

22-Apr-26

REGISTRY

No. S-250121
Vancouver Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

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

BETWEEN:

KINGSETT MORTGAGE CORPORATION

PETITIONER

AND:

LUMINA ECLIPSE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
BETA VIEW HOMES LTD.
LUMINA ECLIPSE GP LTD.

and

D-THIND DEVELOPMENT BETA LTD.

RESPONDENTS

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

Name(s) of applicant(s): CHUNG HEI WONG, LIPING DING and WAI THING NICOLE
WONG (the "Three Purchasers" or the "Applicants")
To: the Service List, attached hereto as Schedule "A"

TAKE NOTICE that an application will be made by the applicant(s) to the Honourable Justice Masuhara at the courthouse at 800 Smithe Street, Vancouver, British Columbia on May 11, 2026 at 10:00 a.m. for the order(s) set out in Part 1 below.

The applicant(s) estimate(s) that the application will take 3 days.

This matter is within the jurisdiction of an associate judge.

This matter is not within the jurisdiction of an associate judge.

Part 1: ORDER(S) SOUGHT

1. Pursuant to Rule 9-7(2) of the *Supreme Court Civil Rules*:
 - (a) a declaration that the Purchase Agreements, as defined below, are unenforceable against the Three Purchasers pursuant to section 23 of the *Real Estate Development Marketing Act* (the "*REDMA*"); and
 - (b) an order requiring the Developers, as defined below, to return the deposits to the Three Purchasers;
2. Costs; and
3. Such further and other relief as this Honourable Court deems just.

Part 2: FACTUAL BASIS

Overview

1. The Three Purchasers are purchasers of development units in the real-estate development which is defined as the “Eclipse Project” in these court proceedings (the “Development”).
2. The developers of the Development are the respondents, Lumina Eclipse Limited Partnership, Beta View Homes Ltd., and Lumina Eclipse GP Ltd. (the “Developers”).
3. On January 8, 2025, KSV Restructuring Inc. (the “Monitor”) was appointed as monitor of the Developers through these court proceedings and was granted control of the Development.
4. The relevant purchase agreements are unenforceable against the Three Purchasers on the grounds of:
 - (a) section 23 of the *Real Estate Development Marketing Act* (the “REDMA”); and
 - (b) in the alternative, misrepresentation.
5. The issue of unenforceability was adjourned from the court hearing on April 8, 2026 to May 11, 2026.

Disclosure Statement and Purchase Agreements

6. The disclosure statement of the Development was signed by the Defendant and is dated September 23, 2021 (the “Disclosure Statement”).
7. The developer, Lumina Eclipse Limited Partnership, as vendor and the Three Purchasers entered into three separate purchase agreements as follows:
 - (a) purchaser: Liping Ding
development unit: “Strata Lot 111”
purchase price: \$597,900.00
date of purchase agreement: October 12, 2021
 - (b) purchaser: Wai Thing Nicole Wong
development unit: “Strata Lot 74”
purchase price: \$589,900.00
date of purchase agreement: April 9, 2022
 - (c) purchaser: Chung Hei Wong
development unit: “Strata Lot 246”
purchase price: \$1,033,900.00
date of purchase agreement: April 3, 2023

8. The purchase agreements consistently refer to the disclosure statement of the Development (the “Disclosure Statement”) throughout.
9. The Three Purchasers had paid deposit funds to the Developers, to be held in trust pursuant to the *REDMA*, as shown below:
 - (a) Liping Ding: \$89,790.00.
 - (b) Wai Thing Nicole Wong: \$88,485.00.
 - (c) Chung Hei Wong: \$51,696.00.

Completion Date: False acceleration

10. The Disclosure Statement contains an estimated date range of completion of construction (the “Completion Date”) to be in 2024, as shown in the second amendment of the Disclosure Statement dated May 2024.
11. In 2025, the Three Purchasers were surprised to hear about this court proceeding commenced by the Developers’ creditor KingSett Mortgage Corporation against the Developers.
12. As shown in the Petition to the Court filed on January 7, 2025 (the “Petition”), specifically paragraphs 7, 21, 23 and 41 of Part 2 of the document, the Developers had allowed critical insurance and building permits to be suspended, and the Canada Revenue Agency obtained a judgment against them in a significant amount of \$11,996,763.09 on June 30, 2023, demonstrating that the Developers have been experiencing significant cash flow problems since **at least 2023**.
13. Also, as shown in the Petition, specifically paragraph 14 of Part 2 of the document, the Developers failed to pay their creditor as demanded on or about December 27, 2024.
14. Even though the Developers have been experiencing significant cash flow problems since at least 2023, they made representations to the Three Purchasers in 2024, via an amendment to the Disclosure Statement, that construction was progressing well because the Completion Date would be accelerated ahead of the original schedule.
15. The Developers purported to accelerate the Completion Date for several months, from “December 1, 2024 and March 1, 2025” to “July 1, 2024 and October 1, 2024”.
16. In 2025, after learning about this court proceeding, it became clear to the Three Purchasers that the Developers’ representations to them were false.

The suspension of building permits

17. As shown in the Petition, specifically paragraphs 7 and 40 of Part 2 of the document, the Developers had allowed building permits for the Development to be suspended. The City of Burnaby suspended the building permits on or about November 14, 2024.

18. The Developers **did not immediately** file an amendment to the Disclosure Statement with the Superintendent of Real Estate to disclose the suspension of building permits.
19. Also, the Developers did not provide the Three Purchasers with such an amendment within a reasonable time.

Completion Date: Failure to timely disclosure that the date was false

20. On December 3, 2024, the Developers signed an amendment to the Disclosure Statement.
21. The amendment purported to change the Completion Date to the range of “January 15, 2025 and April 15, 2025”.
22. The Developers **did not immediately file** an amendment to the Disclosure Statement with the Superintendent of Real Estate to reflect that the new Completion Date was false. Instead, the Developers waited **7 months** before doing so on November 25, 2025.
23. Also, the Developers did not provide the Three Purchasers with such an amendment until **more than 7 months** after April 15, 2025.
24. Prior to October 2014, the *REDMA* and Policy Statement 1 did not limit the estimated date range of commencement or completion of construction. Effective October 2014, the *REDMA* and Policy Statement 1 have limited the estimated date ranges to no more than 3 months.

Completion Date: Representations prior to the Purchase Agreements

25. Before the Three Purchasers entered into the purchase agreements, the Developers represented to them a construction window of 3.5 years based on the commencement date and the completion date as set out in the Disclosure Statement, as shown below:
 - (a) commencement of construction: June 1, 2021
 - (b) completion of construction: between December 1, 2024 and March 1, 2025.
26. The Developers had even represented that the construction window would be shorter, with the Completion Date to be “July 1, 2024 and October 1, 2024”.
27. There has now been a significant delay of **more than 18 months** to the Completion Date.
28. The Developers’ representations to the Three Purchasers before they entered into the purchase agreements were false.

Amendment to Disclosure Statement dated May 24, 2024

29. On May 24, 2024, the Developers signed an amendment to the Disclosure Statement which relates to the Completion Date, among other material facts.

30. However, the Developers did not provide the Three Purchasers with such an amendment until 4 months after May 2024 (provided on or about September 20, 2024), and not within a reasonable time.

Change of control of the Development

31. On January 8, 2025, KSV Restructuring Inc. (the “Monitor”) was appointed as monitor of the Developers through these court proceedings and was granted control of the Development.
32. The Developers are respondents to these court proceedings.
33. Both the Developers and the Monitor **did not immediately file** an amendment to the Disclosure Statement with the Superintendent of Real Estate to reflect that the Monitor was granted control of the Development. Instead, they waited **10 months** before doing so on November 25, 2025.
34. Also, the Developers and the Monitor did not provide the Three Purchasers with such an amendment until **more than 10 months** after January 8, 2025.

Increase in monthly strata fees

35. On June 17, 2022, the Developers signed an amendment to the Disclosure Statement.
36. The amendment purported to increase the monthly strata fee of the Development Unit from the original amount as set out in Exhibit G of the Disclosure Statement.

Features of the development unit: Representations prior to the Purchase Agreements

37. Before Chung Hei Wong entered into a purchase agreement: The Developers represented to him and his family that the development unit, which is one of the more expensive development units within the Development, would have a large balcony for personal use as one of its main features. However, shortly after the signing of the purchase agreement, Mr. Wong discovered that it was false and that strata planter would occupy space within the balcony without the owner’s permission.
38. The Developers subsequently provided their apology to Mr. Wong and his family on several occasions. The Developers proposed to change a different development unit for him within the same Development. Mr. Wong acted promptly after learning of the misrepresentation to disaffirm the purchase agreement in June 2023.

Financing

39. Due to the existing court proceeding, the Royal Bank of Canada has decided to no longer provide financing to Liping Ding even if he wanted to pay the purchase price.

Part 3: LEGAL BASIS

Real Estate Development Marketing Act (the “REDMA”)

40. Section 23 [of the *REDMA*] provides that a purchase agreement is not enforceable against a purchaser by a developer who has breached [provisions of the *REDMA*], including those relating to disclosure statements.
Pinto v. Revelstoke Mountain Resort Limited Partnership, 2011 BCCA 210 at para. 24;
Chameleon Talent Inc. v. Sandcastle Holdings Ltd., 2010 BCCA 300 at para. 6
41. The *REDMA* is consumer protection legislation. ... Consumer protection legislation is to be interpreted generously in favour of the consumer.
Riegel v. Paraskevopoulos, 2013 BCSC 335 (“*Paraskevopoulos*”) at para. 23;
Mazarei v. Icon Omega Developments Ltd., 2012 BCSC 673 (“*Mazarei*”) at paras. 42, 72, 83 and 90;
Riegel v. Revelstoke Mountain Resort Limited Partnership et al., 2012 BCSC 3 (“*Riegel*”) at para. 21;
Pinto v. Revelstoke Mountain Resort Limited Partnership, 2010 BCSC 422 (“*Pinto*”) at paras. 11, 29 and 32, aff’d 2011 BCCA 210 at paras. 17, 36 and 37
42. The onus is placed on the developer who markets real estate developments in British Columbia to strictly comply with *REDMA* or bear the burden and consequences from the failure to comply with the legislation.
Mazarei at para. 92;
Paraskevopoulos at para. 20;
299 Burrard Residential Limited Partnership v. Essalat, 2012 BCCA 271 (“*299 Burrard*”) at paras. 25 and 27
43. A developer who does not want to be subject to *REDMA* simply does not have to enter the British Columbia marketplace. Consumer protection legislation like *REDMA* is not rendered inoperable because of a developer’s lack of foresight. ... The statutory obligations of *REDMA* impacted [the developer] because it chose to market its development in British Columbia.
Mazarei at paras. 83, 90 and 91
44. The form and content required in a disclosure statement under *REDMA* is provided in the Superintendent’s Policy Statement 1 (“Policy Statement 1”).
Ulansky v. Waterscape Homes Limited Partnership, 2011 BCSC 83 at para. 47;
 Section 14(2)(a) of the *REDMA*;
299 Burrard at para. 16
45. In 2012, the Court of Appeal recommended that the Superintendent give guidance on the word “estimate” in Policy Statement 1. Subsequently, the Superintendent revised Policy Statement 1 by changing the requirement of “State the actual or estimated dates of commencement and completion of construction” to limit the estimated date ranges to not exceeding 3 months.
299 Burrard at paras. 16 and 27;
 Policy Statement 1;
Chameleon Talent Inc. v. Sandcastle Holdings Ltd., 2009 BCSC 1670 at para. 17, aff’d 2010 BCCA 300 at para. 5
46. Section 16(1) of the *REDMA*: If a developer becomes aware that a disclosure statement does not comply with the Act or regulations, or contains a misrepresentation, the developer must **immediately**:
 (a) file with the superintendent, as applicable under subsection (2) or (3),:

- (i) a new disclosure statement; or
 - (ii) an amendment to the disclosure statement that clearly identifies and corrects the failure to comply or the misrepresentation; and
- (b) within a reasonable time after filing a new disclosure statement or an amendment under paragraph (a), provide a copy of [it] to each purchaser
47. *REDMA* provides that the developer has a continuing obligation, even after the presale of the unit, to ensure that the information in the current disclosure statement is accurate. ... The remedies in *REDMA* include a right of rescission ... if a purchaser does not receive the amended disclosure statement that he or she is entitled to receive.
- Riegel* at para. 22;
Pinto at paras. 30 and 31, aff'd 2011 BCCA 210 at paras. 4 and 37;
Watson v. Havaday Developments Inc., 2011 BCSC 505 at para. 24
48. The [amendment to the disclosure statement] may or may not have been significant to the purchasers, but as the law stands, a developer is not excused from strict compliance with the statutory disclosure requirements simply because the amendments appear to be insignificant to the developer.
- Paraskevopoulos* at para. 20
49. Informal updates and newsletters [to purchasers] do not satisfy the [*REDMA*].
- 299 Burrard* at paras. 24 and 25;
Chameleon Talent Inc. v. Sandcastle Holdings Ltd., 2010 BCCA 300 at paras. 11 and 12
50. Nothing in the [*REDMA*] requires a purchaser who does not receive an amendment [to the disclosure statement] to demonstrate that the receipt of the amendment would have led to a different course of action. The right of rescission or the right to resist enforcement of the purchase agreement arises automatically on the developer's non-compliance with the *Act*. That, too, is consistent with the purpose of such consumer protection legislation.
- Pinto* at paras. 32, 34 and 35, aff'd 2011 BCCA 210 at paras. 4, 17, 36 and 37;
299 Burrard at para. 25
51. Also, a purchaser's motive is irrelevant. If the purchaser was entitled in law to refuse to complete, it matters not why it decided to do so.
- Jaspaul S. Sandhu Enterprises Ltd. v. Penner*, 2012 BCSC 856 at paras. 1, 4, 16 and 29;
Pinto at paras. 32, 34 and 35, aff'd 2011 BCCA 210 at paras. 4, 17, 36 and 37
52. The purchaser is entitled to return of the deposit.
- 299 Burrard* at paras. 6, 24 and 26;
Paraskevopoulos at para. 23;
Mazarei at paras. 41 and 93

Innocent misrepresentation

53. The remedy for innocent misrepresentation is rescission. Damages are not available for innocent misrepresentation.
- Meslin v. Lee*, 2011 BCSC 1208 at para. 109;
Palcic v. Sadek, 2012 BCSC 1651 at para. 106
54. Section 22(3)(a) of the *REDMA*: If a developer files a disclosure statement respecting a development property and the disclosure statement contains a misrepresentation, a purchaser of a development unit in the development property, whether the purchaser received the disclosure statement or not, is deemed to have relied on the misrepresentation.

Suitable for summary trial

55. Rule 16-1(18) of the *Supreme Court Civil Rules*: Without limiting the court’s right under Rule 22-1(7)(d) to transfer the proceeding referred to in this rule to the trial list, the court may, whether or not on the application of a party, apply any other of these Supreme Court Civil Rules to a proceeding referred to in this rule.
56. Rule 9-7(2)(a) of the *Supreme Court Civil Rules*: A party may apply to the court for judgment under this rule, either on an issue or generally, in an action in which a response to civil claim has been filed.
57. There is growing support for alternative adjudication of disputes and a developing consensus that the traditional balance struck by extensive pre-trial processes and the conventional trial no longer reflects the modern reality and needs to be re-adjusted. A proper balance requires simplified and proportionate procedures for adjudication, and impacts the role of counsel and judges. This balance must recognize that a process can be fair and just, without the expense and delay of a trial, and that alternative models of adjudication are no less legitimate than the conventional trial.
- Ferrer v. 589557 B.C. Ltd.*, 2020 BCCA 83 at para. 26;
Kolny (Litigation Guardian of) v. Moghaddam, 2021 BCSC 1243 (“*Kolny*”) at para. 42, aff’d 2021 BCCA 309 at paras. 23, 75 and 80;
Archibald (Ivy League Developments) v. Wojtarowicz, 2020 BCSC 421 (“*Archibald*”) at para. 26
58. The onus is on the party who asserts that the matter is not suitable for a determination by a summary trial to demonstrate unsuitability.
- iFortune Homes Inc. v. 1011066 B.C. Ltd.*, 2024 BCSC 1974 (“*iFortune*”) at para. 7;
Garcha v. Grewal, 2024 BCSC 746 (“*Garcha*”) at para. 35;
Kolny at para. 48, aff’d 2021 BCCA 309 at paras. 23, 75 and 80
59. Cases will be decided summarily if the court is able to find the facts necessary for that purpose, even though there may be disputed issues of fact and law.
- Gichuru v. Pallai*, 2013 BCCA 60 at para. 30;
Kolny at para. 47, aff’d 2021 BCCA 309 at paras. 23, 75 and 80;
A.A.A. Aluminum Products Ltd. v. Grafos, 2015 BCSC 2128 (“*A.A.A.*”) at para. 7;
Tassone v. Cardinal, 2014 BCCA 149 (“*Tassone*”) at para. 39
60. Even if there is no direct evidence addressing the issue of the matter, the court can still refer to indirect evidence to find the facts necessary to decide the matter summarily.
- Lee v. Chau*, 2021 BCSC 70 (“*Lee*”) at paras. 12, 26, 27, 65 and 67,
 aff’d 2021 BCCA 474 at paras. 14 – 17;
McRae Management Ltd. v. Breezy Properties Ltd., 2008 BCSC 870 at paras. 1, 9, 10 and 68 – 80
61. There does not need to be an assessment of credibility on facts that are not in dispute.
- Schuler v. Melo-Saville Holdings Inc.*, 2023 BCSC 623 (“*Schuler*”) at paras. 19, 24 and 25
62. Even if the party who asserts the matter is not suitable for a determination by a summary trial has argued that evidentiary conflicts demand an assessment of the parties’ credibility, other admissible evidence may make it possible to find the facts necessary to grant judgment such that credibility is not a critical factor.
- Lee* at paras. 10, 22, 23 and 27, aff’d 2021 BCCA 474 at paras. 14 – 17;
A.A.A. at para. 7;
Mathieson v. Aiken, 2023 BCSC 535 (“*Mathieson*”) at paras. 1 – 3, 22, 23, 31, 37 and 38;

- Kim v. Best*, 2022 BCSC 1128 (“*Kim*”) at paras. 1, 2, 9 – 13, 16, 17, 39, 54 – 58, 60 and 73;
Spiering v. Trevor, 2012 BCSC 1653 at paras. 37 and 40 – 50
63. There is a difference between circumstances where the court cannot find the facts ... and a case where there are gaps in the evidence because a party who bears the onus has not put forward evidence to discharge that party’s burden of proof. In the latter circumstances, the answer is not to refuse to determine the case summarily because the evidence is insufficient and instead order a conventional trial, the answer is to determine the matter taking into account that the party who has an onus on an issue has not discharged it.
Garcha at paras. 42, 44, 45, 54, 55 and 58;
Tassone at paras. 1, 27, 40 and 44
64. If the disputes on certain issues are how to apply the law to mostly undisputed facts, instead of disputes of facts, then those disputes do not preclude summary trial determination.
iFortune at paras. 32, 35, 36 and 47
65. There is no rule that discovery must always take place before a matter can be dealt with by way of summary trial, and arguing with the aid of the discovery process that something might turn up is insufficient to defeat a summary trial application.
Khonsari at para. 30;
Tassone at para. 38
Mathieson at para. 34
66. Even if the amounts in issue are such that the matter could bare the cost of a conventional trial, large amounts in issue do not preclude a summary trial or make a conventional trial the only appropriate means of proceeding. Such a conclusion is contrary to Rule 1-3(1) of the *Supreme Court Civil Rules* that provides that every matter is to be determined on its merits in the manner that is most speedy, inexpensive and just in the circumstances.
iFortune at paras. 44, 45 and 47;
University of British Columbia v. Kapelus, 2012 BCSC 486 at para. 25,
aff’d 2014 BCCA 42 at para. 28
67. A multi-day summary trial does not make summary trial unsuitable for the matter.
Schuler at paras. 9, 24 and 25
68. Not all of the listed factors for assessing suitability for summary trial will be relevant in every case. They are not to be used in a checklist approach.
Kolny at paras. 44 and 45, aff’d 2021 BCCA 309 at paras. 23, 75 and 80;
Ferrer v. Janik, 2020 BCCA 83 at paras. 27 and 28

Part 4: MATERIAL TO BE RELIED ON

1. Affidavit #1 of Chung Hei Wong, made and filed April 7, 2026;
2. Affidavit #1 of Liping Ding, made and filed April 7, 2026;
3. Affidavit #1 of Wai Thing Nicole Wong, made and filed April 7, 2026;
4. Petition to the Court, filed January 7, 2025; and
5. Such further and other material as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court may accept.

TO THE PERSONS RECEIVING THIS NOTICE OF APPLICATION: If you wish to respond to this notice of application, you must, within 5 business days after service of this notice of application or, if this application is brought under Rule 9-7, within 8 business days after service of this notice of application,

- (a) file an application response in Form 33,
- (b) file the original of every affidavit, and of every other document, that
 - (i) you intend to refer to at the hearing of this application, and
 - (ii) has not already been filed in this proceeding, and
- (c) serve on the applicant 2 copies of the following, and on every other party of record one copy of the following:
 - (i) a copy of the filed application response;
 - (ii) a copy of the filed affidavits and other documents that you intend to refer to at the hearing of this application and that has not already been served on that person;
 - (iii) if this application is brought under Rule 9-7, any notice that you are required to give under Rule 9-7(9).

The applicants' ADDRESS FOR SERVICE is:

ATAC Law Corporation
Barristers & Solicitors
308-8988 Fraserton Court
Burnaby, British Columbia, V5J 5H8

E-mail address for service: Service by e-mail will only be accepted if sent to both james@ataclaw.ca and service@ataclaw.ca

Date: April 22, 2026



 Signature of JAMES UN
 applicant lawyer for applicant(s)

To be completed by the court only:

Order Made:

in the terms requested in paragraphs of Part 1 of this Notice of Application

with the following variations and additional terms:

.....

.....

.....

Date: Signature of Judge Associate Judge

Appendix

THIS APPLICATION INVOLVES THE FOLLOWING:

- discovery: comply with demand for documents
- discovery: production of additional documents
- extend oral discovery
- other matter concerning oral discovery
- amend pleadings
- add/change parties
- summary judgment
- summary trial
- service
- mediation
- adjournments
- proceedings at trial
- case plan orders: amend
- case plan orders: other
- experts
- none of the above

SCHEDULE "A"
SERVICE LIST

See attached.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

BETWEEN:

KINGSETT MORTGAGE CORPORATION

PETITIONER

AND:

**LUMINA ECLIPSE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
BETA VIEW HOMES LTD.
LUMINA ECLIPSE GP LTD.
and
D-THIND DEVELOPMENT BETA LTD.**

RESPONDENTS

SERVICE LIST

(As of March 30, 2026)

Counsel for the Petitioner, KingSett Mortgage Corporation	Counsel for the Monitor, KSV Restructuring Inc.
Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP Suite 3000, Bentall 4 1055 Dunsmuir Street Vancouver, BC V7X 1K8	Bennett Jones LLP Suite 2500, 666 Burrard Street Vancouver, BC V6C 2X8
Mary Buttery, K.C. Direct: 604.692.2752 Email: mbuttery@osler.com	Sean Zweig Direct: 416.777.6254 Email: zweigs@bennettjones.com
Emma Newbery Direct: 778.785.2738 Email: enewbery@osler.com	Andrew Froh Direct: 604.891.5166 Email: froha@bennettjones.com
Lucas Hodgson Direct: 236.466.2843 Email: lhodgson@osler.com	Joshua Foster Direct: 416.777.7906 Email: fosterj@bennettjones.com

<p>Counsel for the Respondents</p> <p>Richards Buell Sutton LLP Suite 700, 401 West Georgia Street Vancouver, BC V6B 5A1</p> <p>Aneez Devji Direct: 604.909.9301 Email: adevji@rbs.ca</p> <p>Dan Nugent Direct: 604.595.9917 Email: dnugent@rbs.ca</p> <p>Ryan Shaw Direct: 604.909.9312 Email: rshaw@rbs.ca</p> <p>Dolu Aluko Direct: 604.909.9306 Email: daluko@rbs.ca</p> <p>Diana Manuel Direct: 604.595.9918 Email: dmanuel@rbs.ca</p>	<p>KSV Restructuring Inc. 220 Bay Street, 13th Floor, PO Box 20 Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W4</p> <p>Noah Goldstein Direct: 416.932.6207 Email: ngoldstein@ksvadvisory.com</p> <p>Jason Knight Direct: 587.287.2605 Email: jknight@ksvadvisory.com</p> <p>Maha Shah Direct: 587.287.9958 Email: mshah@ksvadvisory.com</p>
<p>Coast Capital Savings Federal Credit Union</p> <p>2515 – 1075 West Georgia Street Vancouver, BC V6E 3C9</p> <p>Sal Toor, Managing Director, Loan Syndications and Mezzanine Financing Email: sal.toor@coastcapitalsavings.com</p> <p>John Muth Email: john.muth@coastcapitalsavings.com</p>	<p>Counsel for Coast Capital Savings Federal Credit Union</p> <p>Owen Bird Law Corporation 2900 – 733 Seymour Street Vancouver, BC V6B 0S6</p> <p>Alan A. Frydenlund Direct: 604.691.7511 Email: afrydenlund@owenbird.com</p>

<p>The Owners of Strata Plan EPS6882</p> <p>400 – 11950 80th Avenue Delta, BC V4C 1Y2</p> <p>With a copy to: Dwell Property Management Suite 170, 4311 Viking Way Richmond, BC V6V 2K9</p>	<p>Counsel for The Owners, Strata Plan EPS6882</p> <p>Bleay Both Uppal LLP 700 – 1155 West Pender Street Vancouver, BC V6E 2P4</p> <p>Jamie A. Bleay Direct: 604.801.6029 Email: jbleay@bbulaw.ca</p>
<p>Shezmin Kurshid Alam Khan</p> <p>3508 – 1372 Seymour Street Vancouver, BC V6B 0L1</p>	<p>Counsel for Clearbrook Iron Works Ltd.</p> <p>Baker Newby LLP 200 – 2955 Gladwin Road Abbotsford, BC V2T 5T4</p> <p>Adnan N. Habib Email: ahabib@bakernewby.com</p>
<p>Mega Cranes Ltd. 6330 148 Street Surrey, BC V3S 3C4 Attn: Arthur Thornhill</p> <p>Email: paralegal@megacranes.com</p>	<p>Super Save Fence Rentals Inc.</p> <p>19395 Langley Bypass Surrey, BC V3S 6K1</p>
<p>Counsel for the Superintendent of Real Estate</p> <p>BC Financial Services Authority 600 – 750 West Pender Street Vancouver, BC V6C 2T8</p> <p>Kyle Ferguson Direct: 778.725.0755 Email: kyle.ferguson@bcfsa.ca</p>	<p>Federal Crown</p> <p>Department of Justice Canada British Columbia Regional Office 900 – 840 Howe Street Vancouver, BC V6Z 2S9</p> <p>Aminollah Sabzevari Direct: 587.930.5282 Email: aminollah.sabzevari@justice.gc.ca</p> <p>Nikhil Pandey Email: nikhil.pandey@justice.gc.ca</p> <p>Khanh Gonzalez Email: khanh.gonzalez@justice.gc.ca</p>

<p>Provincial Crown</p> <p>Ministry of the Attorney General (British Columbia) Legal Services Branch, Ministry of Attorney General PO Box 9280 Stn Prov Govt Victoria, BC V8W 9J7</p> <p>Email: AGLSBRevTaxInsolvency@gov.bc.ca</p>	<p>Bank of Montreal</p> <p>2nd Floor, 234 Simcoe Street Toronto Ontario M5T 1T4</p>
<p>Counsel to Westmount Guarantee Services Inc.</p> <p>Lawson Lundell LLP 1600 – 925 West Georgia Street Vancouver, BC V6C 3L2</p> <p>Bryan Gibbons Email: bgibbons@lawsonlundell.com</p> <p>Mandeep Dhaliwal Email: mdhaliwal@lawsonlundell.com</p> <p>Candace Formosa Email: cformosa@lawsonlundell.com</p>	<p>Counsel to A & B Tool Rentals Ltd.</p> <p>Sportschuetz & Company Law Corporation 315 – 63 West 6th Avenue Vancouver, BC V5Y 1K2</p> <p>Adrian D. Greer Direct: 604.262.3791 Email: adrian@sportschuetz.ca</p>
<p>Counsel to D-Third Development Beta Ltd. and D-Third Development Ltd.</p> <p>McQuarrie Hunter LLP Suite 1500, 13450 102 Avenue Surrey, BC V3T 5X3</p> <p>Dan A. T. Moseley Direct: 604.580.7022 Email: dmoseley@mcquarrie.com</p>	<p>BOXX Modular LP 21690 Smith Crescent Langley, BC V2Y 0W6</p> <p>Nancy Jarman Email: njarman@blackdiamondgroup.com</p>

<p>Counsel to Kone Inc.</p> <p>Whitelaw Twining 2400 – 200 Granville Street Vancouver, BC V6C 1S4</p> <p>Alexandre Maltas Direct: 604.891.7235 Email: amaltas@wt.ca</p>	<p>Counsel to AVI Masonry Ltd.</p> <p>Raj Dhillon Law Corporation 203 – 8078 128 Street Surrey, BC V3W 4E9</p> <p>Rajwinder Dhillon Tel: 604.593.3930 Email: raj@rajdhillonlaw.ca</p>
<p>RAM Geotechnical Engineering Ltd. 220 – 18 Gostick Place North Vancouver, BC V7M 3G3</p> <p>Ting You Koh Email: tingyou.koh@ramconsulting.com</p>	<p>Counsel to Group Security Services Ltd.</p> <p>McKechnie & Company 300 – 1122 Mainland Street Vancouver, BC V6B 5L1</p> <p>Philip Di Tomaso Tel: 604.800.2690 Email: phil@mckechnie.bc.ca</p>
<p>Counsel to Han Appliances & Refrigeration Ltd.</p> <p>Whitelaw Twining 2400 – 200 Granville Street Vancouver, BC V6C 1S4</p> <p>May Mehrabi Direct: 604.891.7280 Email: mmehrabi@wt.ca</p>	<p>Counsel to Midland Appliance Ltd.</p> <p>Borden Ladner Gervais LLP 1200 – 200 Burrard Street Vancouver, BC V7X 1T2</p> <p>Blair Rebane Direct: 604.640.4130 Email: brebane@blg.com</p>
<p>Government of British Columbia – Ministry of Finance Receivables Management Office 1802 Douglas Street, 6th Floor Victoria, BC V8T 4K6</p> <p>Heather Kurbatoff Email: heather.kurbatoff@gov.bc.ca</p>	<p>Counsel to Bank of Montreal</p> <p>Lawson Lundell LLP Suite 1600, Cathedral Place 925 West Georgia Street Vancouver, BC V6C 3L2</p> <p>William L. Roberts Direct: 604.631.9163 Email: wroberts@lawsonlundell.com</p>

<p>Right Touch Construction Ltd. PO Box 2569 STN A Abbotsford, BC V2T 6R3</p> <p>Attention: Kewal Singh Gill</p>	<p>Daljit Thind</p> <p>Tel. No.: 604.451.7780</p> <p>Email: daljit@thind.ca</p> <p><i>A Director of the Respondents</i></p>
<p>Mingkang Hu Airport Square Unit 1530 - 1200 West 73rd Ave. Vancouver, BC V6P 6G5</p> <p><i>A Former Director of Beta View Homes Ltd. and Current Director of Lumina Eclipse GP Ltd.</i></p>	<p>Counsel to Certain Purchasers</p> <p>ATAC Law Corporation 308 – 8988 Fraserston Court Burnaby, BC V5J 5H8</p> <p>James Un Tel: 604.519.0660 Email: james@ataclaw.ca service@ataclaw.ca</p>
<p>Counsel to Certain Purchasers</p> <p>Harper Grey LLP 3200 – 650 West Georgia Street Vancouver, British Columbia V6B 4P7</p> <p>Bryan G. Baynham, K.C. Direct: 604.895.2802 Email: bbaynham@harpergrey.com</p> <p>Daniel L. R. Yaverbaum Direct: 604.895.2933 Email: dyaverbaum@harpergrey.com</p>	

EMAIL SERVICE LIST

mattery@osler.com; enewbery@osler.com; lhodgson@osler.com; zweigs@bennettjones.com;
froha@bennettjones.com; fosterj@bennettjones.com; morenoe@bennettjones.com;
adevji@rbs.ca; dnugent@rbs.ca; rshaw@rbs.ca; daluko@rbs.ca; dmanuel@rbs.ca;
ngoldstein@ksvadvisory.com; jknights@ksvadvisory.com; mshah@ksvadvisory.com;
sal.toor@coastcapitalsavings.com; john.muth@coastcapitalsavings.com;
afrydenlund@owenbird.com; paralegal@megacranes.com; kyle.ferguson@bcfsa.ca;
jbleay@bbulaw.ca; ahabib@bakernewby.com; aminollah.sabzevari@justice.gc.ca;
nikhil.pandey@justice.gc.ca; khanh.gonzalez@justice.gc.ca; bgibbons@lawsonlundell.com;
mdhaliwal@lawsonlundell.com; cformosa@lawsonlundell.com;
AGLSBRevTaxInsolvency@gov.bc.ca; adrian@sportschuetz.ca; dmoseley@mcquarrie.com;
njarman@blackdiamondgroup.com; amaltas@wt.ca; raj@rajdhillonlaw.ca;
tingyou.koh@ramconsulting.com; phil@mckechnie.bc.ca; mmehrabi@wt.ca; brebane@blg.com;
heather.kurbatoff@gov.bc.ca; wroberts@lawsonlundell.com; daljit@thind.ca; james@ataclaw.ca;
service@ataclaw.ca; bbaynham@harpergrey.com; dyaverbaum@harpergrey.com