou à la date postérieure fixée par le tribunal, si ce dernier ordonne la résiliation du contrat en vertu de ce paragraphe.

Propriété intellectuelle

(6) Si la compagnie a autorisé par contrat une personne à utiliser un droit de propriété intellectuelle, la résiliation n'empêche pas la personne de l'utiliser ni d'en faire respecter l'utilisation exclusive, à condition qu'elle respecte ses obligations contractuelles à l'égard de l'utilisation de ce droit, et ce pour la période prévue au contrat et pour toute période additionnelle dont elle peut et décide de se prévaloir de son propre gré.

Pertes découlant de la résiliation

(7) En cas de résiliation du contrat, toute partie à celui-ci qui subit des pertes découlant de la résiliation est réputée avoir une réclamation prouvable.

Reasons for disclaimer or resiliation

(8) A company shall, on request by a party to the agreement, provide in writing the reasons for the proposed disclaimer or resiliation within five days after the day on which the party requests them.

Exceptions

(9) This section does not apply in respect of

- (a)** an eligible financial contract;
- (b)** a collective agreement;
- (c)** a financing agreement if the company is the borrower; or
- (d)** a lease of real property or of an immovable if the company is the lessor.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 29, s. 108, c. 36, ss. 76, 112.

Collective agreements

33 (1) If proceedings under this Act have been commenced in respect of a debtor company, any collective agreement that the company has entered into as the employer remains in force, and may not be altered except as provided in this section or under the laws of the jurisdiction governing collective bargaining between the company and the bargaining agent.

Application for authorization to serve notice to bargain

(2) A debtor company that is a party to a collective agreement and that is unable to reach a voluntary agreement with the bargaining agent to revise any of the provisions of the collective agreement may, on giving five days notice to the bargaining agent, apply to the court for an order authorizing the company to serve a notice to bargain under the laws of the jurisdiction governing collective bargaining between the company and the bargaining agent.

Conditions for issuance of order

(3) The court may issue the order only if it is satisfied that

- (a)** a viable compromise or arrangement could not be made in respect of the company, taking into account the terms of the collective agreement;
- (b)** the company has made good faith efforts to renegotiate the provisions of the collective agreement; and

Motifs de la résiliation

(8) Dans les cinq jours qui suivent la date à laquelle une partie au contrat le lui demande, la compagnie lui expose par écrit les motifs de son projet de résiliation.

Exceptions

(9) Le présent article ne s'applique pas aux contrats suivants :

- a)** les contrats financiers admissibles;
- b)** les conventions collectives;
- c)** les accords de financement au titre desquels la compagnie est l'emprunteur;
- d)** les baux d'immeubles ou de biens réels au titre desquels la compagnie est le locateur.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 29, art. 108, ch. 36, art. 76 et 112.

Conventions collectives

33 (1) Si une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard d'une compagnie débitrice, toute convention collective que celle-ci a conclue à titre d'employeur demeure en vigueur et ne peut être modifiée qu'en conformité avec le présent article ou les règles de droit applicables aux négociations entre les parties.

Demande pour que le tribunal autorise le début de négociations en vue de la révision

(2) Si elle est partie à une convention collective à titre d'employeur et qu'elle ne peut s'entendre librement avec l'agent négociateur sur la révision de celle-ci, la compagnie débitrice peut, après avoir donné un préavis de cinq jours à l'agent négociateur, demander au tribunal de l'autoriser, par ordonnance, à donner à l'agent négociateur un avis de négociations collectives pour que celui-ci entame les négociations collectives en vue de la révision de la convention collective conformément aux règles de droit applicables aux négociations entre les parties.

Cas où l'autorisation est accordée

(3) Le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance que s'il est convaincu, à la fois :

- a)** qu'une transaction ou un arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie ne pourrait être fait compte tenu des dispositions de la convention collective;
- b)** que la compagnie a tenté de bonne foi d'en négocier de nouveau les dispositions;

(c) a failure to issue the order is likely to result in irreparable damage to the company.

No delay on vote

(4) The vote of the creditors in respect of a compromise or an arrangement may not be delayed solely because the period provided in the laws of the jurisdiction governing collective bargaining between the company and the bargaining agent has not expired.

Claims arising from termination or amendment

(5) If the parties to the collective agreement agree to revise the collective agreement after proceedings have been commenced under this Act in respect of the company, the bargaining agent that is a party to the agreement is deemed to have a claim, as an unsecured creditor, for an amount equal to the value of concessions granted by the bargaining agent with respect to the remaining term of the collective agreement.

Order to disclose information

(6) On the application of the bargaining agent and on notice to the person to whom the application relates, the court may, subject to any terms and conditions it specifies, make an order requiring the person to make available to the bargaining agent any information specified by the court in the person's possession or control that relates to the company's business or financial affairs and that is relevant to the collective bargaining between the company and the bargaining agent. The court may make the order only after the company has been authorized to serve a notice to bargain under subsection (2).

Parties

(7) For the purpose of this section, the parties to a collective agreement are the debtor company and the bargaining agent that are bound by the collective agreement.

Unrevised collective agreements remain in force

(8) For greater certainty, any collective agreement that the company and the bargaining agent have not agreed to revise remains in force, and the court shall not alter its terms.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Certain rights limited

34 (1) No person may terminate or amend, or claim an accelerated payment or forfeiture of the term under, any agreement, including a security agreement, with a debtor company by reason only that proceedings commenced under this Act or that the company is insolvent.

c) qu'elle subirait vraisemblablement des dommages irréparables si l'ordonnance n'était pas rendue.

Vote sur la proposition

(4) Le vote des créanciers sur la transaction ou l'arrangement ne peut être retardé pour la seule raison que le délai imparti par les règles de droit applicables aux négociations collectives entre les parties à la convention collective n'est pas expiré.

Réclamation consécutive à la révision

(5) Si les parties parviennent à une entente sur la révision de la convention collective après qu'une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard d'une compagnie, l'agent négociateur en cause est réputé avoir une réclamation à titre de créancier chirographaire pour une somme équivalant à la valeur des concessions accordées à l'égard de la période non écoulée de la convention.

Ordonnance de communication

(6) Sur demande de l'agent négociateur partie à la convention collective et sur avis aux personnes qui ont un intérêt, le tribunal peut ordonner à celles-ci de communiquer au demandeur, aux conditions qu'il précise, tout renseignement qu'elles ont en leur possession ou à leur disposition sur les affaires et la situation financière de la compagnie pertinent pour les négociations collectives. Le tribunal ne peut rendre l'ordonnance qu'après l'envoi à l'agent négociateur de l'avis de négociations collectives visé au paragraphe (2).

Parties

(7) Pour l'application du présent article, les parties à la convention collective sont la compagnie débitrice et l'agent négociateur liés par elle.

Maintien en vigueur des conventions collectives

(8) Il est entendu que toute convention collective que la compagnie et l'agent négociateur n'ont pas convenu de réviser demeure en vigueur et que les tribunaux ne peuvent en modifier les termes.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Limitation de certains droits

34 (1) Il est interdit de résilier ou de modifier un contrat — notamment un contrat de garantie — conclu avec une compagnie débitrice ou de se prévaloir d'une clause de déchéance du terme figurant dans un tel contrat au seul motif qu'une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard de la compagnie ou que celle-ci est insolvable.

Lease

(2) If the agreement referred to in subsection (1) is a lease, the lessor may not terminate or amend the lease by reason only that proceedings commenced under this Act, that the company is insolvent or that the company has not paid rent in respect of any period before the commencement of those proceedings.

Public utilities

(3) No public utility may discontinue service to a company by reason only that proceedings commenced under this Act, that the company is insolvent or that the company has not paid for services rendered or goods provided before the commencement of those proceedings.

Certain acts not prevented

(4) Nothing in this section is to be construed as

- (a) prohibiting a person from requiring payments to be made in cash for goods, services, use of leased property or other valuable consideration provided after the commencement of proceedings under this Act;
- (b) requiring the further advance of money or credit; or
- (c) [Repealed, 2012, c. 31, s. 421]

Provisions of section override agreement

(5) Any provision in an agreement that has the effect of providing for, or permitting, anything that, in substance, is contrary to this section is of no force or effect.

Powers of court

(6) On application by a party to an agreement or by a public utility, the court may declare that this section does not apply — or applies only to the extent declared by the court — if the applicant satisfies the court that the operation of this section would likely cause the applicant significant financial hardship.

Eligible financial contracts

(7) Subsection (1) does not apply

- (a) in respect of an eligible financial contract; or
- (b) to prevent a member of the Canadian Payments Association from ceasing to act as a clearing agent or group clearer for a company in accordance with the *Canadian Payments Act* and the by-laws and rules of that Association.

Baux

(2) Lorsque le contrat visé au paragraphe (1) est un bail, l'interdiction prévue à ce paragraphe vaut également dans le cas où la compagnie est insolvable ou n'a pas payé son loyer à l'égard d'une période antérieure à l'introduction de la procédure.

Entreprise de service public

(3) Il est interdit à toute entreprise de service public d'interrompre la prestation de ses services auprès d'une compagnie débitrice au seul motif qu'une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard de la compagnie, que celle-ci est insolvable ou qu'elle n'a pas payé des services ou marchandises fournis avant l'introduction de la procédure.

Exceptions

(4) Le présent article n'a pas pour effet :

- a) d'empêcher une personne d'exiger que soient effectués des paiements en espèces pour toute contrepartie de valeur — marchandises, services, biens loués ou autres — fournie après l'introduction d'une procédure sous le régime de la présente loi;
- b) d'exiger la prestation de nouvelles avances de fonds ou de nouveaux crédits.
- c) [Abrogé, 2012, ch. 31, art. 421]

Incompatibilité

(5) Le présent article l'emporte sur les dispositions incompatibles de tout contrat, celles-ci étant sans effet.

Pouvoirs du tribunal

(6) À la demande de l'une des parties à un contrat ou d'une entreprise de service public, le tribunal peut déclarer le présent article inapplicable, ou applicable uniquement dans la mesure qu'il précise, s'il est établi par le demandeur que son application lui causerait vraisemblablement de sérieuses difficultés financières.

Contrats financiers admissibles

(7) Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas aux contrats financiers admissibles et n'a pas pour effet d'empêcher un membre de l'Association canadienne des paiements de cesser d'agir, pour une compagnie, à titre d'agent de compensation ou d'adhérent correspondant de groupe conformément à la *Loi canadienne sur les paiements* et aux règles et règlements administratifs de l'association.

Permitted actions

(8) The following actions are permitted in respect of an eligible financial contract that is entered into before proceedings under this Act are commenced in respect of the company and is terminated on or after that day, but only in accordance with the provisions of that contract:

- (a)** the netting or setting off or compensation of obligations between the company and the other parties to the eligible financial contract; and
- (b)** any dealing with financial collateral including
 - (i)** the sale or foreclosure or, in the Province of Quebec, the surrender of financial collateral, and
 - (ii)** the setting off or compensation of financial collateral or the application of the proceeds or value of financial collateral.

Restriction

(9) No order may be made under this Act if the order would have the effect of staying or restraining the actions permitted under subsection (8).

Net termination values

(10) If net termination values determined in accordance with an eligible financial contract referred to in subsection (8) are owed by the company to another party to the eligible financial contract, that other party is deemed to be a creditor of the company with a claim against the company in respect of those net termination values.

Priority

(11) No order may be made under this Act if the order would have the effect of subordinating financial collateral.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 29, s. 109, c. 36, ss. 77, 112; 2012, c. 31, s. 421.

Obligations and Prohibitions

Obligation to provide assistance

35 (1) A debtor company shall provide to the monitor the assistance that is necessary to enable the monitor to adequately carry out the monitor's functions.

Obligation to duties set out in section 158 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*

(2) A debtor company shall perform the duties set out in section 158 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* that are appropriate and applicable in the circumstances.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Opérations permises

(8) Si le contrat financier admissible conclu avant qu'une procédure soit intentée sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard de la compagnie est résilié à la date d'introduction de la procédure ou par la suite, il est permis d'effectuer les opérations ci-après en conformité avec le contrat :

- a)** la compensation des obligations entre la compagnie et les autres parties au contrat;
- b)** toute opération à l'égard de la garantie financière afférente, notamment :
 - (i)** la vente, la demande en forclusion ou, dans la province de Québec, la demande en délaissement,
 - (ii)** la compensation, ou l'affectation de son produit ou de sa valeur.

Restriction

(9) Aucune ordonnance rendue au titre de la présente loi ne peut avoir pour effet de suspendre ou de restreindre le droit d'effectuer les opérations visées au paragraphe (8).

Valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation

(10) Si, aux termes du contrat financier admissible visé au paragraphe (8), des sommes sont dues par la compagnie à une autre partie au contrat au titre de valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation, cette autre partie est réputée être un créancier de la compagnie relativement à ces sommes.

Rang

(11) Il ne peut être rendu, au titre de la présente loi, aucune ordonnance dont l'effet serait d'assigner un rang inférieur à toute garantie financière.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 29, art. 109, ch. 36, art. 77 et 112; 2012, ch. 31, art. 421.

Obligations et interdiction

Assistance

35 (1) La compagnie débitrice est tenue d'aider le contrôleur à remplir adéquatement ses fonctions.

Obligations visées à l'article 158 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*

(2) Elle est également tenue de satisfaire aux obligations visées à l'article 158 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* selon ce qui est indiqué et applicable dans les circonstances.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Restriction on disposition of business assets

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

Notice to creditors

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

Factors to be considered

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

- (a)** whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances;
- (b)** whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition;
- (c)** whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in their opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;
- (d)** the extent to which the creditors were consulted;
- (e)** the effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties; and
- (f)** whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.

Additional factors — related persons

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

- (a)** good faith efforts were made to sell or otherwise dispose of the assets to persons who are not related to the company; and
- (b)** the consideration to be received is superior to the consideration that would be received under any other

Restriction à la disposition d'actifs

36 (1) Il est interdit à la compagnie débitrice à l'égard de laquelle une ordonnance a été rendue sous le régime de la présente loi de disposer, notamment par vente, d'actifs hors du cours ordinaire de ses affaires sans l'autorisation du tribunal. Le tribunal peut accorder l'autorisation sans qu'il soit nécessaire d'obtenir l'acquiescement des actionnaires, et ce malgré toute exigence à cet effet, notamment en vertu d'une règle de droit fédérale ou provinciale.

Avis aux créanciers

(2) La compagnie qui demande l'autorisation au tribunal en avise les créanciers garantis qui peuvent vraisemblablement être touchés par le projet de disposition.

Facteurs à prendre en considération

(3) Pour décider s'il accorde l'autorisation, le tribunal prend en considération, entre autres, les facteurs suivants :

- a)** la justification des circonstances ayant mené au projet de disposition;
- b)** l'acquiescement du contrôleur au processus ayant mené au projet de disposition, le cas échéant;
- c)** le dépôt par celui-ci d'un rapport précisant que, à son avis, la disposition sera plus avantageuse pour les créanciers que si elle était faite dans le cadre de la faillite;
- d)** la suffisance des consultations menées auprès des créanciers;
- e)** les effets du projet de disposition sur les droits de tout intéressé, notamment les créanciers;
- f)** le caractère juste et raisonnable de la contrepartie reçue pour les actifs compte tenu de leur valeur marchande.

Autres facteurs

(4) Si la compagnie projette de disposer d'actifs en faveur d'une personne à laquelle elle est liée, le tribunal, après avoir pris ces facteurs en considération, ne peut accorder l'autorisation que s'il est convaincu :

- a)** d'une part, que les efforts voulus ont été faits pour disposer des actifs en faveur d'une personne qui n'est pas liée à la compagnie;
- b)** d'autre part, que la contrepartie offerte pour les actifs est plus avantageuse que celle qui découlerait de

offer made in accordance with the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition.

Related persons

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

- (a)** a director or officer of the company;
- (b)** a person who has or has had, directly or indirectly, control in fact of the company; and
- (c)** a person who is related to a person described in paragraph (a) or (b).

Assets may be disposed of free and clear

(6) The court may authorize a sale or disposition free and clear of any security, charge or other restriction and, if it does, it shall also order that other assets of the company or the proceeds of the sale or disposition be subject to a security, charge or other restriction in favour of the creditor whose security, charge or other restriction is to be affected by the order.

Restriction — employers

(7) The court may grant the authorization only if the court is satisfied that the company can and will make the payments that would have been required under paragraphs 6(5)(a) and (6)(a) if the court had sanctioned the compromise or arrangement.

Restriction — intellectual property

(8) If, on the day on which an order is made under this Act in respect of the company, the company is a party to an agreement that grants to another party a right to use intellectual property that is included in a sale or disposition authorized under subsection (6), that sale or disposition does not affect that other party's right to use the intellectual property — including the other party's right to enforce an exclusive use — during the term of the agreement, including any period for which the other party extends the agreement as of right, as long as the other party continues to perform its obligations under the agreement in relation to the use of the intellectual property.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 78; 2017, c. 26, s. 14; 2018, c. 27, s. 269.

toute autre offre reçue dans le cadre du projet de disposition.

Personnes liées

(5) Pour l'application du paragraphe (4), les personnes ci-après sont considérées comme liées à la compagnie :

- a)** le dirigeant ou l'administrateur de celle-ci;
- b)** la personne qui, directement ou indirectement, en a ou en a eu le contrôle de fait;
- c)** la personne liée à toute personne visée aux alinéas a) ou b).

Autorisation de disposer des actifs en les libérant de restrictions

(6) Le tribunal peut autoriser la disposition d'actifs de la compagnie, purgés de toute charge, sûreté ou autre restriction, et, le cas échéant, est tenu d'assujettir le produit de la disposition ou d'autres de ses actifs à une charge, sûreté ou autre restriction en faveur des créanciers touchés par la purge.

Restriction à l'égard des employeurs

(7) Il ne peut autoriser la disposition que s'il est convaincu que la compagnie est en mesure d'effectuer et effectuera les paiements qui auraient été exigés en vertu des alinéas 6(5)a) et (6)a) s'il avait homologué la transaction ou l'arrangement.

Restriction à l'égard de la propriété intellectuelle

(8) Si, à la date à laquelle une ordonnance est rendue à son égard sous le régime de la présente loi, la compagnie est partie à un contrat qui autorise une autre partie à utiliser un droit de propriété intellectuelle qui est compris dans la disposition d'actifs autorisée en vertu du paragraphe (6), cette disposition n'empêche pas l'autre partie d'utiliser le droit en question ni d'en faire respecter l'utilisation exclusive, à condition que cette autre partie respecte ses obligations contractuelles à l'égard de l'utilisation de ce droit, et ce, pour la période prévue au contrat et pour toute prolongation de celle-ci dont elle se prévaut de plein droit.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 78; 2017, ch. 26, art. 14; 2018, ch. 27, art. 269.

Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp., Canadian Pension
Capital Ltd. and Canadian Insurers Capital Corp.

Indexed as: Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp.
(C.A.)

4 O.R. (3d) 1
[1991] O.J. No. 1137
Action No. 318/91

ONTARIO
Court of Appeal for Ontario
Goodman, McKinlay and Galligan JJ.A.
July 3, 1991

Debtor and creditor -- Receivers -- Court-appointed receiver accepting offer to purchase assets against wishes of secured creditors -- Receiver acting properly and prudently -- Wishes of creditors not determinative -- Court approval of sale confirmed on appeal.

Air Toronto was a division of Soundair. In April 1990, one of Soundair's creditors, the Royal Bank, appointed a receiver to operate Air Toronto and sell it as a going concern. The receiver was authorized to sell Air Toronto to Air Canada, or, if that sale could not be completed, to negotiate and sell Air Toronto to another person. Air Canada made an offer which the receiver rejected. The receiver then entered into negotiations with Canadian Airlines International (Canadian); two subsidiaries of Canadian, Ontario Express Ltd. and Frontier Airlines Ltd., made an offer to purchase on March 6, 1991 (the OEL offer). Air Canada and a creditor of Soundair, CCFL, presented an offer to purchase to the receiver on March 7, 1991 through 922, a company formed for that purpose (the 922 offer). The receiver declined the 922 offer because it contained an unacceptable condition and accepted the OEL offer. 922 made a

second offer, which was virtually identical to the first one except that the unacceptable condition had been removed. In proceedings before Rosenberg J., an order was made approving the sale of Air Toronto to OEL and dismissing the 922 offer. CCFL appealed.

Held, the appeal should be dismissed.

Per Galligan J.A.: When deciding whether a receiver has acted providently, the court should examine the conduct of the receiver in light of the information the receiver had when it agreed to accept an offer, and should be very cautious before deciding that the receiver's conduct was improvident based upon information which has come to light after it made its decision. The decision to sell to OEL was a sound one in the circumstances faced by the receiver on March 8, 1991. Prices in other offers received after the receiver has agreed to a sale have relevance only if they show that the price contained in the accepted offer was so unreasonably low as to demonstrate that the receiver was improvident in accepting it. If they do not do so, they should not be considered upon a motion to confirm a sale recommended by a court-appointed receiver. If the 922 offer was better than the OEL offer, it was only marginally better and did not lead to an inference that the disposition strategy of the receiver was improvident.

While the primary concern of a receiver is the protecting of the interests of creditors, a secondary but important consideration is the integrity of the process by which the sale is effected. The court must exercise extreme caution before it interferes with the process adopted by a receiver to sell an unusual asset. It is important that prospective purchasers know that, if they are acting in good faith, bargain seriously with a receiver and enter into an agreement with it, a court will not lightly interfere with the commercial judgment of the receiver to sell the asset to them.

The failure of the receiver to give an offering memorandum to those who expressed an interest in the purchase of Air Toronto did not result in the process being unfair, as there was no proof that if an offering memorandum had been widely

distributed among persons qualified to have purchased Air Toronto, a viable offer would have come forth from a party other than 922 or OEL.

The fact that the 922 offer was supported by Soundair's secured creditors did not mean that the court should have given effect to their wishes. Creditors who asked the court to appoint a receiver to dispose of assets (and therefore insulated themselves from the risks of acting privately) should not be allowed to take over control of the process by the simple expedient of supporting another purchaser if they do not agree with the sale by the receiver. If the court decides that a court-appointed receiver has acted providently and properly (as the receiver did in this case), the views of creditors should not be determinative.

Per McKinlay J.A. (concurring in the result): While the procedure carried out by the receiver in this case was appropriate, given the unfolding of events and the unique nature of the assets involved, it was not a procedure which was likely to be appropriate in many receivership sales.

Per Goodman J.A. (dissenting): The fact that a creditor has requested an order of the court appointing a receiver does not in any way diminish or derogate from his right to obtain the maximum benefit to be derived from any disposition of the debtor's assets. The creditors in this case were convinced that acceptance of the 922 offer was in their best interest and the evidence supported that belief. Although the receiver acted in good faith, the process which it used was unfair insofar as 922 was concerned and improvident insofar as the secured creditors were concerned.

Cases referred to

Beauty Counsellors of Canada Ltd. (Re) (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 (Ont. Bkcy.); British Columbia Development Corp. v. Spun Cast Industries Inc. (1977), 5 B.C.L.R. 94, 26 C.B.R. (N.S.) 28 (S.C.); Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303, 86 A.P.R. 303 (C.A.); Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg (1986), 60 O.R. (2d) 87, 22 C.P.C.

Express Limited and Frontier Airlines Limited, who are subsidiaries of Canadian Airlines International. This offer is called the OEL offer.

In the meantime, Air Canada and CCFL were having discussions about making an offer for the purchase of Air Toronto. They formed 92246 Ontario Limited (922) for the purpose of purchasing Air Toronto. On March 1, 1991, CCFL wrote to the receiver saying that it proposed to make an offer. On March 7, 1991, Air Canada and CCFL presented an offer to the receiver in the name of 922. For convenience, its offers are called the 922 offers.

The first 922 offer contained a condition which was unacceptable to the receiver. I will refer to that condition in more detail later. The receiver declined the 922 offer and on March 8, 1991, accepted the OEL offer. Subsequently, 922 obtained an order allowing it to make a second offer. It then submitted an offer which was virtually identical to that of March 7, 1991, except that the unacceptable condition had been removed.

The proceedings before Rosenberg J. then followed. He approved the sale to OEL and dismissed a motion for the acceptance of the 922 offer. Before Rosenberg J., and in this court, both CCFL and the Royal Bank supported the acceptance of the second 922 offer.

There are only two issues which must be resolved in this appeal. They are:

- (1) Did the receiver act properly when it entered into an agreement to sell Air Toronto to OEL?
- (2) What effect does the support of the 922 offer by the secured creditors have on the result?

I will deal with the two issues separately.

I. DID THE RECEIVER ACT PROPERLY

IN AGREEING TO SELL TO OEL?

Before dealing with that issue there are three general observations which I think I should make. The first is that the sale of an airline as a going concern is a very complex process. The best method of selling an airline at the best price is something far removed from the expertise of a court. When a court appoints a receiver to use its commercial expertise to sell an airline, it is inescapable that it intends to rely upon the receiver's expertise and not upon its own. Therefore, the court must place a great deal of confidence in the actions taken and in the opinions formed by the receiver. It should also assume that the receiver is acting properly unless the contrary is clearly shown. The second observation is that the court should be reluctant to second-guess, with the benefit of hindsight, the considered business decisions made by its receiver. The third observation which I wish to make is that the conduct of the receiver should be reviewed in the light of the specific mandate given to him by the court.

The order of O'Brien J. provided that if the receiver could not complete the sale to Air Canada that it was "to negotiate and sell Air Toronto to another person". The court did not say how the receiver was to negotiate the sale. It did not say it was to call for bids or conduct an auction. It told the receiver to negotiate and sell. It obviously intended, because of the unusual nature of the asset being sold, to leave the method of sale substantially in the discretion of the receiver. I think, therefore, that the court should not review minutely the process of the sale when, broadly speaking, it appears to the court to be a just process.

As did Rosenberg J., I adopt as correct the statement made by Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg* (1986), 60 O.R. (2d) 87, 39 D.L.R. (4th) 526 (H.C.J.), at pp. 92-94 O.R., pp. 531-33 D.L.R., of the duties which a court must perform when deciding whether a receiver who has sold a property acted properly. When he set out the court's duties, he did not put them in any order of priority, nor do I. I summarize those duties as follows:

1. It should consider whether the receiver has made a sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently.
2. It should consider the interests of all parties.
3. It should consider the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers are obtained.
4. It should consider whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process.

I intend to discuss the performance of those duties separately.

1. Did the receiver make a sufficient effort to get the best price and did it act providently?

Having regard to the fact that it was highly unlikely that a commercially viable sale could be made to anyone but the two national airlines, or to someone supported by either of them, it is my view that the receiver acted wisely and reasonably when it negotiated only with Air Canada and Canadian Airlines International. Furthermore, when Air Canada said that it would submit no further offers and gave the impression that it would not participate further in the receiver's efforts to sell, the only course reasonably open to the receiver was to negotiate with Canadian Airlines International. Realistically, there was nowhere else to go but to Canadian Airlines International. In doing so, it is my opinion that the receiver made sufficient efforts to sell the airline.

When the receiver got the OEL offer on March 6, 1991, it was over ten months since it had been charged with the responsibility of selling Air Toronto. Until then, the receiver had not received one offer which it thought was acceptable. After substantial efforts to sell the airline over that period, I find it difficult to think that the receiver acted improvidently in accepting the only acceptable offer which it had.

Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta

Citation: Sanjel Corporation (Re), 2016 ABQB 257

Date: 05162016
Docket: 1601 03143
Registry: Calgary

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

And in the matter of the Compromise or Arrangement of Sanjel Corporation, Sanjel Canada Ltd., Terracor Group Ltd., Suretech Group Ltd., Suretech Completions Canada Ltd., Sanjel Energy Services (USA) Inc., Sanjel (USA) Inc., Suretech Completions (USA) Inc., Sanjel Capital (USA) Inc., Terracor (USA) Inc., Terracor Resources (USA) Inc., Terracor Logistics (USA) Inc., Sanjel Middle East Ltd., Sanjel Latin America Limited and Sanjel Energy Services DMCC

Reasons for Decision
of the
Honourable Madam Justice B.E. Romaine

I. Introduction

[1] The Sanjel debtors seek orders approving certain sales of assets generated through a SISP that was conducted prior to the debtors filing under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. The proceeds of the sales will be insufficient to fully payout the secured creditor, and will generate no return to unsecured creditors, including the holders of unsecured Bonds.

[2] The Trustee of the Bonds challenged the process under which the SISP was conducted, and the use of what he characterized as a liquidating CCAA in this situation. He alleged that the use of the CCAA to effect a pre-packaged sale of the debtors' assets for the benefit of the secured creditor was an abuse of the letter and spirit of the CCAA. He also alleged that bad faith and collusion tainted the integrity of the SISP.

[3] After reviewing extensive evidence and hearing submissions from interested parties, I decided to allow the application to approve the sales, and dismiss the application of the Trustee. These are my reasons.

II. Facts

[4] On April 4, 2016, the Sanjel Corporation and its affiliates were granted an Initial Order under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c.C-36, as amended. PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc., ("PWC") was appointed as Monitor of the applicants.

[5] Sanjel and its affiliates (the "Sanjel Group" or "Sanjel") provide fracturing, cementing, coiled tubing and reservoir services to the oil and gas industry in Canada, the United States and Saudi Arabia. Sanjel Corporation, the parent company, is a private corporation, the shares of which are owned by the MacDonald Group Ltd. It was incorporated under the *Alberta Business Corporations Act* in 1980, and its principal executive and registered office is located in Calgary. Four of the other members of the group were incorporated in Alberta, seven in various American states and three in offshore jurisdictions.

[6] The sole director of all Canadian and US Sanjel companies resides in Calgary, as do all of the officers of these companies. The affidavit in support of the Initial Order sets out a number of factors relevant to the Sanjel Group's ability to file under the CCAA and that would be relevant to a determination of a Centre of Main Interest ("COMI") of the Sanjel Group. In subsequent Chapter 15 proceedings in the United States, the US Court declared COMI to be located in Canada and the CCAA proceedings to be a "foreign main proceeding." It is clear that the Sanjel Group is a fully integrated business centralized in Calgary.

[7] Sanjel Corporation and Sanjel (USA) Inc. are borrowers under a credit agreement (the "Bank Credit Facility") dated April 21, 2015 with a banking syndicate (the "Syndicate") led by Alberta Treasury Branches as agent. The total amount outstanding under the Bank Credit Facility at the time of the CCAA filing was approximately \$415.5 million. The Syndicate has perfected security interests over substantially all of the assets of the Sanjel Group, and is the principal secured creditor of the Sanjel Group in these CCAA proceedings.

[8] On June 18, 2014, Sanjel Corporation issued US \$300 million 7.5% Callable Bonds due June 19, 2019. Interest is payable on the Bonds semi-annually on June 19 and December 19. The Bonds are unsecured. Nordic Trust ASA (the "Trustee") is the trustee under the Bond Agreement.

[9] The Sanjel Group has been severely impacted by the catastrophic drop in global oil and gas prices since mid-2014. Over the last 18 months, the Sanjel Group has taken aggressive steps to cut costs, including by reducing staffing levels by more than half. However, by late October, 2015, Sanjel Corporation was in breach of certain covenants under the Bank Credit Facility. By late December, 2016, the Syndicate was in a position to exercise enforcement rights. In addition, an interest payment of USD \$11,250,000 was due on the Bonds on December 19, 2015. Since late 2015, the Sanjel Group has been in negotiations with both the Syndicate and two bondholders, Ascribe Capital LLC and Clearlake Capital Group L.P., (the "Ad Hoc Bondholders"). The Ad Hoc Bondholders hold over 45% of the Bonds.

[10] In the fall of 2015, Sanjel Corporation engaged Bank of America Merrill Lynch ("BAML") to identify strategic partners and attempt to raise additional capital for the Sanjel Group. BAML contacted 28 private equity firms; 19 non-disclosure agreements were executed and 9 management presentations were made. However, the BAML process did not result in a successful transaction.

[11] In December, 2015, the Ad Hoc Bondholders retained a New York law firm, Fried Frank, as their legal advisor and Moelis & Company as their financial advisor.

[12] On December 10, 2015, Fried Frank conveyed a proposal from the Ad Hoc Bondholders to Sanjel. Under this proposal, Sanjel would be required to pay the USD \$11,250,000 interest payment. Provided that the interest payment was made, the bondholders would agree to a standstill agreement for the same period as may be agreed with the Syndicate. In return, the Ad Hoc Bondholders would lend back their pro rata share of that interest payment to Sanjel in return for secured notes ranking *pari passu* with the Bank Credit Facility, bearing interest at the same rate as the Bank Credit Facility plus 2%. The new notes would not be repaid until the Bank Credit Facility was repaid.

[13] The Ad Hoc Bondholders indicated that they would consider acting as standby lenders to Sanjel for the remainder of the interest payment and would offer the other bondholders the option of lending back their pro-rata share to Sanjel on the same basis. If they agreed to be standby lenders, the Ad Hoc Bondholders would receive a commitment fee equal to 10% of their standby commitment, payable in new notes.

[14] The proposal letter indicated that the Ad Hoc Bondholders were aware that Sanjel had been engaged in a process to address liquidity and leverage issues over the past few months, including attempting to raise equity to sell assets. In their view, Sanjel had exhausted those efforts, and the only remaining option was a deal negotiated with the bondholders. However, the Ad Hoc Bondholders would only embark on such a process if the December 19, 2015 interest payment was made.

[15] Sanjel rejected the proposal on December 14, 2015. It is noteworthy that the Bank Credit Facility includes a negative covenant prohibiting Sanjel from granting a security interest over its assets. The Syndicate advised Sanjel that the Ad Hoc Bondholders' proposal to have their existing unsecured position elevated to rank *pari passu* with the Bank Credit Facility was unacceptable, and that it would not provide its consent.

[16] On December 15, 2015, the Ad Hoc Bondholders advised counsel to the Syndicate that they wished to work towards a restructuring, which they envisaged would involve paying down a portion of the Syndicate's debt "in an amount to be mutually agreed on". They also suggested that Sanjel would implement a rights offering to holders of Bonds and then to existing equity, with a conversion of the Bonds into new debt and equity.

[17] On or about December 15, 2015, the Ad Hoc Bondholders sent Sanjel a draft waiver and standstill agreement, which required the payment of part of the December 19 interest payment by December 23, 2015 and the payment of the fees and disbursements of Fried Frank and Moelis in return for arranging for a bondholder meeting to be called to consider a period of forbearance to March 31, 2016.

[18] Fried Frank and Moelis executed Non-Disclosure Agreements ("NDAs") on December 24, 2015, but the Ad Hoc Bondholders did not, thus not restricting their right to trade the Bonds. Fried Frank and Moelis were granted access to a Sanjel virtual database ("VDR") on January 9, 2016.

[19] By January, 2016, given the prolonged downturn in oil and gas prices, Sanjel's liquidity was limited. Events of default under the Bank Credit Facility that had occurred as of October 31, 2015 were exacerbated by a cross-default based on the non-payment of interest under the Bond

Agreement. As of January 31, 2016, the Sanjel Group had total consolidated liabilities of approximately \$1.064 billion.

[20] Sanjel was facing very significant negative cash flow projections over the next few months. As of early January, 2016, Sanjel's projected cash flows showed that its cash position would deteriorate by more than half as of the first week of April, 2016, and would be further reduced by anticipated forbearance payments.

[21] In the circumstances, Sanjel agreed with the Syndicate to implement a Sales and Investment Solicitation Process ("SISP"). Sanjel states that it hoped that if a SISP was implemented, it might find a transaction that preserved the business as a going concern, which would maximize stakeholder value and preserve goodwill and jobs.

[22] In mid-January, 2016, Sanjel engaged PWC as a proposed Monitor in the event it would become necessary to file under the CCAA.

[23] The SISP was commenced on behalf of Sanjel by its financial advisors, PJT Partners Inc. ("PJT") and Credit Suisse Securities (CANADA), Inc. ("CS") on January 17, 2016. The advisors contacted prospective bidders, many of whom had already been identified through the BAML process of late 2015.

[24] The process of soliciting non-bidding indications of interest ran from January 17, 2016 to February 22, 2016. On January 26, 2016, the advisers updated and opened a VDR available to anyone who had signed a NDA. A teaser letter was distributed and meetings and conference calls were held with bidders. A process letter was distributed on January 28, 2016. Nine indications of interest were submitted on or about February 22, 2016.

[25] Before and during the SISP process, Sanjel was negotiating with both the Syndicate and the Ad Hoc Bondholders with respect to separate forbearance agreements, and with the Ad Hoc Bondholders with respect to NDAs to be signed by the Ad Hoc Bondholders. The Ad Hoc Bondholders complain that there was a delay of almost a month before Sanjel's counsel responded to a mark-up of a NDA provided by Fried Frank, but negotiations were stymied by the Ad Hoc Bondholders' insistence that the December interest payment be paid. Until this issue was settled, there was no reason to finalize the NDAs. In addition, it was not until January 29, 2016 that representatives of the Ad Hoc Bondholders advised Sanjel that they were prepared to be restricted from trading and therefore able to receive confidential information. During this period of time, the Ad Hoc Bondholders refused to meet with Sanjel management when they travelled to New York on January 20, 2016.

[26] On February 1, 2016, counsel to Sanjel sent counsel to the Ad Hoc Bondholders a copy of the draft forbearance agreement between the Syndicate and Sanjel, which set out the key dates of the SISP, including the completion of definitive purchase and sales agreements by March 24, 2016. It would have been clear to the Ad Hoc Bondholders from this draft that Sanjel was proceeding on a dual track basis, considering both a potential stand-alone restructuring of the company and a sales process.

[27] The Ad Hoc Bondholders made a second proposal to Sanjel on February 2, 2016, very shortly after the NDAs were signed. This proposal involved the Syndicate recovering a portion of its loan from Sanjel's existing cash reserves and a rights offering backstopped by the Ad Hoc Bondholders. A portion of the Bonds would be converted into equity. The December interest payment would have to be paid. Sanjel's management team met with the Ad Hoc Bondholders

and their advisors in New York on February 3, 2016 and Sanjel's team, the Syndicate and its advisors and the Ad Hoc Bondholders met on February 8, 2016.

[28] Sanjel delivered an indicative restructuring term sheet to the Ad Hoc Bondholders on February 12, 2016, as required by the forbearance agreement that the parties were negotiating. The restructuring term sheet emphasized that a bondholder-led restructuring would require significant new money, a significant capital commitment and ongoing capital, with a significant pay-down of the Syndicate's debt.

[29] Commencing on February 15, 2016, Sanjel allowed representatives of Alvarez and Marsal ("A&M"), advisors to the Ad Hoc Bondholders, to attend in Calgary and conduct due diligence.

[30] On February 18, 2016, Sanjel uploaded to its VDR the final, unsigned versions of the Syndicate Amending and Forbearance Agreement and the Bondholders Forbearance Agreement.

[31] Under the SISP, preliminary, non-binding indications of interest were delivered to the advisors and the company by February 22, 2016. Six such indications of interest were received, all of which were materially superior to the Ad Hoc Bondholders proposal of February 2, 2016. The Ad Hoc Bondholders have admitted that they were aware of the milestones under the SISP and the Bank Forbearance Agreement by mid-February, 2016, although it is clear that their advisors would have been aware of these milestones from February 1, 2016.

[32] As part of finalizing the form of Bond Forbearance Agreement, counsel for Sanjel and for the Ad Hoc Bondholders had negotiated a form of summons that would be used to call a bondholder meeting to consider the agreement. The only item for consideration to be considered at the meeting was to be the Bond Forbearance Agreement. The plan was to have 2/3 of the bondholders approve and execute the Bond Forbearance Agreement, and then to hold a bondholders meeting.

[33] Instead, on February 25, 2016, the Ad Hoc Bondholders caused the Trustee to issue a summons for a meeting on March 10, 2016 to consider and vote on a) whether to declare the Bonds in default, accelerate them and exercise remedies, including commencing involuntary bankruptcy proceedings against Sanjel under Chapter 11 of the *United States Bankruptcy Code*, including claims against the MacDonald family and MacBain Properties Ltd., which owns the business premises that are leased by the Sanjel Group or b) approve the Bond Forbearance Agreement.

[34] On March 2, 2016, the Ad Hoc Bondholders submitted a restructuring proposal to Sanjel. This proposal provided no cash recovery to the Syndicate. Instead, a portion of the debt owed to the Syndicate would be converted to a new loan and the remainder extinguished, with the Syndicate receiving warrants in a reorganized company. There would be a Chapter 11 filing and the bondholders would provide a debtor-in-possession ("DIP") facility to rank *pari passu* with the Syndicate debt. Bondholders who contributed to the DIP would receive new 2nd lien notes for part of their previous notes, the remainder being extinguished. The DIP facility would be converted into 100% of the equity of the reorganized company. Sanjel would be required to appoint a Chief Restructuring Officer ("CRO") designated by the Ad Hoc Bondholders.

[35] On March 4, 2016, in a follow-up letter to a telephone meeting on March 3, 2016, US counsel to the Syndicate wrote to Fried Frank requesting that the March 10 bondholders meeting

be adjourned to March 31, 2016. Canadian counsel to Sanjel made the same request of the Trustee.

[36] Also on March 4, 2016, a template Asset Purchase Agreement (“APA”) for SISP bidders was posted on the VDRs, which disclosed a CCAA/Chapter 15 filing with PWC as designated Monitor. This template agreement was available to the Ad Hoc Bondholders and their advisors.

[37] Counsel for the Ad Hoc Bondholders replied on March 5, 2016 that they would advise the Trustee to postpone the March 10 meeting subject to:

- a) a response to their March 2 proposal by March 10, 2016;
- b) full disclosure of company records for A&M’s representative, “so that [that representative] is ready and best positioned to commence his duties as Chief Restructuring Officer for the Company”.
- c) payment by March 7, 2016 of roughly USD \$2.2 million in fees and disbursements for the Ad Hoc Bondholders’ legal and financial advisors.

[38] After some negotiation, Sanjel agreed to these terms for an adjournment, other than with respect to a small deduction in fees and disbursements. Sanjel made it clear that it reserved all rights with respect to the appointment of a CRO and a filing under Chapter 11, which it would not agree to at that time. On March 8, 2016 the Trustee confirmed that the meeting would be postponed to March 31.

[39] On March 9, 2016, second round bids under the SISP were received. Five bids were received, all of which were materially superior to the Ad Hoc Bondholders’ March 2, 2016 proposal in terms of cash recovery for the Syndicate.

[40] An information update conference for bondholders was scheduled to be held on March 11, 2016, at which Sanjel, the Trustee and the Ad Hoc Bondholders would provide an update to any bondholder that wished to call in. This was rescheduled by the Trustee to March 31, 2016.

[41] On March 11, 2016, the Syndicate sent the counter-offer required by the postponement of meeting agreement to the Ad Hoc Bondholders. This counter-proposal made it clear that there would be a CCAA/Chapter 15 process, rather than a Chapter 11 process. While this counter-proposal is confidential, it is fair to say that the parties were far apart in their negotiations, particularly with respect to treatment of the Syndicate indebtedness.

[42] Also on March 11, 2016, a representative of Sanjel met with A&M’s representative and discussed Sanjel’s intention to disclaim certain leases in the anticipated CCAA proceedings.

[43] Following receipt of the second round bids, Sanjel and its advisors identified the top three bidders and began negotiations with them with the goal of finalizing due diligence and being in a position to execute final APAs on March 24, 2016, as indicated in the Bank Forbearance Agreement.

[44] In the meantime, Sanjel continued meetings with the A&M representative, who asked for, and was provided with:

- a) access to the newly created VDR for second stage bidders/investors in the SISP on March 12, 2016.

- b) draft materials relating to the CCAA filing, including current drafts of cash flow projections and drafts of stakeholder communication regarding the CCAA, on March 21, 2016.

[45] On March 20, 2016, the Ad Hoc Bondholders provided Sanjel and the Syndicate with a third restructuring proposal. This one provided for some paydown of the Syndicate's debt, but involved less than half of that recovery in new money, about the same amount in debt secured by accounts receivable and a substantial amount of bank debt rolled over into a new loan. It also provided for a DIP facility to rank *pari passu* with a new bank credit facility in the event of a liquidation and the conversion of some bondholder debt into secured notes.

[46] On March 23, 2016, counsel for Sanjel requested that the Trustee postpone the bondholder meeting scheduled for March 31, 2016 to April 14, 2016. He also proposed to set up the requested informational update on March 31, 2016. On March 25, 2016, counsel for the Trustee consented to this request.

[47] In the SISP, final bids were received from the three top bidders on March 24, 2016, with negotiations to continue on final APAs. On the same day, Sanjel and its advisors hosted a call with A&M and Moelis, during which they walked through a 13 week cash forecast.

[48] On March 31, 2016 the Syndicate and the Ad Hoc Bondholders had discussions with respect to the Ad Hoc Bondholders' March 20 proposal. In previous correspondence, the Syndicate's counsel had questioned the adequacy of the proposed DIP financing in the proposal and noted Sanjel's significant cash needs following exit from an insolvency proceeding, as opposed to the proposal's assumption that there would be better cash flow. At the conclusion of the call, the Ad Hoc Bondholders indicated that they would provide further modelling with respect to their proposal.

[49] On April 3, 2016, Sanjel entered into final APAs with the proposed purchasers, STEP and Liberty. On April 4, 2016, the Sanjel Group filed for CCAA protection. Counsel for Sanjel Group disclosed that the application was made without notice to the Ad Hoc Bondholders. He submitted that notice would imperil the CCAA proceedings as the bondholders may, with notice, have pre-empted the CCAA filing by an involuntary filing under Chapter 11. There is no requirement to give notice to unsecured creditors of a CCAA filing. There are circumstances, and this was one of them, where it is appropriate to seek an initial order on an ex parte basis:

This may be an appropriate – even necessary – step in order to prevent “creditors from moving to realize on their claims, essentially a ‘stampede to the assets’ once creditors learn of the debtor’s financial distress”: J.P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (2007), at p. 55 (“Rescue!”); see also *Algoma Steel Inc., Re* (2001), 25 C.B.R. (4th) 194 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 7

[50] On April 11, 2016, the Ad Hoc Bondholders presented their fourth proposal for restructuring, not to Sanjel but to the Syndicate. This proposal increases the amount the bondholders would contribute to Sanjel for new equity, which would be used to repay a portion of the Syndicate's loan.

[51] According to Fried Frank, the Syndicate's counsel responded on April 13, 2016 advising that while they appreciated the work done by the Ad Hoc Bondholders, the Syndicate preferred the sale route. The Syndicate proposed alternatives that it might consider involving a higher pay-

out of the Syndicate's debt than offered by the April 11, 2016 proposal. The Ad Hoc Bondholders have not responded.

[52] The Sanjel Group apply for an order approving the sales transactions generated through the SISP, being a sales agreement between Sanjel and STEP Energy Services Ltd., including an assignment of the sale of the debtor's cementing assets in favour of 1961531 Alberta Ltd., and a sales agreement between Sanjel and Liberty.

[53] The Trustee applied for an order dismissing the application for approval of these transactions, allowing the Ad Hoc Bondholders to propose a plan of arrangement, lifting the stay to allow the Trustee to commence a Chapter 11 filing and directing a new Court-monitored SISP, among other applications

III. Applicable Law

[54] Section 36(3) of the CCAA sets out six non-exhaustive factors that must be considered in approving a sale by a CCAA debtor of assets outside the ordinary course of business. They are:

- (a) whether the process leading to the proposed sale was reasonable in the circumstances;
- (b) whether the Monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale;
- (c) whether the Monitor filed with the court a report stating that in its opinion the sale would be more beneficial to creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;
- (d) the extent to which the creditors were consulted;
- (e) the effects of the proposed sale on creditors and other interested parties; and
- (f) whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.

[55] In this case, the Monitor was not in place at the time of the process leading to the proposed sales, nor at the time the SISP was commenced. However, the Monitor has given an opinion on the process, which I will consider as part of my review.

[56] Prior to the enactment of section 36, CCAA courts considered what are known as the Soundair principles in considering approval application, and they are still useful guidelines:

- a) Was there a sufficient effort made to get the price at issue? Did the debtor company act improvidently?
- b) Were the interests of all parties considered?
- c) Are there any questions about the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers were obtained?
- d) Was there unfairness in the working out of the process?

Royal Bank v Soundair, 1991 Carswell Ont (Ont CA) at para 20.

[57] Gascon, J. (as he then was) suggested in *Re AbitibiBowater, Inc*, 2010 QCCS 1742 (C.S. Que.) at paras 70-72 that a court should give due consideration to two further factors:

- a) the business judgment rule, in that a court will not lightly interfere with the exercise of the commercial and business judgment of the debtor company and the

monitor in the context of an asset sale where the marketing and sale process was fair, reasonable, transparent and efficient; and

b) the weight to be given to the recommendation of the monitor.

[58] As noted by Gascon, J., it is not desirable for a bidder to wait to the last minute, even up to a court approval stage, to submit its best offer. However, a court can consider such an offer, if it is evidence that the debtor company did not properly carry out its duty to obtain the best price for creditors.

IV. Analysis

[59] The Trustee has raised a number of objections to the proposed sales, many of which relate to the factors and principles set out in section 36 of the CCAA, the Soundair principles and the AbitibiBowater factors:

A. The Trustee submits that the CCAA can only be used to liquidate the assets of a debtor company and distribute the proceeds where such use is uncontested or where there is clear evidence that the CCAA provides scope for greater recoveries than would be available on a bankruptcy.

[60] Most of the cases relied upon by the Trustee with respect to this submission predate the 2009 enactment of section 36 of the CCAA. While prior to this change to the CCAA, there was some authority that questioned whether the CCAA should be used to carry out a liquidation of a debtors' assets, there was also authority that accepted this as a proper use of the statute.

[61] An analysis of the pre-section 36 state of the law on this issue, and support for the latter view, is well summarized in *Re Nortel Networks Corp.*, [2009] O.J. No. 3169. As noted by Morawetz, J. at para 28 of that decision, the CCAA is a flexible statute, particularly useful in complex insolvency cases in which the court is required to balance numerous constituents and myriad interests. This is such a case.

[62] Section 36 now provides that a CCAA court may authorize the sale or disposition of assets outside the ordinary course of business if authorized to do so by court order. There is thus no jurisdictional impediment to the sale of assets where such sales meet the requisite tests, even in the absence of a plan of arrangement.

[63] Morawetz, J. in *Re Target Canada Co.*, 2015 ONSC 303 at paras 32 and 33, describes the change brought about by section 36:

Prior to the 2009 amendments to the CCAA, Canadian courts accepted that, in appropriate circumstances, debtor companies were entitled to seek the protection of the CCAA where the outcome was not going to be a going concern restructuring, but instead, a "liquidation" or wind-down of the debtor companies' assets or business.

The 2009 amendments did not expressly address whether the CCAA could be used generally to wind-down the business of a debtor company. However, I am satisfied that the enactment of section 36 of the CCAA, which establishes a process for a debtor company to sell assets outside the ordinary course of business while under CCAA protection, is consistent with the principle that the CCAA can be a vehicle to downsize or wind-down a debtor company's business.

See also *Re Brainhunter Inc.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 8207 at para 15.

CITATION: Grafton-Fraser v. Cadillac, 2017 ONSC 2496
DIVISIONAL COURT FILE NO.: CV-17-11677-OOCL
DATE: 20170502

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF
GRAFTON-FRASER INC.

BETWEEN:	)	
	)	
GRAFTON-FRASER INC.	)	<i>Stuart Brotman and Dylan Chochla, for the</i>
	)	<i>Applicant</i>
	)	
Applicant	)	
	)	
– and –	)	
	)	
	)	
CADILLAC FAIRVIEW CORPORATION	)	<i>Lily Coodin, for Cadillac Fairview</i>
LIMITED, ET AL.	)	<i>Corporation Limited</i>
	)	
Respondents	)	<i>J. Dietrich and M. Sassi, for the Monitor</i>
	)	
	)	<i>Gordon Meiklejohn, for Trade & Global Inc.</i>
	)	
	)	<i>N. Renner, for the Purchaser and DIP Lender</i>
	)	
	)	<i>Linda Galessiere, for Various Landlords</i>
	)	
	)	<i>Evan Cobb, for CIBC</i>
	)	
	)	
	)	HEARD: April 20, 2017

)

L. A. PATTILLO J.

Introduction

[1] This is an application by Grafton-Fraser Inc. (“Grafton”) for, among other things, an order approving the sale of its assets as set out in an asset purchase agreement dated January 24, 2017 with 1104307 B.C. Ltd. (now GSO GF Acquisition B.C. Ltd.) (the “Purchaser”) pursuant to the *Companies Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the “CCAA”) (the “Transaction”).

[2] The application is supported by the Third Report of Richter Advisory Group Inc. in its capacity as monitor for Grafton (the “Monitor”).

[3] The application is either agreed to or unopposed by all of the stakeholders with notice save and except for Tradex Global Inc. (“Tradex”) who is an unsecured creditor and who objects to the Transaction as it affects the unsecured creditors.

[4] For the reasons that follow, I approve the Transaction and grant the relief requested by Grafton. Notwithstanding that the Transaction does not treat all of Grafton’s unsecured creditors equally, in my view, it meets the principles set out in *Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp.*, [1991] O.J. No. 1137; 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. C.A.) and s. 36 of the CCAA.

Background

[5] On January 25, 2017, Grafton obtained an order from this court granting it protection pursuant to the CCAA (the “Order”). Among other things, the Order appointed the Monitor and granted Grafton the authority to enter into amended and restated forbearance agreements with its two primary and secured lenders, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce (“CIBC”) and GSO Capital Partners LP (“GSO”) as agent for the GSO Lenders.

[6] Grafton is a leading retailer of men’s clothing which, prior to the Order operated 158 stores in Canada under various names including “Tip Top Tailors” and “George Richards Big and Tall”.

[7] On January 30, 2017, the court issued a further order approving, among other things, the proposed sale and investment solicitation process for Grafton’s business and assets to be carried out with the Monitor’s assistance (the “SISP”) and authorizing Grafton to enter into the Agreement which was to serve as the minimum bid under the SISP (the “Stalking Horse APA”). The Purchaser is a party related to GSO.

[8] To protect confidential information, the SISP contemplated a two stage bidding process. During the first stage, potential bidders were given certain coded information. Bidders who submitted a qualified bid in the first stage would be invited to participate in the second stage with access to confidential information.

[9] The Monitor, in consultation with Grafton, compiled a list of 174 potential interested parties who were invited to participate in the SISP. Eight potential interested parties responded. Four signed non-disclosure agreements and were provided access to the data room. With the exception of the stalking horse bid, no other bids were submitted prior to the stage one bid deadline. The Purchaser was therefore the “successful bidder” under the SISP.

[10] The Transaction is a credit-bid transaction. The Purchaser is acquiring, as a going concern, on an “as is, where is” basis substantially all of Grafton’s business and assets (the “Purchased Assets”). The Purchaser will acquire 139 retail stores operated by Grafton as well as its head office. Seven days prior to the closing of the Agreement, the Purchaser will offer employment to no fewer than 1,100 Grafton employees on substantially similar terms and conditions to their existing employment with Grafton. The proposed closing date for the Transaction is on or before May 31, 2017.

[11] The consideration for the Transaction includes, among other things:

- a) The assumption by the Purchaser of the principal, plus accrued interest and fees owing by Grafton to its operating lender, CIBC;
- b) The assumption by the Purchaser of Grafton’s secured indebtedness under the DIP Facility (as defined in the Agreement);
- c) The release by GSO and certain of its affiliates of certain of the secured indebtedness owing by Grafton under the GSO Facility (as defined in the Agreement); and
- d) The assumption by the Purchaser of certain of Grafton’s obligations, including Supplier Liabilities (as defined in the Agreement, which are pre-filing amounts owed by Grafton to certain suppliers of goods/services to the extent agreements with such suppliers have been entered into with the Purchaser, on terms acceptable to CIBC and the Purchaser, establishing, among other things, the terms of continued supply).

[12] The Purchaser has determined that certain suppliers are critical to the ongoing value and operations of the business and has agreed to assume Grafton’s indebtedness to these creditors on terms satisfactory to the Purchaser. At full value, these claims total approximately \$5.2 million.

[13] At the date of the Order, Grafton had aggregate known unsecured liabilities of approximately \$8 million together with contingent claims in excess of \$2 million. In addition, Grafton has or will shortly disclaim a number of lease agreements and terminate the employment of a number of employees which it expects will give rise to significant unsecured claims.

Tradex

[14] Tradex and its affiliated companies provided procurement and quality control services for Grafton’s overseas purchases for a number of years pursuant to written agreements. The most recent agreements were mutually terminated on May 5, 2016. Tradex’s evidence is that there was

an oral agreement with Tradex that it would continue to supply services at the previously agreed prices, that it did so and it received payment for its services as late as October 7, 2016. It has since not been paid and alleges that to the date of the Order it is owed US \$856,660.00 and Cdn. \$383,316.00.

[15] In correspondence between counsel, Grafton has denied that any amounts are owing to Tradex and advised that since the termination of the agreements, it has not engaged Tradex or any of its related parties.

[16] Tradex is not among the suppliers and other creditors whose claims the Purchaser has agreed to assume upon closing of the Transaction.

Position of the Parties

[17] Tradex submits that the Transaction, as structured, should not be approved. Rather, in order to ensure that all unsecured creditors are treated equally, the Purchaser must be required to make the \$5.2 million and any other amounts it has committed to pay to Grafton's unsecured creditors, not just to a select group of unsecured creditors, but *pari passu* to all unsecured creditors.

[18] Grafton has agreed, for the purposes of this motion only, and without admitting any liability, to accept that Tradex has an unsecured claim against it. It submits that the Transaction is beneficial to Grafton's stakeholders as it provides for the continuation of a substantial portion of its business and should be approved. Further, there is no requirement under the CCAA that creditors be treated equally.

Analysis

[19] Section 36 of the CCAA provides that the court may authorize the disposition of assets of a debtor company outside the ordinary course of business. The factors to be considered by the court in approving such a disposition were first set out by our Court of Appeal in *Soundair* and are now largely set out in s. 36(3) of the CCAA which provides:

s.36(3) In deciding whether to grant the authorization, the court is to consider, among other things,

- a) whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances;
- b) whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or distribution;
- c) whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in their opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;

- d) the extent to which the creditors were consulted;
- e) the effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties; and
- f) whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.

[20] Considering the above factors in respect of the Transaction and the events leading up to it, I find the evidence establishes:

- a) the SISP was reasonable in the circumstances and was approved by the court;
- b) the Monitor approved the SISP and assisted Grafton in carrying out its terms;
- c) the Monitor has confirmed in its Third Report that the Transaction would be substantially more beneficial to Grafton's creditors, as compared to the alternatives, which may result in the liquidation of Grafton's assets;
- d) the Monitor and Grafton's two primary secured creditors, CIBC and GSO, are each supportive of the Transaction;
- e) the Monitor is of the view that the Transaction represents the best opportunity to maximize recoveries for creditors of Grafton and provides the greatest benefit to all stakeholders (including landlords, employees, customers, go-forward suppliers, etc.), as it results in the continuation of Grafton's business;
- f) that further marketing of Grafton's assets would not likely result in greater realizations as the market has been fully canvassed and all likely bidders have already been provided the opportunity to bid on the assets;
- g) the Transaction represents the highest and best offer for the Purchased Assets and the short time-frame to closing will eliminate ongoing costs of the CCAA proceeding; and
- h) Grafton's limited liquidity substantially eliminates the opportunity to further market the Purchased Assets for sale without putting the Transaction at risk and impairing recoveries.

[21] There is no question that certain of Grafton's liabilities, including some of its unsecured creditors will not be paid, as a result of the Transaction as it is structured. In support of its submission that in the absence of all the unsecured creditors being treated equally, the

Transaction should not be approved, Tradex relies on the decision of Newbould J. in *Re Nortel Networks Corp.*, 2015 ONSC 2987; 27 C.B.R. (6th) 175 (Ont. S.C.J.) and specifically the statement at para. 209 that “It is a fundamental tenet of insolvency law that all debts shall be paid *pari passu* and all unsecured creditors receive equal treatment.”

[22] There can be no issue that Newbould J.’s statement is a correct statement of the law. It was made, however, in the context of the issue of how to determine the allocation of liquidation proceeds from *Nortel’s* business among its various creditors in multiple jurisdictions. The reasoning in *Nortel* does not apply in this case where the Transaction is a credit bid which gives rise to no proceeds of sale being available for distribution.

[23] I am in agreement with Grafton’s submission that, in the context of the sale of a company’s business under the CCAA, there is no requirement that creditors be treated equally. That is not to say that their interests are to be ignored. Rather, the effects of the proposed sale on the creditors are one of the factors that must be considered. But they are considered in the larger context of the proposed sale and weighted against the other above noted factors, including the interests of the debtor and the stakeholders generally.

[24] The above principle was applied in *Re Nelson Education Ltd.*, 2015 ONSC 5557, 29 C.B.R. (6th) 140 (Ont. S.C.J.) where Newbould J., in approving a sale of substantially all of Nelson’s assets pursuant to a credit bid pursuant to the CCAA, noted at para. 39 that while there were some excluded liabilities and a small amount owing to former employees that would not be paid, the monitor indicated there was no reasonable prospect of any alternative solution that would provide recovery for those creditors.

[25] The Transaction is beneficial to Grafton’s stakeholders as it provides for the continuation of a substantial portion of Grafton’s business, thereby assuring a customer for go-forward suppliers, a tenant for the landlords of 139 retail stores, employment for a majority of Grafton’s employees and an ongoing business for many of its customers. While the Transaction will result in some of the unsecured creditors, including Tradex, not being paid, when weighted against all the other relevant factors, that provision should not prevent approval of the Transaction, particularly when the likely alternative is liquidation which would result in no recovery for the unsecured creditors generally.

[26] For the above reasons, therefore, the Transaction is approved. The relief requested in the Notice of Motion is approved and the draft Approval and Vesting Order at tab 2 of the Motion Record shall issue.

CITATION: Canwest Global Communications Corp., 2010 ONSC 2870
COURT FILE NO.: CV-10-8533-00CL
DATE: 20100521

ONTARIO

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

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF
CANWEST PUBLISHING INC./PUBLICATIONS CANWEST INC., CANWEST
BOOKS INC., AND CANWEST (CANADA) INC.

APPLICANTS

COUNSEL: *Lyndon Barnes, Alex Cobb and Betsy Putnam* for the Applicant LP Entities
Mario Forte for the Special Committee of the Board of Directors
David Byers and Maria Konyukhova for the Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.
Andrew Kent and Hilary Clarke for the Administrative Agent of the Senior
Secured Lenders Syndicate
M.P. Gottlieb and J.A. Swartz for the Ad Hoc Committee of 9.25% Senior
Subordinated Noteholders
Robert Chadwick and Logan Willis for 7535538 Canada Inc.
Deborah McPhail for the Superintendent of Financial Services (FSCO)
Thomas McRae for Certain Canwest Employees

PEPALL J.

ENDORSEMENT

Relief Requested

[1] The LP Entities seek an order: (1) authorizing them to enter into an Asset Purchase Agreement based on a bid from the Ad Hoc Committee of 9.25% Senior Subordinated Noteholders (“the AHC Bid”); (2) approving an amended claims procedure; (3) authorizing the LP Entities to resume the claims process; and (4) amending the SISP procedures so that the LP Entities can advance the Ad Hoc Committee transaction (the AHC Transaction”) and the Support

Transaction concurrently. They also seek an order authorizing them to call a meeting of unsecured creditors to vote on the Ad Hoc Committee Plan on June 10, 2010. Lastly, they seek an order conditionally sanctioning the Senior Lenders' CCAA Plan.

AHC Bid

[2] Dealing firstly with approval of the AHC Bid, in my Initial Order of January 8, 2010, I approved the Support Agreement between the LP Entities and the Administrative Agent for the Senior Lenders and authorized the LP Entities to file a Senior Lenders' Plan and to commence a sale and investor solicitation process (the SISP). The objective of the SISP was to test the market and obtain an offer that was superior to the terms of the Support Transaction.

[3] On January 11, 2010, the Financial Advisor, RBC Capital Markets, commenced the SISP. Qualified Bids (as that term was defined in the SISP) were received and the Monitor, in consultation with the Financial Advisor and the LP CRA, determined that the AHC Bid was a Superior Cash Offer and that none of the other bids was a Superior Offer as those terms were defined in the SISP.

[4] The Monitor recommended that the LP Entities pursue the AHC Transaction and the Special Committee of the Board of Directors accepted that recommendation.

[5] The AHC Transaction contemplates that 7535538 Canada Inc. ("Holdco") will effect a transaction through a new limited partnership (Opco LP) in which it will acquire substantially all of the financial and operating assets of the LP Entities and the shares of National Post Inc. and assume certain liabilities including substantially all of the operating liabilities for a purchase price of \$1.1 billion. At closing, Opco LP will offer employment to substantially all of the employees of the LP Entities and will assume all of the pension liabilities and other benefits for employees of the LP Entities who will be employed by Opco LP, as well as for retirees currently covered by registered pension plans or other benefit plans. The materials submitted with the AHC Bid indicated that Opco LP will continue to operate all of the businesses of the LP Entities in substantially the same manner as they are currently operated, with no immediate plans to discontinue operations, sell material assets or make significant changes to current management.

The AHC Bid will also allow for a full payout of the debt owed by the LP Entities to the LP Secured Lenders under the LP credit agreement and the Hedging Creditors and provides an additional \$150 million in value which will be available for the unsecured creditors of the LP Entities.

[6] The purchase price will consist of an amount in cash that is equal to the sum of the Senior Secured Claims Amount (as defined in the AHC Asset Purchase Agreement), a promissory note of \$150 million (to be exchanged for up to 45% of the common shares of Holdco) and the assumption of certain liabilities of the LP Entities.

[7] The Ad Hoc Committee has indicated that Holdco has received commitments for \$950 million of funded debt and equity financing to finance the AHC Bid. This includes \$700 million of new senior funded debt to be raised by Opco LP and \$250 million of mezzanine debt and equity to be raised including from the current members of the Ad Hoc Committee.

[8] Certain liabilities are excluded including pre-filing liabilities and restructuring period claims, certain employee related liabilities and intercompany liabilities between and among the LP Entities and the CMI Entities. Effective as of the closing date, Opco LP will offer employment to all full-time and part-time employees of the LP Entities on substantially similar terms as their then existing employment (or the terms set out in their collective agreement, as applicable), subject to the option, exercisable on or before May 30, 2010, to not offer employment to up to 10% of the non-unionized part-time or temporary employees employed by the LP Entities.

[9] The AHC Bid contemplates that the transaction will be implemented pursuant to a plan of compromise or arrangement between the LP Entities and certain unsecured creditors (the "AHC Plan"). In brief, the AHC Plan would provide that Opco LP would acquire substantially all of the assets of the LP Entities. The Senior Lenders would be unaffected creditors and would be paid in full. Unsecured creditors with proven claims of \$1,000 or less would receive cash. The balance of the consideration would be satisfied by an unsecured demand note of \$150 million less the amounts paid to the \$1,000 unsecured creditors. Ultimately, affected unsecured creditors

with proven claims would receive shares in Holdco and Holdco would apply for the listing of its common shares on the Toronto Stock Exchange.

[10] The Monitor recommended that the AHC Asset Purchase Agreement based on the AHC Bid be authorized. Certain factors were particularly relevant to the Monitor in making its recommendation:

- the Senior Lenders will received 100 cents on the dollar;
- the AHC Transaction will preserve substantially all of the business of the LP Entities to the benefit of the LP Entities' suppliers and the millions of people who rely on the LP Entities' publications each day;
- the AHC Transaction preserves the employment of substantially all of the current employees and largely protects the interests of former employees and retirees;
- the AHC Bid contemplates that the transaction will be implemented through a Plan under which \$150 million in cash or shares will be available for distribution to unsecured creditors;
- unlike the Support Transaction, there is no option not to assume certain pension or employee benefits obligations.

[11] The Monitor, the LP CRA and the Financial Advisor considered closing risks associated with the AHC Bid and concluded that the Bid was credible, reasonably certain and financially viable. The LP Entities agreed with that assessment. All appearing either supported the AHC Transaction or were unopposed.

[12] Clearly the SISP was successful and in my view, the LP Entities should be authorized to enter the Ad Hoc Committee Asset Purchase Agreement as requested.

[13] The proposed disposition of assets meets the section 36 CCAA criteria and those set forth in the *Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp.*¹ decision. Indeed, to a large degree, the criteria overlap. The process was reasonable and the Monitor was content with it. Sufficient efforts were made to attract the best possible bid; the SISP was widely publicized; ample time was given to prepare offers; and there was integrity and no unfairness in the process. The Monitor was intimately involved in supervising the SISP and also made the Superior Cash Offer recommendation. The Monitor had previously advised the Court that in its opinion, the Support Transaction was preferable to a bankruptcy. The logical extension of that conclusion is that the AHC Transaction is as well. The LP Entities' Senior Lenders were either consulted and/or had the right to approve the various steps in the SISP. The effect of the proposed sale on other interested parties is very positive. Amongst other things, it provides for a going concern outcome and significant recoveries for both the secured and unsecured creditors. The consideration to be received is reasonable and fair. The Financial Advisor and the Monitor were both of the opinion that the SISP was a thorough canvassing of the market. The AHC Transaction was the highest offer received and delivers considerably more value than the Support Transaction which was in essence a "stalking horse" offer made by the single largest creditor constituency. The remaining subsequent provisions of section 36 of the CCAA are either inapplicable or have been complied with. In conclusion the AHC Transaction ought to be and is approved.

Claims Procedure Order and Meeting Order

[14] Turning to the Claims Procedure Order, as a result of the foregoing, the scope of the claims process needs to be expanded. Claims that have been filed will move to adjudication and resolution and in addition, the scope of the process needs to be expanded so as to ensure that as many creditors as possible have an opportunity to participate in the meeting to consider the Ad

¹ [1991] O.J. 1137.

**Atomic Energy of Canada
Limited** *Appellant*

v.

Sierra Club of Canada *Respondent*

and

**The Minister of Finance of Canada, the
Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada,
the Minister of International Trade of
Canada and the Attorney General of
Canada** *Respondents*

**INDEXED AS: SIERRA CLUB OF CANADA v. CANADA
(MINISTER OF FINANCE)**

Neutral citation: 2002 SCC 41.

File No.: 28020.

2001: November 6; 2002: April 26.

Present: McLachlin C.J. and Gonthier, Iacobucci,
Bastarache, Binnie, Arbour and LeBel JJ.

ON APPEAL FROM THE FEDERAL COURT OF
APPEAL

*Practice — Federal Court of Canada — Filing of
confidential material — Environmental organization
seeking judicial review of federal government's decision
to provide financial assistance to Crown corporation
for construction and sale of nuclear reactors — Crown
corporation requesting confidentiality order in respect of
certain documents — Proper analytical approach to be
applied to exercise of judicial discretion where litigant
seeks confidentiality order — Whether confidentiality
order should be granted — Federal Court Rules, 1998,
SOR/98-106, r. 151.*

Sierra Club is an environmental organization seeking
judicial review of the federal government's decision to
provide financial assistance to Atomic Energy of Canada
Ltd. ("AECL"), a Crown corporation, for the construction
and sale to China of two CANDU reactors. The reactors
are currently under construction in China, where AECL
is the main contractor and project manager. Sierra Club
maintains that the authorization of financial assistance

**Énergie atomique du Canada
Limitée** *Appelante*

c.

Sierra Club du Canada *Intimé*

et

**Le ministre des Finances du Canada, le
ministre des Affaires étrangères du Canada,
le ministre du Commerce international
du Canada et le procureur général du
Canada** *Intimés*

**RÉPERTORIÉ : SIERRA CLUB DU CANADA c. CANADA
(MINISTRE DES FINANCES)**

Référence neutre : 2002 CSC 41.

N° du greffe : 28020.

2001 : 6 novembre; 2002 : 26 avril.

Présents : Le juge en chef McLachlin et les juges
Gonthier, Iacobucci, Bastarache, Binnie, Arbour et
LeBel.

EN APPEL DE LA COUR D'APPEL FÉDÉRALE

*Pratique — Cour fédérale du Canada — Production
de documents confidentiels — Contrôle judiciaire
demandé par un organisme environnemental de la
décision du gouvernement fédéral de donner une aide
financière à une société d'État pour la construction
et la vente de réacteurs nucléaires — Ordonnance de
confidentialité demandée par la société d'État pour
certains documents — Analyse applicable à l'exercice
du pouvoir discrétionnaire judiciaire sur une demande
d'ordonnance de confidentialité — Faut-il accorder
l'ordonnance? — Règles de la Cour fédérale (1998),
DORS/98-106, règle 151.*

Un organisme environnemental, Sierra Club, demande
le contrôle judiciaire de la décision du gouvernement
fédéral de fournir une aide financière à Énergie atomique
du Canada Ltée (« ÉACL »), une société de la Couronne,
pour la construction et la vente à la Chine de deux réac-
teurs CANDU. Les réacteurs sont actuellement en cons-
truction en Chine, où ÉACL est l'entrepreneur principal
et le gestionnaire de projet. Sierra Club soutient que

by the government triggered s. 5(1)(b) of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (“CEAA”), requiring an environmental assessment as a condition of the financial assistance, and that the failure to comply compels a cancellation of the financial arrangements. AECL filed an affidavit in the proceedings which summarized confidential documents containing thousands of pages of technical information concerning the ongoing environmental assessment of the construction site by the Chinese authorities. AECL resisted Sierra Club’s application for production of the confidential documents on the ground, *inter alia*, that the documents were the property of the Chinese authorities and that it did not have the authority to disclose them. The Chinese authorities authorized disclosure of the documents on the condition that they be protected by a confidentiality order, under which they would only be made available to the parties and the court, but with no restriction on public access to the judicial proceedings. AECL’s application for a confidentiality order was rejected by the Federal Court, Trial Division. The Federal Court of Appeal upheld that decision.

Held: The appeal should be allowed and the confidentiality order granted on the terms requested by AECL.

In light of the established link between open courts and freedom of expression, the fundamental question for a court to consider in an application for a confidentiality order is whether the right to freedom of expression should be compromised in the circumstances. The court must ensure that the discretion to grant the order is exercised in accordance with *Charter* principles because a confidentiality order will have a negative effect on the s. 2(b) right to freedom of expression. A confidentiality order should only be granted when (1) such an order is necessary to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and (2) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings. Three important elements are subsumed under the first branch of the test. First, the risk must be real and substantial, well grounded in evidence, posing a serious threat to the commercial interest in question. Second, the important commercial interest must be one which can be expressed in terms of a public interest in confidentiality, where there is a general principle at stake. Finally, the judge is required to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives are available to such an order but also to restrict the order as much as is reasonably possible while preserving the commercial interest in question.

l’autorisation d’aide financière du gouvernement déclenche l’application de l’al. 5(1)b) de la *Loi canadienne sur l’évaluation environnementale* (« LCÉE ») exigeant une évaluation environnementale comme condition de l’aide financière, et que le défaut d’évaluation entraîne l’annulation des ententes financières. ÉACL dépose un affidavit qui résume des documents confidentiels contenant des milliers de pages d’information technique concernant l’évaluation environnementale du site de construction qui est faite par les autorités chinoises. ÉACL s’oppose à la communication des documents demandée par Sierra Club pour la raison notamment qu’ils sont la propriété des autorités chinoises et qu’elle n’est pas autorisée à les divulguer. Les autorités chinoises donnent l’autorisation de les communiquer à la condition qu’ils soient protégés par une ordonnance de confidentialité n’y donnant accès qu’aux parties et à la cour, mais n’imposant aucune restriction à l’accès du public aux débats. La demande d’ordonnance de confidentialité est rejetée par la Section de première instance de la Cour fédérale. La Cour d’appel fédérale confirme cette décision.

Arrêt : L’appel est accueilli et l’ordonnance demandée par ÉACL est accordée.

Vu le lien existant entre la publicité des débats judiciaires et la liberté d’expression, la question fondamentale pour la cour saisie d’une demande d’ordonnance de confidentialité est de savoir si, dans les circonstances, il y a lieu de restreindre le droit à la liberté d’expression. La cour doit s’assurer que l’exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire de l’accorder est conforme aux principes de la *Charte* parce qu’une ordonnance de confidentialité a des effets préjudiciables sur la liberté d’expression garantie à l’al. 2b). On ne doit l’accorder que (1) lorsqu’elle est nécessaire pour écarter un risque sérieux pour un intérêt important, y compris un intérêt commercial, dans le contexte d’un litige, en l’absence d’autres options raisonnables pour écarter ce risque, et (2) lorsque ses effets bénéfiques, y compris ses effets sur le droit des justiciables civils à un procès équitable, l’emportent sur ses effets préjudiciables, y compris ses effets sur la liberté d’expression qui, dans ce contexte, comprend l’intérêt du public dans la publicité des débats judiciaires. Trois éléments importants sont subsumés sous le premier volet de l’analyse. Premièrement, le risque en cause doit être réel et important, être bien étayé par la preuve et menacer gravement l’intérêt commercial en question. Deuxièmement, l’intérêt doit pouvoir se définir en termes d’intérêt public à la confidentialité, mettant en jeu un principe général. Enfin le juge doit non seulement déterminer s’il existe d’autres options raisonnables, il doit aussi restreindre l’ordonnance autant qu’il est raisonnablement possible de le faire tout en préservant l’intérêt commercial en question.

Applying the test to the present circumstances, the commercial interest at stake here relates to the objective of preserving contractual obligations of confidentiality, which is sufficiently important to pass the first branch of the test as long as certain criteria relating to the information are met. The information must have been treated as confidential at all relevant times; on a balance of probabilities, proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could reasonably be harmed by disclosure of the information; and the information must have been accumulated with a reasonable expectation of it being kept confidential. These requirements have been met in this case. Disclosure of the confidential documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of AECL, and there are no reasonably alternative measures to granting the order.

Under the second branch of the test, the confidentiality order would have significant salutary effects on AECL's right to a fair trial. Disclosure of the confidential documents would cause AECL to breach its contractual obligations and suffer a risk of harm to its competitive position. If a confidentiality order is denied, AECL will be forced to withhold the documents in order to protect its commercial interests, and since that information is relevant to defences available under the *CEAA*, the inability to present this information hinders AECL's capacity to make full answer and defence. Although in the context of a civil proceeding, this does not engage a *Charter* right, the right to a fair trial is a fundamental principle of justice. Further, the confidentiality order would allow all parties and the court access to the confidential documents, and permit cross-examination based on their contents, assisting in the search for truth, a core value underlying freedom of expression. Finally, given the technical nature of the information, there may be a substantial public security interest in maintaining the confidentiality of such information.

The deleterious effects of granting a confidentiality order include a negative effect on the open court principle, and therefore on the right to freedom of expression. The more detrimental the confidentiality order would be to the core values of (1) seeking the truth and the common good, (2) promoting self-fulfilment of individuals by allowing them to develop thoughts and ideas as they see fit, and (3) ensuring that participation in the political process is open to all persons, the harder it will be to justify the confidentiality order. In the hands of the parties and their experts, the confidential documents may be of great assistance in probing the truth of the Chinese environmental assessment process, which would assist the court in reaching accurate factual conclusions. Given the highly technical nature of the documents, the important value of the search for the truth which underlies

En l'espèce, l'intérêt commercial en jeu, la préservation d'obligations contractuelles de confidentialité, est suffisamment important pour satisfaire au premier volet de l'analyse, pourvu que certaines conditions soient remplies : les renseignements ont toujours été traités comme des renseignements confidentiels; il est raisonnable de penser que, selon la prépondérance des probabilités, leur divulgation compromettrait des droits exclusifs, commerciaux et scientifiques; et les renseignements ont été recueillis dans l'expectative raisonnable qu'ils resteraient confidentiels. Ces conditions sont réunies en l'espèce. La divulgation des documents confidentiels ferait courir un risque sérieux à un intérêt commercial important de ÉACL et il n'existe pas d'options raisonnables autres que l'ordonnance de confidentialité.

À la deuxième étape de l'analyse, l'ordonnance de confidentialité aurait des effets bénéfiques considérables sur le droit de ÉACL à un procès équitable. Si ÉACL divulguait les documents confidentiels, elle manquerait à ses obligations contractuelles et s'exposerait à une détérioration de sa position concurrentielle. Le refus de l'ordonnance obligerait ÉACL à retenir les documents pour protéger ses intérêts commerciaux et comme ils sont pertinents pour l'exercice des moyens de défense prévus par la *LCÉE*, l'impossibilité de les produire empêcherait ÉACL de présenter une défense pleine et entière. Même si en matière civile cela n'engage pas de droit protégé par la *Charte*, le droit à un procès équitable est un principe de justice fondamentale. L'ordonnance permettrait aux parties et au tribunal d'avoir accès aux documents confidentiels, et permettrait la tenue d'un contre-interrogatoire fondé sur leur contenu, favorisant ainsi la recherche de la vérité, une valeur fondamentale sous-tendant la liberté d'expression. Il peut enfin y avoir un important intérêt de sécurité publique à préserver la confidentialité de ce type de renseignements techniques.

Une ordonnance de confidentialité aurait un effet préjudiciable sur le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires et donc sur la liberté d'expression. Plus l'ordonnance porte atteinte aux valeurs fondamentales que sont (1) la recherche de la vérité et du bien commun, (2) l'épanouissement personnel par le libre développement des pensées et des idées et (3) la participation de tous au processus politique, plus il est difficile de justifier l'ordonnance. Dans les mains des parties et de leurs experts, les documents peuvent être très utiles pour apprécier la conformité du processus d'évaluation environnementale chinois, et donc pour aider la cour à parvenir à des conclusions de fait exactes. Compte tenu de leur nature hautement technique, la production des documents confidentiels en vertu de l'ordonnance demandée favoriserait mieux l'importante valeur de la recherche de la vérité, qui

both freedom of expression and open justice would be promoted to a greater extent by submitting the confidential documents under the order sought than it would by denying the order.

Under the terms of the order sought, the only restrictions relate to the public distribution of the documents, which is a fairly minimal intrusion into the open court rule. Although the confidentiality order would restrict individual access to certain information which may be of interest to that individual, the second core value of promoting individual self-fulfilment would not be significantly affected by the confidentiality order. The third core value figures prominently in this appeal as open justice is a fundamental aspect of a democratic society. By their very nature, environmental matters carry significant public import, and openness in judicial proceedings involving environmental issues will generally attract a high degree of protection, so that the public interest is engaged here more than if this were an action between private parties involving private interests. However, the narrow scope of the order coupled with the highly technical nature of the confidential documents significantly temper the deleterious effects the confidentiality order would have on the public interest in open courts. The core freedom of expression values of seeking the truth and promoting an open political process are most closely linked to the principle of open courts, and most affected by an order restricting that openness. However, in the context of this case, the confidentiality order would only marginally impede, and in some respects would even promote, the pursuit of these values. The salutary effects of the order outweigh its deleterious effects and the order should be granted. A balancing of the various rights and obligations engaged indicates that the confidentiality order would have substantial salutary effects on AECL's right to a fair trial and freedom of expression, while the deleterious effects on the principle of open courts and freedom of expression would be minimal.

Cases Cited

Applied: *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326; *Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480; *Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835; *R. v. Mentuck*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 442, 2001 SCC 76; *M. (A.) v. Ryan*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157; *Irwin Toy Ltd. v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, [1989] 1 S.C.R. 927; *R. v. Keegstra*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697; **referred to:** *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health and*

sous-tend à la fois la liberté d'expression et la publicité des débats judiciaires, que ne le ferait le refus de l'ordonnance.

Aux termes de l'ordonnance demandée, les seules restrictions ont trait à la distribution publique des documents, une atteinte relativement minime à la règle de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Même si l'ordonnance de confidentialité devait restreindre l'accès individuel à certains renseignements susceptibles d'intéresser quelqu'un, la deuxième valeur fondamentale, l'épanouissement personnel, ne serait pas touchée de manière significative. La troisième valeur joue un rôle primordial dans le pourvoi puisque la publicité des débats judiciaires est un aspect fondamental de la société démocratique. Par leur nature même, les questions environnementales ont une portée publique considérable, et la transparence des débats judiciaires sur les questions environnementales mérite généralement un degré élevé de protection, de sorte que l'intérêt public est en l'espèce plus engagé que s'il s'agissait d'un litige entre personnes privées à l'égard d'intérêts purement privés. Toutefois la portée étroite de l'ordonnance associée à la nature hautement technique des documents confidentiels tempère considérablement les effets préjudiciables que l'ordonnance de confidentialité pourrait avoir sur l'intérêt du public à la publicité des débats judiciaires. Les valeurs centrales de la liberté d'expression que sont la recherche de la vérité et la promotion d'un processus politique ouvert sont très étroitement liées au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, et sont les plus touchées par une ordonnance limitant cette publicité. Toutefois, en l'espèce, l'ordonnance de confidentialité n'entraverait que légèrement la poursuite de ces valeurs, et pourrait même les favoriser à certains égards. Ses effets bénéfiques l'emportent sur ses effets préjudiciables, et il y a lieu de l'accorder. Selon la pondération des divers droits et intérêts en jeu, l'ordonnance de confidentialité aurait des effets bénéfiques importants sur le droit de ÉACL à un procès équitable et à la liberté d'expression, et ses effets préjudiciables sur le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires et la liberté d'expression seraient minimes.

Jurisprudence

Arrêts appliqués : *Edmonton Journal c. Alberta (Procureur général)*, [1989] 2 R.C.S. 1326; *Société Radio-Canada c. Nouveau-Brunswick (Procureur général)*, [1996] 3 R.C.S. 480; *Dagenais c. Société Radio-Canada*, [1994] 3 R.C.S. 835; *R. c. Mentuck*, [2001] 3 R.C.S. 442, 2001 CSC 76; *M. (A.) c. Ryan*, [1997] 1 R.C.S. 157; *Irwin Toy Ltd. c. Québec (Procureur général)*, [1989] 1 R.C.S. 927; *R. c. Keegstra*, [1990] 3 R.C.S. 697; **arrêts mentionnés :** *AB Hassle c.*

33 In applying these criteria to the circumstances of the case, Robertson J.A. concluded that the confidentiality order should be granted. In his view, the public interest in open court proceedings did not override the interests of AECL in maintaining the confidentiality of these highly technical documents.

34 Robertson J.A. also considered the public interest in the need to ensure that site plans for nuclear installations were not, for example, posted on a Web site. He concluded that a confidentiality order would not undermine the two primary objectives underlying the principle of open justice: truth and the rule of law. As such, he would have allowed the appeal and dismissed the cross-appeal.

V. Issues

- 35 A. What is the proper analytical approach to be applied to the exercise of judicial discretion where a litigant seeks a confidentiality order under Rule 151 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*?
- B. Should the confidentiality order be granted in this case?

VI. Analysis

A. *The Analytical Approach to the Granting of a Confidentiality Order*

(1) The General Framework: Herein the Dagenais Principles

36 The link between openness in judicial proceedings and freedom of expression has been firmly established by this Court. In *Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480, at para. 23, La Forest J. expressed the relationship as follows:

The principle of open courts is inextricably tied to the rights guaranteed by s. 2(b). Openness permits public access to information about the courts, which in turn permits the public to discuss and put forward opinions and criticisms of court practices and proceedings. While the freedom to express ideas and opinions about the operation of the courts is clearly within the ambit of the

Appliquant ces critères aux circonstances de l'espèce, le juge Robertson conclut qu'il y a lieu de rendre l'ordonnance de confidentialité. Selon lui, l'intérêt du public dans la publicité des débats judiciaires ne prime pas l'intérêt de ÉACL à préserver le caractère confidentiel de ces documents hautement techniques.

Le juge Robertson traite aussi de l'intérêt du public à ce qu'il soit garanti que les plans de site d'installations nucléaires ne seront pas, par exemple, affichés sur un site Web. Il conclut qu'une ordonnance de confidentialité n'aurait aucun impact négatif sur les deux objectifs primordiaux du principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, savoir la vérité et la primauté du droit. Il aurait par conséquent accueilli l'appel et rejeté l'appel incident.

V. Questions en litige

- A. Quelle méthode d'analyse faut-il appliquer à l'exercice du pouvoir judiciaire discrétionnaire lorsqu'une partie demande une ordonnance de confidentialité en vertu de la règle 151 des *Règles de la Cour fédérale (1998)*?
- B. Y a-t-il lieu d'accorder l'ordonnance de confidentialité en l'espèce?

VI. Analyse

A. *Méthode d'analyse applicable aux ordonnances de confidentialité*

(1) Le cadre général : les principes de l'arrêt Dagenais

Le lien entre la publicité des procédures judiciaires et la liberté d'expression est solidement établi dans *Société Radio-Canada c. Nouveau-Brunswick (Procureur général)*, [1996] 3 R.C.S. 480. Le juge La Forest l'exprime en ces termes au par. 23 :

Le principe de la publicité des débats en justice est inextricablement lié aux droits garantis à l'al. 2b). Grâce à ce principe, le public a accès à l'information concernant les tribunaux, ce qui lui permet ensuite de discuter des pratiques des tribunaux et des procédures qui s'y déroulent, et d'émettre des opinions et des critiques à cet égard. La liberté d'exprimer des idées et des opinions sur

freedom guaranteed by s. 2(b), so too is the right of members of the public to obtain information about the courts in the first place.

Under the order sought, public access and public scrutiny of the Confidential Documents would be restricted; this would clearly infringe the public's freedom of expression guarantee.

A discussion of the general approach to be taken in the exercise of judicial discretion to grant a confidentiality order should begin with the principles set out by this Court in *Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835. Although that case dealt with the common law jurisdiction of the court to order a publication ban in the criminal law context, there are strong similarities between publication bans and confidentiality orders in the context of judicial proceedings. In both cases a restriction on freedom of expression is sought in order to preserve or promote an interest engaged by those proceedings. As such, the fundamental question for a court to consider in an application for a publication ban or a confidentiality order is whether, in the circumstances, the right to freedom of expression should be compromised.

Although in each case freedom of expression will be engaged in a different context, the *Dagenais* framework utilizes overarching *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* principles in order to balance freedom of expression with other rights and interests, and thus can be adapted and applied to various circumstances. As a result, the analytical approach to the exercise of discretion under Rule 151 should echo the underlying principles laid out in *Dagenais*, although it must be tailored to the specific rights and interests engaged in this case.

Dagenais dealt with an application by four accused persons under the court's common law jurisdiction requesting an order prohibiting the broadcast of a television programme dealing with the physical and sexual abuse of young boys at

le fonctionnement des tribunaux relève clairement de la liberté garantie à l'al. 2b), mais en relève également le droit du public d'obtenir au préalable de l'information sur les tribunaux.

L'ordonnance sollicitée aurait pour effet de limiter l'accès du public aux documents confidentiels et leur examen public; cela porterait clairement atteinte à la garantie de la liberté d'expression du public.

L'examen de la méthode générale à suivre dans l'exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire d'accorder une ordonnance de confidentialité devrait commencer par les principes établis par la Cour dans *Dagenais c. Société Radio-Canada*, [1994] 3 R.C.S. 835. Cette affaire portait sur le pouvoir discrétionnaire judiciaire, issu de la common law, de rendre des ordonnances de non-publication dans le cadre de procédures criminelles, mais il y a de fortes ressemblances entre les interdictions de publication et les ordonnances de confidentialité dans le contexte des procédures judiciaires. Dans les deux cas, on cherche à restreindre la liberté d'expression afin de préserver ou de promouvoir un intérêt en jeu dans les procédures. En ce sens, la question fondamentale que doit résoudre le tribunal auquel on demande une interdiction de publication ou une ordonnance de confidentialité est de savoir si, dans les circonstances, il y a lieu de restreindre le droit à la liberté d'expression.

Même si, dans chaque cas, la liberté d'expression entre en jeu dans un contexte différent, le cadre établi dans *Dagenais* fait appel aux principes déterminants de la *Charte canadienne des droits et libertés* afin de pondérer la liberté d'expression avec d'autres droits et intérêts, et peut donc être adapté et appliqué à diverses circonstances. L'analyse de l'exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire sous le régime de la règle 151 devrait par conséquent refléter les principes sous-jacents établis par *Dagenais*, même s'il faut pour cela l'ajuster aux droits et intérêts précis qui sont en jeu en l'espèce.

L'affaire *Dagenais* porte sur une requête par laquelle quatre accusés demandaient à la cour de rendre, en vertu de sa compétence de common law, une ordonnance interdisant la diffusion d'une émission de télévision décrivant des abus physiques et

37

38

39

religious institutions. The applicants argued that because the factual circumstances of the programme were very similar to the facts at issue in their trials, the ban was necessary to preserve the accused's right to a fair trial.

sexuels infligés à de jeunes garçons dans des établissements religieux. Les requérants soutenaient que l'interdiction était nécessaire pour préserver leur droit à un procès équitable, parce que les faits racontés dans l'émission ressemblaient beaucoup aux faits en cause dans leurs procès.

40 Lamer C.J. found that the common law discretion to order a publication ban must be exercised within the boundaries set by the principles of the *Charter*. Since publication bans necessarily curtail the freedom of expression of third parties, he adapted the pre-*Charter* common law rule such that it balanced the right to freedom of expression with the right to a fair trial of the accused in a way which reflected the substance of the test from *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103. At p. 878 of *Dagenais*, Lamer C.J. set out his reformulated test:

Le juge en chef Lamer conclut que le pouvoir discrétionnaire de common law d'ordonner l'interdiction de publication doit être exercé dans les limites prescrites par les principes de la *Charte*. Puisque les ordonnances de non-publication restreignent nécessairement la liberté d'expression de tiers, il adapte la règle de common law qui s'appliquait avant l'entrée en vigueur de la *Charte* de façon à établir un juste équilibre entre le droit à la liberté d'expression et le droit de l'accusé à un procès équitable, d'une façon qui reflète l'essence du critère énoncé dans *R. c. Oakes*, [1986] 1 R.C.S. 103. À la page 878 de *Dagenais*, le juge en chef Lamer énonce le critère reformulé :

A publication ban should only be ordered when:

Une ordonnance de non-publication ne doit être rendue que si :

(a) Such a ban is necessary in order to prevent a real and substantial risk to the fairness of the trial, because reasonably available alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and

a) elle est nécessaire pour écarter le risque réel et important que le procès soit inéquitable, vu l'absence d'autres mesures raisonnables pouvant écarter ce risque;

(b) The salutary effects of the publication ban outweigh the deleterious effects to the free expression of those affected by the ban. [Emphasis in original.]

b) ses effets bénéfiques sont plus importants que ses effets préjudiciables sur la libre expression de ceux qui sont touchés par l'ordonnance. [Souligné dans l'original.]

41 In *New Brunswick*, *supra*, this Court modified the *Dagenais* test in the context of the related issue of how the discretionary power under s. 486(1) of the *Criminal Code*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, to exclude the public from a trial should be exercised. That case dealt with an appeal from the trial judge's order excluding the public from the portion of a sentencing proceeding for sexual assault and sexual interference dealing with the specific acts committed by the accused on the basis that it would avoid "undue hardship" to both the victims and the accused.

Dans *Nouveau-Brunswick*, précité, la Cour modifie le critère de l'arrêt *Dagenais* dans le contexte de la question voisine de l'exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire d'ordonner l'exclusion du public d'un procès en vertu du par. 486(1) du *Code criminel*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-46. Il s'agissait d'un appel d'une décision du juge du procès d'ordonner l'exclusion du public de la partie des procédures de détermination de la peine pour agression sexuelle et contacts sexuels portant sur les actes précis commis par l'accusé, au motif que cela éviterait un « préjudice indu » aux victimes et à l'accusé.

42 La Forest J. found that s. 486(1) was a restriction on the s. 2(b) right to freedom of expression in that it provided a "discretionary bar on public and media access to the courts": *New Brunswick*, at para. 33;

Le juge La Forest conclut que le par. 486(1) limite la liberté d'expression garantie à l'al. 2b) en créant un « pouvoir discrétionnaire permettant d'interdire au public et aux médias l'accès aux

however he found this infringement to be justified under s. 1 provided that the discretion was exercised in accordance with the *Charter*. Thus, the approach taken by La Forest J. at para. 69 to the exercise of discretion under s. 486(1) of the *Criminal Code*, closely mirrors the *Dagenais* common law test:

(a) the judge must consider the available options and consider whether there are any other reasonable and effective alternatives available;

(b) the judge must consider whether the order is limited as much as possible; and

(c) the judge must weigh the importance of the objectives of the particular order and its probable effects against the importance of openness and the particular expression that will be limited in order to ensure that the positive and negative effects of the order are proportionate.

In applying this test to the facts of the case, La Forest J. found that the evidence of the potential undue hardship consisted mainly in the Crown's submission that the evidence was of a "delicate nature" and that this was insufficient to override the infringement on freedom of expression.

This Court has recently revisited the granting of a publication ban under the court's common law jurisdiction in *R. v. Mentuck*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 442, 2001 SCC 76, and its companion case *R. v. O.N.E.*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 478, 2001 SCC 77. In *Mentuck*, the Crown moved for a publication ban to protect the identity of undercover police officers and operational methods employed by the officers in their investigation of the accused. The accused opposed the motion as an infringement of his right to a fair and public hearing under s. 11(d) of the *Charter*. The order was also opposed by two intervening newspapers as an infringement of their right to freedom of expression.

The Court noted that, while *Dagenais* dealt with the balancing of freedom of expression on the one hand, and the right to a fair trial of the accused on the other, in the case before it, both the right of the

tribunaux » (*Nouveau-Brunswick*, par. 33). Il considère toutefois que l'atteinte peut être justifiée en vertu de l'article premier pourvu que le pouvoir discrétionnaire soit exercé conformément à la *Charte*. Donc l'analyse de l'exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire en vertu du par. 486(1) du *Code criminel*, décrite par le juge La Forest au par. 69, concorde étroitement avec le critère de common law établi par *Dagenais* :

a) le juge doit envisager les solutions disponibles et se demander s'il existe d'autres mesures de rechange raisonnables et efficaces;

b) il doit se demander si l'ordonnance a une portée aussi limitée que possible; et

c) il doit comparer l'importance des objectifs de l'ordonnance et de ses effets probables avec l'importance de la publicité des procédures et l'activité d'expression qui sera restreinte, afin de veiller à ce que les effets positifs et négatifs de l'ordonnance soient proportionnels.

Appliquant cette analyse aux faits de l'espèce, le juge La Forest conclut que la preuve du risque de préjudice indu consiste principalement en la prétention de l'avocat du ministère public quant à la « nature délicate » des faits relatifs aux infractions et que cela ne suffit pas pour justifier l'atteinte à la liberté d'expression.

La Cour a récemment réexaminé la question des interdictions de publication prononcées par un tribunal en vertu de sa compétence de common law dans *R. c. Mentuck*, [2001] 3 R.C.S. 442, 2001 CSC 76, et l'arrêt connexe *R. c. O.N.E.*, [2001] 3 R.C.S. 478, 2001 CSC 77. Dans *Mentuck*, le ministère public demandait l'interdiction de publication en vue de protéger l'identité de policiers banalisés et leurs méthodes d'enquête. L'accusé s'opposait à la demande en soutenant que l'interdiction porterait atteinte à son droit à un procès public et équitable protégé par l'al. 11d) de la *Charte*. Deux journaux intervenants s'opposaient aussi à la requête, en faisant valoir qu'elle porterait atteinte à leur droit à la liberté d'expression.

La Cour fait remarquer que *Dagenais* traite de la pondération de la liberté d'expression, d'une part, et du droit de l'accusé à un procès équitable, d'autre part, tandis que dans l'affaire dont elle est saisie, le

accused to a fair and public hearing, and freedom of expression weighed in favour of denying the publication ban. These rights were balanced against interests relating to the proper administration of justice, in particular, protecting the safety of police officers and preserving the efficacy of undercover police operations.

45

In spite of this distinction, the Court noted that underlying the approach taken in both *Dagenais* and *New Brunswick* was the goal of ensuring that the judicial discretion to order publication bans is subject to no lower a standard of compliance with the *Charter* than legislative enactment. This goal is furthered by incorporating the essence of s. 1 of the *Charter* and the *Oakes* test into the publication ban test. Since this same goal applied in the case before it, the Court adopted a similar approach to that taken in *Dagenais*, but broadened the *Dagenais* test (which dealt specifically with the right of an accused to a fair trial) such that it could guide the exercise of judicial discretion where a publication ban is requested in order to preserve any important aspect of the proper administration of justice. At para. 32, the Court reformulated the test as follows:

A publication ban should only be ordered when:

(a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to the proper administration of justice because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and

(b) the salutary effects of the publication ban outweigh the deleterious effects on the rights and interests of the parties and the public, including the effects on the right to free expression, the right of the accused to a fair and public trial, and the efficacy of the administration of justice.

46

The Court emphasized that under the first branch of the test, three important elements were subsumed under the “necessity” branch. First, the risk in question must be a serious risk well grounded in the evidence. Second, the phrase “proper administration of justice” must be carefully interpreted so as not to

droit de l’accusé à un procès public et équitable tout autant que la liberté d’expression militent en faveur du rejet de la requête en interdiction de publication. Ces droits ont été soupesés avec l’intérêt de la bonne administration de la justice, en particulier la protection de la sécurité des policiers et le maintien de l’efficacité des opérations policières secrètes.

Malgré cette distinction, la Cour note que la méthode retenue dans *Dagenais* et *Nouveau-Brunswick* a pour objectif de garantir que le pouvoir discrétionnaire des tribunaux d’ordonner des interdictions de publication n’est pas assujéti à une norme de conformité à la *Charte* moins exigeante que la norme applicable aux dispositions législatives. Elle vise cet objectif en incorporant l’essence de l’article premier de la *Charte* et le critère *Oakes* dans l’analyse applicable aux interdictions de publication. Comme le même objectif s’applique à l’affaire dont elle est saisie, la Cour adopte une méthode semblable à celle de *Dagenais*, mais en élargissant le critère énoncé dans cet arrêt (qui portait spécifiquement sur le droit de l’accusé à un procès équitable) de manière à fournir un guide à l’exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire des tribunaux dans les requêtes en interdiction de publication, afin de protéger tout aspect important de la bonne administration de la justice. La Cour reformule le critère en ces termes (au par. 32) :

Une ordonnance de non-publication ne doit être rendue que si :

a) elle est nécessaire pour écarter le risque sérieux pour la bonne administration de la justice, vu l’absence d’autres mesures raisonnables pouvant écarter ce risque;

b) ses effets bénéfiques sont plus importants que ses effets préjudiciables sur les droits et les intérêts des parties et du public, notamment ses effets sur le droit à la libre expression, sur le droit de l’accusé à un procès public et équitable, et sur l’efficacité de l’administration de la justice.

La Cour souligne que dans le premier volet de l’analyse, trois éléments importants sont subsumés sous la notion de « nécessité ». En premier lieu, le risque en question doit être sérieux et bien étayé par la preuve. En deuxième lieu, l’expression « bonne administration de la justice » doit être interprétée

allow the concealment of an excessive amount of information. Third, the test requires the judge ordering the ban to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives are available, but also to restrict the ban as far as possible without sacrificing the prevention of the risk.

At para. 31, the Court also made the important observation that the proper administration of justice will not necessarily involve *Charter* rights, and that the ability to invoke the *Charter* is not a necessary condition for a publication ban to be granted:

The [common law publication ban] rule can accommodate orders that must occasionally be made in the interests of the administration of justice, which encompass more than fair trial rights. As the test is intended to “reflec[t] the substance of the *Oakes* test”, we cannot require that *Charter* rights be the only legitimate objective of such orders any more than we require that government action or legislation in violation of the *Charter* be justified exclusively by the pursuit of another *Charter* right. [Emphasis added.]

The Court also anticipated that, in appropriate circumstances, the *Dagenais* framework could be expanded even further in order to address requests for publication bans where interests other than the administration of justice were involved.

Mentuck is illustrative of the flexibility of the *Dagenais* approach. Since its basic purpose is to ensure that the judicial discretion to deny public access to the courts is exercised in accordance with *Charter* principles, in my view, the *Dagenais* model can and should be adapted to the situation in the case at bar where the central issue is whether judicial discretion should be exercised so as to exclude confidential information from a public proceeding. As in *Dagenais*, *New Brunswick* and *Mentuck*, granting the confidentiality order will have a negative effect on the *Charter* right to freedom of expression, as well as the principle of open and accessible court proceedings, and, as in those cases, courts must ensure that the discretion to grant the order is exercised in accordance with *Charter* principles.

judicieusement de façon à ne pas empêcher la divulgation d'un nombre excessif de renseignements. En troisième lieu, le critère exige non seulement que le juge qui prononce l'ordonnance détermine s'il existe des mesures de rechange raisonnables, mais aussi qu'il limite l'ordonnance autant que possible sans pour autant sacrifier la prévention du risque.

Au paragraphe 31, la Cour fait aussi l'importante observation que la bonne administration de la justice n'implique pas nécessairement des droits protégés par la *Charte*, et que la possibilité d'invoquer la *Charte* n'est pas une condition nécessaire à l'obtention d'une interdiction de publication :

Elle [la règle de common law] peut s'appliquer aux ordonnances qui doivent parfois être rendues dans l'intérêt de l'administration de la justice, qui englobe davantage que le droit à un procès équitable. Comme on veut que le critère « reflète [...] l'essence du critère énoncé dans l'arrêt *Oakes* », nous ne pouvons pas exiger que ces ordonnances aient pour seul objectif légitime les droits garantis par la *Charte*, pas plus que nous exigeons que les actes gouvernementaux et les dispositions législatives contrevenant à la *Charte* soient justifiés exclusivement par la recherche d'un autre droit garanti par la *Charte*. [Je souligne.]

La Cour prévoit aussi que, dans les cas voulus, le critère de *Dagenais* pourrait être élargi encore davantage pour régir des requêtes en interdiction de publication mettant en jeu des questions autres que l'administration de la justice.

Mentuck illustre bien la souplesse de la méthode *Dagenais*. Comme elle a pour objet fondamental de garantir que le pouvoir discrétionnaire d'interdire l'accès du public aux tribunaux est exercé conformément aux principes de la *Charte*, à mon avis, le modèle *Dagenais* peut et devrait être adapté à la situation de la présente espèce, où la question centrale est l'exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire du tribunal d'exclure des renseignements confidentiels au cours d'une procédure publique. Comme dans *Dagenais*, *Nouveau-Brunswick* et *Mentuck*, une ordonnance de confidentialité aura un effet négatif sur le droit à la liberté d'expression garanti par la *Charte*, de même que sur le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires et, comme dans ces affaires, les tribunaux doivent veiller à ce que le

However, in order to adapt the test to the context of this case, it is first necessary to determine the particular rights and interests engaged by this application.

(2) The Rights and Interests of the Parties

49

The immediate purpose for AECL's confidentiality request relates to its commercial interests. The information in question is the property of the Chinese authorities. If the appellant were to disclose the Confidential Documents, it would be in breach of its contractual obligations and suffer a risk of harm to its competitive position. This is clear from the findings of fact of the motions judge that AECL was bound by its commercial interests and its customer's property rights not to disclose the information (para. 27), and that such disclosure could harm the appellant's commercial interests (para. 23).

50

Aside from this direct commercial interest, if the confidentiality order is denied, then in order to protect its commercial interests, the appellant will have to withhold the documents. This raises the important matter of the litigation context in which the order is sought. As both the motions judge and the Federal Court of Appeal found that the information contained in the Confidential Documents was relevant to defences available under the *CEAA*, the inability to present this information hinders the appellant's capacity to make full answer and defence, or, expressed more generally, the appellant's right, as a civil litigant, to present its case. In that sense, preventing the appellant from disclosing these documents on a confidential basis infringes its right to a fair trial. Although in the context of a civil proceeding this does not engage a *Charter* right, the right to a fair trial generally can be viewed as a fundamental principle of justice: *M. (A.) v. Ryan*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, at para. 84, *per* L'Heureux-Dubé J. (dissenting, but not on that point). Although this fair trial right is directly relevant to the appellant, there is also a general public interest in protecting the right to a fair trial. Indeed, as a general proposition, all disputes in the courts should be decided under a fair trial standard. The legitimacy of the judicial process alone

pouvoir discrétionnaire d'accorder l'ordonnance soit exercé conformément aux principes de la *Charte*. Toutefois, pour adapter le critère au contexte de la présente espèce, il faut d'abord définir les droits et intérêts particuliers qui entrent en jeu.

(2) Les droits et les intérêts des parties

L'objet immédiat de la demande d'ordonnance de confidentialité d'ÉACL a trait à ses intérêts commerciaux. Les renseignements en question appartiennent aux autorités chinoises. Si l'appelante divulguait les documents confidentiels, elle manquerait à ses obligations contractuelles et s'exposerait à une détérioration de sa position concurrentielle. Il ressort clairement des conclusions de fait du juge des requêtes qu'ÉACL est tenue, par ses intérêts commerciaux et par les droits de propriété de son client, de ne pas divulguer ces renseignements (par. 27), et que leur divulgation risque de nuire aux intérêts commerciaux de l'appelante (par. 23).

Indépendamment de cet intérêt commercial direct, en cas de refus de l'ordonnance de confidentialité, l'appelante devra, pour protéger ses intérêts commerciaux, s'abstenir de produire les documents. Cela soulève l'importante question du contexte de la présentation de la demande. Comme le juge des requêtes et la Cour d'appel fédérale concluent tous deux que l'information contenue dans les documents confidentiels est pertinente pour les moyens de défense prévus par la *LCÉE*, le fait de ne pouvoir la produire nuit à la capacité de l'appelante de présenter une défense pleine et entière ou, plus généralement, au droit de l'appelante, en sa qualité de justiciable civile, de défendre sa cause. En ce sens, empêcher l'appelante de divulguer ces documents pour des raisons de confidentialité porte atteinte à son droit à un procès équitable. Même si en matière civile cela n'engage pas de droit protégé par la *Charte*, le droit à un procès équitable peut généralement être considéré comme un principe de justice fondamentale : *M. (A.) c. Ryan*, [1997] 1 R.C.S. 157, par. 84, le juge L'Heureux-Dubé (dissidente, mais non sur ce point). Le droit à un procès équitable intéresse directement l'appelante, mais le public a aussi un intérêt général à la protection du droit à un procès équitable. À vrai dire, le principe

demands as much. Similarly, courts have an interest in having all relevant evidence before them in order to ensure that justice is done.

Thus, the interests which would be promoted by a confidentiality order are the preservation of commercial and contractual relations, as well as the right of civil litigants to a fair trial. Related to the latter are the public and judicial interests in seeking the truth and achieving a just result in civil proceedings.

In opposition to the confidentiality order lies the fundamental principle of open and accessible court proceedings. This principle is inextricably tied to freedom of expression enshrined in s. 2(b) of the *Charter: New Brunswick, supra*, at para. 23. The importance of public and media access to the courts cannot be understated, as this access is the method by which the judicial process is scrutinized and criticized. Because it is essential to the administration of justice that justice is done and is seen to be done, such public scrutiny is fundamental. The open court principle has been described as “the very soul of justice”, guaranteeing that justice is administered in a non-arbitrary manner: *New Brunswick*, at para. 22.

(3) Adapting the *Dagenais* Test to the Rights and Interests of the Parties

Applying the rights and interests engaged in this case to the analytical framework of *Dagenais* and subsequent cases discussed above, the test for whether a confidentiality order ought to be granted in a case such as this one should be framed as follows:

A confidentiality order under Rule 151 should only be granted when:

- (a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and

général est que tout litige porté devant les tribunaux doit être tranché selon la norme du procès équitable. La légitimité du processus judiciaire n'exige pas moins. De même, les tribunaux ont intérêt à ce que toutes les preuves pertinentes leur soient présentées pour veiller à ce que justice soit faite.

Ainsi, les intérêts que favoriserait l'ordonnance de confidentialité seraient le maintien de relations commerciales et contractuelles, de même que le droit des justiciables civils à un procès équitable. Est lié à ce dernier droit l'intérêt du public et du judiciaire dans la recherche de la vérité et la solution juste des litiges civils.

Milite contre l'ordonnance de confidentialité le principe fondamental de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Ce principe est inextricablement lié à la liberté d'expression constitutionnalisée à l'al. 2b) de la *Charte : Nouveau-Brunswick*, précité, par. 23. L'importance de l'accès du public et des médias aux tribunaux ne peut être sous-estimée puisque l'accès est le moyen grâce auquel le processus judiciaire est soumis à l'examen et à la critique. Comme il est essentiel à l'administration de la justice que justice soit faite et soit perçue comme l'étant, cet examen public est fondamental. Le principe de la publicité des procédures judiciaires a été décrit comme le « souffle même de la justice », la garantie de l'absence d'arbitraire dans l'administration de la justice : *Nouveau-Brunswick*, par. 22.

(3) Adaptation de l'analyse de *Dagenais* aux droits et intérêts des parties

Pour appliquer aux droits et intérêts en jeu en l'espèce l'analyse de *Dagenais* et des arrêts subséquents précités, il convient d'énoncer de la façon suivante les conditions applicables à une ordonnance de confidentialité dans un cas comme l'espèce :

Une ordonnance de confidentialité en vertu de la règle 151 ne doit être rendue que si :

- a) elle est nécessaire pour écarter un risque sérieux pour un intérêt important, y compris un intérêt commercial, dans le contexte d'un litige, en l'absence d'autres options raisonnables pour écarter ce risque;

51

52

53

(b) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

b) ses effets bénéfiques, y compris ses effets sur le droit des justiciables civils à un procès équitable, l'emportent sur ses effets préjudiciables, y compris ses effets sur la liberté d'expression qui, dans ce contexte, comprend l'intérêt du public dans la publicité des débats judiciaires.

54 As in *Mentuck*, I would add that three important elements are subsumed under the first branch of this test. First, the risk in question must be real and substantial, in that the risk is well grounded in the evidence, and poses a serious threat to the commercial interest in question.

Comme dans *Mentuck*, j'ajouterais que trois éléments importants sont subsumés sous le premier volet de l'analyse. En premier lieu, le risque en cause doit être réel et important, en ce qu'il est bien étayé par la preuve et menace gravement l'intérêt commercial en question.

55 In addition, the phrase "important commercial interest" is in need of some clarification. In order to qualify as an "important commercial interest", the interest in question cannot merely be specific to the party requesting the order; the interest must be one which can be expressed in terms of a public interest in confidentiality. For example, a private company could not argue simply that the existence of a particular contract should not be made public because to do so would cause the company to lose business, thus harming its commercial interests. However, if, as in this case, exposure of information would cause a breach of a confidentiality agreement, then the commercial interest affected can be characterized more broadly as the general commercial interest of preserving confidential information. Simply put, if there is no general principle at stake, there can be no "important commercial interest" for the purposes of this test. Or, in the words of Binnie J. in *F.N. (Re)*, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, 2000 SCC 35, at para. 10, the open court rule only yields "where the public interest in confidentiality outweighs the public interest in openness" (emphasis added).

De plus, l'expression « intérêt commercial important » exige une clarification. Pour être qualifié d'« intérêt commercial important », l'intérêt en question ne doit pas se rapporter uniquement et spécifiquement à la partie qui demande l'ordonnance de confidentialité; il doit s'agir d'un intérêt qui peut se définir en termes d'intérêt public à la confidentialité. Par exemple, une entreprise privée ne pourrait simplement prétendre que l'existence d'un contrat donné ne devrait pas être divulguée parce que cela lui ferait perdre des occasions d'affaires, et que cela nuirait à ses intérêts commerciaux. Si toutefois, comme en l'espèce, la divulgation de renseignements doit entraîner un manquement à une entente de non-divulgence, on peut alors parler plus largement de l'intérêt commercial général dans la protection des renseignements confidentiels. Simplement, si aucun principe général n'entre en jeu, il ne peut y avoir d'« intérêt commercial important » pour les besoins de l'analyse. Ou, pour citer le juge Binnie dans *F.N. (Re)*, [2000] 1 R.C.S. 880, 2000 CSC 35, par. 10, la règle de la publicité des débats judiciaires ne cède le pas que « dans les cas où le droit du public à la confidentialité l'emporte sur le droit du public à l'accessibilité » (je souligne).

56 In addition to the above requirement, courts must be cautious in determining what constitutes an "important commercial interest". It must be remembered that a confidentiality order involves an infringement on freedom of expression. Although the balancing of the commercial interest with freedom of expression takes place under the second

Outre l'exigence susmentionnée, les tribunaux doivent déterminer avec prudence ce qui constitue un « intérêt commercial important ». Il faut rappeler qu'une ordonnance de confidentialité implique une atteinte à la liberté d'expression. Même si la pondération de l'intérêt commercial et de la liberté d'expression intervient à la deuxième étape

branch of the test, courts must be alive to the fundamental importance of the open court rule. See generally Muldoon J. in *Eli Lilly and Co. v. Novopharm Ltd.* (1994), 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437 (F.C.T.D.), at p. 439.

Finally, the phrase “reasonably alternative measures” requires the judge to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives to a confidentiality order are available, but also to restrict the order as much as is reasonably possible while preserving the commercial interest in question.

B. *Application of the Test to this Appeal*

(1) Necessity

At this stage, it must be determined whether disclosure of the Confidential Documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of the appellant, and whether there are reasonable alternatives, either to the order itself, or to its terms.

The commercial interest at stake here relates to the objective of preserving contractual obligations of confidentiality. The appellant argues that it will suffer irreparable harm to its commercial interests if the Confidential Documents are disclosed. In my view, the preservation of confidential information constitutes a sufficiently important commercial interest to pass the first branch of the test as long as certain criteria relating to the information are met.

Pelletier J. noted that the order sought in this case was similar in nature to an application for a protective order which arises in the context of patent litigation. Such an order requires the applicant to demonstrate that the information in question has been treated at all relevant times as confidential and that on a balance of probabilities its proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could reasonably be harmed by the disclosure of the information: *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health and Welfare)* (1998), 83 C.P.R. (3d) 428 (F.C.T.D.), at p. 434. To this I would add the requirement proposed

de l’analyse, les tribunaux doivent avoir pleinement conscience de l’importance fondamentale de la règle de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Voir généralement *Eli Lilly and Co. c. Novopharm Ltd.* (1994), 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437 (C.F. 1^{re} inst.), p. 439, le juge Muldoon.

Enfin, l’expression « autres options raisonnables » oblige le juge non seulement à se demander s’il existe des mesures raisonnables autres que l’ordonnance de confidentialité, mais aussi à restreindre l’ordonnance autant qu’il est raisonnablement possible de le faire tout en préservant l’intérêt commercial en question.

B. *Application de l’analyse en l’espèce*

(1) Nécessité

À cette étape, il faut déterminer si la divulgation des documents confidentiels ferait courir un risque sérieux à un intérêt commercial important de l’appelante, et s’il existe d’autres solutions raisonnables que l’ordonnance elle-même, ou ses modalités.

L’intérêt commercial en jeu en l’espèce a trait à la préservation d’obligations contractuelles de confidentialité. L’appelante fait valoir qu’un préjudice irréparable sera causé à ses intérêts commerciaux si les documents confidentiels sont divulgués. À mon avis, la préservation de renseignements confidentiels est un intérêt commercial suffisamment important pour satisfaire au premier volet de l’analyse dès lors que certaines conditions relatives aux renseignements sont réunies.

Le juge Pelletier souligne que l’ordonnance sollicitée en l’espèce s’apparente à une ordonnance conservatoire en matière de brevets. Pour l’obtenir, le requérant doit démontrer que les renseignements en question ont toujours été traités comme des renseignements confidentiels et que, selon la prépondérance des probabilités, il est raisonnable de penser que leur divulgation risquerait de compromettre ses droits exclusifs, commerciaux et scientifiques : *AB Hassle c. Canada (Ministre de la Santé nationale et du Bien-être social)*, [1998] A.C.F. n° 1850 (QL) (C.F. 1^{re} inst.), par. 29-30. J’ajouterais à cela

57

58

59

60



SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

CITATION: Sherman Estate v.
Donovan, 2021 SCC 25

APPEAL HEARD:
October 6, 2020
JUDGMENT RENDERED:
June 11, 2021
DOCKET: 38695

BETWEEN:

**Estate of Bernard Sherman and Trustees of the Estate and
Estate of Honey Sherman and Trustees of the Estate**
Appellants

and

**Kevin Donovan and
Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd.**
Respondents

- and -

**Attorney General of Ontario, Attorney General of British Columbia,
Canadian Civil Liberties Association, Income Security Advocacy Centre,
Ad IDEM/Canadian Media Lawyers Association, Postmedia Network Inc.,
CTV, a Division of Bell Media Inc., Global News, a division of Corus
Television Limited Partnership, The Globe and Mail Inc.,
Citytv, a division of Rogers Media Inc.,
British Columbia Civil Liberties Association,
HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario, HIV Legal Network
and Mental Health Legal Committee**
Interveners

CORAM: Wagner C.J. and Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Brown, Rowe, Martin and Kasirer JJ.

REASONS FOR Kasirer J. (Wagner C.J. and Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Brown, Rowe and Martin JJ. concurring)

JUDGMENT:
(paras. 1 to 108)

NOTE: This document is subject to editorial revision before its reproduction in final form in the *Canada Supreme Court Reports*.

SHERMAN ESTATE v. DONOVAN

**Estate of Bernard Sherman and Trustees of the Estate and
Estate of Honey Sherman and Trustees of the Estate**

Appellants

v.

**Kevin Donovan and
Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd.**

Respondents

and

**Attorney General of Ontario,
Attorney General of British Columbia,
Canadian Civil Liberties Association,
Income Security Advocacy Centre,
Ad IDEM/Canadian Media Lawyers Association,
Postmedia Network Inc., CTV, a Division of Bell Media Inc.,
Global News, a division of Corus Television Limited Partnership,
The Globe and Mail Inc., Citytv, a division of Rogers Media Inc.,
British Columbia Civil Liberties Association,
HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario,
HIV Legal Network and Mental Health Legal Committee**

Interveners

Indexed as: Sherman Estate v. Donovan

2021 SCC 25

File No.: 38695.

2020: October 6; 2021: June 11.

Present: Wagner C.J. and Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Brown, Rowe, Martin and Kasirer JJ.

ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

Courts — Open court principle — Sealing orders — Discretionary limits on court openness — Important public interest — Privacy — Dignity — Physical safety — Unexplained deaths of prominent couple generating intense public scrutiny and prompting trustees of estates to apply for sealing of probate files — Whether privacy and physical safety concerns advanced by estate trustees amount to important public interests at such serious risk to justify issuance of sealing orders.

A prominent couple was found dead in their home. Their deaths had no apparent explanation and generated intense public interest. To this day, the identity and motive of those responsible remain unknown, and the deaths are being investigated as homicides. The estate trustees sought to stem the intense press scrutiny prompted by the events by seeking sealing orders of the probate files. Initially granted, the sealing orders were challenged by a journalist who had reported on the couple's deaths, and by the newspaper for which he wrote. The application judge sealed the probate files, concluding that the harmful effects of the sealing orders were substantially outweighed by the salutary effects on privacy and physical safety interests. The Court of Appeal unanimously allowed the appeal and lifted the sealing orders. It concluded that the privacy interest advanced lacked a public interest quality, and that there was no evidence of a real risk to anyone's physical safety.

Held: The appeal should be dismissed.

The estate trustees have failed to establish a serious risk to an important public interest under the test for discretionary limits on court openness. As such, the sealing orders should not have been issued. Open courts can be a source of inconvenience and embarrassment, but this discomfort is not, as a general matter, enough to overturn the strong presumption of openness. That said, personal information disseminated in open court can be more than a source of discomfort and may result in an affront to a person's dignity. Insofar as privacy serves to protect individuals from this affront, it is an important public interest and a court can make an exception to the open court principle if it is at serious risk. In this case, the risks to privacy and physical safety cannot be said to be sufficiently serious.

Court proceedings are presumptively open to the public. Court openness is protected by the constitutional guarantee of freedom of expression and is essential to the proper functioning of Canadian democracy. Reporting on court proceedings by a free press is often said to be inseparable from the principle of open justice. The open court principle is engaged by all judicial proceedings, whatever their nature. Matters in a probate file are not quintessentially private or fundamentally administrative. Obtaining a certificate of appointment of estate trustee in Ontario is a court proceeding engaging the fundamental rationale for openness — discouraging mischief and ensuring confidence in the administration of justice through transparency — such that the strong presumption of openness applies.

The test for discretionary limits on court openness is directed at maintaining the presumption while offering sufficient flexibility for courts to protect other public interests where they arise. In order to succeed, the person asking a court to exercise discretion in a way that limits the open court presumption must establish that (1) court openness poses a serious risk to an important public interest; (2) the order sought is necessary to prevent this serious risk to the identified interest because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent this risk; and (3) as a matter of proportionality, the benefits of the order outweigh its negative effects.

The recognized scope of what interests might justify a discretionary exception to open courts has broadened over time and now extends generally to important public interests. The breadth of this category transcends the interests of the parties to the dispute and provides significant flexibility to address harm to fundamental values in our society that unqualified openness could cause. While there is no closed list of important public interests, courts must be cautious and alive to the fundamental importance of the open court rule when they are identifying them. Determining what is an important public interest can be done in the abstract at the level of general principles that extend beyond the parties to the particular dispute. By contrast, whether that interest is at serious risk is a fact-based finding that is necessarily made in context. The identification of an important interest and the seriousness of the risk to that interest are thus theoretically separate and qualitatively distinct operations.

Privacy has been championed as a fundamental consideration in a free society, and its public importance has been recognized in various settings. Though an individual's privacy will be pre-eminently important to that individual, the protection of privacy is also in the interest of society as a whole. Privacy therefore cannot be rejected as a mere personal concern: some personal concerns relating to privacy overlap with public interests.

However, cast too broadly, the recognition of a public interest in privacy could threaten the strong presumption of openness. The privacy of individuals will be at risk in many court proceedings. Furthermore, privacy is a complex and contextual concept, making it difficult for courts to measure. Recognizing an important interest in privacy generally would accordingly be unworkable.

Instead, the public character of the privacy interest involves protecting individuals from the threat to their dignity. Dignity in this sense involves the right to present core aspects of oneself to others in a considered and controlled manner; it is an expression of an individual's unique personality or personhood. This interest is consistent with the Court's emphasis on the importance of privacy, but is tailored to preserve the strong presumption of openness.

Privacy as predicated on dignity will be at serious risk in limited circumstances. Neither the sensibilities of individuals nor the fact that openness is disadvantageous, embarrassing or distressing to certain individuals will generally on their own warrant interference with court openness. Dignity will be at serious risk only

where the information that would be disseminated as a result of court openness is sufficiently sensitive or private such that openness can be shown to meaningfully strike at the individual's biographical core in a manner that threatens their integrity. The question is whether the information reveals something intimate and personal about the individual, their lifestyle or their experiences.

In cases where the information is sufficiently sensitive to strike at an individual's biographical core, a court must then ask whether a serious risk to the interest is made out in the full factual context of the case. The seriousness of the risk may be affected by the extent to which information is disseminated and already in the public domain, and the probability of the dissemination actually occurring. The burden is on the applicant to show that privacy, understood in reference to dignity, is at serious risk; this erects a fact-specific threshold consistent with the presumption of openness.

There is also an important public interest in protecting individuals from physical harm, but a discretionary order limiting court openness can only be made where there is a serious risk to this important public interest. Direct evidence is not necessarily required to establish a serious risk to an important public interest, as objectively discernable harm may be identified on the basis of logical inferences. But this process of inferential reasoning is not a licence to engage in impermissible speculation. It is not just the probability of the feared harm, but also the gravity of the harm itself that is relevant to the assessment of serious risk. Where the feared harm is particularly serious, the probability that this harm materialize need not be shown to be

likely, but must still be more than negligible, fanciful or speculative. Mere assertions of grave physical harm are therefore insufficient.

In addition to a serious risk to an important interest, it must be shown that the particular order sought is necessary to address the risk and that the benefits of the order outweigh its negative effects as a matter of proportionality. This contextual balancing, informed by the importance of the open court principle, presents a final barrier to those seeking a discretionary limit on court openness for the purposes of privacy protection.

In the present case, the risk to the important public interest in privacy, defined in reference to dignity, is not serious. The information contained in the probate files does not reveal anything particularly private or highly sensitive. It has not been shown that it would strike at the biographical core of the affected individuals in a way that would undermine their control over the expression of their identities. Furthermore, the record does not show a serious risk of physical harm. The estate trustees asked the application judge to infer not only the fact that harm would befall the affected individuals, but also that a person or persons exist who wish to harm them. To infer all this on the basis of the deaths and the association of the affected individuals with the deceased is not a reasonable inference but is speculation.

Even if the estate trustees had succeeded in showing a serious risk to privacy, a publication ban — less constraining on openness than the sealing orders — would have likely been sufficient as a reasonable alternative to prevent this risk. As a

final barrier, the estate trustees would have had to show that the benefits of any order necessary to protect from a serious risk to the important public interest outweighed the harmful effects of the order.

Cases Cited

By Kasirer J.

Applied: *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, 2002 SCC 41, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522; **referred to:** *Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480; *Vancouver Sun (Re)*, 2004 SCC 43, [2004] 2 S.C.R. 332; *Khuja v. Times Newspapers Ltd.*, [2017] UKSC 49, [2019] A.C. 161; *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326; *Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835; *R. v. Mentuck*, 2001 SCC 76, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 442; *Lavigne v. Canada (Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages)*, 2002 SCC 53, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 773; *Dagg v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 403; *R. v. Henry*, 2009 BCCA 86, 270 B.C.A.C. 5; *Attorney General of Nova Scotia v. MacIntyre*, [1982] 1 S.C.R. 175; *A.B. v. Bragg Communications Inc.*, 2012 SCC 46, [2012] 2 S.C.R. 567; *Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. v. Ontario*, 2005 SCC 41, [2005] 2 S.C.R. 188; *Re Southam Inc. and The Queen (No.1)* (1983), 41 O.R. (2d) 11; *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103; *Otis v. Otis* (2004), 7 E.T.R. (3d) 221; *H. (M.E.) v. Williams*, 2012 ONCA 35, 108 O.R. (3d) 321; *F.N. (Re)*, 2000 SCC 35, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880; *R. v. Dyment*, [1988] 2 S.C.R. 417; *Alberta (Information and Privacy Commissioner) v. United Food and Commercial*

physical harm to the affected individuals by lifting the sealing orders. Accordingly, this is not an appropriate case in which to make sealing orders, or any order limiting access to these court files. In the circumstances, the admissibility of the Toronto Star's new evidence is moot. I propose to dismiss the appeal.

A. *The Test for Discretionary Limits on Court Openness*

[37] Court proceedings are presumptively open to the public (*MacIntyre*, at p. 189; *A.B. v. Bragg Communications Inc.*, 2012 SCC 46, [2012] 2 S.C.R. 567, at para. 11).

[38] The test for discretionary limits on presumptive court openness has been expressed as a two-step inquiry involving the necessity and proportionality of the proposed order (*Sierra Club*, at para. 53). Upon examination, however, this test rests upon three core prerequisites that a person seeking such a limit must show. Recasting the test around these three prerequisites, without altering its essence, helps to clarify the burden on an applicant seeking an exception to the open court principle. In order to succeed, the person asking a court to exercise discretion in a way that limits the open court presumption must establish that:

(1) court openness poses a serious risk to an important public interest;

(2) the order sought is necessary to prevent this serious risk to the identified interest because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent this risk; and,

(3) as a matter of proportionality, the benefits of the order outweigh its negative effects.

Only where all three of these prerequisites have been met can a discretionary limit on openness — for example, a sealing order, a publication ban, an order excluding the public from a hearing, or a redaction order — properly be ordered. This test applies to all discretionary limits on court openness, subject only to valid legislative enactments (*Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. v. Ontario*, 2005 SCC 41, [2005] 2 S.C.R. 188, at paras. 7 and 22).

[39] The discretion is structured and controlled in this way to protect the open court principle, which is understood to be constitutionalized under the right to freedom of expression at s. 2(b) of the Charter (*New Brunswick*, at para. 23). Sustained by freedom of expression, the open court principle is one of the foundations of a free press given that access to courts is fundamental to newsgathering. This Court has often highlighted the importance of open judicial proceedings to maintaining the independence and impartiality of the courts, public confidence and understanding of their work and ultimately the legitimacy of the process (see, e.g., *Vancouver Sun*, at paras. 23-26). In *New Brunswick*, La Forest J. explained the presumption in favour of court openness had become “one of the hallmarks of a democratic society” (citing *Re Southam Inc. and The Queen (No.1)* (1983), 41 O.R. (2d) 113 (C.A.), at p. 119), that “acts as a guarantee that justice is administered in a non-arbitrary manner, according to the rule of law . . . thereby fostering public confidence in the integrity of the court system and

understanding of the administration of justice” (para. 22). The centrality of this principle to the court system underlies the strong presumption — albeit one that is rebuttable — in favour of court openness (para. 40; *Mentuck*, at para. 39).

[40] The test ensures that discretionary orders are subject to no lower standard than a legislative enactment limiting court openness would be (*Mentuck*, at para. 27; *Sierra Club*, at para. 45). To that end, this Court developed a scheme of analysis by analogy to the *Oakes* test, which courts use to understand whether a legislative limit on a right guaranteed under the *Charter* is reasonable and demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society (*Sierra Club*, at para. 40, citing *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103; see also *Dagenais*, at p. 878; *Vancouver Sun*, at para. 30).

[41] The recognized scope of what interests might justify a discretionary exception to open courts has broadened over time. In *Dagenais*, Lamer C.J. spoke of a requisite risk to the “fairness of the trial” (p. 878). In *Mentuck*, Iacobucci J. extended this to a risk affecting the “proper administration of justice” (para. 32). Finally, in *Sierra Club*, Iacobucci J., again writing for a unanimous Court, restated the test to capture any serious risk to an “important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation” (para. 53). He simultaneously clarified that the important interest must be expressed as a public interest. For example, on the facts of that case, a harm to a particular business interest would not have been sufficient, but the “general commercial interest of preserving confidential information” was an important interest because of its public character (para. 55). This is consistent with the fact that this test

was developed in reference to the *Oakes* jurisprudence that focuses on the “pressing and substantial” objective of legislation of general application (*Oakes*, at pp. 138-39; see also *Mentuck*, at para. 31). The term “important interest” therefore captures a broad array of public objectives.

[42] While there is no closed list of important public interests for the purposes of this test, I share Iacobucci J.’s sense, explained in *Sierra Club*, that courts must be “cautious” and “alive to the fundamental importance of the open court rule” even at the earliest stage when they are identifying important public interests (para. 56). Determining what is an important public interest can be done in the abstract at the level of general principles that extend beyond the parties to the particular dispute (para. 55). By contrast, whether that interest is at “serious risk” is a fact-based finding that, for the judge considering the appropriateness of an order, is necessarily made in context. In this sense, the identification of, on the one hand, an important interest and, on the other, the seriousness of the risk to that interest are, theoretically at least, separate and qualitatively distinct operations. An order may therefore be refused simply because a valid important public interest is not at serious risk on the facts of a given case or, conversely, that the identified interests, regardless of whether they are at serious risk, do not have the requisite important public character as a matter of general principle.

[43] The test laid out in *Sierra Club* continues to be an appropriate guide for judicial discretion in cases like this one. The breadth of the category of “important interest” transcends the interests of the parties to the dispute and provides significant

flexibility to address harm to fundamental values in our society that unqualified openness could cause (see, e.g., P. M. Perell and J. W. Morden, *The Law of Civil Procedure in Ontario* (4th ed. 2020), at para. 3.185; J. Bailey and J. Burkell, “Revisiting the Open Court Principle in an Era of Online Publication: Questioning Presumptive Public Access to Parties’ and Witnesses’ Personal Information” (2016), 48 *Ottawa L. Rev.* 143, at pp. 154-55). At the same time, however, the requirement that a serious risk to an important interest be demonstrated imposes a meaningful threshold necessary to maintain the presumption of openness. Were it merely a matter of weighing the benefits of the limit on court openness against its negative effects, decision-makers confronted with concrete impacts on the individuals appearing before them may struggle to put adequate weight on the less immediate negative effects on the open court principle. Such balancing could be evasive of effective appellate review. To my mind, the structure provided by *Dagenais*, *Mentuck*, and *Sierra Club* remains appropriate and should be affirmed.

[44] Finally, I recall that the open court principle is engaged by all judicial proceedings, whatever their nature (*MacIntyre* at pp. 185-86; *Vancouver Sun*, at para. 31). To the extent the Trustees suggested, in their arguments about the negative effects of the sealing orders, that probate in Ontario does not engage the open court principle or that the openness of these proceedings has no public value, I disagree. The certificates the Trustees sought from the court are issued under the seal of that court, thereby bearing the imprimatur of the court’s authority. The court’s decision, even if rendered in a non-contentious setting, will have an impact on third parties, for example

by establishing the testamentary paper that constitutes a valid will (see *Otis v. Otis* (2004), 7 E.T.R. (3d) 221 (Ont. S.C.), at paras. 23-24). Contrary to what the Trustees argue, the matters in a probate file are not quintessentially private or fundamentally administrative. Obtaining a certificate of appointment of estate trustee in Ontario is a court proceeding and the fundamental rationale for openness — discouraging mischief and ensuring confidence in the administration of justice through transparency — applies to probate proceedings and thus to the transfer of property under court authority and other matters affected by that court action.

[45] It is true that other non-probate estate planning mechanisms may allow for the transfer of wealth outside the ordinary avenues of testate or intestate succession — that is the case, for instance, for certain insurance and pension benefits, and for certain property held in co-ownership. But this does not change the necessarily open court character of probate proceedings. That non-probate transfers keep certain information related to the administration of an estate out of public view does not mean that the Trustees here, by seeking certificates from the court, somehow do not engage this principle. The Trustees seek the benefits that flow from the public judicial probate process: transparency ensures that the probate court’s authority is administered fairly and efficiently (*Vancouver Sun*, at para. 25; *New Brunswick*, at para. 22). The strong presumption in favour of openness plainly applies to probate proceedings and the Trustees must satisfy the test for discretionary limits on court openness.

B. *The Public Importance of Privacy*



SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

CITATION: 9354-9186 Québec inc. v.
Callidus Capital Corp., 2020 SCC 10

APPEALS HEARD AND JUDGMENT
RENDERED: January 23, 2020
REASONS FOR JUDGMENT: May 8, 2020
DOCKET: 38594

2020 SCC 10 (CanLII)

BETWEEN:

9354-9186 Québec inc. and 9354-9178 Québec inc.
Appellants

and

**Callidus Capital Corporation, International Game Technology, Deloitte LLP,
Luc Carignan, François Vigneault, Philippe Millette, Francis Proulx and
François Pelletier**
Respondents

- and -

**Ernst & Young Inc., IMF Bentham Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway
Limited),
Bentham IMF Capital Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Capital
(Canada) Limited), Insolvency Institute of Canada and
Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals**
Interveners

AND BETWEEN:

**IMF Bentham Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Limited) and Bentham
IMF Capital Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Capital (Canada)
Limited)**
Appellants

and

**Callidus Capital Corporation, International Game Technology, Deloitte LLP,
Luc Carignan, François Vigneault, Philippe Millette, Francis Proulx and
François Pelletier**

Respondents

- and -

**Ernst & Young Inc., 9354-9186 Québec inc., 9354-9178 Québec inc.,
Insolvency Institute of Canada and
Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals**
Interveners

CORAM: Wagner C.J. and Abella, Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Côté, Rowe and Kasirer JJ.

JOINT REASONS FOR JUDGMENT: Wagner C.J. and Moldaver J. (Abella, Karakatsanis, Côté, (paras. 1 to 117) Rowe and Kasirer JJ. concurring)

NOTE: This document is subject to editorial revision before its reproduction in final form in the *Canada Supreme Court Reports*.

9354-9186 QUÉ. v. CALLIDUS

**9354-9186 Québec inc. and
9354-9178 Québec inc.**

Appellants

v.

**Callidus Capital Corporation,
International Game Technology,
Deloitte LLP, Luc Carignan,
François Vigneault, Philippe Millette,
Francis Proulx and François Pelletier**

Respondents

and

**Ernst & Young Inc.,
IMF Bentham Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Limited),
Bentham IMF Capital Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Capital
(Canada) Limited), Insolvency Institute of Canada and
Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals** *Intervenors*

- and -

**IMF Bentham Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Limited) and
Bentham IMF Capital Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Capital
(Canada) Limited)** *Appellants*

v.

Callidus Capital Corporation,

**International Game Technology,
Deloitte LLP, Luc Carignan,
François Vigneault, Philippe Millette,
Francis Proulx and François Pelletier**

Respondents

and

**Ernst & Young Inc.,
9354-9186 Québec inc.,
9354-9178 Québec inc., Insolvency Institute of Canada and
Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals** *Intervenors*

Indexed as: 9354-9186 Québec inc. v. Callidus Capital Corp.

2020 SCC 10

File No.: 38594.

Hearing and judgment: January 23, 2020.
Reasons delivered: May 8, 2020.

Present: Wagner C.J. and Abella, Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Côté, Rowe and Kasirer JJ.

ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL FOR QUEBEC

*Bankruptcy and insolvency — Discretionary authority of supervising
judge in proceedings under Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act — Appellate
review of decisions of supervising judge — Whether supervising judge has discretion*

to bar creditor from voting on plan of arrangement where creditor is acting for improper purpose — Whether supervising judge can approve third party litigation funding as interim financing — Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, ss. 11, 11.2.

The debtor companies filed a petition for the issuance of an initial order under the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (“CCAA”) in November 2015. The petition succeeded, and the initial order was issued by a supervising judge, who became responsible for overseeing the proceedings. Since then, substantially all of the assets of the debtor companies have been liquidated, with the notable exception of retained claims for damages against the companies’ only secured creditor. In September 2017, the secured creditor proposed a plan of arrangement, which later failed to receive sufficient creditor support. In February 2018, the secured creditor proposed another, virtually identical, plan of arrangement. It also sought the supervising judge’s permission to vote on this new plan in the same class as the debtor companies’ unsecured creditors, on the basis that its security was worth nil. Around the same time, the debtor companies sought interim financing in the form of a proposed third party litigation funding agreement, which would permit them to pursue litigation of the retained claims. They also sought the approval of a related super-priority litigation financing charge.

The supervising judge determined that the secured creditor should not be permitted to vote on the new plan because it was acting with an improper purpose. As

a result, the new plan had no reasonable prospect of success and was not put to a creditors' vote. The supervising judge allowed the debtor companies' application, authorizing them to enter into a third party litigation funding agreement. On appeal by the secured creditor and certain of the unsecured creditors, the Court of Appeal set aside the supervising judge's order, holding that he had erred in reaching the foregoing conclusions.

Held: The appeal should be allowed and the supervising judge's order reinstated.

The supervising judge made no error in barring the secured creditor from voting or in authorizing the third party litigating funding agreement. A supervising judge has the discretion to bar a creditor from voting on a plan of arrangement where they determine that the creditor is acting for an improper purpose. A supervising judge can also approve third party litigation funding as interim financing, pursuant to s. 11.2 of the CCAA. The Court of Appeal was not justified in interfering with the supervising judge's discretionary decisions in this regard, having failed to treat them with the appropriate degree of deference.

The CCAA is one of three principal insolvency statutes in Canada. It pursues an array of overarching remedial objectives that reflect the wide ranging and potentially catastrophic impacts insolvency can have. These objectives include: providing for timely, efficient and impartial resolution of a debtor's insolvency; preserving and maximizing the value of a debtor's assets; ensuring fair and equitable

treatment of the claims against a debtor; protecting the public interest; and, in the context of a commercial insolvency, balancing the costs and benefits of restructuring or liquidating the company. The architecture of the *CCAA* leaves the case-specific assessment and balancing of these objectives to the supervising judge.

From beginning to end, each proceeding under the *CCAA* is overseen by a single supervising judge, who has broad discretion to make a variety of orders that respond to the circumstances of each case. The anchor of this discretionary authority is s. 11 of the *CCAA*, which empowers a judge to make any order that they consider appropriate in the circumstances. This discretionary authority is broad, but not boundless. It must be exercised in furtherance of the remedial objectives of the *CCAA* and with three baseline considerations in mind: (1) that the order sought is appropriate in the circumstances, and (2) that the applicant has been acting in good faith and (3) with due diligence. The due diligence consideration discourages parties from sitting on their rights and ensures that creditors do not strategically manoeuvre or position themselves to gain an advantage. A high degree of deference is owed to discretionary decisions made by judges supervising *CCAA* proceedings and, as such, appellate intervention will only be justified if the supervising judge erred in principle or exercised their discretion unreasonably.

A creditor can generally vote on a plan of arrangement or compromise that affects its rights, subject to any specific provisions of the *CCAA* that may restrict its voting rights, or a proper exercise of discretion by the supervising judge to constrain or

bar the creditor's right to vote. Given that the *CCAA* regime contemplates creditor participation in decision-making as an integral facet of the workout regime, the discretion to bar a creditor from voting should only be exercised where the circumstances demand such an outcome. Where a creditor is seeking to exercise its voting rights in a manner that frustrates, undermines, or runs counter to the remedial objectives of the *CCAA* — that is, acting for an improper purpose — s. 11 of the *CCAA* supplies the supervising judge with the discretion to bar that creditor from voting. This discretion parallels the similar discretion that exists under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* and advances the basic fairness that permeates Canadian insolvency law and practice. Whether this discretion ought to be exercised in a particular case is a circumstance-specific inquiry that the supervising judge is best-positioned to undertake.

In the instant case, the supervising judge's decision to bar the secured creditor from voting on the new plan discloses no error justifying appellate intervention. When he made this decision, the supervising judge was intimately familiar with these proceedings, having presided over them for over 2 years, received 15 reports from the monitor, and issued approximately 25 orders. He considered the whole of the circumstances and concluded that the secured creditor's vote would serve an improper purpose. He was aware that the secured creditor had chosen not to value any of its claim as unsecured prior to the vote on the first plan and did not attempt to vote on that plan, which ultimately failed to receive the other creditors' approval. Between the failure of the first plan and the proposal of the (essentially identical) new plan, none of the factual

circumstances relating to the debtor companies' financial or business affairs had materially changed. However, the secured creditor sought to value the entirety of its security at nil and, on that basis, sought leave to vote on the new plan as an unsecured creditor. If the secured creditor were permitted to vote in this way, the new plan would certainly have met the double majority threshold for approval under s. 6(1) of the CCAA. The inescapable inference was that the secured creditor was attempting to strategically value its security to acquire control over the outcome of the vote and thereby circumvent the creditor democracy the CCAA protects. The secured creditor's course of action was also plainly contrary to the expectation that parties act with due diligence in an insolvency proceeding, which includes acting with due diligence in valuing their claims and security. The secured creditor was therefore properly barred from voting on the new plan.

Whether third party litigation funding should be approved as interim financing is a case-specific inquiry that should have regard to the text of s. 11.2 of the CCAA and the remedial objectives of the CCAA more generally. Interim financing is a flexible tool that may take on a range of forms. This is apparent from the wording of s. 11.2(1), which is broad and does not mandate any standard form or terms. At its core, interim financing enables the preservation and realization of the value of a debtor's assets. In some circumstances, like the instant case, litigation funding furthers this basic purpose. Third party litigation funding agreements may therefore be approved as interim financing in CCAA proceedings when the supervising judge determines that doing so would be fair and appropriate, having regard to all the circumstances and the

objectives of the Act. This requires consideration of the specific factors set out in s. 11.2(4) of the CCAA. These factors need not be mechanically applied or individually reviewed by the supervising judge, as not all of them will be significant in every case, nor are they exhaustive. Additionally, in order for a third party litigation funding agreement to be approved as interim financing, the agreement must not contain terms that effectively convert it into a plan of arrangement.

In the instant case, there is no basis upon which to interfere with the supervising judge's exercise of his discretion to approve the litigation funding agreement as interim financing. A review of the supervising judge's reasons as a whole, combined with a recognition of his manifest experience with the debtor companies' CCAA proceedings, leads to the conclusion that the factors listed in s. 11.2(4) concern matters that could not have escaped his attention and due consideration. It is apparent that he was focussed on the fairness at stake to all parties, the specific objectives of the CCAA, and the particular circumstances of this case when he approved the litigation funding agreement as interim financing. Further, the litigation funding agreement is not a plan of arrangement because it does not propose any compromise of the creditors' rights. The fact that the creditors may walk away with more or less money at the end of the day does not change the nature or existence of their rights to access the funds generated from the debtor companies' assets, nor can it be said to compromise those rights. Finally, the litigation financing charge does not convert the litigation funding agreement into a plan of arrangement. Holding otherwise would effectively extinguish

the supervising judge's authority to approve these charges without a creditors' vote, which is expressly provided for in s. 11.2 of the CCAA.

Cases Cited

By Wagner C.J. and Moldaver J.

Applied: *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2010 SCC 60, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379; **considered:** *Re Crystallex*, 2012 ONCA 404, 293 O.A.C. 102; *Laserworks Computer Services Inc. (Bankruptcy), Re*, 1998 NSCA 42, 165 N.S.R. (2d) 296; **referred to:** *Bayens v. Kinross Gold Corporation*, 2013 ONSC 4974, 117 O.R. (3d) 150; *Hayes v. The City of Saint John*, 2016 NBQB 125; *Schenk v. Valeant Pharmaceuticals International Inc.*, 2015 ONSC 3215, 74 C.P.C. (7th) 332; *Re Blackburn*, 2011 BCSC 1671, 27 B.C.L.R. (5th) 199; *Sun Indalex Finance, LLC v. United Steelworkers*, 2013 SCC 6, [2013] 1 S.C.R. 271; *Ernst & Young Inc. v. Essar Global Fund Ltd.*, 2017 ONCA 1014, 139 O.R. (3d) 1; *Third Eye Capital Corporation v. Ressources Dianor Inc./Dianor Resources Inc.*, 2019 ONCA 508, 435 D.L.R. (4th) 416; *Re Canadian Red Cross Society* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299; *Re Target Canada Co.*, 2015 ONSC 303, 22 C.B.R. (6th) 323; *Uti Energy Corp. v. Fracmaster Ltd.*, 1999 ABCA 178, 244 A.R. 93, aff'g 1999 ABQB 379, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 204; *Orphan Well Association v. Grant Thornton Ltd.*, 2019 SCC 5, [2019] 1 S.C.R. 150; *Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109; *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24; *North American Tungsten Corp. v. Global Tungsten and Powders Corp.*, 2015 BCCA 390, 377 B.C.A.C. 6; *Re BA Energy Inc.*, 2010 ABQB 507, 70 C.B.R. (5th) 24;

[36] Bluberi and Bentham (collectively, “appellants”), again supported by the Monitor, now appeal to this Court.

IV. Issues

[37] These appeals raise two issues:

- (1) Did the supervising judge err in barring Callidus from voting on its New Plan on the basis that it was acting for an improper purpose?
- (2) Did the supervising judge err in approving the LFA as interim financing, pursuant to s. 11.2 of the CCAA?

V. Analysis

A. *Preliminary Considerations*

[38] Addressing the above issues requires situating them within the contemporary Canadian insolvency landscape and, more specifically, the CCAA regime. Accordingly, before turning to those issues, we review (1) the evolving nature of CCAA proceedings; (2) the role of the supervising judge in those proceedings; and (3) the proper scope of appellate review of a supervising judge’s exercise of discretion.

(1) The Evolving Nature of CCAA Proceedings

[39] The CCAA is one of three principal insolvency statutes in Canada. The others are the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (“BIA”), which covers insolvencies of both individuals and companies, and the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11 (“WURA”), which covers insolvencies of financial institutions and certain other corporations, such as insurance companies (WURA, s. 6(1)). While both the CCAA and the BIA enable reorganizations of insolvent companies, access to the CCAA is restricted to debtor companies facing total claims in excess of \$5 million (CCAA, s. 3(1)).

[40] Together, Canada’s insolvency statutes pursue an array of overarching remedial objectives that reflect the wide ranging and potentially “catastrophic” impacts insolvency can have (*Sun Indalex Finance, LLC v. United Steelworkers*, 2013 SCC 6, [2013] 1 S.C.R. 271, at para. 1). These objectives include: providing for timely, efficient and impartial resolution of a debtor’s insolvency; preserving and maximizing the value of a debtor’s assets; ensuring fair and equitable treatment of the claims against a debtor; protecting the public interest; and, in the context of a commercial insolvency, balancing the costs and benefits of restructuring or liquidating the company (J. P. Sarra, “The Oscillating Pendulum: Canada’s Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law”, in J. P. Sarra and B. Romaine, eds., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2016* (2017), 9, at pp. 9-10; J. P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* 2nd ed. (2013), at pp. 4-5 and 14; Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, *Debtors and Creditors Sharing the Burden: A Review of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*

(2003), at pp. 9-10; R. J. Wood, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law* (2nd ed. 2015), at pp. 4-5).

[41] Among these objectives, the CCAA generally prioritizes “avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company” (*Century Services*, at para. 70). As a result, the typical CCAA case has historically involved an attempt to facilitate the reorganization and survival of the pre-filing debtor company in an operational state — that is, as a going concern. Where such a reorganization was not possible, the alternative course of action was seen as a liquidation through either a receivership or under the *BIA* regime. This is precisely the outcome that was sought in *Century Services* (see para. 14).

[42] That said, the CCAA is fundamentally insolvency legislation, and thus it also “has the simultaneous objectives of maximizing creditor recovery, preservation of going-concern value where possible, preservation of jobs and communities affected by the firm’s financial distress . . . and enhancement of the credit system generally” (Sarrazin, *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, at p. 14; see also *Ernst & Young Inc. v. Essar Global Fund Ltd.*, 2017 ONCA 1014, 139 O.R. (3d) 1, at para. 103). In pursuit of those objectives, CCAA proceedings have evolved to permit outcomes that do not result in the emergence of the pre-filing debtor company in a restructured state, but rather involve some form of liquidation of the debtor’s assets under the auspices of the Act itself (Sarrazin, “The Oscillating Pendulum: Canada’s Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law”, at pp. 19-21). Such scenarios are referred

to as “liquidating CCAAs”, and they are now commonplace in the CCAA landscape (see *Third Eye Capital Corporation v. Ressources Dianor Inc./Dianor Resources Inc.*, 2019 ONCA 508, 435 D.L.R. (4th) 416, at para. 70).

[43] Liquidating CCAAs take diverse forms and may involve, among other things: the sale of the debtor company as a going concern; an “en bloc” sale of assets that are capable of being operationalized by a buyer; a partial liquidation or downsizing of business operations; or a piecemeal sale of assets (B. Kaplan, “Liquidating CCAAs: Discretion Gone Awry?”, in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law* (2008), 79, at pp. 87-89). The ultimate commercial outcomes facilitated by liquidating CCAAs are similarly diverse. Some may result in the continued operation of the business of the debtor under a different going concern entity (e.g., the liquidations in *Indalex* and *Re Canadian Red Cross Society* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. C.J. (Gen. Div.)), while others may result in a sale of assets and inventory with no such entity emerging (e.g., the proceedings in *Re Target Canada Co.*, 2015 ONSC 303, 22 C.B.R. (6th) 323, at paras. 7 and 31). Others still, like the case at bar, may involve a going concern sale of most of the assets of the debtor, leaving residual assets to be dealt with by the debtor and its stakeholders.

[44] CCAA courts first began approving these forms of liquidation pursuant to the broad discretion conferred by the Act. The emergence of this practice was not without criticism, largely on the basis that it appeared to be inconsistent with the CCAA being a “restructuring statute” (see, e.g., *Uti Energy Corp. v. Fracmaster Ltd.*, 1999

ABCA 178, 244 A.R. 93, at paras. 15-16, aff’g 1999 ABQB 379, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 204, at paras. 40-43; A. Nocilla, “The History of the Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act and the Future of Re-Structuring Law in Canada” (2014), 56 *Can. Bus. L.J.* 73, at pp. 88-92).

[45] However, since s. 36 of the *CCAA* came into force in 2009, courts have been using it to effect liquidating CCAAs. Section 36 empowers courts to authorize the sale or disposition of a debtor company’s assets outside the ordinary course of business.³ Significantly, when the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce recommended the adoption of s. 36, it observed that liquidation is not necessarily inconsistent with the remedial objectives of the *CCAA*, and that it may be a means to “raise capital [to facilitate a restructuring], eliminate further loss for creditors or focus on the solvent operations of the business” (p. 147). Other commentators have observed that liquidation can be a “vehicle to restructure a business” by allowing the business to survive, albeit under a different corporate form or ownership (Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, at p. 169; see also K. P. McElcheran, *Commercial Insolvency in Canada* (4th ed. 2019), at p. 311). Indeed, in

³ We note that while s. 36 now codifies the jurisdiction of a supervising court to grant a sale and vesting order, and enumerates factors to guide the court’s discretion to grant such an order, it is silent on when courts ought to approve a liquidation under the *CCAA* as opposed to requiring the parties to proceed to liquidation under a receivership or the *BIA* regime (see Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, at pp. 167–68; A. Nocilla, “Asset Sales Under the Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act and the Failure of Section 36” (2012) 52 *Can. Bus. L.J.* 226, at pp. 243-44 and 247). This issue remains an open question and was not put to this Court in either *Indalex* or these appeals.

Indalex, the company sold its assets under the CCAA in order to preserve the jobs of its employees, despite being unable to survive as their employer (see para. 51).

[46] Ultimately, the relative weight that the different objectives of the CCAA take on in a particular case may vary based on the factual circumstances, the stage of the proceedings, or the proposed solutions that are presented to the court for approval. Here, a parallel may be drawn with the BIA context. In *Orphan Well Association v. Grant Thornton Ltd.*, 2019 SCC 5, [2019] 1 S.C.R. 150, at para. 67, this Court explained that, as a general matter, the BIA serves two purposes: (1) the bankrupt's financial rehabilitation and (2) the equitable distribution of the bankrupt's assets among creditors. However, in circumstances where a debtor corporation will never emerge from bankruptcy, only the latter purpose is relevant (see para. 67). Similarly, under the CCAA, when a reorganization of the pre-filing debtor company is not a possibility, a liquidation that preserves going-concern value and the ongoing business operations of the pre-filing company may become the predominant remedial focus. Moreover, where a reorganization or liquidation is complete and the court is dealing with residual assets, the objective of maximizing creditor recovery from those assets may take centre stage. As we will explain, the architecture of the CCAA leaves the case-specific assessment and balancing of these remedial objectives to the supervising judge.

(2) The Role of a Supervising Judge in CCAA Proceedings

[47] One of the principal means through which the CCAA achieves its objectives is by carving out a unique supervisory role for judges (see Sarra, *Rescue!*

The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, at pp. 18-19). From beginning to end, each CCAA proceeding is overseen by a single supervising judge. The supervising judge acquires extensive knowledge and insight into the stakeholder dynamics and the business realities of the proceedings from their ongoing dealings with the parties.

[48] The CCAA capitalizes on this positional advantage by supplying supervising judges with broad discretion to make a variety of orders that respond to the circumstances of each case and “meet contemporary business and social needs” (*Century Services*, at para. 58) in “real-time” (para. 58, citing R. B. Jones, “The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring: Challenges for the Rule of Law”, in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005* (2006), 481, at p. 484). The anchor of this discretionary authority is s. 11, which empowers a judge “to make any order that [the judge] considers appropriate in the circumstances”. This section has been described as “the engine” driving the statutory scheme (*Stelco Inc. (Re)* (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 36).

[49] The discretionary authority conferred by the CCAA, while broad in nature, is not boundless. This authority must be exercised in furtherance of the remedial objectives of the CCAA, which we have explained above (see *Century Services*, at para. 59). Additionally, the court must keep in mind three “baseline considerations” (at para. 70), which the applicant bears the burden of demonstrating: (1) that the order sought is appropriate in the circumstances, and (2) that the applicant has been acting in good faith and (3) with due diligence (para. 69).

[50] The first two considerations of appropriateness and good faith are widely understood in the CCAA context. Appropriateness “is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the CCAA” (para. 70). Further, the well-established requirement that parties must act in good faith in insolvency proceedings has recently been made express in s. 18.6 of the CCAA, which provides:

Good faith

18.6 (1) Any interested person in any proceedings under this Act shall act in good faith with respect to those proceedings.

Good faith — powers of court

(2) If the court is satisfied that an interested person fails to act in good faith, on application by an interested person, the court may make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

(See also *BIA*, s. 4.2; *Budget Implementation Act, 2019, No. 1*, S.C. 2019, c. 29, ss. 133 and 140.)

[51] The third consideration of due diligence requires some elaboration. Consistent with the CCAA regime generally, the due diligence consideration discourages parties from sitting on their rights and ensures that creditors do not strategically manoeuvre or position themselves to gain an advantage (*Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. C.J. (Gen. Div.)), at p. 31). The procedures set out in the CCAA rely on negotiations and compromise between the debtor and its stakeholders, as overseen by the supervising judge and the monitor. This necessarily requires that, to the extent possible, those involved in the proceedings be on equal footing and have a clear understanding of their respective rights (see *McElcheran*, at p. 262). A party’s failure to participate in CCAA proceedings in a

diligent and timely fashion can undermine these procedures and, more generally, the effective functioning of the CCAA regime (see, e.g., *North American Tungsten Corp. v. Global Tungsten and Powders Corp.*, 2015 BCCA 390, 377 B.C.A.C. 6, at paras. 21-23; *Re BA Energy Inc.*, 2010 ABQB 507, 70 C.B.R. (5th) 24; *HSBC Bank Canada v. Bear Mountain Master Partnership*, 2010 BCSC 1563, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 276, at para. 11; *Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. v. 360networks Corp.*, 2007 BCCA 14, 279 D.L.R. (4th) 701, at paras. 51-52, in which the courts seized on a party's failure to act diligently).

[52] We pause to note that supervising judges are assisted in their oversight role by a court appointed monitor whose qualifications and duties are set out in the CCAA (see ss. 11.7, 11.8 and 23 to 25). The monitor is an independent and impartial expert, acting as “the eyes and the ears of the court” throughout the proceedings (*Essar*, at para. 109). The core of the monitor's role includes providing an advisory opinion to the court as to the fairness of any proposed plan of arrangement and on orders sought by parties, including the sale of assets and requests for interim financing (see CCAA, s. 23(1)(d) and (i); Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, at pp- 566 and 569).

(3) Appellate Review of Exercises of Discretion by a Supervising Judge

[53] A high degree of deference is owed to discretionary decisions made by judges supervising CCAA proceedings. As such, appellate intervention will only be justified if the supervising judge erred in principle or exercised their discretion

ONTARIO COURT (GENERAL DIVISION)

COMMERCIAL LIST

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT
ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c.C-36; and

IN THE MATTER OF THE COURTS OF JUSTICE ACT, R.S.O. 1990,
c.C.43; and

IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE IN RESPECT OF
LEHNDORFF GENERAL PARTNER LTD., in its own capacity and
in its capacity as general partner of

LEHNDORFF UNITED PROPERTIES (CANADA)

LEHNDORFF PROPERTIES (CANADA)

- and -

LEHNDORFF PROPERTIES (CANADA) II

and in respect of certain of their nominees

LEHNDORFF UNITED PROPERTIES (CANADA) LTD.,
LEHNDORFF CANADIAN HOLDINGS LTD.,
LEHNDORFF CANADIAN HOLDINGS II LTD.,
BAYTEMP PROPERTIES LIMITED and
102 BLOOR STREET WEST LIMITED

and in respect of

THG LEHNDORFF VERMÖGENSVERWALTUNG GMBH

in its capacity as limited partner of
LEHNDORFF UNITED PROPERTIES (CANADA)

Applicants

Heard December 24, 1992

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

L Crozier for the Royal Bank of Canada

R.C. Heintzman for the Bank of Montreal

93015 057

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

Jay Schwartz for Citibank Canada

Steven Golick for Peat Marwick Thorne Inc., proposed
monitor

John Teolis for the Fuji Bank Canada

Robert Thorton for certain of the advisory boards

FARLEY J.:

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

- (a) short service of the notice of application;
- (b) a declaration that the applicants were companies to which the CCAA applies;
- (c) authorization for the applicants to file a consolidated plan of compromise;
- (d) authorization for the applicants to call meetings of their secured and unsecured creditors to approve the consolidated plan of compromise;
- (e) A stay of all proceedings taken or that might be taken either in respect of the applicants in their own capacity

or on account of their interest in Lehndorff United Properties (Canada) ("LUPC"), Lehndorff Properties (Canada) ("LPC") and Lehndorff Properties (Canada) II ("LPC II") and collectively (the "Limited Partnerships") whether as limited partner, as general partner or as registered titleholder to certain of their assets as bare trustee and nominee; and

(f) certain other ancillary relief.

The applicants are a number of companies within the larger Lehndorff group ("Group") which operates in Canada and elsewhere. The group appears to have suffered in the same way that a number of other property developers and managers which have also sought protection under the CCAA in recent years. The applicants are insolvent; they each have outstanding debentures issued under trust deeds; and they propose a plan of compromise among themselves and the holders of these debentures as well as those others of their secured and unsecured creditors as they deemed appropriate in the circumstances. Each applicant except THG Lehndorff Vermögensverwaltung GmbH ("GmbH") is an Ontario corporation. GmbH is a company incorporated under the laws of Germany. Each of the applicants has assets or does business in Canada. Therefore each is a "company" within the definition of s.2 of the CCAA. The applicant Lehndorff General Partner Ltd. ("General Partner Company") is the sole general partner of the Limited Partnerships. The General

Partner Company has sole control over the property and businesses of the Limited Partnerships. All major decisions concerning the applicants (and the Limited Partnerships) are made by management operating out of the Lehndorff Toronto Office. The applicants aside from the General Partner Company have as their sole purpose the holding of title to properties as bare trustee or nominee on behalf of the Limited Partnerships. LUPC is a limited partnership registered under the Limited Partnership Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.L.16 ("Ontario LPA"). LPC and LPC II are limited partnerships registered under Part 2 of the Partnership Act, R.S.A. 1980, c.P-2 ("Alberta PA") and each is registered in Ontario as an extra provincial limited partnership. LUPC has over 2,000 beneficial limited partners, LPC over 500 and LPC II over 250, most of whom are residents of Germany. As at March 31, 1992 LUPC had outstanding indebtedness of approximately \$370 million, LPC \$45 million and LPC II \$7 million. Not all of the members of the Group are making an application under the CCAA. Taken together the Group's indebtedness as to Canadian matters (including that of the applicants) was approximately \$543 million. In the summer of 1992 various creditors (Canada Trustco Mortgage Company, Bank of Montreal, Royal Bank of Canada, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce and the Bank of Tokyo Canada) made demands for repayment of their loans. On November 6, 1992 Funtanua Investments Limited, a minor secured lender also made a demand. An interim standstill agreement was worked out following a meeting of July 7, 1992. In conjunction with Peat Marwick Thorne

Inc. which has been acting as an informal monitor to date and Fasken Campbell Godfrey the applicants have held multiple meetings with their senior secured creditors over the past half year and worked on a restructuring plan. The business affairs of the applicants (and the Limited Partnerships) are significantly intertwined as there are multiple instances of intercorporate debt, cross-default provisions and guarantees and they operated a centralized cash management system.

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

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

- (i) Rationalization of the existing debt and security structure in the continuing entities in the Group.

Formal meetings of the beneficial limited partners of the Limited Partnerships are scheduled for January 20 and 21, 1993 in Germany and an information circular has been prepared and at the time of hearing was being translated into German. This application was brought on for hearing at this time for two general reasons: (a) it had now ripened to the stage of proceeding with what had been distilled out of the strategic and consultative meetings; and (b) there were creditors other than senior secured lenders who were in a position to enforce their rights against assets of some of the applicants (and Limited Partnerships) which if such enforcement did take place would result in an undermining of the overall plan. Notice of this hearing was given to various creditors: Barclays Bank of Canada, Barclays Bank PLC, Bank of Montreal, Citibank Canada, Canada Trustco Mortgage Corporation, Royal Trust Corporation of Canada, Royal Bank of Canada, the Bank of Tokyo Canada, Funtauna Investments Limited, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, Fuji Bank Canada and First City Trust Company. In this respect the applicants have recognized that although the initial application under the CCAA maybe made on an ex parte basis (s.11 of the CCAA; Re Langley's Ltd., [1938] O.R. 123, [1938] 3 D.L.R. 230 (C.A.); Re Keppoch Development Ltd. (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 95 (N.S.S.C.T.D.)). The court will be concerned when major creditors

have not been alerted even in the most minimal fashion (Re Inducon Development Corporation (1992), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p.310). The application was either supported or not opposed.

"Instant" debentures are now well recognized and respected by the courts: see Re United Maritime Fisherman Co-Op (1988), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 44, at pp.55-6, varied on reconsideration (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 170, reversed on different grounds (1988), 69 C.B.R. (N.S.) 161 at pp.165-6; Re Stephanie's Fashions ltd. (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 248 (B.C.S.C.) at pp.250-1; Elan Corp. v. Comiskey (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289, 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101 (C.A.) per Doherty J.A., dissenting on another point, at pp.306-310 (O.R.); Ultracare Management Inc. v. Gammon (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 321 (Gen. Div.) at p.327. The applicants would appear to me to have met the technical hurdle of s.3 and as defined s.2) of the CCAA in that they are debtor companies since they are insolvent, they have outstanding an issue of debentures under a trust deed and the compromise or arrangement that is proposed includes that compromise between the applicants and the holders of those trust deed debentures. I am also satisfied that because of the significant intertwining of the applicants it would be appropriate to have a consolidated plan. I would also understand that this court (Ontario Court of Justice (General Division)) is the appropriate court to hear this application since all the applicants except GmbH have their head office or their chief place of business in Ontario and GmbH,

although it does not have a place of business within Canada, does have assets located within Ontario.

The CCAA is intended to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors as an alternative to bankruptcy and, as such, is remedial legislation entitled to a liberal interpretation. It seems to me that the purpose of the statute is to enable insolvent companies to carry on business in the ordinary course or otherwise deal with their assets so as to enable plan of compromise or arrangement to be prepared, filed and considered by their creditors and the court. In the interim, a judge has great discretion under the CCAA to make order so as to effectively maintain the status quo in respect of an insolvent company while it attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for the proposed compromise or arrangement which will be to the benefit of both the company and its creditors. See the preamble to and sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11 of the CCAA; in Re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act; A.G. Can. v. A.G. Que., [1934] S.C.R. 659 at p.661; 16 C.B.R. 1; [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75; Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto-Dominion Bank; Meridian Developments Inc. v. Nu-West Group Ltd., [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215 at pp.219-20; Norcen Energy Resources v. Oakwood Petroleums Limited, et al. (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta L.R. (2d) 361 (Alta., Q.B.), at pp.12-13 (C.B.R.); Re Quintette Coal Limited (1990), 2 C.B.R.(3d) 303 (B.C.C.A), at pp.310-1, affirming Quintette Coal

Limited v. Nippon Steel Corporation et al. (1990) 2 C.B.R. (3d) 291, 47 B.C.L.R. 193 (B.C.S.C.), leave to appeal to S.C.C. dismissed (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 164 (S.C.C.); Elan, supra at p.307 (O.R.); Fine's Flowers v. Creditors of Fine's Flowers (1992), 7 O.R. (3d) 193 (Gen. Div.), at p.199 and "Re-Organizations under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act", Stanley E. Edwards, (1947), 25 Cdn. Bar Rev. 587 at p.592.

The CCAA is intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both. Where a debtor company realistically plans to continue operating or to otherwise deal with its assets but it requires the protection of the court in order to do so and it is otherwise too early for the court to determine whether the debtor company will succeed, relief should be granted under the CCAA. see Elan, supra at pp. 297 and p.316; Stephanie's, supra, at pp.251-2 and Ultracare, supra, at p. 328 and p.330. It has been held that the intention of the CCAA is to prevent any manoeuvres for positioning among the creditors during the period required to develop a plan and obtain approval of creditors. Such manoeuvres could give an aggressive creditor an advantage to the prejudice of others who are less aggressive and would undermine the company's financial position making it even less likely that the plan will succeed: see Meridian, supra, at p.220 (W.W.R.). The possibility that one or more creditors may be prejudiced should not

affect the court's exercise of its authority to grant a stay of proceedings under the CCAA because this affect is offset by the benefit to all creditors and to the company of facilitating a reorganization. The court's primary concerns under the CCAA must be for the debtor and all of the creditors: see Quintette, supra, at pp.108-110; Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84 (B.C.C.A.), at pp.315-318, (C.B.R.) and Stephanie's, supra, at pp.251-2.

One of the purposes of the CCAA is to facilitate ongoing operations of a business where its assets have a greater value as part of an integrated system than individually. The CCAA facilitates reorganization of a company where the alternative, sale of the property piecemeal, is likely to yield far less satisfaction to the creditors. Unlike the Bankruptcy Act, R.S.C. 1985, c.B-3, before the amendments effective November 30, 1992 to transform it into the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act ("BIA"), it is possible under the CCAA to bind secured creditors it has been generally speculated that the CCAA will be resorted to by companies that are generally larger and have a more complicated capital structure and that those companies which make an application under the BIA will be generally smaller and have a less complicated structure. Reorganization may include partial liquidation where it is intended as part of the process of a return to long term viability and profitability. See Chef Ready, supra, at p.318 and Re Assoc.

Investors of Can. Ltd. (1987), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 at pp.245; rev'd on other grounds at (1988), 71 C.B.R. 72. It appears to me that the purpose of the CCAA is also to protect the interests of creditors and to enable an orderly distribution of the debtor company's affairs. This may involve a winding-up or liquidation of a company or simply a substantial downsizing of its business operations, provided the same is proposed in the best interests of the creditors generally. See Assoc. Investors, supra, at p.318; Re Amirault Co. (1951), 32 C.B.R. 1986, [1951] 5 D.L.R. 203 (N.S.S.C.) at pp.187-8 (C.B.R.).

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

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

11. Notwithstanding anything in the Bankruptcy Act or the Winding-up Act, whenever an application has been made under this Act in respect of any company, the court, on the

application of any person interested in the matter, may, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit,

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

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

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

The power to grant a stay of proceeding should be construed broadly in order to permit the CCAA to accomplish its legislative purpose and in particular to enable continuance of the company seeking CCAA protection. The power to grant a stay therefore extends to a stay which affects the position not only of the company's secured and unsecured creditors, but also all non-creditors and other parties who could potentially jeopardize the success of the plan and thereby the continuance of the company. See Norcen, supra at pp.12-7 (C.B.R.) and Quintette, supra, at pp.296-8 (B.C.S.C.) and pp.312-4 (B.C.C.A.) and Meridian, supra, at pp. 219 ff. Further the court has the power to order a stay that is effective in respect of the rights arising in favour of secured creditors under all forms of commercial security: see Chef Ready, supra, at p.320 where Gibbs J.A. for the Court stated:

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

The power to grant a stay may also extend to preventing persons seeking to terminate or cancel executory contracts, including, without limitation agreements with the applying companies for the supply of goods or services, from doing so: see Wynden Canada Inc. v. Gaz Métropolitain Inc. (1982), 44 C.B.R. (N.S.) 285 (Qué. S.C. in Bankruptcy) at pp.290-1 and Quintette, supra, at pp.311-2 (B.C.C.A.). The stay may also extend to prevent a mortgagee from proceeding with foreclosure proceedings (see Re Northland Properties Limited et al. (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 141 (B.C.S.C.) or to prevent landlords from terminating leases, or otherwise enforcing their rights thereunder (see In Re Nathan Feifer et al. v. Frame Manufacturing Corporation (1947), 28 C.B.R. 124 (Qué. C.A.)). Amounts owing to landlords in respect of arrears of rent or unpaid rent for the unexpired portion of lease terms are properly dealt with in a plan of compromise or arrangement: see Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corporation (1992), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 312 (Ont. Gen. Div.) especially at p.318. The jurisdiction of the court to make orders under the CCAA in the interest of protecting the debtor company so as to enable it to prepare and file a plan is effective

SUPERIOR COURT

CANADA
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTREAL

No: 500-11-036133-094

DATE: **NOVEMBER 23, 2009**

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

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

ABITIBIBOWATER INC.

And

ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED INC.

And

BOWATER CANADIAN HOLDINGS INC.

And

The other Petitioners listed on Schedules "A", "B" and "C"
Petitioners

And

ERNST & YOUNG INC.
Monitor

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

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

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

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

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

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

2) THE DISTRIBUTION TO THE SSNs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[71] Despite what the Bondholders argue, it is neither unusual nor unheard of to proceed with an interim distribution of net proceeds in the context of a sale of assets in a CCAA reorganization. Nothing in the CCAA prevents similar interim distribution of monies. There are several examples of such distributions having been authorized by Courts in Canada⁷.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- a) According to its Counsel, the SSNs security on the ACCC's 60% interest in MPCo is valid and enforceable;
- b) The amounts owed to the SSNs far exceed the contemplated distribution while the SSNs' collateral is sufficient for the SSNs' claim to be most likely paid in full;
- c) The proposed distribution entails an economy of CDN\$27 million per year in interest savings; and
- d) Even taking into consideration the CDN\$200 million proposed distribution, the ULC DIP Facility provides the Abitibi Petitioners with the liquidity they require for most of the coming year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

3) THE ORDERS SOUGHT

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

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

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

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

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

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

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT:

ULC DIP Financing

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