

2024

Hfx No. 538745

SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA

BETWEEN:

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES CREDITORS
ARRANGEMENT ACT, RSC 1985, C C-36, AS AMENDED (THE
“CCAA”)

AND IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION OF BLUE
LOBSTER CAPITAL LIMITED, 3284906 NOVA SCOTIA
LIMITED, 3343533 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED AND 4318682
NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED (COLLECTIVELY, THE
“APPLICANTS”)

BRIEF OF AUTHORITIES

November 3, 2025

RECONSTRUCT LLP
80 Richmond Street West
Unit 1700
Toronto, ON M5H 2 A4

Sharon Kour
skour@reconllp.com
Tel: 416.597.6477

Natasha Rambaran
nrambaran@reconllp.com
Tel: 416.587.1439
Counsel for KSV Restructuring Inc., in its
capacity as Court-Appointed Monitor of
the Applicants

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES CREDITORS
ARRANGEMENT ACT, RSC 1985, C C-36, AS AMENDED (THE
“CCAA”)

AND IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION OF BLUE
LOBSTER CAPITAL LIMITED, 3284906 NOVA SCOTIA
LIMITED, 3343533 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED AND 4318682
NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED (COLLECTIVELY, THE
“APPLICANTS”)

BRIEF OF AUTHORITIES

1. *Re Nelson Education Limited*, [2015 ONSC 5557](#)
2. *Re Bloom Lake*, [2015 QCCS 1920](#)
3. *Target Canada Co (Re)*, [2015 ONSC 1487](#)
4. *Re Veris Gold Corp*, [2015 BCSC 1204](#)
5. *Re Quest University Canada (Re)*, [2020 BCSC 1883](#)
6. *Re Canwest Publishing Inc*, [2010 ONSC 2870](#)
7. *Royal Bank of Canada v Soundair Corp*, [1991 CanLII 2727](#)
8. *Sierra Club of Canada v Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [2002 SCC 41](#)
9. *Sherman Estate v Donovan*, [2021 SCC 25](#)
10. *AbitibiBowater inc (Arrangement relatif à)*, [2009 QCCS 6461](#)
11. *Re Target Canada Co*, [2015 ONSC 7574](#)

CITATION: Nelson Education Limited (Re), 2015 ONSC 5557
COURT FILE NO.: CV15-10961-00CL
DATE: 20150908

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
COMMERCIAL LIST**

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

**AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF NELSON EDUCATION LTD. AND
NELSON EDUCATION HOLDINGS LTD.**

Applicants

BEFORE: Newbould J.

COUNSEL: *Benjamin Zarnett, Jessica Kimmel and Caroline Descours*, for the Applicants

Robert W. Staley, Kevin J. Zych and Sean Zweig, for the First Lien Agent and the First Lien Steering Committee

John L. Finnigan, D.J. Miller and Kyla E.M. Mahar, for Royal Bank of Canada

Orestes Pasparaskis, for the Monitor

HEARD: August 13 and 27, 2015

ENDORSEMENT

[1] The applicants Nelson Education Ltd. (“Nelson”) and Nelson Education Holdings Ltd. sought and obtained protection under the CCAA on May 12, 2015. They now apply for approval of the sale of substantially all of the assets and business of Nelson to a newly incorporated entity to be owned indirectly by Nelson’s first ranked secured lenders (the “first lien lenders”) pursuant to a credit bid made by the first lien agent. Nelson also seeks ancillary orders relating to the sale.

The effect of the credit bid, if approved, is that the second lien lenders will receive nothing for their outstanding loans.

[2] RBC is one of 22 first lien lenders, a second lien lender and agent for the second lien lenders. At the time of its motion to replace the Monitor, RBC did not accept that the proposed sale should be approved. RBC now takes no position on the sale approval motion other than to oppose certain ancillary relief sought by the applicants. RBC also has moved for an order that certain amounts said to be owing to it and their portion of a consent fee should be paid by Nelson prior to the completion of the sale. The applicants and the first lien lenders oppose the relief sought by RBC.

Nelson business

[3] Nelson is a Canadian education publishing company, providing learning solutions to universities, colleges, students, teachers, professors, libraries, government agencies, schools, professionals and corporations across the country.

[4] The business and assets of Nelson were acquired by an OMERS entity and certain other funds from the Thomson Corporation in 2007 together with U.S. assets of Thomson for U.S. \$7.75 billion, of which US\$550 million was attributed to the Canadian business. The purchase was financed with first lien debt of approximately US\$311.5 million and second lien debt of approximately US\$171.3 million.

[5] The maturity date under the first lien credit agreement was July 3, 2014 and the maturity date under the second lien credit agreement was July 3, 2015. Nelson has not paid the principal balances owing under either loan. It paid interest on the first lien credit up to the filing of this CCAA application. It has paid no interest on the second lien credit since April 2014. As of the filing date, Nelson was indebted in the aggregate principal amounts of approximately US\$269 million, plus accrued interest, costs and fees, under the first lien credit agreement and

approximately US\$153 million, plus accrued interest, costs and fees, under the second lien credit agreement.

[6] Because these loans are denominated in U.S. dollars, the recent decline in the Canadian dollar against the United States dollar has significantly increased the Canadian dollar balance of the loans. Nelson generates substantially all of its revenue in Canadian dollars and is not hedged against currency fluctuations. Based on an exchange rate of CAD/USD of 1.313, as of August 10, 2015, the Canadian dollar principal balances of the first and second lien loans are \$352,873,910 and \$201,176,237.

[7] According to Mr. Greg Nordal, the CEO of Nelson, the business of Nelson has been affected by a general decline in the education markets over the past few years. Notwithstanding the industry decline over the past few years, Nelson has maintained strong EBITDA over each of the last several years.

Discussions leading to the sale to the first lien lenders

[8] In March 2013, Nelson engaged Alvarez & Marsal Canada Securities ULC (“A&M”), the Canadian corporate finance arm of Alvarez & Marsal to assist it in reviewing and considering potential strategic alternatives. RBC, the second lien agent also engaged a financial advisor in March 2013 and the first lien steering committee engaged a financial advisor in June 2013. RBC held approximately 85% of the second lien debt.

[9] Commencing in April 2013, Nelson and its advisors entered into discussions with stakeholders including the RBC as second lien agent, the first lien steering committee and their advisors. Nelson sought to achieve as its primary objective a consensual transaction that would be supported by all of the first lien lenders and second lien lenders. These discussions took place until September 2014. No agreement with the first lien lenders and second lien lenders was reached.

[10] In April 2014, Nelson and the second lien lenders agreed to two extensions of the cure period under the second lien credit agreement in respect of the second lien interest payment due on March 31, 2014, to May 30, 2014. In connection with these extensions, Nelson made a partial payment of US\$350,000 in respect of the March interest payment and paid certain professional fees of the second lien lenders. Nelson requested a further extension of the second lien cure period beyond May 30, 2014, but the second lien lenders did not agree. Thereafter, Nelson defaulted under the second lien credit agreement and failed to make further interest payments to the second lien lenders.

[11] The first lien credit agreement matured on July 3, 2014. On July 7, 2014, Nelson proposed an amendment and extension of that agreement and solicited consent from its first lien lenders. RBC, as one of the first lien lenders was prepared to consent to the Nelson proposal, being a consent and support agreement, but no agreement was reached with the other first lien lenders and it did not proceed.

[12] In September, 2014, Nelson proposed in a term sheet to the first lien lenders a transaction framework for a sale or restructuring of the business on the terms set out in a term sheet dated September 10, 2014 and sought their support. In connection with the first lien term sheet, Nelson entered into a first lien support agreement with first lien lenders representing approximately 88% of the principal amounts outstanding under the first lien credit agreement. The consenting first lien lenders comprised 21 of the 22 first lien lenders, the only first lien lender not consenting being RBC. Consent fees of approximately US\$12 million have been paid to the consenting first lien lenders.

[13] The first lien term sheet provided that Nelson would conduct a comprehensive and open sale or investment sales process (SISP) to attempt to identify one or more potential purchasers of, or investors in, the Nelson business on terms that would provide for net sale or investment proceeds sufficient to pay in full all obligations under the first lien credit agreement or that was otherwise acceptable to first lien lenders holding at least 66 2/3% of the outstanding obligations under the first lien credit agreement. If such a superior offer was not identified pursuant to the

SISP, the first lien lenders would become the purchaser and purchase substantially all of the assets of Nelson in exchange for the conversion by all of the first lien lenders of all of the debt owing to them under the first lien credit agreement into a new first lien term facility and for common shares of the purchaser.

[14] In September 2014, the company engaged A&M to assist with the SISP. By that time, A&M had been advising the Company for over 17 months and had gained an understanding of the Nelson Business and the educational publishing industry. The SISP was structured as a two-phase process.

[15] Phase 1 involved (i) contacting 168 potential purchasers, including both financial and strategic parties located in Canada, the United States and Europe, and 11 potential lenders to ascertain their potential interest in a transaction, (ii) initial due diligence and (iii) receipt by Nelson of non-binding letters of interest ("LOIs"). The SISP provided that interested parties could propose a purchase of the whole or parts of the business or an investment in Nelson.

[16] Seven potential purchasers submitted LOIs under phase 1, six of which were offers to purchase substantially all of the Nelson business and one of which was an offer to acquire only the K-12 business. Nelson reviewed the LOIs with the assistance of its advisors, and following consultation with the first lien steering committee and its advisors, invited five of the parties that submitted LOIs to phase 2 of the SISP. Phase 2 of the SISP involved additional due diligence, data room access and management presentations aimed at completion of binding documentation for a superior offer.

[17] Three participants submitted non-binding offers by the deadline of December 19, 2014, two of which were for the purchase of substantially all of the Nelson business and one of which was for the acquisition of the K-12 business. All three offers remained subject to further due diligence and reflected values that were significantly below the value of the obligations under the first lien credit agreement.

[18] On December 19, 2014, one of the participants advised A&M that it required additional time to complete and submit its offer, which additional time was granted. An offer was subsequently submitted but not ultimately advanced by the bidder.

[19] Nelson, with the assistance of its advisors, maintained communications throughout its restructuring efforts with Cengage Learnings, the company that has the U.S. business that was sold by Thomson and which is a key business partner of Nelson. Cengage submitted an expression of interest for the higher education business that, even in combination with the offer received for the K-12 business, was substantially lower than the amount of the first lien debt. In February 2015, Cengage and Nelson terminated discussions about a potential sale transaction.

[20] Ultimately, phase 2 of the SISP did not result in a transaction that would generate proceeds sufficient to repay the obligations under the first lien credit agreement in full or would otherwise be supported by the first lien lenders. Accordingly, with the assistance of A&M and its legal advisors, and in consultation with the first lien steering committee, Nelson determined that it should proceed with the sale transaction pursuant to the first lien support agreement.

Sale transaction

[21] The sale transaction is an asset purchase. It will enable the Nelson business to continue as a going concern. It includes:

- (a) the transfer of substantially all of Nelson's assets to a newly incorporated entity to be owned indirectly by the first lien lenders;
- (b) the assumption by the purchaser of substantially all of Nelson's trade payables, contractual obligations and employment obligations incurred in the ordinary course and as reflected in its balance sheet, excluding some obligations including the obligations under the second lien credit agreement and an intercompany promissory note of approximately \$102.3 million owing by Nelson to Nelson Education Holdings Ltd.;

- (c) an offer of employment by the purchaser to all of Nelson's employees; and
- (d) a release by the first lien lenders of all of the indebtedness owing under the first lien credit agreement in exchange for: (i) 100% of the common shares of a newly incorporated entity that will own 100% of the common shares of the purchaser, and (ii) the obligations under a new US\$200 million first lien term facility to be entered into by the Purchaser.

[22] The relief sought by the applicants apart from the approval of the sale transaction involves ancillary relief, including authorizing the distribution from Nelson's cash on hand to the first lien lenders of outstanding fees and interest, effecting mutual releases of parties associated with the sale transaction, and deeming a shareholders' rights agreement to bind all shareholders of the purchaser. This ancillary relief is opposed by RBC.

Analysis

(i) Sale approval

[23] RBC says it takes no position on the sale, although it opposes some of the terms and seeks an order paying the second lien lenders their pre-filing interest and expense claims. Whether RBC is entitled to raise the issues that it has requires a consideration of the intercreditor agreement of July 5, 2007 made between the agents for the first lien lenders and the second lien lenders.

[24] Section 6.1(a) of the intercreditor agreement provides that the second lien lenders shall not object to or oppose a sale and of the collateral and shall be deemed to have consented to it if the first lien claimholders have consented to it. It provides:

The Second Lien Collateral Agent on behalf of the Second Lien Claimholders agrees that it will raise no objection or oppose a sale or other disposition of any Collateral free and clear of its Liens and other claims under Section 363 of the

Bankruptcy Code (or any similar provision of any other Bankruptcy Law or any order of a court of competent jurisdiction) if the First Lien Claimholders have consented to such sale or disposition of such assets and the Second Lien Collateral Agent and each other Second Lien Claimholder will be deemed to have consented under Section 363 of the Bankruptcy Code (or any similar provision of any other Bankruptcy Law or any order of a court of competent jurisdiction) to any sale supported by the First Lien Claimholders and to have released their Liens in such assets. (underlining added)

[25] Section 6.11 of the intercreditor agreement contained a similar provision. RBC raises the point that for these two sections to be applicable, the first lien claimholders must have consented to the sale, and that the definition of first lien claimholders means that all of the first lien lenders must have consented to the sale. In this case, only 88% of the first lien lenders consented to the sale, the lone holdout being RBC. The definition in the intercreditor agreement of first lien claimholder is as follows:

“First Lien Claimholders” means, at any relevant time, the holders of First Lien Obligations at that time, including the First Lien Collateral Agent, the First Lien Lenders, any other “Secured Party” (as defined in the First Lien Credit Agreement) and the agents under the First Lien Loan Documents.

[26] The intercreditor agreement is governed by the New York law and is to be construed and enforced in accordance with that law. The first lien agent filed an opinion of Allan L. Gropper, a former bankruptcy judge in the Southern District of New York and undoubtedly highly qualified to express proper expert opinions regarding the matters in issue. Mr. Gropper did not, however, discuss the principles of interpretation of a commercial contract under New York law, and in the absence of such evidence, I am to take the law of New York so far as contract interpretation is concerned as the same as our law. In any event, New York law regarding the interpretation of a contract would appear to be the same as our law. See *Cruden v. Bank of N.Y.*, 957 F.2d 961, 976 (2d Cir. 1992) and *Rainbow v. Swisher*, 72 N.Y. 2d 106, 531 N.Y.S. 775, 527 N.E.2d 258 (1988).

Mr. Gropper did opine that the sections in question are valid and enforceable in accordance with their terms.¹

[27] The intercreditor agreement, like a lot of complex commercial contracts, appears to have a hodgepodge of terms piled on, or added to, one another, with many definitions and exceptions to exceptions. That is what too often appears to happen when too many lawyers are involved in stirring the broth. It is clear that there are many definitions, including a reference to First Lien Lenders, which is defined to be the Lenders as defined in the First Lien Loan Documents, which is itself a defined term, meaning the First Lien Credit Agreement and the Loan Documents. The provisions of the first lien credit agreement make clear that the Lenders include all those who have lent under that agreement, including obviously RBC.

[28] Under section 8.02(d) of the first lien credit agreement, more than 50% of the first lien lenders (the “Required Lenders”) may direct the first lien agent to exercise on behalf of the first lien lenders all rights and remedies available to. In this case 88% of the first lien lenders, being all except RBC, directed the first lien agent to credit bid all of the first lien debt. This credit bid was thus made on behalf of all of the first lien lenders, including RBC.

[29] While the definition of First Lien Claimholders is expansive and refers to both the First Lien Collateral Agent (the first lien agent) and the First Lien Lenders, suggesting a distinction between the two, once the Required Lenders have caused a credit bid to be made by the First Lien Collateral Agent, RBC in my view is taken to have supported the sale that is contemplated by the credit bid.

¹ I do not think that Mr. Gropper’s views on what particular sections of the agreement meant is the proper subject of expert opinion on foreign law. Such an expert should confine his evidence to a statement of what the law is and how it applies generally and not express his opinion on the very facts in issue before the court. See my comments in *Nortel Networks Corp. (Re)* (2014), 20 C.B.R. (6th) 171 para. 103.

[30] It follows that RBC is deemed under section 6.11 of the intercreditor agreement to have consented to the sale supported by the first lien claimholders. It is nevertheless required that I determine whether the sale and its terms should be approved. It is also important to note that no sale agreement has been signed and it awaits an order approving the form of Asset Purchase Agreement submitted by Nelson in its motion materials.

[31] This is an unusual CCAA case. It involves the acquisition of the Nelson business by its senior secured creditors under a credit bid made after a SISP conducted before any CCAA process and without any prior court approval of the SISP terms. The result of the credit bid in this case will be the continuation of the Nelson business in the hands of the first lien lenders, a business that is generating a substantial EBITDA each year and which has been paying its unsecured creditors in the normal course, but with the extinguishment of the US \$153 million plus interest owed to the second lien lenders.

[32] Liquidating CCAA proceedings without a plan of arrangement are now a part of the insolvency landscape in Canada, but it is usual that the sale process be undertaken after a court has blessed the proposed sale methodology with a monitor fully participating in the sale process and reporting to the court with its views on the process that was carried out². None of this has occurred in this case. One issue therefore is whether the SISP carried out before credit bid sale that has occurred involving an out of court process can be said to meet the *Soundair*³ principles and that the credit bid sale meets the requirements of section 36(3) of the CCAA.

[33] I have concluded that the SISP and the credit bid sale transaction in this case does meet those requirements, for the reasons that follow.

² See *Re Nortel Networks Corp.* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 229 at paras. 35-40 and *Re Brainhunter Inc.* [2009] O.J. No. 5207 at paras. 12-13.

³ *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. C.A.).

[34] Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc. was named the Monitor in the Initial Order over the objections of RBC, but shortly afterwards on the come-back motion by RBC, was replaced as Monitor by FTI Consulting Inc. The reasons for this change are contained in my endorsement of June 2, 2015. There was no suggestion of a lack of integrity or competence on the part of A&M or Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc. In brief, the reason was that A&M had been retained by Nelson in 2013 as a financial advisor in connection with its debt situation, and in September 2014 had been retained to undertake the SISP process that has led to the sale transaction to the first lien lenders. I did not consider it right to put Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc. in the position of providing independent advice to the Court on the SISP process that its affiliate had conducted, and that it would be fairer to all concerned that a different Monitor be appointed in light of the fact that the validity of the SISP process was going to be front and centre in the application of Nelson to have the sale agreement to the first lien lenders approved. Accordingly FTI was appointed to be the Monitor.

[35] FTI did a thorough review of all relevant facts, including interviewing a large number of people involved. In its report to the Court the Monitor expressed the following views:

- (a) The design of the SISP was typical of such marketing processes and was consistent with processes that have been approved by the courts in many CCAA proceedings;
- (b) The SISP allowed interested parties adequate opportunity to conduct due diligence, both A&M and management appear to have been responsive to all requests from potentially interested parties and the timelines provided for in the SISP were reasonable in the circumstances;
- (c) The activities undertaken by A&M were consistent with the activities that any investment banker or sale advisor engaged to assist in the sale of a business would be expected to undertake;

- (d) The selection of A&M as investment banker would not have had a detrimental effect on the SISP or the value of offers;
- (e) Both key senior management and A&M were incentivised to achieve the best value available and there was no impediment to doing so;
- (f) The SISP was undertaken in a thorough and professional manner;
- (g) The results of the SISP clearly demonstrate that none of the interested parties would, or would be likely to, offer a price for the Nelson business that would be sufficient to repay the amounts owing to the first lien lenders under the first lien credit agreement
- (h) The SISP was a thorough market test and can be relied on to establish that there is no value beyond the first lien debt.

[36] The Monitor expressed the further view that:

- (a) There is no realistic prospect that Nelson could obtain a new source of financing sufficient to repay the first lien debt;
- (b) An alternative debt restructuring that might create value for the second lien lenders is not a viable alternative at this time;
- (c) There is no reasonable prospect of a new sale process generating a transaction at a value in excess of the first lien debt;
- (d) It does not appear that there are significant operational improvements reasonably available that would materially improve profitability in the short-term such that the value of the Nelson business would increase to the extent necessary to repay the first lien debt and, accordingly, there is no apparent benefit from delaying the sale of the business.

[37] *Soundair* established factors to be considered in an application to approve a sale in a receivership. These factors have widely been considered in such applications in a CCAA proceeding. They are:

- (a) whether sufficient effort has been made to obtain the best price and that the receiver or debtor (as applicable) has not acted improvidently;
- (b) whether the interests of all parties have been considered;
- (c) the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers have been obtained; and
- (d) whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process.

[38] These factors are now largely mirrored in section 36(3) of the CCAA that requires a court to consider a number of factors, among other things, in deciding to authorize a sale of a debtor's assets. It is necessary to deal briefly with them.

- (a) Whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances. In this case, despite the fact that there was no prior court approval to the SISP, I accept the Monitor's view that the process was reasonable.
- (b) Whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition. In this case there was no monitor at the time of the SISP. This factor is thus not strictly applicable as it assumes a sale process undertaken in a CCAA proceeding. However, the report of FTI blessing the SISP that took place is an important factor to consider.
- (c) Whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in its opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy. The Monitor did not make such a statement in its

report. However, there is no reason to think that a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy would be more beneficial to the creditors. The creditors negatively affected could not expect to fare better in a bankruptcy.

(d) The extent to which the creditors were consulted. The first lien steering committee was obviously consulted. Before the SISP, RBC, the second lien lenders' agent, was consulted and actively participated in the reconstruction discussions. I take it from the evidence that RBC did not actively participate in the SISP, a decision of its choosing, but was provided some updates.

(e) The effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties. The positive effect is that all ordinary course creditors, employees, suppliers and customers will be protected. The effect on the second lien lenders is to wipe out their security and any chance of their loans being repaid. However, apart from their being deemed to have consented to the sale, it is clear that the second lien lenders have no economic interest in the Nelson assets except as might be the case some years away if Nelson were able to improve its profitability to the point that the second lien lenders could be paid something towards the debt owed to them. RBC puts this time line as perhaps five years and it is clearly conjecture. The first lien lenders however are not obliged to wait in the hopes of some future result. As the senior secured creditor, they have priority over the interests of the second lien lenders.

There are some excluded liabilities and a small amount owing to former terminated employees that will not be paid. As to these the Monitor points out that there is no reasonable prospect of any alternative solution that would provide a recovery for those creditors, all of whom rank subordinate to the first lien lenders.

(f) Whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value. The Monitor is of the view that the results

of the SISP indicate that the consideration is fair and reasonable in the circumstances and that the SISP can, and should, be relied on for the purposes of such a determination. There is no evidence to the contrary and I accept the view of the Monitor.

[39] In the circumstances, taking into account the *Soundair* factors and the matters to be considered in section 36(3) of the CCAA, I am satisfied that the sale transaction should be approved. Whether the ancillary relief should be granted is a separate issue, to which I now turn.

(ii) Ancillary claimed relief

(a) Vesting order

[40] The applicants seek a vesting order vesting all of Nelson's right, title and interest in and to the purchased assets in the purchaser, free and clear of all interests, liens, charges and encumbrances, other than the permitted encumbrances and assumed liabilities contemplated in the Asset Purchase Agreement. It is normal relief given in an asset sale under the CCAA and it is appropriate in this case.

(b) Payment of amounts to first lien lenders

[41] As a condition to the completion of the transaction, Nelson is to pay all accrued and unpaid interest owing to the first lien lenders and all unpaid professional fees of the first lien agent and the first lien lenders outstanding under the first lien credit agreement. RBC does not oppose this relief.

[42] If the cash is not paid out before the closing, it will be an asset of the purchaser as all cash on hand is being acquired by the purchaser. Thus the first lien lenders will have the cash. However, because the applicant is requesting a court ordered release by the first lien lenders of all obligations under the first lien credit agreement, the unpaid professional fees of the first lien

agent and the first lien lenders that are outstanding under the first lien credit agreement would no longer be payable after the closing of the transaction. Presumably this is the reason for the payment of these prior to the closing.

[43] These amounts are owed under the provisions of the first lien credit agreement and have priority over the interests of the second lien lenders under the intercreditor agreement. However, on June 2, 2015 it was ordered that pending further order, Nelson was prevented from paying any interest or other expenses to the first lien lenders unless the same payments owing to the second lien lenders. Nelson then chose not to make any payments to the first lien lenders. It is in effect now asking for an order *nunc pro tunc* permitting the payments to be made. I have some reluctance to make such an order, but in light of no opposition to it and that fact that it is clear from the report of the Monitor that there is no value in the collateral for the second lien lenders, the payment is approved.

(c) Releases

[44] The applicants request an order that would include a broad release of the parties to the Asset Purchase Agreement as well as well as other persons including the first lien lenders.

[45] The Asset Purchase Agreement has not been executed. In accordance with the draft approval and vesting order sought by the applicants, it is to be entered into upon the entry of the approval and vesting order. The release contained in the draft Asset Purchase Agreement in section 5.12 provides that the parties release each other from claims in connection with Nelson, the Nelson business, the Asset Purchase Agreement, the transaction, these proceedings, the first lien support agreement, the supplemental support agreement, the payment and settlement agreement, the first lien credit agreement and the other loan documents or the transactions contemplated by them. Released parties are not released from their other obligations or from claims of fraud. The release also does not deal with the second lien credit agreement or the second lien lenders.

[46] The first lien term sheet made a part of the support agreement contained terms and conditions, but it stated that they would not be effective until definitive agreements were made by the applicable parties and until they became effective. One of the terms was that there would be a release “usual and customary for transactions of this nature”, including a release by the first lien lenders in connection with “all matters related to the Existing First Lien Credit Agreement, the other Loan Documents and the transactions contemplated herein”. RBC was not a party to the support agreement or the first lien term sheet.

[47] The release in the Asset Purchase Agreement at section 5.12 provides that “each of the Parties on behalf of itself and its Affiliates does hereby forever release...”. “Affiliates” is defined to include “any other Person that directly or indirectly...controls...such Person”. The party that is the purchaser is a New Brunswick numbered company that will be owned indirectly by the first lien lenders. What instructions will or have been given by the first lien lenders to the numbered company to sign the Asset Purchase Agreement are not in the record, but I will assume that the First Lien Agent has or will authorize it and that RBC as a first lien lenders has not and will not authorize it.

[48] Releases are a feature of approved plans of compromise and arrangement under the CCAA. The conditions for such a release have been laid down in *ATB Financial v. Metcalf and Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*, 2008 ONCA 587 at paras. 43 and 70. Third party releases are authorized under the CCAA if there is a reasonable connection between the third party claim being compromised in the plan and the restructuring achieved by the plan. In *Metcalf*, Blair J.A. found compelling that the claims to be released were rationally related to the purpose of the plan and necessary for it and that the parties who were to have claims against them released were contributing in a tangible and realistic way to the plan⁴.

⁴ This case does not involve a plan under the CCAA. One of the reasons for this may be that pursuant to section 6.9(b) of the intercreditor agreement, in the event the applicants commence any restructuring proceeding in Canada and put forward a plan, the applicants, the first lien lenders and the second lien lenders agreed that the first lien

[49] While there is no CCAA plan in this case, I see no reason not to consider the principles established in *Metcalfe* when considering a sale such as this under the CCAA, with any necessary modifications due to the fact that it is not a sale pursuant to a plan. The application of those principles dictates in my view that the requested release by the first lien lenders should not be ordered.

[50] The beneficiaries of the release by the first lien lenders are providing nothing to the first lien lenders in return for the release. The substance of the support agreement was that Nelson agreed to try to fetch as much as it could through a SISP but that if it could not get enough to satisfy the first lien lenders, it agreed to a credit bid by the first lien lenders. Neither Nelson nor the first lien agent or supplemental first lien agent or any other party gave up anything in return for a release from the first lien lenders. So far as RBC releasing a claim that it may have as a first lien lender against the other first lien lenders, nothing has been provided to RBC by the other first lien lenders in return for such a release. RBC as a first lien lender would be required to give up any claim it might have against the other parties to the release for any matters arising prior to or after the support agreement while receiving nothing in return for its release.

In the circumstances, I decline to approve the release by the first lien lenders requested by the applicants to be included in the approval and vesting order.

(d) Stockholders and Registration Rights Agreement

lenders and the second lien lenders should be classified together in one class. The second lien lenders agreed that they would only vote in favour of a plan if it satisfied one of two conditions, there was no contractual restriction on their ability to vote against a plan.

[51] The applicants seek to have a Stockholders and Registration Rights Agreement declared effective and binding on all persons entitled to receive common shares of Purchaser Holdco in connection with the transaction as though such persons were signatories to the Stockholders and Registration Rights Agreement.

[52] The Stockholders and Registration Rights Agreement is a contract among the purchaser's parent company, Purchaser Holdco, and the holders of Purchaser Holdco's common shares. After implementation of the transaction, the first lien lenders will be the holders of 100% of the shares of Purchaser Holdco. The Stockholders and Registration Rights Agreement was negotiated and agreed to by Purchaser Holdco and the First Lien Steering Committee (all first lien lenders except RBC). The First Lien Steering Committee would like RBC to be bound by the agreement. The evidence of this is in the affidavit of Mr. Nordal, the President and CEO of Nelson, who says that based on discussions with Mr. Chadwick, the First Lien Steering Committee requires that all of the first lien lenders to be bound to the terms of the Stockholders and Registration Rights Agreement. This is of course double hearsay as Mr. Chadwick acts for Nelson and not the First Lien Steering Committee.

The effect of what is being requested is that RBC as a shareholder of Purchaser Holdco would be bound to some shareholder agreement amongst the shareholders of Purchaser Holdco. While the remaining 88% of the shareholders of Purchaser Holdco might want to bind RBC, I see nothing in the record that would justify such a confiscation of such shareholder rights. I agree with RBC that extending the Court's jurisdiction in these CCAA proceedings and exercising it to assist the purchaser's parent company with its corporate governance is not appropriate. The purchaser and its parent company either have the contractual right to bind all first lien lenders to terms as future shareholders, or they do not.

RBC Motion

(a) Second lenders' pre-filing interest and second lien agent's fees

[53] RBC seeks an order that directing Nelson to pay to RBC in its capacity as the second lien agent the second lien interest outstanding at the filing date of CDN\$1,316,181.73 and the second lien fees incurred prior to the filing date of US\$15,365,998.83.

[54] Mr. Zarnett in argument conceded that these amounts are owed under the second lien credit agreement. There are further issues, however, being (i) whether they continue to be owed due to the intercreditor agreement (ii) whether RBC is entitled under the intercreditor agreement to request the payment and (iii) whether RBC is entitled to be paid these under the intercreditor agreement before the first lien lenders are paid in full.

[55] There is a distinction between a lien subordination agreement and a payment subordination agreement. Lien subordination is limited to dealings with the collateral over which both groups of lenders hold security. It gives the senior lender a head start with respect to any enforcement actions in respect of the collateral and ensures a priority waterfall from the proceeds of enforcement over collateral. It entitles second lien lenders to receive and retain payments of interest, principal and other amounts in respect of a second lien obligation unless the receipt results from an enforcement step in respect of the collateral. By contrast, payment subordination means that subordinate lenders have also subordinated in favour of the senior lender their right to payment and have agreed to turn over all money received, whether or not derived from the proceeds of the common collateral⁵. The intercreditor agreement is a lien subordination agreement, as stated in section 8.2.

[56] Nelson and the first lien agent say that RBC has no right to ask the Court to order any payments to it from the cash on hand prior to the closing of the transaction. They rely on the language of section 3.1(a)(1) that provides that until the discharge of the first lien obligations, the second lien collateral agent will not exercise any rights or remedies with respect to any collateral,

⁵ See 65 A.B.A. Bus Law. 809-883 (May 2010).

institute any action or proceeding with respect to such remedies including any enforcement step under the second lien documents. RBC says it is not asking to enforce its security rights but merely asking that it be paid what it is owed and is permitted to receive under the intercreditor agreement, which does not subordinate payments but only liens. It points to section 3.1(c) that provides that:

(c) Notwithstanding the foregoing (i.e. section 3.1(a)(1)) the Second Lien Collateral Agent and any Second Lien Claimholder may (1)... and may take such other action as it deems in good faith to be necessary to protect its rights in an insolvency proceeding" and (4) may file any... motions... which assert rights... available to unsecured creditors...arising under any insolvency... proceeding.

[57] My view of the intercreditor agreement language and what has occurred is that RBC has not taken enforcement steps with respect to collateral. It has asked that payments owing to it under the second lien credit agreement up to the date of filing be paid.

[58] Payment of what the second lien lenders are entitled to under the second lien credit agreement is protected under the intercreditor agreement unless it is as the result of action taken by the second lien lenders to enforce their security. Section 3.1(f) of the intercreditor agreement provides as follows:

(f) Except as set forth in section 3.1(a) and section 4 to the extent applicable, nothing in this Agreement shall prohibit the receipt by the Second Lien Collateral Agent or any Second Lien Claimholders of the required payments of interest, principal and other amounts owed in respect of the Second Lien Obligations or receipt of payments permitted under the First Lien Loan Documents, including without limitation, under section 7.09(a) of the First Lien Credit Agreement, so long as such receipt is not the direct or indirect result of the exercise by the Second Lien Collateral Agent or any Second Lien Claimholders of rights or remedies as a secured creditor (including set off) or enforcement in contravention of this Agreement. ... (underlining added).

[59] Section 3.1(a) prohibits the second lien lenders from exercising any rights or remedies with respect to the collateral before the first liens have been discharged. Section 4 requires any collateral or proceeds thereof received by the first lien collateral agent from a sale of collateral to

be first applied to the first lien obligations and requires any payments received by the second lien lenders from collateral in connection with the exercise of any right or remedy in contravention of the agreement must be paid over to the first lien collateral agent.

[60] It do not agree with the first lien collateral agent that payment to RBC before the sale closes of amounts owing pre-filing under the second lien credit agreement would be in contravention of section 4.1. That section deals with cash from collateral being received by the first lien collateral agent in connection with a sale of collateral, and provides that it shall be applied to the first lien obligations until those obligations have been discharged. In this case, the cash on hand before any closing will not be received by the first lien collateral agent at all. It will be received after the closing by the purchaser.

[61] The first lien collateral agent has made a credit bid on behalf of the first lien lenders. Pursuant to section 3.1(b), that credit bid is deemed to be an exercise of remedies with respect to the collateral held by the first lien lenders. Under the last paragraph of section 3.1(c), until the discharge of the first lien obligations has occurred, the sole right of the second lien collateral agent and the second lien claimholders with respect to the collateral is to hold a lien on the collateral pursuant to the second lien collateral documents and to receive a share of the proceeds thereof, if any, after the discharge of the first lien obligations has occurred. That provision is as follows:

Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, unless and until the discharge of the First Lien Obligations has occurred, except as expressly provided in Sections 3.1(a), 6.3(b) and this Section 3.1(c), the sole right of the Second Lien Collateral Agent and the Second Lien Claimholders with respect to the Collateral is to hold a Lien of the Collateral pursuant to the Second Lien Collateral Documents for the period and to the extend granted therein and to receive a share of the proceeds thereof, if any, after the Discharge of First Lien Obligations has occurred.

[62] RBC points out that its rights under section 3.1(f) to receive payment of amounts owing to the second lien lenders is not subject to section 3.1(c) at all. It is not suggested by the first lien collateral agent that this is a drafting error, but it strikes me that it may be. The provision at the

end of section 3.1(c) is inconsistent with section 3.1(f) as section 3.1(c) is not an exception to section 3.1(f).

[63] Both the liens of the first lien lenders and the second lien lenders are over all of the assets of Nelson. Cash is one of those assets. Therefore if payment were now made to RBC from that cash, the cash would be paid to RBC from the collateral for amounts owing under the second lien credit agreement before the obligations to the first lien lenders were discharged. The obligations to the first lien lenders will be discharged when the sale to the purchaser takes place and the first lien obligations are cancelled.

[64] There is yet another provision of the intercreditor agreement that must be considered. It appears to say that if a judgment is obtained in favour of a second lien lender after exercising rights as an unsecured creditor, the judgment is to be considered a judgment lien subject to the intercreditor agreement for all purposes. Section 3.1(e) provides:

(e) Except as otherwise specifically set forth in Sections 3.1(a) and (d), the Second Lien Collateral Agent and the Second Lien Claimholders may exercise rights and remedies as unsecured creditors against the Company or any other Grantor that has guaranteed or granted Liens to secure the Second Lien Obligations in accordance with the terms of the Second Lien Loan Documents and applicable law; provided that in the event that any Second Lien Claimholder becomes a judgment creditor in respect of Collateral as a result of its enforcement of its rights as an unsecured creditor with respect to the Second Lien Obligations, **such judgment Lien** shall be subject to the terms of this Agreement for all purposes (including in relation to the First Lien Obligations) as the other Liens securing the Second Lien Obligations are subject to this Agreement. (Emphasis added).

[65] What exactly is meant by a “judgment Lien” is not stated in the intercreditor agreement and is not a defined term. If an order is made in this CCAA proceeding that the pre-filing obligations to the second lien collateral agent are to be paid from the cash on hand that Nelson holds, is that a “judgment Lien” meaning that it cannot be exercised before the first lien obligations are discharged? In this case, as the first lien obligations will be discharged as part of the closing of the transaction, does that mean that once the order is made approving the sale and

the transaction closes, the cash on hand will go to the purchaser and the judgment Lien will not be paid? It is not entirely clear. But the section gives some indication that a judgment held as a result of the second lien agent exercising rights as an unsecured creditor cannot be used to attach collateral contrary to the agreement if the first lien obligations have not been discharged.

[66] I have been referred to a number of cases in which statements have been made as to the need for the priority of secured creditors to be recognized in CCAA proceedings, particularly when distributions have been ordered. While in this case we are not dealing with a distribution generally to creditors, the principles are well known and undisputed. However, in considering the priorities between the first and second lien holders in this case, the intercreditor agreement is what must govern, even with all of its warts.

[67] In this case, the cash on hand held by Nelson is collateral, and subject to the rights of the first lien lenders in that collateral. An order made in favour of RBC as second lien agent would reduce that collateral. The overall tenor of the intercreditor agreement, including section 3.1(e), leads me to the conclusion that such an order in favour of RBC should not be made. I do say, however, that the issue is not at all free from doubt and that no credit should be given to those who drafted and settled the intercreditor agreement as it is far from a model of clarity. I decline to make the order sought by RBC.

[68] I should note that RBC has made a claim that that Nelson and the first lien lenders who signed the First Lien Support Agreement acted in bad faith and disregarded the interests of the second lien lenders under the intercreditor agreement. RBC claims that the first lien lenders induced Nelson to breach the second lien credit agreement and that this breach resulted in damages to the second lien agent in the amounts of US\$15,365,998.83 on account of interest and CDN\$1,316,181.73 on account of fees. RBC says that these wrongs should be taken into account in considering whether the credit bid should be accepted and that the powers under section 11 of the CCAA should be exercised to order these amounts to be paid to RBC as second lien agent.

[69] I decline to do so. No decision on this record could be possibly be made as to whether these wrongs took place. The claim for inducing breach of contract surfaced in the RBC factum filed just two days before the hearing and it would be unfair to Nelson or the first lien lenders to have to respond without the chance to fully contest these issues. Moreover, even the release sought by the applicants would not prevent RBC or any second lien lender from bringing an action for wrongs committed. RBC is able to pursue relief for these alleged wrongs in a separate action.

(b) Consent fee

[70] The first lien lenders who signed the First Lien Support Agreement were paid a consent fee. That agreement, and particularly the term sheet made a part of it, provided that those first lien lenders who signed the agreement would be paid a consent fee.

[71] RBC contends that because the consent fee was calculated for each first lien lender that signed the First Lien Support Agreement on the amount of the loans that any consenting first lien lenders held under the first lien credit agreement, the consent fee was paid on account of the loans and thus because all first lien lenders were to be paid equally on their loans on a pro rata basis, RBC is entitled to be paid its share of the consent fees.

[72] Section 2.14 of the first lien credit agreement provides in part, as follows:

If, other than as expressly provided elsewhere herein, **any Lender shall obtain on account of the Loans made by it**, or the participations in L/C Obligations and Swing Line Loans held by it, **any payment** (whether voluntary, involuntary, through the exercise of any right of setoff, or otherwise) **in excess of its ratable share** (or other share contemplated hereunder) thereof, such Lender shall immediately (a) notify the Administrative Agent of such fact, and (b) purchase from the other Lenders such participations in the Loans made by them and/or such subparticipations in the participations in L/C Obligations or Swing Line

Loans held by them, as the case may be, as shall be necessary to cause such purchasing Lender to share the excess payment in respect of such Loans or such participations, as the case may be, pro rata with each of them . . . [emphasis added].

[73] RBC says that while the section refers to a first lien lender obtaining a payment “on account” of its loan, U.S. authorities under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code have held that the words “on account of” do not mean “in exchange for” but rather mean “because of.” As the consent payments are calculated on the amount of the loan of any first lien lender who signed the term sheet, RBC says that they were made because of their loan and thus RBC is entitled to its share of the consent fees that were paid by virtue of section 2.14 of the first lien credit agreement.

[74] I do not accept that argument. The consent fees were paid because the consenting first lien lenders signed the First Lien Support Agreement. The fact that their calculation depended on the amount of the loan made by each consenting first lien lender does not mean they were made because of the loan. RBC declined to sign the First Lien Support Agreement and is not entitled to a consent fee.

Conclusion

[75] An order is to go in accordance with these reasons. As there has been mixed success, there shall be no order as to costs.

Newbould J.

Date: September 8, 2015

SUPERIOR COURT
Commercial Division

CANADA
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTREAL

No: 500-11-048114-157

DATE: April 27, 2015

PRESIDED BY: THE HONOURABLE STEPHEN W. HAMILTON, J.S.C.

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

**BLOOM LAKE GENERAL PARTNER LIMITED
QUINTO MINING CORPORATION
8568391 CANADA LIMITED
CLIFFS QUÉBEC IRON MINING ULC**
Petitioners

And
**THE BLOOM LAKE IRON ORE MINE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
BLOOM LAKE RAILWAY COMPANY LIMITED**
Mises-en-cause

And
FTI CONSULTING CANADA INC.
Monitor

And
9201955 Canada inc.
Mise-en-cause

And
**EABAMETOONG FIRST NATION
GINOOGAMING FIRST NATION
CONSTANCE LAKE FIRST NATION and
LONG LAKE # 58 FIRST NATION
AROLAND FIRST NATION
MARTEN FALLS FIRST NATION**
Objectors

And
8901341 CANADA INC.
CANADIAN DEVELOPMENT AND MARKETING CORPORATION
Intervenors

**JUDGMENT ON PETITIONERS' AMENDED MOTION FOR THE ISSUANCE OF AN
APPROVAL AND VESTING ORDER WITH RESPECT TO THE SALE OF THE
CHROMITE SHARES (#82)**

INTRODUCTION

[1] The Petitioners have made an Amended Motion for the Issuance of an Approval and Vesting Order with respect to the Sale of the Chromite Shares (#82 on the pluriel; the original motion was #65). Objections were filed by (1) six First Nation bands (#85, as amended at the hearing) and (2) 8901341 Canada Inc. and Canadian Development and Marketing Corporation (together, CDM) (#87).

CONTEXT

[2] On January 27, 2015, Mr. Justice Castonguay issued an Initial Order placing the Petitioners and the Mises-en-cause under the protection of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.¹ The ultimate parent of the Petitioners and the Mises-en-cause is Cliffs Natural Resources Inc. (Cliffs), which is neither a Petitioner nor a Mise-en-cause.

[3] The Petitioner Cliffs Québec Iron Mining ULC (CQIM) owns, through two subsidiaries, a 100% interest in the Black Thor and Black Label chromite mining projects and a 70% interest in the Big Daddy chromite mining project. All three projects form part of the Ring of Fire, a mining district in northern Ontario.

[4] Other entities related to Cliffs but which are not parties to the CCAA proceedings own other mining interests in the Ring of Fire.

[5] The proposed transaction with respect to which the Petitioners are seeking an approval and vesting order involves the sale of those various interests, including in particular the sale of CQIM's shares in the subsidiaries described above.

[6] Cliffs and its affiliates paid approximately US\$350 million to acquire their interests in the Ring of Fire projects, and invested a further US\$200 million in developing these projects.

[7] By 2013, Cliffs had suspended all activities related to the Ring of Fire and began making general inquiries with potential interested parties with a view to selling its interests in the Ring of Fire. No material interest resulted from these efforts.

¹ R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended.

[8] By September 2014, Cliffs's desire to sell its interests in the Ring of Fire was publicly known.² It hired Moelis & Company LLC to assist with the sale process for various assets including the Ring of Fire in October 2014.³

[9] The sale process will be described in greater detail below. It resulted in the execution of a letter of intent with Noront on February 13, 2015.⁴

[10] While the sellers were negotiating the Share Purchase Agreement with Noront, CDM sent an unsolicited letter of intent to acquire the Ring of Fire interests on March 14, 2015.⁵ That letter of intent was analyzed by the sellers, Moelis and the Monitor and was rejected.⁶ Two revised letters of intent followed and were also rejected.⁷

[11] The sellers executed the initial Share Purchase Agreement with Noront on March 22, 2015, which provided for a price of US \$20 million.⁸ Noront issued a press release describing the transaction on March 23, 2015.⁹

[12] The initial SPA provided in Section 7.1 a "Superior Proposal" mechanism that allowed the sellers to accept an unsolicited and superior offer from a third party.

[13] On April 2, 2015, the Petitioners made a motion for the issuance of an approval and vesting order with respect to the initial SPA. Four First Nations bands who live and exercise their Aboriginal and treaty rights in and on the land and territories surrounding the Ring of Fire filed an objection to the motion. CDM did not. Instead, on April 13, 2015, CDM made an unsolicited offer for the interests in the Ring of Fire which included a purchase price of US \$23 million.¹⁰

[14] CDM's offer was considered by the sellers, Moelis and the Monitor to be a "Superior Proposal" as defined in Section 7.1 of the initial SPA. As a result, they advised Noront,¹¹ which expressed an interest in making a new offer.

[15] The sellers, after consulting Moelis and the Monitor, developed the Supplemental Bid Process to give each party the chance to submit its best and final offer.¹²

[16] Both Noront and CDM participated in the Supplemental Bid Process and submitted new offers, with Noront's offer at US \$27.5 million and CDM's at US \$25.275 million.¹³

² An article from the Globe & Mail dated September 17, 2014 was produced as Exhibit R-7.

³ The CCAA Parties formally engaged Moelis by engagement letter dated March 23, 2015, and the Court approved the engagement of Moelis by order dated April 17, 2015.

⁴ Exhibit R-9.

⁵ Exhibit R-17.

⁶ Exhibit R-18.

⁷ Exhibits R-19 to R-22.

⁸ Exhibit R-3 (redacted) and R-4 (unredacted).

⁹ The press release was provided to the Court during argument and was not given an exhibit number.

¹⁰ Exhibit R-23.

¹¹ Exhibit R-24.

¹² Exhibits R-25 and R-26.

¹³ Exhibits R-29 and R-30.

[17] The sellers accepted the Noront offer and entered into a revised SPA with Noront on April 17, 2015.¹⁴ The Petitioners then amended their motion to allege the additional facts since April 2, 2015 and to seek the issuance of an approval and vesting order with respect to the revised SPA.

[18] The First Nation bands maintained their objection (#85)¹⁵ and CDM filed a Declaration of Intervention and Contestation with respect to the amended motion (#87).

POSITION OF THE PARTIES

[19] The Petitioners argue that the revised SPA should be approved because:

1. the marketing and sales process was fair, reasonable, transparent and efficient;
2. the price offered by Noront was the highest binding offer received in the process;
3. CQIM exercised its commercial and business judgment with assistance from Moelis;
4. the Monitor assisted and advised CQIM throughout the process and recommends the approval of the motion.

[20] Moreover, they argue that no creditor has opposed the motion, and that the First Nations bands and CDM do not have legal standing to oppose the motion.

[21] The Monitor and Noront supported the position put forward by the Petitioners.

[22] The First Nations bands argued the following points:

1. they have a legitimate interest and standing to contest the motion as an “other interested party” under Section 36 of the CCAA, because they have Aboriginal and treaty rights that are affected by the change in control of the Ring of Fire interests;
2. there was a duty on the part of the sellers and their advisers to consult with and advise the First Nations bands about the sale process. Instead, the First Nations bands were ignored and did not even learn of the existence of the sale process until March 23, 2015;
3. the sale process was not open, fair or transparent and did not recognize the rights of the First Nations bands;
4. there was no sales process order; and
5. there is no urgency and they should be given the opportunity to present an offer.

[23] Finally, CDM argued as follows:

¹⁴ Exhibit R-11 (redacted) and R-12 (unredacted).

¹⁵ It was amended at the hearing to add two First Nations bands as objectors.

1. the sellers were required to accept the “Superior Proposal” made by CDM on April 13, 2015;
2. the Supplemental Bid Process did not treat the two parties fairly;
3. the Monitor’s support of the process is not determinative;
4. it had the necessary interest to intervene in the CCAA proceedings and contest the motion.

ISSUES

[24] The Court will analyze the following issues:

1. Was the sale process “fair, reasonable, transparent and efficient”? In the context of the analysis of this issue, the Court will consider various sub-issues, including the business judgement rule, the importance of the Monitor’s recommendation, and the interpretation of Section 7.1 of the initial SPA.
2. Do the First Nations bands have other grounds on which to object to the proposed transaction?
3. Do the First Nations bands and CDM have legal standing to raise these issues?

ANALYSIS

1. Was the sale process “fair, reasonable, transparent and efficient”?

[25] Section 36 of the CCAA provides in part as follows:

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.

...

(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.

(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.

...

[26] The criteria in Section 36(3) of the CCAA have been held not to be cumulative or exhaustive. The Court must look at the proposed transaction as a whole and decide whether it is appropriate, fair and reasonable:

[48] The elements which can be found in Section 36 CCAA are, first of all, not limitative and secondly they need not to be all fulfilled in order to grant or not grant an order under this section.

[49] The Court has to look at the transaction as a whole and essentially decide whether or not the sale is appropriate, fair and reasonable. In other words, the Court could grant the process for reasons others than those mentioned in Section 36 CCAA or refuse to grant it for reasons which are not mentioned in Section 36 CCAA.¹⁶

[27] Further, in the context of one of the asset sales in *AbitibiBowater*, Mr. Justice Gascon, then of this Court, adopted the following list of relevant factors:

[36] The Court has jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets in the course of CCAA proceedings, notably when such a sale of assets is in the best interest of the stakeholders generally.

[37] In determining whether to authorize a sale of assets under the CCAA, the Court should consider, amongst others, the following key factors:

- have sufficient efforts to get the best price been made and have the parties acted providently;
- the efficacy and integrity of the process followed;
- the interests of the parties; and
- whether any unfairness resulted from the working out process.

¹⁶ *White Birch Paper Holding Company (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2010 QCCS 4915 (leave to appeal refused: 2010 QCCA 1950), par. 48-49.

[38] These principles were enunciated in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* They are equally applicable in a CCAA sale situation.¹⁷

[28] The Court must give due consideration to two further elements in assessing whether the sale should be approved under Section 36 CCAA:

1. the business judgment rule:

[70] That being so, it is not for this Court to second-guess the commercial and business judgment properly exercised by the Petitioners and the Monitor.

[71] A court will not lightly interfere with the exercise of this commercial and business judgment in the context of an asset sale where the marketing and sale process was fair, reasonable, transparent and efficient. This is certainly not a case where it should.¹⁸

2. the weight to be given to the recommendation of the Monitor:

The recommendation of the Monitor, a court-appointed officer experienced in the insolvency field, carries great weight with the Court in any approval process. Absent some compelling, exceptional factor to the contrary, a Court should accept an applicant's proposed sale process where it is recommended by the Monitor and supported by the stakeholders.¹⁹

[29] Debtors often ask the Court to authorize the sale process in advance. This has the advantage of ensuring that the process is clear and of reducing the likelihood of a subsequent challenge. In the present matter, the Petitioners did seek the Court's authorization with respect to a sale process for their other assets, but they did not seek the Court's authorization with respect to the sale process for the Ring of Fire interests because that sale process was already well under way before the CCAA filing. There is no legal requirement that the sale process be approved in advance, but it creates the potential for the process being challenged after the fact, as in this case.

[30] The Court will therefore review the sale process in light of these factors.

(1) *From October 2014 to the execution of the Noront letter of intent on February 13, 2015*

[31] The sale process began in earnest in October 2014 when Cliffs engaged Moelis.

[32] Moelis identified a group of eighteen potential buyers and strategic partners, with the assistance of CQIM and Cliffs. The group included traders, resource buyers,

¹⁷ *AbitibiBowater inc. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2009 QCCS 6460, par. 36-38. See also *White Birch, supra* note 16, par. 53-54, and *Aveos Fleet Performance Inc. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2012 QCCS 4074, par. 50.

¹⁸ *AbitibiBowater inc. (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2010 QCCS 1742, par. 70-71. See also *White Birch Paper Holding Company (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2011 QCCS 7304, par. 68-70.

¹⁹ *AbitibiBowater, supra* note 17, par. 59. See also *White Birch, supra* note 18, par. 73-74.

financial sector participants, local strategic partners, and market participants, as well as parties who had previously expressed an interest in the Ring of Fire.

[33] Moelis began contacting the potential interested parties to solicit interest in purchasing the Ring of Fire project. It sent a form of non-disclosure agreement to fifteen parties. Fourteen executed the agreement and were given access to certain confidential information.

[34] Negotiations ensued with seven of the interested parties, and six were given access to the data room that was established in November 2014.

[35] By January 21, 2015, non-binding letters of intent were received from Noront and from a third party. There were also two verbal expressions of interest, but neither resulted in a letter of intent.

[36] The Noront letter of intent was determined by the sellers in consultation with Moelis and the Monitor to be the better offer. Moelis then contacted all parties who had indicated a preliminary level of interest to give them the opportunity to submit a letter of intent in a price range superior to the Noront letter of intent, but no such letter was received.

[37] Negotiations continued with Noront and a letter of intent was executed with Noront on February 13, 2015.²⁰

[38] With respect to this portion of the process, CDM does not raise any issue but the First Nations bands complain that they were not included in the list of potential interested parties and were not otherwise consulted.

[39] The Court will discuss the special status of the First Nations bands in the next section of this judgment. At this stage, it is sufficient to note that the sale process must be reasonable, but is not required to be perfect. Even if the initial list of eighteen potential buyers and strategic partners omitted some potential buyers, this is not a basis for the Court to intervene, provided that the sellers, with Moelis and the Monitor, took reasonable steps.²¹ The Court is satisfied that this test was met.

(2) *From letter of intent to initial SPA*

[40] Between February 13, 2015 and March 22, 2015, the sellers negotiated the SPA with Noront and signed the initial SPA. In that same period, CDM expressed an interest in the Ring of Fire interests and sent three separate offers, all of which were refused by the sellers.

[41] CDM does not contest the reasonability of the sellers' actions in this period. In fact, CDM did not contest the original motion to approve the initial SPA, but chose instead to make a new offer.

(3) *The initial SPA and the “Superior Proposal”*

[42] The initial SPA with Noront dated March 22, 2015 provided for a purchase price of US \$20 million.

²⁰ Exhibit R-9.

²¹ *Terrace Bay Pulp Inc. (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 4247, par. 48.

[43] Section 7.1 of the initial SPA allowed the sellers to pursue a “Superior Proposal”, defined as an unsolicited offer from a third party which appeared to be more favourable to the sellers. In that eventuality, the sellers had the right to terminate the initial SPA upon reimbursing Noront’s expenses up to \$250,000.

[44] CDM made a new offer on April 13, 2015.²² The sellers, in consultation with their advisers and the Monitor, concluded that it was a Superior Proposal.

[45] CDM argues that in those circumstances, the sellers had the obligation to terminate the initial SPA and to accept the CDM offer.

[46] The Court does not agree.

[47] On its face, the language in Section 7.1 is permissive and not mandatory. It says that the sellers “may” terminate the initial SPA and enter into an agreement with the new offeror. It does not require them to do so.

[48] CDM argued that Section 7.1 does not provide for a right to match, which is found in other agreements of this nature. That may be true, but a right to match is different. Specific language would be necessary to contractually require the sellers to accept an offer from Noront that matched the new offer. No language was required to give Noront the right to make a new offer. Further, specific language would be required to remove the possibility of Noront making a new offer. There is no such language. It would be surprising to find such language: why would Noront give up the right to make another offer, and why would the sellers prevent Noront from making another offer? Any such language would be to the detriment of the two contracting parties and for the exclusive benefit of an unknown third party. As the Monitor pointed out, Section 12.2 of the initial SPA specifies that the SPA is for the sole benefit of the parties and is not intended to give any rights, benefits or remedies to a third party.

[49] As a result, the sellers had no obligation to accept the April 13 offer from CDM.

(4) *The Supplemental Bid Process*

[50] Once the sellers, their advisers and the Monitor determined that the April 13 offer from CDM was a Superior Proposal, they had to decide how to manage the process. They had two interested parties and they decided to give them both the chance to make their best and final offer through a process that they created for the purpose, which is referred to as the Supplemental Bid Process. This was a very reasonable decision, in the best interests of the creditors, although probably not one that either offeror was very happy with.

[51] The sellers, their advisers and the Monitor established a series of rules, and they sent the rules to the two offerors at the same time:

1. Each of the Bidders’ best and final offer is to be delivered in the form of an executed Share Purchase Agreement (the “Final Bid”), together with a blackline mark-up against the March 22 SPA to show proposed changes.

²² Exhibit R-23.

2. Final Bids can remove section 7.1(d) and the related provisions of the March 22 SPA.
3. Final bids are to be received by Moelis by no later than 5:00 p.m. (Toronto time) on Wednesday, April 15, 2015 in accordance with paragraph 7 below.
4. Final Bids may be accompanied by a cover letter setting any additional considerations that the Bidder wishes to be considered in connection with its Final Bid but such cover letter should not amend or modify any of the terms and conditions contained in the executed SPA.
5. Final Bids will be reviewed by the Sellers in consultation with moelis and the Monitor. A determination of the Superior Proposal will be made as soon as practicable and communicated to the Bidders.
6. Any clarifications or other communications with respect to this process should be made in writing to the Sale Advisor, with a copy to the Monitor.
7. Final Bids are to be submitted to the Sale Advisor c/o Carlo De Giroloamo by email at carlo.degirolamo@moelis.com.
8. All initially capitalized terms used herein unless otherwise defined shall have the meanings given to them in the March 22 SPA.²³

[52] They declined a request from Noront to modify the rules.²⁴

[53] Both Noront and CDM decided to participate in the Supplemental Bid Process and both submitted offers.

[54] All parties agree that the CDM offer was in compliance with the rules of the Supplemental Bid Process.

[55] Noront's offer was received at 5:00 p.m. on April 15.²⁵ CDM argues that the offer was not in compliance with the rules:

- The cover email states that final approvals are still required (presumably from Franco-Nevada which was advancing the funds for the transaction and Resource Capital Fund (RCF) which was the principal lender to Noront) and that Noront expected to receive them within the next hour;
- The cover letter was not signed;
- The cover letter stated that the revised offer was effective only if the sellers received another offer; and
- The email did not include an executed SPA, but only a blackline mark-up of the SPA.

[56] Subsequent to 5:00 p.m., Noront completed the requirements:

²³ Exhibits R-25 and R-26.

²⁴ Exhibit CDM-1.

²⁵ Exhibit R-30A.

- At 5:34 p.m., Noront sent a signed cover letter. A paragraph was added to explain that “certain representations and warranties and conditions to the advance of the loan with Franco-Nevada have been reduced in order to provide certainty on Noront’s financing” and that the signature pages for the SPA and the fully executed loan agreement would be sent separately;²⁶
- At 8:50 p.m., Noront’s counsel sent the executed SPA and the amended and restated loan agreement. The executed SPA included some changes described as “cleanup” and “not substantive” since 5:00 p.m. Among those changes, Noront deleted RCF from Exhibit C (Required Consents), suggesting that it had obtained that consent;²⁷
- At 10:00 p.m., Moelis asked Noront for confirmation of the RCF consent and an executed copy of it, an explanation for the source of the additional funds, and clarification of the deadline for the vesting order;²⁸
- At 10:35 p.m., Noront provided the executed RCF consent and an explanation of the funding;²⁹ and
- At 1:25 p.m. on April 16, Noront agreed to extend the date for the vesting order from April 20 to April 27.³⁰

[57] The Noront offer was the higher of the two offers in terms of the purchase price. The issue is whether these issues are such as to invalidate the process such that the Court should require the sellers to start over.

[58] The Court considers that these issues are relatively minor and that they do not invalidate the process:

- Noront submitted its offer on time;
- The offer was not amended in any substantive way after 5:00 p.m. In particular, the purchase price was not amended;
- The lack of a signature on the cover letter was irrelevant;
- The condition that the revised offer was effective only if the sellers received another offer had already been fulfilled before Noront submitted its offer. Noront did not know this, but the sellers, Moelis and the Monitor did;
- The missing third party consents were not within Noront’s control. Noront said at 5:00 p.m. that it expected to receive them within the next hour. In fact, it provided the consents to Moelis at 8:50 p.m.;

²⁶ Exhibit CDM-3.

²⁷ Exhibit CDM-4.

²⁸ Exhibit CDM-4.

²⁹ Exhibit CDM-4.

³⁰ Exhibit CDM-4.

- The executed SPA was provided at 8:50 p.m. The delay appears to be related to the missing consents. There is no evidence that Noront was using this as a means to preserve an out from the offer; and
- The questions with respect to the source of the funding and the date were clarifications requested by Moelis for its evaluation of the offer and were not elements missing from the offer.

[59] This is not a case where there is a fundamental flaw in the process, such as the parties having unequal access to information or one party seeking to amend its offer after it had knowledge of the other offers. The process was fair. It was not perfect, but the Courts do not require perfection.

(5) Conclusion

[60] As a result, the Court concludes that the sale process was reasonable within Section 36(3)(a) of the CCAA. Moreover, the other factors in Section 36(3) favour the approval of the sale:

- The monitor approved the process and was involved throughout;
- The monitor filed a report with the Court in which he recommends the approval of the sale;
- The creditors were not consulted, but the motion and amended motion were served on the service list and no creditor has objected to the sale;
- The consideration appears to be fair, given that it is the result of a reasonable process. The Court gives weight to the business judgment of the sellers and their advisers.

[61] For all of these reasons, the Court dismisses CDM's contestation of the motion.

[62] There remain the issues raised by the First Nations bands.

2. Do the First Nations bands have other grounds on which to object to the transaction?

[63] The First Nations bands raise issues of two natures.

[64] First, they argue that they were denied the opportunity to participate in the sale process and they ask for time to examine the possibility of presenting an offer for the Ring of Fire interests.

[65] Second, they argue that the transaction has an impact on their Aboriginal and treaty rights protected under Section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*.

[66] The Court has already concluded that the process of identifying potential buyers and strategic partners was reasonable.

[67] Further, it is not clear to what extent the First Nations bands had knowledge of the sale process and could have participated. The September 17, 2014 newspaper article says that Cliffs is exploring alternatives including the possibility of selling its

Ring of Fire interests.³¹ That article refers to a letter which was sent to the First Nations bands in the area which again would have referred to a possible sale.

[68] At the very latest, they knew about the potential sale when a press release was published on March 23, 2015.

[69] Moreover, in its materials, CDM alleged that its final offer on April 15 "had the support of two of the most impacted First Nations communities",³² which suggests that the First Nations bands had at least some involvement in the sale process.

[70] Nevertheless, the interest of the First Nations bands remains at a very preliminary level. Although the First Nations bands say that they have hired a financial adviser and that they want a delay to analyze the possibility of making an offer for the Ring of Fire interests, whether on their own or with a partner, there is no evidence to suggest that the bands on their own would make a serious offer, or that they would partner with a party that was not already identified by Moelis and included in the process. It is pure speculation as to whether they will ever present an offer in excess of the Noront offer. The Courts have rejected firm offers for greater amounts received after the sale process has concluded.³³ The Courts should also refuse to stop the sale process because a party arriving late might be interested in presenting an offer which might be better than the offer on the table.

[71] The First Nations bands also plead that they have a special interest in this transaction because they live and exercise their Aboriginal and treaty rights guaranteed by the Constitution on the land and territories surrounding the Ring of Fire.

[72] For the purposes of this motion, the Court will assume that to be true. It is nevertheless unclear to what extent a change of control of the corporations which own the interests in the Ring of Fire project impacts on those rights. The identity of the shareholders of the corporations does not change the rights of the First Nations bands or the obligations of the corporations in relation to the development of the project.

[73] The First Nations bands pointed to two specific issues.

[74] First, they argued that there was a duty to consult which was not respected. It is clear that as a matter of constitutional law, there is a duty to consult. It is equally clear that this duty lies on the Crown, not on private parties.³⁴ As a result, the Crown has a duty to consult when it acts, including when it sells shares in a corporation with interests that impact on the rights of the First Nations.³⁵ However, a sale of shares from one private party to another does not trigger the duty to consult. The First Nations bands also produced the Regional Framework Agreement between nine First Nation bands in the Ring of Fire area, including the six objectors, and the Ontario Crown.³⁶ Cliffs was not a party to this agreement, and the sale of the sellers' interests

³¹ Exhibit R-7.

³² Declaration of Intervention and Contestation (#87), par. 30.

³³ See, for example, *Boutiques San Francisco inc. (Arrangement relatif aux)*, [2004] R.J.Q. 965 (C.S.), par. 11-25; *AbitibiBowater*, *supra* note 18, par. 72-73.

³⁴ *Haida Nation v. British Columbia (Minister of Forests)*, 2004 SCC 73, par. 35, 56; *Rio Tinto Alcan Inc. v. Carrier Sekani Tribal Council*, 2010 SCC 43, par. 79..

³⁵ *In the Matter of CCAA and Skeena Cellulose Inc.*, 2002 BCSC 597, par. 14.

³⁶ Exhibit O-1.

in the Ring of Fire project does not affect any party's rights and obligations under the agreement. It is indeed unfortunate that the First Nations bands were not included in the sale process, because they will have an important role to play in the development of the Ring of Fire. But the failure to include them was not a breach of the duty to consult or of the Regional Framework Agreement.

[75] Second, the First Nations bands gave as an example of how the proposed transaction might prejudice their rights a royalty arrangement which Noront appears to have entered into with Franco-Nevada as part of the financing for the proposed transaction. The press release announcing the initial transaction on March 23, 2015 provided:

Franco-Nevada will receive a 3% royalty over the Black Thor chromite deposit and a 2% royalty over all of Noront's property in the region with the exception of Eagle's Nest, which is excluded.³⁷

[76] Assuming that the financing arrangements for the final transaction include a similar provision, which seems likely, the Court is unconvinced that it should refuse the approval of the transaction for this reason.

[77] It is difficult to see how granting a 2 or 3% royalty impacts the rights of the First Nations bands, unless it is their position that they are entitled to a royalty of more than 97%. They did not advance such an argument during the hearing.

[78] Further, the Court is not being asked to approve the financing arrangements between Noront and Franco-Nevada. If there is something in those financing arrangements that infringes on the rights of the First Nations bands, their rights and their remedies are not affected by the order that the Court is being asked to issue today.

[79] For all of these reasons, the Court dismisses the objection made by the First Nations bands.

3. Interest or Standing

[80] For the reasons set out above, the Court will dismiss CDM's contestation and the objection made by the First Nations bands. In principle, it is not necessary to deal with the issue of interest or standing. Also, given that the Court was given only a short delay to draft this judgment, it might not be wise to get too far into the issue.

[81] However, all parties pleaded the question at length and the Court will therefore deal with it.

[82] The Ontario authorities supporting the position that the "bitter bidder" has no interest or standing to challenge the approval motion are clear³⁸ and they have been followed in Québec.³⁹

³⁷ *Supra*, note 9.

³⁸ *Crown Trust v. Rosenberg*, 1986 CanLII 2760 (ON SC), p. 43; *Skyepharma plc v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp.*, [2000] O.J. No 467 (ON CA), par. 24-26, 30; *Consumers Packaging Inc. (Re)*, 2001 CanLII 6708 (ON CA), par. 7; *BDC Venture Capital Inc. v. Natural Convergence Inc.*, 2009 ONCA 665, par. 7-8.

[83] However, the issues which the Court must consider before approving a sale include the reasonableness of the sale process, which involves questions of the fairness and the integrity of the process.

[84] A losing bidder is not seeking to promote the best interests of the creditors, but is looking to promote its own interest. It will seek to raise these issues, not because it has any particular interest in fairness or integrity, but because it lost and it wants a second kick at the proverbial can. The narrow technical ground on which the losing bidder is found to have no interest is that it has no legal or proprietary right in the property being sold.⁴⁰ The underlying policy reason is that the losing bidder is a distraction, with the potential for delay and additional expense.

[85] However, if the losing bidder is excluded from the process, who will raise the issues of fairness and integrity? The creditors will not do so, because their interest is limited to getting the best price. Where there is a subsequent higher bid, their interest will be in direct conflict with the integrity of the sale process.

[86] Perhaps the way to reconcile all of this is to exclude the losing bidder from the Court approval process and instead require the losing bidder to make its complaints and objections to the monitor. The monitor would then be required to report to the Court on any such complaints and objections. In this case, the Monitor's Fourth Report deals with the objection of the First Nations bands in fair and objective manner. However, because CDM filed its intervention after the Monitor filed his report, the Monitor's Fourth Report does not deal with the issues raised by CDM. In that sense, the CDM intervention was useful to the Court in exercising its jurisdiction under Section 36 of the CCAA.

[87] The objection of the First Nations bands went beyond their status as losing bidders or excluded bidders, and included issues related to their Aboriginal and treaty rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

[88] The case law on the interest or standing of the “bitter bidder” and the policy considerations underlying that case law have no application to these issues. The interest of the First Nations bands is closer to the interest of “social stakeholders” that have been recognized in a number of cases.⁴¹

[89] Although the Court will dismiss the objections raised by the First Nations bands and CDM, it will not do so on grounds of a lack of interest or standing.

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT HEREBY:

[90] **GRANTS** the Petitioners' Amended Motion for the Issuance of an Approval and Vesting Order (#82).

³⁹ *AbitibiBowater*, *supra* note 18, par. 81-88; *White Birch*, *supra* note 16, par. 55-56.

⁴⁰ Purchasers generally do not have a proprietary interest in the property they are buying.

⁴¹ *Re Canadian Airlines Corporation*, 2000 ABQB 442, par. 95; *Canadian Red Cross Society, Re*, 1998 CanLII 14907 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), par. 50; *Anvil Range Mining Corp., Re*, 1998 CarswellOnt 5319 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), par. 9; *Skydome Corp., Re*, 1998 CarswellOnt 5922 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), par. 6-7.

[91] **ORDERS** that all capitalized terms in this Order shall have the meaning given to them in the Share Purchase Agreement dated as of March 22, 2015, as amended and restated as of April 17, 2015 (the “**Share Purchase Agreement**”) by and among Petitioner Cliffs Québec Iron Mining ULC (“**CQIM**”), Cliffs Greene B.V., Cliffs Netherlands B.V. and the Additional Sellers, as vendors, Noront Resources Ltd., as parent, and 9201955 Canada Inc., as purchaser (the “**Purchaser**”), a redacted copy of which was filed as Exhibit R-11 to the Motion, unless otherwise indicated herein.

SERVICE

[92] **ORDERS** that any prior delay for the presentation of this Motion is hereby abridged and validated so that this Motion is properly returnable today and hereby dispenses with further service thereof.

[93] **PERMITS** service of this Order at any time and place and by any means whatsoever.

SALE APPROVAL

[94] **ORDERS and DECLARES** that the transaction (the “**Transaction**”) contemplated by the Share Purchase Agreement is hereby approved, and the execution of the Share Purchase Agreement by CQIM is hereby authorized and approved, *nunc pro tunc*, with such non-material alterations, changes, amendments, deletions or additions thereto as may be agreed to but only with the consent of the Monitor.

[95] **AUTHORIZES and DIRECTS** the Monitor to hold the Deposit, *nunc pro tunc*, and to apply, disburse and/or deliver the Deposit or the applicable portions thereof in accordance with the provisions of the Share Purchase Agreement.

EXECUTION OF DOCUMENTATION

[96] **AUTHORIZES and DIRECTS** CQIM and the Monitor to perform all acts, sign all documents and take any necessary action to execute any agreement, contract, deed, provision, transaction or undertaking stipulated in or contemplated by the Share Purchase Agreement (Exhibit R-12) and any other ancillary document which could be required or useful to give full and complete effect thereto.

AUTHORIZATION

[97] **ORDERS and DECLARES** that this Order shall constitute the only authorization required by CQIM to proceed with the Transaction and that no shareholder approval, if applicable, shall be required in connection therewith.

VESTING OF THE AMALCO SHARES

[98] **ORDERS and DECLARES** that upon the issuance of a Monitor’s certificate substantially in the form appended as **Schedule “A”** hereto (the “**Certificate**”), all of CQIM’s right, title and interest in and to the Amalco Shares shall vest absolutely and exclusively in and with the Purchaser, free and clear of and from any and all right, title,

benefits, priorities, claims (including claims provable in bankruptcy in the event that CQIM should be adjudged bankrupt), liabilities (direct, indirect, absolute or contingent), obligations, interests, prior claims, security interests (whether contractual, statutory or otherwise), liens, charges, hypothecs, mortgages, pledges, trusts, deemed trusts (whether contractual, statutory, or otherwise), assignments, judgments, executions, writs of seizure or execution, notices of sale, options, agreements, rights of distress, legal, equitable or contractual setoff, adverse claims, levies, taxes, disputes, debts, charges, rights of first refusal or other pre-emptive rights in favour of third parties, restrictions on transfer of title, or other claims or encumbrances, whether or not they have attached or been perfected, registered, published or filed and whether secured, unsecured or otherwise (collectively, the "**Encumbrances**") by or of any and all persons or entities of any kind whatsoever, including without limiting the generality of the foregoing (i) any Encumbrances created by the Initial Order of this Court dated January 27, 2015 (as amended on February 20, 2015 and as may be further amended from time to time), and (ii) all charges, security interests or charges evidenced by registration, publication or filing pursuant to the Civil Code of Québec, the Ontario Personal Property Security Act, the British Columbia Personal Property Security Act or any other applicable legislation providing for a security interest in personal or movable property, and, for greater certainty, **ORDERS** that all of the Encumbrances affecting or relating to the Amalco Shares be expunged and discharged as against the Amalco Shares, in each case effective as of the applicable time and date of the Certificate.

[99] **ORDERS and DIRECTS** the Monitor to file with the Court a copy of the Certificate, forthwith after issuance thereof.

[100] **DECLARES** that the Monitor shall be at liberty to rely exclusively on the Conditions Certificates in issuing the Certificate, without any obligation to independently confirm or verify the waiver or satisfaction of the applicable conditions.

[101] **AUTHORIZES and DIRECTS** the Monitor to receive and hold the Purchase Price and to remit the Purchase Price in accordance with the provisions of this Order.

[102] **AUTHORIZES and DIRECTS** the Monitor to remit, following closing of the Transaction, that portion of the Purchase Price payable to the Non-Filing Sellers, to the Non-Filing Sellers in accordance with the Purchase Price Allocation described under Exhibit D of the Share Purchase Agreement (Exhibit R-12), as it may be amended by the Non-Filing Sellers, or as the Non-Filing Sellers may otherwise direct.

CANCELLATION OF SECURITY REGISTRATIONS

[103] **ORDERS** the Québec Personal and Movable Real Rights Registrar, upon presentation of the required form with a true copy of this Order and the Certificate, to reduce the scope of or strike the registrations in connection with the Amalco Shares, listed in **Schedule "B"** hereto, in order to allow the transfer to the Purchaser of the Amalco Shares free and clear of such registrations.

[104] **ORDERS** that upon the issuance of the Certificate, CQIM shall be authorized and directed to take all such steps as may be necessary to effect the discharge of all Encumbrances registered against the Amalco Shares, including filing such financing

change statements in the Ontario Personal Property Registry (“**OPPR**”) as may be necessary, from any registration filed against CQIM in the OPPR, provided that CQIM shall not be authorized or directed to effect any discharge that would have the effect of releasing any collateral other than the Amalco Shares, and CQIM shall be authorized to take any further steps by way of further application to this Court.

[105] **ORDERS** that upon the issuance of the Certificate, CQIM shall be authorized and directed to take all such steps as may be necessary to effect the discharge of all Encumbrances registered against the Amalco Shares, including filing such financing change statements in the British Columbia Personal Property Security Registry (the “**BCPPR**”) as may be necessary, from any registration filed against CQIM in the BCPPR, provided that CQIM shall not be authorized or directed to effect any discharge that would have the effect of releasing any collateral other than the Amalco Shares, and CQIM shall be authorized to take any further steps by way of further application to this Court.

CQIM NET PROCEEDS

[106] **ORDERS** that the proportion of the Purchase Price payable to CQIM in accordance with the Share Purchase Agreement (the “**CQIM Net Proceeds**”) shall be remitted to the Monitor and shall be held by the Monitor pending further order of the Court.

[107] **ORDERS** that for the purposes of determining the nature and priority of the Encumbrances, the CQIM Net Proceeds shall stand in the place and stead of the Amalco Shares, and that upon payment of the Purchase Price by the Purchaser, all Encumbrances shall attach to the CQIM Net Proceeds with the same priority as they had with respect to the Amalco Shares immediately prior to the sale, as if the Amalco Shares had not been sold and remained in the possession or control of the person having that possession or control immediately prior to the sale.

VALIDITY OF THE TRANSACTION

[108] **ORDERS** that notwithstanding:

- a) the pendency of these proceedings;
- b) any petition for a receiving order now or hereafter issued pursuant to the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (“**BIA**”) and any order issued pursuant to any such petition; or
- c) the provisions of any federal or provincial legislation;

the vesting of the Amalco Shares contemplated in this Order, as well as the execution of the Share Purchase Agreement pursuant to this Order, are to be binding on any trustee in bankruptcy that may be appointed, and shall not be void or voidable nor deemed to be a preference, assignment, fraudulent conveyance, transfer at undervalue or other reviewable transaction under the BIA or any other applicable federal or provincial legislation, as against CQIM,

the Purchaser or the Monitor, and shall not constitute oppressive or unfairly prejudicial conduct pursuant to any applicable federal or provincial legislation.

LIMITATION OF LIABILITY

[109] **DECLARES** that, subject to other orders of this Court, nothing herein contained shall require the Monitor to take control, or to otherwise manage all or any part of the Purchased Shares. The Monitor shall not, as a result of this Order, be deemed to be in possession of any of the Purchased Shares within the meaning of environmental legislation, the whole pursuant to the terms of the CCAA.

[110] **DECLARES** that no action lies against the Monitor by reason of this Order or the performance of any act authorized by this Order, except by leave of the Court. The entities related to the Monitor or belonging to the same group as the Monitor shall benefit from the protection arising under the present paragraph.

CONFIDENTIALITY

[111] **ORDERS** that the unredacted Initial Purchase Agreement filed with the Court as Exhibit R-3, the summary of the two LOIs filed with the Court as Exhibit R-8, the unredacted Share Purchase Agreement filed with the Court as Exhibit R-12 and the unredacted blackline of the Share Purchase Agreement showing changes from the Initial Purchase Agreement filed with the Court as Exhibit R-16 shall be sealed, kept confidential and not form part of the public record, but rather shall be placed, separate and apart from all other contents of the Court file, in a sealed envelope attached to a notice that sets out the title of these proceedings and a statement that the contents are subject to a sealing order and shall only be opened upon further Order of the Court.

GENERAL

[112] **DECLARES** that this Order shall have full force and effect in all provinces and territories in Canada.

[113] **DECLARES** that the Monitor shall be authorized to apply as it may consider necessary or desirable, with or without notice, to any other court or administrative body, whether in Canada, the United States of America or elsewhere, for orders which aid and complement this Order and, without limitation to the foregoing, an order under Chapter 15 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code, for which the Monitor shall be the foreign representative of the Petitioners and Mises-en-cause. All courts and administrative bodies of all such jurisdictions are hereby respectfully requested to make such orders and to provide such assistance to the Monitor as may be deemed necessary or appropriate for that purpose.

[114] **REQUESTS** the aid and recognition of any court or administrative body in any Province of Canada and any Canadian federal court or administrative body and any federal or state court or administrative body in the United States of America and any court or administrative body elsewhere, to act in aid of and to be complementary to this Court in carrying out the terms of this Order.

[115] **ORDERS** the provisional execution of the present Order notwithstanding any appeal and without the requirement to provide any security or provision for costs whatsoever.

[116] **THE WHOLE WITHOUT COSTS.**

STEPHEN W. HAMILTON J.S.C.

Me Bernard Boucher
Me Sébastien Guy
Me Steven J. Weisz
BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON, S.E.N.C.R.L.
for:

Bloom Lake General Partner Limited
Quinto Mining Corporation
8568391 Canada Limited
Cliffs Quebec Iron Mining ULC
The Bloom Lake Iron Ore Mine Limited Partnership
Bloom Lake Railway Company Limited

Me Sylvain Rigaud
Me Chrystal Ashby
NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT CANADA S.E.N.C.R.L.
for:
FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Me Jean-Yves Simard
LAVERY DE BILLY, S.E.N.C.R.L.
Me Sean Zweig
BENNETT JONES
for:
9201955 CANADA INC.

Me Stéphane Hébert
Me Maurice Fleming
MILLER THOMSON, S.E.N.C.R.L./LLP
for:

Eabametoong First Nation
Ginoogaming First Nation
Constance Lake First Nation and
Long Lake # 58 First Nation
Aroland First Nation
Marten Falls First Nation

Me Sandra Abitan
Me Éric Préfontaine
Me Julien Morissette
OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT, S.E.N.C.R.L./S.R.L.
for:
8901341 Canada inc.
Canadian Development and Marketing Corporation

Date of hearing: April 24, 2015

SCHEDULE "A"
FORM OF CERTIFICATE OF THE MONITOR
SUPERIOR COURT
(Commercial Division)

C A N A D A
PROVINCE OF QUÉBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTRÉAL

File: No: 500-11-048114-157

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

BLOOM LAKE GENERAL PARTNER LIMITED

QUINTO MINING CORPORATION

8568391 CANADA LIMITED

CLIFFS QUEBEC IRON MINING ULC

Petitioners

-and-

THE BLOOM LAKE IRON ORE MINE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

BLOOM LAKE RAILWAY COMPANY LIMITED

Mises-en-cause

-and-

9201955 CANADA INC.

Mise-en-cause

-and-

THE REGISTRAR OF THE REGISTER OF PERSONAL AND MOVABLE REAL RIGHTS

Mise-en-cause

-and-

FTI CONSULTING CANADA INC.

Monitor

CERTIFICATE OF THE MONITOR

RECITALS

A. Pursuant to an initial order rendered by the Honourable Mr. Justice Martin Catonguay, J.S.C., of the Superior Court of Québec, [Commercial Division] (the "Court") on January 27, 2015 (as amended on February 20, 2015 and as may be further amended from time to time, the "Initial Order"), FTI Consulting Canada Inc. (the "Monitor") was appointed to monitor the business and financial affairs of the Petitioners and the Mises-en-cause (together with the Petitioners, the "CCAA Parties").

B. Pursuant to an order (the “**Approval and Vesting Order**”) rendered by the Court on **<*>**, 2015, the transaction contemplated by the Share Purchase Agreement dated as of March 22, 2015, as amended and restated as of April 17, 2015 (the “**Share Purchase Agreement**”) by and among Petitioner Cliffs Québec Iron Mining ULC (“**CQIM**”), Cliffs Greene B.V., Cliffs Netherlands B.V. and the Additional Sellers (as defined therein), as vendors, Noront Resources Ltd., as parent, and 9201955 Canada Inc., as purchaser (the “**Purchaser**”) was authorized and approved, with a view, *inter alia*, to vest in and to the Purchaser, all of CQIM’s right, title and interest in and to the Amalco Shares.

C. Each capitalized term used and not defined herein has the meaning given to such term in the Share Purchase Agreement.

D. The Approval and Vesting Order provides for the vesting of all of CQIM’s right, title and interest in and to the Amalco Shares in the Purchaser, in accordance with the terms of the Approval and Vesting Order and upon the delivery of a certificate (the “**Certificate**”) issued by the Monitor confirming that the Sellers and the Purchaser have each delivered Conditions Certificates to the Monitor.

E. In accordance with the Approval and Vesting Order, the Monitor has the power to authorize, execute and deliver this Certificate.

F. The Approval and Vesting Order also directed the Monitor to file with the Court, a copy of this Certificate forthwith after issuance thereof.

THEREFORE, THE MONITOR CERTIFIES THE FOLLOWING:

A. The Sellers and the Purchaser have each delivered to the Monitor the Conditions Certificates evidencing that all applicable conditions under the Share Purchase Agreement have been satisfied and/or waived, as applicable.

B. The Closing Time is deemed to have occurred on at **<TIME>** on **<*>**, 2015.

THIS CERTIFICATE was issued by the Monitor at **<TIME>** on **<*>**, 2015.

FTI Consulting Canada Inc., in its capacity as Monitor of the CCAA Parties, and not in its personal capacity.

By: _____

Name Nigel Meakin

:

SCHEDULE "B"
REGISTRATIONS TO BE REDUCED OR STRICKEN

Nil.

[NTD: Updated searches will be run before motion is heard to confirm no registrations in Quebec.]

8453339.6

CITATION: Target Canada Co. (Re), 2015 ONSC 1487
COURT FILE NO.: CV-15-10832-00CL
DATE: 2015-03-05

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF TARGET CANADA CO., TARGET CANADA
HEALTH CO., TARGET CANADA MOBILE GP CO., TARGET CANADA
PHARMACY (BC) CORP., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY (ONTARIO)
CORP., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY CORP., TARGET CANADA
PHARMACY (SK) CORP., and TARGET CANADA PROPERTY LLC.

BEFORE: Regional Senior Justice Morawetz

COUNSEL: *Jeremy Dacks, Tracy Sandler and Shawn Irving*, for the Target Canada Co.,
Target Canada Health Co., Target Canada Mobile GP Co., Target Canada
Pharmacy (BC) Corp., Target Canada Pharmacy (Ontario) Corp., Target Canada
Pharmacy Corp., Target Canada Pharmacy (SK) Corp., and Target Canada
Property LLC (the "Applicants")

Jay Swartz, for the Target Corporation

D.J. Miller, for Oxford Properties Group Inc.

Jeff Carhart, for Hamilton Beach Corp. et al.

Alan Mark and Melaney Wagner, for the Monitor, Alvarez & Marsal Inc.

Leonard Loewith, for Solutions 2 Go et al.

Aubrey Kauffman, for Ivanhoe Cambridge Inc.

Ruzbeh Hosseini, for Amskor Corporation

Sean Zweig, for RioCan Management Inc. and Kingsett Capital Inc.

Lou Brzezinski and Alexandra Teoderescu, for Thyssenkrupp Elevator (Canada)
Limited, Advitek, Universal Studios Canada Inc., Nintendo of Canada, Ltd., and
Bentall Kennedy (Canada) LP Group

Melvyn L. Solmon, for ISSI Inc.

HEARD and RELEASED: March 5, 2015

ENDORSEMENT

[1] On February 11, 2015, Target Canada Co. ("TCC") received Court approval to conduct a real estate sales process (the "Real Property Portfolio Sales Process") to seek qualified purchasers for TCC's leases and other real property, to be conducted by the Target Canada Entities in consultation with their financial advisor, Lazard Frères & Co., LLC (the "Financial Advisor") and their real estate advisor, Northwest Atlantic (Canada) Co. (the "Broker"), with the supervision and oversight of the Monitor.

[2] The Applicants bring this motion to approve a lease transaction agreement (the "Lease Transaction Agreement") that has been negotiated in response to an unsolicited bid by certain landlords (Oxford Properties Corporation ("Oxford") and Ivanhoe Cambridge Inc. ("IC") and certain others, together the "Landlord Entities").

[3] Under the Lease Transaction Agreement, TCC will surrender its interest in eleven leases (the "Eleven Leases") to the Landlord Entities in consideration for the purchase price and certain other benefits.

[4] The Target Entities decided, after considering the likely benefits and risks associated with the unsolicited offer by the Landlord Entities, to exercise their right under the terms of the Real Property Portfolio Sales Process to withdraw the applicable leases from the bidding and auction phases of the process. The Target Canada Entities contend that the decision to exercise this right was made based on the informed business judgment of the Target Canada Entities with advice from the Financial Advisor and the Broker, in consultation and with the approval of the Monitor.

[5] The Applicants submit that the process by which the decision was made to pursue a potential transaction with the Landlord Entities, and withdraw the Eleven Leases from the bidding and auction phases of the Real Property Portfolio Sales Process, was fair and reasonable in light of the facts and circumstances. Further, they submit that the process by which the benefits of the Lease Transaction Agreement were evaluated, and the Lease Transaction Agreement was negotiated, was reasonable in the circumstances.

[6] The Applicants contend that the purchase price being offered by the Landlord Entities is in the high-range of value for the Eleven Leases. As such, the Applicants contend that the price is reasonable, taking into account the market value of the assets. Moreover, the Applicants submit that the estate of the Target Canada Entities will benefit not only from the value represented by the purchase price, but from the release of claims. That includes the potentially material claims that the Landlord Entities may otherwise have been entitled to assert against the estate of the Target Canada Entities, if some or all of the Eleven Leases had been purchased by a third party or disclaimed by the Target Canada Entities.

[7] The Target Canada Entities submit that it is in their best interests and that of their stakeholders to enter into the Lease Transaction Agreement. They also rely on the Monitor's

approval of and consent to the Target Canada Entities entering into the Lease Transaction Agreement.

[8] The Target Canada Entities are of the view that the Lease Transaction Agreement secures premium pricing for the Eleven Leases in a manner that is both certain and efficient, while allowing the Target Canada Entities to continue the Inventory Liquidation Process for the benefit of all stakeholders and to honour their commitments to the pharmacy franchisees.

[9] The terms of the Lease Transaction Agreement are set out in the affidavit of Mark J. Wong, sworn February 27, 2015, and are also summarized in the Third Report of the Monitor. The Lease Transaction Agreement is also summarized in the factum submitted by the Applicants.

[10] If approved, the closing of the Lease Transaction Agreement is scheduled for March 6, 2015.

[11] One aspect of the Lease Transaction Agreement requires specific mention. Almost all of TCC's retail store leases were subleased to TCC Propco. The Premises were then subleased back to TCC. The Applicants contend that these arrangements were reflected in certain agreements between the parties (the "TCC Propco Agreements"). Mr. Wong states in his affidavit that it is a condition of the Lease Transaction Agreement that TCC terminate any subleases prior to closing. TCC will also wind-down other arrangements with TCC Propco.

[12] The Applicants contend that the TCC Propco Agreements have been terminated in accordance with their terms and an early termination payment is now owing as a result of this wind-down by TCC to TCC Propco, which, they contend, will be addressed within a claims process to be approved in due course by the Court. The claim of TCC Propco is not insignificant. This intercompany claim is expected to be in the range of \$1.9 billion.

[13] The relief requested by the Target Canada Entities was not opposed.

[14] Section 36 of the CCAA sets out the applicable legal test for obtaining court approval where a debtor company seeks to sell assets outside the ordinary course of business during a CCAA proceeding.

[15] In deciding whether to grant authorization, pursuant to section 36(3), 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 its 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 asset is reasonable and fair, taking into account its market value.

[16] The factors listed in section 36(3) are not intended to be exhaustive, nor are they intended to be a formulaic check list that must be followed in every sale transaction under the CCAA (see: *Re White Birch Paper Holding Co.*, 2010 QCCS 4915; leave to appeal refused 2010 QCCA 1950).

[17] The factors overlap, to a certain degree, with the *Soundair* factors that were applied in approving sale transactions under pre-amendment CCAA case law (see: *Re Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc.*, 2010 ONSC 2870, citing *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.*, [1991] O.J. No. 1137 (C.A.) ("Soundair").)

[18] I am satisfied, having reviewed the record and hearing submissions, that -- taking into account the factors listed in s. 36(3) of the CCAA -- the Lease Transaction Agreement should be approved. In arriving at this conclusion, I have taken the following into account: in the absence of any indication that the Target Canada Entities have acted improvidently, the informed business judgment of the Target Canada Entities (as supported by the advice of the Financial Advisor and the consent of the Monitor) that the Lease Transaction Agreement is in the best interests of the Target Canada Entities and their stakeholders is entitled to deference by this Court.

[19] I am also satisfied that the process for achieving the Sale Transaction was fair and reasonable in the circumstances. It is also noted that the Monitor concurs with the assessment of the Target Canada Entities.

[20] The Target Canada Entities, the Monitor and the Financial Advisor are all of the view that the consideration to be received by TCC is reasonable, taking into account the market value of the Eleven Leases.

[21] I am also satisfied that the Transaction is in the best interest of the stakeholders.

[22] The Applicants also submit that all of the other statutory requirements for obtaining relief under section 36 of the CCAA have been satisfied. Having reviewed the factum and, in particular, paragraphs 46 and 47, I accept this submission of the Applicants.

[23] As referenced above, the relief requested by the Applicants was not opposed. However, it is necessary to consider this non-opposition in the context of the TCC Propco Agreements. The Applicants contend that the TCC Propco Agreements have been terminated in accordance with their terms, and that the early termination payment now owing as a result of this wind-down

by TCC to TCC Propco will be addressed within a claims process to be approved in due course as part of the CCAA proceedings.

[24] The Monitor's consent to the entering into of the Termination Agreement, and the filing of the Third Report, do not constitute approval by the Monitor as to the validity, ranking or quantum of the intercompany claim. Further, when the intercompany claims are submitted in the claims process to be approved the Court, the Monitor will prepare a report thereon and make it available to the Court and all creditors. The creditors will have an opportunity to seek any remedy or relief with respect to the intercompany claim in the claims process.

[25] In my view, it is necessary to stress the importance of the role of the Monitor in any assessment of the intercompany claim. It is appropriate for the Monitor to take an active and independent role in the review process, such that all creditors are satisfied with respect to the transparency of the process.

[26] Finally, it is noted that the actual consideration is not disclosed in the public record.

[27] The Applicants are of the view that the specific information relating to the consideration to be paid by the Landlord Entities and the valuation analysis of the Eleven Leases is sensitive commercial information, the disclosure of which could be harmful to stakeholders.

[28] The Applicants have requested that Confidential Appendices "A" and "B" be sealed. Confidential Appendix "A" contains an unredacted version of the Lease Transaction Agreement. The Applicants request that this document be sealed until the closing of the transaction. The Applicants request that the transaction and valuation analysis as contained in Appendix "B" be sealed pending further order.

[29] No party objected to the sealing requests.

[30] Having considered the principles set out in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522, I am satisfied that it is appropriate, in the circumstances, to grant the sealing relief as requested by the Applicants.

[31] In the result, the motion is granted. The approval and vesting order in respect of the Lease Transaction Agreement has been signed.

Regional Senior Justice G.B. Morawetz

Date: March 5, 2015

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Citation: Veris Gold Corp. (Re),
2015 BCSC 1204

Date: 20150710
Docket: S144431
Registry: Vancouver

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

And

**In the matter of the *Canada Business Corporations Act*,
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44**

And

**In the matter of the *Business Corporations Act*,
S.B.C. 2002, c. 57**

And

**In the Matter of Veris Gold Corp., Queenstake
Resources Ltd., Ketza River Holdings, and Veris Gold USA, Inc.**

Petitioners

Before: The Honourable Madam Justice Fitzpatrick

Reasons for Judgment

Counsel for the Monitor, Ernst & Young Inc.:

J. Sandrelli
T. Jeffries

Counsel for Deutsche Bank A.G.:

D. Vu

Counsel for Moelis & Company:

C. Ramsay
S. Irving
K. Mak

Counsel for Whitebox Advisors LLC, WBox
2014-1 Ltd.:

K. Jackson
D. Toigo

Counsel for the Attorney General of Nevada:

R. Morse
N. Vaartunou A/S

Counsel for Nevada Cement:

C. Ramsay
K. Mak

Counsel for NV Energy:

C. Brousson
J. Bradshaw A/S

Counsel for Government of Yukon:

J. Porter

Counsel for AIG:

K. Siddall

Counsel for Linde LLC:

S. Ross

Place and Date of Hearing:

Vancouver, B.C.
May 28, 2015

Place and Date of Judgment:

Vancouver, B.C.
July 10, 2015

Introduction

[1] This is a proceeding pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the “*CCAA*”). The assets of the petitioner companies (collectively, “*Veris Gold*”) principally comprise a gold mine in the State of Nevada, United States of America and mining properties in Yukon, Canada.

[2] There has been no shortage of effort in these proceedings to restructure the considerable debt or monetize the assets of *Veris Gold* for the benefit of the stakeholders. However, in the face of considerable operational setbacks and disappointing refinancing and sale results, those stakeholders now face two stark options: (i) allow the interim lender to deal with the assets in a receivership or liquidation scenario; or (ii) allow an orderly transfer of the assets to that interim lender by way of a credit bid which would allow operations in the U.S. to continue.

[3] The court-appointed monitor, Ernst & Young Inc., (the “*Monitor*”) now applies to complete the sale to a new entity created by the interim lender, which is said to provide the best result achievable in less than desirable circumstances.

Background Facts

[4] Much of the history of these proceedings was set out in my reasons for judgment issued earlier this year: *Veris Gold Corp. (Re)*, 2015 BCSC 399. For the purposes of this application, I will summarize that history as follows.

[5] On June 9, 2014, this Court granted an initial order. This filing was necessary in light of the imminent steps that were to be taken by *Veris Gold*’s major secured creditor, Deutsche Bank A.G. (“*DB*”) to collect its debt of approximately US\$90 million.

[6] The Canadian filing was immediately followed by the *Monitor* commencing proceedings in Nevada pursuant to Chapter 15 of the *United States Bankruptcy Code*, 11 U.S.C. §§ 101-1532 (the “*Bankruptcy Code*”).

[7] Arising from orders granted in both the Canadian and Nevada proceedings and the agreements reached between Veris Gold and DB, matters were stabilized. Those orders and agreements allowed Veris Gold to continue its efforts to restructure its debt and equity with the assistance of Raymond James & Associates. In addition, firm milestone dates were put in place to conclude any refinancing and also to commence a sales process if those refinancing efforts were not successful.

[8] In October 2014, this Court approved interim financing to be obtained from WBox 2014-1 Ltd. ("WBox") in the amount of US \$12 million.

[9] On November 18, 2014, this Court approved a detailed sale and solicitation process to be conducted by Moelis and Company ("Moelis"), again with firm deadlines for such matters as receipt of qualified bids. Although certain of the deadlines under the sales process were extended, no qualified bids were received by the extended bid deadline, January 30, 2015.

[10] Following these disappointing sale results, the Monitor engaged in discussions with Veris Gold and the two stakeholders who appeared to have the only economic interest remaining in the assets, being DB and WBox. What was critical at this time was allowing Veris Gold to continue to operate in the ordinary course while these stakeholders considered their next steps.

[11] In mid-February 2015, DB issued various notices of default under its security and the agreements reached earlier with Veris Gold. This also resulted in an immediate default under the interim financing agreements between Veris Gold and WBox. With a view to securing greater oversight over the continued operations of Veris Gold, DB later applied for and was granted an order expanding the powers of the Monitor on February 23, 2015. That order was later recognized by the U.S. court in the Chapter 15 proceedings on March 2, 2015.

[12] By late March 2015, both DB and WBox were continuing to consider their options, including the possibility of making a credit bid for the assets. WBox conducted due diligence of the assets toward that possibility. The Monitor reported

at that time that, absent a credit bid from DB, a credit bid from WBox was the only viable alternative.

[13] Accordingly, on March 30, 2015, this Court granted an order extending the stay of proceedings to April 7, 2015 to enable completion of discussions in relation to a credit bid transaction whereby certain of Veris Gold's assets would be transferred to a nominee of WBox.

[14] On April 2, 2015, Veris Gold suffered yet another operational setback when a fire occurred at the processing plant, causing an estimated shutdown of one week. The already tenuous cash problems were therefore exacerbated by the deferral of revenue of approximately US\$4 million as a result of the shutdown. The timing of this difficulty was unfortunate, in that by this time, the Monitor had negotiated an agreement in principle with WBox for the purchase of the assets and an increase in the interim funding to allow operations to continue to the closing date.

[15] Not surprisingly, the fire and ensuing difficulties caused WBox to delay any credit bid and the provision of further financing while it considered, among other things, the impact on the cash requirements of continuing operations. In addition, in light of what the Monitor described as the "mounting challenges", the Monitor and WBox moved to a consideration of liquidation scenarios. Preliminary work on various shutdown options, including care and maintenance, indicated that significant monies would have to be expended even before the assets could be transferred on an orderly basis to environmental regulators.

[16] On April 7, 2015, this Court extended the stay of proceedings to April 24, 2015 in order to enable WBox and other interested parties to assess their options and to allow the Monitor time to have further discussions with the environmental regulators. During this extension of the stay period, WBox renewed discussions with the Monitor in respect of a potential transaction that would involve the equity participation of a financial partner. It was discussed that this partner could participate in WBox's nominee, which would be the entity to hold and operate Veris Gold's mining assets.

[17] Discussions were also ongoing at this time whereby WBox would provide increased financing to Veris Gold in order to allow further time to finalize a transaction.

[18] On April 24, 2015, this Court granted an order extending the stay of proceedings to June 12, 2015. In addition, at the request of the Monitor, an order was granted increasing the interim funding from WBox by US\$3 million to US\$15 million, which would allow Veris Gold's operations to continue. WBox approved a cash flow forecast and it was agreed that WBox would maintain control over payments made from this further facility. On April 29, 2015, the U.S. court approved this amendment to the interim financing facility.

[19] On May 28, 2015, Veris Gold entered into an asset sale agreement (the "Agreement") with WBVG, LLC ("WBVG"). WBVG is an entity wholly owned by WBox although, as anticipated, WBox sought and obtained the future participation of another equity partner. The transaction provides that WBox will transfer a majority interest in WBVG to 2176423 Ontario Ltd., a company owned by Eric Sprott. Mr. Sprott was already involved in Veris Gold, having a 20% equity interest and also having a royalty interest in the Nevada mining properties.

[20] The salient terms of the Agreement are as follows:

- a) WBVG will purchase all tangible and intangible assets of Veris Gold, subject to certain defined excluded assets;
- b) the Monitor is to continue efforts to sell the Ketza assets in Yukon over a 60-day period with any sale proceeds being payable to WBVG. If no sale occurs, then those assets will be transferred to WBVG;
- c) WBVG is to assume certain obligations arising under assumed contracts, including all bonds, and also pay any "cure costs" relating to such assumed contracts, limited to US\$10 million;

- d) WBVG will assume the amounts owing to WBox under the interim lending facility and will pay certain of the court-ordered charges, such as the administration charges, having priority over the interim lender's charge in favour of WBox to a maximum of US\$1.8 million;
- e) WBVG will not assume any liabilities for pre-closing obligations;
- f) all employees of Veris Gold are to be terminated on closing and WBVG may offer employment to some or all of them; and
- g) a "DIP Financing Cash Reserve" fund estimated in the amount of US\$3.1 million is to be established to pay certain post-filing obligations that will be outstanding as of the closing date, including employee wages and amounts due to suppliers and contractors for the supply of goods and services. Any funds remaining in the DIP Financing Cash Reserve after these payables have been satisfied shall be returned to WBVG.

[21] The Agreement is still conditional in that it is subject to approval by both this Court and the U.S. court. Further conditions relate to obtaining an assignment of certain critical contracts, such as bonding agreements and other arrangements with the Nevada environmental regulators.

Statutory Framework

[22] The authority of this Court to approve the sale is found in s. 36 of the CCAA. Section 36(3) of the CCAA sets out a list of non-exhaustive factors to be considered by the court:

- (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.

[23] A more general test has been restated, as discerned from the above factors, namely to consider the transaction as a whole and decide "whether or not the sale is appropriate, fair and reasonable": *Re White Birch Paper Holding Co.*, 2010 QCCS 4915 at para. 49, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 49, leave to appeal ref'd 2010 QCCA 1950.

[24] In addition, the principles identified in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1 at 6 (C.A.) are helpful in considering whether to approve a sale:

1. Whether the party conducting the sale made sufficient efforts to obtain the best price and did not act improvidently;
2. The interests of all parties;
3. The efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers were obtained; and
4. Whether there has been any unfairness in the sales process.

[25] Various authorities support that, in considering the test under s. 36 of the CCAA, the principles of *Soundair* remain relevant and indeed overlap some of the specific factors set out in s. 36(3): *Re Canwest Publishing Inc.*, 2010 ONSC 2870 at para. 13; *White Birch* at para. 50; *Re PCAS Patient Care Automation Services Inc.*, 2012 ONSC 3367 at para. 54.

Discussion

(a) CCAA Factors

[26] I am more than satisfied that the factors set out in s. 36(3) of the CCAA support the granting of the order approving the Agreement with WBVG.

[27] I have already outlined the extensive process by which Veris Gold's assets were exposed to the market by Moelis in accordance with the court-approved sales

process. That process, which took place over many months, unfortunately did not yield any realistic offers, despite an extension of the bid deadline.

[28] The Monitor did receive a non-binding expression of interest from a party on May 8, 2015. Some of the persons behind this expression of interest had been involved in the unsuccessful sales process. However, despite the purchase price being slightly above the WBox borrowings (US\$20 million), the Monitor's view was that it would not be pursued by reason of the numerous significant conditions and the reality that the delay in pursuing any offer would place Veris Gold's operations at significant risk given its precarious financial (cash) condition. On May 13, 2015, this indicative offer was increased to US\$23 million but that increase did not elicit any support from either WBox or the Monitor.

[29] In response to the concerns of WBox and the Monitor, this party submitted a non-binding indicative offer on May 22, 2015 with additional materials indicating that financing had been tentatively obtained. Even so, the Monitor supported WBox's continued position that this offer should not be pursued further given the risk and delay in doing so. DB did not challenge this assessment.

[30] It should be noted that, with the possible exception of DB, no one was more interested in obtaining an offer to purchase the assets than WBox in terms of seeing some recovery under the interim financing. In large part, WBVG's offer is made somewhat reluctantly by WBox as the only real alternative to obtaining some value from the assets secured under its court-ordered charge.

[31] The Monitor has been extensively involved throughout these proceedings and the sales efforts, particularly given the Monitor's role in brokering the peace between Veris Gold and DB that allowed the refinancing and sale efforts to continue without much controversy. To that extent, the Monitor was very much involved in fashioning the sales process that was eventually approved by the court on November 18, 2014.

[32] At this time, the stark reality is that no other viable options exist other than this sale or a receivership and liquidation, with the latter providing considerable

uncertainty in terms of future operations. That uncertainty has justifiably caused some concern with the regulators, both in Nevada and Yukon, who must necessarily address any environmental issues that might precipitously arise from a failure to continue operations.

[33] In my view, the process leading to this transaction was fair and reasonable in the circumstances. No person has suggested that these efforts were insufficient or inadequate.

[34] Needless to say, the Monitor, being the applicant, is in favour of the transaction with WBVG and recommends its approval by the court. The Monitor has been involved in the negotiations and finalization of the asset sale agreement throughout.

[35] The reasons to approve the sale to WBVG and to do so quickly are outlined in the Monitor's sixteenth report to the court dated May 25, 2015. The portions of the report that highlight those reasons are:

[Veris Gold] would unlikely be able to recover from a further significant interruption of operations. The result would likely be the commencement of a liquidation process with the resultant loss of jobs, supply chain benefits and heightened environmental risks related to the need to transition care and maintenance activities to the Nevada environmental regulators on an extremely short timeline.

...

The [transaction] is essentially a realization process by [WBox], which has no viable alternatives. The operations continue on borrowed time, and prolonging any process results, in the Monitor's view, in significant risk to numerous stakeholders – [WBox], employees, suppliers of goods and services, and the environmental regulators.

...

[I]t is urgent to have an expedited resolution to these proceedings. ... The alternative, which would involve facilitating due diligence by the EOI Party or other late emerging parties, together with the related purchase agreement negotiations and discussions with the environmental regulators, translates into an extended timeframe and a higher risk of non-completion or future operational disruption. The party exposed to the risk of loss in the event on non-completion is [WBox].

[36] There has obviously been extensive consultation with WBox throughout these proceedings since the interim financing was initially approved in October 2014.

[37] Since February 2015, when it was clear that no sales had materialized, DB's interest in these proceedings has undoubtedly lessened. This is largely due to the realization that there was likely no value beyond what was owed to WBox under its interim financing, which stands in priority to the secured debt of DB. In essence, DB's lack of opposition to this sale is in recognition that it will obtain no recovery of the substantial debt owed by Veris Gold to it in excess of US\$90 million.

[38] Other creditors junior in priority to DB have not been consulted; however, it has been abundantly clear since January 2015 that DB stood little chance of collecting even a portion of its debt, let alone realize a refinancing or sale that would see these junior creditors recover from any excess. Therefore, the proposed transaction will have no material effect on these other creditors.

[39] It has also necessarily been the case that the various parties, and in particular the Monitor, WBox, Mr. Sprott and WBVG, have been in extensive discussions with the environmental regulators throughout these proceedings and specifically regarding the proposed transaction with WBVG. Discussions were held with the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection and the U.S. Forest Service in connection with the proposed transaction and any alternative scenarios. Those regulators were either in support or not opposed to the relief sought on this application, having secured terms in the proposed court order to address any concerns on their part.

[40] While the outcome for DB and other pre-filing creditors is complete non-recovery, the benefits for various other stakeholders, being WBox, the employees, suppliers and the environmental regulators, is evident enough. It is these stakeholders who will suffer in the event that Veris Gold's operations do not continue and the environmental regulators in Nevada are left with the significant care and maintenance responsibilities for the mine site in a liquidation scenario. This transaction will see a continuation of Veris Gold's operations in Nevada. Accordingly,

I agree with the Monitor that this is the best outcome for these operational stakeholders.

[41] The operations in Yukon have been dormant for some time. Discussions between the Monitor and the Yukon regulators are continuing at this time toward a potential purchase of the Ketza assets by Yukon and a relinquishment of Veris Gold's mineral claims and mining leases there. The Agreement contemplates that these discussions will continue, hopefully toward a satisfactory conclusion.

[42] The Monitor and WBox have also addressed in part concerns expressed by the court concerning the ongoing supply of goods and services and the uncertainty of payment for those goods and services while the Agreement was being negotiated. As noted above, upon the closing of the transaction, employees and suppliers to the Nevada mine site will be paid by Veris Gold for goods and services supplied up to the time of closing. As it relates to the employees, this addresses the requirement in the CCAA, s. 36(7) in that the court is satisfied that employee-related claims will be paid. Additional benefits will also redound to all of these stakeholders by either the potential of continued employment with WBVG or the continuation of many of the supply contracts which are to be assumed by WBVG post-closing.

[43] I also conclude that the history of these proceedings, as outlined above, demonstrates that the consideration to be received for Veris Gold's assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value. While no appraisals of the assets have been obtained, that fair market value is reflected in the market response to the extensive sales efforts undertaken.

[44] No one misunderstands that if the transaction is not approved WBox will withdraw funding and Veris Gold will almost certainly have to commence an orderly wind down of its operations and liquidation of its assets to satisfy the debt owed to WBox. It is more than likely that WBox will suffer a shortfall in a liquidation scenario. A liquidation scenario will also likely result in the Nevada environmental regulators taking over care and maintenance of the mine site on an expedited basis, at

significant expense and with the possibility of environmental damage resulting from a surrender of the mine site without the lead time needed by the regulators.

[45] In all the circumstances, a consideration of all the factors in s. 36 of the CCAA supports the conclusions that the proposed transaction is fair and reasonable and that the Agreement should be approved.

(b) Assignment of Contracts

[46] The asset sale agreement provides that WBVG will be assigned the "Assigned Contracts", which are defined as meaning "all Designated Seller Contracts" and also described as "Required Assigned Contracts". All of these contracts are listed in a schedule attached to the purchaser disclosure schedule delivered by WBVG to Veris Gold.

[47] The Monitor seeks approval of the assignment of the Designated Seller Contracts, save to the extent that consents from counterparties have not already been obtained.

[48] The relevant statutory authority to approve such assignments is found in s. 11.3 of the CCAA:

11.3 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to every party to an agreement and the monitor, the court may make an order assigning the rights and obligations of the company under the agreement to any person who is specified by the court and agrees to the assignment.

....

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

- (a) whether the monitor approved the proposed assignment;
- (b) whether the person to whom the rights and obligations are to be assigned would be able to perform the obligations; and
- (c) whether it would be appropriate to assign the rights and obligations to that person.

(4) The court may not make the order unless it is satisfied that all monetary defaults in relation to the agreement — other than those arising by reason only of the company's insolvency, the commencement of proceedings under this Act or the company's failure to perform a non-monetary obligation — will be remedied on or before the day fixed by the court.

(5) The applicant is to send a copy of the order to every party to the agreement.

[49] The Monitor's report and recommendations are in support of approval of these assignments. These approvals are part of the Monitor's overall recommendations in favour of the Agreement. WBVG has indicated its willingness to continue the operations of Veris Gold in Nevada on a going concern basis. The participation of WBox and Mr. Sprott lend credibility to its ability to do so, while performing any obligations under these contracts.

[50] In that context, it is appropriate that WBVG obtain the benefit of contracts that will facilitate its ability to continue these operations. Indeed, some of the contracts are critical or necessary for future operations.

[51] In addition, the Agreement contemplates the payment of "cure costs" which are defined in the Agreement in relation to statutory obligations arising under both s. 11.3(4) of the CCAA and s. 365(b)(1) of the *Bankruptcy Code* where the assignment of contracts is approved. Cure costs are defined in the Agreement as follows:

"Cure Cost" means, as applicable with respect to any Seller, (i) any amounts or assurances required by Section 365(b)(1) of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code under any applicable Designated Seller Contract or (ii) any amounts required to satisfy monetary defaults in relation to the applicable Designated Seller Contract pursuant to Section 11.3 of the CCAA.

[52] Each of the Designated Seller Contracts and related anticipated cure costs are set out in a schedule to the Agreement. Pursuant to the Agreement, such cure costs are payable on closing. The order sought provides that upon payment, and upon assignment:

10. ... the Required Assigned Contracts [aka the Designated Seller Contracts] shall be deemed valid and binding and in full force and effect at the Closing, and the Purchaser shall enjoy all of the rights and benefits under each such Required Assigned Contract as of the applicable date of assumption.

[53] Section 11.3 of the CCAA came into force in September 2009. Prior to that time, there was little case authority in terms of a CCAA court approving assignments of contracts over the objections of counterparties. One of those early cases is *Playdium Entertainment Corp., Re*, [2002] 31 C.B.R. (4th) 302 (Ont. S.C.J.); additional reasons [2002] 31 C.B.R. (4th) 309 (Ont. S.C.J.).

[54] In *Re Nexient Learning Inc.*, [2010] 62 C.B.R. (5th) 248 at 258 (Ont. S.C.J.), Wilton-Siegel J. cited both Spence J. in *Playdium* and Tysoe J. (as he then was) in *Re Woodward's Ltd.* (1993), 79 B.C.L.R. (2d) 257 (S.C.), in framing the test as being whether the assignment was “important to the reorganization process”. Also of relevance was the effect of the assignment on the counterparty and the principle that third party rights should only be affected as is absolutely required to assist in the reorganization and in a manner fair to that counterparty: see the additional reasons in *Playdium* at 319; *Nexient* at 259. See also discussion in *Barafiedl Realty Ltd. v. Just Energy (B.C.) Limited Partnership*, 2014 BCSC 945 at paras. 107-108.

[55] The approach of the courts in these earlier cases was essentially confirmed in *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2010 SCC 60, where the Court stated the basis upon which relief might be “appropriate” and that any relief should result in “fair” treatment to all stakeholders:

[70] The general language of the CCAA should not be read as being restricted by the availability of more specific orders. However, the requirements of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising CCAA authority. Appropriateness under the CCAA is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the CCAA. The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to achieve the remedial purpose of the CCAA — avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company. I would add that appropriateness extends not only to the purpose of the order, but also to the means it employs. Courts should be mindful that chances for successful reorganizations are enhanced where participants achieve common ground and all stakeholders are treated as advantageously and fairly as the circumstances permit.

[Emphasis added.]

[56] Like many other amendments to the CCAA in September 2009, s. 11.3 was intended, in my view, to codify what had been the general approach to assignment issues, while also clarifying certain matters that had been to that time uncertain. One example of certainty achieved, although irrelevant on this application, arises by s. 11.3(2) which excludes certain contracts from the statutory authority of the court in s. 11.3(1).

[57] Since its enactment, judicial consideration of s. 11.3 is scarce. In *Re TBS Acquireco Inc.*, 2013 ONSC 4663, D.M. Brown J. (as he then was) approved the assignment of certain leases and designated contracts, finding that this would result in the continuation of the business in the greatest number of stores and the continued employment of the greater number of people. Cure costs were also to be paid: see paras. 19-25.

[58] I do not see the result in *TBS* as deviating from the previous approach of the courts in considering whether to approve an assignment based on the twin goals of assisting the reorganization process (i.e., the sale in this case) while also treating a counterparty fairly and equitably. These considerations can be discerned in particular from the factors set out in s. 11.3(3) set out above.

[59] That brings me to the only issue that arises here in relation to the assignments. While no objection was raised to the assignments by persons who did not otherwise consent, the Monitor's counsel was candid in advising the court that only those persons on the service list were served with the Canadian application materials. It is not therefore apparent that the counterparties to the contracts did in fact receive a copy of the application materials.

[60] This is not an approach that I would endorse. It may often be the case that a counterparty is not a creditor of the estate and therefore, that party would not get notice of the filing at the commencement of those proceedings. Further, even if that is the case, no assignment issue may be apparent at the time of initial service to the point that such person would take steps to be placed on the service list.

[61] The best practice in these circumstances is to serve all counterparties to the particular contracts that are sought to be assigned, whether they are on the service list or not. Section 11.3(1) specifically provides that the application is to be “on notice to every party to an agreement”. Common sense dictates that the person to be directly affected by the assignment should have the ability to consider whether the applicant debtor company has satisfied its burden that the order is appropriate, including the factors set out in s. 11.3(3). Only by service will that counterparty be made aware of the need to consider its position if such approval is granted and possibly advance evidence and considerations that would be equally relevant to the court’s decision on the issue.

[62] Before proceeding with the application in *TBS*, Brown J. was satisfied that the applicant had given notice of the request to seek a court-authorized assignment of the contracts: para. 25.

[63] As I have mentioned, there was urgency in approving the Agreement so that Veris Gold’s operations could continue in the ordinary course. Further delay was not feasible nor was it in the interests of all the stakeholders. The Monitor’s counsel advised that all of the counterparties were in the U.S. and most of those counterparties, being capital lessors, were represented by Nevada counsel. Finally, I was advised that all of these counterparties were served with the U.S. application materials in anticipation of an application in Nevada to also approve the Agreement immediately after this application. Therefore, specific notice of the terms of the Agreement and the fact that approval of the assignment was sought would have been provided in any event, albeit in the context of the U.S. court materials.

[64] In these exigent and extraordinary circumstances, I approved the assignments on the terms sought, but subject to the U.S. court being satisfied with the notification to and service on the counterparties to the Required Assigned Contracts who did not receive direct notice of this application. In that way, these counterparties will have been given the ability to attend the U.S. hearing and make

submissions on the relief sought, all of which is a required condition to closing the Agreement.

Conclusion

[65] Veris Gold has faced a number of operational challenges and adverse events over the course of this restructuring proceeding. Initially at least, they faced significant opposition by their major secured creditor, DB. Efforts to refinance or sell the assets have been met with little interest and certainly no offer was received by that process on which to base a transaction.

[66] As matters stand, Veris Gold's operations are undercapitalized and susceptible to further disruptions unless stability is achieved quickly to avoid a liquidation process. That process would undoubtedly result in a loss of jobs, disruption of supply arrangements and heightened environmental risk.

[67] The only realistic alternative is the one before the court on this application; namely, a credit bid by WBox, the interim lender, which would see a continuation of the operations in Nevada. The Monitor's view is that proceeding to close the Agreement on an expedited basis is necessary to protect the interests of the principal stakeholders in Veris Gold's operations, namely WBox, the employees, suppliers of goods and services and the environmental regulators.

[68] The statutory requirements of the CCAA in ss. 36 and 11.3 have been satisfied by the Monitor toward approval of the Agreement, including approving the assignments of the Required Assigned Contracts. I am also satisfied that the orders sought are appropriate in the circumstances and consistent with the objectives of the CCAA.

[69] The relief sought by the Monitor is granted. The Agreement is approved and Veris Gold and the Monitor are authorized to proceed to finalize the transactions with WBVG. The vesting of the assets on closing will be subject to an order of the U.S. court approving the Agreement and making such other ancillary orders as are appropriate in accordance with the *Bankruptcy Code*. The order provides that any

issues that may be raised by the U.S. environmental regulators will be addressed by the U.S. court. Accordingly, this Court requests the aid, recognition and assistance of the U.S. court in terms of the carrying out of the terms of the order granted.

[70] Finally, all orders sought with respect to the approval of the assignment by Veris Gold to WBVG of the Required Assigned Contracts are granted on the terms sought, including that such approval is subject to the payment of the cure costs.

“Fitzpatrick J.”

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Citation: *Quest University Canada (Re)*,
2020 BCSC 1883

Date: 20201202
Docket: S200586
Registry: Vancouver

**In the Matter of the COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C.
1985, c. C-36, as amended**

- and -

In the Matter of the SEA TO SKY UNIVERSITY ACT, S.B.C. 2002, c. 54

- and -

**In the Matter of A PLAN OF COMPROMISE AND ARRANGEMENT OF QUEST
UNIVERSITY CANADA**

Petitioner

Before: The Honourable Madam Justice Fitzpatrick

Reasons for Judgment (Sale Approval)

Counsel for the Petitioner:	J.R. Sandrelli V. Cross
Counsel for the Monitor PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc.:	V.L. Tickle
Counsel for Primacorp Ventures Inc.:	P. Rubin G. Umbach
Counsel for RCM Capital Management Ltd. and SESA-BC Holdings Ltd.:	K. Jackson G. Nesbitt
Counsel for Southern Star Developments Ltd.:	P. Reardon K. Strong
Counsel for Vanchorverve Foundation:	C.D. Brousson
Counsel for Dana Hospitality LP:	D.V. Bateman

Counsel for Halladay Education Group:	D. Lawrenson
Counsel for Capilano University:	K. Mak
Counsel for Landrex Ventures Inc.:	J. D. West
Counsel for Quest University Faculty Union:	J. Sanders S. Rogers
Counsel for Bank of Montreal:	K. Davies
Counsel for Her Majesty The Queen In Right of Province of British Columbia and the Ministry of Advanced Education Skills and Training:	A. Welch
Counsel for 1114586 B.C. Ltd.:	K.E. Siddall
Counsel for Association for the Advancement of Scholarship:	L. Hiebert
Place and Date of Hearing:	Vancouver, B.C. November 12-13, 16, 2020
Place and Date of Decision with Written Reasons to Follow:	Vancouver, B.C. November 16, 2020
Place and Date of Written Reasons:	Vancouver, B.C. December 2, 2020

INTRODUCTION

[1] On November 3, 2020, the petitioner, Quest University Canada (“Quest”), applied for various orders in these *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985 c. C-36 (“CCAA”) proceedings. Orders sought by Quest included approval of a sale transaction with Primacorp Ventures Inc. (“Primacorp”) and orders necessary to facilitate that transaction, namely allowing Quest to implement a claims process and calling a meeting to consider its plan of arrangement.

[2] On November 3, 2020, I granted the Claims Process Order and a Meeting Order to allow the creditors to consider Quest’s plan of arrangement dated November 1, 2020 (the “Plan”). I also approved Quest’s agreement to pay Primacorp a Break Up Fee and granted a charge to secure that amount: *Quest University Canada (Re)*, 2020 BCSC 1845.

[3] I adjourned Quest’s application for a Transaction Approval and Vesting Order (TAVO) to approve the Primacorp transaction to these hearing dates to allow opposing parties to consider the matter further and prepare necessary materials.

[4] Southern Star Developments Ltd. (“Southern Star”) has since formalized its opposition to the granting of the TAVO. Indeed, its opposition has since increased in force because Quest and Primacorp have now changed the relief sought to approve the Primacorp transaction within the context of a “reverse vesting order” (“RVO”), as explained below. Southern Star also now applies for an order prohibiting Quest from disclaiming certain subleases, as is required in order for the Primacorp transaction to proceed.

[5] In the meantime, other parties have joined in opposing the approval of the Primacorp transaction for a variety of reasons, including those advanced by Southern Star in relation to the RVO.

[6] At the conclusion of this hearing, I granted the RVO and dismissed Southern Star’s application, with written reasons to follow. These are my reasons for those orders.

BACKGROUND FACTS

[7] This CCAA proceeding has been underway for almost ten months, after the granting of the Initial Order on January 16, 2020.

[8] Since that time, the Court has extended the stay of proceedings a number of times, to allow Quest to undertake efforts to find a restructuring solution to its financial difficulties that would allow it to continue its educational endeavours. Many stakeholders have been actively involved in these proceedings, including secured creditors who, collectively, will be owed approximately \$30.7 million by the end of December 2020.

[9] I have also approved interim financing to allow Quest to continue its operations while in this proceeding, with that debt now approaching \$11 million.

[10] Quest's assets include lands in Squamish, BC, being Lot 1, on which the campus is located (the "Campus Lands"), as well as the surrounding 38 acres (the "Development Lands".) Lot 1 is encumbered by various charges, liens, interests, mortgages and assignments of rent, including a mortgage held by Capilano University ("CapU"). In addition, CapU holds various rights of first refusal, including a right of first refusal to purchase, a right of first refusal to lease and rights of first refusal to acquire the charges of Quest's major secured creditor, Vanchorverve Foundation ("VF") (collectively, the "ROFR").

[11] Quest is also the registered owner of five real property lots (Lots A-E), four of which are the sites of its university residences (on Lots A-D) (collectively, the "Residences").

[12] One of the significant flashpoints in this proceeding has been, and continues to be, in relation to the Residences that Quest leases from Southern Star. After the Residences became vacant in March 2020 following the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, Quest attempted to defer payment of the substantial lease payments owed to Southern Star. On June 19, 2020, I denied that relief: *Quest University Canada (Re)*, 2020 BCSC 921 (the "Rent Deferral Reasons").

[13] Quest's principal focus in these proceedings has been toward identifying a partner/investor to purchase its land assets and/or identifying an academic partner/investor that would permit Quest to continue as a post-secondary institution.

[14] Since January 2020, Quest's Board of Governors and its Restructuring Committee have been working with a private educational consultant, Halladay Education Group Inc. to find a prospective academic partner. In addition, since March 2020, Quest has been working with Colliers Macaulay Nicolls Inc. to find prospective purchasers for Quest's real property assets.

[15] There is no dispute that the sale and partner search process (SISP) has been extensive, as confirmed by the Monitor. Quest submits, and I accept that its management, the Restructuring Committee, and the Board analyzed all proposals based on a number of factors, including:

- a) Creditor recovery from the purchase price or other consideration under the proposal;
- b) That the proposal would result in a completed transaction;
- c) That the proposal offered allowed for Quest's long-term continuation as a post-secondary academic institution; and
- d) That the proposal would lead to the continuation of a school on Quest's lands that aligned with Quest's current vision and academic quality.

[16] The SISP resulted in a number of academic and real estate organizations approaching Quest to express interest in pursuing a transaction. Quest engaged with a number of potential purchasers or partners from Canada, the United States and other countries. Some parties executed Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs) and Quest received numerous Letters of Intent (LOIs) and other proposals.

[17] On May 28, 2020, this Court granted an extension of the stay of proceedings. At that time, Quest stated that there was a realistic potential of a transaction with the

party identified as the “Academic Partner”. Unfortunately, that transaction did not proceed.

[18] On August 7, 2020, this Court granted a further extension of the stay of proceedings to December 24, 2020 to allow Quest to continue seeking proposals towards a transaction by that deadline and to allow Quest to offer the fall term to its students. Quest was still in discussions with various interested parties at that time. By then, Quest had received LOIs, including one from Primacorp (identified as “Academic Partner #2) as of July 29, 2020.

[19] Since August 7, 2020, Quest and Primacorp have worked extensively to negotiate the definitive documents toward completing a transaction. On September 16, 2020, Quest and Primacorp executed a Purchase and Sale Agreement (the “Primacorp PSA”).

[20] The Primacorp transaction, as originally presented, provided for:

- a) Sufficient funds to pay Quest’s secured creditors’ claims, including claims secured by the CCAA charges;
- b) Funding for a plan of arrangement to be voted on by Quest’s unsecured creditors;
- c) Funds for these insolvency proceedings; and
- d) A working capital facility, and marketing and recruiting support to permit Quest to become self-sustaining as a post-secondary institution.

[21] The main and subsidiary agreements executed between Quest and Primacorp in September/October 2020 are complex. They were complete by October 28, 2020 and included, as defined in the Monitor’s Fourth Report, the Primacorp PSA, the Campus Lease, an Operating Loan Agreement and an Operating Agreement. Significant terms included:

- a) Primacorp will purchase substantially all of Quest's lands and related assets, including the Campus Lands, the Development Lands, the residence Lands (Lots A-E; four of which involve Southern Star's subleases), chattels and vehicles;
- b) Primacorp will lease specific Campus Lands back to Quest under a long-term lease arrangement;
- c) Primacorp will provide marketing and recruiting expertise to support Quest as a university;
- d) The Purchase Price will satisfy all of Quest's secured lenders and any commissions on sales;
- e) Primacorp will fund sufficient monies to pay the lesser of the Unsecured Creditor Claims and \$1.35 million under Quest's Plan; and
- f) Primacorp will provide Quest with a \$20 million secured working capital facility to support its operations.

[22] The Primacorp transaction was subject to a number of significant conditions:

- a) Quest's disclaimer of the four Southern Star subleases of the Residences or an agreement with Southern Star. On October 23, 2020, Quest disclaimed those subleases;
- b) Court approval of the Primacorp transaction including approval of a Break Up Fee and Break Up Fee Charge to secure Primacorp's costs. On November 3, 2020, I approved the Break Up Fee and granted a charge to secure this amount;
- c) Creditor approval of Quest's Plan under the CCAA. On November 3, 2020, I granted the Meeting Order to allow Quest to present the Plan, after having completed a claims process under the Claims Process Order, also granted on that date; and

d) Court approval of the Plan under the CCAA.

[23] On November 3, 2020, when Quest sought the TAVO (which was adjourned), Quest asserted that the Primacorp transaction was beneficial in many respects. Quest argued that it maximized the value of Quest's assets, offered the greatest benefit to stakeholders, had a high likelihood of completing, provided a recovery for secured and unsecured creditors, and had the highest likelihood that Quest will continue to operate within its current academic model.

[24] The Monitor concurred. In its Fourth Report dated November 2, 2020, the Monitor referred to the fact that there were only two viable proposals, with Primacorp's offer being the superior one. The Monitor's Supplemental and Confidential Report dated November 2, 2020 (the "Confidential Report") is also before the Court, although filed under seal. That Confidential Report referred to four other proposals received by Quest that were "not currently at a stage such that they are capable of being accepted by Quest".

[25] Quest and Primacorp both see the closing of the Primacorp transaction as very time sensitive. Pursuant to agreements with the Interim Lender, Quest was required to enter into a transaction by October 30, 2020 with an anticipated closing of November 30, 2020. The Interim Lender has since agreed to amend that requirement to extend the necessary closing date to December 24, 2020 in accordance with the Primacorp transaction.

[26] In addition to satisfying increasing pressure to repay its secured creditors, Quest seeks to exit these CCAA proceedings as soon as possible to allow it to recruit and plan for the upcoming 2021/22 academic year. Finally, there are other more financially driven and critical concerns. The Interim Lender has indicated that it will not fund its loan past December 2020. Without funding of some sort, Quest has no liquidity or financial ability after that time to continue operations.

ISSUES

[27] The paramount issue for consideration is, of course, whether the Court should approve the Primacorp transaction under s. 36 of the CCAA. A number of subsidiary issues also emerged at this hearing, as a result of submissions from various stakeholders:

- a) Lot E: Southern Star objects to the TAVO (now RVO), as vesting off any interest it may have under an unregistered lease of Lot E;
- b) ROFR: CapU objects to the sale to Primacorp, asserting that Quest is ignoring its rights under the ROFR that allows CapU to purchase/lease Quest's lands;
- c) Other Offer: Landrex Ventures Inc. ("Landrex"), together with CapU, assert that they should be given further time to finalize their offer for Quest's assets;
- d) Disclaimers: Southern Star, supported by its secured creditor, Bank of Montreal (BMO), applies for an order that the subleases of the Residences not be disclaimed by Quest; and
- e) RVO: Southern Star and another unsecured creditor, Dana Hospitality LP ("Dana"), object to the TAVO (now RVO), as being inappropriate and unfair in the circumstances and contrary to the spirit of the CCAA.

[28] I will address the subsidiary issues in the first instance, before turning to an overall assessment of the Primacorp transaction and whether the Court should approve that transaction.

Lot E

[29] As I described in the Rent Deferral Reasons (at para. 62), Quest, Southern Star and other parties are involved in a complex suite of agreements concerning the Residences that were built some time ago.

[30] Quest is the limited partner in a limited partnership agreement with Southern Star, who is the General Partner (GP). They formed the Southern Star Developments Limited Partnership (the “LP”) to build the Residences. Quest, as the owner of Lots A-D, leases those lands under Ground Leases to Southern Star (as the GP of the LP). The ground leases are at a nominal rate. In turn, Southern Star (the GP), as landlord, and Quest, as tenant, entered into Subleases for the Residences, once they were built.

[31] The initial arrangements between Quest and Southern Star anticipated that a fifth student residence would be built on Lot E, the lot adjacent to Lot D.

[32] In September 2017, as part of those arrangements, Quest and Southern Star executed certain Land Title documents (Form C Charges) attaching a Ground Lease and a Sublease with respect to Lot E. When the parties executed the Form C Charges, the Ground Lease was incomplete in many respects; it did not include any legal description because Lot E was created after the execution of the Form C Charges; and, it did not specify the applicable dates of the 99-year term. Finally, the Schedules to the Ground Lease included various documents between Quest, Southern Star and Southern Star’s lender intended to be later executed once the Ground Lease, the Sublease and the mortgage were finalized and registered at the Land Title Office.

[33] The parties delivered to Form C Charges to a law firm to be held in escrow pending the commencement of construction of the Lot E residence. Only recently, in response to this application, did a lawyer of the law firm complete the legal description for Lot E. Quest authorized this addition some time ago and I do not consider that matter as determinative of Southern Star’s rights, if any, under the Lot E Ground Lease.

[34] At present, Quest’s title to Lot E remains clear of any registration relating to Southern Star’s Ground Lease so there is no need for Quest to obtain a vesting order to remove it from the title. However, Quest and Primacorp seek an order that any claims that arise from the yet incomplete and unregistered Ground Lease on

Lot E shall not attach to Quest's assets that are to be vested in Primacorp. They also seek an order permanently enjoining Southern Star from registering the Lot E Ground Lease against title to Lot E.

[35] Southern Star objects to the RVO as vesting off any interest it may have in the unregistered Lot E Ground Lease, arguing:

- a) This Court has no jurisdiction to do so under the CCAA. Southern Star argues that this is simply a disguised disclaimer of the Ground Lease that the CCAA expressly prohibits. Disclaimers are allowed pursuant to s. 32 of the CCAA, however, limits are imposed by s. 32(9)(d) which provides that disclaimers can not be made:

. . . in respect of real property or of an immovable if the company is the lessor.
- b) If such jurisdiction exists under the CCAA, the relief sought is not fair and equitable in the circumstances.

[36] I will begin by discussing the nature of any interest held by Southern Star in relation to the Lot E Ground Lease.

[37] In my view, no "*lease*" *per se* is yet in existence and valid and enforceable between Quest and Southern Star. Although the parties executed the Form C Charges relating to the Lot E Ground Lease, Southern Star's principal, Michael Hutchison, acknowledges that they were not to be registered until construction had commenced. I conclude that the parties did not intend that the Ground Lease would be valid and effective between them until that time, in conjunction with the registration of the Sublease and the execution and registration of Southern Star's mortgage that would allow construction to begin.

[38] Southern Star does not argue that it has acquired any legal or beneficial interest in Lot E. At its highest, I conclude that Southern Star's rights to Lot E are purely contractual; Quest agreed that it would grant the Lot E Ground Lease in the future and it would become effective upon certain conditions being satisfied – in

essence, an agreement to agree. Those conditions included that Quest would decide to build a residence building on Lot E and that Southern Star would arrange financing to construct the building. In these circumstances, I readily conclude that this condition has not been satisfied and will never be satisfied by Quest given Quest's insolvency.

[39] Further, even assuming that this is a "disguised" disclaimer, I conclude that Quest is not a "lessor" as that term is used in s. 32(9)(d) of the CCAA. Quest agreed that, if certain conditions were satisfied, it would become a "lessor" under the Ground Lease; however, that has not come to pass.

[40] I conclude that I have the jurisdiction under s. 11 of the CCAA to grant the order sought by Quest to ensure that Southern Star does not assert any rights under the Lot E Ground Lease at a future date. In addition, I rely on s. 36(6) of the CCAA that allows the Court to exercise its jurisdiction to vest off "other restrictions".

[41] The exercise of the Court's jurisdiction under s. 11 and 36 of the CCAA requires that the relief sought be "appropriate". This is in the sense that it accords with the statutory objectives of the CCAA, not only in terms of what the order will achieve, but the means by which it employs to that end: *Century Services Ltd. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2010 SCC 60 at para. 70.

[42] In this respect, the parties have advanced arguments as to equitable considerations in terms of whether such relief is appropriate in the circumstances, while taking into account the respective positions of the parties. While in the receivership context, Quest has referred to various authorities that discuss the balancing of interests in similar situations where leases (in these cases effective and enforceable) were vested off title: *Meridian Credit Union Ltd. v. 984 Bay Street Inc.*, [2006] O.J. No. 3169 (Ont. S.C.J.) at paras. 19-23, citing *New Skeena Forest Products Inc. v. Kitwanga Lumber Co.*, 2005 BCCA 154; *Romspen Investments Corp. v. Woods Property Development Inc.*, 2011 ONSC 3648 at para. 66; rev'd other grounds *Romspen Investment Corp. v. Woods Property Development Inc.*, 2011 ONCA 817 at para. 25.

[43] Southern Star argues that the equities favour it, not Quest, in these circumstances.

[44] Southern Star contends that neither Quest nor Primacorp have made any attempt to negotiate with it concerning its interest in Lot E. I would not accede to this argument. While the negotiations between Quest, Primacorp and Southern Star were not fruitful, it remains the case that Quest has made good faith efforts to address Southern Star's interests, although its ability in that respect were hampered by Primacorp's willingness to accommodate those interests.

[45] Southern Star also argues that it will be prejudiced if its contractual right is vested off in that Quest and Primacorp are not offering compensation for the loss of that interest. Southern Star focusses on what it says is the "status quo", arguing that it has the "right" to build a residence on Lot E. However, any such "right" is illusory at best, since Quest has no present ability to occupy the Residences, let alone the financial capability to participate in the construction of a fifth one on Lot E. Nor is there any realistic prospect that Quest will be in a position to do so in the future.

[46] Southern Star's argument in relation to Lot E is an attempt to gain leverage more than anything else. If Southern Star's argument succeeds and the relief sought is refused, Southern Star would be in the same position—facing a sale of Lot E and a likely order vesting off any rights or interests it may have. It is a condition of the Primacorp transaction that Lot E be transferred to it without any further involvement with Southern Star. Without an order rejecting Southern Star's claim in respect of the escrowed Ground Lease on Lot E, the likely result would be the end of these proceedings and the commencement of realization proceedings by the Interim Lender and other secured creditors.

[47] The Ground Lease is not effective and enforceable; the Ground Lease is not registered on title to Lot E. Given the circumstances, Quest has no ability to build a residence on Lot E and there is no reasonable prospect of that happening, given its insolvency and the need to dispose of its assets, including Lot E.

[48] While I acknowledge the negative impact on Southern Star arising from this relief, that impact must be balanced in the context of Quest's restructuring efforts in this proceeding. Those efforts are intended to address not only Southern Star's interests, but also the myriad interests held by other stakeholders. The sale of Lot E to Primacorp will allow Quest to realize on its interest in Lot E to the benefit of the stakeholders as a whole.

[49] I conclude that the relief sought by Quest in the RVO in relation to Lot E is appropriate and it is granted.

CapU ROFR

[50] Lot 1 and Lots A-E are subject to various charges in favour of CapU.

[51] In March 2019, Quest granted mortgage security in favour of CapU in connection with a loan made to Quest. As part of these agreements, in April 2019, Quest also granted the ROFR in favour of CapU. CapU registered the ROFR against these lands. Under the Primacorp transaction, Quest is required to obtain title to Lot 1 and Lots A-E without reference to the ROFR.

[52] Pursuant to s. 9 of the *Property Law Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 377, a right of first refusal to land is an equitable interest in land.

[53] CapU has referred to two non-CCAA cases that discuss ROFRs generally.

[54] In *Adesa Auctions of Canada Corp. v. Southern Railway of B.C.*, 2001 BCSC 1421 at paras. 26-30, the Court found that the contractual terms were to be strictly enforced and that the rights under the ROFR could not be defeated or circumvented by an offer that included other lands not covered by the ROFR. To similar effect, *Alim Holdings Ltd. v. Tom Howe Holdings Ltd.*, 2016 BCCA 84 at para. 41 states, following *Adesa*, that a ROFR will be triggered by a package sale that includes the subject property, subject to contrary language in the ROFR.

[55] It is common ground, however, that different considerations may also apply in the CCAA context. Having said that, there is little case authority on the ability of a court in CCAA proceedings to vest off a ROFR, whether triggered or not.

[56] In “Rights of First Refusal and Options to Purchase in Insolvency Proceedings” (2019) 8 J.I.I.C. 103 (the “ROFR Article”), the authors Virginie Gauthier, David Sieradzki and Hugo Margoc extensively review the issue, including in relation to Options to Purchase (OTPs). At 106, the authors state:

... Section 11 of the CCAA grants courts the right to "make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances" except as limited by the CCAA. As such, the CCAA court is well equipped to approve the sale of an OTP- or ROFR-encumbered asset to a party other than the rights-holder and without having first complied with the restrictive covenants if the transaction is in the best interests of the creditors at large, provided that the interest of the OTP or ROFR-holders is taken into account. The court will consider, *inter alia*, the monitor's views on these issues before making any such approvals.

[57] At 118-119, the authors conclude that:

While jurisprudence on this matter is not conclusive, it appears that a CCAA court would likely only vest out a valid and unexpired OTP that runs with the land in exceptional circumstances such as in the context of a going-concern restructuring where obtaining the highest possible price for the encumbered asset is paramount to support the restructuring efforts of the debtor company, and where the OTP rights-holders are also creditors in the proceeding and could seek compensation for any loss incurred due to the removal of the OTP right.

...

In summary, common law CCAA courts may vest out valid or unexpired ROFRs and OPTs in a case where the equities favour such an order or on consent.

[58] Quest has referred to *Bear Hills Pork Producers Ltd. (Re)*, 2004 SKQB 213, additional reasons 2004 SKQB 216. In that CCAA proceeding, the debtors sought approval of a sale of bundled assets relating to a hog farm, in the face of a ROFR that applied to the land only. Justice Kyle referred to the overall security affecting the assets; the court also commented that a withdrawal of the lands from the sale would not allow the proposed sale to complete, leading possibly to a liquidation (at paras. 4-5).

[59] However, in *Bear Hills*, Kyle J. relied on authorities that have since been questioned in *Alim Holdings* (see paras. 38-41). Justice Kyle's conclusion at para. 10 that the ROFR was not triggered runs contrary to the court's conclusion in *Alim Holdings* at para. 41.

[60] I have no doubt that courts across Canada have vested off ROFRs in the context of assets sales approved in CCAA proceedings. For example, Quest refers to *Artic Glacier Income Fund (Re)*, [2012] M.J. No. 451 (Q.B.) where a ROFR was vested off title, although the circumstances under which that CCAA relief was granted is not clear.

[61] Similarly, in *Great Slave Helicopters Ltd. v. Gwichin Development Corp.* (November 23, 2018), CV-18-604434-00CL (Ont. S.C.J.), Justice Hainey's endorsement directed that a purchaser of aggregated assets in a CCAA proceeding provide certain information to the holder of the ROFR with respect to the purchase price allocation. The ROFR Article, which discusses the circumstances before the court in *Great Slave Helicopters* at 108-109, indicates that the issue of the exercise of the ROFR was ultimately resolved consensually.

[62] Fortunately, in this case, there is no dispute concerning the Court's jurisdiction to address CapU's rights arising under the ROFR. Both Quest and CapU agree that the Court has jurisdiction under the CCAA to vest off the ROFR, subject to a consideration of the equities as between the parties.

[63] For the following reasons, I conclude that a balancing of the equities favours vesting off CapU's ROFR to allow the Primacorp transaction to proceed:

- a) Since January 2020, Quest has been pursuing a going concern restructuring that will permit it to remain as a university and employer in the Squamish area. CapU has been involved in this proceeding from the outset and was well aware of the opportunity to participate in that pursuit;

b) There is a significant issue as to whether the ROFR has even been triggered by delivery of the Primacorp PSA. The definition provided in the ROFR of “Bona Fide Offer to Purchase” means, in part, an offer that is:

(iii) only for the entirety of the Property [the lands] and all chattels thereto and no other property, rights or assets
[Emphasis added.]

The definition of “Purchased Assets” in the Primacorp PSA is broad and refers not only to lands and chattels, but a variety of other assets (for example, contracts, plans, permits, vehicles and intellectual property). This express language is what the court in *Alim Holdings*, at para. 41, described could indicate an intention that any such aggregated offer would *not* trigger the ROFR;

c) The term of the ROFR expires in March 2024. The ROFR appears to contemplate that, even if CapU does not exercise the ROFR, the purchaser of the lands must still agree to grant CapU a ROFR on the same terms. Similarly, “change of control” provisions are potentially effective that would allow CapU to later acquire control of Quest in place of anyone else. This would frustrate Primacorp’s expectation under the Primacorp PSA that it would have the right to nominate the board of governors for Quest after closing;

Primacorp does not agree to assume these restrictions. In addition, every other offer for Quest’s assets required that the ROFR be vested off title to the lands. It is difficult to see that any purchaser would agree to take title to purchased assets with such significant restrictions. If the ROFR is effective, this would give rise to a severe “chilling effect” on the market, with potentially disastrous results for Quest’s restructuring efforts;

- d) The 60-day period within which CapU is entitled to consider any “Bona Fide Offer to Purchase” is simply unworkable in these circumstances. This is not a matter of expediency, without regard to any rights held by CapU. Quest will have no funds to continue its operations past December 2020 and, if realizations by the secured creditors ensue, CapU’s ROFR rights will be illusory at best;
- e) CapU complains that it received the redacted Primacorp PSA only recently, on October 29, 2020. CapU then requested an unredacted copy, which Quest agreed to do upon CapU executing an NDA. CapU refused to sign the NDA, stating that it would hamper its ability to participate in its own offer. Again, CapU has had months to formulate its own offer;
- f) Quest asserts that CapU has no intention to or ability to make its own offer for all of Quest’s assets in competition to the Primacorp transaction. CapU has not put forward any evidence at this hearing to confirm such intention or ability. Similarly, there is no evidence that CapU truly wishes to or is able to exercise any rights under the ROFR to purchase Quest’s lands and chattels;
- g) I consider that the evidence conclusively supports that CapU advances its arguments under the ROFR simply as a tactic to oppose the Primacorp transaction and delay the matter so that it and Landrex can seek to advance their own joint competing offer;
- h) As I will discuss below, the terms of the joint Landrex/CapU proposal is only semi-formed at this point and Quest has indicated that some major terms are not acceptable. As such, it is highly questionable that this joint offer is, as CapU asserts, a “better, higher offer”;
- i) I conclude that Quest has given proper regard to and has not ignored CapU’s rights under the ROFR in the context of these proceedings.

CapU has had sufficient information even from the redacted Primacorp PSA to discern the substance of the Primacorp transaction in terms of advancing any competing offer or exercising the ROFR;

- j) Given the above circumstances, including CapU's involvement in Quest's lengthy efforts to restructure, I cannot conclude that CapU will suffer significant prejudice if the ROFR is vested off. Quest has indicated that CapU will have the opportunity to file a proof of claim in respect of any loss alleged to arise because of the vesting off of the ROFR. Of course, the value of any such claim would be questionable unless CapU can establish that its rights were triggered by the Primacorp transaction and that it had the ability to complete under the ROFR; and
- k) The Monitor supports the Primacorp sale, as maximizing the value of Quest's assets for the stakeholders and allowing a successful restructuring of Quest's business.

[64] If CapU has rights under the ROFR, allowing CapU to assert those rights would delay the Primacorp sale and potentially negate it, all with potentially devastating effect on the broader stakeholder group. The Primacorp sale is the only sale that is before the Court that would result in a restructuring of Quest for the benefit of the stakeholders. Clearly, within that context, the rights of all affected stakeholders must be balanced in respect of any rights held by CapU.

[65] In *Bear Hills*, similar considerations were before the court. The Saskatchewan Court of Queen's Bench approved a bundled sale of assets, without first requiring compliance with a ROFR. In part, the prospective purchaser would only consider purchasing the complete bundle of properties for an aggregate purchase price and did not allocate value on a property-by-property basis.

[66] As I have sought to do here, the court in *Bear Hills* (at para. 9) was attuned to the overarching and remedial statutory purpose and objective of the CCAA to avoid

the “social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company”: *Century Services* at para. 70 and *9354-9186 Québec inc. v. Callidus Capital Corp.*, 2020 SCC 10 at paras. 40-41. This objective is not to be achieved simply in the most expedient manner and without due regard to interests of stakeholders that are affected in that process. As the Court further stated in *Century Services* at para. 70, any restructuring is best achieved when “all stakeholders are treated as advantageously and fairly as the circumstances permit”.

[67] I am satisfied that it is appropriate, in the context of the Primacorp transaction, to vest off the ROFR held by CapU. In that regard, I have also considered the factors set out in s. 36(3) of the CCAA in terms of assessing any rights of CapU under the ROFR in that context.

Landrex / CapU Offer

[68] Landrex, supported by CapU, opposes approval of the Primacorp transaction. Landrex argues that they should be given further time to present an offer for Quest’s assets in competition with the Primacorp transaction.

[69] As with CapU, Landrex has been fully engaged in discussions with Quest for some time now, having been alerted to the possibility of a transaction as long ago as fall 2019. Landrex’s interest in Quest has always been in conjunction with securing an academic partner, namely, CapU.

[70] In June 2020, Landrex and Quest entered into an agreement for a sale; however, the conditions lapsed.

[71] On October 8, 2020, Landrex and Quest executed a further purchase and sale agreement (the “Landrex PSA”) providing for a purchase price of \$51 million for most of Quest’s assets (Lot 1 only and excluding Lots A-E: obviating any need for disclaimers of the Southern Star Subleases or vesting off any of Southern Star’s rights under the Lot E Ground Lease). The closing date under the Landrex PSA is December 23, 2020.

[72] By the start of this hearing, significant conditions precedent in respect of the Landrex PSA were still outstanding. Those included the financing condition in favour of Landrex and the mutual condition by which “another party” (CapU) was to have secured a sublease with Quest after Landrex had granted CapU a lease in the first instance.

[73] Landrex suggests that Quest is contractually bound to honour the Landrex PSA by allowing it further time to remove the conditions precedent, citing the good faith organizing principle discussed in *Bhasin v. Hrynew*, 2014 SCC 71. Further, Landrex argues that Quest has a duty to take all reasonable steps to satisfy the conditions precedent: *Dynamic Transport Ltd. v. O.K. Detailing Ltd.*, [1978] 2 S.C.R. 1072.

[74] Further discussions and negotiations continued between Landrex and Quest beyond October 8, 2020; however, matters under the Landrex PSA were not advanced.

[75] By late October 2020, Quest was under significant pressure, if not a legal requirement from the Interim Lender, to conclude a transaction. At that time, only two potentially viable proposals were on the table, one being from Primacorp. As above, where the Monitor noted in its Confidential Report that other proposals were “not currently at a stage such that they are capable of being accepted by Quest”, those “other proposals” included the Landrex PSA.

[76] By the time the Landrex PSA was executed on October 8, 2020, Landrex was not aware that Quest had already signed the Primacorp PSA. However, I agree with Quest’s counsel that Landrex had not secured any rights of exclusivity in terms of advancing its offer. The Landrex PSA provided:

20.2 Notwithstanding anything else contained herein, Landrex acknowledges and agrees that, following from date of the acceptance of this Offer by the Vendor until the date that the Vendor waives or declares satisfied the Vendor’s Condition, the Vendor will be authorized to negotiate with or offer the Property for sale to any third party (including the entering into of any agreement by the Vendor with any third party). . . .

[77] Under the Landrex PSA, Quest's Vendor's Condition was approval from its Board of Governors. Quest never obtained that approval because Quest's Board of Governors did not agree to certain deal terms under the Landrex PSA.

[78] By October 29, 2020, Landrex would have been fully aware that its offer was not going to be advanced by Quest any further since, by then, Quest had chosen Primacorp.

[79] On November 2, 2020, Landrex made a further offer for \$53.5 million. The only other significant change to their offer was to describe the requirement for a lease/sublease arrangement between Landrex, "another party" (intended to be CapU) and Quest as Landrex's condition precedent, not a mutual condition precedent. Quest did not accept this offer.

[80] In any event, by that time, Landrex's financing condition was far from being satisfied. On November 9, 2020, TD Asset Management ("TD"), Landrex's lender, provided a letter simply stating that it was continuing to work with Landrex and CapU to provide that financing.

[81] I acknowledge that, since the initial hearing date of November 3, 2020, Landrex has moved to finalize its offer but it has only done so to some extent.

[82] On November 13, 2020, Landrex secured a letter from TD that referred to a term sheet being in place after a final financing structure was negotiated (no documents were disclosed). However, TD's commitment is clearly conditional upon CapU's board approving the lease between Landrex and CapU at a meeting that is not scheduled to take place until November 24, 2020. There is no evidence as to what those lease terms are and whether there is a reasonable likelihood that CapU's board will approve it. Further, this whole arrangement continues to hinge on a negotiated sublease between CapU and Quest, which is not in place.

[83] On November 16, 2020, Landrex's counsel advised of yet further developments: (i) removal of its financing condition; (ii) an LOI with Southern Star by

which it would take over the Residences but not require disclaimer of the Subleases; and, (iii) agreement with CapU to remove the ROFR.

[84] Despite these developments, Quest advised that it was still not agreeable to the terms of the Landrex transaction. In addition, the Monitor continues to support approval of the Primacorp transaction, noting the uncertainty and potential delay of CapU obtaining ministerial approval to allow its participation in the Landrex transaction.

[85] The s. 36(3) factors continue to provide a useful structure for consideration of the Landrex transaction, and these late breaking developments.

[86] I am satisfied that Landrex was given a reasonable opportunity to participate in the SISP and that it has been aware of this opportunity for many months, even before it officially began. The fact that the cash consideration under the Landrex transaction exceeds that of Primacorp is deserving of consideration. However, other considerations arise, including that the Primacorp transaction involves significant other benefits to Quest in terms of its future operations, including the working capital facility of \$20 million.

[87] Both Quest and the Monitor continue to be of the view that the Primacorp transaction is more beneficial to the creditors. I agree with this, particularly considering the continuing uncertainty and risk associated with the Landrex/CapU transaction that is yet to be resolved, leaving aside that Quest has unequivocally stated that it has no intention to pursue it. Even if the further negotiations required under the Landrex sale were advanced in an expeditious manner, it seems unlikely to be finalized by the end of the year. To the contrary, the Primacorp transaction has been finalized after weeks of complex negotiations and Quest and Primacorp are ready to close without further delay. I agree that time is of the essence at this stage of the proceedings, for the reasons already noted above.

[88] In the overall circumstances here, I see no reason to delay, if not risk, the “bird in hand” transaction that arose through a reasonable sales process, in the hope that a more uncertain transaction may be finalized, such as with Landrex.

Southern Star Disclaimers

[89] On October 23, 2020, and with the approval of the Monitor, Quest issued notices of disclaimer (the “Disclaimers”) to Southern Star relating to the Subleases on Lots A-D by which Southern Star leases those lands and the Residences to Quest.

[90] A condition precedent of the Primacorp transaction is that either Quest will disclaim the Subleases or Primacorp will have entered into an agreement with Southern Star to its satisfaction. The evidence discloses that negotiations did take place between the parties but they did not reach a mutually acceptable agreement.

[91] Quest’s rent payments to Southern Star under the Subleases for the Residences on Lots A-D total approximately \$236,218 per month.

[92] Very recently, on November 15, 2020, before the conclusion of this hearing, Quest voluntarily withdrew the Disclaimers with respect to Lots A-B. Accordingly, failing an agreement between Primacorp and Southern Star, it remains a condition of the Primacorp transaction that Quest’s Disclaimers of the Subleases in relation to Lots C-D be upheld.

[93] The Ground Leases are registered against Lots A-D. BMO’s security is registered against Southern Star’s interest under the Ground Leases; in addition, Fivestone Capital Corp. (“Fivestone”), a company controlled by Mr. Hutchison, has registered security against the Ground Leases. Quest does not seek any relief in respect of the Ground Leases; unlike Lot E, those documents are fully effective and enforceable and have been the basis upon which the parties have developed those properties.

[94] What remains to be addressed is Southern Star's application pursuant to s. 32(2) of the CCAA, supported by BMO, for an order disallowing any disclaimer by Quest of the Subleases of the Residences on Lots C-D. Section 32(4) of the CCAA lists various non-exhaustive factors that the court is to consider in relation to disputes over disclaimers:

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.

[95] In *League Assets Corp. (Re)*, 2016 BCSC 2262, I discussed the significance of disclaimers in CCAA proceedings, both from the point of view of the counterparty and that of the entire stakeholder group:

[49] These CCAA provisions are not inconsequential in the face of this type of proceedings. At this point, the matter is no longer between the debtor company and a counterparty. There are other stakeholders involved and the statutory provisions, and the provisions of court orders such as the Initial Order, are meant to protect the stakeholder group as a whole, while also allowing a certain amount of flexibility for the debtor company. A disclaimer of a contract has consequences not only to the debtor company, but the estate generally. Such an action can substantially increase the debt being faced by the estate or divest the debtor of a substantial benefit that might be realized for the benefit of the creditors. It is in that context that the CCAA requires that certain procedures be followed by the debtor company, with the necessary oversight by the Court's officer, the Monitor, as to whether any disclaimer will be approved or not.

[96] The factor under s. 32(4)(b) of the CCAA as to enhancing the prospects of a viable restructuring applies equally in respect of disclaimers in the context of a sales process by which the business is to continue as a going concern: *Timminco Ltd. (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 4471 at paras. 51-52 and *Aveos Fleet Performance Inc. (Re)*, 2012 QCCS 6796 at paras. 48-50. In addition, the disclaimer need not be proven as "essential", only "advantageous and beneficial": *Timminco* at para. 54.

[97] Quest asserts that the Disclaimers are necessary to pursue and complete the Primacorp transaction, which it considers the best possible outcome for Quest and its stakeholders, including students, faculty, staff, secured and unsecured creditors, suppliers and vendors. In its letter dated October 28, 2020 to Southern Star, Quest also refers to its liquidity crisis and that amounts owing to its secured creditors became due some time ago.

[98] In its Fourth Report dated November 2, 2020, the Monitor confirmed its approval of the Disclaimers, based on:

- 2.8.1 The residences are not currently being used by Quest (other than two units being used by staff members and some limited use by a film crew recently) given on-line learning format being employed as a result of COVID 19;
- 2.8.2 It is a term of the Primacorp Agreement that the subleases be disclaimed; and,
- 2.8.3 The Monitor noted that the two most promising alternative parties in discussions with Quest also required the Southern Star subleases to be disclaimed.

[99] Southern Star advances a number of arguments in relation to the Disclaimers.

[100] Firstly, it argues that the Disclaimers will not result in a viable compromise or arrangement. Southern Star argues that there is no indication that Quest and Primacorp do not wish to continue to have the Residences as part of the student experience for those attending Quest.

[101] I agree that, in the Rent Deferral Reasons, many of my comments (at paras. 23-26, 90) were confirmatory of the importance of the Residences to Quest in respect of its future operations. However, that was then and this is now. The pandemic continues in full force and Quest is necessarily required to make decisions in the face of current circumstances. I agree that it is likely that Quest will seek to continue the student residence experience once the pandemic has receded, however, when that might happen is anyone's guess.

[102] In the meantime, Quest, under the Primacorp transaction, must make decisions as to its financial capabilities going forward. Maintaining two empty

Residences with accompanying rent payments is, on its face, not a reasonable business decision in the circumstances. It was Primacorp, an arms length purchaser, who has imposed this condition.

[103] Further, the Monitor agrees with Quest that the Disclaimers are necessary to enhance the prospects of Quest making a viable compromise or arrangement in these proceedings. There is no reason to question the Monitor's view as it is apparent that the Monitor has considered all relevant matters.

[104] I agree that the Disclaimers will enhance the prospects of Quest making a viable compromise or arrangement. The Monitor overwhelmingly agrees after a consideration of all the circumstances including those particularly faced by Southern Star as a result.

[105] Secondly, Southern Star argues that Quest delivered the Disclaimers simply to secure a bargaining advantage for Quest and Primacorp toward a re-visitation of the rent deferral issue or to attempt to reduce the rent. I agree that there is some indication that Quest and Primacorp had that in mind; however, that is often the reality that arises after a debtor concludes that it is no longer viable to abide by those contractual commitments and that a disclaimer is appropriate. If it were possible to come to an amicable resolution with Southern Star in the context of the Primacorp transaction, I expect Quest would have done so.

[106] Southern Star refers to the statements in *Allarco Entertainment Inc. (Re)*, 2009 ABQB 503 at para. 59, where Justice Veit considered whether certain contracts should be terminated. She was attuned to whether the termination was fair, appropriate and reasonable and whether it arose after good faith negotiations. In this case, there is no evidence to suggest that the parties did not approach the negotiations in good faith. Clearly, it is not my role on this application to assess the reasonableness of the respective positions of Quest, Primacorp and Southern Star in those negotiations. It does appear, however, that Quest and Primacorp have moved toward a middle ground by the withdrawal of the Disclaimers in relation to Lots A-B.

[107] Thirdly, Southern Star places great emphasis on what it says will be the significant hardship it will suffer if the Disclaimers are upheld. Southern Star says that it has spent approximately \$41.7 million to construct the Residences.

[108] The monthly mortgage payments to BMO and Fivestone are approximately \$220,000. The outstanding balance of the BMO loan facility is \$34.4 million. Mr. Hutchison indicates that, without payment of rent by Quest, Southern Star will not be able to make its mortgage payments to BMO. In that event, BMO will be in a position to foreclose on the Ground Leases. Mr. Hutchison has guaranteed the BMO debt, as has another of Mr. Hutchison's companies.

[109] As noted by Quest, any financial consequences to Southern Star will largely depend on what mitigating measures are undertaken. Those could include a re-letting of the Residences or a sale of its interests under the Ground Leases. At present, with no clear indication as to how those matters might evolve, I am unable to conclude with certainty that any hardship suffered by Southern Star would be "significant".

[110] Regardless of any hardship faced by Southern Star, the reality is that Quest has only one viable means by which to advance the restructuring at this time – the Primacorp transaction. Within the confines of that transaction, Primacorp sees no merit in maintaining the Subleases on these two Residences. Apparently, no other interested party expressed an interest in maintaining the Subleases besides Landrex. In light of Landrex's submissions at the conclusion of this hearing on November 16, 2020, I have considered that the Landrex/CapU transaction may have presented a more palatable resolution of the Subleases given the recent LOI between Landrex and Southern Star. However, I conclude that delaying the Primacorp sale, on the prospect that the Landrex/CapU transaction will come about, is not a viable option for the reasons discussed above.

[111] I agree that this decision will visit hardship, even arguably significant hardship, upon Southern Star. However, it is difficult to see that preventing delivery of the Disclaimers would avoid that result in any event. If the Primacorp transaction

does not proceed, there is no transaction and Quest has no financial means to continue past December 2020. The Interim Lender has indicated that it will not advance funds to Quest beyond that date, and specifically, that it has no interest in funding continued rent payments to Southern Star.

[112] In that event, Southern Star will be in the same position post December 2020, with Quest unable to pay the rent for the Residences at that time: see *Target Canada Co. (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 1028 at paras. 27-28.

[113] As the court noted in *Target Canada* at paras. 24-25, the court must give due consideration to the stakeholder group as a whole in assessing whether the Disclaimers are fair and reasonable: *Doman Industries Ltd. (Re)*, 2004 BCSC 733 at para. 33. The price of setting aside the Disclaimers is that the Primacorp transaction will not proceed and a receivership at the behest of the Interim Lender will likely follow. In my view, this is not in the best interests of that larger stakeholder group which, in my view, has primacy here even in the face of the hardship and prejudice caused to Southern Star.

[114] I dismiss Southern Star's application for order that the Subleases of the Residences on Lots C-D not be disclaimed by Quest.

RVO

[115] At the November 3, 2020 hearing, when Quest originally sought the TAVO, Quest was seeking to uphold the Disclaimers of the Subleases. At that time, Southern Star's evidence and submissions were to the effect that, if the Court upheld the Disclaimers, it would have a substantial unsecured claim against the estate. As indicated above, the amount of any claim that Southern Star might advance in the estate is far from clear, given possible mitigation, although there is potential for a significant claim.

[116] This position did not come as a surprise to Quest; however, it appears that Quest did not appreciate the potential magnitude of Southern Star's claim. More importantly, Quest has not fully appreciated that a very unhappy claimant – Southern

Star under the Disclaimers – was not likely to vote in favour of the Plan and that the value of its claim could swamp the class votes to prevent any approval by the creditors. Again, creditor approval of the Plan is a requirement of the Primacorp Transaction.

[117] In early November 2020, known unsecured creditor's claims were estimated at approximately \$2.3 million. "Restructuring Claims" (which will include any claim of Southern Star under the Disclaimers) were yet unknown.

[118] Initially, Primacorp agreed to fund Quest's Plan in the amount of the lesser of 50% of the claims or \$1.35 million. The Monitor now states that there is a "high probability" that Southern Star's claim will be large enough such that Southern Star will control the value of the votes at the creditors meeting. Other major unsecured creditor claims have also since emerged, being that of Dana (estimated \$1 million) and the Association for the Advancement of Scholarship (estimated \$5 million).

[119] As the Monitor notes, any of these claims could effectively veto the Plan.

[120] Quest and Primacorp were then facing a dilemma. They determined that, while they might succeed on the Disclaimer issue, they could not likely obtain approval of the Plan, a further requirement of the Primacorp PSA, if Southern Star carried through with its suggested negative vote. While Quest could raise arguments in relation to the value of any claim advanced by Southern Star, uncertain and lengthy litigation would likely result; even if Quest was successful, it would be too late to factor into this restructuring.

[121] Quest, with Primacorp's approval, solved this dilemma by revising the TAVO to an RVO. In addition, the Primacorp PSA was amended to delete the conditions precedent requiring creditor and court approval of the Plan. Accordingly, the only condition precedent that remains before closing of the Primacorp transaction is the granting of the RVO.

[122] The Monitor supports this change as necessary in the circumstances in order to allow Quest to complete the Primacorp transaction. The Monitor supports the granting of the RVO.

[123] In its Fifth Report dated November 10, 2020, the Monitor describes the characteristics of the new structure and steps under the RVO, which involves Quest's subsidiary, Guardian Properties Ltd. ("Guardian"):

RVO Structure & Impact

- 2.6 The RVO provides for the following to occur in sequential order on the closing of the Primacorp Transaction:
 - 2.6.1 A wholly owned subsidiary of Quest, Quest Guardian Properties Ltd. ("Guardian") shall be added as a Petitioner in these CCAA proceedings. Guardian was incorporated on January 25, 2018 and has never carried on any business and has never held any assets or liabilities;
 - 2.6.2 All of Quest's right, title and interest in and to the Excluded Assets (as defined in the Primacorp PSA and the RVO) shall be transferred to and vested in Guardian;
 - 2.6.3 All Contracts (other than Approved Contracts), Claims and Liabilities of Quest shall be transferred to Guardian and Quest shall be released from and in respect of all obligations in respect of such Contracts, Claims and Liabilities;
 - 2.6.4 Primacorp will pay the Purchase Price to the Monitor to the extent of the Secured Charges and all the Secured Claims and the Secured Charges shall be extinguished and cancelled. The Purchase Price will stand in the place of the Purchased Assets;
 - 2.6.5 All of Quest's right, title and interest in the Purchased Assets shall vest in Primacorp free and clear of any security interests, Claims and Liabilities; and,
 - 2.6.6 Quest will cease to be a Petitioner in these CCAA proceedings leaving Guardian as the sole Petitioner.
- 2.7 The RVO contains release provisions similar to those contained in the Plan. Quest, its employees, legal advisors and other representatives, Quest's Governors and Officers, and the Monitor and its legal counsel shall be released from any and all demands and claims relating to, arising out of, or in connection with these CCAA Proceedings. The releases do not apply in the case of wilful misconduct or fraud.
- 2.8 As a result of the amendments to the Primacorp Transaction and the RVO, if the RVO is granted:
 - 2.8.1 There will be no uncertainty as to whether the Primacorp Transaction can close and the condition precedent for the

approval of the Plan is no longer applicable. As a result, there will be certainty for the go-forward operations of Quest, thereby creating security for the Quest students, faculty and staff leading into the critical enrolment period for the winter term;

2.8.2 Guardian will become responsible for the obligations under the Southern Star subleases should they not be disclaimed. As Guardian will not have the financial resources to meet those obligations, it is expected that Guardian would default on the Southern Star subleases in January 2021; and

2.8.3 The Plan, which will now compromise the debts of Guardian, will be funded through the Primacorp Transaction and therefore this aspect of the Primacorp Transaction and the Plan has not changed.

[124] As I will discuss below, the effect and substance of the RVO is to achieve what Quest has originally sought by way of a restructuring in these proceedings; namely, a sale of certain assets to Primacorp and, importantly, Quest continuing as a going concern as an academic institution, in partnership with Primacorp. The only aspect now missing is that, under the RVO, Quest will avoid having to obtain creditor or Court approval of the Plan.

[125] The intention is that the amounts that Primacorp was to fund under the Plan will now be transferred to Guardian to be distributed under Guardian's plan in relation to the Quest's liabilities that are to be transferred to Guardian. Effectively, Guardian will be funded just as it was originally intended that Quest's Plan was to have been funded to resolve those claims.

[126] Southern Star and Dana, as unsecured creditors of Quest, object to the granting of an RVO, contending that it effectively and unfairly negates their right to vote on Quest's Plan under s. 6 of the CCAA. They object to the transfer of their claims to Guardian. They say that, although they will have the ability to vote on Guardian's plan, it will effectively mean that they cannot vote to block Quest's restructuring to enable it to continue as a going concern within the context of the Primacorp transaction.

RVO Jurisdiction and Authorities

[127] There is no dispute between the parties that this Court has authority to grant the RVO under its general statutory jurisdiction found in s. 11 of the CCAA.

[128] Quest has referred me to a number of decisions across Canada where courts have exercised that jurisdiction to grant an RVO in the context of sale approvals considered under s. 36 of the CCAA. I will review those decisions in some detail below to highlight the relevant circumstances.

[129] In *Re T. Eaton Co.* 2000 CarswellOnt 4502, 26 C.C.P.B. 295, the Ontario court granted such an order under its CCAA proceedings. There are no written reasons discussing the circumstances in that case. The only brief reference to that structure is found in Claims Officer Houlden's decision in *Eaton's* that addressed an unrelated issue. The agreed statement of facts before the Claims Officer provided:

5. The CCAA Plan contemplated that all of the assets of Eaton's which were not being retained by Eaton's under the Sears Agreement would be transferred to a new corporation, Distributionco Inc. ("Distributionco"). These assets would then be liquidated by Richter & Partners Inc. ("Richter") in its capacity as court-appointed liquidator of the estate and effects of Distributionco. Richter would then distribute the assets of Distributionco to unsecured creditors and others in accordance with priorities set out in the CCAA Plan.
6. Under the CCAA Plan, unsecured creditor claims against Eaton's are converted into a right to participate in distributions in the liquidation of Distributionco based on the amount of the creditor's claim against Eaton's. Accordingly, a critical initial step in the liquidation of Distributionco is the determination of the validity and amount of claims asserted against Eaton's. For this purpose the CCAA Plan establishes a Claims Procedure for the resolution of such claims, of which the parties to this matter are aware.

[130] It is unclear as to the basis upon which the court approved this structure in *Eaton's* although, as Southern Star notes, it was a transaction approved within the context of a CCAA Plan.

[131] More recently, this structure was approved in *Plasco Energy* (July 17, 2015), Toronto CV-15-10869-00C (Ont. S.C.J. [Comm. List]). In those CCAA proceedings,

an agreement was approved that “effectively” transferred current tax losses and intellectual property to a purchaser. Justice Wilton-Siegel’s endorsement stated:

The Global Settlement contemplates implementation of a corporate reorganization by which the shares of Plasco will be transferred to an acquisition corporation owned by NSPG and CWP and the remaining assets of the applicants will be held by a new corporation, referred to as “New Plasco”, which will assume all of the liabilities and obligations of Plasco. I am satisfied that the Court has authority under section 11 of the CCAA to authorize such transactions notwithstanding that the applicants are not proceeding under s. 6(2) of the CCAA insofar as it is not contemplated that the applicants will propose a plan of arrangement or compromise. For this purpose, I consider that the Global Settlement is analogous to such a plan in the context of these particular proceedings. ...

[132] Justice Gouin granted an RVO in the CCAA proceedings of *Stornoway Diamond Corporation* (October 7, 2019), Montreal 500-11-057094-191 (Q.C.S.C. [Comm. Div.]). There are no written reasons from the court; however, the motion materials disclose that, under the transaction, the purchasers acquired substantially all the debtor’s assets by purchasing 100% of the shares of one debtor company (SDCI, which held the acquired assets). In consideration, the purchaser released certain liabilities owed by the debtors and agreed to assume others.

[133] In *Stornoway Diamond*, to ensure the purchaser acquired the assets free and clear of all encumbrances, the debtors incorporated a new subsidiary (Newco), added Newco as an applicant in the CCAA proceedings, and transferred all liabilities, obligations, and unacquired assets of SDCI to Newco. The debtor’s motion referred to this transaction as the only viable alternative to preserve the going concern value of the debtor. The debtor noted that the equity and “non-operational related unsecured claims” had no value. As in the RVO sought here, the court’s order included familiar aspects found in sanction orders, including releases.

[134] An RVO was also approved in the CCAA proceedings of *Wayland Group Corp.* (April 21, 2020), Toronto CV-19-00632079-00CL (Ont. S.C.J. [Comm. List]). Approval was sought in the context of preserving valuable cannabis licenses. Justice Hainey’s brief endorsement indicates that the relief was unopposed. The court

approved a sale of substantially all of the debtor's assets to the successful bidder under a share purchase agreement after a sales and investment solicitation process.

[135] Other information before me regarding the *Wayland Group* transaction is found in the applicant's factum. The factum refers to both *Plasco Energy* and *Stornoway Diamond*, while also referring to ss. 11 and 36(3) of the CCAA as the jurisdictional basis for the relief. The applicants argued that transferring certain assets and liabilities of the debtors into a "newco" would ensure that the purchaser acquired the underlying assets of the target company free and clear of all claims and encumbrances and allow the business to continue as a going-concern. They asserted that this was the "only way" to complete the sale to realize the value in the assets; it was also argued that this transaction was in the best interests of stakeholders and did not prejudice major creditors. In *Wayland Group*, the transaction value was only sufficient to repay the interim lender and perhaps some amount for the first secured creditor.

[136] The Ontario court again approved a similar RVO transaction in the CCAA proceedings of *Comark Holdings Inc.* (July 13, 2020), Toronto CV-20-00642013-00CL (Ont. S.C.J. [Comm. List]). Justice Hainey granted the RVO while again indicating in a brief endorsement that the relief was unopposed. The share sale preserved the tax attributes of the debtor, which the purchaser viewed as critical for the success of the future business. The purchaser was a related party who was making a credit bid for the assets.

[137] In *Comark Holdings*, the purchaser acquired all the issued and outstanding shares of the primary CCAA debtor and agreed to pay out all the secured debt and priority claims. The excluded assets, agreements, liabilities and encumbrances were transferred to another entity that became a debtor in the CCAA proceedings, with the result that the CCAA debtor held its assets free and clear of all claims and encumbrances and was then removed from the CCAA proceedings. The purchaser and the primary CCAA debtor then amalgamated. The new CCAA debtor (Newco) was authorized to make an assignment into bankruptcy. The monitor, along with the

principal secured creditors, including the interim lender, supported the transactions. As in *Plasco Energy*, *Stornoway Diamond* and *Wayland Group*, the debtors in *Comark Holdings* argued that this was the “only option” to preserve the business, that the value in that business would be lost in a liquidation and that the transaction was in the best interests of the stakeholders generally.

[138] Justice Conway granted an RVO in the CCAA proceedings of *Beleave Inc.* (September 18, 2020), Toronto, CV-20-00642097-00CL (Ont. S.C.J. [Comm. List]). As in *Wayland Group*, the preservation of valuable cannabis licenses were at stake. The motion was supported by the monitor and unopposed. Justice Conway stated in her brief endorsement:

The Applicants seek approval of the transaction whereby . . . (the Purchaser) will acquire the operating business of the Applicants. The structure of the transaction is partly by share sale and partly by asset sale. The reason for the structure is to accommodate the licensing requirements of Health Canada. The order is structured as a reverse vesting order, in which excluded liabilities and assets will be transferred to “Residualco”, which will then become one of the Applicants in the CCAA proceedings. Reverse vesting orders have been approved by the courts in other cases: see *Re Stornoway Diamond Corporation* . . . and *Re Wayland Group Corp.* . . .

The transaction is the culmination of a stalking horse sales process approved by the court. The motion is unopposed. The Monitor recommends and supports the transaction in its Fourth Report. In particular, the Monitor states that the proposed transaction is economically superior to the estimated liquidation value of the Beleave Group’s assets and operations, will allow the Purchaser to maintain operations and use of the Cannabis licenses and will provide for continued employment for a majority of the existing employees. In my view, the transaction satisfies s. 36(3) of the CCAA and the *Soundair* test and should be approved.

[139] In *Beleave*, the RVO included releases of claims similar to that granted in other RVO decisions. These provisions were also consistent generally with sanction orders and are similar to the relief sought by Quest here.

[140] Even more recently, the Alberta court approved an RVO structure in the CCAA proceedings of *JMB Crushing Systems Inc.* (October 16, 2020), Calgary 2001-05482 (A.B.Q.B.). Justice Eidsvik approved the RVO structure as part of a sale approval. No written reasons of the court are available, however, the monitor’s bench brief discloses the relevant facts.

[141] As in the above cases, the transaction addressed in *JMB Crushing* arose from a sale and investment solicitation process that yielded only one offer, with the RVO described as a critical component. The underlying intention was to preserve the value of the paid up capital and regulatory permits in the CCAA debtor.

[142] In *JMB Crushing*, the monitor relied on the orders granted in *Plasco Energy*, *Stornoway Diamond*, *Wayland Group* and *Beleave*, arguing that the RVO structure was justified in those circumstances:

24. In recent CCAA proceedings, where it was not practical to compromise amounts owed to creditors through a traditional plan of compromise and arrangement, but it was critical to the viability of a transaction to “cleanse” the debtor company, such that a prospective purchaser may: (i) utilize non-transferrable regulatory licenses (by way of amalgamation or the purchase of the shares of the debtor company); or, (ii) make use of tax attributes of the debtor company, such as [paid up capital], Courts have recently approved and utilized reverse vesting orders to achieve such objectives.
25. The purpose of a reverse vesting order is to transfer and vest all of the assets and liabilities of a debtor company, which are not subject to a sale, to another company within the same CCAA proceedings. The cleansed debtor company is then able to: (i) be utilized by a purchaser as a go-forward vehicle, without any concern regarding creditors and obligations that may otherwise be “laying in the weeds”; and, (ii) allow the purchaser to make use of the debtor company’s tax attributes and non-transferrable regulatory licenses. This approach is necessary in situations where the parties would otherwise be unable to preserve the value of significant assets that are subject to restraints on alienation and to provide a corresponding realizable benefit for creditors and stakeholders.

[143] In *JMB Crushing*, the monitor further justified the RVO structure in asserting that the debtor’s secured creditors would suffer a shortfall even with such measures. The monitor stated that the unsecured creditors had no economic interest in the transaction and there was no reasonable prospect of any recovery to them. The debtor did not intend to undertake a claims process or present a plan to its unsecured creditors.

[144] By pure coincidence, another and perhaps more compelling authority came to the attention of the parties during this hearing.

[145] On November 11, 2020, the Québec Court of Appeal dismissed an application for leave to appeal the granting of an RVO by Gouin J. of the Québec Superior Court on October 15, 2020: *Arrangement relatif à Nemaska Lithium inc.*, 2020 QCCS 3218; leave to appeal denied *Arrangement relatif à Nemaska Lithium inc.*, 2020 QCCA 1488. The Court of Appeal's decision is in English; Gouin J.'s decision is in French and no English translation was available. As such, all references to *Nemaska Lithium* will be to the QCCA.

[146] All counsel agree that Gouin J.'s decision in *Nemaska Lithium* is the first time a Canadian court has granted an RVO in contested CCAA proceedings.

[147] In *Nemaska Lithium* (at para. 5), the court stated that the RVO allowed the purchaser to carry on the operations of the Nemaska Lithium entities (mining in James Bay) by maintaining existing permits, licenses and authorizations. This goal was accomplished via a credit bid for the shares in Nemaska Lithium in return for assumption of the secured debt. At para. 22, the court refers to the intention of the "residual companies" to later present a plan of arrangement to the "remaining creditors", but the details are not disclosed.

[148] In denying leave to appeal in *Nemaska Lithium*, the court stated that an appeal would hinder the progress of the proceedings. More relevant to this application were the court's comments on the legitimacy of the position of the only objecting creditor, Cantore, and the court's rejection that it was appropriate to allow Cantore to exercise a veto in the restructuring:

[38] As it turns out, the value of the Cantore provable claims (setting aside the later debate regarding his potential real rights) stands at \$8,160 million out of a total value of provable claims of \$200 million. Thus, Cantore's provable claims represent at this point in time 4% of the total value of "unsecured creditors" claims as determined by the Monitor. Yet, Cantore is the only creditor having voiced an objection to the RVO approval. This begs the question: whose interest is being served by the proposed appeal? What would be the true impact of the Cantore vote on the RVO transaction if it were made subject to prior approval on the part of the creditors as he suggests?

[39] In these circumstances, I am simply not convinced that the arguments that are advanced by Cantore are anything but a "bargaining tool", while he pursues multidirectional attacks on the RVO with the same arguments that were dismissed in the first instance.

[149] Similar to Cantore's position in the *Nemaska Lithium* restructuring, Southern Star and Dana's objections to the RVO are grounded in the assertion it will negate their effective veto on the Plan (and hence the Primacorp transaction) by which they seek to leverage further concessions. For obvious reasons, those concessions can only come about at a cost to other stakeholders, whose interests remain to be addressed.

Discussion

[150] Quest, with the support of the Monitor, submits that the Primacorp transaction satisfies s. 36 of the CCAA and that the Court should grant the RVO pursuant to ss. 11 and 36 of the CCAA.

[151] As with the structures approved in the above CCAA proceedings, the RVO has certain aspects that Southern Star says are objectionable. Those include primarily: (i) the addition of Guardian as a petitioner in the CCAA proceeding; (ii) the vesting of the Excluded Liabilities and Excluded Contracts in Guardian; (iii) Quest's exit from this CCAA proceeding; and (iv) the release of Quest in respect of the Excluded Liabilities and Excluded Contracts.

[152] Essentially, unsecured claims against Quest and minor assets are transferred to Guardian and Quest continues as a going concern after having transferred the bulk of its assets to Primacorp free and clear of any encumbrances (save for certain Retained Liabilities). Quest no longer requires approval of the Plan by the creditors and the Court to complete the Primacorp transaction.

[153] At para. 19, the QCCA in *Nemaska Lithium* referred to Gouin J.'s comment that s. 36 of the CCAA allows the court a broad discretion to consider and, if appropriate, grant relief that represents an innovative solution to any challenges in a proceeding. Justice Gouin considered that approving an RVO structure was such an innovative solution. Indeed, this is the history of CCAA jurisprudence under the court's broad statutory discretion and court approval of innovative solutions continues to this time.

[154] That said, the ability of a CCAA court to be innovative and creative is not boundless; as always, the court must exercise its discretion with a view to the statutory objectives and purposes of the CCAA: *Century Services*.

[155] I find further support for Quest's position in the recent comments of the Court in *Callidus*. The Court was there addressing a different issue – whether a CCAA judge has jurisdiction under s. 11 to bar a creditor from voting where the creditor is “acting for an improper purpose” – but the Court's comments on the exercise of jurisdiction under the CCAA ring true in relation to the RVO structure:

[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.)

...

[65] There is no dispute that the CCAA is silent on when a creditor who is otherwise entitled to vote on a plan can be barred from voting. However, CCAA supervising judges are often called upon “to sanction measures for which there is no explicit authority in the CCAA” (*Century Services*, at para. 61; see also para. 62). In *Century Services*, this Court endorsed a “hierarchical” approach to determining whether jurisdiction exists to sanction

a proposed measure: “courts [must] rely first on an interpretation of the provisions of the CCAA text before turning to inherent or equitable jurisdiction to anchor measures taken in a CCAA proceeding” (para. 65). In most circumstances, a purposive and liberal interpretation of the provisions of the CCAA will be sufficient “to ground measures necessary to achieve its objectives” (para. 65).

...

[67] Courts have long recognized that s. 11 of the CCAA signals legislative endorsement of the “broad reading of CCAA authority developed by the jurisprudence” (*Century Services*, at para. 68). . . .

On the plain wording of the provision, the jurisdiction granted by s. 11 is constrained only by restrictions set out in the CCAA itself, and the requirement that the order made be “appropriate in the circumstances”.

[68] Where a party seeks an order relating to a matter that falls within the supervising judge’s purview, and for which there is no CCAA provision conferring more specific jurisdiction, s. 11 necessarily is the provision of first resort in anchoring jurisdiction. As Blair J.A. put it in *Stelco*, s. 11 “for the most part supplants the need to resort to inherent jurisdiction” in the CCAA context (para. 36).

...

[70] . . . The exercise of this discretion must further the remedial objectives of the CCAA and be guided by the baseline considerations of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence. This means that, where a creditor is seeking to exercise its voting rights in a manner that frustrates, undermines, or runs counter to those objectives — that is, acting for an “improper purpose” — the supervising judge has the discretion to bar that creditor from voting.

...

[75] We also observe that the recognition of this discretion under the CCAA advances the basic fairness that “permeates Canadian insolvency law and practice” (Sarra, “The Oscillating Pendulum: Canada’s Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law”, at p. 27; see also *Century Services*, at paras. 70 and 77). As Professor Sarra observes, fairness demands that supervising judges be in a position to recognize and meaningfully address circumstances in which parties are working against the goals of the statute:

The Canadian insolvency regime is based on the assumption that creditors and the debtor share a common goal of maximizing recoveries. The substantive aspect of fairness in the insolvency regime is based on the assumption that all involved parties face real economic risks. Unfairness resides where only some face these risks, while others actually benefit from the situation If the CCAA is to be interpreted in a purposive way, the courts must be able to recognize when people have conflicting interests and are working actively against the goals of the statute.

(“The Oscillating Pendulum: Canada’s Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law”, at p. 30 (emphasis added))

In this vein, the supervising judge’s oversight of the CCAA voting regime must not only ensure strict compliance with the Act, but should further its goals as well. We are of the view that the policy objectives of the CCAA necessitate the recognition of the discretion to bar a creditor from voting where the creditor is acting for an improper purpose.

[76] Whether this discretion ought to be exercised in a particular case is a circumstance-specific inquiry that must balance the various objectives of the CCAA. As this case demonstrates, the supervising judge is best-positioned to undertake this inquiry.

[Underline emphasis added; italic emphasis in original.]

[156] Quest is not seeking to bar Southern Star or Dana from voting on the Plan. It is seeking approval of a structure that would result in Guardian submitting its own plan to the unsecured creditors, which would include Southern Star and Dana, at which time they are generally free to vote their “self-interest” subject to any relevant constraint (for example, if the court finds that they are voting for an improper purpose): *Callidus* at para. 24 and 56.

[157] There is no provision in the CCAA that prohibits an RVO structure. As is usually the case in CCAA matters, the court must ensure that any relief is “appropriate” in the circumstances and that all stakeholders are treated as fairly and reasonably “as the circumstances permit”: *Century Services* at para. 70.

[158] As with the sales considered in most of the above RVO cases, including *Nemaska Lithium*, this is the *only* transaction that has emerged to resolve the financial affairs of Quest. No other options are before the stakeholders and the Court that would suggest another path forward. As was noted by Gouin J. in *Nemaska Lithium* (at para. 12), it is not up to the Court to dictate the terms and conditions that are included in an offer. Primacorp has presumably made the best offer that it is prepared to make in the circumstances – that is the offer the Court must consider.

[159] I agree with the Monitor that, without the RVO structure, the Primacorp transaction is in jeopardy. The only other likely path forward for Quest is

receivership, liquidation and bankruptcy, a future that looms in early 2021 if the transaction is not approved.

[160] Many of the RVO cases cited above involve a sale of an ongoing business with a purchaser. The RVO structure was crafted to allow those businesses to continue through the debtor company, since it was that corporate vehicle who owned the valuable “assets” that could be not transferred.

[161] Akin to the tax losses, permits and licences that could not be transferred in those RVO cases, is Quest’s ability to confer degrees under its statutory authority under s. 4(2) of the *Sea to Sky Act*, S.B.C. 2002, c. 54 (the “*Sea to Sky Act*”). Quest cannot sell its ability to grant degrees under s. 4(2) of the *Sea to Sky Act*. Nor can any purchaser acquire the right to grant degrees indirectly through a purchase of the shares in Quest. Pursuant to s. 2 of the *Sea to Sky Act*, Quest is a corporation “composed of the members of the board” and no shareholders exist. Pursuant to s. 1 of the *Sea to Sky Act*, the “board” means the board of governors of the university.

[162] It is a critical requirement under the Primacorp transaction that Quest remain a viable entity to continue its operations and, in particular, continue to grant degrees. That is a significant component of the Primacorp transaction and the value that Primacorp is prepared to pay under the transaction reflects that component. In other words, the stakeholders are receiving a benefit from this transaction by which Primacorp ensures that Quest continues after exiting these CCAA proceedings.

[163] At para. 38, the court in *Nemaska Lithium* asked:

. . . whose interest is being served by the proposed appeal? What would be the true impact of the Cantore vote on the RVO transaction if it were made subject to prior approval on the part of the creditors as he suggests?

[164] I acknowledge the negative consequences that arise particularly for Southern Star if the Primacorp transaction is approved, although there is significant uncertainty about the extent of any loss that may be suffered. Dana’s unsecured claim has little, if any value, outside of the benefits of the Primacorp transaction.

[165] In that light, I would ask Southern Star and Dana a similar question to that of the QCCA—to what end is your veto if Quest's Plan is put presented for creditor approval?

[166] Both creditors potentially hold the sword of Damocles over the head of the significant broad stakeholder group who stand to benefit from the Primacorp transaction. Recently, Southern Star has secured further benefits by the withdrawal of two of the Disclaimers. Both objecting creditors have nothing to lose at this point in this dangerous game of chicken with Primacorp, with only the oversight of this Court to oversee this strategy. By any stretch, no one is blinking at this point, while significant other interests hang in the balance.

[167] The Monitor's comments in its Fifth Report as to the jeopardy to those other interests are apt:

2.15 The Monitor has considered the competing interests of Southern Star and the interests of Quest's other stakeholders. In the Monitor's view, the Primacorp Transaction should not be jeopardized by the lack of agreement between Southern Star and Primacorp. Southern Star can mitigate its financial hardship by entering into an agreement with Primacorp for use of some or all of the residences. By contrast, Quest's other stakeholders have no ability to mitigate their potential losses in the event that the Primacorp Transaction does not close. They are reliant on the completion of the Primacorp Transaction or face significant losses themselves should it not complete.

[168] In my view, in the vein of the Court's discussion in *Callidus*, these are unique and exceptional circumstances where the Court may grant the relief by allowing Quest to employ the RVO structure within the context of this sale transaction.

[169] Southern Star and Dana seek to effectively block the only reasonable outcome here by insisting that they must approve of Quest's Plan in conjunction with the sale. However, creditor approval of a sale is not required under s. 36 of the CCAA.

[170] The granting of the RVO in these circumstances is in accordance with the remedial purposes of the CCAA. To use the words of Dr. Sarra, quoted above in

Callidus, I conclude that Southern Star and Dana are working actively against the goals of the CCAA by their opposition to the RVO.

[171] I do not consider that an RVO structure would be generally employed or approved in a CCAA restructuring to simply rid a debtor of a recalcitrant creditor who may seek to exert leverage through its vote on a plan while furthering its own interests. Clearly, every situation must be considered based on its own facts; different circumstances may dictate different results. A debtor should not seek an RVO structure simply to expedite their desired result without regard to the remedial objectives of the CCAA.

[172] Here, in these complex and unique circumstances, I conclude that it is appropriate to exercise my discretion to allow the RVO structure. Quest seeks this relief in good faith and while acting with due diligence to promote the best outcome for all stakeholders. I have considered the balance between the competing interests at play. This transaction is unquestionably the fairest and most reasonable means by which the greatest benefit can be achieved for the overall stakeholder group, a group that includes Southern Star and Dana.

[173] The structure also allows Quest to continue its operations in partnership with Primacorp, a result that will avoid the devastating social and economic consequences that will be visited upon the stakeholders if this transaction is not approved. Ironically, the continuation of Quest's operations will also benefit Southern Star in the future through the continued payment of rent for two of the Residences. Other potential benefits may also arise if Southern Star and Quest are later able to come to terms once the pandemic has receded and students return to campus.

THE PRIMACORP TRANSACTION

[174] Quest applies for the granting of the RVO in favour of Primacorp pursuant to s. 36(1) of the CCAA.

[175] Section 36(1) of the CCAA allows the court to authorize the sale of a debtor company's assets out of the ordinary course of business. Section 36(3) of the CCAA lists the relevant non-exhaustive factors to be considered:

- (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.

[176] The well-known considerations identified in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1 at 6 (C.A.) are consistent with and overlap many of the s. 36(3) factors: see *Veris Gold Corp. (Re)*, 2015 BCSC 1204 at para. 25, referring to various authorities such as *Canwest Publishing Inc. (Re)*, 2010 ONSC 2870 at para. 13. Those considerations include: (i) whether the party conducting the sale made sufficient efforts to obtain the best price and did not act improvidently; (ii) the interests of all parties; (iii) the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers were obtained; and, (iv) whether there has been any unfairness in the sales process.

[177] More generally, in analyzing whether a transaction should be approved, taking into consideration the s. 36(3) and *Soundair* factors, a court is to consider the transaction as a whole and decide whether or not the sale is appropriate, fair and reasonable: *Veris Gold* at para. 23.

[178] I conclude that the s. 36(3) and *Soundair* factors all favour approving the Primacorp transaction and granting the RVO. Specifically:

- a) The process leading to the Primacorp transaction has been lengthy and exhaustive. The Monitor has overseen that entire process;

- b) Quest 's Restructuring committee and its Board of Governors have sought and obtained professional advice throughout the CCAA process toward finding a suitable academic partner and/or a purchaser/developer for Quest's lands;
- c) No stakeholder objects to the proposition that the sales process was conducted in an appropriate, fair and reasonable manner;
- d) The Primacorp transaction will see the repayment of Quest's secured creditors, now totalling approximately \$42.2 million in what has been an increasingly pressurized environment to do so after long standing defaults;
- e) Since August 7, 2020, the Interim Lender and VF, Quest's major secured creditors, have been kept apprised of developments. They both support the Primacorp transaction. In addition, other secured creditors have been involved throughout these proceedings and support the transaction;
- f) There has been significant community and stakeholder involvement throughout the sales process;
- g) The Primacorp transaction will ensure that Quest continues as a going concern, by continuing operations as a post-secondary institution in Squamish. This will result in continuing benefits to the broad stakeholder group. This includes faculty, staff, students, secured and unsecured creditors, suppliers, landlords and the community generally;
- h) The broader stakeholder interests must be balanced against those who will be negatively affected by the transaction, such as Southern Star under the Disclaimers, although no viable offer has emerged that does not include the Disclaimers;

- i) Quest's Board of Governors have exercised their business judgment and determined that the Primacorp transaction is the best option to fulfil the goals of Quest's restructuring;
- j) The Primacorp transaction will fund a Plan for unsecured creditors;
- k) The Primacorp transaction provides Quest with significant benefits in terms of its future operations. These include the \$20 million working capital facility and Primacorp support for Quest's marketing, recruiting and operations to allow it to continue as a post-secondary institution into the future;
- l) No other or better offer or proposal has emerged that can be considered superior to the Primacorp transaction;
- m) The Monitor is satisfied that the consideration to be received from Primacorp is reasonable and fair, taking into account the market value of the assets and the other unique factors of these proceedings;
- n) The Monitor is of the view that this transaction will yield a greater benefit to the stakeholders than might be achieved in a liquidation or bankruptcy;
- o) Any delay of approval is likely to lead to ruinous consequences after December 2020, when Quest will be out of funds and the Interim Lender will be in a position to commence a receivership and liquidation of Quest's assets; and
- p) Simply, Quest has run out of time to find a restructuring solution and the Primacorp transaction presently stands as the *only* viable option to avoid the devastating social and economic consequences to its stakeholders if a liquidation results.

CONCLUSIONS

[179] I grant the RVO as sought by Quest, and as supported by the Monitor.

[180] The Primacorp transaction is the best option available that maximizes recovery for Quest's creditors and preserves Quest's university operations. Allowing Quest to continue as a university will benefit all stakeholders, including Quest's current and former employees, current and future students of Quest and the community generally. The RVO structure is an appropriate means to accomplish this result in these unique and exceptional circumstances.

“Fitzpatrick J.”

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 (Opcos 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, Opcos 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 Opcos 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 Opcos 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 Opcos 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, Opcos 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 Opcos 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 receive 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.

Hoc Committee Plan and to participate in distributions. Dates and timing also have to be adjusted. In these circumstances the requested Claims Procedure Order should be approved. Additionally, the Meeting Order required to convene a meeting of unsecured creditors on June 10, 2010 to vote on the Ad Hoc Committee Plan is granted.

SISP Amendment

[15] It is proposed that the LP Entities will work diligently to implement the AHC Transaction while concurrently pursuing such steps as are required to effect the Support Transaction. The SISP procedures must be amended. The AHC Transaction which is to be effected through the Ad Hoc Committee Plan cannot be completed within the sixty days contemplated by the SISP. On consent of the Monitor, the LP Administrative Agent, the Ad Hoc Committee and the LP Entities, the SISP is amended to extend the date for closing of the AHC Transaction and to permit the proposed dual track procedure. The proposed amendments to the SISP are clearly warranted as a practical matter and so as to procure the best available going concern outcome for the LP Entities and their stakeholders. Paragraph 102 of the Initial Order contains a comeback clause which provides that interested parties may move to amend the Initial Order on notice. This would include a motion to amend the SISP which is effectively incorporated into the Initial Order by reference. The Applicants submit that I have broad general jurisdiction under section 11 of the CCAA to make such amendments. In my view, it is unnecessary to decide that issue as the affected parties are consenting to the proposed amendments.

Dual Track and Sanction of Senior Lenders' CCAA Plan

[16] In my view, it is prudent for the LP Entities to simultaneously advance the AHC Transaction and the Support Transaction. To that end, the LP Entities seek approval of a conditional sanction order. They ask for conditional authorization to enter into the Acquisition and Assumption Agreement pursuant to a Credit Acquisition Sanction, Approval and Vesting Order.

[17] The Senior Lenders' meeting was held January 27, 2010 and 97.5% in number and 88.7% in value of the Senior Lenders holding Proven Principal Claims who were present and voting voted in favour of the Senior Lenders' Plan. This was well in excess of the required majorities.

[18] The LP Entities are seeking the sanction of the Senior Lenders' CCAA Plan on the basis that its implementation is conditional on the delivery of a Monitor's Certificate. The certificate will not be delivered if the AHC Bid closes. Satisfactory arrangements have been made to address closing timelines as well as access to advisor and management time. Absent the closing of the AHC Transaction, the Senior Lenders' CCAA Plan is fair and reasonable as between the LP Entities and its creditors. If the AHC Transaction is unable to close, I conclude that there are no available commercial going concern alternatives to the Senior Lenders' CCAA Plan. The market was fully canvassed during the SISP; there was ample time to conduct such a canvass; it was professionally supervised; and the AHC Bid was the only Superior Offer as that term was defined in the SISP. For these reasons, I am prepared to find that the Senior Lenders' CCAA Plan is fair and reasonable and may be conditionally sanctioned. I also note that there has been strict compliance with statutory requirements and nothing has been done or purported to have been done which was not authorized by the CCAA. As such, the three part test set forth in the *Re: Canadian Airlines Corp.*² has been met. Additionally, there has been compliance with section 6 of the CCAA. The Crown, employee and pension claims described in section 6 (3),(5), and (6) have been addressed in the Senior Lenders' Plan at sections 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4.

Conclusion

[19] In conclusion, it is evident to me that the parties who have been engaged in this CCAA proceeding have worked diligently and cooperatively, rigorously protecting their own interests but at the same time achieving a positive outcome for the LP Entities' stakeholders as a whole.

² 2000, A.B.Q.B. 442, leave to appeal refused 2000, A.B.C.A. 23, affirmed 2001, A.B.C.A. 9, leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused July 12, 2001.

As I indicated in Court, for this they and their professional advisors should be commended. The business of the LP Entities affects many people – creditors, employees, retirees, suppliers, community members and the millions who rely on their publications for their news. This is a good chapter in the LP Entities' CCAA story. Hopefully, it will have a happy ending.

Pepall J.

Released: May 21, 2010

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 BOOKD INC., AND CANWEST
(CANADA) INC.

APPLICANTS

REASONS FOR DECISION

Pepall J.

Released: May 21, 2010

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.

(2d) 131, 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 320 (note), 39 D.L.R. (4th) 526 (H.C.J.); Salima Investments Ltd. v. Bank of Montreal (1985), 41 Alta. L.R. (2d) 58, 65 A.R. 372, 59 C.B.R. (N.S.) 242, 21 D.L.R. (4th) 473 (C.A.); Selkirk (Re) (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 245 (Ont. Bkcy.); Selkirk (Re) (1987), 64 C.B.R. (N.S.) 140 (Ont. Bkcy.)

Statutes referred to

Employment Standards Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 137

Environmental Protection Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 141

APPEAL from the judgment of the General Division, Rosenberg J., May 1, 1991, approving the sale of an airline by a receiver.

J.B. Berkow and Steven H. Goldman, for appellants.

John T. Morin, Q.C., for Air Canada.

L.A.J. Barnes and Lawrence E. Ritchie, for Royal Bank of Canada.

Sean F. Dunphy and G.K. Ketcheson for Ernst & Young Inc., receiver of Soundair Corp., respondent.

W.G. Horton, for Ontario Express Ltd.

Nancy J. Spies, for Frontier Air Ltd.

GALLIGAN J.A.--- This is an appeal from the order of Rosenberg J. made on May 1, 1991 (Gen. Div.). By that order, he approved the sale of Air Toronto to Ontario Express Limited and Frontier Air Limited and he dismissed a motion to approve an offer to purchase Air Toronto by 922246 Ontario Limited.

It is necessary at the outset to give some background to the dispute. Soundair Corporation (Soundair) is a corporation

engaged in the air transport business. It has three divisions. One of them is Air Toronto. Air Toronto operates a scheduled airline from Toronto to a number of mid-sized cities in the United States of America. Its routes serve as feeders to several of Air Canada's routes. Pursuant to a connector agreement, Air Canada provides some services to Air Toronto and benefits from the feeder traffic provided by it. The operational relationship between Air Canada and Air Toronto is a close one.

In the latter part of 1989 and the early part of 1990, Soundair was in financial difficulty. Soundair has two secured creditors who have an interest in the assets of Air Toronto. The Royal Bank of Canada (the Royal Bank) is owed at least \$65,000,000. The appellants Canadian Pension Capital Limited and Canadian Insurers Capital Corporation (collectively called CCFL) are owed approximately \$9,500,000. Those creditors will have a deficiency expected to be in excess of \$50,000,000 on the winding-up of Soundair.

On April 26, 1990, upon the motion of the Royal Bank, O'Brien J. appointed Ernst & Young Inc. (the receiver) as receiver of all of the assets, property and undertakings of Soundair. The order required the receiver to operate Air Toronto and sell it as a going concern. Because of the close relationship between Air Toronto and Air Canada, it was contemplated that the receiver would obtain the assistance of Air Canada to operate Air Toronto. The order authorized the receiver:

(b) to enter into contractual arrangements with Air Canada to retain a manager or operator, including Air Canada, to manage and operate Air Toronto under the supervision of Ernst & Young Inc. until the completion of the sale of Air Toronto to Air Canada or other person ...

Also because of the close relationship, it was expected that Air Canada would purchase Air Toronto. To that end, the order of O'Brien J. authorized the receiver:

(c) to negotiate and do all things necessary or desirable to complete a sale of Air Toronto to Air Canada and, if a sale

to Air Canada cannot be completed, to negotiate and sell Air Toronto to another person, subject to terms and conditions approved by this Court.

Over a period of several weeks following that order, negotiations directed towards the sale of Air Toronto took place between the receiver and Air Canada. Air Canada had an agreement with the receiver that it would have exclusive negotiating rights during that period. I do not think it is necessary to review those negotiations, but I note that Air Canada had complete access to all of the operations of Air Toronto and conducted due diligence examinations. It became thoroughly acquainted with every aspect of Air Toronto's operations.

Those negotiations came to an end when an offer made by Air Canada on June 19, 1990, was considered unsatisfactory by the receiver. The offer was not accepted and lapsed. Having regard to the tenor of Air Canada's negotiating stance and a letter sent by its solicitors on July 20, 1990, I think that the receiver was eminently reasonable when it decided that there was no realistic possibility of selling Air Toronto to Air Canada.

The receiver then looked elsewhere. Air Toronto's feeder business is very attractive, but it only has value to a national airline. The receiver concluded reasonably, therefore, that it was commercially necessary for one of Canada's two national airlines to be involved in any sale of Air Toronto. Realistically, there were only two possible purchasers whether direct or indirect. They were Air Canada and Canadian Airlines International.

It was well known in the air transport industry that Air Toronto was for sale. During the months following the collapse of the negotiations with Air Canada, the receiver tried unsuccessfully to find viable purchasers. In late 1990, the receiver turned to Canadian Airlines International, the only realistic alternative. Negotiations began between them. Those negotiations led to a letter of intent dated February 11, 1991. On March 6, 1991, the receiver received an offer from Ontario

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 922246 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.

On March 8, 1991, the date when the receiver accepted the OEL offer, it had only two offers, the OEL offer which was acceptable, and the 922 offer which contained an unacceptable condition. I cannot see how the receiver, assuming for the moment that the price was reasonable, could have done anything but accept the OEL offer.

When deciding whether a receiver had 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. In this case, the court should look at the receiver's conduct in the light of the information it had when it made its decision on March 8, 1991. The court 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. To do so, in my view, would derogate from the mandate to sell given to the receiver by the order of O'Brien J. I agree with and adopt what was said by Anderson J. in *Crown Trust v. Rosenberg*, *supra*, at p. 112 O.R., p. 551 D.L.R.:

Its decision was made as a matter of business judgment on the elements then available to it. It is of the very essence of a receiver's function to make such judgments and in the making of them to act seriously and responsibly so as to be prepared to stand behind them.

If the court were to reject the recommendation of the Receiver in any but the most exceptional circumstances, it would materially diminish and weaken the role and function of the Receiver both in the perception of receivers and in the perception of any others who might have occasion to deal with them. It would lead to the conclusion that the decision of the Receiver was of little weight and that the real decision was always made upon the motion for approval. That would be a consequence susceptible of immensely damaging results to the disposition of assets by court-appointed receivers.

(Emphasis added)

I also agree with and adopt what was said by Macdonald J.A.

in Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303 (C.A.), at p. 11 C.B.R., p. 314 N.S.R.:

In my opinion if the decision of the receiver to enter into an agreement of sale, subject to court approval, with respect to certain assets is reasonable and sound under the circumstances at the time existing it should not be set aside simply because a later and higher bid is made. To do so would literally create chaos in the commercial world and receivers and purchasers would never be sure they had a binding agreement.

(Emphasis added)

On March 8, 1991, the receiver had two offers. One was the OEL offer which it considered satisfactory but which could be withdrawn by OEL at any time before it was accepted. The receiver also had the 922 offer which contained a condition that was totally unacceptable. It had no other offers. It was faced with the dilemma of whether it should decline to accept the OEL offer and run the risk of it being withdrawn, in the hope that an acceptable offer would be forthcoming from 922. An affidavit filed by the president of the receiver describes the dilemma which the receiver faced, and the judgment made in the light of that dilemma:

24. An asset purchase agreement was received by Ernst & Young on March 7, 1991 which was dated March 6, 1991. This agreement was received from CCFL in respect of their offer to purchase the assets and undertaking of Air Toronto. Apart from financial considerations, which will be considered in a subsequent affidavit, the Receiver determined that it would not be prudent to delay acceptance of the OEL agreement to negotiate a highly uncertain arrangement with Air Canada and CCFL. Air Canada had the benefit of an "exclusive" in negotiations for Air Toronto and had clearly indicated its intention to take itself out of the running while ensuring that no other party could seek to purchase Air Toronto and maintain the Air Canada connector arrangement vital to its survival. The CCFL offer represented a radical reversal of this position by Air Canada at the eleventh hour. However, it

contained a significant number of conditions to closing which were entirely beyond the control of the Receiver. As well, the CCFL offer came less than 24 hours before signing of the agreement with OEL which had been negotiated over a period of months, at great time and expense.

(Emphasis added)

I am convinced that the decision made was a sound one in the circumstances faced by the receiver on March 8, 1991.

I now turn to consider whether the price contained in the OEL offer was one which it was provident to accept. At the outset, I think that the fact that the OEL offer was the only acceptable one available to the receiver on March 8, 1991, after ten months of trying to sell the airline, is strong evidence that the price in it was reasonable. In a deteriorating economy, I doubt that it would have been wise to wait any longer.

I mentioned earlier that, pursuant to an order, 922 was permitted to present a second offer. During the hearing of the appeal, counsel compared at great length the price contained in the second 922 offer with the price contained in the OEL offer. Counsel put forth various hypotheses supporting their contentions that one offer was better than the other.

It is my opinion that the price contained in the 922 offer is relevant only if it shows that the price obtained by the Receiver in the OEL offer was not a reasonable one. In *Crown Trust v. Rosenberg*, *supra*, Anderson J., at p. 113 O.R., p. 551 D.L.R., discussed the comparison of offers in the following way:

No doubt, as the cases have indicated, situations might arise where the disparity was so great as to call in question the adequacy of the mechanism which had produced the offers. It is not so here, and in my view that is substantially an end of the matter.

In two judgments, Saunders J. considered the circumstances in which an offer submitted after the receiver had agreed to a

sale should be considered by the court. The first is *Re Selkirk* (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 245 (Ont. Bkcy.), at p. 247:

If, for example, in this case there had been a second offer of a substantially higher amount, then the court would have to take that offer into consideration in assessing whether the receiver had properly carried out his function of endeavouring to obtain the best price for the property.

The second is *Re Beauty Counsellors of Canada Ltd.* (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 (Ont. Bkcy.), at p. 243:

If a substantially higher bid turns up at the approval stage, the court should consider it. Such a bid may indicate, for example, that the trustee has not properly carried out its duty to endeavour to obtain the best price for the estate.

In *Re Selkirk* (1987), 64 C.B.R. (N.S.) 140 (Ont. Bkcy.), at p. 142, McRae J. expressed a similar view:

The court will not lightly withhold approval of a sale by the receiver, particularly in a case such as this where the receiver is given rather wide discretionary authority as per the order of Mr. Justice Trainor and, of course, where the receiver is an officer of this court. Only in a case where there seems to be some unfairness in the process of the sale or where there are substantially higher offers which would tend to show that the sale was improvident will the court withhold approval. It is important that the court recognize the commercial exigencies that would flow if prospective purchasers are allowed to wait until the sale is in court for approval before submitting their final offer. This is something that must be discouraged.

(Emphasis added)

What those cases show is that the prices in other offers have relevance only if they show that the price contained in the offer accepted by the receiver was so unreasonably low as to demonstrate that the receiver was improvident in accepting it. I am of the opinion, therefore, that if they do not tend to

show that the receiver was improvident, they should not be considered upon a motion to confirm a sale recommended by a court-appointed receiver. If they were, the process would be changed from a sale by a receiver, subject to court approval, into an auction conducted by the court at the time approval is sought. In my opinion, the latter course is unfair to the person who has entered bona fide into an agreement with the receiver, can only lead to chaos, and must be discouraged.

If, however, the subsequent offer is so substantially higher than the sale recommended by the receiver, then it may be that the receiver has not conducted the sale properly. In such circumstances, the court would be justified itself in entering into the sale process by considering competitive bids. However, I think that that process should be entered into only if the court is satisfied that the receiver has not properly conducted the sale which it has recommended to the court.

It is necessary to consider the two offers. Rosenberg J. held that the 922 offer was slightly better or marginally better than the OEL offer. He concluded that the difference in the two offers did not show that the sale process adopted by the receiver was inadequate or improvident.

Counsel for the appellants complained about the manner in which Rosenberg J. conducted the hearing of the motion to confirm the OEL sale. The complaint was, that when they began to discuss a comparison of the two offers, Rosenberg J. said that he considered the 922 offer to be better than the OEL offer. Counsel said that when that comment was made, they did not think it necessary to argue further the question of the difference in value between the two offers. They complain that the finding that the 922 offer was only marginally better or slightly better than the OEL offer was made without them having had the opportunity to argue that the 922 offer was substantially better or significantly better than the OEL offer. I cannot understand how counsel could have thought that by expressing the opinion that the 922 offer was better, Rosenberg J. was saying that it was a significantly or substantially better one. Nor can I comprehend how counsel took the comment to mean that they were foreclosed from arguing that

the offer was significantly or substantially better. If there was some misunderstanding on the part of counsel, it should have been raised before Rosenberg J. at the time. I am sure that if it had been, the misunderstanding would have been cleared up quickly. Nevertheless, this court permitted extensive argument dealing with the comparison of the two offers.

The 922 offer provided for \$6,000,000 cash to be paid on closing with a royalty based upon a percentage of Air Toronto profits over a period of five years up to a maximum of \$3,000,000. The OEL offer provided for a payment of \$2,000,000 on closing with a royalty paid on gross revenues over a five-year period. In the short term, the 922 offer is obviously better because there is substantially more cash up front. The chances of future returns are substantially greater in the OEL offer because royalties are paid on gross revenues while the royalties under the 922 offer are paid only on profits. There is an element of risk involved in each offer.

The receiver studied the two offers. It compared them and took into account the risks, the advantages and the disadvantages of each. It considered the appropriate contingencies. It is not necessary to outline the factors which were taken into account by the receiver because the manager of its insolvency practice filed an affidavit outlining the considerations which were weighed in its evaluation of the two offers. They seem to me to be reasonable ones. That affidavit concluded with the following paragraph:

24. On the basis of these considerations the Receiver has approved the OEL offer and has concluded that it represents the achievement of the highest possible value at this time for the Air Toronto division of SoundAir.

The court appointed the receiver to conduct the sale of Air Toronto and entrusted it with the responsibility of deciding what is the best offer. I put great weight upon the opinion of the receiver. It swore to the court which appointed it that the OEL offer represents the achievement of the highest possible value at this time for Air Toronto. I have not been convinced

that the receiver was wrong when he made that assessment. I am, therefore, of the opinion that the 922 offer does not demonstrate any failure upon the part of the receiver to act properly and providently.

It follows that if Rosenberg J. was correct when he found that the 922 offer was in fact better, I agree with him that it could only have been slightly or marginally better. The 922 offer does not lead to an inference that the disposition strategy of the receiver was inadequate, unsuccessful or improvident, nor that the price was unreasonable.

I am, therefore, of the opinion that the receiver made a sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently.

2. Consideration of the interests of all parties

It is well established that the primary interest is that of the creditors of the debtor: see *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, *supra*, and *Re Selkirk* (1986, Saunders J.), *supra*. However, as Saunders J. pointed out in *Re Beauty Counsellors*, *supra*, at p. 244 C.B.R., "it is not the only or overriding consideration".

In my opinion, there are other persons whose interests require consideration. In an appropriate case, the interests of the debtor must be taken into account. I think also, in a case such as this, where a purchaser has bargained at some length and doubtless at considerable expense with the receiver, the interests of the purchaser ought to be taken into account. While it is not explicitly stated in such cases as *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, *supra*, *Re Selkirk* (1986, Saunders J.), *supra*, *Re Beauty Counsellors*, *supra*, *Re Selkirk* (1987, McRae J.), *supra*, and *Cameron*, *supra*, I think they clearly imply that the interests of a person who has negotiated an agreement with a court-appointed receiver are very important.

In this case, the interests of all parties who would have an interest in the process were considered by the receiver and by Rosenberg J.

3. Consideration of the efficacy and integrity of the process by which the offer was obtained

While it is accepted that the primary concern of a receiver is the protecting of the interests of the creditors, there is a secondary but very important consideration and that is the integrity of the process by which the sale is effected. This is particularly so in the case of a sale of such a unique asset as an airline as a going concern.

The importance of a court protecting the integrity of the process has been stated in a number of cases. First, I refer to *Re Selkirk* (1986), *supra*, where Saunders J. said at p. 246 C.B.R.:

In dealing with the request for approval, the court has to be concerned primarily with protecting the interest of the creditors of the former bankrupt. A secondary but important consideration is that the process under which the sale agreement is arrived at should be consistent with commercial efficacy and integrity.

In that connection I adopt the principles stated by Macdonald J.A. of the Nova Scotia Supreme Court (Appeal Division) in *Cameron v. Bank of N.S.* (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303, 86 A.P.R. 303 (C.A.), where he said at p. 11:

In my opinion if the decision of the receiver to enter into an agreement of sale, subject to court approval, with respect to certain assets is reasonable and sound under the circumstances at the time existing it should not be set aside simply because a later and higher bid is made. To do so would literally create chaos in the commercial world and receivers and purchasers would never be sure they had a finding agreement. On the contrary, they would know that other bids could be received and considered up until the application for court approval is heard -- this would be an intolerable situation.

While those remarks may have been made in the context of a

bidding situation rather than a private sale, I consider them to be equally applicable to a negotiation process leading to a private sale. Where the court is concerned with the disposition of property, the purpose of appointing a receiver is to have the receiver do the work that the court would otherwise have to do.

In *Salima Investments Ltd. v. Bank of Montreal* (1985), 41 Alta. L.R. (2d) 58, 21 D.L.R. (4th) 473 (C.A.), at p. 61 Alta. L.R., p. 476 D.L.R., the Alberta Court of Appeal said that sale by tender is not necessarily the best way to sell a business as an ongoing concern. It went on to say that when some other method is used which is provident, the court should not undermine the process by refusing to confirm the sale.

Finally, I refer to the reasoning of Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, *supra*, at p. 124 O.R., pp. 562-63 D.L.R.:

While every proper effort must always be made to assure maximum recovery consistent with the limitations inherent in the process, no method has yet been devised to entirely eliminate those limitations or to avoid their consequences. Certainly it is not to be found in loosening the entire foundation of the system. Thus to compare the results of the process in this case with what might have been recovered in some other set of circumstances is neither logical nor practical.

(Emphasis added)

It is my opinion that 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.

Before this court, counsel for those opposing the confirmation of the sale to OEL suggested many different ways

in which the receiver could have conducted the process other than the way which he did. However, the evidence does not convince me that the receiver used an improper method of attempting to sell the airline. The answer to those submissions is found in the comment of Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, *supra*, at p. 109 O.R., p. 548 D.L.R.:

The court ought not to sit as on appeal from the decision of the Receiver, reviewing in minute detail every element of the process by which the decision is reached. To do so would be a futile and duplicitous exercise.

It would be a futile and duplicitous exercise for this court to examine in minute detail all of the circumstances leading up to the acceptance of the OEL offer. Having considered the process adopted by the receiver, it is my opinion that the process adopted was a reasonable and prudent one.

4. Was there unfairness in the process?

As a general rule, I do not think it appropriate for the court to go into the minutia of the process or of the selling strategy adopted by the receiver. However, the court has a responsibility to decide whether the process was fair. The only part of this process which I could find that might give even a superficial impression of unfairness is the failure of the receiver to give an offering memorandum to those who expressed an interest in the purchase of Air Toronto.

I will outline the circumstances which relate to the allegation that the receiver was unfair in failing to provide an offering memorandum. In the latter part of 1990, as part of its selling strategy, the receiver was in the process of preparing an offering memorandum to give to persons who expressed an interest in the purchase of Air Toronto. The offering memorandum got as far as draft form, but was never released to anyone, although a copy of the draft eventually got into the hands of CCFL before it submitted the first 922 offer on March 7, 1991. A copy of the offering memorandum forms part of the record and it seems to me to be little more than puffery, without any hard information which a sophisticated

purchaser would require in order to make a serious bid.

The offering memorandum had not been completed by February 11, 1991. On that date, the receiver entered into the letter of intent to negotiate with OEL. The letter of intent contained a provision that during its currency the receiver would not negotiate with any other party. The letter of intent was renewed from time to time until the OEL offer was received on March 6, 1991.

The receiver did not proceed with the offering memorandum because to do so would violate the spirit, if not the letter, of its letter of intent with OEL.

I do not think that the conduct of the receiver shows any unfairness towards 922. When I speak of 922, I do so in the context that Air Canada and CCFL are identified with it. I start by saying that the receiver acted reasonably when it entered into exclusive negotiations with OEL. I find it strange that a company, with which Air Canada is closely and intimately involved, would say that it was unfair for the receiver to enter into a time-limited agreement to negotiate exclusively with OEL. That is precisely the arrangement which Air Canada insisted upon when it negotiated with the receiver in the spring and summer of 1990. If it was not unfair for Air Canada to have such an agreement, I do not understand why it was unfair for OEL to have a similar one. In fact, both Air Canada and OEL in its turn were acting reasonably when they required exclusive negotiating rights to prevent their negotiations from being used as a bargaining lever with other potential purchasers. The fact that Air Canada insisted upon an exclusive negotiating right while it was negotiating with the receiver demonstrates the commercial efficacy of OEL being given the same right during its negotiations with the receiver. I see no unfairness on the part of the receiver when it honoured its letter of intent with OEL by not releasing the offering memorandum during the negotiations with OEL.

Moreover, I am not prepared to find that 922 was in any way prejudiced by the fact that it did not have an offering memorandum. It made an offer on March 7, 1991, which it

contends to this day was a better offer than that of OEL. 922 has not convinced me that if it had an offering memorandum its offer would have been any different or any better than it actually was. The fatal problem with the first 922 offer was that it contained a condition which was completely unacceptable to the receiver. The receiver properly, in my opinion, rejected the offer out of hand because of that condition. That condition did not relate to any information which could have conceivably been in an offering memorandum prepared by the receiver. It was about the resolution of a dispute between CCFL and the Royal Bank, something the receiver knew nothing about.

Further evidence of the lack of prejudice which the absence of an offering memorandum has caused 922 is found in CCFL's stance before this court. During argument, its counsel suggested, as a possible resolution of this appeal, that this court should call for new bids, evaluate them and then order a sale to the party who put in the better bid. In such a case, counsel for CCFL said that 922 would be prepared to bid within seven days of the court's decision. I would have thought that, if there were anything to CCFL's suggestion that the failure to provide an offering memorandum was unfair to 922, it would have told the court that it needed more information before it would be able to make a bid.

I am satisfied that Air Canada and CCFL have, and at all times had, all of the information which they would have needed to make what to them would be a commercially viable offer to the receiver. I think that an offering memorandum was of no commercial consequence to them, but the absence of one has since become a valuable tactical weapon.

It is my opinion that there is no convincing 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. Therefore, the failure to provide an offering memorandum was neither unfair nor did it prejudice the obtaining of a better price on March 8, 1991, than that contained in the OEL offer. I would not give effect to the contention that the process adopted by the receiver was an unfair one.

There are two statements by Anderson J. contained in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, *supra*, which I adopt as my own. The first is at p. 109 O.R., p. 548 D.L.R.:

The court should not proceed against the recommendations of its Receiver except in special circumstances and where the necessity and propriety of doing so are plain. Any other rule or approach would emasculate the role of the Receiver and make it almost inevitable that the final negotiation of every sale would take place on the motion for approval.

The second is at p. 111 O.R., p. 550 D.L.R.:

It is equally clear, in my view, though perhaps not so clearly enunciated, that it is only in an exceptional case that the court will intervene and proceed contrary to the Receiver's recommendations if satisfied, as I am, that the Receiver has acted reasonably, prudently and fairly and not arbitrarily.

In this case the receiver acted reasonably, prudently, fairly and not arbitrarily. I am of the opinion, therefore, that the process adopted by the receiver in reaching an agreement was a just one.

In his reasons for judgment, after discussing the circumstances leading to the 922 offer, Rosenberg J. said this [at p. 31 of the reasons]:

They created a situation as of March 8, where the receiver was faced with two offers, one of which was in acceptable form and one of which could not possibly be accepted in its present form. The receiver acted appropriately in accepting the OEL offer.

I agree.

The receiver made proper and sufficient efforts to get the best price that it could for the assets of Air Toronto. It adopted a reasonable and effective process to sell the airline

which was fair to all persons who might be interested in purchasing it. It is my opinion, therefore, that the receiver properly carried out the mandate which was given to it by the order of O'Brien J. It follows that Rosenberg J. was correct when he confirmed the sale to OEL.

II. THE EFFECT OF THE SUPPORT OF THE 922 OFFER BY THE TWO SECURED CREDITORS

As I noted earlier, the 922 offer was supported before Rosenberg J., and in this court, by CCFL and by the Royal Bank, the two secured creditors. It was argued that, because the interests of the creditors are primary, the court ought to give effect to their wish that the 922 offer be accepted. I would not accede to that suggestion for two reasons.

The first reason is related to the fact that the creditors chose to have a receiver appointed by the court. It was open to them to appoint a private receiver pursuant to the authority of their security documents. Had they done so, then they would have had control of the process and could have sold Air Toronto to whom they wished. However, acting privately and controlling the process involves some risks. The appointment of a receiver by the court insulates the creditors from those risks. But insulation from those risks carries with it the loss of control over the process of disposition of the assets. As I have attempted to explain in these reasons, when a receiver's sale is before the court for confirmation the only issues are the propriety of the conduct of the receiver and whether it acted providently. The function of the court at that stage is not to step in and do the receiver's work or change the sale strategy adopted by the receiver. Creditors who asked the court to appoint a receiver to dispose of assets 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 made by the receiver. That would take away all respect for the process of sale by a court-appointed receiver.

There can be no doubt that the interests of the creditor are an important consideration in determining whether the receiver has properly conducted a sale. The opinion of the creditors as

to which offer ought to be accepted is something to be taken into account. But, if the court decides that the receiver has acted properly and providently, those views are not necessarily determinative. Because, in this case, the receiver acted properly and providently, I do not think that the views of the creditors should override the considered judgment of the receiver.

The second reason is that, in the particular circumstances of this case, I do not think the support of CCFL and the Royal Bank of the 922 offer is entitled to any weight. The support given by CCFL can be dealt with summarily. It is a co-owner of 922. It is hardly surprising and not very impressive to hear that it supports the offer which it is making for the debtors' assets.

The support by the Royal Bank requires more consideration and involves some reference to the circumstances. On March 6, 1991, when the first 922 offer was made, there was in existence an interlender agreement between the Royal Bank and CCFL. That agreement dealt with the share of the proceeds of the sale of Air Toronto which each creditor would receive. At the time, a dispute between the Royal Bank and CCFL about the interpretation of that agreement was pending in the courts. The unacceptable condition in the first 922 offer related to the settlement of the interlender dispute. The condition required that the dispute be resolved in a way which would substantially favour CCFL. It required that CCFL receive \$3,375,000 of the \$6,000,000 cash payment and the balance, including the royalties, if any, be paid to the Royal Bank. The Royal Bank did not agree with that split of the sale proceeds.

On April 5, 1991, the Royal Bank and CCFL agreed to settle the interlender dispute. The settlement was that if the 922 offer was accepted by the court, CCFL would receive only \$1,000,000 and the Royal Bank would receive \$5,000,000 plus any royalties which might be paid. It was only in consideration of that settlement that the Royal Bank agreed to support the 922 offer.

The Royal Bank's support of the 922 offer is so affected by

the very substantial benefit which it wanted to obtain from the settlement of the interlender dispute that, in my opinion, its support is devoid of any objectivity. I think it has no weight.

While there may be circumstances where the unanimous support by the creditors of a particular offer could conceivably override the proper and provident conduct of a sale by a receiver, I do not think that this is such a case. This is a case where the receiver has acted properly and in a provident way. It would make a mockery out of the judicial process, under which a mandate was given to this receiver to sell this airline, if the support by these creditors of the 922 offer were permitted to carry the day. I give no weight to the support which they give to the 922 offer.

In its factum, the receiver pointed out that, because of greater liabilities imposed upon private receivers by various statutes such as the Employment Standards Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 137, and the Environmental Protection Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 141, it is likely that more and more the courts will be asked to appoint receivers in insolvencies. In those circumstances, I think that creditors who ask for court-appointed receivers and business people who choose to deal with those receivers should know that if those receivers act properly and providently their decisions and judgments will be given great weight by the courts who appoint them. I have decided this appeal in the way I have in order to assure business people who deal with court-appointed receivers that they can have confidence that an agreement which they make with a court-appointed receiver will be far more than a platform upon which others may bargain at the court approval stage. I think that persons who enter into agreements with court-appointed receivers, following a disposition procedure that is appropriate given the nature of the assets involved, should expect that their bargain will be confirmed by the court.

The process is very important. It should be carefully protected so that the ability of court-appointed receivers to negotiate the best price possible is strengthened and supported. Because this receiver acted properly and providently in entering into the OEL agreement, I am of the opinion that

Rosenberg J. was right when he approved the sale to OEL and dismissed the motion to approve the 922 offer.

I would, accordingly, dismiss the appeal. I would award the receiver, OEL and Frontier Airlines Limited their costs out of the Soundair estate, those of the receiver on a solicitor-and-client scale. I would make no order as to the costs of any of the other parties or interveners.

MCKINLAY J.A. (concurring in the result):-- I agree with Galligan J.A. in result, but wish to emphasize that I do so on the basis that the undertaking being sold in this case was of a very special and unusual nature. It is most important that the integrity of procedures followed by court-appointed receivers be protected in the interests of both commercial morality and the future confidence of business persons in their dealings with receivers. Consequently, in all cases, the court should carefully scrutinize the procedure followed by the receiver to determine whether it satisfies the tests set out by Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg* (1986), 60 O.R. (2d) 87, 39 D.L.R. (4th) 526 (H.C.J.). While the procedure carried out by the receiver in this case, as described by Galligan J.A., was appropriate, given the unfolding of events and the unique nature of the assets involved, it is not a procedure that is likely to be appropriate in many receivership sales.

I should like to add that where there is a small number of creditors who are the only parties with a real interest in the proceeds of the sale (i.e., where it is clear that the highest price attainable would result in recovery so low that no other creditors, shareholders, guarantors, etc., could possibly benefit therefrom), the wishes of the interested creditors should be very seriously considered by the receiver. It is true, as Galligan J.A. points out, that in seeking the court appointment of a receiver, the moving parties also seek the protection of the court in carrying out the receiver's functions. However, it is also true that in utilizing the court process the moving parties have opened the whole process to detailed scrutiny by all involved, and have probably added significantly to their costs and consequent shortfall as a result of so doing. The adoption of the court process should in

no way diminish the rights of any party, and most certainly not the rights of the only parties with a real interest. Where a receiver asks for court approval of a sale which is opposed by the only parties in interest, the court should scrutinize with great care the procedure followed by the receiver. I agree with Galligan J.A. that in this case that was done. I am satisfied that the rights of all parties were properly considered by the receiver, by the learned motions court judge, and by Galligan J.A.

GOODMAN J.A. (dissenting):-- I have had the opportunity of reading the reasons for judgment herein of Galligan and McKinlay JJ.A. Respectfully, I am unable to agree with their conclusion.

The case at bar is an exceptional one in the sense that upon the application made for approval of the sale of the assets of Air Toronto two competing offers were placed before Rosenberg J. Those two offers were that of Frontier Airlines Ltd. and Ontario Express Limited (OEL) and that of 922246 Ontario Limited (922), a company incorporated for the purpose of acquiring Air Toronto. Its shares were owned equally by Canadian Pension Capital Limited and Canadian Insurers Capital Corporation (collectively CCFL) and Air Canada. It was conceded by all parties to these proceedings that the only persons who had any interest in the proceeds of the sale were two secured creditors, viz., CCFL and the Royal Bank of Canada (the Bank). Those two creditors were unanimous in their position that they desired the court to approve the sale to 922. We were not referred to nor am I aware of any case where a court has refused to abide by the unanimous wishes of the only interested creditors for the approval of a specific offer made in receivership proceedings.

In *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.), Berger J. said at p. 95 B.C.L.R., p. 30 C.B.R.:

Here all of those with a financial stake in the plant have joined in seeking the court's approval of the sale to Fincas. This court does not have a roving commission to decide what

is best for investors and businessmen when they have agreed among themselves what course of action they should follow. It is their money.

I agree with that statement. It is particularly apt to this case. The two secured creditors will suffer a shortfall of approximately \$50,000,000. They have a tremendous interest in the sale of assets which form part of their security. I agree with the finding of Rosenberg J., Gen. Div., May 1, 1991, that the offer of 922 is superior to that of OEL. He concluded that the 922 offer is marginally superior. If by that he meant that mathematically it was likely to provide slightly more in the way of proceeds it is difficult to take issue with that finding. If on the other hand he meant that having regard to all considerations it was only marginally superior, I cannot agree. He said in his reasons [pp. 17-18]:

I have come to the conclusion that knowledgeable creditors such as the Royal Bank would prefer the 922 offer even if the other factors influencing their decision were not present. No matter what adjustments had to be made, the 922 offer results in more cash immediately. Creditors facing the type of loss the Royal Bank is taking in this case would not be anxious to rely on contingencies especially in the present circumstances surrounding the airline industry.

I agree with that statement completely. It is apparent that the difference between the two offers insofar as cash on closing is concerned amounts to approximately \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000. The Bank submitted that it did not wish to gamble any further with respect to its investment and that the acceptance and court approval of the OEL offer, in effect, supplanted its position as a secured creditor with respect to the amount owing over and above the down payment and placed it in the position of a joint entrepreneur but one with no control. This results from the fact that the OEL offer did not provide for any security for any funds which might be forthcoming over and above the initial downpayment on closing.

In Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303 (C.A.), Hart J.A., speaking for the majority

of the court, said at p. 10 C.B.R., p. 312 N.S.R.:

Here we are dealing with a receiver appointed at the instance of one major creditor, who chose to insert in the contract of sale a provision making it subject to the approval of the court. This, in my opinion, shows an intention on behalf of the parties to invoke the normal equitable doctrines which place the court in the position of looking to the interests of all persons concerned before giving its blessing to a particular transaction submitted for approval. In these circumstances the court would not consider itself bound by the contract entered into in good faith by the receiver but would have to look to the broader picture to see that the contract was for the benefit of the creditors as a whole. When there was evidence that a higher price was readily available for the property the chambers judge was, in my opinion, justified in exercising his discretion as he did. Otherwise he could have deprived the creditors of a substantial sum of money.

This statement is apposite to the circumstances of the case at bar. I hasten to add that in my opinion it is not only price which is to be considered in the exercise of the judge's discretion. It may very well be, as I believe to be so in this case, that the amount of cash is the most important element in determining which of the two offers is for the benefit and in the best interest of the creditors.

It is my view, and the statement of Hart J.A. is consistent therewith, that 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. I agree completely with the views expressed by McKinlay J.A. in that regard in her reasons.

It is my further view that any negotiations which took place between the only two interested creditors in deciding to support the approval of the 922 offer were not relevant to the determination by the presiding judge of the issues involved in the motion for approval of either one of the two offers nor are

they relevant in determining the outcome of this appeal. It is sufficient that the two creditors have decided unanimously what is in their best interest and the appeal must be considered in the light of that decision. It so happens, however, that there is ample evidence to support their conclusion that the approval of the 922 offer is in their best interests.

I am satisfied that the interests of the creditors are the prime consideration for both the receiver and the court. In Re Beauty Counsellors of Canada Ltd. (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 (Ont. Bkcy.) Saunders J. said at p. 243:

This does not mean that a court should ignore a new and higher bid made after acceptance where there has been no unfairness in the process. The interests of the creditors, while not the only consideration, are the prime consideration.

I agree with that statement of the law. In Re Selkirk (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 245 (Ont. Bkcy.) Saunders J. heard an application for court approval for the sale by the sheriff of real property in bankruptcy proceedings. The sheriff had been previously ordered to list the property for sale subject to approval of the court. Saunders J. said at p. 246 C.B.R.:

In dealing with the request for approval, the court has to be concerned primarily with protecting the interests of the creditors of the former bankrupt. A secondary but important consideration is that the process under which the sale agreement is arrived at should be consistent with the commercial efficacy and integrity.

I am in agreement with that statement as a matter of general principle. Saunders J. further stated that he adopted the principles stated by Macdonald J.A. in Cameron, *supra*, at pp. 92-94 O.R., pp. 531-33 D.L.R., quoted by Galligan J.A. in his reasons. In Cameron, the remarks of Macdonald J.A. related to situations involving the calling of bids and fixing a time limit for the making of such bids. In those circumstances the process is so clear as a matter of commercial practice that an interference by the court in such process might have a

deleterious effect on the efficacy of receivership proceedings in other cases. But Macdonald J.A. recognized that even in bid or tender cases where the offeror for whose bid approval is sought has complied with all requirements a court might not approve the agreement of purchase and sale entered into by the receiver. He said at pp. 11-12 C.B.R., p. 314 N.S.R.:

There are, of course, many reasons why a court might not approve an agreement of purchase and sale, viz., where the offer accepted is so low in relation to the appraised value as to be unrealistic; or, where the circumstances indicate that insufficient time was allowed for the making of bids or that inadequate notice of sale by bid was given (where the receiver sells property by the bid method); or, where it can be said that the proposed sale is not in the best interest of either the creditors or the owner. Court approval must involve the delicate balancing of competing interests and not simply a consideration of the interests of the creditors.

The deficiency in the present case is so large that there has been no suggestion of a competing interest between the owner and the creditors.

I agree that the same reasoning may apply to a negotiation process leading to a private sale but the procedure and process applicable to private sales of a wide variety of businesses and undertakings with the multiplicity of individual considerations applicable and perhaps peculiar to the particular business is not so clearly established that a departure by the court from the process adopted by the receiver in a particular case will result in commercial chaos to the detriment of future receivership proceedings. Each case must be decided on its own merits and it is necessary to consider the process used by the receiver in the present proceedings and to determine whether it was unfair, improvident or inadequate.

It is important to note at the outset that Rosenberg J. made the following statement in his reasons [p. 15]:

On March 8, 1991 the trustee accepted the OEL offer subject to court approval. The receiver at that time had no other

offer before it that was in final form or could possibly be accepted. The receiver had at the time the knowledge that Air Canada with CCFL had not bargained in good faith and had not fulfilled the promise of its letter of March 1. The receiver was justified in assuming that Air Canada and CCFL's offer was a long way from being in an acceptable form and that Air Canada and CCFL's objective was to interrupt the finalizing of the OEL agreement and to retain as long as possible the Air Toronto connector traffic flowing into Terminal 2 for the benefit of Air Canada.

In my opinion there was no evidence before him or before this court to indicate that Air Canada with CCFL had not bargained in good faith and that the receiver had knowledge of such lack of good faith. Indeed, on this appeal, counsel for the receiver stated that he was not alleging Air Canada and CCFL had not bargained in good faith. Air Canada had frankly stated at the time that it had made its offer to purchase which was eventually refused by the receiver that it would not become involved in an "auction" to purchase the undertaking of Air Canada and that, although it would fulfil its contractual obligations to provide connecting services to Air Toronto, it would do no more than it was legally required to do insofar as facilitating the purchase of Air Toronto by any other person. In so doing Air Canada may have been playing "hard ball" as its behaviour was characterized by some of the counsel for opposing parties. It was nevertheless merely openly asserting its legal position as it was entitled to do.

Furthermore there was no evidence before Rosenberg J. or this court that the receiver had assumed that Air Canada and CCFL's objective in making an offer was to interrupt the finalizing of the OEL agreement and to retain as long as possible the Air Toronto connector traffic flowing into Terminal 2 for the benefit of Air Canada. Indeed, there was no evidence to support such an assumption in any event although it is clear that 922 and through it CCFL and Air Canada were endeavouring to present an offer to purchase which would be accepted and/or approved by the court in preference to the offer made by OEL.

To the extent that approval of the OEL agreement by Rosenberg

J. was based on the alleged lack of good faith in bargaining and improper motivation with respect to connector traffic on the part of Air Canada and CCFL, it cannot be supported.

I would also point out that, rather than saying there was no other offer before it that was final in form, it would have been more accurate to have said that there was no unconditional offer before it.

In considering the material and evidence placed before the court I am satisfied that the receiver was at all times acting in good faith. I have reached the conclusion, however, that the process which he used was unfair insofar as 922 is concerned and improvident insofar as the two secured creditors are concerned.

Air Canada had been negotiating with Soundair Corporation for the purchase from it of Air Toronto for a considerable period of time prior to the appointment of a receiver by the court. It had given a letter of intent indicating a prospective sale price of \$18,000,000. After the appointment of the receiver, by agreement dated April 30, 1990, Air Canada continued its negotiations for the purchase of Air Toronto with the receiver. Although this agreement contained a clause which provided that the receiver "shall not negotiate for the sale ... of Air Toronto with any person except Air Canada", it further provided that the receiver would not be in breach of that provision merely by receiving unsolicited offers for all or any of the assets of Air Toronto. In addition, the agreement, which had a term commencing on April 30, 1990, could be terminated on the fifth business day following the delivery of a written notice of termination by one party to the other. I point out this provision merely to indicate that the exclusivity privilege extended by the Receiver to Air Canada was of short duration at the receiver's option.

As a result of due diligence investigations carried out by Air Canada during the month of April, May and June of 1990, Air Canada reduced its offer to 8.1 million dollars conditional upon there being \$4,000,000 in tangible assets. The offer was made on June 14, 1990 and was open for acceptance until June

29, 1990.

By amending agreement dated June 19, 1990 the receiver was released from its covenant to refrain from negotiating for the sale of the Air Toronto business and assets to any person other than Air Canada. By virtue of this amending agreement the receiver had put itself in the position of having a firm offer in hand with the right to negotiate and accept offers from other persons. Air Canada in these circumstances was in the subservient position. The receiver, in the exercise of its judgment and discretion, allowed the Air Canada offer to lapse. On July 20, 1990 Air Canada served a notice of termination of the April 30, 1990 agreement.

Apparently as a result of advice received from the receiver to the effect that the receiver intended to conduct an auction for the sale of the assets and business of the Air Toronto Division of Soundair Corporation, the solicitors for Air Canada advised the receiver by letter dated July 20, 1990 in part as follows:

Air Canada has instructed us to advise you that it does not intend to submit a further offer in the auction process.

This statement together with other statements set forth in the letter was sufficient to indicate that Air Canada was not interested in purchasing Air Toronto in the process apparently contemplated by the receiver at that time. It did not form a proper foundation for the receiver to conclude that there was no realistic possibility of selling Air Toronto to Air Canada, either alone or in conjunction with some other person, in different circumstances. In June 1990 the receiver was of the opinion that the fair value of Air Toronto was between \$10,000,000 and \$12,000,000.

In August 1990 the receiver contacted a number of interested parties. A number of offers were received which were not deemed to be satisfactory. One such offer, received on August 20, 1990, came as a joint offer from OEL and Air Ontario (an Air Canada connector). It was for the sum of \$3,000,000 for the good will relating to certain Air Toronto routes but did not

include the purchase of any tangible assets or leasehold interests.

In December 1990 the receiver was approached by the management of Canadian Partner (operated by OEL) for the purpose of evaluating the benefits of an amalgamated Air Toronto/Air Partner operation. The negotiations continued from December of 1990 to February of 1991 culminating in the OEL agreement dated March 8, 1991.

On or before December, 1990, CCFL advised the receiver that it intended to make a bid for the Air Toronto assets. The receiver, in August of 1990, for the purpose of facilitating the sale of Air Toronto assets, commenced the preparation of an operating memorandum. He prepared no less than six draft operating memoranda with dates from October 1990 through March 1, 1991. None of these were distributed to any prospective bidder despite requests having been received therefor, with the exception of an early draft provided to CCFL without the receiver's knowledge.

During the period December 1990 to the end of January 1991, the receiver advised CCFL that the offering memorandum was in the process of being prepared and would be ready soon for distribution. He further advised CCFL that it should await the receipt of the memorandum before submitting a formal offer to purchase the Air Toronto assets.

By late January CCFL had become aware that the receiver was negotiating with OEL for the sale of Air Toronto. In fact, on February 11, 1991, the receiver signed a letter of intent with OEL wherein it had specifically agreed not to negotiate with any other potential bidders or solicit any offers from others.

By letter dated February 25, 1991, the solicitors for CCFL made a written request to the Receiver for the offering memorandum. The receiver did not reply to the letter because he felt he was precluded from so doing by the provisions of the letter of intent dated February 11, 1991. Other prospective purchasers were also unsuccessful in obtaining the promised memorandum to assist them in preparing their bids. It should be

noted that exclusivity provision of the letter of intent expired on February 20, 1991. This provision was extended on three occasions, viz., February 19, 22 and March 5, 1991. It is clear that from a legal standpoint the receiver, by refusing to extend the time, could have dealt with other prospective purchasers and specifically with 922.

It was not until March 1, 1991 that CCFL had obtained sufficient information to enable it to make a bid through 922. It succeeded in so doing through its own efforts through sources other than the receiver. By that time the receiver had already entered into the letter of intent with OEL. Notwithstanding the fact that the receiver knew since December of 1990 that CCFL wished to make a bid for the assets of Air Toronto (and there is no evidence to suggest that at any time such a bid would be in conjunction with Air Canada or that Air Canada was in any way connected with CCFL) it took no steps to provide CCFL with information necessary to enable it to make an intelligent bid and, indeed, suggested delaying the making of the bid until an offering memorandum had been prepared and provided. In the meantime by entering into the letter of intent with OEL it put itself in a position where it could not negotiate with CCFL or provide the information requested.

On February 28, 1991, the solicitors for CCFL telephoned the receiver and were advised for the first time that the receiver had made a business decision to negotiate solely with OEL and would not negotiate with anyone else in the interim.

By letter dated March 1, 1991 CCFL advised the receiver that it intended to submit a bid. It set forth the essential terms of the bid and stated that it would be subject to customary commercial provisions. On March 7, 1991 CCFL and Air Canada, jointly through 922, submitted an offer to purchase Air Toronto upon the terms set forth in the letter dated March 1, 1991. It included a provision that the offer was conditional upon the interpretation of an interlender agreement which set out the relative distribution of proceeds as between CCFL and the Royal Bank. It is common ground that it was a condition over which the receiver had no control and accordingly would not have been acceptable on that ground alone. The receiver did not, however,

contact CCFL in order to negotiate or request the removal of the condition although it appears that its agreement with OEL not to negotiate with any person other than OEL expired on March 6, 1991.

The fact of the matter is that by March 7, 1991, the receiver had received the offer from OEL which was subsequently approved by Rosenberg J. That offer was accepted by the receiver on March 8, 1991. Notwithstanding the fact that OEL had been negotiating the purchase for a period of approximately three months the offer contained a provision for the sole benefit of the purchaser that it was subject to the purchaser obtaining:

... a financing commitment within 45 days of the date hereof in an amount not less than the Purchase Price from the Royal Bank of Canada or other financial institution upon terms and conditions acceptable to them. In the event that such a financing commitment is not obtained within such 45 day period, the purchaser or OEL shall have the right to terminate this agreement upon giving written notice of termination to the vendor on the first Business Day following the expiry of the said period.

The purchaser was also given the right to waive the condition.

In effect the agreement was tantamount to a 45-day option to purchase excluding the right of any other person to purchase Air Toronto during that period of time and thereafter if the condition was fulfilled or waived. The agreement was, of course, stated to be subject to court approval.

In my opinion the process and procedure adopted by the receiver was unfair to CCFL. Although it was aware from December 1990 that CCFL was interested in making an offer, it effectively delayed the making of such offer by continually referring to the preparation of the offering memorandum. It did not endeavour during the period December 1990 to March 7, 1991 to negotiate with CCFL in any way the possible terms of purchase and sale agreement. In the result no offer was sought from CCFL by the receiver prior to February 11, 1991 and thereafter it put itself in the position of being unable to

negotiate with anyone other than OEL. The receiver, then, on March 8, 1991 chose to accept an offer which was conditional in nature without prior consultation with CCFL (922) to see whether it was prepared to remove the condition in its offer.

I do not doubt that the receiver felt that it was more likely that the condition in the OEL offer would be fulfilled than the condition in the 922 offer. It may be that the receiver, having negotiated for a period of three months with OEL, was fearful that it might lose the offer if OEL discovered that it was negotiating with another person. Nevertheless it seems to me that it was imprudent and unfair on the part of the receiver to ignore an offer from an interested party which offered approximately triple the cash down payment without giving a chance to the offeror to remove the conditions or other terms which made the offer unacceptable to it. The potential loss was that of an agreement which amounted to little more than an option in favour of the offeror.

In my opinion the procedure adopted by the receiver was unfair to CCFL in that, in effect, it gave OEL the opportunity of engaging in exclusive negotiations for a period of three months notwithstanding the fact that it knew CCFL was interested in making an offer. The receiver did not indicate a deadline by which offers were to be submitted and it did not at any time indicate the structure or nature of an offer which might be acceptable to it.

In his reasons Rosenberg J. stated that as of March 1, CCFL and Air Canada had all the information that they needed and any allegations of unfairness in the negotiating process by the receiver had disappeared. He said [p. 31]:

They created a situation as of March 8, where the receiver was faced with two offers, one of which was in acceptable form and one of which could not possibly be accepted in its present form. The receiver acted appropriately in accepting the OEL offer.

If he meant by "acceptable in form" that it was acceptable to the receiver, then obviously OEL had the unfair advantage of

its lengthy negotiations with the receiver to ascertain what kind of an offer would be acceptable to the receiver. If, on the other hand, he meant that the 922 offer was unacceptable in its form because it was conditional, it can hardly be said that the OEL offer was more acceptable in this regard as it contained a condition with respect to financing terms and conditions "acceptable to them".

It should be noted that on March 13, 1991 the representatives of 922 first met with the receiver to review its offer of March 7, 1991 and at the request of the receiver withdrew the inter-lender condition from its offer. On March 14, 1991 OEL removed the financing condition from its offer. By order of Rosenberg J. dated March 26, 1991, CCFL was given until April 5, 1991 to submit a bid and on April 5, 1991, 922 submitted its offer with the interlender condition removed.

In my opinion the offer accepted by the receiver is improvident and unfair insofar as the two creditors are concerned. It is not improvident in the sense that the price offered by 922 greatly exceeded that offered by OEL. In the final analysis it may not be greater at all. The salient fact is that the cash down payment in the 922 offer constitutes approximately two-thirds of the contemplated sale price whereas the cash down payment in the OEL transaction constitutes approximately 20 to 25 per cent of the contemplated sale price. In terms of absolute dollars, the down payment in the 922 offer would likely exceed that provided for in the OEL agreement by approximately \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000.

In Re Beauty Counsellors of Canada Ltd., *supra*, Saunders J. said at p. 243 C.B.R.:

If a substantially higher bid turns up at the approval stage, the court should consider it. Such a bid may indicate, for example, that the trustee has not properly carried out its duty to endeavour to obtain the best price for the estate. In such a case the proper course might be to refuse approval and to ask the trustee to recommence the process.

I accept that statement as being an accurate statement of the

law. I would add, however, as previously indicated, that in determining what is the best price for the estate the receiver or court should not limit its consideration to which offer provides for the greater sale price. The amount of down payment and the provision or lack thereof to secure payment of the balance of the purchase price over and above the down payment may be the most important factor to be considered and I am of the view that is so in the present case. It is clear that that was the view of the only creditors who can benefit from the sale of Air Toronto.

I note that in the case at bar the 922 offer in conditional form was presented to the receiver before it accepted the OEL offer. The receiver in good faith, although I believe mistakenly, decided that the OEL offer was the better offer. At that time the receiver did not have the benefit of the views of the two secured creditors in that regard. At the time of the application for approval before Rosenberg J. the stated preference of the two interested creditors was made quite clear. He found as a fact that knowledgeable creditors would not be anxious to rely on contingencies in the present circumstances surrounding the airline industry. It is reasonable to expect that a receiver would be no less knowledgeable in that regard and it is his primary duty to protect the interests of the creditors. In my view it was an improvident act on the part of the receiver to have accepted the conditional offer made by OEL and Rosenberg J. erred in failing to dismiss the application of the receiver for approval of the OEL offer. It would be most inequitable to foist upon the two creditors who have already been seriously hurt more unnecessary contingencies.

Although in other circumstances it might be appropriate to ask the receiver to recommence the process, in my opinion, it would not be appropriate to do so in this case. The only two interested creditors support the acceptance of the 922 offer and the court should so order.

Although I would be prepared to dispose of the case on the grounds stated above, some comment should be addressed to the question of interference by the court with the process and

procedure adopted by the receiver.

I am in agreement with the view expressed by McKinlay J.A. in her reasons that the undertaking being sold in this case was of a very special and unusual nature. As a result the procedure adopted by the receiver was somewhat unusual. At the outset, in accordance with the terms of the receiving order, it dealt solely with Air Canada. It then appears that the receiver contemplated a sale of the assets by way of auction and still later contemplated the preparation and distribution of an offering memorandum inviting bids. At some point, without advice to CCFL, it abandoned that idea and reverted to exclusive negotiations with one interested party. This entire process is not one which is customary or widely accepted as a general practice in the commercial world. It was somewhat unique having regard to the circumstances of this case. In my opinion the refusal of the court to approve the offer accepted by the receiver would not reflect on the integrity of procedures followed by court-appointed receivers and is not the type of refusal which will have a tendency to undermine the future confidence of business persons in dealing with receivers.

Rosenberg J. stated that the Royal Bank was aware of the process used and tacitly approved it. He said it knew the terms of the letter of intent in February 1991 and made no comment. The Royal Bank did, however, indicate to the receiver that it was not satisfied with the contemplated price nor the amount of the down payment. It did not, however, tell the receiver to adopt a different process in endeavouring to sell the Air Toronto assets. It is not clear from the material filed that at the time it became aware of the letter of intent, it knew that CCFL was interested in purchasing Air Toronto.

I am further of the opinion that a prospective purchaser who has been given an opportunity to engage in exclusive negotiations with a receiver for relatively short periods of time which are extended from time to time by the receiver and who then makes a conditional offer, the condition of which is for his sole benefit and must be fulfilled to his satisfaction unless waived by him, and which he knows is to be subject to

court approval, cannot legitimately claim to have been unfairly dealt with if the court refuses to approve the offer and approves a substantially better one.

In conclusion I feel that I must comment on the statement made by Galligan J.A. in his reasons to the effect that the suggestion made by counsel for 922 constitutes evidence of lack of prejudice resulting from the absence of an offering memorandum. It should be pointed out that the court invited counsel to indicate the manner in which the problem should be resolved in the event that the court concluded that the order approving the OEL offer should be set aside. There was no evidence before the court with respect to what additional information may have been acquired by CCFL since March 8, 1991 and no inquiry was made in that regard. Accordingly, I am of the view that no adverse inference should be drawn from the proposal made as a result of the court's invitation.

For the above reasons I would allow the appeal with one set of costs to CCFL-922, set aside the order of Rosenberg J., dismiss the receiver's motion with one set of costs to CCFL-922 and order that the assets of Air Toronto be sold to numbered corporation 922246 on the terms set forth in its offer with appropriate adjustments to provide for the delay in its execution. Costs awarded shall be payable out of the estate of Soundair Corporation. The costs incurred by the receiver in making the application and responding to the appeal shall be paid to him out of the assets of the estate of Soundair Corporation on a solicitor-and-client basis. I would make no order as to costs of any of the other parties or interveners.

Appeal dismissed.

**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.

Nº 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 réacteurs CANDU. Les réacteurs sont actuellement en construction 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 comprometttrait 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.*

Welfare), [2000] 3 F.C. 360, aff'g (1998), 83 C.P.R. (3d) 428; *Ethyl Canada Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)* (1998), 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278; *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103; *R. v. O.N.E.*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 478, 2001 CSC 77; *F.N. (Re)*, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, 2000 CSC 35; *Eli Lilly and Co. v. Novopharm Ltd.* (1994), 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437.

Statutes and Regulations Cited

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, ss. 1, 2(b).
Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, S.C. 1992, c. 37, ss. 5(1)(b), 8, 54, 54(2)(b).
Federal Court Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106, rr. 151, 312.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal, [2000] 4 F.C. 426, 187 D.L.R. (4th) 231, 256 N.R. 1, 24 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, [2000] F.C.J. No. 732 (QL), affirming a decision of the Trial Division, [2000] 2 F.C. 400, 178 F.T.R. 283, [1999] F.C.J. No. 1633 (QL). Appeal allowed.

J. Brett Ledger and Peter Chapin, for the appellant.

Timothy J. Howard and Franklin S. Gertler, for the respondent Sierra Club of Canada.

Graham Garton, Q.C., and *J. Sanderson Graham*, for the respondents 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.

The judgment of the Court was delivered by

IACOBUCCI J. —

I. Introduction

1

In our country, courts are the institutions generally chosen to resolve legal disputes as best they can through the application of legal principles to the facts of the case involved. One of the underlying principles of the judicial process is public openness, both in the proceedings of the dispute, and in the material that is relevant to its resolution. However, some material can be made the subject of a confidentiality order. This appeal raises the important

Canada (Ministre de la Santé nationale et du Bien-être social), [2000] 3 C.F. 360, conf. [1998] A.C.F. n° 1850 (QL); *Ethyl Canada Inc. c. Canada (Attorney General)* (1998), 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278; *R. c. Oakes*, [1986] 1 R.C.S. 103; *R. c. O.N.E.*, [2001] 3 R.C.S. 478, 2001 CSC 77; *F.N. (Re)*, [2000] 1 R.C.S. 880, 2000 CSC 35; *Eli Lilly and Co. c. Novopharm Ltd.* (1994), 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437.

Lois et règlements cités

Charte canadienne des droits et libertés, art. 1, 2b).
Loi canadienne sur l'évaluation environnementale, L.C. 1992, ch. 37, art. 5(1)b), 8, 54, 54(2) [abr. & rempl. 1993, ch. 34, art. 37].
Règles de la Cour fédérale (1998), DORS/98-106, règles 151, 312.

POURVOI contre un arrêt de la Cour d'appel fédérale, [2000] 4 C.F. 426, 187 D.L.R. (4th) 231, 256 N.R. 1, 24 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, [2000] A.C.F. n° 732 (QL), qui a confirmé une décision de la Section de première instance, [2000] 2 C.F. 400, 178 F.T.R. 283, [1999] A.C.F. n° 1633 (QL). Pourvoi accueilli.

J. Brett Ledger et Peter Chapin, pour l'appelante.

Timothy J. Howard et Franklin S. Gertler, pour l'intimé Sierra Club du Canada.

Graham Garton, c.r., et *J. Sanderson Graham*, pour les intimés 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.

Version française du jugement de la Cour rendu par

LE JUGE IACOBUCCI —

I. Introduction

Dans notre pays, les tribunaux sont les institutions généralement choisies pour résoudre au mieux les différends juridiques par l'application de principes juridiques aux faits de chaque espèce. Un des principes sous-jacents au processus judiciaire est la transparence, tant dans la procédure suivie que dans les éléments pertinents à la solution du litige. Certains de ces éléments peuvent toutefois faire l'objet d'une ordonnance de confidentialité. Le

issues of when, and under what circumstances, a confidentiality order should be granted.

For the following reasons, I would issue the confidentiality order sought and accordingly would allow the appeal.

II. Facts

The appellant, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (“AECL”) is a Crown corporation that owns and markets CANDU nuclear technology, and is an intervenor with the rights of a party in the application for judicial review by the respondent, the Sierra Club of Canada (“Sierra Club”). Sierra Club is an environmental organization seeking judicial review of the federal government’s decision to provide financial assistance in the form of a \$1.5 billion guaranteed loan relating to the construction and sale of two CANDU nuclear reactors to China by the appellant. The reactors are currently under construction in China, where the appellant is the main contractor and project manager.

The respondent maintains that the authorization of financial assistance by the government triggered s. 5(1)(b) of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, S.C. 1992, c. 37 (“CEAA”), which requires that an environmental assessment be undertaken before a federal authority grants financial assistance to a project. Failure to undertake such an assessment compels cancellation of the financial arrangements.

The appellant and the respondent Ministers argue that the *CEAA* does not apply to the loan transaction, and that if it does, the statutory defences available under ss. 8 and 54 apply. Section 8 describes the circumstances where Crown corporations are required to conduct environmental assessments. Section 54(2)(b) recognizes the validity of an environmental assessment carried out by a foreign authority provided that it is consistent with the provisions of the *CEAA*.

In the course of the application by Sierra Club to set aside the funding arrangements, the appellant

pourvoi soulève les importantes questions de savoir à quel moment et dans quelles circonstances il y a lieu de rendre une ordonnance de confidentialité.

Pour les motifs qui suivent, je suis d’avis de rendre l’ordonnance de confidentialité demandée et par conséquent d’accueillir le pourvoi.

II. Les faits

L’appelante, Énergie atomique du Canada Limitée (« EACL »), société d’État propriétaire et vendeuse de la technologie nucléaire CANDU, est une intervenante ayant reçu les droits de partie dans la demande de contrôle judiciaire présentée par l’intimé, Sierra Club du Canada (« Sierra Club »), un organisme environnemental. Sierra Club demande le contrôle judiciaire de la décision du gouvernement fédéral de fournir une aide financière, sous forme de garantie d’emprunt de 1,5 milliard de dollars, pour la construction et la vente à la Chine de deux réacteurs nucléaires CANDU par l’appelante. Les réacteurs sont actuellement en construction en Chine, où l’appelante est entrepreneur principal et gestionnaire de projet.

L’intimé soutient que l’autorisation d’aide financière du gouvernement déclenche l’application de l’al. 5(1)b) de la *Loi canadienne sur l’évaluation environnementale*, L.C. 1992, ch. 37 (« LCÉE »), qui exige une évaluation environnementale avant qu’une autorité fédérale puisse fournir une aide financière à un projet. Le défaut d’évaluation entraîne l’annulation des ententes financières.

Selon l’appelante et les ministres intimés, la LCÉE ne s’applique pas à la convention de prêt et si elle s’y applique, ils peuvent invoquer les défenses prévues aux art. 8 et 54 de cette loi. L’article 8 prévoit les circonstances dans lesquelles les sociétés d’État sont tenues de procéder à des évaluations environnementales. Le paragraphe 54(2) reconnaît la validité des évaluations environnementales effectuées par des autorités étrangères pourvu qu’elles soient compatibles avec les dispositions de la LCÉE.

Dans le cadre de la requête de Sierra Club en annulation des ententes financières, l’appelante a

filed an affidavit of Dr. Simon Pang, a senior manager of the appellant. In the affidavit, Dr. Pang referred to and summarized certain documents (the “Confidential Documents”). The Confidential Documents are also referred to in an affidavit prepared by Mr. Feng, one of AECL’s experts. Prior to cross-examining Dr. Pang on his affidavit, Sierra Club made an application for the production of the Confidential Documents, arguing that it could not test Dr. Pang’s evidence without access to the underlying documents. The appellant resisted production on various grounds, including the fact that the documents were the property of the Chinese authorities and that it did not have authority to disclose them. After receiving authorization by the Chinese authorities to disclose the documents on the condition that they be protected by a confidentiality order, the appellant sought to introduce the Confidential Documents under Rule 312 of the *Federal Court Rules*, 1998, SOR/98-106, and requested a confidentiality order in respect of the documents.

7

Under the terms of the order requested, the Confidential Documents would only be made available to the parties and the court; however, there would be no restriction on public access to the proceedings. In essence, what is being sought is an order preventing the dissemination of the Confidential Documents to the public.

8

The Confidential Documents comprise two Environmental Impact Reports on Siting and Construction Design (the “EIRs”), a Preliminary Safety Analysis Report (the “PSAR”), and the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang which summarizes the contents of the EIRs and the PSAR. If admitted, the EIRs and the PSAR would be attached as exhibits to the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang. The EIRs were prepared by the Chinese authorities in the Chinese language, and the PSAR was prepared by the appellant with assistance from the Chinese participants in the project. The documents contain a mass of technical information and comprise thousands of pages. They describe the ongoing environmental assessment of the construction site by the Chinese authorities under Chinese law.

déposé un affidavit de M. Simon Pang, un de ses cadres supérieurs. Dans l’affidavit, M. Pang mentionne et résume certains documents (les « documents confidentiels ») qui sont également mentionnés dans un affidavit de M. Feng, un expert d’ÉACL. Avant de contre-interroger M. Pang sur son affidavit, Sierra Club a demandé par requête la production des documents confidentiels, au motif qu’il ne pouvait vérifier la validité de sa déposition sans consulter les documents de base. L’appelante s’oppose pour plusieurs raisons à la production des documents, dont le fait qu’ils sont la propriété des autorités chinoises et qu’elle n’est pas autorisée à les divulguer. Après avoir obtenu des autorités chinoises l’autorisation de communiquer les documents à la condition qu’ils soient protégés par une ordonnance de confidentialité, l’appelante a cherché à les produire en invoquant la règle 312 des *Règles de la Cour fédérale* (1998), DORS/98-106, et a demandé une ordonnance de confidentialité à leur égard.

Aux termes de l’ordonnance demandée, seules les parties et la cour auraient accès aux documents confidentiels. Aucune restriction ne serait imposée à l’accès du public aux débats. On demande essentiellement d’empêcher la diffusion des documents confidentiels au public.

Les documents confidentiels comprennent deux Rapports d’impact environnemental (« RIE ») sur le site et la construction, un Rapport préliminaire d’analyse sur la sécurité (« RPAS ») ainsi que l’affidavit supplémentaire de M. Pang qui résume le contenu des RIE et du RPAS. S’ils étaient admis, les rapports seraient joints en annexe de l’affidavit supplémentaire de M. Pang. Les RIE ont été préparés en chinois par les autorités chinoises, et le RPAS a été préparé par l’appelante en collaboration avec les responsables chinois du projet. Les documents contiennent une quantité considérable de renseignements techniques et comprennent des milliers de pages. Ils décrivent l’évaluation environnementale du site de construction qui est faite par les autorités chinoises en vertu des lois chinoises.

As noted, the appellant argues that it cannot introduce the Confidential Documents into evidence without a confidentiality order, otherwise it would be in breach of its obligations to the Chinese authorities. The respondent's position is that its right to cross-examine Dr. Pang and Mr. Feng on their affidavits would be effectively rendered nugatory in the absence of the supporting documents to which the affidavits referred. Sierra Club proposes to take the position that the affidavits should therefore be afforded very little weight by the judge hearing the application for judicial review.

The Federal Court of Canada, Trial Division refused to grant the confidentiality order and the majority of the Federal Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. In his dissenting opinion, Robertson J.A. would have granted the confidentiality order.

III. Relevant Statutory Provisions

Federal Court Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106

151. (1) On motion, the Court may order that material to be filed shall be treated as confidential.

(2) Before making an order under subsection (1), the Court must be satisfied that the material should be treated as confidential, notwithstanding the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

IV. Judgments Below

A. *Federal Court, Trial Division, [2000] 2 F.C. 400*

Pelletier J. first considered whether leave should be granted pursuant to Rule 312 to introduce the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang to which the Confidential Documents were filed as exhibits. In his view, the underlying question was that of relevance, and he concluded that the documents were relevant to the issue of the appropriate remedy. Thus, in the absence of prejudice to the respondent, the affidavit should be permitted to be served and filed. He noted that the respondent would be prejudiced by delay, but since both parties had brought

9
Comme je le note plus haut, l'appelante prétend ne pas pouvoir produire les documents confidentiels en preuve sans qu'ils soient protégés par une ordonnance de confidentialité, parce que ce serait un manquement à ses obligations envers les autorités chinoises. L'intimé soutient pour sa part que son droit de contre-interroger M. Pang et M. Feng sur leurs affidavits serait pratiquement futile en l'absence des documents auxquels ils se réfèrent. Sierra Club entend soutenir que le juge saisi de la demande de contrôle judiciaire devrait donc leur accorder peu de poids.

10
La Section de première instance de la Cour fédérale du Canada a rejeté la demande d'ordonnance de confidentialité et la Cour d'appel fédérale, à la majorité, a rejeté l'appel. Le juge Robertson, dissident, était d'avis d'accorder l'ordonnance.

III. Dispositions législatives

Règles de la Cour fédérale (1998), DORS/98-106

151. (1) La Cour peut, sur requête, ordonner que des documents ou éléments matériels qui seront déposés soient considérés comme confidentiels.

(2) Avant de rendre une ordonnance en application du paragraphe (1), la Cour doit être convaincue de la nécessité de considérer les documents ou éléments matériels comme confidentiels, étant donné l'intérêt du public à la publicité des débats judiciaires.

IV. Les décisions antérieures

A. *Cour fédérale, Section de première instance, [2000] 2 C.F. 400*

12
Le juge Pelletier examine d'abord s'il y a lieu, en vertu de la règle 312, d'autoriser la production de l'affidavit supplémentaire de M. Pang auquel sont annexés les documents confidentiels. À son avis, il s'agit d'une question de pertinence et il conclut que les documents se rapportent à la question de la réparation. En l'absence de préjudice pour l'intimé, il y a donc lieu d'autoriser la signification et le dépôt de l'affidavit. Il note que des retards seraient préjudiciables à l'intimé mais que, puisque les deux parties ont présenté des requêtes

interlocutory motions which had contributed to the delay, the desirability of having the entire record before the court outweighed the prejudice arising from the delay associated with the introduction of the documents.

13 On the issue of confidentiality, Pelletier J. concluded that he must be satisfied that the need for confidentiality was greater than the public interest in open court proceedings, and observed that the argument for open proceedings in this case was significant given the public interest in Canada's role as a vendor of nuclear technology. As well, he noted that a confidentiality order was an exception to the rule of open access to the courts, and that such an order should be granted only where absolutely necessary.

14 Pelletier J. applied the same test as that used in patent litigation for the issue of a protective order, which is essentially a confidentiality order. The granting of such an order requires the appellant to show a subjective belief that the information is confidential and that its interests would be harmed by disclosure. In addition, if the order is challenged, then the person claiming the benefit of the order must demonstrate objectively that the order is required. This objective element requires the party to show that the information has been treated as confidential, and that it is reasonable to believe that its proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could be harmed by the disclosure of the information.

15 Concluding that both the subjective part and both elements of the objective part of the test had been satisfied, he nevertheless stated: "However, I am also of the view that in public law cases, the objective test has, or should have, a third component which is whether the public interest in disclosure exceeds the risk of harm to a party arising from disclosure" (para. 23).

16 A very significant factor, in his view, was the fact that mandatory production of documents was not in issue here. The fact that the application involved a voluntary tendering of documents to advance the

interlocutoires qui ont entraîné les délais, les avantages de soumettre le dossier au complet à la cour compensent l'inconvénient du retard causé par la présentation de ces documents.

Sur la confidentialité, le juge Pelletier conclut qu'il doit être convaincu que la nécessité de protéger la confidentialité l'emporte sur l'intérêt du public à la publicité des débats judiciaires. Il note que les arguments en faveur de la publicité des débats judiciaires en l'espèce sont importants vu l'intérêt du public envers le rôle du Canada comme vendeur de technologie nucléaire. Il fait aussi remarquer que les ordonnances de confidentialité sont une exception au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires et ne devraient être accordées que dans des cas de nécessité absolue.

Le juge Pelletier applique le même critère que pour une ordonnance conservatoire en matière de brevets, qui est essentiellement une ordonnance de confidentialité. Pour obtenir l'ordonnance, le requérant doit démontrer qu'il croit subjectivement que les renseignements sont confidentiels et que leur divulgation nuirait à ses intérêts. De plus, si l'ordonnance est contestée, le requérant doit démontrer objectivement qu'elle est nécessaire. Cet élément objectif l'oblige à démontrer que les renseignements ont toujours été traités comme étant confidentiels et qu'il est raisonnable de croire que leur divulgation risque de compromettre ses droits exclusifs, commerciaux et scientifiques.

Ayant conclu qu'il est satisfait à l'élément subjectif et aux deux volets de l'élément objectif du critère, il ajoute : « J'estime toutefois aussi que, dans les affaires de droit public, le critère objectif comporte, ou devrait comporter, un troisième volet, en l'occurrence la question de savoir si l'intérêt du public à l'égard de la divulgation l'emporte sur le préjudice que la divulgation risque de causer à une personne » (par. 23).

Il estime très important le fait qu'il ne s'agit pas en l'espèce de production obligatoire de documents. Le fait que la demande vise le dépôt volontaire de documents en vue d'étayer la thèse de l'appelante,

appellant's own cause as opposed to mandatory production weighed against granting the confidentiality order.

In weighing the public interest in disclosure against the risk of harm to AECL arising from disclosure, Pelletier J. noted that the documents the appellant wished to put before the court were prepared by others for other purposes, and recognized that the appellant was bound to protect the confidentiality of the information. At this stage, he again considered the issue of materiality. If the documents were shown to be very material to a critical issue, "the requirements of justice militate in favour of a confidentiality order. If the documents are marginally relevant, then the voluntary nature of the production argues against a confidentiality order" (para. 29). He then decided that the documents were material to a question of the appropriate remedy, a significant issue in the event that the appellant failed on the main issue.

Pelletier J. also considered the context of the case and held that since the issue of Canada's role as a vendor of nuclear technology was one of significant public interest, the burden of justifying a confidentiality order was very onerous. He found that AECL could expunge the sensitive material from the documents, or put the evidence before the court in some other form, and thus maintain its full right of defence while preserving the open access to court proceedings.

Pelletier J. observed that his order was being made without having perused the Confidential Documents because they had not been put before him. Although he noted the line of cases which holds that a judge ought not to deal with the issue of a confidentiality order without reviewing the documents themselves, in his view, given their voluminous nature and technical content as well as his lack of information as to what information was already in the public domain, he found that an examination of these documents would not have been useful.

par opposition à une production obligatoire, joue contre l'ordonnance de confidentialité.

En soupesant l'intérêt du public dans la divulgation et le préjudice que la divulgation risque de causer à ÉACL, le juge Pelletier note que les documents que l'appelante veut soumettre à la cour ont été rédigés par d'autres personnes à d'autres fins, et il reconnaît que l'appelante est tenue de protéger la confidentialité des renseignements. À cette étape, il examine de nouveau la question de la pertinence. Si on réussit à démontrer que les documents sont très importants sur une question cruciale, « les exigences de la justice militent en faveur du prononcé d'une ordonnance de confidentialité. Si les documents ne sont pertinents que d'une façon accessoire, le caractère facultatif de la production milite contre le prononcé de l'ordonnance de confidentialité » (par. 29). Il conclut alors que les documents sont importants pour résoudre la question de la réparation à accorder, elle-même un point important si l'appelante échoue sur la question principale.

Le juge Pelletier considère aussi le contexte de l'affaire et conclut que, puisque la question du rôle du Canada comme vendeur de technologies nucléaires est une importante question d'intérêt public, la charge de justifier une ordonnance de confidentialité est très onéreuse. Il conclut qu'ÉACL pourrait retrancher les éléments délicats des documents ou soumettre à la cour la même preuve sous une autre forme, et maintenir ainsi son droit à une défense complète tout en préservant la publicité des débats judiciaires.

Le juge Pelletier signale qu'il prononce l'ordonnance sans avoir examiné les documents confidentiels puisqu'ils n'ont pas été portés à sa connaissance. Bien qu'il mentionne la jurisprudence indiquant qu'un juge ne devrait pas se prononcer sur une demande d'ordonnance de confidentialité sans avoir examiné les documents eux-mêmes, il estime qu'il n'aurait pas été utile d'examiner les documents, vu leur volume et leur caractère technique, et sans savoir quelle part d'information était déjà dans le domaine public.

17

18

19

20

Pelletier J. ordered that the appellant could file the documents in current form, or in an edited version if it chose to do so. He also granted leave to file material dealing with the Chinese regulatory process in general and as applied to this project, provided it did so within 60 days.

21

At the Federal Court of Appeal, AECL appealed the ruling under Rule 151 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*, and Sierra Club cross-appealed the ruling under Rule 312.

22

With respect to Rule 312, Evans J.A. held that the documents were clearly relevant to a defence under s. 54(2)(b) which the appellant proposed to raise if s. 5(1)(b) of the *CEAA* was held to apply, and were also potentially relevant to the exercise of the court's discretion to refuse a remedy even if the Ministers were in breach of the *CEAA*. Evans J.A. agreed with Pelletier J. that the benefit to the appellant and the court of being granted leave to file the documents outweighed any prejudice to the respondent owing to delay and thus concluded that the motions judge was correct in granting leave under Rule 312.

23

On the issue of the confidentiality order, Evans J.A. considered Rule 151, and all the factors that the motions judge had weighed, including the commercial sensitivity of the documents, the fact that the appellant had received them in confidence from the Chinese authorities, and the appellant's argument that without the documents it could not mount a full answer and defence to the application. These factors had to be weighed against the principle of open access to court documents. Evans J.A. agreed with Pelletier J. that the weight to be attached to the public interest in open proceedings varied with context and held that, where a case raises issues of public significance, the principle of openness of judicial process carries greater weight as a factor in

Dans son ordonnance, le juge Pelletier autorise l'appelante à déposer les documents sous leur forme actuelle ou sous une version révisée, à son gré. Il autorise aussi l'appelante à déposer des documents concernant le processus réglementaire chinois en général et son application au projet, à condition qu'elle le fasse sous 60 jours.

B. *Cour d'appel fédérale*, [2000] 4 C.F. 426

(1) Evans J.A. (Sharlow J.A. concurring)

ÉACL fait appel en Cour d'appel fédérale, en vertu de la règle 151 des *Règles de la Cour fédérale (1998)*, et Sierra Club forme un appel incident en vertu de la règle 312.

Sur la règle 312, le juge Evans conclut que les documents en cause sont clairement pertinents dans une défense que l'appelante a l'intention d'invoquer en vertu du par. 54(2) si la cour conclut que l'al. 5(1)(b) de la *LCÉE* doit s'appliquer, et pourraient l'être aussi pour l'exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire de la cour de refuser d'accorder une réparation dans le cas où les ministres auraient enfreint la *LCÉE*. Comme le juge Pelletier, le juge Evans est d'avis que l'avantage pour l'appelante et pour la cour d'une autorisation de déposer les documents l'emporte sur tout préjudice que le retard pourrait causer à l'intimé, et conclut par conséquent que le juge des requêtes a eu raison d'accorder l'autorisation en vertu de la règle 312.

Sur l'ordonnance de confidentialité, le juge Evans examine la règle 151 et tous les facteurs que le juge des requêtes a appréciés, y compris le secret commercial attaché aux documents, le fait que l'appelante les a reçus à titre confidentiel des autorités chinoises, et l'argument de l'appelante selon lequel, sans les documents, elle ne pourrait assurer effectivement sa défense. Ces facteurs doivent être pondérés avec le principe de la publicité des documents soumis aux tribunaux. Le juge Evans convient avec le juge Pelletier que le poids à accorder à l'intérêt du public à la publicité des débats varie selon le contexte, et il conclut que lorsqu'une affaire soulève des questions de grande importance pour le public, le principe de la publicité des débats a plus de poids

the balancing process. Evans J.A. noted the public interest in the subject matter of the litigation, as well as the considerable media attention it had attracted.

In support of his conclusion that the weight assigned to the principle of openness may vary with context, Evans J.A. relied upon the decisions in *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health and Welfare)*, [2000] 3 F.C. 360 (C.A.), where the court took into consideration the relatively small public interest at stake, and *Ethyl Canada Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)* (1998), 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278 (Ont. Ct. (Gen. Div.)), at p. 283, where the court ordered disclosure after determining that the case was a significant constitutional case where it was important for the public to understand the issues at stake. Evans J.A. observed that openness and public participation in the assessment process are fundamental to the *CEAA*, and concluded that the motions judge could not be said to have given the principle of openness undue weight even though confidentiality was claimed for a relatively small number of highly technical documents.

Evans J.A. held that the motions judge had placed undue emphasis on the fact that the introduction of the documents was voluntary; however, it did not follow that his decision on the confidentiality order must therefore be set aside. Evans J.A. was of the view that this error did not affect the ultimate conclusion for three reasons. First, like the motions judge, he attached great weight to the principle of openness. Secondly, he held that the inclusion in the affidavits of a summary of the reports could go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals, should the appellant choose not to put them in without a confidentiality order. Finally, if AECL submitted the documents in an expunged fashion, the claim for confidentiality would rest upon a relatively unimportant factor, i.e., the appellant's claim that it would suffer a loss of business if it breached its undertaking with the Chinese authorities.

Evans J.A. rejected the argument that the motions judge had erred in deciding the motion without

comme facteur à prendre en compte dans le processus de pondération. Le juge Evans note l'intérêt du public à l'égard de la question en litige ainsi que la couverture médiatique considérable qu'elle a suscitée.

À l'appui de sa conclusion que le poids accordé au principe de la publicité des débats peut varier selon le contexte, le juge Evans invoque les décisions *AB Hassle c. Canada (Ministre de la Santé nationale et du Bien-être social)*, [2000] 3 C.F. 360 (C.A.), où la cour a tenu compte du peu d'intérêt du public, et *Ethyl Canada Inc. c. Canada (Attorney General)* (1998), 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278 (C. Ont. (Div. gén.)), p. 283, où la cour a ordonné la divulgation après avoir déterminé qu'il s'agissait d'une affaire constitutionnelle importante et qu'il importait que le public comprenne ce qui était en cause. Le juge Evans fait remarquer que la transparence du processus d'évaluation et la participation du public ont une importance fondamentale pour la *LCÉE*, et il conclut qu'on ne peut prétendre que le juge des requêtes a accordé trop de poids au principe de la publicité des débats, même si la confidentialité n'est demandée que pour un nombre relativement restreint de documents hautement techniques.

Le juge Evans conclut que le juge des requêtes a donné trop de poids au fait que la production des documents était volontaire mais qu'il ne s'ensuit pas que sa décision au sujet de la confidentialité doive être écartée. Le juge Evans est d'avis que l'erreur n'entâche pas sa conclusion finale, pour trois motifs. Premièrement, comme le juge des requêtes, il attache une grande importance à la publicité du débat judiciaire. Deuxièmement, il conclut que l'inclusion dans les affidavits d'un résumé des rapports peut, dans une large mesure, compenser l'absence des rapports, si l'appelante décide de ne pas les déposer sans ordonnance de confidentialité. Enfin, si ÉACL déposait une version modifiée des documents, la demande de confidentialité reposera sur un facteur relativement peu important, savoir l'argument que l'appelante perdrat des occasions d'affaires si elle violait son engagement envers les autorités chinoises.

Le juge Evans rejette l'argument selon lequel le juge des requêtes a commis une erreur en statuant

24

25

26

reference to the actual documents, stating that it was not necessary for him to inspect them, given that summaries were available and that the documents were highly technical and incompletely translated. Thus the appeal and cross-appeal were both dismissed.

(2) Robertson J.A. (dissenting)

27

Robertson J.A. disagreed with the majority for three reasons. First, in his view, the level of public interest in the case, the degree of media coverage, and the identities of the parties should not be taken into consideration in assessing an application for a confidentiality order. Instead, he held that it was the nature of the evidence for which the order is sought that must be examined.

28

In addition, he found that without a confidentiality order, the appellant had to choose between two unacceptable options: either suffering irreparable financial harm if the confidential information was introduced into evidence, or being denied the right to a fair trial because it could not mount a full defence if the evidence was not introduced.

29

Finally, he stated that the analytical framework employed by the majority in reaching its decision was fundamentally flawed as it was based largely on the subjective views of the motions judge. He rejected the contextual approach to the question of whether a confidentiality order should issue, emphasizing the need for an objective framework to combat the perception that justice is a relative concept, and to promote consistency and certainty in the law.

30

To establish this more objective framework for regulating the issuance of confidentiality orders pertaining to commercial and scientific information, he turned to the legal rationale underlying the commitment to the principle of open justice, referring to *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326. There, the Supreme Court of Canada held that open proceedings foster the search for the truth, and reflect the importance of public scrutiny of the courts.

sans avoir examiné les documents réels, affirmant que cela n'était pas nécessaire puisqu'il y avait des précis et que la documentation était hautement technique et partiellement traduite. L'appel et l'appel incident sont donc rejetés.

(2) Le juge Robertson (dissident)

Le juge Robertson se dissocie de la majorité pour trois raisons. En premier lieu, il estime que le degré d'intérêt du public dans une affaire, l'importance de la couverture médiatique et l'identité des parties ne devraient pas être pris en considération pour statuer sur une demande d'ordonnance de confidentialité. Selon lui, il faut plutôt examiner la nature de la preuve que protégerait l'ordonnance de confidentialité.

Il estime aussi qu'à défaut d'ordonnance de confidentialité, l'appelante doit choisir entre deux options inacceptables : subir un préjudice financier irréparable si les renseignements confidentiels sont produits en preuve, ou être privée de son droit à un procès équitable parce qu'elle ne peut se défendre pleinement si la preuve n'est pas produite.

Finalement, il dit que le cadre analytique utilisé par les juges majoritaires pour arriver à leur décision est fondamentalement défectueux en ce qu'il est fondé en grande partie sur le point de vue subjectif du juge des requêtes. Il rejette l'approche contextuelle sur la question de l'ordonnance de confidentialité, soulignant la nécessité d'un cadre d'analyse objectif pour combattre la perception que la justice est un concept relatif et pour promouvoir la cohérence et la certitude en droit.

Pour établir ce cadre plus objectif appelé à régir la délivrance d'ordonnances de confidentialité en matière de renseignements commerciaux et scientifiques, il examine le fondement juridique du principe de la publicité du processus judiciaire, en citant l'arrêt de notre Cour, *Edmonton Journal c. Alberta (Procureur général)*, [1989] 2 R.C.S. 1326, qui conclut que la publicité des débats favorise la recherche de la vérité et témoigne de l'importance de soumettre le travail des tribunaux à l'examen public.

Robertson J.A. stated that although the principle of open justice is a reflection of the basic democratic value of accountability in the exercise of judicial power, in his view, the principle that justice itself must be secured is paramount. He concluded that justice as an overarching principle means that exceptions occasionally must be made to rules or principles.

He observed that, in the area of commercial law, when the information sought to be protected concerns “trade secrets”, this information will not be disclosed during a trial if to do so would destroy the owner’s proprietary rights and expose him or her to irreparable harm in the form of financial loss. Although the case before him did not involve a trade secret, he nevertheless held that the same treatment could be extended to commercial or scientific information which was acquired on a confidential basis and attached the following criteria as conditions precedent to the issuance of a confidentiality order (at para. 13):

(1) the information is of a confidential nature as opposed to facts which one would like to keep confidential; (2) the information for which confidentiality is sought is not already in the public domain; (3) on a balance of probabilities the party seeking the confidentiality order would suffer irreparable harm if the information were made public; (4) the information is relevant to the legal issues raised in the case; (5) comparatively, the information is “necessary” to the resolution of those issues; (6) the granting of a confidentiality order does not unduly prejudice the opposing party; and (7) the public interest in open court proceedings does not override the private interests of the party seeking the confidentiality order. The onus in establishing that criteria one to six are met is on the party seeking the confidentiality order. Under the seventh criterion, it is for the opposing party to show that a *prima facie* right to a protective order has been overtaken by the need to preserve the openness of the court proceedings. In addressing these criteria one must bear in mind two of the threads woven into the fabric of the principle of open justice: the search for truth and the preservation of the rule of law. As stated at the outset, I do not believe that the perceived degree of public importance of a case is a relevant consideration.

Selon le juge Robertson, même si le principe de la publicité du processus judiciaire reflète la valeur fondamentale que constitue dans une démocratie l’imputabilité dans l’exercice du pouvoir judiciaire, le principe selon lequel il faut que justice soit faite doit, à son avis, l’emporter. Il conclut que la justice vue comme principe universel signifie que les règles ou les principes doivent parfois souffrir des exceptions.

Il fait observer qu’en droit commercial, lorsque les renseignements qu’on cherche à protéger ont trait à des « secrets industriels », ils ne sont pas divulgués au procès lorsque cela aurait pour effet d’annihiler les droits du propriétaire et l’exposerait à un préjudice financier irréparable. Il conclut que, même si l’espèce ne porte pas sur des secrets industriels, on peut traiter de la même façon des renseignements commerciaux et scientifiques acquis sur une base confidentielle, et il établit les critères suivants comme conditions à la délivrance d’une ordonnance de confidentialité (au par. 13) :

1) les renseignements sont de nature confidentielle et non seulement des faits qu’une personne désire ne pas divulguer; 2) les renseignements qu’on veut protéger ne sont pas du domaine public; 3) selon la prépondérance des probabilités, la partie qui veut obtenir une ordonnance de confidentialité subirait un préjudice irréparable si les renseignements étaient rendus publics; 4) les renseignements sont pertinents dans le cadre de la résolution des questions juridiques soulevées dans le litige; 5) en même temps, les renseignements sont « nécessaires » à la résolution de ces questions; 6) l’octroi d’une ordonnance de confidentialité ne cause pas un préjudice grave à la partie adverse; 7) l’intérêt du public à la publicité des débats judiciaires ne prime pas les intérêts privés de la partie qui sollicite l’ordonnance de confidentialité. Le fardeau de démontrer que les critères un à six sont respectés incombe à la partie qui cherche à obtenir l’ordonnance de confidentialité. Pour le septième critère, c’est la partie adverse qui doit démontrer que le droit *prima facie* à une ordonnance de non-divulgation doit céder le pas au besoin de maintenir la publicité des débats judiciaires. En utilisant ces critères, il y a lieu de tenir compte de deux des fils conducteurs qui sous-tendent le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires : la recherche de la vérité et la sauvegarde de la primauté du droit. Comme je l’ai dit au tout début, je ne crois pas que le degré d’importance qu’on croit que le public accorde à une affaire soit une considération pertinente.

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

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.

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:

A publication ban should only be ordered when:

- (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
- (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.]

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.

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;

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.

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 :

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

- 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) 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.]

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.

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 CSC 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 assujetti 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 contreviennent 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;

(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.

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.

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).

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

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.

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.

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-divulgation, 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).

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

by Robertson J.A. that the information in question must be of a “confidential nature” in that it has been “accumulated with a reasonable expectation of it being kept confidential” as opposed to “facts which a litigant would like to keep confidential by having the courtroom doors closed” (para. 14).

61

Pelletier J. found as a fact that the *AB Hassle* test had been satisfied in that the information had clearly been treated as confidential both by the appellant and by the Chinese authorities, and that, on a balance of probabilities, disclosure of the information could harm the appellant’s commercial interests (para. 23). As well, Robertson J.A. found that the information in question was clearly of a confidential nature as it was commercial information, consistently treated and regarded as confidential, that would be of interest to AECL’s competitors (para. 16). Thus, the order is sought to prevent a serious risk to an important commercial interest.

62

The first branch of the test also requires the consideration of alternative measures to the confidentiality order, as well as an examination of the scope of the order to ensure that it is not overly broad. Both courts below found that the information contained in the Confidential Documents was relevant to potential defences available to the appellant under the *CEAA* and this finding was not appealed at this Court. Further, I agree with the Court of Appeal’s assertion (at para. 99) that, given the importance of the documents to the right to make full answer and defence, the appellant is, practically speaking, compelled to produce the documents. Given that the information is necessary to the appellant’s case, it remains only to determine whether there are reasonably alternative means by which the necessary information can be adduced without disclosing the confidential information.

63

Two alternatives to the confidentiality order were put forward by the courts below. The motions judge suggested that the Confidential Documents could be expunged of their commercially sensitive contents, and edited versions of the documents could be

l’exigence proposée par le juge Robertson que les renseignements soient « de nature confidentielle » en ce qu’ils ont été « recueillis dans l’expectative raisonnable qu’ils resteront confidentiels », par opposition à « des faits qu’une partie à un litige voudrait garder confidentiels en obtenant le huis clos » (par. 14).

Le juge Pelletier constate que le critère établi dans *AB Hassle* est respecté puisque tant l’appelante que les autorités chinoises ont toujours considéré les renseignements comme confidentiels et que, selon la prépondérance des probabilités, leur divulgation risque de nuire aux intérêts commerciaux de l’appelante (par. 23). Le juge Robertson conclut lui aussi que les renseignements en question sont clairement confidentiels puisqu’il s’agit de renseignements commerciaux, uniformément reconnus comme étant confidentiels, qui présentent un intérêt pour les concurrents d’ÉACL (par. 16). Par conséquent, l’ordonnance est demandée afin de prévenir un risque sérieux de préjudice à un intérêt commercial important.

Le premier volet de l’analyse exige aussi l’examen d’options raisonnables autres que l’ordonnance de confidentialité, et de la portée de l’ordonnance pour s’assurer qu’elle n’est pas trop vaste. Les deux jugements antérieurs en l’espèce concluent que les renseignements figurant dans les documents confidentiels sont pertinents pour les moyens de défense offerts à l’appelante en vertu de la *LCÉE*, et cette conclusion n’est pas portée en appel devant notre Cour. De plus, je suis d’accord avec la Cour d’appel lorsqu’elle affirme (au par. 99) que vu l’importance des documents pour le droit de présenter une défense pleine et entière, l’appelante est pratiquement forcée de les produire. Comme les renseignements sont nécessaires à la cause de l’appelante, il ne reste qu’à déterminer s’il existe d’autres options raisonnables pour communiquer les renseignements nécessaires sans divulguer de renseignements confidentiels.

Deux options autres que l’ordonnance de confidentialité sont mentionnées dans les décisions antérieures. Le juge des requêtes suggère de retrancher des documents les passages commercialement délicats et de produire les versions ainsi modifiées.

filed. As well, the majority of the Court of Appeal, in addition to accepting the possibility of expungement, was of the opinion that the summaries of the Confidential Documents included in the affidavits could go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals. If either of these options is a reasonable alternative to submitting the Confidential Documents under a confidentiality order, then the order is not necessary, and the application does not pass the first branch of the test.

There are two possible options with respect to expungement, and in my view, there are problems with both of these. The first option would be for AECL to expunge the confidential information without disclosing the expunged material to the parties and the court. However, in this situation the filed material would still differ from the material used by the affiants. It must not be forgotten that this motion arose as a result of Sierra Club's position that the summaries contained in the affidavits should be accorded little or no weight without the presence of the underlying documents. Even if the relevant information and the confidential information were mutually exclusive, which would allow for the disclosure of all the information relied on in the affidavits, this relevancy determination could not be tested on cross-examination because the expunged material would not be available. Thus, even in the best case scenario, where only irrelevant information needed to be expunged, the parties would be put in essentially the same position as that which initially generated this appeal, in the sense that, at least some of the material relied on to prepare the affidavits in question would not be available to Sierra Club.

Further, I agree with Robertson J.A. that this best case scenario, where the relevant and the confidential information do not overlap, is an untested assumption (para. 28). Although the documents themselves were not put before the courts on this motion, given that they comprise thousands of pages of detailed information, this assumption is at best optimistic. The expungement alternative would be further complicated by the fact that the Chinese

La majorité en Cour d'appel estime que, outre cette possibilité d'épuration des documents, l'inclusion dans les affidavits d'un résumé des documents confidentiels pourrait, dans une large mesure, compenser l'absence des originaux. Si l'une ou l'autre de ces deux options peut raisonnablement se substituer au dépôt des documents confidentiels aux termes d'une ordonnance de confidentialité, alors l'ordonnance n'est pas nécessaire et la requête ne franchit pas la première étape de l'analyse.

Il existe deux possibilités pour l'épuration des documents et, selon moi, elles comportent toutes deux des problèmes. La première serait que ÉACL retranche les renseignements confidentiels sans divulguer les éléments retranchés ni aux parties ni au tribunal. Toutefois, dans cette situation, la documentation déposée serait encore différente de celle utilisée pour les affidavits. Il ne faut pas perdre de vue que la requête découle de l'argument de Sierra Club selon lequel le tribunal ne devrait accorder que peu ou pas de poids aux résumés sans la présence des documents de base. Même si on pouvait totalement séparer les renseignements pertinents et les renseignements confidentiels, ce qui permettrait la divulgation de tous les renseignements sur lesquels se fondent les affidavits, l'appréciation de leur pertinence ne pourrait pas être mise à l'épreuve en contre-interrogatoire puisque la documentation retranchée ne serait pas disponible. Par conséquent, même dans le meilleur cas de figure, où l'on n'aurait qu'à retrancher les renseignements non pertinents, les parties se retrouveraient essentiellement dans la même situation que celle qui a donné lieu au pourvoi, en ce sens qu'au moins une partie des documents ayant servi à la préparation des affidavits en question ne serait pas mise à la disposition de Sierra Club.

De plus, je partage l'opinion du juge Robertson que ce meilleur cas de figure, où les renseignements pertinents et les renseignements confidentiels ne se recoupent pas, est une hypothèse non confirmée (par. 28). Même si les documents eux-mêmes n'ont pas été produits devant les tribunaux dans le cadre de la présente requête, parce qu'ils comprennent des milliers de pages de renseignements détaillés, cette hypothèse est au mieux optimiste. L'option de

authorities require prior approval for any request by AECL to disclose information.

66

The second option is that the expunged material be made available to the court and the parties under a more narrowly drawn confidentiality order. Although this option would allow for slightly broader public access than the current confidentiality request, in my view, this minor restriction to the current confidentiality request is not a viable alternative given the difficulties associated with expungement in these circumstances. The test asks whether there are reasonably alternative measures; it does not require the adoption of the absolutely least restrictive option. With respect, in my view, expungement of the Confidential Documents would be a virtually unworkable and ineffective solution that is not reasonable in the circumstances.

67

A second alternative to a confidentiality order was Evans J.A.'s suggestion that the summaries of the Confidential Documents included in the affidavits "may well go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals" (para. 103). However, he appeared to take this fact into account merely as a factor to be considered when balancing the various interests at stake. I would agree that at this threshold stage to rely on the summaries alone, in light of the intention of Sierra Club to argue that they should be accorded little or no weight, does not appear to be a "reasonably alternative measure" to having the underlying documents available to the parties.

68

With the above considerations in mind, I find the confidentiality order necessary in that disclosure of the Confidential Documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of the appellant, and that there are no reasonably alternative measures to granting the order.

(2) The Proportionality Stage

69

As stated above, at this stage, the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial, must be weighed against the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right to free

l'épuration serait en outre compliquée par le fait que les autorités chinoises exigent l'approbation préalable de toute demande de divulgation de renseignements de la part d'ÉACL.

La deuxième possibilité serait de mettre les documents supprimés à la disposition du tribunal et des parties en vertu d'une ordonnance de confidentialité plus restreinte. Bien que cela permettrait un accès public un peu plus large que ne le ferait l'ordonnance de confidentialité sollicitée, selon moi, cette restriction mineure à la requête n'est pas une option viable étant donné les difficultés liées à l'épuration dans les circonstances. Il s'agit de savoir s'il y a d'autres options raisonnables et non d'adopter l'option qui soit absolument la moins restrictive. Avec égards, j'estime que l'épuration des documents confidentiels serait une solution virtuellement impraticable et inefficace qui n'est pas raisonnable dans les circonstances.

Une deuxième option autre que l'ordonnance de confidentialité serait, selon le juge Evans, l'inclusion dans les affidavits d'un résumé des documents confidentiels pour « dans une large mesure, compenser [leur] absence » (par. 103). Il ne semble toutefois envisager ce fait qu'à titre de facteur à considérer dans la pondération des divers intérêts en cause. Je conviens qu'à cette étape liminaire, se fonder uniquement sur les résumés en connaissant l'intention de Sierra Club de plaider leur faiblesse ou l'absence de valeur probante, ne semble pas être une « autre option raisonnable » à la communication aux parties des documents de base.

Vu les facteurs susmentionnés, je conclus que l'ordonnance de confidentialité est nécessaire en ce que la divulgation des documents confidentiels ferait courir un risque sérieux à un intérêt commercial important de l'appelante, et qu'il n'existe pas d'autres options raisonnables.

(2) L'étape de la proportionnalité

Comme on le mentionne plus haut, à cette étape, les effets bénéfiques de l'ordonnance de confidentialité, y compris ses effets sur le droit de l'appelante à un procès équitable, doivent être pondérés avec ses effets préjudiciables, y compris ses effets sur le droit

expression, which in turn is connected to the principle of open and accessible court proceedings. This balancing will ultimately determine whether the confidentiality order ought to be granted.

(a) *Salutary Effects of the Confidentiality Order*

As discussed above, the primary interest that would be promoted by the confidentiality order is the public interest in the right of a civil litigant to present its case, or, more generally, the fair trial right. Because the fair trial right is being invoked in this case in order to protect commercial, not liberty, interests of the appellant, the right to a fair trial in this context is not a *Charter* right; however, a fair trial for all litigants has been recognized as a fundamental principle of justice: *Ryan, supra*, at para. 84. It bears repeating that there are circumstances where, in the absence of an affected *Charter* right, the proper administration of justice calls for a confidentiality order: *Mentuck, supra*, at para. 31. In this case, the salutary effects that such an order would have on the administration of justice relate to the ability of the appellant to present its case, as encompassed by the broader fair trial right.

The Confidential Documents have been found to be relevant to defences that will be available to the appellant in the event that the *CEAA* is found to apply to the impugned transaction and, as discussed above, the appellant cannot disclose the documents without putting its commercial interests at serious risk of harm. As such, there is a very real risk that, without the confidentiality order, the ability of the appellant to mount a successful defence will be seriously curtailed. I conclude, therefore, that the confidentiality order would have significant salutary effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial.

Aside from the salutary effects on the fair trial interest, the confidentiality order would also have a beneficial impact on other important rights and interests. First, as I discuss in more detail below, the confidentiality order would allow all parties and the court access to the Confidential Documents, and

à la liberté d'expression, qui à son tour est lié au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Cette pondération déterminera finalement s'il y a lieu d'accorder l'ordonnance de confidentialité.

a) *Les effets bénéfiques de l'ordonnance de confidentialité*

Comme nous l'avons vu, le principal intérêt qui serait promu par l'ordonnance de confidentialité est l'intérêt du public à la protection du droit du justiciable civil de faire valoir sa cause ou, de façon plus générale, du droit à un procès équitable. Puisque l'appelante l'invoque en l'espèce pour protéger ses intérêts commerciaux et non son droit à la liberté, le droit à un procès équitable dans ce contexte n'est pas un droit visé par la *Charte*; toutefois, le droit à un procès équitable pour tous les justiciables a été reconnu comme un principe de justice fondamentale : *Ryan*, précité, par. 84. Il y a lieu de rappeler qu'il y a des circonstances où, en l'absence de violation d'un droit garanti par la *Charte*, la bonne administration de la justice exige une ordonnance de confidentialité : *Mentuck*, précité, par. 31. En l'espèce, les effets bénéfiques d'une telle ordonnance sur l'administration de la justice tiennent à la capacité de l'appelante de soutenir sa cause, dans le cadre du droit plus large à un procès équitable.

Les documents confidentiels ont été jugés pertinents en ce qui a trait aux moyens de défense que l'appelante pourrait invoquer s'il est jugé que la *LCÉE* s'applique à l'opération attaquée et, comme nous l'avons vu, l'appelante ne peut communiquer les documents sans risque sérieux pour ses intérêts commerciaux. De ce fait, il existe un risque bien réel que, sans l'ordonnance de confidentialité, la capacité de l'appelante à mener à bien sa défense soit gravement réduite. Je conclus par conséquent que l'ordonnance de confidentialité aurait d'importants effets bénéfiques pour le droit de l'appelante à un procès équitable.

En plus des effets bénéfiques pour le droit à un procès équitable, l'ordonnance de confidentialité aurait aussi des incidences favorables sur d'autres droits et intérêts importants. En premier lieu, comme je l'exposerai plus en détail ci-après, l'ordonnance de confidentialité permettrait aux parties ainsi qu'au

permit cross-examination based on their contents. By facilitating access to relevant documents in a judicial proceeding, the order sought would assist in the search for truth, a core value underlying freedom of expression.

73

Second, I agree with the observation of Robertson J.A. that, as the Confidential Documents contain detailed technical information pertaining to the construction and design of a nuclear installation, it may be in keeping with the public interest to prevent this information from entering the public domain (para. 44). Although the exact contents of the documents remain a mystery, it is apparent that they contain technical details of a nuclear installation, and there may well be a substantial public security interest in maintaining the confidentiality of such information.

74

Granting the confidentiality order would have a negative effect on the open court principle, as the public would be denied access to the contents of the Confidential Documents. As stated above, the principle of open courts is inextricably tied to the s. 2(b) *Charter* right to freedom of expression, and public scrutiny of the courts is a fundamental aspect of the administration of justice: *New Brunswick, supra*, at paras. 22-23. Although as a general principle, the importance of open courts cannot be overstated, it is necessary to examine, in the context of this case, the particular deleterious effects on freedom of expression that the confidentiality order would have.

75

Underlying freedom of expression are 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: *Irwin Toy Ltd. v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, [1989] 1 S.C.R.

tribunal d'avoir accès aux documents confidentiels, et permettrait la tenue d'un contre-interrogatoire fondé sur leur contenu. En facilitant l'accès aux documents pertinents dans une procédure judiciaire, l'ordonnance sollicitée favoriserait la recherche de la vérité, qui est une valeur fondamentale sous-tendant la liberté d'expression.

En deuxième lieu, je suis d'accord avec l'observation du juge Robertson selon laquelle puisque les documents confidentiels contiennent des renseignements techniques détaillés touchant la construction et la conception d'une installation nucléaire, il peut être nécessaire, dans l'intérêt public, d'empêcher que ces renseignements tombent dans le domaine public (par. 44). Même si le contenu exact des documents demeure un mystère, il est évident qu'ils comprennent des détails techniques d'une installation nucléaire et il peut bien y avoir un important intérêt de sécurité publique à préserver la confidentialité de ces renseignements.

b) *Les effets préjudiciables de l'ordonnance de confidentialité*

Une ordonnance de confidentialité aurait un effet préjudiciable sur le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, puisqu'elle priverait le public de l'accès au contenu des documents confidentiels. Comme on le dit plus haut, le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires est inextricablement lié au droit à la liberté d'expression protégé par l'al. 2b) de la *Charte*, et la vigilance du public envers les tribunaux est un aspect fondamental de l'administration de la justice : *Nouveau-Brunswick*, précité, par. 22-23. Même si, à titre de principe général, l'importance de la publicité des débats judiciaires ne peut être sous-estimée, il faut examiner, dans le contexte de l'espèce, les effets préjudiciables particuliers que l'ordonnance de confidentialité aurait sur la liberté d'expression.

Les valeurs fondamentales qui sous-tendent la liberté d'expression 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 : *Irwin Toy Ltd. c. Québec (Procureur général)*, [1989] 1 R.C.S. 927, p. 976; *R. c. Keegstra*, [1990]

927, at p. 976; *R. v. Keegstra*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697, at pp. 762-64, *per* Dickson C.J. Charter jurisprudence has established that the closer the speech in question lies to these core values, the harder it will be to justify a s. 2(b) infringement of that speech under s. 1 of the Charter: *Keegstra*, at pp. 760-61. Since the main goal in this case is to exercise judicial discretion in a way which conforms to Charter principles, a discussion of the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order on freedom of expression should include an assessment of the effects such an order would have on the three core values. The more detrimental the order would be to these values, the more difficult it will be to justify the confidentiality order. Similarly, minor effects of the order on the core values will make the confidentiality order easier to justify.

Seeking the truth is not only at the core of freedom of expression, but it has also been recognized as a fundamental purpose behind the open court rule, as the open examination of witnesses promotes an effective evidentiary process: *Edmonton Journal, supra*, at pp. 1357-58, *per* Wilson J. Clearly the confidentiality order, by denying public and media access to documents relied on in the proceedings, would impede the search for truth to some extent. Although the order would not exclude the public from the courtroom, the public and the media would be denied access to documents relevant to the evidentiary process.

However, as mentioned above, to some extent the search for truth may actually be promoted by the confidentiality order. This motion arises as a result of Sierra Club's argument that it must have access to the Confidential Documents in order to test the accuracy of Dr. Pang's evidence. If the order is denied, then the most likely scenario is that the appellant will not submit the documents with the unfortunate result that evidence which may be relevant to the proceedings will not be available to Sierra Club or the court. As a result, Sierra Club will not be able to fully test the accuracy of Dr. Pang's evidence on cross-examination. In addition, the court will not have the benefit of this cross-examination or

3 R.C.S. 697, p. 762-764, le juge en chef Dickson. La jurisprudence de la *Charte* établit que plus l'expression en cause est au cœur de ces valeurs fondamentales, plus il est difficile de justifier, en vertu de l'article premier de la *Charte*, une atteinte à l'al. 2b) à son égard : *Keegstra*, p. 760-761. Comme l'objectif principal en l'espèce est d'exercer un pouvoir discrétionnaire dans le respect des principes de la *Charte*, l'examen des effets préjudiciables de l'ordonnance de confidentialité sur la liberté d'expression devrait comprendre une appréciation des effets qu'elle aurait sur les trois valeurs fondamentales. Plus l'ordonnance de confidentialité porte préjudice à ces valeurs, plus il est difficile de la justifier. Inversement, des effets mineurs sur les valeurs fondamentales rendent l'ordonnance de confidentialité plus facile à justifier.

76

La recherche de la vérité est non seulement au cœur de la liberté d'expression, elle est aussi reconnue comme un objectif fondamental de la règle de la publicité des débats judiciaires, puisque l'examen public des témoins favorise l'efficacité du processus de présentation de la preuve : *Edmonton Journal*, précité, p. 1357-1358, le juge Wilson. À l'évidence, enlevant au public et aux médias l'accès aux documents invoqués dans les procédures, l'ordonnance de confidentialité nuirait jusqu'à un certain point à la recherche de la vérité. L'ordonnance n'exclurait pas le public de la salle d'audience, mais le public et les médias n'auraient pas accès aux documents pertinents quant à la présentation de la preuve.

77

Toutefois, comme nous l'avons vu plus haut, la recherche de la vérité peut jusqu'à un certain point être favorisée par l'ordonnance de confidentialité. La présente requête résulte de l'argument de Sierra Club selon lequel il doit avoir accès aux documents confidentiels pour vérifier l'exactitude de la déposition de M. Pang. Si l'ordonnance est refusée, le scénario le plus probable est que l'appelante s'abstiendra de déposer les documents, avec la conséquence fâcheuse que des preuves qui peuvent être pertinentes ne seront pas portées à la connaissance de Sierra Club ou du tribunal. Par conséquent, Sierra Club ne sera pas en mesure de vérifier complètement l'exactitude de la preuve de M. Pang en contre-

documentary evidence, and will be required to draw conclusions based on an incomplete evidentiary record. This would clearly impede the search for truth in this case.

78

As well, it is important to remember that the confidentiality order would restrict access to a relatively small number of highly technical documents. The nature of these documents is such that the general public would be unlikely to understand their contents, and thus they would contribute little to the public interest in the search for truth in this case. However, in the hands of the parties and their respective experts, the documents may be of great assistance in probing the truth of the Chinese environmental assessment process, which would in turn assist the court in reaching accurate factual conclusions. Given the nature of the documents, in my view, the important value of the search for truth which underlies 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, and thereby preventing the parties and the court from relying on the documents in the course of the litigation.

79

In addition, under the terms of the order sought, the only restrictions on these documents relate to their public distribution. The Confidential Documents would be available to the court and the parties, and public access to the proceedings would not be impeded. As such, the order represents a fairly minimal intrusion into the open court rule, and thus would not have significant deleterious effects on this principle.

80

The second core value underlying freedom of speech, namely, the promotion of individual self-fulfilment by allowing open development of thoughts and ideas, focusses on individual expression, and thus does not closely relate to the open court principle which involves institutional expression. Although the confidentiality order would

interrogatoire. De plus, le tribunal ne bénéficiera pas du contre-interrogatoire ou de cette preuve documentaire, et il lui faudra tirer des conclusions fondées sur un dossier de preuve incomplet. Cela nuira manifestement à la recherche de la vérité en l'espèce.

De plus, il importe de rappeler que l'ordonnance de confidentialité ne restreindrait l'accès qu'à un nombre relativement peu élevé de documents hautement techniques. La nature de ces documents est telle que le public en général est peu susceptible d'en comprendre le contenu, de sorte qu'ils contribuerait peu à l'intérêt du public à la recherche de la vérité en l'espèce. Toutefois, dans les mains des parties et de leurs experts respectifs, les documents peuvent être très utiles pour apprécier la conformité du processus d'évaluation environnementale chinois, ce qui devrait aussi aider le tribunal à tirer des conclusions de fait exactes. À mon avis, compte tenu de leur nature, la production des documents confidentiels en vertu de l'ordonnance de confidentialité sollicitée favoriserait mieux l'importante valeur de la recherche de la vérité, qui sous-tend à la fois la liberté d'expression et la publicité des débats judiciaires, que ne le ferait le rejet de la demande qui aurait pour effet d'empêcher les parties et le tribunal de se fonder sur les documents au cours de l'instance.

De plus, aux termes de l'ordonnance demandée, les seules restrictions imposées à l'égard de ces documents ont trait à leur distribution publique. Les documents confidentiels seraient mis à la disposition du tribunal et des parties, et il n'y aurait pas d'entrave à l'accès du public aux procédures. À ce titre, l'ordonnance représente une atteinte relativement minime à la règle de la publicité des débats judiciaires et elle n'aurait donc pas d'effets préjudiciables importants sur ce principe.

La deuxième valeur fondamentale sous-jacente à la liberté d'expression, la promotion de l'épanouissement personnel par le libre développement de la pensée et des idées, est centrée sur l'expression individuelle et n'est donc pas étroitement liée au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires qui concerne l'expression institutionnelle. Même

restrict individual access to certain information which may be of interest to that individual, I find that this value would not be significantly affected by the confidentiality order.

The third core value, open participation in the political process, figures prominently in this appeal, as open justice is a fundamental aspect of a democratic society. This connection was pointed out by Cory J. in *Edmonton Journal, supra*, at p. 1339:

It can be seen that freedom of expression is of fundamental importance to a democratic society. It is also essential to a democracy and crucial to the rule of law that the courts are seen to function openly. The press must be free to comment upon court proceedings to ensure that the courts are, in fact, seen by all to operate openly in the penetrating light of public scrutiny.

Although there is no doubt as to the importance of open judicial proceedings to a democratic society, there was disagreement in the courts below as to whether the weight to be assigned to the open court principle should vary depending on the nature of the proceeding.

On this issue, Robertson J.A. was of the view that the nature of the case and the level of media interest were irrelevant considerations. On the other hand, Evans J.A. held that the motions judge was correct in taking into account that this judicial review application was one of significant public and media interest. In my view, although the public nature of the case may be a factor which strengthens the importance of open justice in a particular case, the level of media interest should not be taken into account as an independent consideration.

Since cases involving public institutions will generally relate more closely to the core value of public participation in the political process, the public nature of a proceeding should be taken into consideration when assessing the merits of a confidentiality order. It is important to note that this core value will always be engaged where the open court

si l'ordonnance de confidentialité devait restreindre l'accès individuel à certains renseignements susceptibles d'intéresser quelqu'un, j'estime que cette valeur ne serait pas touchée de manière significative.

La troisième valeur fondamentale, la libre participation au processus politique, joue un rôle primordial dans le pourvoi puisque la publicité des débats judiciaires est un aspect fondamental de la société démocratique. Ce lien est souligné par le juge Cory dans *Edmonton Journal*, précité, p. 1339 :

On voit que la liberté d'expression est d'une importance fondamentale dans une société démocratique. Il est également essentiel dans une démocratie et fondamental pour la primauté du droit que la transparence du fonctionnement des tribunaux soit perçue comme telle. La presse doit être libre de commenter les procédures judiciaires pour que, dans les faits, chacun puisse constater que les tribunaux fonctionnent publiquement sous les regards pénétrants du public.

Même si on ne peut douter de l'importance de la publicité des débats judiciaires dans une société démocratique, les décisions antérieures divergent sur la question de savoir si le poids à accorder au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires devrait varier en fonction de la nature de la procédure.

Sur ce point, le juge Robertson estime que la nature de l'affaire et le degré d'intérêt des médias sont des considérations dénuées de pertinence. Le juge Evans estime quant à lui que le juge des requêtes a eu raison de tenir compte du fait que la demande de contrôle judiciaire suscite beaucoup d'intérêt de la part du public et des médias. À mon avis, même si la nature publique de l'affaire peut être un facteur susceptible de renforcer l'importance de la publicité des débats judiciaires dans une espèce particulière, le degré d'intérêt des médias ne devrait pas être considéré comme facteur indépendant.

Puisque les affaires concernant des institutions publiques ont généralement un lien plus étroit avec la valeur fondamentale de la participation du public au processus politique, la nature publique d'une instance devrait être prise en considération dans l'évaluation du bien-fondé d'une ordonnance de confidentialité. Il importe de noter que cette valeur

principle is engaged owing to the importance of open justice to a democratic society. However, where the political process is also engaged by the substance of the proceedings, the connection between open proceedings and public participation in the political process will increase. As such, I agree with Evans J.A. in the court below where he stated, at para. 87:

While all litigation is important to the parties, and there is a public interest in ensuring the fair and appropriate adjudication of all litigation that comes before the courts, some cases raise issues that transcend the immediate interests of the parties and the general public interest in the due administration of justice, and have a much wider public interest significance.

84

This motion relates to an application for judicial review of a decision by the government to fund a nuclear energy project. Such an application is clearly of a public nature, as it relates to the distribution of public funds in relation to an issue of demonstrated public interest. Moreover, as pointed out by Evans J.A., openness and public participation are of fundamental importance under the *CEAA*. Indeed, 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. In this regard, I agree with Evans J.A. that the public interest is engaged here more than it would be if this were an action between private parties relating to purely private interests.

85

However, with respect, to the extent that Evans J.A. relied on media interest as an indicium of public interest, this was an error. In my view, it is important to distinguish public interest, from media interest, and I agree with Robertson J.A. that media exposure cannot be viewed as an impartial measure of public interest. It is the public nature of the proceedings which increases the need for openness, and this public nature is not necessarily reflected by the media desire to probe the facts of the case.

fondamentale sera toujours engagée lorsque sera mis en cause le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, vu l'importance de la transparence judiciaire dans une société démocratique. Toutefois, le lien entre la publicité des débats judiciaires et la participation du public dans le processus politique s'accentue lorsque le processus politique est également engagé par la substance de la procédure. Sous ce rapport, je suis d'accord avec ce que dit le juge Evans (au par. 87) :

Bien que tous les litiges soient importants pour les parties, et qu'il en va de l'intérêt du public que les affaires soumises aux tribunaux soient traitées de façon équitable et appropriée, certaines affaires soulèvent des questions qui transcendent les intérêts immédiats des parties ainsi que l'intérêt du public en général dans la bonne administration de la justice, et qui ont une signification beaucoup plus grande pour le public.

La requête est liée à une demande de contrôle judiciaire d'une décision du gouvernement de financer un projet d'énergie nucléaire. La demande est clairement de nature publique, puisqu'elle a trait à la distribution de fonds publics en rapport avec une question dont l'intérêt public a été démontré. De plus, comme le souligne le juge Evans, la transparence du processus et la participation du public ont une importance fondamentale sous le régime de la *LCÉE*. En effet, 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. À cet égard, je suis d'accord avec le juge Evans pour conclure 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.

J'estime toutefois avec égards que, dans la mesure où il se fonde sur l'intérêt des médias comme indice de l'intérêt du public, le juge Evans fait erreur. À mon avis, il est important d'établir une distinction entre l'intérêt du public et l'intérêt des médias et, comme le juge Robertson, je note que la couverture médiatique ne peut être considérée comme une mesure impartiale de l'intérêt public. C'est la nature publique de l'instance qui accentue le besoin de transparence, et cette nature publique ne se reflète

I reiterate the caution given by Dickson C.J. in *Keegstra, supra*, at p. 760, where he stated that, while the speech in question must be examined in light of its relation to the core values, “we must guard carefully against judging expression according to its popularity”.

Although the public interest in open access to the judicial review application as a whole is substantial, in my view, it is also important to bear in mind the nature and scope of the information for which the order is sought in assigning weight to the public interest. With respect, the motions judge erred in failing to consider the narrow scope of the order when he considered the public interest in disclosure, and consequently attached excessive weight to this factor. In this connection, I respectfully disagree with the following conclusion of Evans J.A., at para. 97:

Thus, having considered the nature of this litigation, and having assessed the extent of public interest in the openness of the proceedings in the case before him, the Motions Judge cannot be said in all the circumstances to have given this factor undue weight, even though confidentiality is claimed for only three documents among the small mountain of paper filed in this case, and their content is likely to be beyond the comprehension of all but those equipped with the necessary technical expertise.

Open justice is a fundamentally important principle, particularly when the substance of the proceedings is public in nature. However, this does not detract from the duty to attach weight to this principle in accordance with the specific limitations on openness that the confidentiality order would have. As Wilson J. observed in *Edmonton Journal, supra*, at pp. 1353-54:

One thing seems clear and that is that one should not balance one value at large and the conflicting value in its context. To do so could well be to pre-judge the issue by placing more weight on the value developed at large than is appropriate in the context of the case.

pas nécessairement dans le désir des médias d'examiner les faits de l'affaire. Je réitère l'avertissement donné par le juge en chef Dickson dans *Keegstra*, précité, p. 760, où il dit que même si l'expression en cause doit être examinée dans ses rapports avec les valeurs fondamentales, « nous devons veiller à ne pas juger l'expression en fonction de sa popularité ».

Même si l'intérêt du public à la publicité de la demande de contrôle judiciaire dans son ensemble est important, à mon avis, il importe tout autant de prendre en compte la nature et la portée des renseignements visés par l'ordonnance demandée, lorsqu'il s'agit d'apprécier le poids de l'intérêt public. Avec égards, le juge des requêtes a commis une erreur en ne tenant pas compte de la portée limitée de l'ordonnance dans son appréciation de l'intérêt du public à la communication et en accordant donc un poids excessif à ce facteur. Sous ce rapport, je ne partage pas la conclusion suivante du juge Evans (au par. 97) :

Par conséquent, on ne peut dire qu'après que le juge des requêtes eut examiné la nature de ce litige et évalué l'importance de l'intérêt du public à la publicité des procédures, il aurait dans les circonstances accordé trop d'importance à ce facteur, même si la confidentialité n'est demandée que pour trois documents parmi la montagne de documents déposés en l'instance et que leur contenu dépasse probablement les connaissances de ceux qui n'ont pas l'expertise technique nécessaire.

La publicité des débats judiciaires est un principe fondamentalement important, surtout lorsque la substance de la procédure est de nature publique. Cela ne libère toutefois aucunement de l'obligation d'apprécier le poids à accorder à ce principe en fonction des limites particulières qu'imposerait l'ordonnance de confidentialité à la publicité des débats. Comme le dit le juge Wilson dans *Edmonton Journal*, précité, p. 1353-1354 :

Une chose semble claire et c'est qu'il ne faut pas évaluer une valeur selon la méthode générale et l'autre valeur en conflit avec elle selon la méthode contextuelle. Agir ainsi pourrait fort bien revenir à préjuger de l'issue du litige en donnant à la valeur examinée de manière générale plus d'importance que ne l'exige le contexte de l'affaire.

87

In my view, it is important that, although there is significant public interest in these proceedings, open access to the judicial review application would be only slightly impeded by the order sought. 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.

88

In addressing the effects that the confidentiality order would have on freedom of expression, it should also be borne in mind that the appellant may not have to raise defences under the *CEAA*, in which case the Confidential Documents would be irrelevant to the proceedings, with the result that freedom of expression would be unaffected by the order. However, since the necessity of the Confidential Documents will not be determined for some time, in the absence of a confidentiality order, the appellant would be left with the choice of either submitting the documents in breach of its obligations, or withholding the documents in the hopes that either it will not have to present a defence under the *CEAA*, or that it will be able to mount a successful defence in the absence of these relevant documents. If it chooses the former option, and the defences under the *CEAA* are later found not to apply, then the appellant will have suffered the prejudice of having its confidential and sensitive information released into the public domain, with no corresponding benefit to the public. Although this scenario is far from certain, the possibility of such an occurrence also weighs in favour of granting the order sought.

89

In coming to this conclusion, I note that if the appellant is not required to invoke the relevant defences under the *CEAA*, it is also true that the appellant's fair trial right will not be impeded, even if the confidentiality order is not granted. However, I do not take this into account as a factor which weighs in favour of denying the order because, if the order is granted and the Confidential Documents are not required, there will be no deleterious effects on either the public interest in freedom of expression or the appellant's commercial interests or fair trial right. This neutral result is in contrast with the

À mon avis, il importe de reconnaître que, malgré l'intérêt significatif que porte le public à ces procédures, l'ordonnance demandée n'entraverait que légèrement la publicité de la demande de contrôle judiciaire. 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.

Pour traiter des effets qu'aurait l'ordonnance de confidentialité sur la liberté d'expression, il faut aussi se rappeler qu'il se peut que l'appelante n'ait pas à soulever de moyens de défense visés par la *LCÉE*, auquel cas les documents confidentiels perdraient leur pertinence et la liberté d'expression ne serait pas touchée par l'ordonnance. Toutefois, puisque l'utilité des documents confidentiels ne sera pas déterminée avant un certain temps, l'appelante n'aurait plus, en l'absence d'ordonnance de confidentialité, que le choix entre soit produire les documents en violation de ses obligations, soit les retenir dans l'espoir de ne pas avoir à présenter de défense en vertu de la *LCÉE* ou de pouvoir assurer effectivement sa défense sans les documents pertinents. Si elle opte pour le premier choix et que le tribunal conclut par la suite que les moyens de défense visés par la *LCÉE* ne sont pas applicables, l'appelante aura subi le préjudice de voir ses renseignements confidentiels et délicats tomber dans le domaine public sans que le public n'en tire d'avantage correspondant. Même si sa réalisation est loin d'être certaine, la possibilité d'un tel scénario milite également en faveur de l'ordonnance sollicitée.

En arrivant à cette conclusion, je note que si l'appelante n'a pas à invoquer les moyens de défense pertinents en vertu de la *LCÉE*, il est également vrai que son droit à un procès équitable ne sera pas entravé même en cas de refus de l'ordonnance de confidentialité. Je ne retiens toutefois pas cela comme facteur militant contre l'ordonnance parce que, si elle est accordée et que les documents confidentiels ne sont pas nécessaires, il n'y aura alors aucun effet préjudiciable ni sur l'intérêt du public à la liberté d'expression ni sur les droits commerciaux ou le droit de l'appelante à un procès

scenario discussed above where the order is denied and the possibility arises that the appellant's commercial interests will be prejudiced with no corresponding public benefit. As a result, the fact that the Confidential Documents may not be required is a factor which weighs in favour of granting the confidentiality order.

In summary, 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. As such, the order would not have significant deleterious effects on freedom of expression.

VII. Conclusion

In balancing the various rights and interests engaged, I note that the confidentiality order would have substantial salutary effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial, and freedom of expression. On the other hand, the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order on the principle of open courts and freedom of expression would be minimal. In addition, if the order is not granted and in the course of the judicial review application the appellant is not required to mount a defence under the *CEAA*, there is a possibility that the appellant will have suffered the harm of having disclosed confidential information in breach of its obligations with no corresponding benefit to the right of the public to freedom of expression. As a result, I find that the salutary effects of the order outweigh its deleterious effects, and the order should be granted.

Consequently, I would allow the appeal with costs throughout, set aside the judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal, and grant the confidentiality order on the terms requested by the appellant under Rule 151 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*.

équitable. Cette issue neutre contraste avec le scénario susmentionné où il y a refus de l'ordonnance et possibilité d'atteinte aux droits commerciaux de l'appelante sans avantage correspondant pour le public. Par conséquent, le fait que les documents confidentiels puissent ne pas être nécessaires est un facteur en faveur de l'ordonnance de confidentialité.

En résumé, 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, dans le contexte en l'espèce, l'ordonnance de confidentialité n'entraverait que légèrement la poursuite de ces valeurs, et pourrait même les favoriser à certains égards. À ce titre, l'ordonnance n'aurait pas d'effets préjudiciables importants sur la liberté d'expression.

VII. Conclusion

Dans la pondération des divers droits et intérêts en jeu, je note que l'ordonnance de confidentialité aurait des effets bénéfiques importants sur le droit de l'appelante à un procès équitable et sur la liberté d'expression. D'autre part, les effets préjudiciables de l'ordonnance de confidentialité sur le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires et la liberté d'expression seraient minimes. En outre, si l'ordonnance est refusée et qu'au cours du contrôle judiciaire l'appelante n'est pas amenée à invoquer les moyens de défense prévus dans la *LCÉE*, il se peut qu'elle subisse le préjudice d'avoir communiqué des renseignements confidentiels en violation de ses obligations sans avantage correspondant pour le droit du public à la liberté d'expression. Je conclus donc que les effets bénéfiques de l'ordonnance l'emportent sur ses effets préjudiciables, et qu'il y a lieu d'accorder l'ordonnance.

Je suis donc d'avis d'accueillir le pourvoi avec dépens devant toutes les cours, d'annuler l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel fédérale, et d'accorder l'ordonnance de confidentialité selon les modalités demandées par l'appelante en vertu de la règle 151 des *Règles de la Cour fédérale (1998)*.

Appeal allowed with costs.

Solicitors for the appellant: Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt, Toronto.

Solicitors for the respondent Sierra Club of Canada: Timothy J. Howard, Vancouver; Franklin S. Gertler, Montréal.

Solicitor for the respondents 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: The Deputy Attorney General of Canada, Ottawa.

Pourvoi accueilli avec dépens.

Procureurs de l'appelante : Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt, Toronto.

Procureurs de l'intimé Sierra Club du Canada : Timothy J. Howard, Vancouver; Franklin S. Gertler, Montréal.

Procureur des intimés 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 : Le sous-procureur général du Canada, Ottawa.

**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 *Intervenors***

**Succession de Bernard Sherman et
fiduciaires de la succession et
Succession de Honey Sherman et
fiduciaires de la succession *Appelants***

c.

**Kevin Donovan et
Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. *Intimés***

et

**Procureur général de l'Ontario,
procureur général de la Colombie-
Britannique,
Association canadienne des libertés civiles,
Centre d'action pour la sécurité du revenu,
Ad IDEM/Canadian Media Lawyers
Association,
Postmedia Network Inc., CTV, une division
de Bell Média 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, Réseau
juridique VIH et
Mental Health Legal Committee *Intervenants***

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*

**RÉPERTORIÉ : SHERMAN (SUCCESSION) *c.*
DONOVAN**

2021 CSC 25

N° du greffe : 38695.

2020 : 6 octobre; 2021 : 11 juin.

Présents : Le juge en chef Wagner et les juges Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Brown, Rowe, Martin et Kasirer.

EN APPEL DE LA COUR D'APPEL DE L'ONTARIO

Tribunaux — Principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires — Ordonnances de mise sous scellés — Limites

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

discretionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires — Intérêt public important — Vie privée — Dignité — Sécurité physique — Décès inexpliqué d'un couple important suscitant une vive attention chez le public et amenant les fiduciaires des successions à demander la mise sous scellés des dossiers d'homologation — Les préoccupations en matière de vie privée et de sécurité physique soulevées par les fiduciaires des successions constituent-elles des intérêts publics importants qui sont à ce point sérieusement menacés qu'ils justifient le prononcé d'ordonnances de mise sous scellés?

Un couple important a été retrouvé mort dans sa résidence. Les décès apparemment inexpliqués ont suscité un vif intérêt chez le public. À ce jour, l'identité et le mobile des personnes responsables demeurent inconnus, et les décès font l'objet d'une enquête pour homicides. Les fiduciaires des successions ont cherché à réfréner l'attention médiatique intense provoquée par les événements en sollicitant des ordonnances visant à mettre sous scellés les dossiers d'homologation. Les ordonnances de mise sous scellés ont au départ été accordées, puis ont été contestées par un journaliste qui avait rédigé des articles sur le décès du couple, ainsi que par le journal pour lequel il écrivait. Le juge de première instance a fait placer sous scellés les dossiers d'homologation, concluant que les effets bénéfiques des ordonnances de mise sous scellés sur les intérêts en matière de vie privée et de sécurité physique l'emportaient sensiblement sur leurs effets préjudiciables. La Cour d'appel à l'unanimité a accueilli l'appel et levé les ordonnances de mise sous scellés. Elle a conclu que l'intérêt en matière de vie privée qui avait été soulevé ne comportait pas la qualité d'intérêt public, et qu'il n'y avait aucun élément de preuve d'un risque réel pour la sécurité physique de quiconque.

Arrêt : Le pourvoi est rejeté.

Les fiduciaires des successions n'ont pas établi l'existence d'un risque sérieux pour un intérêt public important en vertu du test applicable en matière de limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires. Par conséquent, les ordonnances de mise sous scellés n'auraient pas dû être rendues. La publicité des débats judiciaires peut être source d'inconvénients et d'embarras, mais ce désagrément n'est pas, en règle générale, suffisant pour permettre de réfuter la forte présomption de publicité des débats. Cela dit, la diffusion de renseignements personnels dans le cadre de débats judiciaires publics peut être plus qu'une source de désagrément et peut aussi entraîner une atteinte

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.

à la dignité d'une personne. Dans la mesure où elle sert à protéger les personnes contre une telle atteinte, la vie privée constitue un intérêt public important et un tribunal peut faire une exception au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires si elle est sérieusement menacée. Dans la présente affaire, on ne peut pas dire que le risque pour la vie privée et pour la sécurité physique est suffisamment sérieux.

Les procédures judiciaires sont présumées accessibles au public. La publicité des débats judiciaires, qui est protégée par la garantie constitutionnelle de la liberté d'expression, est essentielle au bon fonctionnement de la démocratie canadienne. On dit souvent de la liberté de la presse de rendre compte des procédures judiciaires qu'elle est indissociable du principe de publicité. Le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires s'applique dans toutes les procédures judiciaires, quelle que soit leur nature. Les questions soulevées dans un dossier d'homologation ne sont pas typiquement de nature privée ou fondamentalement de nature administrative. L'obtention d'un certificat de nomination à titre de fiduciaire d'une succession en Ontario est une procédure judiciaire qui met en cause la raison d'être fondamentale de la publicité des débats — décourager les actes malveillants et garantir la confiance dans l'administration de la justice par la transparence —, de sorte que la forte présomption de publicité s'applique.

Le test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires vise à maintenir la présomption tout en offrant suffisamment de souplesse aux tribunaux pour leur permettre de protéger d'autres intérêts publics lorsqu'ils entrent en jeu. Pour obtenir gain de cause, la personne qui demande au tribunal d'exercer son pouvoir discrétionnaire de façon à limiter la présomption de publicité doit établir ce qui suit : (1) la publicité des débats judiciaires pose un risque sérieux pour un intérêt public important; (2) l'ordonnance sollicitée est nécessaire pour écarter ce risque sérieux pour l'intérêt mis en évidence, car d'autres mesures raisonnables ne permettront pas d'écarter ce risque; et (3) du point de vue de la proportionnalité, les avantages de l'ordonnance l'emportent sur ses effets négatifs.

La portée reconnue des intérêts qui pourraient justifier une exception discrétionnaire à la publicité des débats judiciaires s'est élargie au fil du temps et s'étend désormais en général aux intérêts publics importants. L'étendue de cette catégorie transcende les intérêts des parties au litige et offre une grande souplesse pour remédier à l'atteinte aux valeurs fondamentales de notre société qu'une publicité absolue des procédures judiciaires pourrait causer. Bien qu'il n'y ait aucune liste exhaustive des intérêts publics importants, les tribunaux doivent faire preuve de prudence

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

et avoir pleinement conscience de l'importance fondamentale de la règle de la publicité des débats judiciaires lorsqu'ils les constatent. Déterminer ce qu'est un intérêt public important peut se faire dans l'abstrait sur le plan des principes généraux qui vont au-delà des parties à un litige donné. En revanche, la conclusion sur la question de savoir si un risque sérieux menace cet intérêt est une conclusion factuelle qui est nécessairement prise eu égard au contexte. Le fait de constater un intérêt important et celui de constater le caractère sérieux du risque auquel cet intérêt est exposé sont donc en théorie des opérations séparées et qualitativement distinctes.

La vie privée a été défendue en tant que considération fondamentale d'une société libre et son importance pour le public a été reconnue dans divers contextes. Bien que la vie privée d'une personne soit d'une importance primordiale pour celle-ci, la protection de la vie privée est également dans l'intérêt de la société dans son ensemble. La vie privée ne saurait donc être rejetée en tant que simple préoccupation personnelle : il y a chevauchement entre certaines préoccupations personnelles relatives à la vie privée et les intérêts du public.

Cependant, si la vie privée est définie trop largement, la reconnaissance d'un intérêt public en matière de vie privée pourrait menacer la forte présomption de publicité. La vie privée des personnes sera menacée dans de nombreuses procédures judiciaires. De plus, la vie privée est une notion complexe et contextuelle, de sorte qu'il est difficile pour les tribunaux de la mesurer. La reconnaissance d'un intérêt important à l'égard de la notion générale de vie privée serait donc irréalisable.

Le caractère public de l'intérêt en matière de vie privée consiste plutôt à protéger les gens contre la menace à leur dignité. La dignité en ce sens comporte le droit de présenter des aspects fondamentaux de soi-même aux autres de manière réfléchie et contrôlée; il s'agit de l'expression de la personnalité ou de l'identité unique d'une personne. Cet intérêt est conforme à l'accent mis par la Cour sur l'importance de la vie privée, tout en permettant de maintenir la forte présomption de publicité des débats.

Se fondant sur la dignité, la vie privée sera sérieusement menacée dans des circonstances limitées. Ni la susceptibilité des gens ni le fait que la publicité soit dévantageuse, embarrassante ou pénible pour certaines personnes ne justifieront généralement, à eux seuls, une atteinte à la publicité des débats judiciaires. La dignité ne sera sérieusement menacée que lorsque les renseignements qui seraient diffusés en raison de la publicité des débats sont suffisamment sensibles ou privés pour que l'on puisse démontrer que la publicité porte atteinte de

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.

façon significative au cœur même des renseignements biographiques de la personne d'une manière qui menace son intégrité. Il faut se demander si les renseignements révèlent quelque chose d'intime et de personnel sur la personne, son mode de vie ou ses expériences.

Dans les cas où les renseignements sont suffisamment sensibles pour toucher au cœur même des renseignements biographiques d'une personne, le tribunal doit alors se demander si le contexte factuel global de l'affaire permet d'établir l'existence d'un risque sérieux pour l'intérêt en cause. La mesure dans laquelle les renseignements sont diffusés et font déjà partie du domaine public, ainsi que la probabilité que la diffusion se produise réellement, peuvent avoir une incidence sur le caractère sérieux du risque. Il incombe au demandeur de démontrer que la vie privée, considérée au regard de la dignité, est sérieusement menacée; cela permet d'établir un seuil, tributaire des faits, compatible avec la présomption de publicité des débats.

Il existe également un intérêt public important dans la protection des personnes contre un préjudice physique, mais une ordonnance discrétionnaire ayant pour effet de limiter la publicité des débats judiciaires ne peut être rendue qu'en présence d'un risque sérieux pour cet intérêt public important. Une preuve directe n'est pas nécessairement exigée pour démontrer qu'un intérêt public important est sérieusement menacé, car il est possible d'établir l'existence d'un préjudice objectivement discernable sur la base d'inférences logiques. Or, ce raisonnement inférentiel ne permet pas de se livrer à des conjectures inadmissibles. Ce n'est pas seulement la probabilité du préjudice appréhendé qui est pertinente lorsqu'il s'agit d'évaluer si un risque est sérieux, mais également la gravité du préjudice lui-même. Lorsque le préjudice appréhendé est particulièrement sérieux, il n'est pas nécessaire de démontrer que la probabilité que ce préjudice se matérialise est vraisemblable, mais elle doit tout de même être plus que négligeable, fantaisiste ou conjecturale. Le simple fait d'invoquer un préjudice physique grave n'est donc pas suffisant.

Il faut démontrer, outre un risque sérieux pour un intérêt important, que l'ordonnance particulière demandée est nécessaire pour écarter le risque et que, du point de vue de la proportionnalité, les avantages de l'ordonnance l'emportent sur ses effets négatifs. Cette pondération contextuelle, éclairée par l'importance du principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, constitue un dernier obstacle sur la route de ceux qui cherchent à faire limiter de façon discrétionnaire la publicité des débats judiciaires aux fins de la protection de la vie privée.

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

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.

En l'espèce, le risque pour l'intérêt public important en matière de vie privée, défini au regard de la dignité, n'est pas sérieux. Les renseignements contenus dans les dossiers d'homologation ne révèlent rien de particulièrement privé ni de très sensible. Il n'a pas été démontré qu'ils toucheraient au cœur même des renseignements biographiques des personnes touchées d'une manière qui minerait leur contrôle sur l'expression de leur identité. De plus, le dossier ne démontre pas l'existence d'un risque sérieux de préjudice physique. Les fiduciaires des successions ont demandé au juge de première instance d'inférer non seulement le fait qu'un préjudice serait causé aux personnes touchées, mais également qu'il existe une ou des personnes qui souhaitent leur faire du mal. Déduire tout cela en se fondant sur les décès et sur les liens unissant les personnes touchées aux défunt ne constitue pas une inférence raisonnable, mais une conjecture.

Même si les fiduciaires des successions avaient réussi à démontrer l'existence d'un risque sérieux pour la vie privée, une interdiction de publication — moins contraintante à l'égard de la publicité des débats que les ordonnances de mise sous scellés — aurait probablement été suffisante en tant qu'autre option raisonnable pour écarter ce risque. Comme dernier obstacle, les fiduciaires des successions auraient eu à démontrer que les avantages de toute ordonnance nécessaire à la protection contre un risque sérieux pour l'intérêt public important l'emportaient sur ses effets préjudiciables.

Jurisprudence

Arrêt appliqué : *Sierra Club du Canada c. Canada (Ministre des Finances)*, 2002 CSC 41, [2002] 2 R.C.S. 522; **arrêts mentionnés :** *Société Radio-Canada c. Nouveau-Brunswick (Procureur général)*, [1996] 3 R.C.S. 480; *Vancouver Sun (Re)*, 2004 CSC 43, [2004] 2 R.C.S. 332; *Khuja c. Times Newspapers Ltd.*, [2017] UKSC 49, [2019] A.C. 161; *Edmonton Journal c. Alberta (Procureur général)*, [1989] 2 R.C.S. 1326; *Dagenais c. Société Radio-Canada*, [1994] 3 R.C.S. 835; *R. c. Mentuck*, 2001 CSC 76, [2001] 3 R.C.S. 442; *Lavigne c. Canada (Commissariat aux langues officielles)*, 2002 CSC 53, [2002] 2 R.C.S. 773; *Dagg c. Canada (Ministre des Finances)*, [1997] 2 R.C.S. 403; *R. c. Henry*, 2009 BCCA 86, 270 B.C.A.C. 5; *Procureur général de la Nouvelle-Écosse c. MacIntyre*, [1982] 1 R.C.S. 175; *A.B. c. Bragg Communications Inc.*, 2012 CSC 46, [2012] 2 R.C.S. 567; *Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. c. Ontario*, 2005 CSC 41, [2005] 2 R.C.S. 188; *Re Southam Inc. and The Queen (No.1)* (1983), 41 O.R. (2d) 113; *R. c. Oakes*,

(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 Workers, Local 401*, 2013 SCC 62, [2013] 3 S.C.R. 733; *Toronto Star Newspaper Ltd. v. R.*, 2012 ONCJ 27, 289 C.C.C. (3d) 549; *Douez v. Facebook, Inc.*, 2017 SCC 33, [2017] 1 S.C.R. 751; *R. v. Paterson* (1998), 102 B.C.A.C. 200; *S. v. Lamontagne*, 2020 QCCA 663; *Himel v. Greenberg*, 2010 ONSC 2325, 93 R.F.L. (6th) 357; *A.B. v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2017 FC 629; *R. v. Pickton*, 2010 BCSC 1198; *Lac d'Amiante du Québec Ltée v. 2858-0702 Québec Inc.*, 2001 SCC 51, [2001] 2 S.C.R. 743; *3834310 Canada inc. v. Chamberland*, 2004 CanLII 4122; *R. v. Spencer*, 2014 SCC 43, [2014] 2 S.C.R. 212; *Coltsfoot Publishing Ltd. v. Foster-Jacques*, 2012 NSCA 83, 320 N.S.R. (2d) 166; *Goulet v. Transamerica Life Insurance Co. of Canada*, 2002 SCC 21, [2002] 1 S.C.R. 719; *Godbout v. Longueuil (Ville de)*, [1995] R.J.Q. 2561, aff'd [1997] 3 S.C.R. 844; *A. v. B.*, 1990 CanLII 3132; *R. v. Plant*, [1993] 3 S.C.R. 281; *R. v. Tessling*, 2004 SCC 67, [2004] 3 S.C.R. 432; *R. v. Cole*, 2012 SCC 53, [2012] 3 S.C.R. 34; *Work Safe Twerk Safe v. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario*, 2021 ONSC 1100; *Fedeli v. Brown*, 2020 ONSC 994; *R. v. Marakah*, 2017 SCC 59, [2017] 2 S.C.R. 608; *R. v. Quesnelle*, 2014 SCC 46, [2014] 2 S.C.R. 390; *R. v. Mabior*, 2012 SCC 47, [2012] 2 S.C.R. 584; *R. v. Chanmany*, 2016 ONCA 576, 352 O.A.C. 121; *X. v. Y.*, 2011 BCSC 943, 21 B.C.L.R. (5th) 410; *R. v. Esseghaier*, 2017 ONCA 970, 356 C.C.C. (3d) 455.

Statutes and Regulations Cited

Bill C-11, *An Act to enact the Consumer Privacy Protection Act and the Personal Information and Data Protection Tribunal Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts*, 2nd Sess., 43rd Parl., 2020.

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, ss. 2(b), 8. *Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms*, CQLR, c. C-12, s. 5.

Civil Code of Québec, arts. 35 to 41.

Code of Civil Procedure, CQLR, c. C-25.01, art. 12.

Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. F.31.

Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act, S.C. 2000, c. 5.

Privacy Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. P-21.

[1986] 1 R.C.S. 103; *Otis c. Otis* (2004), 7 E.T.R. (3d) 221; *H. (M.E.) c. Williams*, 2012 ONCA 35, 108 O.R. (3d) 321; *F.N. (Re)*, 2000 CSC 35, [2000] 1 R.C.S. 880; *R. c. Dyment*, [1988] 2 R.C.S. 417; *Alberta (Information and Privacy Commissioner) c. Travailleurs et travailleuses unis de l'alimentation et du commerce, section locale 401*, 2013 CSC 62, [2013] 3 R.C.S. 733; *Toronto Star Newspaper Ltd. c. R.*, 2012 ONCJ 27, 289 C.C.C. (3d) 549; *Douez c. Facebook, Inc.*, 2017 CSC 33, [2017] 1 R.C.S. 751; *R. c. Paterson* (1998), 102 B.C.A.C. 200; *S. c. Lamontagne*, 2020 QCCA 663; *Himel c. Greenberg*, 2010 ONSC 2325, 93 R.F.L. (6th) 357; *A.B. c. Canada (Citoyenneté et Immigration)*, 2017 CF 629; *R. c. Pickton*, 2010 BCSC 1198; *Lac d'Amiante du Québec Ltée c. 2858-0702 Québec Inc.*, 2001 CSC 51, [2001] 2 R.C.S. 743; *3834310 Canada inc. c. Chamberland*, 2004 CanLII 4122; *R. c. Spencer*, 2014 CSC 43, [2014] 2 R.C.S. 212; *Coltsfoot Publishing Ltd. c. Foster-Jacques*, 2012 NSCA 83, 320 N.S.R. (2d) 166; *Goulet c. Cie d'Assurance-Vie Transamerica du Canada*, 2002 CSC 21, [2002] 1 R.C.S. 719; *Godbout c. Longueuil (Ville de)*, [1995] R.J.Q. 2561, conf. par [1997] 3 R.C.S. 844; *A. c. B.*, 1990 CanLII 3132; *R. c. Plant*, [1993] 3 R.C.S. 281; *R. c. Tessling*, 2004 CSC 67, [2004] 3 R.C.S. 432; *R. c. Cole*, 2012 CSC 53, [2012] 3 R.C.S. 34; *Work Safe Twerk Safe c. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario*, 2021 ONSC 1100; *Fedeli c. Brown*, 2020 ONSC 994; *R. c. Marakah*, 2017 CSC 59, [2017] 2 R.C.S. 608; *R. c. Quesnelle*, 2014 CSC 46, [2014] 2 R.C.S. 390; *R. c. Mabior*, 2012 CSC 47, [2012] 2 R.C.S. 584; *R. c. Chanmany*, 2016 ONCA 576, 352 O.A.C. 121; *X. c. Y.*, 2011 BCSC 943, 21 B.C.L.R. (5th) 410; *R. c. Esseghaier*, 2017 ONCA 970, 356 C.C.C. (3d) 455.

Lois et règlements cités

Charte canadienne des droits et libertés, art. 2b), 8.

Charte des droits et libertés de la personne, RLRQ, c. C-12, art. 5.

Code civil du Québec, art. 35 à 41.

Code de procédure civile, RLRQ, c. C-25.01, art. 12.

Loi sur l'accès à l'information et la protection de la vie privée, L.R.O. 1990, c. F.31.

Loi sur la protection des renseignements personnels, L.R.C. 1985, c. P-21.

Loi sur la protection des renseignements personnels et les documents électroniques, L.C. 2000, c. 5.

Projet de loi C-11, *Loi édictant la Loi sur la protection de la vie privée des consommateurs et la Loi sur le Tribunal de la protection des renseignements personnels et des données et apportant des modifications corrélatives et connexes à d'autres lois*, 2^e sess., 43^e lég., 2020.

Authors Cited

Ardia, David S. "Privacy and Court Records: Online Access and the Loss of Practical Obscurity" (2017), 4 *U. Ill. L. Rev.* 1385.

Austin, Lisa M. "Re-reading Westin" (2019), 20 *Theor. Inq. L.* 53.

Bailey, Jane, and Jacquelyn 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.

Cockfield, Arthur J. "Protecting the Social Value of Privacy in the Context of State Investigations Using New Technologies" (2007), 40 *U.B.C. L. Rev.* 41.

Eltis, Karen. *Courts, Litigants, and the Digital Age*, 2nd ed. Toronto: Irwin Law, 2016.

Eltis, Karen. "The Judicial System in the Digital Age: Revisiting the Relationship between Privacy and Accessibility in the Cyber Context" (2011), 56 *McGill L.J.* 289.

Ferland, Denis, et Benoît Emery. *Précis de procédure civile du Québec*, vol. 1, 6^e éd. Montréal: Yvon Blais, 2020.

Gewirtz, Paul. "Privacy and Speech", [2001] *Sup. Ct. Rev.* 139.

Guillemard, Sylvette, et Séverine Menétry. *Comprendre la procédure civile québécoise*, 2^e éd. Montréal: Yvon Blais, 2017.

Hughes, Kirsty. "A Behavioural Understanding of Privacy and its Implications for Privacy Law" (2012), 75 *Mod. L. Rev.* 806.

Matheson, David. "Dignity and Selective Self-Presentation", in Ian Kerr, Valerie Steeves and Carole Lucock, eds., *Lessons from the Identity Trail: Anonymity, Privacy and Identity in a Networked Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009, 319.

McIsaac, Barbara, Kris Klein, and Shaun Brown. *The Law of Privacy in Canada*, vol. 1. Toronto: Thomson Reuters, 2000 (loose-leaf updated 2020, release 11).

McLachlin, Beverley. "Courts, Transparency and Public Confidence – To the Better Administration of Justice" (2003), 8 *Deakin L. Rev.* 1.

Paton-Simpson, Elizabeth. "Privacy and the Reasonable Paranoid: The Protection of Privacy in Public Places" (2000), 50 *U.T.L.J.* 305.

Perell, Paul M., and John W. Morden. *The Law of Civil Procedure in Ontario*, 4th ed. Toronto: LexisNexis, 2020.

Québec. Ministère de la Justice. *Commentaires de la ministre de la Justice: Code de procédure civile, chapitre C-25.01*. Montréal: SOQUIJ, 2015.

Doctrine et autres documents cités

Ardia, David S. « Privacy and Court Records : Online Access and the Loss of Practical Obscurity » (2017), 4 *U. Ill. L. Rev.* 1385.

Austin, Lisa M. « Re-reading Westin » (2019), 20 *Theor. Inq. L.* 53.

Bailey, Jane, and Jacquelyn Burkell. « Revisiting the Open Court Principle in an Era of Online Publication : Questioning Presumptive Public Access to Parties' and Witnesses' Personal Information » (2016), 48 *R.D. Ottawa* 143.

Cockfield, Arthur J. « Protecting the Social Value of Privacy in the Context of State Investigations Using New Technologies » (2007), 40 *U.B.C. L. Rev.* 41.

Eltis, Karen. *Courts, Litigants, and the Digital Age*, 2nd ed., Toronto, Irwin Law, 2016.

Eltis, Karen. « The Judicial System in the Digital Age : Revisiting the Relationship between Privacy and Accessibility in the Cyber Context » (2011), 56 *R.D. McGill* 289.

Ferland, Denis, et Benoît Emery. *Précis de procédure civile du Québec*, vol. 1, 6^e éd., Montréal, Yvon Blais, 2020.

Gewirtz, Paul. « Privacy and Speech », [2001] *Sup. Ct. Rev.* 139.

Guillemard, Sylvette, et Séverine Menétry. *Comprendre la procédure civile québécoise*, 2^e éd., Montréal, Yvon Blais, 2017.

Hughes, Kirsty. « A Behavioural Understanding of Privacy and its Implications for Privacy Law » (2012), 75 *Mod. L. Rev.* 806.

Matheson, David. « Dignity and Selective Self-Presentation », in Ian Kerr, Valerie Steeves and Carole Lucock, eds., *Lessons from the Identity Trail : Anonymity, Privacy and Identity in a Networked Society*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2009, 319.

McIsaac, Barbara, Kris Klein, and Shaun Brown. *The Law of Privacy in Canada*, vol. 1, Toronto, Thomson Reuters, 2000 (loose-leaf updated 2020, release 11).

McLachlin, Beverley. « Courts, Transparency and Public Confidence – To the Better Administration of Justice » (2003), 8 *Deakin L. Rev.* 1.

Paton-Simpson, Elizabeth. « Privacy and the Reasonable Paranoid : The Protection of Privacy in Public Places » (2000), 50 *U.T.L.J.* 305.

Perell, Paul M., and John W. Morden. *The Law of Civil Procedure in Ontario*, 4th ed., Toronto, LexisNexis, 2020.

Québec. Ministère de la Justice. *Commentaires de la ministre de la Justice : Code de procédure civile, chapitre C-25.01*, Montréal, SOQUIJ, 2015.

Rochette, Sébastien, et Jean-François Côté. “Article 12”, dans Luc Chamberland, dir. *Le grand collectif: Code de procédure civile — Commentaires et annotations*, vol. 1, 5^e éd. Montréal: Yvon Blais, 2020.

Rossiter, James. *Law of Publication Bans, Private Hearings and Sealing Orders*. Toronto: Thomson Reuters, 2006 (loose-leaf updated 2020, release 2).

Solove, Daniel J. “Conceptualizing Privacy” (2002), 90 *Cal. L. Rev.* 1087.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Ontario Court of Appeal (Doherty, Rouleau and Hourigan JJ.A.), 2019 ONCA 376, 47 E.T.R. (4th) 1, [2019] O.J. No. 2373 (QL), 2019 CarswellOnt 6867 (WL Can.), setting aside a decision of Dunphy J., 2018 ONSC 4706, 417 C.R.R. (2d) 321, 41 E.T.R. (4th) 126, 28 C.P.C. (8th) 102, [2018] O.J. No. 4121 (QL), 2018 CarswellOnt 13017 (WL Can.). Appeal dismissed.

Chantelle Cseh and Timothy Youdan, for the appellants.

Iris Fischer and Skye A. Sepp, for the respondents.

Peter Scrutton, for the intervener the Attorney General of Ontario.

Jaqueline Hughes, for the intervener the Attorney General of British Columbia.

Ryder Gilliland, for the intervener the Canadian Civil Liberties Association.

Ewa Krajewska, for the intervener the Income Security Advocacy Centre.

Robert S. Anderson, Q.C., for the interveners 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. and Citytv, a division of Rogers Media Inc.

Adam Goldenberg, for the intervener the British Columbia Civil Liberties Association.

Khalid Janmohamed, for the interveners the HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario, the HIV Legal Network and the Mental Health Legal Committee.

Rochette, Sébastien, et Jean-François Côté. « Article 12 », dans Luc Chamberland, dir. *Le grand collectif : Code de procédure civile — Commentaires et annotations*, vol. 1, 5^e éd., Montréal, Yvon Blais, 2020.

Rossiter, James. *Law of Publication Bans, Private Hearings and Sealing Orders*, Toronto, Thomson Reuters, 2006 (loose-leaf updated 2020, release 2).

Solove, Daniel J. « Conceptualizing Privacy » (2002), 90 *Cal. L. Rev.* 1087.

POURVOI contre un arrêt de la Cour d’appel de l’Ontario (les juges Doherty, Rouleau et Hourigan), 2019 ONCA 376, 47 E.T.R. (4th) 1, [2019] O.J. No. 2373 (QL), 2019 CarswellOnt 6867 (WL Can.), qui a infirmé une décision du juge Dunphy, 2018 ONSC 4706, 417 C.R.R. (2d) 321, 41 E.T.R. (4th) 126, 28 C.P.C. (8th) 102, [2018] O.J. No. 4121 (QL), 2018 CarswellOnt 13017 (WL Can.). Pourvoi rejeté.

Chantelle Cseh et Timothy Youdan, pour les appellants.

Iris Fischer et Skye A. Sepp, pour les intimés.

Peter Scrutton, pour l’intervenant le procureur général de l’Ontario.

Jaqueline Hughes, pour l’intervenant le procureur général de la Colombie-Britannique.

Ryder Gilliland, pour l’intervenante l’Association canadienne des libertés civiles.

Ewa Krajewska, pour l’intervenant le Centre d’action pour la sécurité du revenu.

Robert S. Anderson, c.r., pour les intervenants Ad IDEM/Canadian Media Lawyers Association, Postmedia Network Inc., CTV, une division de Bell Média inc., Global News, a division of Corus Television Limited Partnership, The Globe and Mail Inc. and Citytv, a division of Rogers Media Inc.

Adam Goldenberg, pour l’intervenante British Columbia Civil Liberties Association.

Khalid Janmohamed, pour les intervenants HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario, le Réseau juridique VIH et Mental Health Legal Committee.

The judgment of the Court was delivered by

KASIRER J. —

I. Overview

[1] This Court has been resolute in recognizing that the open court principle is protected by the constitutionally-entrenched right of freedom of expression and, as such, it represents a central feature of a liberal democracy. As a general rule, the public can attend hearings and consult court files and the press — the eyes and ears of the public — is left free to inquire and comment on the workings of the courts, all of which helps make the justice system fair and accountable.

[2] Accordingly, there is a strong presumption in favour of open courts. It is understood that this allows for public scrutiny which can be the source of inconvenience and even embarrassment to those who feel that their engagement in the justice system brings intrusion into their private lives. But this discomfort is not, as a general matter, enough to overturn the strong presumption that the public can attend hearings and that court files can be consulted and reported upon by the free press.

[3] Notwithstanding this presumption, exceptional circumstances do arise where competing interests justify a restriction on the open court principle. Where a discretionary court order limiting constitutionally-protected openness is sought — for example, a sealing order, a publication ban, an order excluding the public from a hearing, or a redaction order — the applicant must demonstrate, as a threshold requirement, that openness presents a serious risk to a competing interest of public importance. That this requirement is considered a high bar serves to maintain the strong presumption of open courts. Moreover, the protection of open courts does not stop there. The applicant must still show that the order is necessary to prevent the risk and that, as a matter of

Version française du jugement de la Cour rendu par

LE JUGE KASIRER —

I. Survol

[1] La Cour a toujours fermement reconnu que le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires est protégé par le droit constitutionnel à la liberté d'expression, et qu'il représente à ce titre un élément fondamental d'une démocratie libérale. En règle générale, le public peut assister aux audiences et consulter les dossiers judiciaires, et les médias — les yeux et les oreilles du public — sont libres de poser des questions et de formuler des commentaires sur les activités des tribunaux, ce qui contribue à rendre le système judiciaire équitable et responsable.

[2] Par conséquent, il existe une forte présomption en faveur de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Il est entendu que cela permet un examen public minutieux qui peut être source d'inconvénients, voire d'embarras, pour ceux qui estiment que leur implication dans le système judiciaire entraîne une atteinte à leur vie privée. Cependant, ce désagrément n'est pas, en règle générale, suffisant pour permettre de réfuter la forte présomption voulant que le public puisse assister aux audiences, et que les dossiers judiciaires puissent être consultés et leur contenu rapporté par une presse libre.

[3] Malgré cette présomption, il se présente des circonstances exceptionnelles où des intérêts opposés justifient de restreindre le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Lorsqu'un demandeur sollicite une ordonnance judiciaire discrétionnaire limitant le principe constitutionnalisé de la publicité des procédures judiciaires — par exemple, une ordonnance de mise sous scellés, une interdiction de publication, une ordonnance excluant le public d'une audience ou une ordonnance de caviardage —, il doit démontrer, comme condition préliminaire, que la publicité des débats en cause présente un risque sérieux pour un intérêt opposé qui revêt une importance pour le public. Le fait que cette condition soit considérée comme un seuil élevé vise à assurer

proportionality, the benefits of that order restricting openness outweigh its negative effects.

[4] This appeal turns on whether concerns advanced by persons seeking an exception to the ordinarily open court file in probate proceedings — the concerns for privacy of the affected individuals and their physical safety — amount to important public interests that are at such serious risk that the files should be sealed. The parties to this appeal agree that physical safety is an important public interest that could justify a sealing order but disagree as to whether that interest would be at serious risk, in the circumstances of this case, should the files be unsealed. They further disagree whether privacy is in itself an important interest that could justify a sealing order. The appellants say that privacy is a public interest of sufficient import that can justify limits on openness, especially in light of the threats individuals face as technology facilitates widespread dissemination of personally sensitive information. They argue that the Court of Appeal was mistaken to say that personal concerns for privacy, without more, lack the public interest component that is properly the subject-matter of a sealing order.

[5] This Court has, in different settings, consistently championed privacy as a fundamental consideration in a free society. Pointing to cases decided in other contexts, the appellants contend that privacy should be recognized here as a public interest that, on the facts of this case, substantiates their plea for orders sealing the probate files. The respondents resist,

le maintien de la forte présomption de publicité des débats judiciaires. En outre, la protection accordée à la publicité des débats ne s'arrête pas là. Le demandeur doit encore démontrer que l'ordonnance est nécessaire pour écarter le risque et que, du point de vue de la proportionnalité, les avantages de cette ordonnance restreignant la publicité l'emportent sur ses effets négatifs.

[4] Le présent pourvoi porte sur la question de savoir si les préoccupations soulevées par les personnes qui demandent qu'une exception soit faite à la publicité habituelle des dossiers judiciaires dans le cadre de procédures d'homologation successorale — à savoir les préoccupations concernant la vie privée et la sécurité physique des personnes touchées — constituent des intérêts publics importants qui sont à ce point sérieusement menacés que les dossiers devraient être mis sous scellés. Les parties au présent pourvoi conviennent que la sécurité physique constitue un intérêt public important qui pourrait justifier une ordonnance de mise sous scellés, mais elles ne s'entendent pas sur la question de savoir si cet intérêt serait sérieusement menacé, dans les circonstances de l'espèce, advenant la levée des scellés. Elles sont également en désaccord sur la question de savoir si la vie privée constitue en elle-même un intérêt important qui pourrait justifier une ordonnance de mise sous scellés. Les appelants affirment que la vie privée est un intérêt public suffisamment important pouvant justifier l'imposition de limites à la publicité des débats judiciaires, plus particulièrement à la lumière des menaces auxquelles les gens sont exposés dans un contexte où la technologie facilite la diffusion à grande échelle de renseignements personnels sensibles. Ils font valoir que la Cour d'appel a eu tort d'affirmer que les préoccupations personnelles en matière de vie privée, à elles seules, ne comportent pas l'élément d'intérêt public qui relève à juste titre d'une ordonnance de mise sous scellés.

[5] Notre Cour a, dans différents contextes, défendu de manière constante la vie privée en tant que considération fondamentale d'une société libre. Invoquant des arrêts rendus dans d'autres contextes, les appellants soutiennent que la vie privée devrait être reconnue en l'espèce comme un intérêt public qui, au vu des faits de la présente affaire, étaye leur

recalling that privacy has generally been seen as a poor justification for an exception to openness. After all, they say, virtually every court proceeding entails some disquiet for the lives of those concerned and these intrusions on privacy must be tolerated because open courts are essential to a healthy democracy.

[6] This appeal offers, then, an occasion to decide whether privacy can amount to a public interest in the open court jurisprudence and, if so, whether openness puts privacy at serious risk here so as to justify the kind of orders sought by the appellants.

[7] For the reasons that follow, I propose to recognize an aspect of privacy as an important public interest for the purposes of the relevant test from *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, 2002 SCC 41, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522. Proceedings in open court can lead to the dissemination of highly sensitive personal information that would result not just in discomfort or embarrassment, but in an affront to the affected person's dignity. Where this narrower dimension of privacy, rooted in what I see as the public interest in protecting human dignity, is shown to be at serious risk, an exception to the open court principle may be justified.

[8] In this case, and with this interest in mind, it cannot be said that the risk to privacy is sufficiently serious to overcome the strong presumption of openness. The same is true of the risk to physical safety here. The Court of Appeal was right in the circumstances to set aside the sealing orders and I would therefore dismiss the appeal.

plaider en faveur du prononcé d'ordonnances de mise sous scellés des dossiers d'homologation. Les intimés s'opposent à ce que de telles ordonnances soient rendues, rappelant que la protection de la vie privée est généralement considérée comme une faible justification à une exception à la publicité des débats. Ils affirment qu'après tout, presque chaque procédure judiciaire entraîne un certain dérangement dans la vie des personnes concernées et que ces atteintes à la vie privée doivent être tolérées parce que la publicité des débats judiciaires est essentielle à une saine démocratie.

[6] Le présent pourvoi offre donc l'occasion de trancher la question de savoir si la vie privée peut constituer un intérêt public suivant la jurisprudence relative à la publicité des débats judiciaires et, dans l'affirmative, si la publicité des débats menace sérieusement la vie privée en l'espèce au point de justifier le type d'ordonnances demandé par les appellants.

[7] Pour les motifs qui suivent, je propose de reconnaître qu'un aspect de la vie privée constitue un intérêt public important pour l'application du test pertinent énoncé dans l'arrêt *Sierra Club du Canada c. Canada (Ministre des Finances)*, 2002 CSC 41, [2002] 2 R.C.S. 522. La tenue de procédures judiciaires publiques peut mener à la diffusion de renseignements personnels très sensibles, laquelle entraînerait non seulement un désagrément ou de l'embarras pour la personne touchée, mais aussi une atteinte à sa dignité. Dans les cas où il est démontré que cette dimension plus restreinte de la vie privée, qui me semble tirer son origine de l'intérêt du public à la protection de la dignité humaine, est sérieusement menacée, une exception au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires peut être justifiée.

[8] Dans la présente affaire, et en gardant cet intérêt à l'esprit, on ne peut pas dire que le risque pour la vie privée est suffisamment sérieux pour permettre de réfuter la forte présomption de publicité des débats judiciaires. Il en est de même du risque pour la sécurité physique en l'espèce. Dans les circonstances, la Cour d'appel a eu raison d'annuler les ordonnances de mise sous scellés et je suis donc d'avis de rejeter le pourvoi.

II. Background

[9] Prominent in business and philanthropic circles, Bernard Sherman and Honey Sherman were found dead in their Toronto home in December of 2017. Their deaths had no apparent explanation and generated intense public interest and press scrutiny. In January of the following year, the Toronto Police Service announced that the deaths were being investigated as homicides. As the present matter came before the courts, the identity and motive of those responsible remained unknown.

[10] The couple's estates and estate trustees (collectively the "Trustees")¹ sought to stem the intense press scrutiny prompted by the events. The Trustees hoped to see to the orderly transfer of the couple's property, at arm's length from what they saw as the public's morbid interest in the unexplained deaths and the curiosity around apparently great sums of money involved.

[11] When the time came to obtain certificates of appointment of estate trustee from the Superior Court of Justice, the Trustees sought a sealing order so that the estate trustees and beneficiaries ("affected individuals") might be spared any further intrusions into their privacy and be protected from what was alleged to be a risk to their safety. The Trustees argued that if the information in the court files was revealed to the public, the safety of the affected individuals would be at risk and their privacy compromised as long as the deaths were unexplained and those responsible for the tragedy remained at large. In support of their request, they argued that there was a real and substantial risk that the affected individuals would suffer serious harm from the public exposure of the materials in the circumstances.

¹ As noted in the title of proceedings, the appellants in this matter have been referred to consistently as the "Estate of Bernard Sherman and Trustees of the Estate and Estate of Honey Sherman and Trustees of the Estate". In these reasons the appellants are referred to throughout as the "Trustees" for convenience.

II. Contexte

[9] Bernard Sherman et Honey Sherman, figures importantes du monde des affaires et de la philanthropie, ont été retrouvés morts dans leur résidence de Toronto en décembre 2017. Leur décès apparemment inexpliqué a suscité un vif intérêt chez le public et une attention médiatique intense. En janvier de l'année suivante, le service de police de Toronto a annoncé que les décès faisaient l'objet d'une enquête pour homicides. Au moment où l'affaire a été portée devant les tribunaux, l'identité et le mobile des personnes responsables demeuraient inconnus.

[10] Les successions du couple et les fiduciaires des successions (collectivement les « fiduciaires »)¹ ont cherché à réfréner l'attention médiatique intense provoquée par les événements. Les fiduciaires souhaitaient veiller au transfert harmonieux des biens du couple, à distance de ce qu'ils percevaient comme un intérêt morbide du public pour les décès inexpliqués et la curiosité suscitée par les importantes sommes d'argent apparemment en jeu.

[11] Quand le temps est venu d'obtenir auprès de la Cour supérieure de justice leurs certificats de nomination à titre de fiduciaires des successions, les fiduciaires ont sollicité une ordonnance de mise sous scellés dans le but d'épargner aux fiduciaires des successions et aux bénéficiaires (« personnes touchées ») de nouvelles atteintes à leur vie privée, et de les protéger contre ce qui, selon les allégations, aurait constitué un risque pour leur sécurité. Les fiduciaires ont soutenu que, si les renseignements contenus dans les dossiers judiciaires étaient révélés au public, la sécurité des personnes touchées serait menacée et leur vie privée compromise tant et aussi longtemps que les décès demeuraient inexpliqués et que les personnes responsables de la tragédie seraient en liberté. À l'appui de leur demande, ils ont fait valoir qu'il existait un risque réel et important que les personnes touchées subissent un préjudice sérieux en raison de la diffusion publique des documents dans les circonstances.

¹ Comme l'indique l'intitulé de la cause, les appellants en l'espèce ont, tout au long des procédures, été désignés comme suit : « succession de Bernard Sherman et fiduciaires de la succession et succession de Honey Sherman et fiduciaires de la succession ». Dans les présents motifs, les appellants sont appelés les « fiduciaires » par souci de commodité.

[12] Initially granted, the sealing orders were challenged by Kevin Donovan, a journalist who had written a series of articles on the couple’s deaths, and Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd., for which he wrote (collectively the “Toronto Star”).² The Toronto Star said the orders violated its constitutional rights of freedom of expression and freedom of the press, as well as the attending principle that the workings of the courts should be open to the public as a means of guaranteeing the fair and transparent administration of justice.

III. Proceedings Below

A. *Ontario Superior Court of Justice, 2018 ONSC 4706, 41 E.T.R. (4th) 126 (Dunphy J.)*

[13] In addressing whether the circumstances warranted interference with the open court principle, the application judge relied on this Court’s judgment in *Sierra Club*. He noted that a confidentiality order should only be granted when: “(1) such an order is necessary . . . to prevent a serious risk to an important interest because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and (2) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression and the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings” (para. 13(d)).

[14] The application judge considered whether the Trustees’ interests would be served by granting the sealing orders. In his view, the Trustees had correctly identified two legitimate interests in support of making an exception to the open court principle: “protecting the privacy and dignity of victims of crime and their loved ones” and “a reasonable apprehension

² The use of “Toronto Star” as a collective term referring to both respondents should not be taken to suggest that only Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. is participating in this appeal. Mr. Donovan is the only respondent to have been a party throughout. Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. was a party in first instance, but was removed as a party on consent at the Court of Appeal. By order of Karakatsanis J. dated March 25, 2020, Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. was added as a respondent in this Court.

[12] Les ordonnances de mise sous scellés ont au départ été accordées, puis ont été contestées par Kevin Donovan, un journaliste qui avait rédigé une série d’articles sur le décès du couple, ainsi que par Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd., le journal pour lequel il écrivait (collectivement le « Toronto Star »)². Le Toronto Star a affirmé que les ordonnances portaient atteinte à ses droits constitutionnels à la liberté d’expression et à la liberté de la presse, ainsi qu’au principe corollaire selon lequel les activités des tribunaux devraient être accessibles au public comme moyen de garantir l’équité et la transparence de l’administration de la justice.

III. Historique judiciaire

A. *Cour supérieure de justice de l’Ontario, 2018 ONSC 4706, 41 E.T.R. (4th) 126 (le juge Dunphy)*

[13] Examinant la question de savoir si les circonstances justifiaient une atteinte au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, le juge de première instance s’est appuyé sur l’arrêt *Sierra Club* de notre Cour. Il a souligné qu’une ordonnance de confidentialité ne devrait être accordée que si [TRADUCTION] : « (1) elle est nécessaire [. . .] pour écarter un risque sérieux pour un intérêt important en l’absence d’autres options raisonnables pour écarter ce risque, et (2) ses effets bénéfiques l’emportent sur ses effets préjudiciables, y compris ses effets sur la liberté d’expression et l’intérêt du public à la publicité des débats judiciaires » (par. 13(d)).

[14] Le juge de première instance a examiné la question de savoir si les intérêts des fiduciaires seraient servis par l’octroi des ordonnances de mise sous scellés. À son avis, les fiduciaires avaient correctement mis en évidence deux intérêts légitimes à l’appui d’une exception au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, à savoir [TRADUCTION] « la

² L’utilisation du terme « Toronto Star » pour désigner collectivement les deux intimés ne devrait pas être interprétée comme indiquant que seule la société Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. participe au présent pourvoi. Monsieur Donovan est le seul intimé à avoir été une partie devant toutes les cours. Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. a participé à la première instance, mais, sur consentement, elle a été retirée comme partie à la Cour d’appel. Par une ordonnance de la juge Karakatsanis datée du 25 mars 2020, Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. a été ajoutée en tant qu’intimée devant notre Cour.

of risk on behalf of those known to have an interest in receiving or administering the assets of the deceased” (paras. 22-25). With respect to the first interest, the application judge found that “[t]he degree of intrusion on that privacy and dignity has already been extreme and . . . excruciating” (para. 23). For the second interest, although he noted that “it would have been preferable to include objective evidence of the gravity of that risk from, for example, the police responsible for the investigation”, he concluded that “the lack of such evidence is not fatal” (para. 24). Rather, the necessary inferences could be drawn from the circumstances notably the “willingness of the perpetrator(s) of the crimes to resort to extreme violence to pursue whatever motive existed” (*ibid.*). He concluded that the “current uncertainty” was the source of a reasonable apprehension of the risk of harm and, further, that the foreseeable harm was “grave” (*ibid.*).

[15] The application judge ultimately accepted the Trustees’ submission that these interests “very strongly outweigh” what he called the proportionately narrow public interest in the “essentially administrative files” at issue (paras. 31 and 33). He therefore concluded that the harmful effects of the sealing orders were substantially outweighed by the salutary effects on the rights and interests of the affected individuals.

[16] Finally, the application judge considered what order would protect the affected individuals while infringing upon the open court principle to the minimum extent possible. He decided no meaningful part of either file could be disclosed if one were to make the redactions necessary to protect the interests he had identified. Open-ended sealing orders did not, however, sit well with him. The application judge therefore sealed the files for an initial period of two years, with the possibility of renewal.

protection de la vie privée et de la dignité des victimes d’actes criminels ainsi que de leurs êtres chers », et « une crainte raisonnable d’un risque de préjudice chez les personnes connues comme ayant un intérêt à recevoir ou à administrer les biens des défunt » (par. 22-25). S’agissant du premier intérêt, le juge de première instance a conclu que [TRADUCTION] « le degré d’atteinte à cette vie privée et à cette dignité est déjà extrême et [. . .] insoutenable » (par. 23). En ce qui a trait au deuxième intérêt, bien qu’il ait souligné qu’« il aurait été préférable d’inclure des éléments de preuve objectifs de la gravité de ce risque, obtenus, par exemple, auprès des policiers responsables de l’enquête », il a conclu que « l’absence de tels éléments de preuve n’est pas fatale » (par. 24). Les inférences nécessaires pouvaient plutôt être tirées des circonstances, notamment [TRADUCTION] « la volonté de la personne ou des personnes ayant perpétré les crimes de recourir à une violence extrême pour obéir à un mobile quelconque » (*ibid.*). Il a conclu que [TRADUCTION] « l’incertitude actuelle » était source d’une crainte raisonnable du risque de préjudice, et qu’en outre, le préjudice prévisible était « grave » (*ibid.*).

[15] Le juge de première instance a finalement accepté l’argument des fiduciaires selon lequel ces intérêts [TRADUCTION] « l’emportent très fortement » sur ce qu’il a qualifié d’intérêt public proportionnellement restreint à l’égard des « dossiers essentiellement administratifs » en cause (par. 31 et 33). Il a donc conclu que les effets bénéfiques des ordonnances de mise sous scellés sur les droits et les intérêts des personnes touchées l’emportaient sensiblement sur leurs effets préjudiciables.

[16] Enfin, le juge de première instance a examiné la question de savoir quelle ordonnance protégerait les personnes touchées tout en portant le moins possible atteinte au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Il a décidé que, si l’on devait apporter aux deux dossiers le caviardage nécessaire à la protection des intérêts qu’il avait constatés, il n’en resterait plus aucun passage digne d’intérêt susceptible d’être divulgué. Des ordonnances de mise sous scellés d’une durée indéterminée ne lui semblaient toutefois pas une bonne solution. Le juge de première instance a donc fait placer sous scellés les dossiers pour une période initiale de deux ans, avec possibilité de renouvellement.

B. *Court of Appeal for Ontario, 2019 ONCA 376, 47 E.T.R. (4th) 1 (Doherty, Rouleau and Hourigan J.J.A.)*

[17] The Toronto Star's appeal was allowed, unanimously, and the sealing orders were lifted.

[18] The Court of Appeal considered the two interests advanced before the application judge in support of the orders to seal the probate files. As to the need to protect the privacy and dignity of the victims of violent crime and their loved ones, it recalled that the kind of interest that is properly protected by a sealing order must have a public interest component. Citing *Sierra Club*, the Court of Appeal wrote that “[p]ersonal concerns cannot, without more, justify an order sealing material that would normally be available to the public under the open court principle” (para. 10). It concluded that the privacy interest for which the Trustees sought protection lacked this quality of public interest.

[19] While it recognized the personal safety of individuals as an important public interest generally, the Court of Appeal wrote that there was no evidence in this case that could warrant a finding that disclosure of the contents of the estate files posed a real risk to anyone's physical safety. The application judge had erred on this point: “the suggestion that the beneficiaries and trustees are somehow at risk because the Shermans were murdered is not an inference, but is speculation. It provides no basis for a sealing order” (para. 16).

[20] The Court of Appeal concluded that the Trustees had failed the first stage of the test for obtaining orders sealing the probate files. It therefore allowed the appeal and set aside the orders.

B. *Cour d'appel de l'Ontario, 2019 ONCA 376, 47 E.T.R. (4th) 1 (les juges Doherty, Rouleau et Hourigan)*

[17] L'appel interjeté par le Toronto Star a été accueilli à l'unanimité et les ordonnances de mise sous scellés ont été levées.

[18] La Cour d'appel a examiné les deux intérêts qui avaient été soulevés devant le juge de première instance au soutien des ordonnances visant à mettre sous scellés les dossiers d'homologation. En ce qui concerne la nécessité de protéger la vie privée et la dignité des victimes de crimes violents et de leurs êtres chers, elle a rappelé que le type d'intérêt qui est à juste titre protégé par une ordonnance de mise sous scellés doit comporter un élément d'intérêt public. Citant l'arrêt *Sierra Club*, la Cour d'appel a écrit que [TRADUCTION] « [d]es préoccupations personnelles ne peuvent à elles seules justifier une ordonnance de mise sous scellés de documents qui seraient normalement accessibles au public en vertu du principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires » (par. 10). Elle a conclu que l'intérêt en matière de vie privée à l'égard duquel les fiduciaires sollicitaient une protection ne comportait pas cette qualité d'intérêt public.

[19] Bien qu'elle ait reconnu que la sécurité personnelle des gens constituait, de manière générale, un intérêt public important, la Cour d'appel a écrit qu'il n'y avait aucun élément de preuve en l'espèce permettant de conclure que la divulgation du contenu des dossiers de succession posait un risque réel pour la sécurité physique de quiconque. Le juge de première instance avait commis une erreur sur ce point : [TRADUCTION] « l'idée selon laquelle les bénéficiaires et les fiduciaires sont en quelque sorte en danger parce que les Sherman ont été assassinés n'est pas une inférence, mais une conjecture. Elle ne justifie aucunement l'octroi d'une ordonnance de mise sous scellés » (par. 16).

[20] La Cour d'appel a conclu que les fiduciaires n'avaient pas franchi la première étape du test relatif à l'obtention d'ordonnances de mise sous scellés des dossiers d'homologation. Elle a donc accueilli l'appel et annulé les ordonnances.

C. *Subsequent Proceedings*

[21] The Court of Appeal's order setting aside the sealing orders has been stayed pending the disposition of this appeal. The Toronto Star brought a motion to adduce new evidence on this appeal, comprised of land titles documents, transcripts of the cross-examination of a detective on the murder investigation, and various news articles. This evidence, it says, supports the conclusion that the sealing orders should be lifted. The motion was referred to this panel.

IV. Submissions

[22] The Trustees have appealed to this Court seeking to restore the sealing orders made by the application judge. In addition to contesting the motion for new evidence, they maintain that the orders are necessary to prevent a serious risk to the privacy and physical safety of the affected individuals and that the salutary effects of sealing the court probate files outweigh the harmful effects of limiting court openness. The Trustees argue that two legal errors led the Court of Appeal to conclude otherwise.

[23] First, they submit the Court of Appeal erred in holding that privacy is a personal concern that cannot, without more, constitute an important interest under *Sierra Club*. The Trustees say the application judge was right to characterize privacy and dignity as an important public interest which, as it was subject to a serious risk, justified the orders. They ask this Court to recognize that privacy in itself is an important public interest for the purposes of the analysis.

[24] Second, the Trustees submit that the Court of Appeal erred in overturning the application judge's conclusion that there was a serious risk of physical

C. *Procédures subséquentes*

[21] L'ordonnance de la Cour d'appel annulant les ordonnances de mise sous scellés a été suspendue en attendant l'issue du présent pourvoi. Le Toronto Star a présenté une requête pour être autorisé à déposer de nouveaux éléments de preuve dans le cadre du pourvoi, éléments de preuve qui comprennent des documents d'enregistrement des droits immobiliers, des transcriptions du contre-interrogatoire d'un détective sur l'enquête relative aux meurtres ainsi que divers articles de presse. Ces éléments de preuve, affirme-t-il, étaient la conclusion selon laquelle les ordonnances de mise sous scellés devraient être levées. La requête a été renvoyée à notre formation.

IV. Moyens

[22] Les fiduciaires ont interjeté appel devant notre Cour pour demander le rétablissement des ordonnances de mise sous scellés rendues par le juge de première instance. En plus de contester la requête en production de nouveaux éléments de preuve, ils soutiennent que les ordonnances sont nécessaires pour écarter un risque sérieux pour la vie privée et la sécurité physique des personnes touchées, et que les effets bénéfiques de la mise sous scellés des dossiers d'homologation judiciaire l'emportent sur les effets préjudiciables du fait de limiter la publicité des débats judiciaires. Les fiduciaires soutiennent que deux erreurs de droit ont amené la Cour d'appel à conclure autrement.

[23] Premièrement, ils soutiennent que la Cour d'appel a conclu à tort que la vie privée est une préoccupation personnelle qui ne peut, à elle seule, constituer un intérêt important suivant l'arrêt *Sierra Club*. Les fiduciaires affirment que le juge de première instance a qualifié à bon droit la vie privée et la dignité comme un intérêt public important qui, étant exposé à un risque sérieux, justifiait les ordonnances. Ils demandent à notre Cour de reconnaître que la vie privée constitue en elle-même un intérêt public important pour les besoins de l'analyse.

[24] Deuxièmement, les fiduciaires avancent que la Cour d'appel a commis une erreur en infirmant la conclusion du juge de première instance selon

harm. They argue that the Court of Appeal failed to recognize that courts have the ability to draw reasonable inferences by applying reason and logic even in the absence of specific evidence of the alleged risk.

[25] The Trustees say that these errors led the Court of Appeal to mistakenly set aside the sealing orders. In answer to questions at the hearing, the Trustees acknowledged that an order redacting certain documents in the file or a publication ban could assist in addressing some of their concerns, but maintained neither is a reasonable alternative to the sealing orders in the circumstances.

[26] The Trustees submit further that the protection of these interests outweighs the deleterious effects of the orders. They argue that the importance of the open court principle is attenuated by the nature of these probate proceedings. Given that it is non-contentious and not strictly speaking necessary for the transfer of property at death, probate is a court proceeding of an “administrative” character, which diminishes the imperative of applying the open court principle here (paras. 113-14).

[27] The Toronto Star takes the position that the Court of Appeal made no mistake in setting aside the sealing orders and that the appeal should be dismissed. In the Toronto Star’s view, while privacy can be an important interest where it evinces a public component, the Trustees have only identified a subjective desire for the affected individuals in this case to avoid further publicity, which is not inherently harmful. According to the Toronto Star and some of the interveners, the Trustees’ position would allow that measure of inconvenience and embarrassment that arises in every court proceeding to take precedence over the interest in court openness protected by the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* in which all of society has a stake. The Toronto Star argues further that the information in the court files

laquelle il y avait un risque sérieux de préjudice physique. Ils font valoir que la Cour d’appel n’a pas reconnu que les tribunaux sont habilités à tirer des inférences raisonnables sur le fondement de la raison et de la logique, même en l’absence d’éléments de preuve précis du risque allégué.

[25] Les fiduciaires affirment que ces erreurs ont amené la Cour d’appel à annuler à tort les ordonnances de mise sous scellés. En réponse aux questions qui leur ont été posées à l’audience, les fiduciaires ont reconnu qu’une ordonnance de caviardage de certains documents dans le dossier ou encore une interdiction de publication pourrait contribuer à apaiser certaines de leurs préoccupations, mais ils ont maintenu qu’aucune de ces mesures ne constituait une solution de rechange raisonnable aux ordonnances de mise sous scellés dans les circonstances.

[26] Les fiduciaires font également valoir que la protection de ces intérêts l’emporte sur les effets préjudiciables des ordonnances. Ils soutiennent que la nature des procédures d’homologation successorale dans la présente affaire atténue l’importance du principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Étant donné qu’elle n’est ni contentieuse ni, à proprement parler, nécessaire au transfert des biens au décès, l’homologation est une procédure judiciaire de nature [TRADUCTION] « administrative », ce qui réduit la nécessité d’appliquer le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires à l’espèce (par. 113-114).

[27] Le Toronto Star soutient pour sa part que la Cour d’appel n’a commis aucune erreur en annulant les ordonnances de mise sous scellés et que l’appel devrait être rejeté. Selon le Toronto Star, bien que la vie privée puisse constituer un intérêt important quand elle révèle la présence d’un élément public, les fiduciaires ont seulement fait état d’un désir subjectif de la part des personnes touchées en l’espèce d’éviter toute publicité supplémentaire, laquelle n’est pas préjudiciable en soi. De l’avis du Toronto Star et de certains des intervenants, la position des fiduciaires reviendrait à permettre à cette part d’inconvénients et d’embarras propre à toute instance judiciaire à avoir préséance sur l’intérêt dans la publicité des débats judiciaires, un principe qui est garanti par la *Charte canadienne des droits et libertés* et dans

is not highly sensitive. On the issue of whether the sealing orders were necessary to protect the affected individuals from physical harm, the Toronto Star submits that the Court of Appeal was right to conclude that the Trustees had failed to establish a serious risk to this interest.

[28] In the alternative, even if there were a serious risk to one or another important interest, the Toronto Star says the sealing orders are not necessary because the risk could be addressed by an alternative, less onerous order. Furthermore, it says the orders are not proportionate. In seeking to minimize the importance of openness in probate proceedings, the Trustees invite an inflexible approach to balancing the effects of the order that is incompatible with the principle that openness applies to all court proceedings. In any event, there is a public interest in openness specifically here, given that the certificates sought can affect the rights of third parties and that openness ensures the fairness of the proceedings, whether they are contested or not.

V. Analysis

[29] The outcome of the appeal turns on whether the application judge should have made the sealing orders pursuant to the test for discretionary limits on court openness from this Court's decision in *Sierra Club*.

[30] Court openness is protected by the constitutional guarantee of freedom of expression and is essential to the proper functioning of our democracy (*Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480, at para. 23; *Vancouver Sun (Re)*, 2004 SCC 43, [2004] 2 S.C.R. 332, at paras. 23-26). Reporting on court proceedings by a free press is often said to be inseparable from the

lequel toute la société a un intérêt. Le Toronto Star soutient également que les renseignements contenus dans les dossiers judiciaires ne sont pas de nature très sensible. En ce qui a trait à la question de savoir si les ordonnances de mise sous scellés étaient nécessaires pour protéger les personnes touchées d'un préjudice physique, le Toronto Star fait valoir que la Cour d'appel a eu raison de conclure que les fiduciaires n'avaient pas établi l'existence d'un risque sérieux pour cet intérêt.

[28] Subsidiairement, le Toronto Star affirme que, même s'il existe un risque sérieux pour un intérêt important quelconque, les ordonnances de mise sous scellés ne sont pas nécessaires, car le risque pourrait être écarté par une autre ordonnance moins sévère. De plus, il soutient que les ordonnances ne sont pas proportionnées. En cherchant à minimiser l'importance de la publicité des débats judiciaires dans les procédures d'homologation, les fiduciaires invitent à adopter, à l'égard de la pondération des effets de l'ordonnance, une approche inflexible, incompatible avec le principe de la publicité qui s'applique à toutes les procédures judiciaires. Quoi qu'il en soit, il existe précisément un intérêt public à l'égard de la publicité des débats dans la présente affaire, étant donné que les certificats demandés peuvent avoir une incidence sur les droits de tiers et que la publicité des débats garantit l'équité des procédures, qu'elles soient contestées ou non.

V. Analyse

[29] L'issue du pourvoi dépend de la question de savoir si le juge de première instance aurait dû rendre les ordonnances de mise sous scellés conformément au test applicable en matière de limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires, test établi par notre Cour dans l'arrêt *Sierra Club*.

[30] La publicité des débats judiciaires, qui est protégée par la garantie constitutionnelle de la liberté d'expression, est essentielle au bon fonctionnement de notre démocratie (*Société Radio-Canada c. Nouveau-Brunswick (Procureur général)*, [1996] 3 R.C.S. 480, par. 23; *Vancouver Sun (Re)*, 2004 CSC 43, [2004] 2 R.C.S. 332, par. 23-26). On dit souvent de la liberté de la presse de rendre compte

principle of open justice. “In reporting what has been said and done at a public trial, the media serve as the eyes and ears of a wider public which would be absolutely entitled to attend but for purely practical reasons cannot do so” (*Khuja v. Times Newspapers Ltd.*, [2017] UKSC 49, [2019] A.C. 161, at para. 16, citing *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326, at pp. 1339-40, per Cory J.). Limits on openness in service of other public interests have been recognized, but sparingly and always with an eye to preserving a strong presumption that justice should proceed in public view (*Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835, at p. 878; *R. v. Mentuck*, 2001 SCC 76, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 442, at paras. 32-39; *Sierra Club*, at para. 56). The test for discretionary limits on court openness is directed at maintaining this presumption while offering sufficient flexibility for courts to protect these other public interests where they arise (*Mentuck*, at para. 33). The parties agree that this is the appropriate framework of analysis for resolving this appeal.

[31] The parties and the courts below disagree, however, about how this test applies to the facts of this case and this calls for clarification of certain points of the *Sierra Club* analysis. Most centrally, there is disagreement about how an important interest in the protection of privacy could be recognized such that it would justify limits on openness, and in particular when privacy can be a matter of public concern. The parties bring two settled principles of this Court’s jurisprudence to bear in support of their respective positions. First, this Court has often observed that privacy is a fundamental value necessary to the preservation of a free and democratic society (*Lavigne v. Canada (Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages)*, 2002 SCC 53, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 773, at para. 25; *Dagg v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 403, at paras. 65-66, per La Forest J. (dissenting but not on this point); *New Brunswick*, at para. 40). Courts have invoked privacy, in some instances, as the basis for an exception to openness under the *Sierra*

des procédures judiciaires qu’elle est indissociable du principe de publicité. [TRADUCTION] « En rendant compte de ce qui a été dit et fait dans un procès public, les médias sont les yeux et les oreilles d’un public plus large qui aurait parfaitement le droit d’y assister, mais qui, pour des raisons purement pratiques, ne peut le faire » (*Khuja c. Times Newspapers Ltd.*, [2017] UKSC 49, [2019] A.C. 161, par. 16, citant *Edmonton Journal c. Alberta (Procureur général)*, [1989] 2 R.C.S. 1326, p. 1339-1340, le juge Cory). Le pouvoir d’imposer des limites à la publicité des débats judiciaires afin de servir d’autres intérêts publics est reconnu, mais il doit être exercé avec modération et en veillant toujours à maintenir la forte présomption selon laquelle la justice doit être rendue au vu et au su du public (*Dagenais c. Société Radio-Canada*, [1994] 3 R.C.S. 835, p. 878; *R. c. Mentuck*, 2001 CSC 76, [2001] 3 R.C.S. 442, par. 32-39; *Sierra Club*, par. 56). Le test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires vise à maintenir cette présomption tout en offrant suffisamment de souplesse aux tribunaux pour leur permettre de protéger ces autres intérêts publics lorsqu’ils entrent en jeu (*Mentuck*, par. 33). Les parties conviennent qu’il s’agit du cadre d’analyse approprié à appliquer pour trancher le présent pourvoi.

[31] Les parties et les tribunaux d’instance inférieure ne s’entendent pas, cependant, sur la façon dont ce test s’applique aux faits de la présente affaire et cela nécessite des éclaircissements sur certains points de l’analyse établie dans l’arrêt *Sierra Club*. Plus fondamentalement, il y a désaccord sur la façon dont un intérêt important à la protection de la vie privée pourrait être reconnu de telle sorte qu’il justifierait des limites à la publicité des débats, et en particulier lorsque la vie privée peut constituer une question d’intérêt public. Les parties font valoir deux principes établis dans la jurisprudence de la Cour à l’appui de leur position respective. Tout d’abord, notre Cour a souvent fait observer que la vie privée est une valeur fondamentale nécessaire au maintien d’une société libre et démocratique (*Lavigne c. Canada (Commissariat aux langues officielles)*, 2002 CSC 53, [2002] 2 R.C.S. 773, par. 25; *Dagg c. Canada (Ministre des Finances)*, [1997] 2 R.C.S. 403, par. 65-66, le juge La Forest (dissident, mais non sur ce point); *Nouveau-Brunswick*, par. 40).

Club test (see, e.g., *R. v. Henry*, 2009 BCCA 86, 270 B.C.A.C. 5, at paras. 11 and 17). At the same time, the jurisprudence acknowledges that some degree of privacy loss — resulting in inconvenience, even in upset or embarrassment — is inherent in any court proceeding open to the public (*New Brunswick*, at para. 40). Accordingly, upholding the presumption of openness has meant recognizing that neither individual sensibilities nor mere personal discomfort associated with participating in judicial proceedings are likely to justify the exclusion of the public from court (*Attorney General of Nova Scotia v. MacIntyre*, [1982] 1 S.C.R. 175, at p. 185; *New Brunswick*, at para. 41). Determining the role of privacy in the *Sierra Club* analysis requires reconciling these two ideas, which is the nub of the disagreement between the parties. The right of privacy is not absolute; the open court principle is not without exceptions.

[32] For the reasons that follow, I disagree with the Trustees that the ostensibly unbounded privacy interest they invoke qualifies as an important public interest within the meaning of *Sierra Club*. Their broad claim fails to focus on the elements of privacy that are deserving of public protection in the open court context. That is not to say, however, that privacy can never ground an exceptional measure such as the sealing orders sought in this case. While the mere embarrassment caused by the dissemination of personal information through the open court process does not rise to the level justifying a limit on court openness, circumstances do exist where an aspect of a person's private life has a plain public interest dimension.

[33] 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

Dans certains cas, les tribunaux ont invoqué la vie privée pour justifier l'application d'une exception à la publicité des débats judiciaires conformément au test établi dans *Sierra Club* (voir, p. ex., *R. c. Henry*, 2009 BCCA 86, 270 B.C.A.C. 5, par. 11 et 17). En même temps, la jurisprudence reconnaît qu'un certain degré d'atteinte à la vie privée — qui entraîne des inconvénients, voire de la contrariété ou de l'embarras — est inhérent à toute instance judiciaire accessible au public (*Nouveau-Brunswick*, par. 40). Par conséquent, le maintien de la présomption de la publicité des débats judiciaires signifie reconnaître que ni la susceptibilité individuelle ni le simple désagrément personnel découlant de la participation à des procédures judiciaires ne sont susceptibles de justifier l'exclusion du public des tribunaux (*Procureur général de la Nouvelle-Écosse c. MacIntyre*, [1982] 1 R.C.S. 175, p. 185; *Nouveau-Brunswick*, par. 41). Déterminer le rôle de la vie privée dans le cadre de l'analyse prévue dans l'arrêt *Sierra Club* exige de concilier ces deux idées, et c'est là le nœud du désaccord entre les parties. Le droit à vie privée n'est pas absolu et le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires n'est pas sans exception.

[32] Pour les motifs qui suivent, je ne suis pas d'accord avec les fiduciaires pour dire que l'intérêt en matière de vie privée apparemment illimité qu'ils invoquent constitue un intérêt public important au sens de *Sierra Club*. Leur revendication large n'est pas axée sur les éléments de la vie privée qui méritent une protection publique dans le contexte de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Cela ne veut pas dire, cependant, que la protection de la vie privée ne peut jamais justifier une mesure exceptionnelle comme les ordonnances de mise sous scellés sollicitées en l'espèce. Bien que le simple embarras causé par la diffusion de renseignements personnels dans le cadre d'une procédure judiciaire publique ne suffise pas à justifier une limite à la publicité des débats judiciaires, il existe des circonstances où un aspect de la vie privée d'une personne revêt une dimension d'intérêt public manifeste.

[33] La diffusion de renseignements personnels dans le cadre de débats judiciaires publics peut être plus qu'une source de désagrément et peut aussi entraîner une atteinte à la dignité d'une personne.

affront, it is an important public interest relevant under *Sierra Club*. Dignity in this sense is a related but narrower concern than privacy generally; it transcends the interests of the individual and, like other important public interests, is a matter that concerns the society at large. A court can make an exception to the open court principle, notwithstanding the strong presumption in its favour, if the interest in protecting core aspects of individuals' personal lives that bear on their dignity is at serious risk by reason of the dissemination of sufficiently sensitive information. The question is not whether the information is "personal" to the individual concerned, but whether, because of its highly sensitive character, its dissemination would occasion an affront to their dignity that society as a whole has a stake in protecting.

[34] This public interest in privacy appropriately focuses the analysis on the impact of the dissemination of sensitive personal information, rather than the mere fact of this dissemination, which is frequently risked in court proceedings and is necessary in a system that privileges court openness. It is a high bar — higher and more precise than the sweeping privacy interest relied upon here by the Trustees. This public interest will only be seriously at risk where the information in question strikes at what is sometimes said to be the core identity of the individual concerned: information so sensitive that its dissemination could be an affront to dignity that the public would not tolerate, even in service of open proceedings.

[35] I hasten to say that applicants for an order making exception to the open court principle cannot content themselves with an unsubstantiated claim that this public interest in dignity is compromised any more than they could by an unsubstantiated claim that their physical integrity is endangered. Under *Sierra Club*, the applicant must show on the facts of the case that, as an important interest, this

Dans la mesure où elle sert à protéger les personnes contre une telle atteinte, la vie privée constitue un intérêt public important qui est pertinent selon *Sierra Club*. La dignité en ce sens est une préoccupation connexe à la vie privée en général, mais elle est plus restreinte que celle-ci; elle transcende les intérêts individuels et, comme d'autres intérêts publics importants, c'est une question qui concerne la société en général. Un tribunal peut faire une exception au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, malgré la forte présomption en faveur de son application, si l'intérêt à protéger les aspects fondamentaux de la vie personnelle des individus qui se rapportent à leur dignité est sérieusement menacé par la diffusion de renseignements suffisamment sensibles. La question est de savoir non pas si les renseignements sont « personnels » pour la personne concernée, mais si, en raison de leur caractère très sensible, leur diffusion entraînerait une atteinte à sa dignité que la société dans son ensemble a intérêt à protéger.

[34] Cet intérêt du public à l'égard de la vie privée axe à juste titre l'analyse sur l'incidence de la diffusion de renseignements personnels sensibles, plutôt que sur le simple fait de cette diffusion, intérêt qui est fréquemment menacé dans les procédures judiciaires et qui est nécessaire dans un système qui privilégie la publicité des débats judiciaires. Il s'agit d'un seuil élevé — plus élevé et plus précis que le vaste intérêt en matière de vie privée invoqué en l'espèce par les fiduciaires. Cet intérêt public ne sera sérieusement menacé que lorsque les renseignements en question portent atteinte à ce que l'on considère parfois comme l'identité fondamentale de la personne concernée : des renseignements si sensibles que leur diffusion pourrait porter atteinte à la dignité de la personne d'une manière que le public ne tolérerait pas, pas même au nom du principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires.

[35] Je m'empresse de dire que la personne qui demande une ordonnance visant à faire exception au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires ne peut se contenter d'affirmer sans fondement que cet intérêt du public à l'égard de la dignité est compromis, pas plus qu'elle ne le pourrait si c'était son intégrité physique qui était menacée. Selon *Sierra Club*, le demandeur doit démontrer, au vu des faits de l'affaire,

dignity dimension of their privacy is at “serious risk”. For the purposes of the test for discretionary limits on court openness, this requires the applicant to show that the information in the court file is sufficiently sensitive such that it can be said to strike at the biographical core of the individual and, in the broader circumstances, that there is a serious risk that, without an exceptional order, the affected individual will suffer an affront to their dignity.

[36] In the present case, the information in the court files was not of this highly sensitive character that it could be said to strike at the core identity of the affected persons; the Trustees have failed to show how the lifting of the sealing orders engages the dignity of the affected individuals. I am therefore not convinced that the intrusion on their privacy raises a serious risk to an important public interest as required by *Sierra Club*. Moreover, as I shall endeavour to explain, there was no serious risk of 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

qu’il y a un « risque sérieux » pour cette dimension de sa vie privée liée à sa dignité. Pour l’application du test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaire, le demandeur doit donc démontrer que les renseignements contenus dans le dossier judiciaire sont suffisamment sensibles pour que l’on puisse dire qu’ils touchent au cœur même des renseignements biographiques de la personne et, dans un contexte plus large, qu’il existe un risque sérieux d’atteinte à la dignité de la personne concernée si une ordonnance exceptionnelle n’est pas rendue.

[36] En l’espèce, les renseignements contenus dans les dossiers judiciaires ne revêtent pas ce caractère si sensible qu’on pourrait dire qu’ils touchent à l’identité fondamentale des personnes concernées; les fiduciaires n’ont pas démontré en quoi la levée des ordonnances de mise sous scellés met en jeu la dignité des personnes touchées. Je ne suis donc pas convaincu que l’atteinte à leur vie privée soulève un risque sérieux pour un intérêt public important, comme l’exige *Sierra Club*. De plus, comme je tenterai de l’expliquer, il n’y avait pas de risque sérieux que les personnes visées subissent un préjudice physique en raison de la levée des ordonnances de mise sous scellés. Par conséquent, la présente affaire n’est pas un cas où il convient de rendre des ordonnances de mise sous scellés ni aucune ordonnance limitant l’accès aux dossiers judiciaires en cause. Dans les circonstances, la question de l’admissibilité des nouveaux éléments de preuve du Toronto Star est théorique. Je suis d’avis de rejeter le pourvoi.

A. *Le test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires*

[37] Les procédures judiciaires sont présumées accessibles au public (*MacIntyre*, p. 189; *A.B. c. Bragg Communications Inc.*, 2012 CSC 46, [2012] 2 R.C.S. 567, par. 11).

[38] Le test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité présumée des débats judiciaires a été décrit comme une analyse en deux étapes, soit l’étape de la nécessité et celle de la proportionnalité de l’ordonnance proposée (*Sierra Club*, par. 53). Après un examen, cependant, je constate que ce test repose sur trois conditions préalables fondamentales dont une

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*,

personne cherchant à faire établir une telle limite doit démontrer le respect. La reformulation du test autour de ces trois conditions préalables, sans en modifier l'essence, aide à clarifier le fardeau auquel doit satisfaire la personne qui sollicite une exception au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Pour obtenir gain de cause, la personne qui demande au tribunal d'exercer son pouvoir discrétionnaire de façon à limiter la présomption de publicité doit établir que :

- (1) la publicité des débats judiciaires pose un risque sérieux pour un intérêt public important;
- (2) l'ordonnance sollicitée est nécessaire pour écarter ce risque sérieux pour l'intérêt mis en évidence, car d'autres mesures raisonnables ne permettront pas d'écarter ce risque; et
- (3) du point de vue de la proportionnalité, les avantages de l'ordonnance l'emportent sur ses effets négatifs.

Ce n'est que lorsque ces trois conditions préalables sont remplies qu'une ordonnance discrétionnaire ayant pour effet de limiter la publicité des débats judiciaires — par exemple une ordonnance de mise sous scellés, une interdiction de publication, une ordonnance excluant le public d'une audience ou une ordonnance de caviardage — pourra dûment être rendue. Ce test s'applique à toutes les limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires, sous réserve uniquement d'une loi valide (*Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. c. Ontario*, 2005 CSC 41, [2005] 2 R.C.S. 188, par. 7 et 22).

[39] Le pouvoir discrétionnaire est ainsi structuré et contrôlé de manière à protéger le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, qui est considéré comme étant constitutionnalisé sous le régime du droit à la liberté d'expression garanti par l'al. 2b) de la *Charte* (*Nouveau-Brunswick*, par. 23). Reposant sur la liberté d'expression, le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires est l'un des fondements de la liberté de la presse étant donné que l'accès aux tribunaux est un élément essentiel de la collecte d'information. Notre Cour a souvent souligné l'importance de la publicité pour maintenir l'indépendance et l'impartialité des tribunaux, la confiance du

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

public à l’égard de leur travail et sa compréhension de celui-ci, et, au bout du compte, la légitimité du processus (voir, p. ex., *Vancouver Sun*, par. 23-26). Dans l’arrêt *Nouveau-Brunswick*, le juge La Forest a expliqué que la présomption en faveur de la publicité des débats judiciaires était devenue « [TRADUCTION] “l’une des caractéristiques d’une société démocratique” » (citant *Re Southam Inc. and The Queen (No.1)* (1983), 41 O.R. (2d) 113 (C.A.), p. 119), qui « fait en sorte que la justice est administrée de manière non arbitraire, conformément à la primauté du droit [. . .], situation qui favorise la confiance du public dans la probité du système judiciaire et la compréhension de l’administration de la justice » (par. 22). Le caractère fondamental de ce principe pour le système judiciaire sous-tend la forte présomption — quoique réfutable — en faveur de la tenue de procédures judiciaires publiques (par. 40; *Mentuck*, par. 39).

[40] Le test fait en sorte que les ordonnances discrétionnaires ne soient pas assujetties à une norme moins exigeante que la norme à laquelle seraient assujetties des dispositions législatives qui limiteraient la publicité des débats judiciaires (*Mentuck*, par. 27; *Sierra Club*, par. 45). À cette fin, la Cour a élaboré un cadre d’analyse par analogie avec le test de l’arrêt *Oakes*, que les tribunaux utilisent pour déterminer si une limite imposée par un texte de loi à un droit garanti par la *Charte* est raisonnable et si sa justification peut se démontrer dans le cadre d’une société libre et démocratique (*Sierra Club*, par. 40, citant *R. c. Oakes*, [1986] 1 R.C.S. 103; voir également *Dagenais*, p. 878; *Vancouver Sun*, par. 30).

[41] La portée reconnue des intérêts qui pourraient justifier une exception discrétionnaire à la publicité des débats judiciaires s’est élargie au fil du temps. Dans l’arrêt *Dagenais*, le juge en chef Lamer a parlé de la nécessité d’un risque « que le procès soit inéquitable » (p. 878). Dans *Mentuck*, le juge Iacobucci a étendu cette condition à un risque « pour la bonne administration de la justice » (par. 32). Enfin, dans *Sierra Club*, le juge Iacobucci, s’exprimant encore une fois au nom de la Cour à l’unanimité, a reformulé le test de manière à englober tout risque sérieux pour un « intérêt important, y compris un intérêt commercial, dans le contexte d’un litige » (par. 53). Il a en

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

même temps précisé que l’intérêt important doit être exprimé en tant qu’intérêt public. Par exemple, à la lumière des faits de cette affaire, le préjudice causé à un intérêt commercial particulier n’aurait pas été suffisant, mais « l’intérêt commercial général dans la protection des renseignements confidentiels » constituait un intérêt important en raison de son caractère public (par. 55). Cette conclusion est compatible avec le fait que ce test a été élaboré à l’égard de la jurisprudence relative à l’arrêt *Oakes*, laquelle met l’accent sur l’objectif « urgen[t] et rée[!] » d’un texte de loi d’application générale (*Oakes*, p. 138-139; voir également *Mentuck*, par. 31). L’expression « intérêt important » vise donc un large éventail d’objectifs d’intérêt public.

[42] Bien qu’il n’y ait aucune liste exhaustive des intérêts publics importants pour l’application de ce test, je partage l’opinion du juge Iacobucci, exprimée dans *Sierra Club*, selon laquelle les tribunaux doivent faire preuve de « prudence » et « avoir pleinement conscience de l’importance fondamentale de la règle de la publicité des débats judiciaires », même à la toute première étape lorsqu’ils constatent les intérêts publics importants (par. 56). Déterminer ce qu’est un intérêt public important peut se faire dans l’abstrait sur le plan des principes généraux qui vont au-delà des parties à un litige donné (par. 55). En revanche, la conclusion sur la question de savoir si un « risque sérieux » menace cet intérêt est une conclusion factuelle qui, pour le juge qui examine le caractère approprié d’une ordonnance, est nécessairement prise en égard au contexte. En ce sens, le fait de constater, d’une part, un intérêt important et celui de constater, d’autre part, le caractère sérieux du risque auquel cet intérêt est exposé sont, en théorie du moins, des opérations séparées et qualitativement distinctes. Une ordonnance peut donc être refusée du simple fait qu’un intérêt public important valide n’est pas sérieusement menacé au vu des faits de l’affaire ou, à l’inverse, parce que les intérêts constatés, qu’ils soient ou non sérieusement menacés, ne présentent pas le caractère public important requis sur le plan des principes généraux.

[43] Le test énoncé dans *Sierra Club* continue d’être un guide approprié en ce qui a trait à l’exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire des tribunaux dans des

“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

affaires comme en l’espèce. L’étendue de la catégorie d’« intérêt important » transcende les intérêts des parties au litige et offre une grande souplesse pour remédier à l’atteinte aux valeurs fondamentales de notre société qu’une publicité absolue des procédures judiciaires pourrait causer (voir, p. ex., P. M. Perell et J. W. Morden, *The Law of Civil Procedure in Ontario* (4^e éd. 2020), par. 3.185; J. Bailey et 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 *R.D. Ottawa* 143, p. 154-155). Parallèlement, cependant, l’obligation de démontrer l’existence d’un risque sérieux pour un intérêt important établit un seuil valable nécessaire au maintien de la présomption de publicité des débats. S’ils devaient tout simplement mettre en balance les avantages et les effets négatifs de l’imposition d’une limite à la publicité des débats judiciaires, les décideurs appelés à examiner les incidences concrètes pour les personnes qui comparaissent devant eux pourraient avoir du mal à accorder un poids suffisant aux effets négatifs moins immédiats sur le principe de la publicité des débats. Une telle pondération pourrait échapper à un contrôle efficace en appel. À mon avis, le cadre d’analyse fourni par les arrêts *Dagenais*, *Mentuck* et *Sierra Club* demeure approprié et devrait être confirmé.

[44] Enfin, je rappelle que le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires s’applique dans toutes les procédures judiciaires, quelle que soit leur nature (*MacIntyre*, p. 185-186; *Vancouver Sun*, par. 31). Je suis en désaccord avec les fiduciaires dans la mesure où ils affirment, dans leurs arguments sur les effets négatifs des ordonnances de mise sous scellés, que l’homologation successorale en Ontario ne fait pas intervenir le principe de la publicité des procédures judiciaires ou que la publicité de ces procédures n’a pas de valeur pour le public. Les certificats que les fiduciaires ont demandés au tribunal sont délivrés sous le sceau de ce tribunal, portant ainsi l’imprimatur du pouvoir judiciaire. La décision du tribunal, même si elle est rendue dans un contexte non contentieux, aura une incidence sur des tiers, par exemple en déterminant l’écrit testamentaire qui constitue un testament valide (voir *Otis c. Otis* (2004), 7 E.T.R. (3d) 221 (C.S. Ont.), par. 23-24). Contrairement

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*

[46] As mentioned, I disagree with the Trustees that an unbounded interest in privacy qualifies as an important public interest under the test for discretionary limits on court openness. Yet in some of its

à ce que les fiduciaires soutiennent, les questions soulevées dans un dossier d'homologation ne sont pas typiquement de nature privée ou fondamentalement de nature administrative. L'obtention d'un certificat de nomination à titre de fiduciaire d'une succession en Ontario est une procédure judiciaire, et la raison d'être fondamentale de la publicité des débats — décourager les actes malveillants et garantir la confiance dans l'administration de la justice par la transparence — s'applique aux procédures d'homologation et donc au transfert de biens sous l'autorité d'un tribunal ainsi qu'à d'autres questions touchées par ce recours judiciaire.

[45] Il est vrai que d'autres mécanismes de planification successorale non assujettis à une procédure d'homologation peuvent permettre que le transfert du patrimoine soit effectué en dehors des voies ordinaires de la succession testamentaire ou *ab intestat* — c'est le cas, par exemple, de certaines assurances et prestations de retraite, et de certains biens détenus en copropriété. Cependant, cela ne change rien au caractère nécessairement public des procédures d'homologation. Le fait que les transferts non assujettis à une procédure d'homologation soustraient aux regards du public certains renseignements se rapportant à l'administration d'une succession ne signifie pas que les fiduciaires en l'espèce, en demandant au tribunal de leur délivrer des certificats, ne font pas d'une façon ou d'une autre intervenir ce principe. Les fiduciaires sollicitent les avantages qui découlent de la procédure judiciaire publique d'homologation : la transparence garantit que le tribunal successoral exerce son pouvoir de manière équitable et efficace (*Vancouver Sun*, par. 25; *Nouveau-Brunswick*, par. 22). La forte présomption en faveur de la publicité des débats judiciaires s'applique manifestement aux procédures d'homologation et les fiduciaires doivent satisfaire au test des limites discrétionnaires à cette publicité.

B. *L'importance pour le public de la protection de la vie privée*

[46] Comme il a été mentionné précédemment, je ne suis pas d'accord avec les fiduciaires pour dire qu'un intérêt illimité en matière de vie privée constitue un intérêt public important au sens du test des

manifestations, privacy does have social importance beyond the person most immediately concerned. On that basis, it cannot be excluded as an interest that could justify, in the right circumstances, a limit to court openness. Indeed, the public importance of privacy has been recognized by this Court in various settings, and this sheds light on why the narrower aspect of privacy related to the protection of dignity is an important public interest.

[47] I respectfully disagree with the manner in which the Court of Appeal disposed of the claim by the Trustees that there is a serious risk to the interest in protecting personal privacy in this case. For the appellate judges, the privacy concerns raised by the Trustees amounted to “[p]ersonal concerns” which cannot, “without more”, satisfy the requirement from *Sierra Club* that an important interest be framed as a public interest (para. 10). The Court of Appeal in our case relied, at para. 10, on *H. (M.E.) v. Williams*, 2012 ONCA 35, 108 O.R. (3d) 321, in which it was held that “[p]urely personal interests cannot justify non-publication or sealing orders” (para. 25). Citing as authority judgments of this Court in *MacIntyre* and *Sierra Club*, the court continued by observing that “personal concerns of a litigant, including concerns about the very real emotional distress and embarrassment that can be occasioned to litigants when justice is done in public, will not, standing alone, satisfy the necessity branch of the test” (para. 25). Respectfully stated, the emphasis that the Court of Appeal placed on personal concerns as a means of deciding that the sealing orders failed to meet the necessity requirement in this case and in *Williams* is, I think, mistaken. Personal concerns that relate to aspects of the privacy of an individual who is before the courts can coincide with a public interest in confidentiality.

limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires. Pourtant, dans certaines de ses manifestations, la vie privée revêt une importance sociale allant au-delà de la personne la plus immédiatement touchée. Sur ce fondement, elle ne peut être exclue en tant qu’intérêt qui pourrait justifier, dans les circonstances appropriées, une limite à la publicité des débats judiciaires. En fait, la Cour a dans divers contextes reconnu l’importance pour le public de la vie privée, ce qui permet de mieux comprendre pourquoi l’aspect plus restreint de la vie privée lié à la protection de la dignité constitue un intérêt public important.

[47] Soit dit en tout respect, je ne puis souscrire à la manière dont la Cour d’appel a statué sur l’allegation des fiduciaires selon laquelle il existe un risque sérieux pour l’intérêt à la protection de la vie privée personnelle dans la présente affaire. Pour les juges d’appel, les préoccupations en matière de vie privée soulevées par les fiduciaires équivalent à des [TRADUCTION] « [p]réoccupations personnelles » qui ne peuvent, « à elles seules », satisfaire à l’exigence énoncée dans *Sierra Club* voulant qu’un intérêt important soit exprimé en tant qu’intérêt public (par. 10). Au paragraphe 10 de ses motifs dans l’affaire qui nous occupe, la Cour d’appel s’est appuyée sur l’arrêt *H. (M.E.) c. Williams*, 2012 ONCA 35, 108 O.R. (3d) 321, où il a été conclu que [TRADUCTION] « [d]es intérêts purement personnels ne peuvent justifier des ordonnances de non-publication ou de mise sous scellés » (par. 25). Citant les arrêts *MacIntyre* et *Sierra Club* de notre Cour comme des décisions faisant autorité à cet égard, la cour a poursuivi en soulignant que « les préoccupations personnelles d’une partie, y compris les préoccupations relatives à la détresse émotionnelle et à l’embarras bien réels que peuvent subir les parties quand la justice est rendue en public, ne satisferont pas à elle seules au volet nécessité du test » (par. 25). En toute déférence, j’estime que la Cour d’appel a eu tort de mettre l’accent sur les préoccupations personnelles pour décider que les ordonnances de mise sous scellés ne satisfaisaient pas à l’exigence de la nécessité dans la présente affaire et dans *Williams*. Les préoccupations personnelles qui s’attachent à des aspects de la vie privée de la personne qui comparait devant les tribunaux peuvent coïncider avec un intérêt public à la confidentialité.

[48] Like the Court of Appeal, I do agree with the view expressed particularly in the pre-*Charter* case of *MacIntyre*, that where court openness results in an intrusion on privacy which disturbs the “sensibilities of the individuals involved” (p. 185), that concern is generally insufficient to justify a sealing or like order and does not amount to an important public interest under *Sierra Club*. But I disagree with the Court of Appeal in this case and in *Williams* that this is because the intrusion only occasions “personal concerns”. Certain personal concerns — even “without more” — can coincide with important public interests within the meaning of *Sierra Club*. To invoke the expression of Binnie J. in *F.N. (Re)*, 2000 SCC 35, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, at para. 10, there is a “public interest in confidentiality” that is felt, first and foremost, by the person involved and is most certainly a personal concern. Even in *Williams*, the Court of Appeal was careful to note that where, without privacy protection, an individual would face “a substantial risk of serious debilitating emotional . . . harm”, an exception to openness should be available (paras. 29-30). The means of discerning whether a privacy interest reflects a “public interest in confidentiality” is therefore not whether the interest reflects or is rooted in “personal concerns” for the privacy of the individuals involved. Some personal concerns relating to privacy overlap with public interests in confidentiality. These interests in privacy can be, in my view, important public interests within the meaning of *Sierra Club*. It is true that an individual’s privacy is pre-eminently important to that individual. But this Court has also long recognized that the protection of privacy is, in a variety of settings, in the interest of society as a whole.

[49] The proposition that privacy is important, not only to the affected individual but to our society, has deep roots in the jurisprudence of this Court outside the context of the test for discretionary limits on

[48] À l’instar de la Cour d’appel, je souscris à l’opinion exprimée en particulier dans *MacIntyre*, une affaire antérieure à la *Charte*, selon laquelle lorsque la publicité des débats judiciaires entraîne une atteinte à la vie privée qui perturbe « la susceptibilité des personnes en cause » (p. 185), cette préoccupation est généralement insuffisante pour justifier une ordonnance de mise sous scellés ou une ordonnance semblable et ne constitue pas un intérêt public important suivant l’arrêt *Sierra Club*. Cependant, je ne suis pas d’accord avec la Cour d’appel dans la présente affaire et dans *Williams* pour dire que c’est parce que l’atteinte n’occasionne que des [TRADUCTION] « préoccupations personnelles ». Certaines préoccupations personnelles — même « à elles seules » — peuvent coïncider avec des intérêts publics importants au sens de *Sierra Club*. Pour reprendre l’expression du juge Binnie dans *F.N. (Re)*, 2000 CSC 35, [2000] 1 R.C.S. 880, par. 10, il y a un « droit du public à la confidentialité » qui touche, d’abord et avant tout, la personne concernée et qui est très certainement une préoccupation personnelle. Même dans *Williams*, la Cour d’appel a pris soin de souligner que lorsque, sans protection de la vie privée, une personne serait exposée à [TRADUCTION] « un risque important de préjudice émotionnel [. . .] débilitant », une exception à la publicité des débats devrait être permise (par. 29-30). Pour savoir si un intérêt en matière de vie privée reflète un « droit du public à la confidentialité », il ne s’agit donc pas de se demander si l’intérêt est le reflet ou tire sa source de « préoccupations personnelles » relatives à la vie privée des personnes concernées. Il y a chevauchement entre certaines préoccupations personnelles relatives à la vie privée et les intérêts du public en matière de confidentialité. Ces intérêts relatifs à la vie privée peuvent, à mon avis, être des intérêts publics importants au sens de *Sierra Club*. Il est vrai que la vie privée d’une personne est d’une importance primordiale pour celle-ci. Cependant, notre Cour reconnaît depuis longtemps que la protection de la vie privée est, dans divers contextes, dans l’intérêt de la société dans son ensemble.

[49] La proposition selon laquelle la vie privée est importante, non seulement pour la personne touchée, mais également pour notre société, est profondément enracinée dans la jurisprudence de la Cour en dehors

court openness. This background helps explain why privacy cannot be rejected as a mere personal concern. However, the key differences in these contexts are such that the public importance of privacy cannot be transposed to open courts without adaptation. Only specific aspects of privacy interests can qualify as important public interests under *Sierra Club*.

[50] In the context of s. 8 of the *Charter* and public sector privacy legislation, La Forest J. cited American privacy scholar Alan F. Westin for the proposition that privacy is a fundamental value of the modern state, first in *R. v. Dyment*, [1988] 2 S.C.R. 417, at pp. 427-28 (concurring), and then in *Dagg*, at para. 65 (dissenting but not on this point). In the latter case, La Forest J. wrote: “The protection of privacy is a fundamental value in modern, democratic states. An expression of an individual’s unique personality or personhood, privacy is grounded on physical and moral autonomy — the freedom to engage in one’s own thoughts, actions and decisions” (para. 65 (citations omitted)). That statement was endorsed unanimously by this Court in *Lavigne*, at para. 25.

[51] Further, in *Alberta (Information and Privacy Commissioner) v. United Food and Commercial Workers, Local 401*, 2013 SCC 62, [2013] 3 S.C.R. 733 (“UFCW”), decided in the context of a statute regulating the use of information by organizations, the objective of providing an individual with some control over their information was recognized as “intimately connected to individual autonomy, dignity and privacy, self-evidently significant social values” (para. 24). The importance of privacy, its “quasi-constitutional status” and its role in protecting moral autonomy continues to find expression in our recent jurisprudence (see, e.g., *Lavigne*, at para. 24; *Bragg*, at para. 18, per Abella J., citing *Toronto Star Newspaper Ltd. v. R.*, 2012 ONCJ 27, 289 C.C.C. (3d) 549, at paras. 40-41 and 44; *Douez v. Facebook, Inc.*, 2017 SCC 33, [2017] 1 S.C.R. 751, at para. 59).

du contexte du test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires. Cela aide à expliquer pourquoi la vie privée ne saurait être rejetée en tant que simple préoccupation personnelle. Cependant, les différences clés dans ces contextes sont telles que l’importance pour le public de la vie privée ne saurait être transposée sans adaptation dans le contexte de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Seuls certains aspects particuliers des intérêts en matière de vie privée peuvent constituer des intérêts publics importants suivant l’arrêt *Sierra Club*.

[50] Dans le contexte de l’art. 8 de la *Charte* et des mesures législatives sur la protection de la vie privée dans le secteur public, le juge La Forest a cité un universitaire américain spécialiste de la vie privée, Alan F. Westin, à l’appui de la thèse selon laquelle la vie privée est une valeur fondamentale de l’État moderne; il l’a fait d’abord dans *R. c. Dyment*, [1988] 2 R.C.S. 417, p. 427-428 (motifs concordants), puis dans *Dagg*, par. 65 (dissident, mais non sur ce point). Dans ce dernier arrêt, le juge La Forest a écrit : « La protection de la vie privée est une valeur fondamentale des États démocratiques modernes. Étant l’expression de la personnalité ou de l’identité unique d’une personne, la notion de vie privée repose sur l’autonomie physique et morale — la liberté de chacun de penser, d’agir et de décider pour lui-même » (par. 65 (références omises)). Notre Cour a entériné à l’unanimité cette déclaration dans *Lavigne*, par. 25.

[51] De plus, dans l’arrêt *Alberta (Information and Privacy Commissioner) c. Travailleurs et travailleuses unis de l’alimentation et du commerce, section locale 401*, 2013 CSC 62, [2013] 3 R.C.S. 733 (« TTUAC »), qui a été jugé dans le contexte d’une loi régissant l’utilisation de renseignements par des organisations, il a été reconnu que l’objectif de fournir à une personne un certain droit de regard sur les renseignements la concernant était « intimement lié à son autonomie, à sa dignité et à son droit à la vie privée, des valeurs sociales dont l’importance va de soi » (par. 24). L’importance de la vie privée, son « caractère quasi constitutionnel » et son rôle dans la protection de l’autonomie morale continuent de trouver écho dans notre jurisprudence récente (voir, p. ex., *Lavigne*, par. 24; *Bragg*, par. 18, la juge Abella, citant *Toronto Star Newspaper Ltd. c. R.*,

In *Douez*, Karakatsanis, Wagner (as he then was) and Gascon JJ. underscored this same point, adding that “the growth of the Internet, virtually timeless with pervasive reach, has exacerbated the potential harm that may flow from incursions to a person’s privacy interests” (para. 59).

[52] Privacy as a public interest is underlined by specific aspects of privacy protection present in legislation at the federal and provincial levels (see, e.g., *Privacy Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. P-21; *Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act*, S.C. 2000, c. 5 (“*PIPEDA*”); *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. F.31; *Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms*, CQLR, c. C-12, s. 5; *Civil Code of Québec*, arts. 35 to 41).³ Further, in assessing the constitutionality of a legislative exception to the open court principle, this Court has recognized that the protection of individual privacy can be a pressing and substantial objective (*Edmonton Journal*, at p. 1345, per Cory J.; see also the concurring reasons of Wilson J., at p. 1354, in which “the public interest in protecting the privacy of litigants generally in matrimonial cases against the public interest in an open court process” was explicitly noted). There is also continued support for the social and public importance of individual privacy in the academic literature (see, e.g., A. J. Cockfield, “Protecting the Social Value of Privacy in the Context of State Investigations Using New Technologies” (2007), 40 *U.B.C. L. Rev.* 41, at p. 41; K. Hughes, “A Behavioural Understanding of Privacy and its Implications for Privacy Law” (2012), 75 *Mod. L. Rev.* 806, at p. 823; P. Gewirtz, “Privacy and Speech” (2001), *Sup. Ct. Rev.* 139, at p. 139). It is therefore inappropriate, in my respectful view, to dismiss the public interest in protecting privacy as merely a personal concern. This does not mean,

2012 ONCJ 27, 289 C.C.C. (3d) 549, par. 40-41 et 44; *Douez c. Facebook, Inc.*, 2017 CSC 33, [2017] 1 R.C.S. 751, par. 59). Dans l’arrêt *Douez*, les juges Karakatsanis, Wagner (maintenant juge en chef) et Gascon ont insisté sur le même point, ajoutant que « la croissance d’Internet — un réseau quasi atemporel au rayonnement infini — a exacerbé le préjudice susceptible d’être infligé à une personne par une atteinte à son droit à la vie privée » (par. 59).

[52] La protection de la vie privée en tant qu’intérêt public est mise en évidence par des aspects particuliers de cette protection présents dans les lois fédérales et provinciales (voir, p. ex., *Loi sur la protection des renseignements personnels*, L.R.C. 1985, c. P-21; *Loi sur la protection des renseignements personnels et les documents électroniques*, L.C. 2000, c. 5 (« *LPRPDE* »); *Loi sur l’accès à l’information et la protection de la vie privée*, L.R.O. 1990, c. F.31; *Charte des droits et libertés de la personne*, RLRQ, c. C-12, art. 5; *Code civil du Québec*, art. 35 à 41)³. En outre, en examinant la constitutionnalité d’une exception législative au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, notre Cour a reconnu que la protection de la vie privée de la personne pouvait constituer un objectif urgent et réel (*Edmonton Journal*, p. 1345, le juge Cory; voir également les motifs concordants de la juge Wilson, à la p. 1354, dans lesquels a explicitement été souligné « l’intérêt public à la protection de la vie privée de l’ensemble des parties aux affaires matrimoniales par rapport à l’intérêt public à la publicité du processus judiciaire »). L’importance sociale et publique de la vie privée de la personne trouve également un appui continu dans la doctrine (voir, p. ex., A. J. Cockfield, « Protecting the Social Value of Privacy in the Context of State Investigations Using New Technologies » (2007), 40 *U.B.C. L. Rev.* 41, p. 41; K. Hughes, « A Behavioural Understanding of Privacy and its Implications for Privacy Law » (2012), 75 *Mod. L. Rev.* 806, p. 823; P. Gewirtz,

³ At the time of writing the House of Commons is considering a bill that would replace part one of *PIPEDA*: Bill C-11, *An Act to enact the Consumer Privacy Protection Act and the Personal Information and Data Protection Tribunal Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts*, 2nd Sess., 43rd Parl., 2020.

³ Au moment de la rédaction des présents motifs, la Chambre des communes étudiait un projet de loi destiné à remplacer la première partie de la *LPRPDE* : le projet de loi C-11, *Loi édictant la Loi sur la protection de la vie privée des consommateurs et la Loi sur le Tribunal de la protection des renseignements personnels et des données et apportant des modifications corrélatives et connexes à d’autres lois*, 2^e sess., 43^e lég., 2020.

however, that privacy generally is an important public interest in the context of limits on court openness.

[53] The fact that the case before the application judge concerned individuals who were advancing their own privacy interests, which were undeniably important to them as individuals, does not mean that there is no public interest at stake. In *F.N. (Re)*, this was the personal interest that young offenders had in remaining anonymous in court proceedings as a means of encouraging their personal rehabilitation (para. 11). All of society had a stake, according to Binnie J., in the young person's personal prospect for rehabilitation. This same idea from *F.N. (Re)* was cited in support of finding the interest in *Sierra Club* to be a public interest. That interest, rooted first in an agreement of personal concern to the contracting parties involved, was a private matter that evinced, alongside its personal interest to the parties, a "public interest in confidentiality" (*Sierra Club*, at para. 55). Similarly, while the Trustees have a personal interest in preserving their privacy, this does not mean that the public has no stake in this same interest because — as this Court has made clear — it is related to moral autonomy and dignity which are pressing and substantial concerns.

[54] In this appeal, the Toronto Star suggests that legitimate privacy concerns would be effectively protected by a discretionary order where there is "something more" to elevate them beyond personal concerns and sensibilities (R.F., at para. 73). The Income Security Advocacy Centre, by way of example, submits that privacy serves the public interests of preventing harm and of ensuring individuals are not dissuaded from accessing the courts. I agree that these concepts are related, but in my view care must be taken not to conflate the public importance of

« Privacy and Speech », [2001] *Sup. Ct. Rev.* 139, p. 139). Il est donc inapproprié, en toute déférence, de rejeter l'intérêt du public à la protection de la vie privée au motif qu'il s'agit d'une simple préoccupation personnelle. Cela ne signifie pas, cependant, que la vie privée est, de façon générale, un intérêt public important dans le contexte de l'imposition de limites à la publicité des débats judiciaires.

[53] Le fait que l'affaire dont était saisi le juge de première instance concernait des personnes défendant leurs propres intérêts en matière de vie privée, intérêts qui étaient indéniablement importants pour elles en tant qu'individus, ne signifie pas qu'il n'y a aucun intérêt public en jeu. Dans *F.N. (Re)*, il était question de l'intérêt personnel que les jeunes contrevenants avaient à garder l'anonymat dans les procédures judiciaires afin de favoriser leur réadaptation personnelle (par. 11). Selon le juge Binnie, la société dans son ensemble avait un intérêt dans les perspectives personnelles de réadaptation de l'adolescent visé. Cette même idée exposée dans *F.N. (Re)* a été citée à l'appui de la conclusion selon laquelle l'intérêt en cause dans *Sierra Club* était un intérêt public. Cet intérêt, qui prenait tout d'abord sa source dans une entente touchant personnellement les parties contractantes concernées, était une question de nature privée qui, en plus de son intérêt personnel pour les parties, faisait état d'un « intérêt public à la confidentialité » (*Sierra Club*, par. 55). De même, si les fiduciaires ont un intérêt personnel à protéger leur vie privée, cela ne signifie pas que le public n'a pas un intérêt à cet égard, car — comme l'a clairement souligné la Cour —, cet intérêt est lié à l'autonomie morale et à la dignité, lesquelles constituent des préoccupations urgentes et réelles.

[54] Dans le présent pourvoi, le Toronto Star avance que les préoccupations légitimes en matière de vie privée seraient efficacement protégées par une ordonnance discrétionnaire dans le cas où il y aurait [TRADUCTION] « quelque chose de plus » pour les éléver au-delà des préoccupations et de la susceptibilité personnelles (m.i., par. 73). Le Centre d'action pour la sécurité du revenu, par exemple, soutient que la protection de la vie privée sert les intérêts du public qui consistent à prévenir les préjudices et à faire en sorte que les particuliers ne soient pas

privacy with that of other interests; aspects of privacy, such as dignity, may constitute important public interests in and of themselves. A risk to personal privacy may be tied to a risk to psychological harm, as it was in *Bragg* (para. 14; see also J. Rossiter, *Law of Publication Bans, Private Hearings, and Sealing Orders* (loose-leaf), s. 2.4.1). But concerns for privacy may not always coincide with a desire to avoid psychological harm, and may focus instead, for example, on protecting one's professional standing (see, e.g., *R. v. Paterson* (1998), 102 B.C.A.C. 200, at paras. 76, 78 and 87-88). Similarly, there may be circumstances where the prospect of surrendering the personal information necessary to pursue a legal claim may deter an individual from bringing that claim (see *S. v. Lamontagne*, 2020 QCCA 663, at paras. 34-35 (CanLII)). In the same way, the prospect of surrendering sensitive commercial information would have impaired the conduct of the party's defence in *Sierra Club* (at para. 71), or could pressure an individual into settling a dispute prematurely (K. Eltis, *Courts, Litigants and the Digital Age* (2nd ed. 2016), at p. 86). But this does not necessarily mean that a public interest in privacy is wholly subsumed by such concerns. I note, for example, that access to justice concerns do not apply where the privacy interest to be protected is that of a third party to the litigation, such as a witness, whose access to the courts is not at stake and who has no choice available to terminate the litigation and avoid any privacy impacts (see, e.g., *Himel v. Greenberg*, 2010 ONSC 2325, 93 R.F.L. (6th) 357, at para. 58; see also Rossiter, s. 2.4.2(2)). In any event, the recognition of these related and valid important public interests does not answer the question as to whether aspects of privacy in and of themselves are important public interests and does not diminish the distinctive public character of privacy, considered above.

dissuadés de recourir aux tribunaux. Je reconnais que ces notions sont liées, mais il faut, à mon avis, prendre soin de ne pas confondre l'importance pour le public de la vie privée avec l'importance pour le public d'autres intérêts; des aspects de la vie privée, comme la dignité, peuvent constituer des intérêts publics importants en soi. Un risque pour la vie privée personnelle peut être lié à un risque de préjudice psychologique, comme c'était le cas dans l'affaire *Bragg* (par. 14; voir également J. Rossiter, *Law of Publication Bans, Private Hearings and Sealing Orders* (feuilles mobiles), section 2.4.1). Cependant, il se peut que les préoccupations relatives à la vie privée ne coïncident pas toujours avec le désir d'éviter un préjudice psychologique et soient plutôt axées, par exemple, sur la protection de la réputation professionnelle d'une personne (voir, p. ex., *R. c. Paterson* (1998), 102 B.C.A.C. 200, par. 76, 78 et 87-88). De même, il peut y avoir des circonstances où la perspective de devoir communiquer les renseignements personnels nécessaires à la poursuite d'une action en justice peut dissuader une personne d'intenter cette action (voir *S. c. Lamontagne*, 2020 QCCA 663, par. 34-35 (CanLII)). De la même manière, la perspective de devoir communiquer des renseignements commerciaux sensibles aurait nui à la conduite de la défense d'une partie dans *Sierra Club* (par. 71), ou pourrait inciter une personne à régler un litige prématûrément (K. Eltis, *Courts, Litigants, and the Digital Age* (2^e éd. 2016), p. 86). Cependant, cela ne signifie pas nécessairement qu'un intérêt public en matière de vie privée est entièrement subsumé dans de telles préoccupations. Je tiens à souligner, par exemple, que les préoccupations relatives à l'accès à la justice ne s'appliquent pas lorsque l'intérêt à protéger en matière de vie privée est celui d'un tiers au litige, comme un témoin, dont l'accès aux tribunaux n'est pas en cause et à qui il n'est pas loisible de mettre fin au litige et d'éviter toute incidence sur sa vie privée (voir, p. ex., *Himel c. Greenberg*, 2010 ONSC 2325, 93 R.F.L. (6th) 357, par. 58; voir également Rossiter, section 2.4.2(2)). En tout état de cause, la reconnaissance de ces importants intérêts publics connexes et valides ne permet pas de savoir si certains aspects de la vie privée constituent en eux-mêmes des intérêts publics importants et ne diminue en rien le caractère public distinctif de la vie privée, examiné précédemment.

[55] Indeed, the specific harms to privacy occasioned by open courts have not gone unnoticed nor been discounted as merely personal concerns. Courts have exercised their discretion to limit court openness in order to protect personal information from publicity, including to prevent the disclosure of sexual orientation (see, e.g., *Paterson*, at paras. 76, 78 and 87-88), HIV status (see, e.g., *A.B. v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2017 FC 629, at para. 9 (CanLII)), and a history of substance abuse and criminality (see, e.g., *R. v. Pickton*, 2010 BCSC 1198, at paras. 11 and 20 (CanLII)). This need to reconcile the public interest in privacy with the open court principle has been highlighted by this Court (see, e.g., *Edmonton Journal*, at p. 1353, per Wilson J.). Writing extra-judicially, McLachlin C.J. explained that “[i]f we are serious about peoples’ private lives, we must preserve a modicum of privacy. Equally, if we are serious about our justice system, we must have open courts. The question is how to reconcile these dual imperatives in a fair and principled way” (“Courts, Transparency and Public Confidence – To the Better Administration of Justice” (2003), 8 *Deakin L. Rev.* 1, at p. 4). In seeking that reconciliation, the question becomes whether the relevant dimension of privacy amounts to an important public interest that, when seriously at risk, would justify rebutting the strong presumption favouring open courts.

C. *The Important Public Interest in Privacy Bears on the Protection of Individual Dignity*

[56] While the public importance of privacy has clearly been recognized by this Court in various settings, caution is required in deploying this concept in the test for discretionary limits on court openness. It is a matter of settled law that open court proceedings by their nature can be a source of discomfort and embarrassment and these intrusions on privacy

[55] En fait, les atteintes particulières à la vie privée ayant été occasionnées par la publicité des débats judiciaires ne sont pas passées inaperçues et n’ont pas non plus été écartées au motif qu’il s’agissait de simples préoccupations personnelles. Les tribunaux ont exercé leur pouvoir discrétionnaire de limiter la publicité des débats judiciaires afin de protéger les renseignements personnels de la publicité, y compris pour empêcher que soient divulgués l’orientation sexuelle d’une personne (voir, p. ex., *Paterson*, par. 76, 78 et 87-88), sa séropositivité (voir, p. ex., *A.B. c. Canada (Citoyenneté et Immigration)*, 2017 CF 629, par. 9 (CanLII)), et ses antécédents de toxicomanie et de criminalité (voir, p. ex., *R. c. Pickton*, 2010 BCSC 1198, par. 11 et 20 (CanLII)). Notre Cour a souligné cette nécessité de concilier l’intérêt du public à l’égard de la vie privée et le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires (voir, p. ex., *Edmonton Journal*, p. 1353, la juge Wilson). Dans un article de doctrine, la juge en chef McLachlin a expliqué que [TRADUCTION] « [s]i nous nous préoccupons sérieusement de la vie intime des gens, nous devons protéger un minimum de vie privée. De même, si nous nous préoccupons sérieusement de notre système judiciaire, les débats judiciaires doivent être publics. La question est de savoir comment concilier ces deux impératifs d’une manière qui soit équitable et raisonnée » (« Courts, Transparency and Public Confidence – To the Better Administration of Justice » (2003), 8 *Deakin L. Rev.* 1, p. 4). En cherchant à concilier ces deux impératifs, il faut alors se demander si la dimension de la vie privée en cause constitue un intérêt public important qui, lorsqu’il est sérieusement menacé, justifierait de réfuter la forte présomption en faveur de la publicité des débats judiciaires.

C. *L’intérêt public important en matière de vie privée se rapporte à la protection de la dignité de la personne*

[56] Bien que l’importance pour le public de la protection de la vie privée ait clairement été reconnue par la Cour dans divers contextes, la prudence est de mise lorsqu’il s’agit d’utiliser cette notion dans le cadre du test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires. Il est bien établi en droit que les procédures judiciaires publiques, de par leur

are generally seen as of insufficient importance to overcome the presumption of openness. The Toronto Star has raised the concern that recognizing privacy as an important public interest will lower the burden for applicants because the privacy of litigants will, in some respects, always be at risk in court proceedings. I agree that the requirement to show a serious risk to an important interest is a key threshold component of the analysis that must be preserved in order to protect the open court principle. The recognition of a public interest in privacy could threaten the strong presumption of openness if privacy is cast too broadly without a view to its public character.

[57] Privacy poses challenges in the test for discretionary limits on court openness because of the necessary dissemination of information that openness implies. It bears recalling that when Dickson J., as he then was, wrote in *MacIntyre* that “covertness is the exception and openness the rule”, he was explicitly treating a privacy argument, returning to and dismissing the view, urged many times before, “that the ‘privacy’ of litigants requires that the public be excluded from court proceedings” (p. 185 (emphasis added)). Dickson J. rejected the view that personal privacy concerns require closed courtroom doors, explaining that “[a]s a general rule the sensibilities of the individuals involved are no basis for exclusion of the public from judicial proceedings” (*ibid.*).

[58] Though writing before *Dagenais*, and therefore not commenting on the specific steps of the analysis as we now understand them, to my mind, Dickson J. was right to recognize that the open court principle brings necessary limits to the right to privacy. While individuals may have an expectation that information about them will not be revealed in judicial proceedings, the open court principle stands presumptively in opposition to that expectation. For

nature, peuvent être une source de désagrément et d’embarras, et l’on considère généralement que ces atteintes à la vie privée ne sont pas suffisamment importantes pour réfuter la présomption de publicité des débats. Le Toronto Star a exprimé la crainte que la reconnaissance de la vie privée en tant qu’intérêt public important n’allège le fardeau de preuve incombant aux demandeurs, car la vie privée des parties à un litige sera, à certains égards, toujours menacée dans les procédures judiciaires. Je conviens que l’exigence de démontrer l’existence d’un risque sérieux pour un intérêt important est un élément préliminaire clé de l’analyse qui doit être maintenu afin de protéger le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires. La reconnaissance d’un intérêt public en matière de vie privée pourrait menacer la forte présomption de publicité si la vie privée est définie trop largement sans tenir compte de son caractère public.

[57] La vie privée pose des défis dans l’application du test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires en raison de la diffusion nécessaire de renseignements que supposent des procédures publiques. Il convient de rappeler que lorsqu’il a écrit, dans l’arrêt *MacIntyre*, que « le secret est l’exception et que la publicité est la règle », le juge Dickson, plus tard juge en chef, examinait explicitement un argument relatif à la vie privée en revenant sur un point de vue préconisé maintes fois auparavant devant les tribunaux selon lequel « le droit des parties au litige de jouir de leur vie privée exige des audiences à huis clos » (p. 185 (je souligne)), et en rejetant celui-ci. Le juge Dickson a rejeté l’opinion selon laquelle les préoccupations personnelles en matière de vie privée exigent des audiences à huis clos, expliquant qu’« [e]n règle générale, la susceptibilité des personnes en cause ne justifie pas qu’on exclut le public des procédures judiciaires » (*ibid.*).

[58] Bien qu’il ait rendu sa décision avant le prononcé de l’arrêt *Dagenais* et qu’il ne commente donc pas les étapes précises de l’analyse telles que nous les comprenons aujourd’hui, j’estime que le juge Dickson a, à juste titre, reconnu que le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires apporte des limites nécessaires au droit à la vie privée. Quoique les particuliers puissent s’attendre à ce que les renseignements qui les concernent ne soient pas révélés

example, in *Lac d'Amiate du Québec Ltée v. 2858-0702 Québec Inc.*, 2001 SCC 51, [2001] 2 S.C.R. 743, LeBel J. held that “a party who institutes a legal proceeding waives his or her right to privacy, at least in part” (para. 42). *MacIntyre* and cases like it recognize — in stating that openness is the rule and covertness the exception — that the right to privacy, however defined, in some measure gives way to the open court ideal. I share the view that the open court principle presumes that this limit on the right to privacy is justified.

[59] The Toronto Star is therefore right to say that the privacy of individuals will very often be at some risk in court proceedings. Disputes between and concerning individuals that play out in open court necessarily reveal information that may have otherwise remained out of public view. Indeed, much like the Court of Appeal in this case, courts have explicitly adverted to this concern when concluding that mere inconvenience is insufficient to cross the initial threshold of the test (see, e.g., *3834310 Canada inc. v. Chamberland*, 2004 CanLII 4122 (Que. C.A.), at para. 30). Saying that any impact on individual privacy is sufficient to establish a serious risk to an important public interest for the purposes of the test for discretionary limits on court openness could render this initial requirement moot. Many cases would turn on the balancing at the proportionality stage. Such a development would amount to a departure from *Sierra Club*, which is the appropriate framework and one which must be preserved.

[60] Further, recognizing an important interest in privacy generally could prove to be too open-ended and difficult to apply. Privacy is a complex and contextual concept (*Dagg*, at para. 67; see also B. McIsaac, K. Klein and S. Brown, *The Law of Privacy in Canada* (loose-leaf), vol. 1, at pp. 1-4; D. J. Solove, “Conceptualizing Privacy” (2002), 90

dans le cadre de procédures judiciaires, le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires s’oppose par présomption à cette attente. Par exemple, dans l’arrêt *Lac d'Amiate du Québec Ltée c. 2858-0702 Québec Inc.*, 2001 CSC 51, [2001] 2 R.C.S. 743, le juge LeBel a conclu que la « partie qui engage un débat judiciaire renonce, à tout le moins en partie, à la protection de sa vie privée » (par. 42). L’arrêt *MacIntyre* et les jugements similaires reconnaissent — en affirmant que la publicité est la règle et le secret, l’exception — que le droit à la vie privée, quelle qu’en soit la définition, cède le pas, dans une certaine mesure, à l’idéal de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Je partage le point de vue selon lequel le principe de la publicité des débats suppose que cette limite au droit à la vie privée est justifiée.

[59] Le Toronto Star a donc raison d’affirmer que la vie privée des personnes sera très souvent en quelque sorte menacée dans les procédures judiciaires. Les litiges entre et concernant des particuliers qui se déroulent dans le cadre de débats judiciaires publics révèlent nécessairement des renseignements qui pourraient autrement être restés à l’abri des regards du public. En fait, tout comme la Cour d’appel en l’espèce, les tribunaux ont explicitement fait mention de cette préoccupation lorsqu’ils ont conclu que de simples inconvénients ne suffisaient pas à franchir le seuil initial du test (voir, p. ex., *3834310 Canada inc. c. Chamberland*, 2004 CanLII 4122 (C.A. Qc), par. 30). Affirmer que toute incidence sur la vie privée d’une personne suffit à établir un risque sérieux pour un intérêt public important pour l’application du test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires pourrait rendre cette exigence préliminaire théorique. Le sort de nombreuses causes dépendrait de la pondération à l’étape de la proportionnalité. Une telle évolution reviendrait à déroger à l’arrêt *Sierra Club*, qui constitue le cadre approprié à appliquer, lequel doit être maintenu.

[60] De plus, la reconnaissance d’un intérêt important à l’égard de la notion générale de vie privée pourrait s’avérer trop indéterminée et difficile à appliquer. La vie privée est une notion complexe et contextuelle (*Dagg*, par. 67; voir également B. McIsaac, K. Klein et S. Brown, *The Law of Privacy in Canada* (feuilles mobiles), vol. 1, p. 1-4; D. J.

Cal. L. Rev. 1087, at p. 1090). Indeed, this Court has described the nature of limits of privacy as being in a state of “theoretical disarray” (*R. v. Spencer*, 2014 SCC 43, [2014] 2 S.C.R. 212, at para. 35). Much turns on the context in which privacy is invoked. I agree with the *Toronto Star* that a bald recognition of privacy as an important interest in the context of the test for discretionary limits on court openness, as the Trustees advance here, would invite considerable confusion. It would be difficult for courts to measure a serious risk to such an interest because of its multi-faceted nature.

[61] While I acknowledge these concerns have merit, I disagree that they require that privacy never be considered in determining whether there is a serious risk to an important public interest. I reach this conclusion for two reasons. First, the problem of privacy’s complexity can be attenuated by focusing on the purpose underlying the public protection of privacy as it is relevant to the judicial process, in order to fix precisely on that aspect which transcends the interests of the parties in this context. That narrower dimension of privacy is the protection of dignity, an important public interest that can be threatened by open courts. Indeed, rather than attempting to apply a single unwieldy concept of privacy in all contexts, this Court has generally fixed on more specific privacy interests tailored to the particular situation (*Spencer*, at para. 35; *Edmonton Journal*, at p. 1362, per Wilson J.). That is what must be done here, with a view to identifying the public aspect of privacy that openness might inappropriately undermine.

[62] Second, I recall that in order to pass the first stage of the analysis one must not simply invoke an important interest, but must also overcome the presumption of openness by showing a serious risk to this interest. The burden of showing a risk to such

Solove, « Conceptualizing Privacy » (2002), 90 *Cal. L. Rev.* 1087, p. 1090). En fait, notre Cour a décrit la nature des limites à la vie privée comme étant dans un état de « confusion [...] sur le plan théorique » (*R. c. Spencer*, 2014 CSC 43, [2014] 2 R.C.S. 212, par. 35). Cela dépend en grande partie du contexte dans lequel la vie privée est invoquée. Je suis d’accord avec le *Toronto Star* pour dire que la reconnaissance de la vie privée, sans nuances, comme un intérêt important dans le contexte du test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires, ainsi que le revendent les fiduciaires en l’espèce, susciterait énormément de confusion. Il serait difficile pour les tribunaux de mesurer un risque sérieux pour un tel intérêt, en raison de ses multiples facettes.

[61] Bien que je reconnaisse la validité de ces préoccupations, je ne suis pas d’accord pour dire qu’elles exigent que la vie privée ne soit jamais prise en considération lorsqu’il s’agit de décider s’il existe un risque sérieux pour un intérêt public important. J’arrive à cette conclusion pour deux raisons. Premièrement, il est possible d’atténuer le problème de la complexité de la vie privée en se concentrant sur l’objectif qui sous-tend la protection publique de la vie privée, lequel est pertinent dans le cadre du processus judiciaire, de manière à s’en tenir précisément à l’aspect qui transcende les intérêts des parties dans ce contexte. Cette dimension plus restreinte de la vie privée est la protection de la dignité, un intérêt public important qui peut être menacé par la publicité des débats judiciaires. D’ailleurs, plutôt que d’essayer d’appliquer une notion unique et complexe de la vie privée à tous les contextes, notre Cour s’est généralement arrêtée sur des intérêts plus précis en matière de vie privée adaptés à la situation particulière en cause (*Spencer*, par. 35; *Edmonton Journal*, p. 1362, la juge Wilson). C’est ce qu’il faut faire en l’espèce, en vue de cerner l’aspect public de la vie privée que la publicité des débats risque de miner indûment.

[62] Deuxièmement, je rappelle que, pour franchir la première étape de l’analyse, il ne suffit pas d’invoquer un intérêt important, mais il faut aussi réfuter la présomption de publicité des débats en démontrant l’existence d’un risque sérieux pour cet intérêt. Le

an interest on the facts of a given case constitutes the true initial threshold on the person seeking to restrict openness. It is never sufficient to plead a recognized important public interest on its own. The demonstration of a serious risk to this interest is still required. What is important is that the interest be accurately defined to capture only those aspects of privacy that engage legitimate public objectives such that showing a serious risk to that interest remains a high bar. In this way, courts can effectively maintain the guarantee of presumptive openness.

[63] Specifically, in order to preserve the integrity of the open court principle, an important public interest concerned with the protection of dignity should be understood to be seriously at risk only in limited cases. Nothing here displaces the principle that covertness in court proceedings must be exceptional. 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 (*MacIntyre*, at p. 185; *New Brunswick*, at para. 40; *Williams*, at para. 30; *Coltsfoot Publishing Ltd. v. Foster-Jacques*, 2012 NSCA 83, 320 N.S.R. (2d) 166, at para. 97). These principles do not preclude recognizing the public character of a privacy interest as important when it is related to the protection of dignity. They merely require that a serious risk be shown to exist in respect of this interest in order to justify, exceptionally, a limit on openness, as is the case with any important public interest under *Sierra Club*. As Professors Sylvette Guillemand and Séverine Menétrey explain, [TRANSLATION] “[t]he confidentiality of the proceedings may be justified, in particular, in order to protect the parties’ privacy However, the jurisprudence indicates that embarrassment or shame is not a sufficient reason to order that proceedings be held *in camera* or to impose a publication ban” (*Comprendre la procédure civile québécoise* (2nd ed. 2017), at p. 57).

fardeau d'établir l'existence d'un risque pour un tel intérêt au vu des faits d'une affaire donnée constitue le véritable seuil initial à franchir pour la personne cherchant à restreindre la publicité. Il n'est jamais suffisant d'alléguer la seule existence d'un intérêt public important reconnu. Démontrer l'existence d'un risque sérieux pour cet intérêt demeure toujours nécessaire. Ce qui importe, c'est que l'intérêt soit précisément défini de manière à ce qu'il n'englobe que les aspects de la vie privée qui font entrer en jeu des objectifs publics légitimes, de sorte que le seuil à franchir pour établir l'existence d'un risque sérieux pour cet intérêt demeure élevé. De cette manière, les tribunaux peuvent efficacement maintenir la garantie de la présomption de publicité des débats.

[63] Plus particulièrement, pour maintenir l'intégrité du principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, un intérêt public important à l'égard de la protection de la dignité devrait être considéré sérieusement menacé seulement dans des cas limités. Rien en l'espèce n'écarte le principe selon lequel le secret en matière de procédures judiciaires doit être exceptionnel. Ni la susceptibilité des gens ni le fait que la publicité soit désavantageuse, embarrassante ou pénible pour certaines personnes ne justifieront généralement, à eux seuls, une atteinte au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires (*MacIntyre*, p. 185; *Nouveau-Brunswick*, par. 40; *Williams*, par. 30; *Coltsfoot Publishing Ltd. c. Foster-Jacques*, 2012 NSCA 83, 320 N.S.R. (2d) 166, par. 97). Ces principes n'empêchent pas de reconnaître l'importance du caractère public d'un intérêt en matière de vie privée quand celui-ci est lié à la protection de la dignité. Ils obligent simplement à faire la preuve de l'existence d'un risque sérieux pour cet intérêt de manière à justifier, à titre exceptionnel, une restriction à la publicité des débats, comme c'est le cas pour tout intérêt public important au regard de l'arrêt *Sierra Club*. Comme l'expliquent les professeures Sylvette Guillemand et Séverine Menétrey, « [l]a confidentialité des débats peut se justifier notamment pour protéger la vie privée des parties [. . .] La jurisprudence affirme cependant que l'embarras ou la honte ne sont pas des motifs suffisants pour ordonner le huis clos ou la non-publication » (*Comprendre la procédure civile québécoise* (2^e éd. 2017), p. 57).

[64] How should the privacy interest at issue be understood as raising an important public interest relevant to the test for discretionary limits on court openness in this context? It is helpful to recall that the orders below were sought to limit access to documents and information in the court files. The Trustees' argument on this point focused squarely on the risk of immediate and widespread dissemination of the personally identifying and other sensitive information contained in the sealed materials by the Toronto Star. The Trustees submit that this dissemination would constitute an unwarranted intrusion into the privacy of the affected individuals beyond the upset they have already suffered as a result of the publicity associated with the death of the Shermans.

[65] In my view, there is value in leaving individuals free to restrict when, how and to what extent highly sensitive information about them is communicated to others in the public sphere, because choosing how we present ourselves in public preserves our moral autonomy and dignity as individuals. This Court has had occasion to underscore the connection between the privacy interest engaged by open courts and the protection of dignity specifically. For example, in *Edmonton Journal*, Wilson J. noted that the impugned provision which would limit publication about matrimonial proceedings addressed “a somewhat different aspect of privacy, one more closely related to the protection of one’s dignity . . . namely the personal anguish and loss of dignity that may result from having embarrassing details of one’s private life printed in the newspapers” (pp. 1363-64). In *Bragg*, as a further example, the protection of a young person’s ability to control sensitive information was said to foster respect for “dignity, personal integrity and autonomy” (para. 18, citing *Toronto Star Newspaper Ltd.*, at para. 44).

[64] Comment devrait-on considérer que l’intérêt en matière de vie privée en cause soulève un intérêt public important qui est pertinent pour les besoins du test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires dans le présent contexte? Il est utile de rappeler que les ordonnances rendues en première instance avaient été demandées pour limiter l’accès aux documents et aux renseignements figurant dans les dossiers judiciaires. L’argument des fiduciaires sur ce point était directement axé sur le risque de diffusion immédiate et à grande échelle, par le Toronto Star, de renseignements permettant d’identifier des personnes ainsi que d’autres renseignements sensibles contenus dans les documents placés sous scellés. Les fiduciaires soutiennent que cette diffusion constituerait une atteinte injustifiée à la vie privée des personnes touchées, qui s’ajouteraient à la contrariété qu’elles ont déjà subie en raison de la publicité ayant entouré le décès des Sherman.

[65] À mon avis, il est bon de laisser les personnes libres de fixer des limites quant à savoir à quel moment les renseignements très sensibles les concernant seront communiqués à d’autres personnes dans la sphère publique, et de quelle manière et dans quelle mesure ils le seront. En effet, en choisissant la manière dont on se présente en public, on protège son autonomie morale et sa dignité en tant que personne. La Cour a eu l’occasion de faire ressortir le lien entre l’intérêt en matière de vie privée mis en jeu par la tenue de procédures judiciaires publiques et la protection de la dignité plus particulièrement. Par exemple, dans l’arrêt *Edmonton Journal*, la juge Wilson a souligné que la disposition contestée, qui devait avoir pour effet de limiter la publication de détails sur des procédures matrimoniales, portait sur « un aspect un peu différent de la vie privée, un aspect qui se rapproche davantage de la protection de la dignité personnelle [. . .], c’est-à-dire l’angoisse et la perte de dignité personnelle qui peuvent résulter de la publication dans les journaux de détails gênants de la vie privée d’une personne » (p. 1363-1364). Citons comme autre exemple l’affaire *Bragg*, dans laquelle la protection de la capacité des jeunes à contrôler des renseignements sensibles avait été considérée comme favorisant le respect [TRADUCTION] « de leur dignité, de leur intégrité personnelle et de leur autonomie » (par. 18, citant *Toronto Star Newspaper Ltd.*, par. 44).

[66] Consistent with this jurisprudence, I note by way of example that the Quebec legislature expressly highlighted the preservation of dignity when the *Sierra Club* test was codified in the *Code of Civil Procedure*, CQLR, c. C-25.01 (“C.C.P.”), art. 12 (see also Ministère de la Justice, *Commentaires de la ministre de la Justice: Code de procédure civile, chapitre C-25.01* (2015), art. 12). Under art. 12 C.C.P., a discretionary exception to the open court principle can be made by the court if “public order, in particular the preservation of the dignity of the persons involved or the protection of substantial and legitimate interests”, requires it.

[67] The concept of public order evidences flexibility analogous to the concept of an important public interest under *Sierra Club* yet it recalls that the interest invoked transcends, in importance and consequence, the purely subjective sensibilities of the persons affected. Like the “important public interest” that must be at serious risk to justify the sealing orders in the present appeal, public order encompasses a wide array of general principles and imperative norms identified by a legislature and the courts as fundamental to a given society (see *Goulet v. Transamerica Life Insurance Co. of Canada*, 2002 SCC 21, [2002] 1 S.C.R. 719, at paras. 42-44, citing *Godbout v. Longueuil (Ville de)*, [1995] R.J.Q. 2561 (C.A.), at p. 2570, aff’d [1997] 3 S.C.R. 844). As one Quebec judge wrote, referring to *Sierra Club* prior to the enactment of art. 12 C.C.P., the interest must be understood as defined [TRANSLATION] “in terms of a public interest in confidentiality” (see *3834310 Canada inc.*, at para. 24, per Gendreau J.A. for the Court of appeal). From among the various considerations that make up the concept of public order and other legitimate interests to which art. 12 C.C.P. alludes, it is significant that dignity, and not an untailored reference to either privacy, harm or access to justice, was given pride of place. Indeed, it is that narrow aspect of privacy considered to be a fundamental right that courts had fixed upon before the enactment of art. 12 C.C.P. — [TRANSLATION] “what is part of one’s personal life, in short, what constitutes a minimum personal sphere” (*Godbout*, at p. 2569, per Baudouin J.A.; see also *A. v. B.*, 1990

[66] Conformément à cette jurisprudence, je relève, par exemple, que le législateur québécois a expressément fait ressortir la protection de la dignité lorsque le test énoncé dans l’arrêt *Sierra Club* a été codifié dans le *Code de procédure civile*, RLRQ, c. C-25.01 (« C.p.c. »), art. 12 (voir Ministère de la Justice, *Commentaires de la ministre de la Justice : Code de procédure civile, chapitre C-25.01* (2015), art. 12). Selon l’art. 12 C.p.c., un tribunal peut faire exception de façon discrétionnaire au principe de la publicité si « l’ordre public, notamment la protection de la dignité des personnes concernées par une demande, ou la protection d’intérêts légitimes importants » l’exige.

[67] La notion d’ordre public témoigne d’une souplesse analogue à la notion d’intérêt public important suivant l’arrêt *Sierra Club*; elle rappelle pourtant que l’intérêt invoqué transcende, en ce qui a trait à son importance et à ses conséquences, la susceptibilité purement subjective des personnes touchées. Tout comme l’« intérêt public important » qui doit être sérieusement menacé pour justifier des ordonnances de mise sous scellés dans le présent pourvoi, l’ordre public englobe un large éventail de principes généraux et de normes impératives qu’un législateur et les tribunaux considèrent comme fondamentaux pour une société donnée (voir *Goulet c. Cie d’Assurance-Vie Transamerica du Canada*, 2002 CSC 21, [2002] 1 R.C.S. 719, par. 42-44, citant *Godbout c. Longueuil (Ville de)*, [1995] R.J.Q. 2561 (C.A.), p. 2570, conf. par [1997] 3 R.C.S. 844). Comme l’a écrit un juge québécois en renvoyant à l’arrêt *Sierra Club* avant l’adoption de l’art. 12 C.p.c., l’intérêt doit être considéré comme étant défini « en termes d’intérêt public à la confidentialité » (voir *3834310 Canada inc.*, par. 24, le juge Gendreau s’exprimant au nom de la Cour d’appel). Parmi les diverses considérations qui composent la notion d’ordre public et d’autres intérêts légitimes évoqués par l’art. 12 C.p.c., il est significatif que la dignité, et non une référence générale à la vie privée, au préjudice ou à l’accès à la justice, se soit vu accorder une place de choix. En effet, c’est cet aspect restreint de la vie privée considéré comme un droit fondamental que les tribunaux ont retenu avant l’adoption de l’art. 12 C.p.c. — « ce qui fait partie de la vie intime de la personne, bref ce qui constitue un

CanLII 3132 (Que. C.A.), at para. 20, per Rothman J.A.).

[68] The “preservation of the dignity of the persons involved” is now consecrated as the archetypal public order interest in art. 12 *C.C.P.* It is the exemplar of the *Sierra Club* important public interest in confidentiality that stands as justification for an exception to openness (S. Rochette and J.-F. Côté, “Article 12”, in L. Chamberland, ed., *Le grand collectif: Code de procédure civile — Commentaires et annotations* (5th ed. 2020), vol. 1, at p. 102; D. Ferland and B. Emery, *Précis de procédure civile du Québec* (6th ed. 2020), vol. 1, at para. 1-111). Dignity gives concrete expression to this public order interest because all of society has a stake in its preservation, notwithstanding its personal connections to the individuals concerned. This codification of *Sierra Club*’s notion of important public interest highlights the superordinate importance of human dignity and the appropriateness of limiting court openness on this basis as against an overbroad understanding of privacy that might be otherwise unsuitable to the open court context.

[69] Consistent with this idea, understanding privacy as predicated on dignity has been advanced as useful in connection with challenges brought by digital communications (K. Eltis, “The Judicial System in the Digital Age: Revisiting the Relationship between Privacy and Accessibility in the Cyber Context” (2011), 56 *McGill L.J.* 289, at p. 314).

[70] It is also significant, in my view, that the application judge in this case explicitly recognized, in response to the relevant arguments from the Trustees, an interest in “protecting the privacy and dignity of victims of crime and their loved ones” (para. 23 (emphasis added)). This elucidates that the central concern for the affected individuals on this point is not merely protecting their privacy for its own sake but privacy where it coincides with the public character of the dignity interests of these individuals.

cercle personnel irréductible » (*Godbout*, p. 2569, le juge Baudouin; voir également *A. c. B.*, 1990 CanLII 3132 (C.A. Qc), par. 20, le juge Rothman).

[68] La « protection de la dignité des personnes concernées » est désormais consacrée comme l’archétype de l’intérêt d’ordre public à l’art. 12 *C.p.c.* C’est le modèle de l’intérêt public important à la confidentialité de *Sierra Club* qui sert à justifier une exception à la publicité des débats (S. Rochette et J.-F. Côté, « Article 12 », dans L. Chamberland, dir., *Le grand collectif: Code de procédure civile — Commentaires et annotations* (5^e éd. 2020), vol. 1, p. 102; D. Ferland et B. Emery, *Précis de procédure civile du Québec* (6^e éd. 2020), vol. 1, par. 1-111). La dignité donne une expression concrète à cet intérêt d’ordre public parce que toute la société a intérêt à ce qu’elle soit protégée, malgré ses liens personnels avec les personnes touchées. Cette codification de la notion d’intérêt public important de *Sierra Club* souligne l’importance primordiale de la dignité humaine et la pertinence de limiter la publicité des débats judiciaires sur ce fondement au lieu de donner une interprétation trop large à la vie privée qui pourrait par ailleurs ne pas convenir au contexte de la publicité des débats.

[69] Dans le même ordre d’idée, on a fait valoir qu’il est utile de considérer que la vie privée se fonde sur la dignité dans le contexte des défis que posent les communications numériques (K. Eltis, « The Judicial System in the Digital Age : Revisiting the Relationship between Privacy and Accessibility in the Cyber Context » (2011), 56 *R.D. McGill* 289, p. 314).

[70] Il est également significatif, à mon avis, que le juge de première instance en l’espèce ait explicitement reconnu, en réponse aux arguments pertinents des fiduciaires, un intérêt à [TRADUCTION] « la protection de la vie privée et de la dignité des victimes d’actes criminels ainsi que de leurs êtres chers » (par. 23 (je souligne)). Cela montre clairement que la préoccupation centrale des personnes touchées à cet égard n’est pas simplement de protéger leur vie privée en tant que telle, mais bien de protéger leur vie privée là où elle coïncide avec le caractère public de leurs intérêts en matière de dignité.

[71] Violations of privacy that cause a loss of control over fundamental personal information about oneself are damaging to dignity because they erode one's ability to present aspects of oneself to others in a selective manner (D. Matheson, "Dignity and Selective Self-Presentation", in I. Kerr, V. Steeves and C. Lucock, eds., *Lessons from the Identity Trail: Anonymity, Privacy and Identity in a Networked Society* (2009), 319, at pp. 327-28; L. M. Austin, "Re-reading Westin" (2019), 20 *Theor. Inq. L.* 53, at pp. 66-68; Eltis (2016), at p. 13). Dignity, used in this context, is a social concept that involves presenting core aspects of oneself to others in a considered and controlled manner (see generally Matheson, at pp. 327-28; Austin, at pp. 66-68). Dignity is eroded where individuals lose control over this core identity-giving information about themselves, because a highly sensitive aspect of who they are that they did not consciously decide to share is now available to others and may shape how they are seen in public. This was even alluded to by La Forest J., dissenting but not on this point, in *Dagg*, where he referred to privacy as "[a]n expression of an individual's unique personality or personhood" (para. 65).

[72] Where dignity is impaired, the impact on the individual is not theoretical but could engender real human consequences, including psychological distress (see generally *Bragg*, at para. 23). La Forest J., concurring, observed in *Dyment* that privacy is essential to the well-being of individuals (p. 427). Viewed in this way, a privacy interest, where it shields the core information associated with dignity necessary to individual well-being, begins to look much like the physical safety interest also raised in this case, the important and public nature of which is neither debated, nor, in my view, seriously debatable. The administration of justice suffers when the operation of courts threatens physical well-being because a responsible court system is attuned to the physical harm it inflicts on individuals and works to avoid such effects. Similarly, in my view, a responsible

[71] Les atteintes à la vie privée qui entraînent une perte de contrôle à l'égard de renseignements personnels fondamentaux peuvent porter préjudice à la dignité d'une personne, car elles minent sa capacité à présenter de manière sélective certains aspects de sa personne aux autres (D. Matheson, « Dignity and Selective Self-Presentation », dans I. Kerr, V. Steeves et C. Lucock, dir., *Lessons from the Identity Trail : Anonymity, Privacy and Identity in a Networked Society* (2009), 319, p. 327-328; L. M. Austin, « Re-reading Westin » (2019), 20 *Theor. Inq. L.* 53, p. 66-68; Eltis (2016), p. 13). La dignité, employée dans ce contexte, est un concept social qui consiste à présenter des aspects fondamentaux de soi-même aux autres de manière réfléchie et contrôlée (voir de manière générale Matheson, p. 327-328; Austin, p. 66-68). La dignité est minée lorsque les personnes perdent le contrôle sur la possibilité de fournir des renseignements sur elles-mêmes qui touchent leur identité fondamentale, car un aspect très sensible de qui elles sont qu'elles n'ont pas décidé consciemment de communiquer est désormais accessible à autrui et risque de façonner la manière dont elles sont perçues en public. Cela a même été évoqué par le juge La Forest, dissident mais non sur ce point, dans l'arrêt *Dagg*, lorsqu'il a parlé de la notion de vie privée comme « [é]tant l'expression de la personnalité ou de l'identité unique d'une personne » (par. 65).

[72] En cas d'atteinte à la dignité, l'incidence sur la personne n'est pas théorique, mais pourrait entraîner des conséquences humaines réelles, y compris une détresse psychologique (voir de manière générale *Bragg*, par. 23). Dans l'arrêt *Dyment*, le juge La Forest a fait remarquer dans ses motifs concordants que la notion de vie privée est essentielle au bien-être d'une personne (p. 427). Vu sous cet angle, un intérêt en matière de vie privée, lorsqu'il protège les renseignements fondamentaux associés à la dignité qui est nécessaire au bien-être d'une personne, commence à ressembler beaucoup à l'intérêt relatif à la sécurité physique également soulevé en l'espèce, dont la nature importante et publique n'est pas débattue, et n'est pas non plus, selon moi, sérieusement discutable. Lorsque le fonctionnement des tribunaux menace le bien-être physique d'une

court must be attuned and responsive to the harm it causes to other core elements of individual well-being, including individual dignity. This parallel helps to understand dignity as a more limited dimension of privacy relevant as an important public interest in the open court context.

[73] I am accordingly of the view that protecting individuals from the threat to their dignity that arises when information revealing core aspects of their private lives is disseminated through open court proceedings is an important public interest for the purposes of the test.

[74] Focusing on the underlying value of privacy in protecting individual dignity from the exposure of private information in open court overcomes the criticisms that privacy will always be at risk in open court proceedings and is theoretically complex. Openness brings intrusions on personal privacy in virtually all cases, but dignity as a public interest in protecting an individual's core sensibility is more rarely in play. Specifically, and consistent with the cautious approach to the recognition of important public interests, this privacy interest, while determined in reference to the broader factual setting, will be at serious risk only where the sensitivity of the information strikes at the subject's more intimate self.

[75] If the interest is ultimately about safeguarding a person's dignity, that interest will be undermined when the information reveals something sensitive about them as an individual, as opposed to generic information that reveals little if anything about who they are as a person. Therefore the information that will be revealed by court openness must consist of

personne, l'administration de la justice en souffre, car un système judiciaire responsable est sensible aux dommages physiques qu'il inflige aux individus et s'efforce d'éviter de tels effets. De même, j'estime qu'un tribunal responsable doit être sensible et attentif aux dommages qu'il cause à d'autres éléments fondamentaux du bien-être individuel, notamment la dignité individuelle. Ce parallèle aide à comprendre que la dignité est une dimension plus limitée de la vie privée, pertinente en tant qu'intérêt public important dans le contexte de la publicité des débats judiciaires.

[73] Je suis donc d'avis que protéger les gens contre la menace à leur dignité qu'entraîne la diffusion de renseignements révélant des aspects fondamentaux de leur vie privée dans le cadre de procédures judiciaires publiques constitue un intérêt public important pour l'application du test.

[74] Insister sur la valeur sous-jacente de la vie privée lorsqu'il s'agit de protéger la dignité d'une personne de la diffusion de renseignements privés dans le cadre de débats judiciaires publics permet de surmonter les critiques selon lesquelles la vie privée sera toujours menacée dans un tel cadre et constitue une notion théoriquement complexe. La publicité des débats donne lieu à des atteintes à la vie privée personnelle dans presque tous les cas, mais la dignité en tant qu'intérêt public dans la protection de la sensibilité fondamentale d'une personne entre plus rarement en jeu. Plus précisément, et conformément à l'approche prudente servant à reconnaître des intérêts publics importants, cet intérêt en matière de vie privée, bien qu'il soit déterminé par rapport au contexte factuel plus large, ne sera sérieusement menacé que lorsque le caractère sensible des renseignements touche à l'aspect le plus intime de la personne.

[75] S'il porte essentiellement sur la protection de la dignité d'une personne, cet intérêt sera miné dans le cas de renseignements qui révèlent quelque chose de sensible sur elle en tant qu'individu, par opposition à des renseignements d'ordre général révélant peu ou rien sur ce qu'elle est en tant que personne. Par conséquent, les renseignements qui

intimate or personal details about an individual — what this Court has described in its jurisprudence on s. 8 of the *Charter* as the “biographical core” — if a serious risk to an important public interest is to be recognized in this context (*R. v. Plant*, [1993] 3 S.C.R. 281, at p. 293; *R. v. Tessling*, 2004 SCC 67, [2004] 3 S.C.R. 432, at para. 60; *R. v. Cole*, 2012 SCC 53, [2012] 3 S.C.R. 34, at para. 46). Dignity transcends personal inconvenience by reason of the highly sensitive nature of the information that might be revealed. This Court in *Cole* drew a similar line between the sensitivity of personal information and the public interest in protecting that information in reference to the biographical core. It held that “reasonable and informed Canadians” would be more willing to recognize the existence of a privacy interest where the relevant information cuts to the “biographical core” or, “[p]ut another way, the more personal and confidential the information” (para. 46). The presumption of openness means that mere discomfort associated with lesser intrusions of privacy will generally be tolerated. But there is a public interest in ensuring that openness does not unduly entail the dissemination of this core information that threatens dignity — even if it is “personal” to the affected person.

[76] The test for discretionary limits on court openness imposes on the applicant the burden to show that the important public interest is at serious risk. Recognizing that privacy, understood in reference to dignity, is only at serious risk where the information in the court file is sufficiently sensitive erects a threshold consistent with the presumption of openness. This threshold is fact specific. It addresses the concern, noted above, that personal information can frequently be found in court files and yet finding this sufficient to pass the serious risk threshold in every case would undermine the structure of the test. By requiring the applicant to demonstrate the sensitivity

seront révélés en raison de la publicité des débats judiciaires doivent être constitués de détails intimes ou personnels concernant une personne — ce que notre Cour a décrit, dans sa jurisprudence relative à l’art. 8 de la *Charte*, comme le cœur même des « renseignements biographiques » — pour qu’un risque sérieux pour un intérêt public important soit reconnu dans ce contexte (*R. c. Plant*, [1993] 3 R.C.S. 281, p. 293; *R. c. Tessling*, 2004 CSC 67, [2004] 3 R.C.S. 432, par. 60; *R. c. Cole*, 2012 CSC 53, [2012] 3 R.C.S. 34, par. 46). La dignité transcende les inconvénients personnels en raison de la nature très sensible des renseignements qui pourraient être révélés. Notre Cour a tracé dans l’arrêt *Cole* une ligne de démarcation similaire entre le caractère sensible des renseignements personnels et l’intérêt du public à protéger ces renseignements en ce qui a trait au cœur même des renseignements biographiques. Elle a conclu que « les Canadiens raisonnables et bien informés » seraient plus disposés à reconnaître l’existence d’un intérêt en matière de vie privée lorsque les renseignements pertinents concernent le cœur même des « renseignements biographiques » ou, « [a]utrement dit, plus les renseignements sont personnels et confidentiels » (par. 46). La présomption de publicité des débats signifie que le simple désagrément associé à des atteintes moindres à la vie privée sera généralement toléré. Cependant, il est dans l’intérêt public de veiller à ce que cette publicité n’entraîne pas indûment la diffusion de ces renseignements fondamentaux qui menacent la dignité — même s’ils sont « personnels » pour la personne touchée.

[76] Selon le test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires, il incombe au demandeur de démontrer que l’intérêt public important est sérieusement menacé. Reconnaître que la vie privée, considérée au regard de la dignité, n’est sérieusement menacée que lorsque les renseignements contenus dans le dossier judiciaire sont suffisamment sensibles permet d’établir un seuil compatible avec la présomption de publicité des débats. Ce seuil est tributaire des faits. Il répond à la préoccupation, mentionnée précédemment, portant que les dossiers judiciaires comportent fréquemment des renseignements personnels, mais conclure que cela suffit à franchir le

of the information as a necessary condition to the finding of a serious risk to this interest, the scope of the interest is limited to only those cases where the rationale for not revealing core aspects of a person's private life, namely protecting individual dignity, is most actively engaged.

[77] There is no need here to provide an exhaustive catalogue of the range of sensitive personal information that, if exposed, could give rise to a serious risk. It is enough to say that courts have demonstrated a willingness to recognize the sensitivity of information related to stigmatized medical conditions (see, e.g., *A.B.*, at para. 9), stigmatized work (see, e.g., *Work Safe Twerk Safe v. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario*, 2021 ONSC 1100, at para. 28 (CanLII)), sexual orientation (see, e.g., *Paterson*, at paras. 76, 78 and 87-88), and subjection to sexual assault or harassment (see, e.g., *Fedeli v. Brown*, 2020 ONSC 994, at para. 9 (CanLII)). I would also note the submission of the intervener the Income Security Advocacy Centre, that detailed information about family structure and work history could in some circumstances constitute sensitive information. The question in every case is whether the information reveals something intimate and personal about the individual, their lifestyle or their experiences.

[78] I pause here to note that I refer to cases on s. 8 of the *Charter* above for the limited purpose of providing insight into types of information that are more or less personal and therefore deserving of public protection. If the impact on dignity as a result of disclosure is to be accurately measured, it is critical that the analysis differentiate between information in this way. Helpfully, one factor in determining whether an applicant's subjective expectation of privacy is objectively reasonable in the s. 8 jurisprudence focuses

seuil du risque sérieux dans tous les cas mettrait en péril la structure du test. Exiger du demandeur qu'il démontre le caractère sensible des renseignements comme condition nécessaire à la conclusion d'un risque sérieux pour cet intérêt a pour effet de limiter le champ d'application de l'intérêt aux seuls cas où la justification de la non-divulgation des aspects fondamentaux de la vie privée d'une personne, à savoir la protection de la dignité individuelle, est fortement en jeu.

[77] Il n'est aucunement nécessaire en l'espèce de fournir une liste exhaustive de l'étendue des renseignements personnels sensibles qui, s'ils étaient diffusés, pourraient entraîner un risque sérieux. Qu'il suffise de dire que les tribunaux ont démontré la volonté de reconnaître le caractère sensible des renseignements liés à des problèmes de santé stigmatisés (voir, p. ex., *A.B.*, par. 9), à un travail stigmatisé (voir, p. ex., *Work Safe Twerk Safe c. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario*, 2021 ONSC 1100, par. 28 (CanLII)), à l'orientation sexuelle (voir, p. ex., *Paterson*, par. 76, 78 et 87-88), et au fait d'avoir été victime d'agression sexuelle ou de harcèlement (voir, p. ex., *Fedeli c. Brown*, 2020 ONSC 994, par. 9 (CanLII)). Je prends acte également de l'observation du Centre d'action pour la sécurité du revenu, intervenant, selon laquelle des renseignements détaillés quant à la structure familiale et aux antécédents professionnels pourraient, dans certaines circonstances, constituer des renseignements sensibles. Dans chaque cas, il faut se demander si les renseignements révèlent quelque chose d'intime et de personnel sur la personne, son mode de vie ou ses expériences.

[78] Je marque ici un temps d'arrêt pour souligner que je renvoie ci-dessus aux décisions relatives à l'art. 8 de la *Charte* à seule fin de donner une idée des types de renseignements qui sont plus ou moins personnels et qui méritent donc une protection publique. Pour mesurer avec précision l'incidence de la divulgation sur la dignité, il est essentiel que l'analyse différencie ainsi les renseignements. Ce qui est utile, c'est que l'un des facteurs permettant de déterminer si l'attente subjective d'un demandeur en

on the degree to which information is private (see, e.g., *R. v. Marakah*, 2017 SCC 59, [2017] 2 S.C.R. 608, at para. 31; *Cole*, at paras. 44-46). But while these decisions may assist for this limited purpose, this is not to say that the remainder of the s. 8 analysis has any relevance to the application of the test for discretionary limits on court openness. For example, asking what the Trustees' reasonable expectation of privacy was here could invite a circular analysis of whether they reasonably expected their court files to be open to the public or whether they reasonably expected to be successful in having them sealed. Therefore, it is only for the limited purpose described above that the s. 8 jurisprudence is useful.

[79] 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. While this is obviously a fact-specific determination, some general observations may be made here to guide this assessment.

[80] I note that the seriousness of the risk may be affected by the extent to which information would be disseminated without an exception to the open court principle. If the applicant raises a risk that the personal information will come to be known by a large segment of the public in the absence of an order, this is a plainly more serious risk than if the result will be that a handful of people become aware of the same information, all else being equal. In the past, the requirement that one be physically present to acquire information in open court or from a court record meant that information was, to some extent, protected because it was "practically obscure" (D. S. Ardia, "Privacy and Court Records: Online Access and the Loss of Practical Obscurity" (2017), 4 *U. Ill. L. Rev.* 1385, at p. 1396). However, today,

matière de vie privée est objectivement raisonnable dans la jurisprudence relative à l'art. 8 met l'accent sur la mesure dans laquelle les renseignements sont privés (voir, p. ex., *R. c. Marakah*, 2017 CSC 59, [2017] 2 R.C.S. 608, par. 31; *Cole*, par. 44-46). Cependant, bien que la consultation de ces décisions puisse être avantageuse à cette fin précise, cela ne veut pas dire que le reste de l'analyse relative à l'art. 8 est pertinent pour l'application du test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats. Par exemple, demander aux fiduciaires quelle était leur attente raisonnable en matière de vie privée en l'espèce pourrait entraîner une analyse circulaire visant à déterminer s'ils s'attendaient raisonnablement à ce que leurs dossiers judiciaires soient accessibles au public ou s'ils s'attendaient raisonnablement à réussir à obtenir leur mise sous scellés. En conséquence, la jurisprudence relative à l'art. 8 n'est utile qu'à la fin décrite ci-dessus.

[79] Dans les cas où les renseignements sont suffisamment sensibles pour toucher au cœur même des renseignements biographiques d'une personne, le tribunal doit alors se demander si le contexte factuel global de l'affaire permet d'établir l'existence d'un risque sérieux pour l'intérêt en cause. Bien qu'il s'agisse manifestement d'une question de fait, il est possible de faire certaines observations générales en l'espèce pour guider cette appréciation.

[80] Je souligne que la mesure dans laquelle les renseignements seraient diffusés en l'absence d'une exception au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires peut avoir une incidence sur le caractère sérieux du risque. Si le demandeur invoque le risque que les renseignements personnels en viennent à être connus par un large segment de la population en l'absence d'une ordonnance, il s'agit manifestement d'un risque plus sérieux que si le résultat était qu'une poignée de personnes prendrait connaissance des mêmes renseignements, toutes autres choses étant égales par ailleurs. Par le passé, l'obligation d'être physiquement présent pour obtenir des renseignements dans le cadre de débats judiciaires publics ou à partir d'un dossier judiciaire signifiait que les renseignements étaient, dans une certaine

courts should be sensitive to the information technology context, which has increased the ease with which information can be communicated and cross-referenced (see Bailey and Burkell, at pp. 169-70; Ardia, at pp. 1450-51). In this context, it may well be difficult for courts to be sure that information will not be broadly disseminated in the absence of an order.

[81] It will be appropriate, of course, to consider the extent to which information is already in the public domain. If court openness will simply make available what is already broadly and easily accessible, it will be difficult to show that revealing the information in open court will actually result in a meaningful loss of that aspect of privacy relating to the dignity interest to which I refer here. However, just because information is already accessible to some segment of the public does not mean that making it available through the court process will not exacerbate the risk to privacy. Privacy is not a binary concept, that is, information is not simply either private or public, especially because, by reason of technology in particular, absolute confidentiality is best thought of as elusive (see generally *R. v. Quesnelle*, 2014 SCC 46, [2014] 2 S.C.R. 390, at para. 37; *UFCW*, at para. 27). The fact that certain information is already available somewhere in the public sphere does not preclude further harm to the privacy interest by additional dissemination, particularly if the feared dissemination of highly sensitive information is broader or more easily accessible (see generally Solove, at p. 1152; Ardia, at p. 1393-94; E. Paton-Simpson, “Privacy and the Reasonable Paranoid: The Protection of Privacy in Public Places” (2000), 50 *U.T.L.J.* 305, at p. 346).

mesure, protégés parce qu'ils n'étaient [TRADUCTION] « pratiquement pas connus » (D. S. Ardia, « Privacy and Court Records : Online Access and the Loss of Practical Obscurity » (2017), 4 *U. Ill. L. Rev.* 1385, p. 1396). Cependant, aujourd’hui, les tribunaux devraient prendre en considération le contexte des technologies de l’information, qui a facilité la communication de renseignements et le renvoi à ceux-ci (voir Bailey et Burkell, p. 169-170; Ardia, p. 1450-1451). Dans ce contexte, il peut fort bien être difficile pour les tribunaux d’avoir la certitude que les renseignements ne seront pas largement diffusés en l’absence d’une ordonnance.

[81] Il y aura lieu, bien sûr, d'examiner la mesure dans laquelle les renseignements font déjà partie du domaine public. Si la tenue de procédures judiciaires publiques ne fait que rendre accessibles ce qui est déjà largement et facilement accessible, il sera difficile de démontrer que la divulgation des renseignements dans le cadre de débats judiciaires publics entraînera effectivement une atteinte significative à cet aspect de la vie privée se rapportant à l'intérêt en matière de dignité auquel je fais référence en l'espèce. Cependant, le seul fait que des renseignements soient déjà accessibles à un segment de la population ne signifie pas que les rendre accessibles dans le cadre d'une procédure judiciaire n'exacerbera pas le risque pour la vie privée. La vie privée n'est pas une notion binaire, c'est-à-dire que les renseignements ne sont pas simplement soit privés, soit publics, d'autant plus que, en raison de la technologie en particulier, il vaut mieux considérer la confidentialité absolue comme difficile à atteindre (voir, de manière générale, *R. c. Quesnelle*, 2014 CSC 46, [2014] 2 R.C.S. 390, par. 37; TTUAC, par. 27). Le fait que certains renseignements soient déjà accessibles quelque part dans la sphère publique n'empêche pas qu'une diffusion additionnelle de ceux-ci puisse nuire davantage à l'intérêt en matière de vie privée, en particulier si la diffusion appréhendée de renseignements très sensibles est plus large ou d'accès plus facile (voir de manière générale Solove, p. 1152; Ardia, p. 1393-1394; E. Paton-Simpson, « Privacy and the Reasonable Paranoid : The Protection of Privacy in Public Places » (2000), 50 *U.T.L.J.* 305, p. 346).

[82] Further, the seriousness of the risk is also affected by the probability that the dissemination the applicant suggests will occur actually occurs. I hasten to say that implicit in the notion of risk is that the applicant need not establish that the feared dissemination will certainly occur. However, the risk to the privacy interest related to the protection of dignity will be more serious the more likely it is that the information will be disseminated. While decided in a different context, this Court has held that the magnitude of risk is a product of both the gravity of the feared harm and its probability (*R. v. Mabior*, 2012 SCC 47, [2012] 2 S.C.R. 584, at para. 86).

[83] That said, the likelihood that an individual's highly sensitive personal information will be disseminated in the absence of privacy protection will be difficult to quantify precisely. It is best to note as well that probability in this context need not be identified in mathematical or numerical terms. Rather, courts may merely discern probability in light of the totality of the circumstances and balance this one factor alongside other relevant factors.

[84] Finally, and as discussed above, individual sensitivities alone, even if they can be notionally associated with "privacy", are generally insufficient to justify a restriction on court openness where they do not rise above those inconveniences and discomforts that are inherent to court openness (*MacIntyre*, at p. 185). An applicant will only be able to establish that the risk is sufficient to justify a limit on openness in exceptional cases, where the threatened loss of control over information about oneself is so fundamental that it strikes meaningfully at individual dignity. These circumstances engage "social values of superordinate importance" beyond the more ordinary intrusions inherent to participating in the judicial process that Dickson J. acknowledged could justify curtailing public openness (pp. 186-87).

[82] De plus, la probabilité que la diffusion évoquée par le demandeur se produise réellement a également une incidence sur le caractère sérieux du risque. Je m'emprise de dire qu'il est implicite dans la notion de risque que le demandeur n'a pas besoin d'établir que la diffusion appréhendée se produira assurément. Cependant, plus la probabilité de diffusion des renseignements est grande, plus le risque pour l'intérêt en matière de vie privée lié à la protection de la dignité sera sérieux. Bien qu'elle l'ait fait dans un contexte différent, la Cour a déjà conclu que l'ampleur du risque est le fruit de la gravité du préjudice appréhendé et de sa probabilité (*R. c. Mabior*, 2012 CSC 47, [2012] 2 R.C.S. 584, par. 86).

[83] Cela dit, la probabilité que les renseignements personnels très sensibles d'une personne soient diffusés en l'absence de mesures de protection de la vie privée sera difficile à quantifier avec précision. Il convient également de souligner que la probabilité dans ce contexte n'a pas à être quantifiée en termes mathématiques ou numériques. Les tribunaux peuvent plutôt simplement déterminer cette probabilité à la lumière de l'ensemble des circonstances et mettre en balance ce facteur avec d'autres facteurs pertinents.

[84] Enfin, rappelons que la susceptibilité individuelle à elle seule, même si elle peut théoriquement être associée à la notion de « vie privée », est généralement insuffisante pour justifier de restreindre la publicité des débats judiciaires lorsqu'elle ne dépasse pas les inconvénients et les désagréments inhérents à la publicité des débats (*MacIntyre*, p. 185). Un demandeur ne pourra établir que le risque est suffisant pour justifier une limite à la publicité des débats que dans des cas exceptionnels, lorsque la perte de contrôle appréhendée des renseignements le concernant est fondamentale au point de porter atteinte de manière significative à sa dignité individuelle. Ces circonstances mettent en jeu « des valeurs sociales qui ont préséance », qui vont au-delà des atteintes plus ordinaires propres à la participation à une procédure judiciaire et qui, comme l'a reconnu le juge Dickson, pourraient justifier de restreindre la publicité des débats (p. 186-187).

[85] To summarize, the important public interest in privacy, as understood in the context of the limits on court openness, is aimed at allowing individuals to preserve control over their core identity in the public sphere to the extent necessary to preserve their dignity. The public has a stake in openness, to be sure, but it also has an interest in the preservation of dignity: the administration of justice requires that where dignity is threatened in this way, measures be taken to accommodate this privacy concern. Although measured by reference to the facts of each case, the risk to this interest will be serious only where the information that would be disseminated as a result of court openness is sufficiently sensitive such that openness can be shown to meaningfully strike at the individual's biographical core in a manner that threatens their integrity. Recognizing this interest is consistent with this Court's emphasis on the importance of privacy and the underlying value of individual dignity, but is also tailored to preserve the strong presumption of openness.

D. *The Trustees Have Failed to Establish a Serious Risk to an Important Public Interest*

[86] As *Sierra Club* made plain, a discretionary order limiting court openness can only be made where there is a serious risk to an important public interest. The arguments on this appeal concerned whether privacy is an important public interest and whether the facts here disclose the existence of serious risks to privacy and safety. While the broad privacy interest invoked by the Trustees cannot be relied on to justify a limit on openness, the narrower concept of privacy understood in relation to dignity is an important public interest for the purposes of the test. I also recognize that a risk to physical safety is an important public interest, a point on which there is no dispute here. Accordingly, the relevant question at the first step is whether there is a serious risk to one or both of these interests. For reasons that follow, the Trustees have failed to establish a serious risk to

[85] En résumé, l'intérêt public important en matière de vie privée, tel qu'il est considéré dans le contexte des limites à la publicité des débats, vise à permettre aux personnes de garder un contrôle sur leur identité fondamentale dans la sphère publique dans la mesure nécessaire pour protéger leur dignité. Le public a certainement un intérêt dans la publicité des débats, mais il a aussi un intérêt dans la protection de la dignité : l'administration de la justice exige que, lorsque la dignité est menacée de cette façon, des mesures puissent être prises pour tenir compte de cette préoccupation en matière de vie privée. Bien qu'il soit évalué en fonction des faits de chaque cas, le risque pour cet intérêt ne sera sérieux que lorsque les renseignements qui seraient diffusés en raison de la publicité des débats judiciaires sont suffisamment sensibles pour que l'on puisse démontrer que la publicité porte atteinte de façon significative au cœur même des renseignements biographiques de la personne d'une manière qui menace son intégrité. La reconnaissance de cet intérêt est conforme à l'accent mis par la Cour sur l'importance de la vie privée et de la valeur sous-jacente de la dignité individuelle, tout en permettant aussi de maintenir la forte présomption de publicité des débats.

D. *Les fiduciaires n'ont pas établi l'existence d'un risque sérieux pour un intérêt public important*

[86] Comme il a été clairement indiqué dans *Sierra Club*, une ordonnance discrétionnaire ayant pour effet de limiter la publicité des débats judiciaires ne peut être rendue qu'en présence d'un risque sérieux pour un intérêt public important. Les arguments soulevés dans le présent pourvoi portaient sur la question de savoir si la vie privée constitue un intérêt public important et si les faits en l'espèce révèlent l'existence de risques sérieux pour la vie privée et la sécurité. Bien que le large intérêt en matière de vie privée que font valoir les fiduciaires ne puisse être invoqué pour justifier une limite à la publicité des débats, la notion plus restreinte de vie privée considérée au regard de la dignité constitue un intérêt public important pour l'application du test. Je reconnais aussi qu'un risque pour la sécurité physique représente un intérêt public important, un point qui n'est pas

either. This alone is sufficient to conclude that the sealing orders should not have been issued.

(1) The Risk to Privacy Alleged in this Case Is Not Serious

[87] As I have said, the important public interest in privacy must be understood as one tailored to the protection of individual dignity and not the broadly defined interest the Trustees have asked this Court to recognize. In order to establish a serious risk to this interest, the information in the court files about which the Trustees are concerned must be sufficiently sensitive in that it strikes at the biographical core of the affected individuals. If it is not, there is no serious risk that would justify an exception to openness. If it is, the question becomes whether a serious risk is made out in light of the facts of this case.

[88] The application judge never explicitly identified a serious risk to the privacy interest he identified but, to the extent he implicitly reached this conclusion, I respectfully do not share his view. His finding was limited to the observation that “[t]he degree of intrusion on that privacy and dignity [i.e., that of the victims and their loved ones] has already been extreme and, I am sure, excruciating” (para. 23). But the intense scrutiny faced by the Shermans up to the time of the application is only part of the equation. As the sealing orders can only protect against the disclosure of the information in these court files relating to probate, the application judge was required to consider the sensitivity of the specific information they contained. He made no such measure. His conclusion about the seriousness of the risk then focused entirely on the risk of physical harm, with

contesté en l’espèce. Par conséquent, la question pertinente à la première étape est celle de savoir s’il existe un risque sérieux pour l’un de ces intérêts ou pour ces deux intérêts. Pour les motifs qui suivent, les fiduciaires n’ont pas établi l’existence d’un risque sérieux pour l’un ou l’autre de ces intérêts. Cela suffit en soi pour conclure que les ordonnances de mise sous scellés n’auraient pas dû être rendues.

(1) Le risque pour la vie privée allégué en l’espèce n’est pas sérieux

[87] Comme je l’ai déjà dit, l’intérêt public important en matière de vie privée doit être considéré comme un intérêt propre à la protection de la dignité individuelle et non comme l’intérêt largement défini que les fiduciaires ont demandé à la Cour de reconnaître. Pour établir l’existence d’un risque sérieux à l’égard de cet intérêt, les renseignements contenus dans les dossiers judiciaires qui préoccupent les fiduciaires doivent être suffisamment sensibles du fait qu’ils touchent au cœur même des renseignements biographiques des personnes touchées. Si ce n’est pas le cas, il n’y a pas de risque sérieux qui justifierait une exception à la publicité des débats. Si, par contre, c’est le cas, il faut alors se demander si les faits de l’espèce permettent d’établir l’existence d’un risque sérieux.

[88] Le juge de première instance n’a jamais explicitement constaté de risque sérieux pour l’intérêt en matière de vie privée qu’il a relevé, mais, dans la mesure où il est implicitement arrivé à cette conclusion, je ne puis, en toute déférence, partager son point de vue. Sa conclusion se limitait à l’observation selon laquelle [TRADUCTION] « [I]l degré d’atteinte à cette vie privée et à cette dignité [c.-à-d. celle des victimes et de leurs êtres chers] est déjà extrême et, j’en suis sûr, insoutenable » (par. 23). Cependant, l’attention intense dont les Sherman ont fait l’objet jusqu’à la présentation de leur demande n’est qu’une partie de l’équation. Comme les ordonnances de mise sous scellés ne peuvent qu’offrir une protection contre la divulgation des renseignements contenus dans les dossiers judiciaires se rapportant à l’homologation, le juge de première instance était tenu d’examiner le

no indication that he found that the Trustees met their burden as to the serious risk to the privacy interest. Said very respectfully and with the knowledge that the application judge did not have the benefit of the above framework, the failure to assess the sensitivity of the information constituted a failure to consider a required element of the legal test. This warranted intervention on appeal.

[89] Applying the appropriate framework to the facts of this case, I conclude that the risk to the important public interest in the affected individuals' privacy, as I have defined it above in reference to dignity, is not serious. The information the Trustees seek to protect is not highly sensitive and this alone is sufficient to conclude that there is no serious risk to the important public interest in privacy so defined.

[90] There is little controversy in this case about the likelihood and extent of dissemination of the information contained in the estate files. There is near certainty that the Toronto Star will publish at least some aspects of the estate files if it is provided access. Given the breadth of the audience of its media organization, and the high-profile nature of the events surrounding the death of the Shermans, I have no difficulty in concluding that the affected individuals would lose control over this information to a significant extent should the files be open.

[91] With regard to the sensitivity of the information, however, the information contained in these files does not reveal anything particularly private about the affected individuals. What would be revealed might well cause inconvenience and perhaps embarrassment, but it has not been shown that it would strike at their biographical core in a way that

caractère sensible des renseignements précis qu'ils contenaient. Or, il n'a pas procédé à une telle appréciation. Sa conclusion sur le caractère sérieux du risque s'est alors entièrement concentrée sur le risque de préjudice physique, alors que rien n'indiquait qu'il avait conclu que les fiduciaires s'étaient acquittés de leur fardeau quant à la démonstration d'un risque sérieux pour l'intérêt en matière de vie privée. En toute déférence, et en sachant qu'il ne disposait pas du cadre d'analyse précédemment exposé, j'estime qu'en n'examinant pas le caractère sensible des renseignements, le juge de première instance a omis de se pencher sur un élément nécessaire du test juridique. Cela justifiait une intervention en appel.

[89] En appliquant le cadre approprié aux faits de la présente affaire, je conclus que le risque pour l'intérêt public important à l'égard de la vie privée des personnes touchées, que j'ai défini précédemment au regard de la dignité, n'est pas sérieux. Les renseignements que les fiduciaires cherchent à protéger ne sont pas très sensibles, ce qui suffit en soi pour conclure qu'il n'y a pas de risque sérieux pour l'intérêt public important en matière de vie privée ainsi défini.

[90] Il y a peu de controverse en l'espèce sur la probabilité de diffusion des renseignements contenus dans les dossiers de succession et sur l'étendue de cette diffusion. Il est presque certain que le Toronto Star publiera au moins certains aspects des dossiers de succession si on lui en donne l'accès. Compte tenu de l'important auditoire de l'entreprise médiatique en cause et de la nature très médiatisée des événements entourant la mort des Sherman, je n'ai aucune difficulté à conclure que les personnes touchées perdraient, dans une large mesure, le contrôle des renseignements en question si les dossiers étaient rendus accessibles.

[91] Cependant, en ce qui concerne le caractère sensible des renseignements, ceux contenus dans ces dossiers ne révèlent rien de particulièrement privé sur les personnes touchées. Ce qui serait révélé pourrait bien causer des inconvénients et peut-être de l'embarras, mais il n'a pas été démontré que la divulgation toucherait au cœur même des renseignements

would undermine their control over the expression of their identities. Their privacy would be troubled, to be sure, but the relevant privacy interest bearing on the dignity of the affected persons has not been shown to be at serious risk. At its highest, the information in these files will reveal something about the relationship between the deceased and the affected individuals, in that it may reveal to whom the deceased entrusted the administration of their estates and those who they wished or were deemed to wish to be beneficiaries of their property at death. It may also reveal some basic personal information, such as addresses. Some of the beneficiaries might well, it may fairly be presumed, bear family names other than Sherman. I am mindful that the deaths are being investigated as homicides by the Toronto Police Service. However, even in this context, none of this information provides significant insight into who they are as individuals, nor would it provoke a fundamental change in their ability to control how they are perceived by others. The fact of being linked through estate documents to victims of an unsolved murder is not in itself highly sensitive. It may be the source of discomfort but has not been shown to constitute an affront to dignity in that it does not probe deeply into the biographical core of these individuals. As a result, the Trustees have failed to establish a serious risk to an important public interest as required by *Sierra Club*.

[92] The fact that some of the affected individuals may be minors is also insufficient to cross the seriousness threshold. While the law recognizes that minors are especially vulnerable to intrusions of privacy (see *Bragg*, at para. 17), the mere fact that information concerns minors does not displace the generally applicable analysis (see, e.g., *Bragg*, at para. 11). Even taking into account the increased vulnerability of minors who may be affected individuals in the probate files, there is no evidence that

biographiques de ces personnes d'une manière qui minerait leur contrôle sur l'expression de leur identité. Leur vie privée serait certes perturbée, mais il n'a pas été démontré que l'intérêt pertinent en matière de vie privée se rapportant à la dignité des personnes touchées serait sérieusement menacé. Tout au plus, les renseignements contenus dans ces dossiers pourraient-ils révéler quelque chose sur la relation entre les défunt et les personnes touchées, en ce qu'ils pourraient dévoiler à qui les défunt ont confié l'administration de leur succession respective, et qui ils voulaient voir ou étaient présumés vouloir voir devenir héritiers de leurs biens à leur décès. Ils pourraient également révéler certaines données personnelles de base, par exemple des adresses. On peut à juste titre présumer qu'il se peut fort bien que certains des bénéficiaires portent un nom de famille autre que Sherman. Je suis conscient que les décès font l'objet d'une enquête pour homicides par le service de police de Toronto. Cependant, même dans ce contexte, aucun de ces renseignements ne donne des indications importantes sur qui ils sont en tant que personnes, et aucun d'eux n'entraînerait non plus un changement fondamental dans leur capacité à contrôler la façon dont ils sont perçus par les autres. Le fait pour des personnes d'être liées par des documents de succession aux victimes d'un meurtre non résolu n'est pas en soi un renseignement très sensible. Il peut être la source de désagréments, mais il n'a pas été démontré qu'il constitue une atteinte à la dignité, en ce qu'il ne touche pas au cœur même des renseignements biographiques de ces personnes. En conséquence, les fiduciaires n'ont pas établi l'existence d'un risque sérieux pour un intérêt public important comme l'exige l'arrêt *Sierra Club*.

[92] Le fait que certaines des personnes touchées puissent être mineures ne suffit pas non plus à franchir le seuil du caractère sérieux. Bien que le droit reconnaise que les mineurs sont particulièrement vulnérables aux atteintes à la vie privée (voir *Bragg*, par. 17), le simple fait que des renseignements concernant des mineurs n'écarte pas l'analyse généralement applicable (voir, p. ex., *Bragg*, par. 11). Même en tenant compte de la vulnérabilité accrue des mineurs pouvant être des personnes touchées

they would lose control of information about themselves that reveals something close to the core of their identities. Merely associating the beneficiaries or trustees with the Shermans' unexplained deaths is not enough to constitute a serious risk to the identified important public interest in privacy, defined in reference to dignity.

[93] Further, while the intense media scrutiny on the family following the deaths suggests that the information would likely be widely disseminated, it is not in itself indicative of the sensitivity of the information contained in the probate files.

[94] Showing that the information that would be revealed by court openness is sufficiently sensitive and private such that it goes to the biographical core of the affected individual is a necessary prerequisite to showing a serious risk to the relevant public interest aspect of privacy. The Trustees did not advance any specific reason why the contents of these files are more sensitive than they may seem at first glance. When asserting a privacy risk, it is essential to show not only that information about individuals will escape the control of the person concerned — which will be true in every case — but that this particular information concerns who the individuals are as people in a manner that undermines their dignity. This the Trustees have not done.

[95] Therefore, while some of the material in the court files may well be broadly disseminated, the nature of the information has not been shown to give rise to a serious risk to the important public interest in privacy, as appropriately defined in this context in reference to dignity. For that reason alone, I conclude that the Trustees have failed to show a serious risk to this interest.

dans les dossiers d'homologation, rien dans la preuve n'indique qu'ils perdraient le contrôle des renseignements les concernant qui révèlent quelque chose se rapprochant du cœur de leur identité. Le simple fait d'associer les bénéficiaires ou les fiduciaires à la mort inexpliquée des Sherman ne suffit pas à constituer un risque sérieux pour l'intérêt public important en matière de dignité ayant été constaté, intérêt défini au regard de la dignité.

[93] De plus, bien qu'elle indique que les renseignements seraient probablement largement diffusés, l'intense attention médiatique dont a fait l'objet la famille à la suite des décès n'est pas en soi révélatrice du caractère sensible des renseignements contenus dans les dossiers d'homologation.

[94] Démontrer que les renseignements qui seraient révélés en raison de la publicité des débats judiciaires sont suffisamment sensibles et privés pour toucher au cœur même des renseignements biographiques des personnes touchées est une condition préalable nécessaire pour établir l'existence d'un risque sérieux pour l'aspect pertinent de la vie privée relativ à l'intérêt public. Les fiduciaires n'ont pas fait valoir de raison précise pour laquelle le contenu de ces dossiers serait plus sensible qu'il n'y paraît à première vue. Lorsque l'on affirme qu'il existe un risque pour la vie privée, il est essentiel de démontrer non seulement que les renseignements qui concernent des personnes échapperont au contrôle de celles-ci — ce qui sera vrai dans tous les cas —, mais aussi que ces renseignements concernent ce qu'elles sont en tant que personnes, d'une manière qui mine leur dignité. Or, les fiduciaires n'ont pas fait cette preuve.

[95] Par conséquent, même si certains des éléments contenus dans les dossiers judiciaires peuvent fort bien être largement diffusés, il n'a pas été démontré que la nature des renseignements en cause entraîne un risque sérieux pour l'intérêt public important en matière de vie privée, qui a été défini adéquatement dans le présent contexte au regard de la dignité. Pour cette seule raison, je conclus que les fiduciaires n'ont pas établi l'existence d'un risque sérieux pour cet intérêt.

(2) The Risk to Physical Safety Alleged in this Case is Not Serious

[96] Unlike the privacy interest raised in this case, there was no controversy that there is an important public interest in protecting individuals from physical harm. It is worth underscoring that the application judge correctly treated the protection from physical harm as a distinct important interest from that of the protection of privacy and found that this risk of harm was “foreseeable” and “grave” (paras. 22-24). The issue is whether the Trustees have established a serious risk to this interest for the purpose of the test for discretionary limits on court openness. The application judge observed that it would have been preferable to include objective evidence of the seriousness of the risk from the police service conducting the homicide investigation. He nevertheless concluded there was sufficient proof of risk to the physical safety of the affected individuals to meet the test. The Court of Appeal says that was a misreading of the evidence, and the Toronto Star agrees that the application judge’s conclusion as to the existence of a serious risk to safety was mere speculation.

[97] At the outset, I note that direct evidence is not necessarily required to establish a serious risk to an important interest. This Court has held that it is possible to identify objectively discernable harm on the basis of logical inferences (*Bragg*, at paras. 15-16). But this process of inferential reasoning is not a licence to engage in impermissible speculation. An inference must still be grounded in objective circumstantial facts that reasonably allow the finding to be made inferentially. Where the inference cannot reasonably be drawn from the circumstances, it amounts to speculation (*R. v. Chanmany*, 2016 ONCA 576, 352 O.A.C. 121, at para. 45).

[98] As the Trustees correctly argue, it is not just the probability of the feared harm, but also the gravity

(2) Le risque pour la sécurité physique allégué en l’espèce n’est pas sérieux

[96] Contrairement à ce qu’il en est pour l’intérêt en matière de vie privée soulevé en l’espèce, nul n’a contesté l’existence d’un intérêt public important dans la protection des personnes contre un préjudice physique. Il convient de souligner que le juge de première instance a correctement traité la protection contre un préjudice physique comme un intérêt important distinct de l’intérêt à l’égard de la protection de la vie privée, et a conclu que ce risque était [TRADUCTION] « prévisible » et « grave » (par. 22-24). La question consiste à savoir si les fiduciaires ont établi que cet intérêt est sérieusement menacé pour l’application du test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires. Le juge de première instance a fait remarquer qu’il aurait été préférable d’inclure des éléments de preuve objectifs du caractère sérieux du risque fournis par le service de police menant l’enquête pour homicides. Il a néanmoins conclu que la preuve de risque pour la sécurité physique des personnes touchées était suffisante pour que le test soit respecté. Selon la Cour d’appel, il s’agit d’une mauvaise interprétation de la preuve, et, de son côté, le Toronto Star convient que la conclusion du juge de première instance quant à l’existence d’un risque sérieux pour la sécurité constitue une simple conjecture.

[97] D’entrée de jeu, je souligne qu’une preuve directe n’est pas nécessairement exigée pour démontrer qu’un intérêt important est sérieusement menacé. Notre Cour a statué qu’il est possible d’établir l’existence d’un préjudice objectivement discernable sur la base d’inférences logiques (*Bragg*, par. 15-16). Or, ce raisonnement inférentiel ne permet pas de se livrer à des conjectures inadmissibles. Une inférence doit tout de même être fondée sur des faits circonstanciels objectifs qui permettent raisonnablement de tirer la conclusion par inférence. Lorsque celle-ci ne peut raisonnablement être tirée à partir des circonstances, elle équivaut à une conjecture (*R. c. Chanmany*, 2016 ONCA 576, 352 O.A.C. 121, par. 45).

[98] Comme le soutiennent à juste titre les fiduciaires, ce n’est pas seulement la probabilité du

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. The question is ultimately whether this record allowed the application judge to objectively discern a serious risk of physical harm.

[99] This conclusion was not open to the application judge on this record. There is no dispute that the feared physical harm is grave. I agree with the Toronto Star, however, that the probability of this harm occurring was speculative. The application judge's conclusion as to the seriousness of the risk of physical harm was grounded on what he called "the degree of mystery that persists regarding both the perpetrator and the motives" associated with the deaths of the Shermans and his supposition that this motive might be "transported" to the trustees and beneficiaries (para. 5; see also paras. 19 and 23). The further step in reasoning that the unsealed estate files would lead to the perpetrator's next crime, to be visited upon someone mentioned in the files, is based on speculation, not the available affidavit evidence, and cannot be said to be a proper inference or some kind of objectively discerned harm or risk thereof. If that were the case, the estate files of every victim of an unsolved murder would pass the initial threshold of the test for a sealing order.

[100] Further, I recall that what is at issue here is not whether the affected individuals face a safety risk in general, but rather whether they face such a risk as a result of the openness of these court files. In light of the contents of these files, the Trustees had to point to some further reason why the risk posed

préjudice appréhendé qui est pertinente lorsqu'il s'agit d'évaluer si un risque est sérieux, mais également la gravité du préjudice lui-même. Lorsque le préjudice appréhendé est particulièrement sérieux, il n'est pas nécessaire de démontrer que la probabilité que ce préjudice se matérialise est vraisemblable, mais elle doit tout de même être plus que négligeable, fantaisiste ou conjecturale. La question consiste finalement à savoir si le présent dossier permettait au juge de première instance de discerner de manière objective l'existence d'un risque sérieux de préjudice physique.

[99] Il n'était pas loisible au juge de première instance de tirer cette conclusion au vu du dossier. Nul ne conteste que le préjudice physique appréhendé est grave. Je conviens cependant avec le Toronto Star que la probabilité que ce préjudice se produise était conjecturale. La conclusion du juge de première instance quant au caractère sérieux du risque de préjudice physique était fondée sur ce qu'il a appelé [TRADUCTION] « le degré de mystère qui persiste en ce qui concerne à la fois le coupable et le mobile » en lien avec la mort des Sherman et sur sa supposition que ce mobile pourrait être « transposé » aux fiduciaires et aux bénéficiaires (par. 5; voir aussi par. 19 et 23). L'étape suivante du raisonnement, selon laquelle le fait de lever les scellés sur les dossiers de succession amènerait les coupables à commettre leur prochain crime contre une personne mentionnée dans les dossiers, repose sur des conjectures, et non sur les éléments de preuve par affidavit présentés, et ne peut être considérée comme une inférence appropriée ou un quelconque préjudice ou risque de préjudice objectivement discerné. Si tel était le cas, le dossier de succession de chaque victime d'un meurtre non résolu franchirait le seuil initial du test applicable pour déterminer si une ordonnance de mise sous scellés peut être rendue.

[100] En outre, je rappelle que la question à trancher en l'espèce n'est pas de savoir si les personnes touchées sont exposées à un risque pour leur sécurité en général, mais plutôt si la publicité des présents dossiers judiciaires les expose à un tel risque. À la lumière du contenu des dossiers en l'espèce, les

by this information becoming publicly available was more than negligible.

[101] The speculative character of the chain of reasoning leading to the conclusion that a serious risk of physical harm exists in this case is underlined by differences between these facts and those cases relied on by the Trustees. In *X. v. Y.*, 2011 BCSC 943, 21 B.C.L.R. (5th) 410, the risk of physical harm was inferred on the basis that the plaintiff was a police officer who had investigated “cases involving gang violence and dangerous firearms” and wrote sentencing reports for such offenders which identified him by full name (para. 6). In *R. v. Esseghaier*, 2017 ONCA 970, 356 C.C.C. (3d) 455, Watt J.A. considered it “self-evident” that the disclosure of identifiers of an undercover operative working in counter-terrorism would compromise the safety of the operative (para. 41). In both cases, the danger flowed from facts establishing that the applicants were in antagonistic relationships with alleged criminal or terrorist organizations. But in this case, the 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 Shermans’ deaths and the association of the affected individuals with the deceased is not reasonably possible on this record. It is not a reasonable inference but, as the Court of Appeal noted, a conclusion resting on speculation.

[102] Were the mere assertion of grave physical harm sufficient to show a serious risk to an important interest, there would be no meaningful threshold in the analysis. Instead, the test requires the serious risk asserted to be well grounded in the record or the circumstances of the particular case (*Sierra Club*,

fiduciaires devaient avancer une autre raison pour laquelle le risque que posait le fait que ces renseignements deviennent accessibles au public était plus que négligeable.

[101] Le caractère conjectural du raisonnement menant à la conclusion selon laquelle il existe un risque sérieux de préjudice physique en l’espèce ressort des différences entre les faits en cause et ceux des affaires invoquées par les fiduciaires. Dans *X. c. Y.*, 2011 BCSC 943, 21 B.C.L.R. (5th) 410, le tribunal a inféré le risque de préjudice physique au motif que le demandeur était un policier qui avait enquêté sur des [TRADUCTION] « affaires portant sur la violence des gangs et des armes à feu dangereuses » et qui avait rédigé des rapports de détermination de la peine pour ces contrevenants, rapports dans lesquels il était identifié par son nom au complet (par. 6). Dans *R. c. Esseghaier*, 2017 ONCA 970, 356 C.C.C. (3d) 455, le juge Watt a considéré qu’il était [TRADUCTION] « évident » que la divulgation d’éléments permettant d’identifier un agent d’infiltation travaillant dans le domaine du contre-terrorisme compromettait la sécurité de l’agent (par. 41). Dans les deux cas, le danger découlait de faits établissant que les demandeurs entretenaient des relations antagonistes avec de prétendues organisations criminelles ou terroristes. Cependant, dans l’affaire qui nous occupe, les fiduciaires ont demandé au juge de première instance d’inférer non seulement le fait qu’un préjudice serait causé aux personnes touchées, mais également qu’il existe une ou des personnes qui souhaitent leur faire du mal. Il n’est pas raisonnablement possible au vu du dossier en l’espèce d’inférer tout cela en se fondant sur le décès des Sherman et sur les liens unissant les personnes touchées aux défunts. Il ne s’agit pas d’une inférence raisonnable, mais, comme l’a souligné la Cour d’appel, d’une conclusion reposant sur des conjectures.

[102] Si le simple fait d’invoquer un préjudice physique grave suffisait à démontrer un risque sérieux pour un intérêt important, il n’y aurait pas de seuil valable dans l’analyse. Le test exige plutôt que le risque sérieux invoqué soit bien appuyé par le dossier ou les circonstances de l’espèce (*Sierra*

at para. 54; *Bragg*, at para. 15). This contributes to maintaining the strong presumption of openness.

[103] Again, in other cases, circumstantial facts may allow a court to infer the existence of a serious risk of physical harm. Applicants do not necessarily need to retain experts who will attest to the physical or psychological risk related to the disclosure. But on this record, the bare assertion that such a risk exists fails to meet the threshold necessary to establish a serious risk of physical harm. The application judge's conclusion to the contrary was an error warranting the intervention of the Court of Appeal.

E. *There Would Be Additional Barriers to a Sealing Order on the Basis of the Alleged Risk to Privacy*

[104] While not necessary to dispose of the appeal, it bears mention that the Trustees would have faced additional barriers in seeking the sealing orders on the basis of the privacy interest they advanced. I recall that to meet the test for discretionary limits on court openness, a person must show, in addition to a serious risk to an important interest, 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 (*Sierra Club*, at para. 53).

[105] Even if the Trustees had succeeded in showing a serious risk to the privacy interest they assert, a publication ban — less constraining on openness than the sealing orders — would have likely been sufficient as a reasonable alternative to prevent this risk. The condition that the order be necessary requires the court to consider whether there are alternatives to the order sought and to restrict the order as much as reasonably possible to prevent the serious risk (*Sierra Club*, at para. 57). An order imposing a publication ban could restrict the dissemination

Club, par. 54; *Bragg*, par. 15), ce qui contribue au maintien de la forte présomption de publicité des débats judiciaires.

[103] Encore une fois, dans d'autres affaires, des faits circonstanciels pourraient permettre à un tribunal d'inférer l'existence d'un risque sérieux de préjudice physique. Les demandeurs n'ont pas nécessairement à retenir les services d'experts qui attestent l'existence du risque physique ou psychologique lié à la divulgation. Cependant, sur la foi du présent dossier, le simple fait d'affirmer qu'un tel risque existe ne permet pas de franchir le seuil requis pour établir l'existence d'un risque sérieux de préjudice physique. La conclusion contraire tirée par le juge de première instance était une erreur justifiant l'intervention de la Cour d'appel.

E. *Il y aurait des obstacles additionnels à l'octroi d'une ordonnance de mise sous scellés fondée sur le risque d'atteinte à la vie privée allégué*

[104] Bien que cela ne soit pas nécessaire pour trancher le pourvoi, il convient de mentionner que les fiduciaires auraient eu à faire face à des obstacles additionnels en cherchant à obtenir les ordonnances de mise sous scellés sur la base de l'intérêt en matière de vie privée qu'ils ont fait valoir. Je rappelle que, pour satisfaire au test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires, une personne doit démontrer, outre un risque sérieux pour un intérêt important, que l'ordonnance particulière demandée est nécessaire pour écarter le risque et que, du point de vue de la proportionnalité, les avantages de l'ordonnance l'emportent sur ses effets négatifs (*Sierra Club*, par. 53).

[105] Même si les fiduciaires avaient réussi à démontrer l'existence d'un risque sérieux pour l'intérêt en matière de vie privée qu'ils invoquent, une interdiction de publication — moins contraignante à l'égard de la publicité des débats que les ordonnances de mise sous scellés — aurait probablement été suffisante en tant qu'autre option raisonnable pour écarter ce risque. La condition selon laquelle l'ordonnance doit être nécessaire oblige le tribunal à examiner s'il existe des mesures autres que l'ordonnance demandée et à restreindre l'ordonnance autant

of personal information to only those persons consulting the court record for themselves and prohibit those individuals from spreading the information any further. As I have noted, the likelihood and extent of dissemination may be relevant factors in determining the seriousness of a risk to privacy in this context. While the Toronto Star would be able to consult the files subject to a publication ban, for example, which may assist it in its investigations, it would not be able to publish and thereby broadly disseminate the contents of the files. A publication ban would seem to protect against this latter harm, which has been the focus of the Trustees' argument, while allowing some access to the file, which is not possible under the sealing orders. Therefore, even if a serious risk to the privacy interest had been made out, it would likely not have justified a sealing order, because a less onerous order would have likely been sufficient to mitigate this risk effectively. I hasten to add, however, that a publication ban is not available here since, as noted, the seriousness of the risk to the privacy interest at play has not been made out.

qu'il est raisonnablement possible de le faire pour écarter le risque sérieux (*Sierra Club*, par. 57). Une ordonnance imposant une interdiction de publication pourrait restreindre la diffusion de renseignements personnels aux seules personnes qui consultent le dossier judiciaire pour elles-mêmes et interdire à celles-ci de diffuser davantage les renseignements. Comme je l'ai mentionné, la probabilité et l'étendue de la diffusion peuvent être des facteurs pertinents lorsqu'il s'agit de déterminer le caractère sérieux d'un risque pour la vie privée dans ce contexte. Alors que le Toronto Star serait en mesure de consulter les dossiers faisant l'objet d'une interdiction de publication, par exemple, ce qui pourrait l'aider dans ses enquêtes, il ne pourrait publier, et ainsi diffuser largement, le contenu des dossiers. Une interdiction de publication semble offrir une protection contre ce dernier préjudice, qui a été au centre de l'argumentation des fiduciaires, tout en permettant un certain accès au dossier, ce qui n'est pas possible aux termes des ordonnances de mise sous scellés. En conséquence, même si un risque sérieux pour l'intérêt en matière de vie privée avait été établi, ce risque n'aurait probablement pas justifié une ordonnance de mise sous scellés, car une ordonnance moins sévère aurait probablement suffi à atténuer ce risque de manière efficace. Je m'empresse cependant d'ajouter qu'une interdiction de publication ne peut être prononcée en l'espèce, puisque, comme il a été souligné, le caractère sérieux du risque pour l'intérêt en matière de vie privée en jeu n'a pas été établi.

[106] Further, the 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, including the negative impact on the open court principle (*Sierra Club*, at para. 53). In balancing the privacy interests against the open court principle, it is important to consider whether the information the order seeks to protect is peripheral or central to the judicial process (paras. 78 and 86; *Bragg*, at paras. 28-29). There will doubtless be cases where the information that poses a serious risk to privacy, bearing as it does on individual dignity, will be central to the case. But the interest in important and legally relevant information being aired in open court may well overcome any concern for the privacy interests in that same

[106] De plus, les fiduciaires auraient eu à démontrer que les avantages de toute ordonnance nécessaire à la protection contre un risque sérieux pour l'intérêt public important l'emportaient sur ses effets préjudiciables, y compris l'incidence négative sur le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires (*Sierra Club*, par. 53). Pour mettre en balance les intérêts en matière de vie privée et le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, il importe de se demander si les renseignements que l'ordonnance vise à protéger sont accessoires ou essentiels au processus judiciaire (par. 78 et 86; *Bragg*, par. 28-29). Il y aura sans doute des affaires où les renseignements présentant un risque sérieux pour la vie privée, du fait qu'ils toucheront à la dignité individuelle, seront essentiels au litige. Cependant, l'intérêt à ce

information. 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.

que des renseignements importants et juridiquement pertinents soient diffusés dans le cadre de débats judiciaires publics pourrait bien prévaloir sur toute préoccupation à l'égard des intérêts en matière de vie privée relativement à ces mêmes renseignements. Cette pondération contextuelle, éclairée par l'importance du principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, constitue un dernier obstacle sur la route de ceux qui cherchent à faire limiter de façon discrétionnaire la publicité des débats judiciaires aux fins de la protection de la vie privée.

VI. Conclusion

[107] The conclusion that the Trustees have failed to establish a serious risk to an important public interest ends the analysis. In such circumstances, the Trustees are not entitled to any discretionary order limiting the open court principle, including the sealing orders they initially obtained. The Court of Appeal rightly concluded that there was no basis for asking for redactions because the Trustees had failed at this stage of the test for discretionary limits on court openness. This is dispositive of the appeal. The decision to set aside the sealing orders rendered by the application judge should be affirmed. Given that I propose to dismiss the appeal on the existing record, I would dismiss the Toronto Star's motion for new evidence as being moot.

VI. Conclusion

[107] La conclusion selon laquelle les fiduciaires n'ont pas établi l'existence d'un risque sérieux pour un intérêt public important met fin à l'analyse. En de telles circonstances, les fiduciaires n'ont droit à aucune ordonnance discrétionnaire limitant le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, y compris les ordonnances de mise sous scellés qu'ils ont initialement obtenues. La Cour d'appel a conclu à juste titre qu'il n'y avait aucune raison de demander un caviardage parce que les fiduciaires n'avaient pas franchi cette étape du test des limites discrétionnaires à la publicité des débats judiciaires. Cette conclusion est déterminante quant à l'issue du pourvoi. La décision d'annuler les ordonnances de mise sous scellés rendues par le juge de première instance devrait être confirmée. Étant donné que je suis d'avis de rejeter le pourvoi eu égard au dossier existant, je rejeterais la requête en production de nouveaux éléments de preuve présentée par le Toronto Star au motif que celle-ci est théorique.

[108] For the foregoing reasons, I would dismiss the appeal. The Toronto Star requests no costs given the important public issues in dispute. As such, there will be no order as to costs.

[108] Pour les motifs qui précèdent, je rejeterais le pourvoi. Le Toronto Star ne sollicite aucun dépens, compte tenu des importantes questions d'intérêt public en litige. Dans les circonstances, aucun dépens ne seront adjugés.

Appeal dismissed.

Solicitors for the appellants: Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg, Toronto.

Solicitors for the respondents: Blake, Cassels & Graydon, Toronto.

Pourvoi rejeté.

Procureurs des appellants : Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg, Toronto.

Procureurs des intimés : Blake, Cassels & Graydon, Toronto.

Solicitor for the intervener the Attorney General of Ontario: Attorney General of Ontario, Toronto.

Solicitor for the intervener the Attorney General of British Columbia: Attorney General of British Columbia, Vancouver.

Solicitors for the intervener the Canadian Civil Liberties Association: DMG Advocates, Toronto.

Solicitors for the intervener the Income Security Advocacy Centre: Borden Ladner Gervais, Toronto.

Solicitors for the interveners 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. and Citytv, a division of Rogers Media Inc.: Farris, Vancouver.

Solicitors for the intervener the British Columbia Civil Liberties Association: McCarthy Tétrault, Toronto.

Solicitors for the interveners the HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario, the HIV Legal Network and the Mental Health Legal Committee: HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario, Toronto.

Procureur de l'intervenant le procureur général de l'Ontario : Procureur général de l'Ontario, Toronto.

Procureur de l'intervenant le procureur général de la Colombie-Britannique : Procureur général de la Colombie-Britannique, Vancouver.

Procureurs de l'intervenante l'Association canadienne des libertés civiles : DMG Advocates, Toronto.

Procureurs de l'intervenant le Centre d'action pour la sécurité du revenu : Borden Ladner Gervais, Toronto.

Procureurs des intervenants Ad IDEM/Canadian Media Lawyers Association, Postmedia Network Inc., CTV, une division de Bell Média inc., Global News, a division of Corus Television Limited Partnership, The Globe and Mail Inc. and Citytv, a division of Rogers Media Inc. : Farris, Vancouver.

Procureurs de l'intervenante British Columbia Civil Liberties Association : McCarthy Tétrault, Toronto.

Procureurs des intervenants HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario, le Réseau juridique VIH and Mental Health Legal Committee : HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario, Toronto.

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

ULC DIP Motion was argued but before the related Judgment of the Court was rendered on November 16, 2009;

[2] **WHEREAS** the request is justified to avoid any misunderstanding as to the exact scope of this Court's Judgment;

[3] **WHEREAS** a small correction to paragraph [17] of the conclusions and the addition of a new paragraph [21.1] are necessary to that end;

FOR THESE REASONS, THE COURT:

ULC DIP Financing

[1] **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 Scotia Company, an unlimited liability company ("**ULC**"), as lender (the "**ULC DIP Lender**"), to be approved by Alcoa acting reasonably, which terms will be consistent with the ULC DIP Term Sheet communicated as **Exhibit R-1** in support of the ULC DIP Motion, subject to such non-material amendments and modifications as the parties may agree with a copy thereof being provided in advance to the Monitor and to modifications required by Alcoa, acting reasonably, which credit facility shall be in an aggregate principal amount outstanding at any time not exceeding **\$230** million.

[2] **ORDERS** that the credit facility provided pursuant to the ULC DIP Agreement (the "**ULC DIP**") will be subject to the following draw conditions:

- a) a first draw of \$130 million to be advanced at closing;
- b) subsequent draws for a maximum total amount of \$50 million in increments of up to \$25 million to be advanced upon a five (5) business day notice and in accordance with paragraph 61.11 of the Second Amended Initial Order which shall apply mutatis mutandis to advances under the ULC DIP; and
- c) the balance of \$50 million shall become available upon further order of the Court.

At the request of the Borrower, all undrawn amounts under the ULC DIP shall either (i) be transferred to the Monitor to be held in an interest bearing account for the benefit of the Borrower providing that any requests for advances thereafter shall continue to be made and processed in accordance herewith as if the transfer had not occurred, or (ii) be invested by ULC in an interest bearing account with all interest earned thereon being for the benefit of and remitted to the Borrower forthwith following receipt thereof.

[3] **ORDERS** the Petitioners to communicate a draft of the substantially final ULC DIP Agreement (the "Draft ULC DIP Agreement") to the Monitor and to any party listed on the Service List which requests a copy of same (an "Interested Party") no later than five (5) days prior to the anticipated closing of the MPCo Transaction, as said term is defined in the ULC DIP Motion.

[4] **ORDERS** that any Interested Party who objects to any provisions of the Draft ULC DIP Agreement as not being substantially in accordance with the terms of the ULC DIP Term Sheet, Exhibit R-1, or objectionable for any other reason, shall, before the close of business of the day following delivery of the Draft ULC DIP Agreement, make a request for a hearing before this Court stating the grounds upon which such objection is based, failing which the Draft ULC DIP Agreement shall be considered to conform to the ULC DIP Term Sheet and shall be deemed to constitute the ULC DIP Agreement for the purposes of this Order.

[5] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized and empowered to execute and deliver the ULC DIP Agreement, subject to the terms of this Order and the approval of Alcoa, acting reasonably, as well as such commitment letters, fee letters, credit agreements, mortgages, charges, hypothecs and security documents, guarantees, mandate and other definitive documents (collectively with the ULC DIP Agreement, the "ULC DIP Documents"), as are contemplated by the ULC DIP Agreement or as may be reasonably required by the ULC DIP Lender pursuant to the terms thereof, and the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized and directed to pay and perform all of their indebtedness, interest, fees, liabilities and obligations to the ULC DIP Lender under and pursuant to the ULC DIP Documents as and when same become due and are to be performed, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order.

[6] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners shall substantially comply with the terms and conditions set forth in the ULC DIP Documents and the 13-week cash flow forecast (the "Budget") provided to the financial advisors of the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party.

[7] **ORDERS** that, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the ULC DIP Documents, the Abitibi Petitioners shall use the proceeds of the ULC DIP substantially in compliance with the Budget, that the Monitor shall monitor the ongoing disbursements of the Abitibi Petitioners under the Budget, and that the Monitor shall forthwith advise the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party of the Monitor's understanding of any pending or anticipated substantial non-compliance with the Budget and/or any other pending or anticipated event of default or termination event under any of the ULC DIP Documents.

[8] **GIVES ACT** to the Abitibi Petitioners of their stated intention to provide a business plan to the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party by no later than 5:00 p.m. on November 27, 2009.

[9] **GIVES ACT** to the Abitibi Petitioners of their stated intention to provide a restructuring and recapitalization term sheet (the "Recapitalization Term Sheet") to the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party by no later than 5:00 p.m. on December 15, 2009.

[10] **ORDERS** that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order, the Abitibi Petitioners shall pay to the ULC DIP Lender when due all amounts owing (including principal, interest, fees and expenses, including without limitation, all fees and disbursements of counsel and all other advisers to or agents of the ULC DIP Lender on a full indemnity basis (the "**ULC DIP Expenses**") under the ULC DIP Documents and shall perform all of their other obligations to the ULC DIP Lender pursuant to the ULC DIP Documents and this Order.

[11] **ORDERS** that the claims of the ULC DIP Lender pursuant to the ULC DIP Documents shall not be compromised or arranged pursuant to the Plan or these proceedings and the ULC DIP Lender, in such capacity, shall be treated as an unaffected creditor in these proceedings and in any Plan or any proposal filed by any Abitibi Petitioner under the *BIA*.

[12] **ORDERS** that the ULC DIP Lender may, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order or the Initial Order:

- a) take such steps from time to time as it may deem necessary or appropriate to register, record or perfect the ACI DIP Charge and the ULC DIP Documents in all jurisdictions where it deems it to be appropriate; and
- b) upon the occurrence of a Termination Event (as each such term is defined in the ULC DIP Documents), refuse to make any advance to the Abitibi Petitioners and terminate, reduce or restrict any further commitment to the Abitibi Petitioners to the extent any such commitment remains, set off or consolidate any amounts owing by the ULC DIP Lender to the Abitibi Petitioners against any obligation of the Abitibi Petitioners to the ULC DIP Lender, make demand, accelerate payment or give other similar notices, or to apply to this Court for the appointment of a receiver, receiver and manager or interim receiver, or for a bankruptcy order against the Abitibi Petitioners and for the appointment of a trustee in bankruptcy of the Abitibi Petitioners, and upon the occurrence of an event of default under the terms of the ULC DIP Documents, the ULC DIP Lender shall be entitled to apply to the Court to seize and retain proceeds from the sale of any of the Property of the Abitibi Petitioners and the cash flow of the Abitibi Petitioners to repay amounts owing to the ULC DIP Lender in accordance with the ULC DIP Documents and the ACI DIP Charge.

[13] **ORDERS** that the foregoing rights and remedies of the ULC DIP Lender shall be enforceable against any trustee in bankruptcy, interim receiver, receiver or receiver and

manager of the Abitibi Petitioners or the Property of the Abitibi Petitioners, the whole in accordance with and to the extent provided in the ULC DIP Documents.

[14] **ORDERS** that the ULC DIP Lender shall not take any enforcement steps under the ULC DIP Documents or the ACI DIP Charge without providing five (5) business day (the "Notice Period") written enforcement notice of a default thereunder to the Abitibi Petitioners, the Monitor, the Senior Secured Noteholders, Alcoa, the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party. Upon expiry of such Notice Period, and notwithstanding any stay of proceedings provided herein, the ULC DIP Lender shall be entitled to take any and all steps and exercise all rights and remedies provided for under the ULC DIP Documents and the ACI DIP Charge and otherwise permitted at law, the whole in accordance with applicable provincial laws, but without having to send any notices under Section 244 of the *BIA*. For greater certainty, the ULC DIP Lender may issue a prior notice pursuant to Article 2757 CCQ concurrently with the written enforcement notice of a default mentioned above.

[15] **ORDERS** that, subject to further order of this Court, no order shall be made varying, rescinding, or otherwise affecting paragraphs 61.1 to 61.9 of the Initial Order, the approval of the ULC DIP Documents or the ACI DIP Charge unless either (a) notice of a motion for such order is served on the Petitioners, the Monitor, Alcoa, the Senior Secured Noteholders and the ULC DIP Lender by the moving party and returnable within seven (7) days after the party was provided with notice of this Order in accordance with paragraph 70(a) hereof or (b) each of the ULC DIP Lender and Alcoa applies for or consents to such order.

[16] **ORDERS** that 3239432 Nova Scotia Company is authorized to assign its interest in the ULC DIP to Alcoa pursuant to the security agreements and guarantees to be granted pursuant to the Implementation Agreement and this Court's Order dated September 29, 2009.

[17] **AMENDS** the Initial Order issued by this Court on April 17, 2009 (as amended and restated) by adding the following at the end of paragraph 61.3:

"ORDERS further, that from and after the date of closing of the MPCo Transaction (as said term is defined in the Petitioners' ULC DIP Motion dated November 9, 2009) and provided the principal, interest and costs under the ACI DIP Agreement (as defined in the Order of this Court dated May 6, 2009), are concurrently paid in full, the ACI DIP Charge shall be increased by the aggregate amount of **\$230** million (subject to the same limitations provided in the first sentence hereof in relation to the Replacement Securitization Facility) and shall be extended by a movable and immovable hypothec, mortgage, lien and security interest on all property of the Abitibi Petitioners (other than the property of Abitibi Consolidated (U.K.) Inc.) in favour of the ULC DIP Lender for all amounts owing, including principal, interest and ULC DIP Expenses and all obligations required to be performed under or in connection with the ULC

DIP Documents. The ACI DIP Charge as so increased shall continue to have the priority established by paragraphs 89 and 91 hereof provided such increased ACI DIP Charge (being the portion of the ACI DIP Charge in favour of the ULC DIP Lender) shall in all respects be subordinate (i) to the subrogation rights in favour of the Senior Secured Noteholders arising from the repayment of the ACI DIP Lender from the proceeds of the sale of the MPCo transaction as approved by this Court in its Order of September 29, 2009 and as confirmed by paragraph 11 of that Order, notwithstanding the amendment of paragraph 61.10 of this Order by the subsequent Order dated November 16, 2009, as well as the further subrogation rights, if any, in favour of the Term Lenders; and (ii) rights in favour of the Term Lenders arising from the use of cash for the payment of interest fees and accessories as determined by the Monitor. No order shall have the effect of varying or amending the priority of the ACI DIP Charge and the interest of the ULC DIP Lender therein without the consent of the Senior Secured Noteholders and Alcoa. The terms "ULC DIP Lender", "ULC DIP Documents", "ULC DIP Expenses", "Senior Secured Noteholders" and "Alcoa" shall be as defined in the Order of this Court dated November 16, 2009. Notwithstanding the subrogation rights created or confirmed herein, in no event shall the ULC DIP Lender be subordinated to more than approximately \$40 million, being the aggregate of the proceeds of the MPCo Transaction paid to the ACI DIP Lender plus the interest, fees and expenses paid to the ACI DIP Lender as determined by the Monitor."

ACI DIP Agreement

[18] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized to make, execute and deliver one or more amendment agreements in connection with the ACI DIP Agreement providing for (i) an extension of the period during which any undrawn portion of the credit facility provided pursuant to the ACI DIP Agreement shall be available and (ii) the modification of the date upon which such credit facility must be repaid from November 1, 2009 to the earlier of the closing of the MPCo Transaction and December 15, 2009, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the ACI DIP Agreement, save and except for non-material amendments.

Senior Secured Notes Distribution

[19] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners are authorized and directed to make a distribution to the Trustee of the Senior Secured Notes in the amount of \$200 million upon completion of the MPCo Transaction (as said term is defined in the ULC DIP Motion) from the proceeds of such sale and of the ULC DIP Facility, providing always that the ACI DIP is repaid in full upon completion of the MPCo Transaction.

[20] **ORDERS** that, subject to completion of the ULC DIP (including the initial draw of \$130 million thereunder) and providing always that the ACI DIP is repaid in full upon completion of the MPCo Transaction, the distribution referred to in the preceding paragraph and the flow of funds upon completion of the MPCo Transaction and the ULC DIP shall be arranged in accordance with the following principles: (a) MPCo Proceeds shall be used, first, to fund the distribution to the Senior Secured Notes referenced in the previous paragraph and, secondly, to fund the repayment of the ACI DIP; (b) the initial draw of \$130 million made under the ULC DIP shall fund any remaining balance due to repay in full the ACI DIP and this, upon completion of the MPCo Transaction. The Monitor shall be authorized to review the completion of the MPCo Transaction, the ULC DIP and the repayment of the ACI DIP and shall report to the Court regarding compliance with this provision as it deems necessary.

Amendment to the Subrogation Provision

[21] **ORDERS** that Subsection 61.10 of the Initial Order, as amended and restated, is replaced by the following:

Subrogation to ACI DIP Charge

[61.10] **ORDERS** that the holders of Secured Notes, the Lenders under the Term Loan Facility (collectively, the "**Secured Creditors**") and McBurney Corporation, McBurney Power Limited and MBB Power Services Inc. (collectively, the "**Lien Holder**") that hold security over assets that are subject to the ACI DIP Charge and that, as of the Effective Time, was opposable to third parties (including a trustee in bankruptcy) in accordance with the law applicable to such security (an "**Impaired Secured Creditor**" and "**Existing Security**", respectively) shall be subrogated to the ACI DIP Charge to the extent of the lesser of (i) any net proceeds from the Existing Security including from the sale or other disposition of assets, resulting from the collection of accounts receivable or other claims (other than Property subject to the Securitization Program Agreements and for greater certainty, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the ACI DIP Charge shall in no circumstances extend to any assets sold pursuant to the Securitization Program Agreements, any Replacement Securitization Facility or any assets of ACUSFC, the term "Replacement Securitization Facility" having the meaning ascribed to same in Schedule A of the ACI DIP Agreement) and/or cash that is subject to the Existing Security of such Impaired Secured Creditor that is used directly to pay (a) the ACI DIP Lender or (b) another Impaired Secured Creditor (including by any means of realization) on account of principal, interest or costs, in whole or in part, as determined by the Monitor (subject to adjudication by the Court in the event of any dispute) and (ii) the unpaid amounts due and/or becoming due and/or owing to such Impaired Secured Creditor that are secured by its Existing Security. For this

purpose "**ACI DIP Lender**" shall be read to include Bank of Montreal, IQ, the ULC DIP Lender and their successors and assigns, including any lender or lenders providing replacement DIP financing should same be approved by subsequent order of this Court. No Impaired Secured Creditor shall be able to enforce its right of subrogation to the ACI DIP Charge until all obligations to the ACI DIP Lender have been paid in full and providing that all rights of subrogation hereunder shall be postponed to the right of subrogation of IQ under the IQ Guarantee Offer, and, for greater certainty, no subrogee shall have any rights over or in respect of the IQ Guarantee Offer. In the event that, following the repayment in full of the ACI DIP Lender in circumstances where that payment is made, wholly or in part, from net proceeds of the Existing Security of an Impaired Secured Creditor (the "**First Impaired Secured Creditor**"), such Impaired Secured Creditor enforces its right of subrogation to the ACI DIP Charge and realizes net proceeds from the Existing Security of another Impaired Secured Creditor (the "**Second Impaired Secured Creditor**"), the Second Impaired Secured Creditor shall not be able to enforce its right of subrogation to the ACI DIP Charge until all obligations to the First Impaired Secured Creditor have been paid in full. In the event that more than one Impaired Secured Creditor is subrogated to the ACI DIP Charge as a result of a payment to the ACI DIP Lender, such Impaired Secured Creditors shall rank pari passu as subrogees, rateably in accordance with the extent to which each of them is subrogated to the ACI DIP Charge. The allocation of the burden of the ACI DIP Charge amongst the assets and creditors shall be determined by subsequent application to the Court if necessary."

[21.1] **DECLARES** that for the purposes of paragraphs 1, 5, 10, 12, 13, 17 and 18 of the present Order, the term "Abitibi Petitioners" shall not include Abitibi-Consolidated (U.K.) Inc. added to the schedule of Abitibi Petitioners by Order of this Court on November 10, 2009;

[22] **ORDERS** the provisional execution of this Order notwithstanding any appeal and without the necessity of furnishing any security.

[23] **WITHOUT COSTS.**

CLÉMENT GASCON, J.S.C.

Me Sean Dunphy and Me Joseph Reynaud
STIKEMAN, ELLIOTT
Attorneys for Petitioners

Me Robert Thornton

THORNTON GROUT FINNIGAN
Attorneys for the Monitor

Me Jason Dolman
FLANZ FISHMAN MELAND PAQUIN
Attorneys for the Monitor

Me Alain Riendeau
FASKEN MARTINEAU DuMOULIN
Attorneys for Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., Administrative Agent under the Credit and
Guarantee Agreement Dated April 1, 2008

Me Marc Duchesne
BORDEN, LADNER, GERVAIS
Attorneys for the Ad hoc Committee of the Senior Secured Noteholders and U.S. Bank
National Association, Indenture Trustee for the Senior Secured Noteholders

Me Frederick L. Myers
GOODMANS LLP
Co-Counsel for the Ad Hoc Committee of Unsecured Noteholders of AbitibiBowater Inc.
and certain of its Affiliates

Me Jean-Yves Simard
LAVERY, DE BILLY
Co-Counsel for the Ad Hoc Committee of Unsecured Noteholders of AbitibiBowater Inc.
and certain of its Affiliates

Me Patrice Benoît
GOWLING LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP
Attorneys for Investissement Québec

Me S. Richard Orzy
BENNETT JONES
Attorneys for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of AbitibiBowater Inc. & Al.

Me Frédéric Desmarais
McMILLAN LLP
Attorneys for Bank of Montreal

Me Anastasia Flouris
KUGLER, KANDESTIN, LLP
Attorneys for Alcoa

Date of hearing: November 23, 2009

SCHEDULE "A"
ABITIBI PETITIONERS

1. ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED INC.
2. ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED COMPANY OF CANADA
3. 3224112 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED
4. MARKETING DONOHUE INC.
5. ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED CANADIAN OFFICE PRODUCTS HOLDINGS INC.
6. 3834328 CANADA INC.
7. 6169678 CANADA INC.
8. 4042140 CANADA INC.
9. DONOHUE RECYCLING INC.
10. 1508756 ONTARIO INC.
11. 3217925 NOVA SCOTIA COMPANY
12. LA TUQUE FOREST PRODUCTS INC.
13. ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED NOVA SCOTIA INCORPORATED
14. SAGUENAY FOREST PRODUCTS INC.
15. TERRA NOVA EXPLORATIONS LTD.
16. THE JONQUIERE PULP COMPANY
17. THE INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE AND TERMINAL COMPANY
18. SCRAMBLE MINING LTD.
19. 9150-3383 QUÉBEC INC.
20. ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED (U.K.) INC.

SCHEDULE "B"
BOWATER PETITIONERS

1. BOWATER CANADIAN HOLDINGS INC.
2. BOWATER CANADA FINANCE CORPORATION
3. BOWATER CANADIAN LIMITED
4. 3231378 NOVA SCOTIA COMPANY
5. ABITIBIBOWATER CANADA INC.
6. BOWATER CANADA TREASURY CORPORATION
7. BOWATER CANADIAN FOREST PRODUCTS INC.
8. BOWATER SHELBOURNE CORPORATION
9. BOWATER LAHAVE CORPORATION
10. ST-MAURICE RIVER DRIVE COMPANY LIMITED
11. BOWATER TREATED WOOD INC.
12. CANEXEL HARDBOARD INC.
13. 9068-9050 QUÉBEC INC.
14. ALLIANCE FOREST PRODUCTS (2001) INC.
15. BOWATER BELLEDUNE SAWMILL INC.
16. BOWATER MARITIMES INC.
17. BOWATER MITIS INC.
18. BOWATER GUÉRETTE INC.
19. BOWATER COUTURIER INC.

SCHEDULE "C"
18.6 CCAA PETITIONERS

1. ABITIBIBOWATER INC.
2. ABITIBIBOWATER US HOLDING 1 CORP.
3. BOWATER VENTURES INC.
4. BOWATER INCORPORATED
5. BOWATER NUWAY INC.
6. BOWATER NUWAY MID-STATES INC.
7. CATAWBA PROPERTY HOLDINGS LLC
8. BOWATER FINANCE COMPANY INC.
9. BOWATER SOUTH AMERICAN HOLDINGS INCORPORATED
10. BOWATER AMERICA INC.
11. LAKE SUPERIOR FOREST PRODUCTS INC.
12. BOWATER NEWSPRINT SOUTH LLC
13. BOWATER NEWSPRINT SOUTH OPERATIONS LLC
14. BOWATER FINANCE II, LLC
15. BOWATER ALABAMA LLC
16. COOSA PINES GOLF CLUB HOLDINGS LLC

SUPERIOR COURT

CANADA
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC
DISTRICT OF MONTREAL

No: 500-11-036133-094

DATE: **NOVEMBER 16, 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

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)**

INTRODUCTION

[1] In the context of their CCAA¹ restructuring, the Abitibi Petitioners² present a Motion³ for 1) the approval of a second DIP financing and 2) the distribution of certain proceeds of the Manicouagan Power Company ("MPCo") sale transaction to the Senior Secured Noteholders ("SSNs").

[2] More particularly, the Abitibi Petitioners seek:

- 1) Orders authorizing Abitibi Consolidated Inc. ("ACI") and Abitibi Consolidated Company of Canada Inc. ("ACCC") to enter into a Loan Agreement (the "ULC DIP Agreement") with 3239432 Nova Scotia Company ("ULC"), as lender, providing for a CDN\$230 million super-priority secured debtor in possession credit facility (the "ULC DIP Facility").

The ULC DIP Facility is to be funded from the ULC reserve of approximately CDN\$282.3 million (the "ULC Reserve"), with terms that will be substantially in the form of the term sheet (the "ULC DIP Term Sheet") attached to the ULC DIP Motion;

- 2) Orders authorizing the distribution to the SSNs of up to CDN\$200 million upon completion of the sale of ACCC's 60% interest in MPCo and Court approval of the ULC DIP Agreement.

The distribution is to be paid from the net proceeds of the MPCo sale transaction after the payments, holdbacks, reserves and deductions provided for in the Implementation Agreement agreed upon in regard to that transaction; and

- 3) Orders amending the Second Amended Initial Order to increase the super priority charge set out in paragraph 61.3 (the "ACI DIP Charge") in respect of the ACI DIP Facility by an amount of CDN\$230 million in favour of ULC for all amounts owing in connection with the ULC DIP Facility.

¹ *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the "CCAA").

² In this Judgment, all capitalized terms not otherwise defined have the meaning ascribed thereto in either: 1) the *Second Amended Initial Order* issued by the Court on May 6, 2009; 2) the *Motion for the Distribution by the Monitor of Certain Proceeds of the MPCo Sale Transaction to U.S. Bank National Association, Indenture and Collateral Trustee for the Senior Secured Noteholders* (the "Distribution Motion") of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Senior Secured Noteholders and U.S. Bank National Association, Indenture Trustee for the Senior Secured Notes (respectively, the "Committee" and "Trustee", collectively the "SSNs") dated October 6, 2009; or 3) the Abitibi Petitioners' *Re-Amended Motion for the Approval of a Second DIP Financing in Respect of the Abitibi Petitioners and for the Distribution of Certain Proceeds of the MPCo Sale Transaction to the Trustee for the Senior Secured Notes* (the "ULC DIP Motion") dated November 9, 2009.

³ *Re-Amended Motion for the Approval of a Second DIP Financing in Respect of the Abitibi Petitioners and for the Distribution of Certain Proceeds of the MPCo Sale Transaction to the Trustee for the Senior Secured Notes* dated November 9, 2009 (the "ULC DIP Motion").

This increase in the ACI DIP Charge is to still be subordinated to any and all subrogated rights in favour of the SSNs, the lenders under the ACCC Term Loan (the "**Term Lenders**") and McBurney Corporation, McBurney Power Limited and MBB Power Services Inc. (the "**Lien Holders**") arising under paragraph 61.10 of the Second Amended Initial Order.

[3] The SSNs and the Term Lenders, the only two secured creditor groups of the Abitibi Petitioners, do not, in the end, contest the ULC DIP Motion. Pursuant to intense negotiations and following concessions made by everyone, an acceptable wording to the orders sought was finally agreed upon on the eve of the hearing. The efforts of all parties and Counsel involved are worth mentioning; the help and guidance of the Monitor and its Counsel as well.

[4] Of the unsecured creditors and other stakeholders, only the Ad Hoc Unsecured Noteholders Committee (the "**Bondholders**") opposes the ULC DIP Motion, and even there, just in part. At hearing, Counsel for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors set up in the corresponding U.S. proceedings pending in the State of Delaware also voiced that his client shared some of the Bondholders' concerns.

[5] In short, while not contesting the request for approval of the second DIP financing, the Bondholders contend that the CDN\$200 million immediate proposed distribution to the SSNs is inappropriate and uncalled for at this time.

[6] Before analyzing the various orders sought, an overview of the MPCo sale transaction and of the ULC DIP Facility that are the subject of the debate is necessary.

THE MPCo SALE TRANSACTION

[7] The MPCo sale transaction is central to the orders sought in the ULC DIP Motion.

[8] Under the terms of an Implementation Agreement signed in that regard, Hydro-Québec ("**HQ**") agreed to pay ACCC CDN\$615 million (the "**Purchase Price**") for ACCC's 60% interest in MPCo.

[9] Of this amount, it is expected that (i) CDN\$25 million will be paid at closing to Alcoa, the owner of the other 40% interest in MPCo, for tax liabilities; (ii) approximately CDN\$31 million will be held by HQ for two years to secure various indemnifications (the "**HQ Holdback**"); (iii) certain inter-party accounts will be settled; (iv) the CDN\$282.3 million ULC Reserve, set up primarily to guarantee potential contingent pension liabilities and taxes resulting from the Proposed Transactions, will be held by the Monitor in trust for the ULC pending further Order of the Court; and (v) the ACI DIP Facility will be repaid.

[10] That said, until the sale, ACCC's 60% interest in MPCo remains subject to the SSN's first ranking security. This first ranking security interest has never been

contested by any party. In fact, after their review of same, the Monitor's Counsel concluded that it is valid and enforceable⁴.

[11] Accordingly, the proceeds of the sale less adjustments, holdbacks and reserve would normally be paid to the SSNs as holders of valid first ranking security over this asset.

[12] To that end, the SSNs' claim of US\$477,545,769.53 (US\$413 million in principal and US\$64,545,769.53 in interest as at October 1st, 2009) is not really contested except for a 0.5% to 2% additional default interest over the 13.75% original loan rate.

[13] In that context, on September 29, 2009, the Court issued an Order approving the sale of ACCC's 60% interest in MPCo on certain conditions. Amongst others, the Court:

- a) Approved the terms and conditions of the Implementation Agreement;
- b) Authorized and directed ACI and ACCC to implement and complete the Proposed Transactions with such non-material alterations or amendments as the parties may agree to with the consent of the Monitor;
- c) Declared that (i) the proceeds from the Proposed Transactions, net of certain payments, holdbacks, reserves and deductions, and (ii) the shares of the ULC, shall constitute and be treated as proceeds of the disposition of ACCC's MPCo shares (collectively, the "**MPCo Share Proceeds**");
- d) Declared that the MPCo Share Proceeds extend to and include (a) ACCC's interest in the HQ Holdback and (b) ACCC's interest in claims arising from the satisfaction of related-party claims;
- e) Declared that the MPCo Share Proceeds will be subject to a replacement charge (the "**MPCo Noteholder Charge**") in favour of the SSNs with the same rank and priority as the security held in respect of the ACCC's MPCo shares;
- f) Declared that the ULC Reserve is subject to a charge in favour of the SSNs which is subordinate to a charge in favour of Alcoa (the "**ULC Reserve Charge**"); and
- g) Ordered that the cash component of the MPCo Share Proceeds and the ULC Reserve be paid to and held by the Monitor in an interest bearing account or investment grade marketable securities pending further Order of the Court.

[14] The Proposed Transactions are not expected to close until the latter part of November or early December 2009. ACI has requested and obtained an extension

⁴ See Monitor's 19th Report dated October 27, 2009.

from Investissement Quebec (“IQ”) to December 15, 2009 for the repayment of the ACI DIP Facility that matured on November 1st, 2009.

[15] Based on the amounts of the significant payments, holdbacks, reserves and deductions from the Purchase Price, and considering that the amount drawn under the ACI DIP Facility presently stands at CDN\$54.8 million, the Net Available Proceeds after payment of the ACI DIP Facility would be approximately CDN\$173.9 million.

THE ULC DIP FACILITY

[16] Pursuant to the Implementation Agreement, ULC is required to maintain the ULC Reserve. On the closing of the Proposed Transactions, ULC will hold the ULC Reserve in the amount of approximately CDN\$282.3 million.

[17] This amount may be used for a limited number of purposes (the “**Permitted Investments**”) that are described in the Implementation Agreement. Such Permitted Investments include making a DIP loan to either ACI or ACCC.

[18] Based on that, the ULC DIP Term Sheet provides that the ACI Group will borrow CDN\$230 million from the ULC Reserve as a Permitted Investment.

[19] According to the Monitor⁵, the significant terms of the ULC DIP Term Sheet are as follows:

- i) **Manner of Borrowing** – Initially, the ULC DIP Facility was to be available by way of an immediate draw of CDN\$230 million. After negotiations with the Term Lenders, it was rather agreed that (i) a first draw of CDN\$130 million will be advanced at closing, (ii) subsequent draws for a maximum total amount of CDN\$50 million in increments of up to CDN\$25 million will be advanced upon a five (5) business day notice and in accordance with paragraph 61.11 of the Second Amended Initial Order, and (iii) the balance of CDN\$50 million shall become available upon further order of the Court.
- ii) **Interest Payments** – No interest will be payable on the ULC DIP Facility;
- iii) **Fees** –No fees are payable in respect of the ULC DIP Facility;
- iv) **Expenses** – The borrowers will pay all reasonable expenses incurred by ULC and Alcoa in connection with the ULC DIP Facility;
- v) **Reporting** – Reporting will be similar to that provided under the ACI DIP Facility and copies of all financial information will be placed in the data room. Reporting will include notice of events of default or maturing events of default;

⁵ See Monitor's 19th Report dated October 27, 2009.

- vi) **Use of Proceeds** – The ULC DIP Facility will be used for general corporate purposes in material compliance with the 13-week cash flow forecasts to be provided no less frequently than the first Friday of each month (the “**Budget**”);
- vii) **Events of Default** – The events of default include the following:
 - (a) Substantial non-compliance with the Budget;
 - (b) Termination of the CCAA Stay of Proceedings;
 - (c) Failure to file a CCAA Plan with the Court by September 30, 2010; and
 - (d) Withdrawal of the existing Securitization Program unless replaced with a reasonably similar facility;
- viii) **Rights of Alcoa** – Alcoa will receive all reporting noted above and notices of events of default. Alcoa’s consent is required for any amendments or waivers;
- ix) **Rights of Senior Secured Noteholders** – The Senior Secured Noteholders’ rights consist of:
 - (a) Receiving all reporting noted above and any notice of an Event of Default;
 - (b) Consent of Senior Secured Noteholders holding a majority of the principal amount of the Senior Secured Notes is required for any amendments to the maximum amount of the ULC DIP Facility or any change to the Outside Maturity Date or the interest rate;
 - (c) Upon an Event of Default, there is no right to accelerate payment or maturity, subject to the right to apply to Court for the termination of the ULC DIP Facility, which right is without prejudice to the right of ACI, ACCC, the ULC or Alcoa to oppose such application;
 - (d) Entitlement to review draft of documents, but final approval of such documents is in Alcoa’s sole discretion; and
 - (e) Entitlement to request the approval of the Court to amend any monthly cash flow budget which has been filed;
- x) **Security** – Security is similar to the existing ACI DIP Facility and ranking immediately after the existing ACI DIP Charge. There are no charges on the assets of the Chapter 11 Debtors (as defined in the existing ACI DIP Facility).

[20] The Monitor notes that the ULC DIP Facility will provide the ACI Group with additional net liquidity (after the retirement of the ACI DIP Facility and after the payment of the proposed distribution to the SSNs) in the amount of some CDN\$167 million.

THE QUESTIONS AT ISSUE

[21] In light of this background, the Court must answer the following questions:

- 1) Should the ULC DIP Facility of CDN\$230 million be approved?
- 2) Should the proposed distribution of CDN\$200 million to the SSNs be authorized?
- 3) Is the wording of the orders sought appropriate, notably with regard to the additions proposed by the Bondholders in terms of the future steps to be taken by the Abitibi Petitioners?

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

1) THE APPROVAL OF THE DIP FINANCING

[22] In the Court's opinion, the second DIP financing, that is, the ULC DIP Facility of CDN\$230 million, should be approved on the amended terms agreed upon by the numerous parties involved.

[23] In this restructuring, the Court has already approved DIP financing in respect of both the Abitibi Petitioners and the Bowater Petitioners.

[24] On April 22, 2009, it issued a Recognition Order (U.S. Interim DIP Order) recognizing an Interim Order of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for a DIP loan of up to US\$206 million to the Bowater Petitioners. On May 6, 2009, it approved the ACI DIP Facility, a US\$100 million loan to the Abitibi Petitioners by Bank of Montreal ("BMO"), guaranteed by IQ.

[25] The jurisdiction of the Court to approve DIP financing and the requirement of the Abitibi Petitioners for such were canvassed at length in the May 6 Judgment. The requirements of the Abitibi Petitioners for liquidity and the authority of the Court to approve agreements to satisfy those requirements have already been reviewed and ruled upon.

[26] There have been no circumstances intervening since the approval of the ACI DIP Facility that can fairly be characterized as negating the requirement of the Abitibi Petitioners for DIP financing.

[27] The only issue here is whether this particular ULC DIP Facility proposal, replacing as it does the prior ACI DIP Facility, is one that the Court ought to approve. As indicated earlier, the answer is yes.

[28] At this stage in the proceedings where the phase of business stabilization is largely complete, the Court is not required to approach the subject of DIP financing from the perspective of excessive caution or parsimony.

[29] On the one hand, as highlighted notably by the Monitor⁶, the Abitibi Petitioners have presented substantial reasons to support their need for liquidity by way of a DIP loan. Suffice it to note to that end that:

- a) Without an adequate cushion, in view of potential adverse exchange rate fluctuations and further adverse price declines in the market, the Abitibi Petitioners' liquidity could easily be insufficient to meet the requirements of its Securitization Program (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraphs 49, 50 and chart at paragraph 61);
- b) Absent a DIP loan, there is, in fact, a "high risk of default" under the Securitization Program (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraph 32);
- c) Despite Abitibi Petitioners' best efforts at forecasting, weekly cash flow forecasts have varied by as much as US\$26 million. Weekly disbursements have varied by 100%. Each 1¢ variation in the foreign exchange rate as against the US dollar could produce a US\$17 million negative cash flow variation. The ultimate cash flow requirements will be highly dependent on variables that the Abitibi Petitioners' cannot control (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraphs 54, 60 and 61);
- d) The market decline has eroded the Abitibi Petitioners' liquidity, while foreign exchange fluctuations are placing further strain on this liquidity. Even if prices increase, the resulting need for additional working capital to increase production will paradoxically put yet further strain on this liquidity;
- e) Without the ULC DIP Facility, the Abitibi Petitioners would lack access to sufficient operating credit to maintain normal operations. They would be significantly impaired in their ability to operate in the ordinary course and they would face an increase in the risk of unexpected interruptions; and
- f) The Abitibi Petitioners have yet to complete their business plan and it is premature to predict the length of the proceedings (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraphs 47 and 48).

[30] In fact, based upon its sensitivity analysis, the inter-month variability of the cash flows, the minimum liquidity requirements under the Securitization Program, and the requirement to repay the ACI DIP Facility, the Monitor is of the view that the Abitibi Petitioners need the new ULC DIP Facility to ensure that ACI has sufficient liquidity to complete its restructuring.

⁶ See Monitor's 19th Report dated October 27, 2009.

[31] On the other hand, the reasonableness of the amount of the ULC DIP Facility is supported by the following facts:

- a) Only about CDN\$168 million of incremental liquidity is being provided and post-transaction, the Abitibi Petitioners will have, at best, about CDN\$335 million of liquidity (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraph 68);
- b) The Bowater Petitioners, a group of the same approximate size as the Abitibi Petitioners, enjoy liquidity of approximately US\$400 million (Monitor's 19th Report at paragraph 69) and a DIP facility of approximately US\$200 million;
- c) Even with the ULC DIP Facility, the Abitibi Petitioners will be at the low end of average relative to their peers in terms of available liquidity relative to their size;
- d) The cash flow of the Abitibi Petitioners is subject to significant intra-month variations and has risks associated with pricing and currency fluctuations which are larger the longer the period examined; and
- e) The Abitibi Petitioners are required by the Securitization Facility to maintain liquidity on a rolling basis above US\$100 million.

[32] In addition, the Court and the stakeholders have all the means necessary at their disposal to monitor the use of liquidity without, at the same time, having to ration its access at a level far below that enjoyed by the peers with whom the Abitibi Petitioners compete.

[33] In this regard, it is important to emphasize that the ULC DIP Facility includes, after all, particularly interesting conditions in terms of interest payments and associated fees. Because ULC is the lender, none are payable.

[34] Finally, the provisions of section 11.2 of the amended CCAA, and in particular the factors for review listed in subsection 11.2(4), are instructive guidelines to the exercise of the Court's discretion to approve the ULC DIP Facility.

[35] Pursuant to subsection 11.2(4) of the amended CCAA, for restructurings undertaken after September 18, 2009, the judge is now directed to consider the following factors in determining whether to exercise his or her discretion to make an order such as this one:

- a) The period during which the company is expected to be subject to CCAA proceedings;
- b) How the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;

- c) Whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
- d) Whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made;
- e) The nature and value of the company's property;
- f) Whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
- g) The Monitor's report.

[36] Applying these criteria to this case, it is, first, premature to speculate how long the Abitibi Petitioners will remain subject to proceedings under the CCAA.

[37] The Monitor's 19th Report has considered cash flow forecasts until December 2010. The Abitibi Petitioners are hopeful of progressing to a plan outline by year-end with a view to emergence in the first or second quarter of 2010.

[38] In considering a DIP financing proposal, the Court can take note of the fact that the time and energies ought, at this stage in the proceedings, to be more usefully and profitably devoted to completing the business restructuring, raising the necessary exit financing and negotiating an appropriate restructuring plan with the stakeholders.

[39] Second, even if the ULC DIP Facility of CDN\$230 million is a high, albeit reasonable, figure under the circumstances, access to the funds and use of the funds remain closely monitored.

[40] Based on the compromise reached with the Term Lenders, access to the funds will be progressive and subject to control. The initial draw is limited to CDN\$130 million. Subsequent additional draws up to CDN\$50 million will be in maximum increments of CDN\$25 million and subject to prior notice. The final CDN\$50 million will only be available with the Court's approval.

[41] As well, the use of the funds is subject to considerable safeguards as to the interests of all stakeholders. These include the following:

- a) The Monitor is on site monitoring and reviewing cash flow sources and uses in real time with full access to senior management, stakeholders and the Court;
- b) Stakeholders have very close to real time access to financial information regarding sources and use of cash flow by reason of the weekly cash flow forecasts provided to their financial advisors and the weekly calls with such financial advisors, participated in by senior management;

- c) The Monitor provides regular reporting to the Court including as to the tracking of variances in cash use relative to forecast and as to evolution of the business environment in which the Abitibi Petitioners are operating; and
- d) All stakeholders have full access to this Court to bring such motions as they see fit should a material adverse change in the business or affairs intervene.

[42] Third, there has been no suggestion that the management of the Abitibi Petitioners has lost the confidence of its major creditors. To the contrary:

- a) Management has successfully negotiated a settlement of very complex and thorny issues with both the Term Lenders and the SSNs, which has enabled this ULC DIP Motion to be brought forward with their support;
- b) While management does not agree with all positions taken by the Bondholders at all times, it has by and large enjoyed the support of that group throughout these proceedings;
- c) Management has been attentive to the suggestions and guidance of the Monitor with the result that there have been few if any instances where the Monitor has been publicly obliged to oppose or take issue with steps taken;
- d) Management has been proactive in hiring a Chief Restructuring Officer who has provided management with additional depth and strength in navigating through difficult circumstances; and
- e) The Abitibi Petitioners' management conducts regular meetings with the financial advisors of their major stakeholders, in addition to having an "open door" policy.

[43] The Court is satisfied that, in requesting the approval of the ULC DIP Facility, management is doing so with a broad measure of support and the confidence of its major creditor constituencies.

[44] Fourth, with an adequate level of liquidity, the Abitibi Petitioners will be able to run their business as a going concern on as normal a basis as possible, with a view to enhancing and preserving its value while the restructuring process proceeds.

[45] By facilitating a level of financial support that is reasonable and adequate and of sufficient duration to enable them to complete the restructuring on most reasonable assumptions, the Abitibi Petitioners will have the benefit of an umbrella of stability around their core business operations.

[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

Scotia Company, an unlimited liability company ("ULC"), as lender (the "**ULC DIP Lender**"), to be approved by Alcoa acting reasonably, which terms will be consistent with the ULC DIP Term Sheet communicated as **Exhibit R-1** in support of the ULC DIP Motion, subject to such non-material amendments and modifications as the parties may agree with a copy thereof being provided in advance to the Monitor and to modifications required by Alcoa, acting reasonably, which credit facility shall be in an aggregate principal amount outstanding at any time not exceeding **\$230** million.

[88] **ORDERS** that the credit facility provided pursuant to the ULC DIP Agreement (the "**ULC DIP**") will be subject to the following draw conditions:

- d) a first draw of \$130 million to be advanced at closing;
- e) subsequent draws for a maximum total amount of \$50 million in increments of up to \$25 million to be advanced upon a five (5) business day notice and in accordance with paragraph 61.11 of the Second Amended Initial Order which shall apply mutatis mutandis to advances under the ULC DIP; and
- f) the balance of \$50 million shall become available upon further order of the Court.

At the request of the Borrower, all undrawn amounts under the ULC DIP shall either (i) be transferred to the Monitor to be held in an interest bearing account for the benefit of the Borrower providing that any requests for advances thereafter shall continue to be made and processed in accordance herewith as if the transfer had not occurred, or (ii) be invested by ULC in an interest bearing account with all interest earned thereon being for the benefit of and remitted to the Borrower forthwith following receipt thereof.

[89] **ORDERS** the Petitioners to communicate a draft of the substantially final ULC DIP Agreement (the "**Draft ULC DIP Agreement**") to the Monitor and to any party listed on the Service List which requests a copy of same (an "**Interested Party**") no later than five (5) days prior to the anticipated closing of the MPCo Transaction, as said term is defined in the ULC DIP Motion.

[90] **ORDERS** that any Interested Party who objects to any provisions of the Draft ULC DIP Agreement as not being substantially in accordance with the terms of the ULC DIP Term Sheet, Exhibit R-1, or objectionable for any other reason, shall, before the close of business of the day following delivery of the Draft ULC DIP Agreement, make a request for a hearing before this Court stating the grounds upon which such objection is based, failing which the Draft ULC DIP Agreement shall be considered to conform to the ULC DIP Term Sheet and shall be deemed to constitute the ULC DIP Agreement for the purposes of this Order.

[91] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized and empowered to execute and deliver the ULC DIP Agreement, subject to the terms of this Order and the

approval of Alcoa, acting reasonably, as well as such commitment letters, fee letters, credit agreements, mortgages, charges, hypothecs and security documents, guarantees, mandate and other definitive documents (collectively with the ULC DIP Agreement, the "**ULC DIP Documents**"), as are contemplated by the ULC DIP Agreement or as may be reasonably required by the ULC DIP Lender pursuant to the terms thereof, and the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized and directed to pay and perform all of their indebtedness, interest, fees, liabilities and obligations to the ULC DIP Lender under and pursuant to the ULC DIP Documents as and when same become due and are to be performed, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order.

[92] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners shall substantially comply with the terms and conditions set forth in the ULC DIP Documents and the 13-week cash flow forecast (the "Budget") provided to the financial advisors of the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party.

[93] **ORDERS** that, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the ULC DIP Documents, the Abitibi Petitioners shall use the proceeds of the ULC DIP substantially in compliance with the Budget, that the Monitor shall monitor the ongoing disbursements of the Abitibi Petitioners under the Budget, and that the Monitor shall forthwith advise the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party of the Monitor's understanding of any pending or anticipated substantial non-compliance with the Budget and/or any other pending or anticipated event of default or termination event under any of the ULC DIP Documents.

[94] **GIVES ACT** to the Abitibi Petitioners of their stated intention to provide a business plan to the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party by no later than 5:00 p.m. on November 27, 2009.

[95] **GIVES ACT** to the Abitibi Petitioners of their stated intention to provide a restructuring and recapitalization term sheet (the "Recapitalization Term Sheet") to the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party by no later than 5:00 p.m. on December 15, 2009.

[96] **ORDERS** that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order, the Abitibi Petitioners shall pay to the ULC DIP Lender when due all amounts owing (including principal, interest, fees and expenses, including without limitation, all fees and disbursements of counsel and all other advisers to or agents of the ULC DIP Lender on a full indemnity basis (the "**ULC DIP Expenses**") under the ULC DIP Documents and shall perform all of their other obligations to the ULC DIP Lender pursuant to the ULC DIP Documents and this Order.

[97] **ORDERS** that the claims of the ULC DIP Lender pursuant to the ULC DIP Documents shall not be compromised or arranged pursuant to the Plan or these proceedings and the ULC DIP Lender, in such capacity, shall be treated as an unaffected creditor in these proceedings and in any Plan or any proposal filed by any Abitibi Petitioner under the *BIA*.

[98] **ORDERS** that the ULC DIP Lender may, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order or the Initial Order:

- c) take such steps from time to time as it may deem necessary or appropriate to register, record or perfect the ACI DIP Charge and the ULC DIP Documents in all jurisdictions where it deems it to be appropriate; and
- d) upon the occurrence of a Termination Event (as each such term is defined in the ULC DIP Documents), refuse to make any advance to the Abitibi Petitioners and terminate, reduce or restrict any further commitment to the Abitibi Petitioners to the extent any such commitment remains, set off or consolidate any amounts owing by the ULC DIP Lender to the Abitibi Petitioners against any obligation of the Abitibi Petitioners to the ULC DIP Lender, make demand, accelerate payment or give other similar notices, or to apply to this Court for the appointment of a receiver, receiver and manager or interim receiver, or for a bankruptcy order against the Abitibi Petitioners and for the appointment of a trustee in bankruptcy of the Abitibi Petitioners, and upon the occurrence of an event of default under the terms of the ULC DIP Documents, the ULC DIP Lender shall be entitled to apply to the Court to seize and retain proceeds from the sale of any of the Property of the Abitibi Petitioners and the cash flow of the Abitibi Petitioners to repay amounts owing to the ULC DIP Lender in accordance with the ULC DIP Documents and the ACI DIP Charge.

[99] **ORDERS** that the foregoing rights and remedies of the ULC DIP Lender shall be enforceable against any trustee in bankruptcy, interim receiver, receiver or receiver and manager of the Abitibi Petitioners or the Property of the Abitibi Petitioners, the whole in accordance with and to the extent provided in the ULC DIP Documents.

[100] **ORDERS** that the ULC DIP Lender shall not take any enforcement steps under the ULC DIP Documents or the ACI DIP Charge without providing five (5) business day (the "**Notice Period**") written enforcement notice of a default thereunder to the Abitibi Petitioners, the Monitor, the Senior Secured Noteholders, Alcoa, the Notice Parties (as defined in the Second Amended Initial Order) and any Interested Party. Upon expiry of such Notice Period, and notwithstanding any stay of proceedings provided herein, the ULC DIP Lender shall be entitled to take any and all steps and exercise all rights and remedies provided for under the ULC DIP Documents and the ACI DIP Charge and otherwise permitted at law, the whole in accordance with applicable provincial laws, but without having to send any notices under Section 244 of the *BIA*. For greater certainty, the ULC DIP Lender may issue a prior notice pursuant to Article 2757 CCQ concurrently with the written enforcement notice of a default mentioned above.

[101] **ORDERS** that, subject to further order of this Court, no order shall be made varying, rescinding, or otherwise affecting paragraphs 61.1 to 61.9 of the Initial Order, the approval of the ULC DIP Documents or the ACI DIP Charge unless either (a) notice of a motion for such order is served on the Petitioners, the Monitor, Alcoa, the Senior

Secured Noteholders and the ULC DIP Lender by the moving party and returnable within seven (7) days after the party was provided with notice of this Order in accordance with paragraph 70(a) hereof or (b) each of the ULC DIP Lender and Alcoa applies for or consents to such order.

[102] **ORDERS** that 3239432 Nova Scotia Company is authorized to assign its interest in the ULC DIP to Alcoa pursuant to the security agreements and guarantees to be granted pursuant to the Implementation Agreement and this Court's Order dated September 29, 2009.

[103] **AMENDS** the Initial Order issued by this Court on April 17, 2009 (as amended and restated) by adding the following at the end of paragraph 61.3:

"ORDERS further, that from and after the date of closing of the MPCo Transaction (as said term is defined in the Petitioners' ULC DIP Motion dated November 9, 2009) and provided the principal, interest and costs under the ACI DIP Agreement (as defined in the Order of this Court dated May 6, 2009), are concurrently paid in full, the ACI DIP Charge shall be increased by the aggregate amount of **\$230** million (subject to the same limitations provided in the first sentence hereof in relation to the Replacement Securitization Facility) and shall be extended by a movable and immovable hypothec, mortgage, lien and security interest on all property of the Abitibi Petitioners in favour of the ULC DIP Lender for all amounts owing, including principal, interest and ULC DIP Expenses and all obligations required to be performed under or in connection with the ULC DIP Documents. The ACI DIP Charge as so increased shall continue to have the priority established by paragraphs 89 and 91 hereof provided such increased ACI DIP Charge (being the portion of the ACI DIP Charge in favour of the ULC DIP Lender) shall in all respects be subordinate (i) to the subrogation rights in favour of the Senior Secured Noteholders arising from the repayment of the ACI DIP Lender from the proceeds of the sale of the MPCo transaction as approved by this Court in its Order of September 29, 2009 and as confirmed by paragraph 11 of that Order, notwithstanding the amendment of paragraph 61.10 of this Order by the subsequent Order dated November 16, 2009, as well as the further subrogation rights, if any, in favour of the Term Lenders; and (ii) rights in favour of the Term Lenders arising from the use of cash for the payment of interest fees and accessories as determined by the Monitor. No order shall have the effect of varying or amending the priority of the ACI DIP Charge and the interest of the ULC DIP Lender therein without the consent of the Senior Secured Noteholders and Alcoa. The terms "ULC DIP Lender", "ULC DIP Documents", "ULC DIP Expenses", "Senior Secured Noteholders" and "Alcoa" shall be as defined in the Order of this Court dated November 16, 2009. Notwithstanding the subrogation rights created or confirmed herein, in no event shall the ULC DIP Lender be subordinated to more than approximately \$40 million, being the aggregate

of the proceeds of the MPCo Transaction paid to the ACI DIP Lender plus the interest, fees and expenses paid to the ACI DIP Lender as determined by the Monitor."

ACI DIP Agreement

[104] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners are hereby authorized to make, execute and deliver one or more amendment agreements in connection with the ACI DIP Agreement providing for (i) an extension of the period during which any undrawn portion of the credit facility provided pursuant to the ACI DIP Agreement shall be available and (ii) the modification of the date upon which such credit facility must be repaid from November 1, 2009 to the earlier of the closing of the MPCo Transaction and December 15, 2009, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the ACI DIP Agreement, save and except for non-material amendments.

Senior Secured Notes Distribution

[105] **ORDERS** that the Abitibi Petitioners are authorized and directed to make a distribution to the Trustee of the Senior Secured Notes in the amount of \$200 million upon completion of the MPCo Transaction (as said term is defined in the ULC DIP Motion) from the proceeds of such sale and of the ULC DIP Facility, providing always that the ACI DIP is repaid in full upon completion of the MPCo Transaction.

[106] **ORDERS** that, subject to completion of the ULC DIP (including the initial draw of \$130 million thereunder) and providing always that the ACI DIP is repaid in full upon completion of the MPCo Transaction, the distribution referred to in the preceding paragraph and the flow of funds upon completion of the MPCo Transaction and the ULC DIP shall be arranged in accordance with the following principles: (a) MPCo Proceeds shall be used, first, to fund the distribution to the Senior Secured Notes referenced in the previous paragraph and, secondly, to fund the repayment of the ACI DIP; (b) the initial draw of \$130 million made under the ULC DIP shall fund any remaining balance due to repay in full the ACI DIP and this, upon completion of the MPCo Transaction. The Monitor shall be authorized to review the completion of the MPCo Transaction, the ULC DIP and the repayment of the ACI DIP and shall report to the Court regarding compliance with this provision as it deems necessary.

Amendment to the Subrogation Provision

[107] **ORDERS** that Subsection 61.10 of the Initial Order, as amended and restated, is replaced by the following:

Subrogation to ACI DIP Charge

[61.10] **ORDERS** that the holders of Secured Notes, the Lenders under the Term Loan Facility (collectively, the "**Secured Creditors**") and McBurney Corporation, McBurney Power Limited and MBB Power Services Inc. (collectively, the "**Lien Holder**") that hold security over assets that are subject to the ACI DIP Charge and that, as of the Effective Time, was opposable to third parties (including a trustee in bankruptcy) in accordance with the law applicable to such security (an "**Impaired Secured Creditor**" and "**Existing Security**", respectively) shall be subrogated to the ACI DIP Charge to the extent of the lesser of (i) any net proceeds from the Existing Security including from the sale or other disposition of assets, resulting from the collection of accounts receivable or other claims (other than Property subject to the Securitization Program Agreements and for greater certainty, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the ACI DIP Charge shall in no circumstances extend to any assets sold pursuant to the Securitization Program Agreements, any Replacement Securitization Facility or any assets of ACUSFC, the term "**Replacement Securitization Facility**" having the meaning ascribed to same in Schedule A of the ACI DIP Agreement) and/or cash that is subject to the Existing Security of such Impaired Secured Creditor that is used directly to pay (a) the ACI DIP Lender or (b) another Impaired Secured Creditor (including by any means of realization) on account of principal, interest or costs, in whole or in part, as determined by the Monitor (subject to adjudication by the Court in the event of any dispute) and (ii) the unpaid amounts due and/or becoming due and/or owing to such Impaired Secured Creditor that are secured by its Existing Security. For this purpose "**ACI DIP Lender**" shall be read to include Bank of Montreal, IQ, the ULC DIP Lender and their successors and assigns, including any lender or lenders providing replacement DIP financing should same be approved by subsequent order of this Court. No Impaired Secured Creditor shall be able to enforce its right of subrogation to the ACI DIP Charge until all obligations to the ACI DIP Lender have been paid in full and providing that all rights of subrogation hereunder shall be postponed to the right of subrogation of IQ under the IQ Guarantee Offer, and, for greater certainty, no subrogee shall have any rights over or in respect of the IQ Guarantee Offer. In the event that, following the repayment in full of the ACI DIP Lender in circumstances where that payment is made, wholly or in part, from net proceeds of the Existing Security of an Impaired Secured Creditor (the "**First Impaired Secured Creditor**"), such Impaired Secured Creditor enforces its right of subrogation to the ACI DIP Charge and realizes net proceeds from the Existing Security of another Impaired Secured Creditor (the "**Second Impaired Secured Creditor**"), the Second Impaired Secured Creditor shall not be able to enforce its right of subrogation to the ACI DIP Charge until all obligations to the First

Impaired Secured Creditor have been paid in full. In the event that more than one Impaired Secured Creditor is subrogated to the ACI DIP Charge as a result of a payment to the ACI DIP Lender, such Impaired Secured Creditors shall rank pari passu as subrogees, rateably in accordance with the extent to which each of them is subrogated to the ACI DIP Charge. The allocation of the burden of the ACI DIP Charge amongst the assets and creditors shall be determined by subsequent application to the Court if necessary."

[108] **ORDERS** the provisional execution of this Order notwithstanding any appeal and without the necessity of furnishing any security.

[109] **WITHOUT COSTS.**

CLÉMENT GASCON, J.S.C.

Me Sean Dunphy and Me Joseph Reynaud
STIKEMAN, ELLIOTT
Attorneys for Petitioners

Me Robert Thornton
THORNTON GROUT FINNIGAN
Attorneys for the Monitor

Me Jason Dolman
FLANZ FISHMAN MELAND PAQUIN
Attorneys for the Monitor

Me Alain Riendeau
FASKEN MARTINEAU DuMOULIN
Attorneys for Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., Administrative Agent under the Credit and Guarantee Agreement Dated April 1, 2008

Me Marc Duchesne
BORDEN, LADNER, GERVAIS
Attorneys for the Ad hoc Committee of the Senior Secured Noteholders and U.S. Bank National Association, Indenture Trustee for the Senior Secured Noteholders

Me Frederick L. Myers
GOODMANS LLP
Co-Counsel for the Ad Hoc Committee of Unsecured Noteholders of AbitibiBowater Inc. and certain of its Affiliates

Me Jean-Yves Simard
LAVERY, DE BILLY

Co-Counsel for the Ad Hoc Committee of Unsecured Noteholders of AbitibiBowater Inc.
and certain of its Affiliates

Me Patrice Benoît
GOWLING LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP
Attorneys for Investissement Québec

Me S. Richard Orzy
BENNETT JONES
Attorneys for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of AbitibiBowater Inc. & Al.

Me Frédéric Desmarais
McMILLAN LLP
Attorneys for Bank of Montreal

Me Anastasia Flouris
KUGLER, KANDESTIN, LLP
Attorneys for Alcoa

Date of hearing: November 9, 2009

SCHEDULE "A"
ABITIBI PETITIONERS

21. ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED INC.
22. ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED COMPANY OF CANADA
23. 3224112 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED
24. MARKETING DONOHUE INC.
25. ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED CANADIAN OFFICE PRODUCTS HOLDINGS INC.
26. 3834328 CANADA INC.
27. 6169678 CANADA INC.
28. 4042140 CANADA INC.
29. DONOHUE RECYCLING INC.
30. 1508756 ONTARIO INC.
31. 3217925 NOVA SCOTIA COMPANY
32. LA TUQUE FOREST PRODUCTS INC.
33. ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED NOVA SCOTIA INCORPORATED
34. SAGUENAY FOREST PRODUCTS INC.
35. TERRA NOVA EXPLORATIONS LTD.
36. THE JONQUIERE PULP COMPANY
37. THE INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE AND TERMINAL COMPANY
38. SCRAMBLE MINING LTD.
39. 9150-3383 QUÉBEC INC.
40. ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED (U.K.) INC.

SCHEDULE "B"
BOWATER PETITIONERS

20. BOWATER CANADIAN HOLDINGS INC.
21. BOWATER CANADA FINANCE CORPORATION
22. BOWATER CANADIAN LIMITED
23. 3231378 NOVA SCOTIA COMPANY
24. ABITIBIBOWATER CANADA INC.
25. BOWATER CANADA TREASURY CORPORATION
26. BOWATER CANADIAN FOREST PRODUCTS INC.
27. BOWATER SHELBOURNE CORPORATION
28. BOWATER LAHAVE CORPORATION
29. ST-MAURICE RIVER DRIVE COMPANY LIMITED
30. BOWATER TREATED WOOD INC.
31. CANEXEL HARDBOARD INC.
32. 9068-9050 QUÉBEC INC.
33. ALLIANCE FOREST PRODUCTS (2001) INC.
34. BOWATER BELLEDUNE SAWMILL INC.
35. BOWATER MARITIMES INC.
36. BOWATER MITIS INC.
37. BOWATER GUÉRETTE INC.
38. BOWATER COUTURIER INC.

SCHEDULE "C"
18.6 CCAA PETITIONERS

17. ABITIBIBOWATER INC.
18. ABITIBIBOWATER US HOLDING 1 CORP.
19. BOWATER VENTURES INC.
20. BOWATER INCORPORATED
21. BOWATER NUWAY INC.
22. BOWATER NUWAY MID-STATES INC.
23. CATAWBA PROPERTY HOLDINGS LLC
24. BOWATER FINANCE COMPANY INC.
25. BOWATER SOUTH AMERICAN HOLDINGS INCORPORATED
26. BOWATER AMERICA INC.
27. LAKE SUPERIOR FOREST PRODUCTS INC.
28. BOWATER NEWSPRINT SOUTH LLC
29. BOWATER NEWSPRINT SOUTH OPERATIONS LLC
30. BOWATER FINANCE II, LLC
31. BOWATER ALABAMA LLC
32. COOSA PINES GOLF CLUB HOLDINGS LLC

CITATION: Target Canada Co. (Re), 2015 ONSC 7574
COURT FILE NO.: CV-15-10832-00CL
DATE: 2015-12-11

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO

RE: **IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF TARGET CANADA CO., TARGET CANADA HEALTH CO., TARGET CANADA MOBILE GP CO., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY (BC) CORP., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY (ONTARIO) CORP., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY CORP., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY (SK) CORP. AND TARGET CANADA PROPERTY LLC.**

BEFORE: Regional Senior Justice Morawetz

COUNSEL: *J. Swartz* and *Dina Milivojevic*, for the Target Corporation

Jeremy Dacks, for the Target Canada Entities

Susan Philpott, for the Employees

Richard Swan and *S. Richard Orzy*, for Rio Can Management Inc. and KingSett Capital Inc.

Jay Carfagnini and *Alan Mark*, for Alvarez & Marsal, Monitor

Jeff Carhart, for Ginsey Industries

Lauren Epstein, for the Trustee of the Employee Trust

Lou Brzezinski and *Alexandra Teodescu*, for Nintendo of Canada Limited, Universal Studios, Thyssenkrupp Elevator (Canada) Limited, United Cleaning Services, RPJ Consulting Inc., Blue Vista, Farmer Brothers, East End Project, Trans Source, E One Entertainment, Foxy Originals

Linda Galessiere, for Various Landlords

ENDORSEMENT

[1] Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc., in its capacity as Monitor of the Applicants (the "Monitor") seeks approval of Monitor's Reports 3-18, together with the Monitor's activities set out in each of those Reports.

[2] Such a request is not unusual. A practice has developed in proceedings under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA") whereby the Monitor will routinely bring a

motion for such approval. In most cases, there is no opposition to such requests, and the relief is routinely granted.

[3] Such is not the case in this matter.

[4] The requested relief is opposed by Rio Can Management Inc. (“Rio Can”) and KingSett Capital Inc. (“KingSett”), two landlords of the Applicants (the “Target Canada Estates”). The position of these landlords was supported by Mr. Brzezinski on behalf of his client group and as agent for Mr. Solmon, who acts for ISSI Inc., as well as Ms. Galessiere, acting on behalf of another group of landlords.

[5] The essence of the opposition is that the request of the Monitor to obtain approval of its activities – particularly in these liquidation proceedings – is both premature and unnecessary and that providing such approval, in the absence of full and complete disclosure of all of the underlying facts, would be unfair to the creditors, especially if doing so might in future be asserted and relied upon by the Applicants, or any other party, seeking to limit or prejudice the rights of creditors or any steps they may wish to take.

[6] Further, the objecting parties submit that the requested relief is unnecessary, as the Monitor has the full protections provided to it in the Initial Order and subsequent orders, and under the CCAA.

[7] Alternatively, the objecting parties submit that if such approval is to be granted, it should be specifically limited by the following words:

“provided, however, that only the Monitor, in its personal capacity and only with respect to its own personal liability, shall be entitled to rely upon or utilize in any way such approval.”

[8] The CCAA mandates the appointment of a monitor to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company (section 11.7).

[9] The duties and functions of the monitor are set forth in Section 23(1). Section 23(2) provides a degree of protection to the monitor. The section reads as follows:

(2) Monitor not liable – if the monitor acts in good faith and takes reasonable care in preparing the report referred to in any of paragraphs (1)(b) to (d.1), the monitor is not liable for loss or damage to any person resulting from that person’s reliance on the report.

[10] Paragraphs 1(b) to (d.1) primarily relate to review and reporting issues on specific business and financial affairs of the debtor.

[11] In addition, paragraph 51 of the Amended and Restated Order provides that:

... in addition to the rights, and protections afforded the Monitor under the CCAA or as an officer of the Court, the Monitor shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of its appointment or the carrying out of the provisions of this Order, including for great certainty in the Monitor's capacity as Administrator of the Employee Trust, save and except for any gross negligence or wilful misconduct on its part.

[12] The Monitor sets out a number of reasons why it believes that the requested relief is appropriate in these circumstances. Such approval

- (a) allows the monitor and stakeholders to move forward confidently with the next step in the proceeding by fostering the orderly building-block nature of CCAA proceedings;
- (b) brings the monitor's activities in issue before the court, allowing an opportunity for the concerns of the court or stakeholders to be addressed, and any problems to be rectified in a timely way;
- (c) provides certainty and finality to processes in the CCAA proceedings and activities undertaken (eg., asset sales), all parties having been given an opportunity to raise specific objections and concerns;
- (d) enables the court, tasked with supervising the CCAA process, to satisfy itself that the monitor's court-mandated activities have been conducted in a prudent and diligent manner;
- (e) provides protection for the monitor, not otherwise provided by the CCAA; and
- (f) protects creditors from the delay in distribution that would be caused by:
 - a. re-litigation of steps taken to date; and
 - b. potential indemnity claims by the monitor.

[13] Counsel to the Monitor also submits that the doctrine of issue estoppel applies (as do related doctrines of collateral attack and abuse of process) in respect of approval of the Monitor's activities as described in its reports. Counsel submits that given the functions that court approval serves, the availability of the doctrine (and related doctrines) is important to the CCAA process. Counsel submits that actions mandated and authorized by the court, and the activities taken by the Monitor to carry them out, are not interim measure that ought to remain open for second guessing or re-litigating down the road and there is a need for finality in a CCAA process for the benefit of all stakeholders.

[14] Prior to consideration of these arguments, it is helpful to review certain aspects of the doctrine of *res judicata* and its relationship to both issue estoppel and cause of action estoppel.

The issue was recently considered in *Forrest v. Vriend*, 2015 Carswell BC 2979, where Ehrcke J. stated:

25. "TD and Vriend point out that the doctrine of *res judicata* is not limited to issue estoppel, but includes cause of action estoppel as well. The distinction between these two related components of *res judicata* was concisely explained by Cromwell J.A., as he then was, in *Hoque v. Montreal Trust Co. of Canada* (1997), 162 N.S.R. (2d) 321 (C.A.) at para. 21:

21 *Res judicata* is mainly concerned with two principles. First, there is a principle that "... prevents the contradiction of that which was determined in the previous litigation, by prohibiting the relitigation of issues already actually addressed.": see Sopinka, Lederman and Bryant, *The Law of Evidence in Canada* (1991) at p. 997. The second principle is that parties must bring forward all of the claims and defences with respect to the cause of action at issue in the first proceeding and that, if they fail to do so, they will be barred from asserting them in a subsequent action. This "... prevents fragmentation of litigation by prohibiting the litigation of matters that were never actually addressed in the previous litigation, but which properly belonged to it.": *ibid* at 998. Cause of action estoppel is usually concerned with the application of this second principle because its operation bars all of the issues properly belonging to the earlier litigation.

....

30. It is salutary to keep in mind Mr. Justice Cromwell's caution against an overly broad application of cause of action estoppel. In *Hoque* at paras. 25, 30 and 37, he wrote:

25. The appellants submit, relying on these and similar statements, that cause of action estoppel is broad in scope and inflexible in application. With respect, I think this overstates the true position. In my view, this very broad language which suggests an inflexible application of cause of action estoppel to all matters that "could" have been raised does not fully reflect the present law.

....

30. The submission that all claims that could have been dealt with in the main action are barred is not borne out by the Canadian cases. With respect to matter not actually raised and decided, the

test appears to me to be that the party should have raised the matter and, in deciding whether the party should have done so, a number of factors are considered.

...

37. Although many of these authorities cite with approval the broad language of *Henderson v. Henderson, supra*, to the effect that any matter which the parties had the opportunity to raise will be barred, I think, however, that this language is somewhat too wide. The better principle is that those issues which the parties had the opportunity to raise and, in all the circumstances, should have raised, will be barred. In determining whether the matter should have been raised, a court will consider whether proceeding constitutes a collateral attack on the earlier findings, whether it simply asserts a new legal conception of facts previously litigated, whether it relies on "new" evidence that could have been discovered in the earlier proceeding with reasonable diligence, whether the two proceedings relate to separate and distinct causes of action and whether, in all the circumstances, the second proceeding constitutes an abuse of process.

[15] In this case, I accept the submission of counsel to the Monitor to the effect that the Monitor plays an integral part in balancing and protecting the various interests in the CCAA environment.

[16] Further, in this particular case, the court has specifically mandated the Monitor to undertake a number of activities, including in connection with the sale of the debtors assets. The Monitor has also, in its various Reports, provided helpful commentary to the court and to Stakeholders on the progress of the CCAA proceedings.

[17] Turning to the issue as to whether these Reports should be approved, it is important to consider how Monitor's Reports are in fact relied upon and used by the court in arriving at certain determinations.

[18] For example, if the issue before the court is to approve a sales process or to approve a sale of assets, certain findings of fact must be made before making a determination that the sale process or the sale of assets should be approved. Evidence is generally provided by way of affidavit from a representative of the applicant and supported by commentary from the monitor in its report. The approval issue is put squarely before the court and the court must, among other things conclude that the sales process or the sale of assets is, among other things, fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

[19] On motions of the type, where the evidence is considered and findings of fact are made, the resulting decision affects the rights of all stakeholders. This is recognized in the jurisprudence with the acknowledgment that res judicata and related doctrines apply to approval

of a Monitor's report in these circumstances. (See: *Toronto Dominion Bank v. Preston Spring Gardens Inc.*, [2006] O.J. No. 1834 (SCJ Comm. List); *Toronto Dominion Bank v. Preston Spring Gardens Inc.*, 2007 ONCA 145 and *Bank of America Canada v. Willann Investments Limited*, [1993] O.J. No. 3039 (SCJ Gen. Div.)).

[20] The foregoing must be contrasted with the current scenario, where the Monitor seeks a general approval of its Reports. The Monitor has in its various reports provided commentary, some based on its own observations and work product and some based on information provided to it by the Applicant or other stakeholders. Certain aspects of the information provided by the Monitor has not been scrutinized or challenged in any formal sense. In addition, for the most part, no fact-finding process has been undertaken by the court.

[21] In circumstances where the Monitor is requesting approval of its reports and activities in a general sense, it seems to me that caution should be exercised so as to avoid a broad application of *res judicata* and related doctrines. The benefit of any such approval of the Monitor's reports and its activities should be limited to the Monitor itself. To the extent that approvals are provided, the effect of such approvals should not extend to the Applicant or other third parties.

[22] I recognized there are good policy and practical reasons for the court to approve of Monitor's activities and providing a level of protection for Monitors during the CCAA process. These reasons are set out in paragraph [12] above. However, in my view, the protection should be limited to the Monitor in the manner suggested by counsel to Rio Can and KingSett.

[23] By proceeding in this manner, Court approval serves the purposes set out by the Monitor above. Specifically, Court approval:

- (a) allows the Monitor to move forward with the next steps in the CCAA proceedings;
- (b) brings the Monitor's activities before the Court;
- (c) allows an opportunity for the concerns of the stakeholders to be addressed, and any problems to be rectified,
- (d) enables the Court to satisfy itself that the Monitor's activities have been conducted in prudent and diligent manners;
- (e) provides protection for the Monitor not otherwise provided by the CCAA; and
- (f) protects the creditors from the delay and distribution that would be caused by:
 - (i) re-litigation of steps taken to date, and
 - (ii) potential indemnity claims by the Monitor.

[24] By limiting the effect of the approval, the concerns of the objecting parties are addressed as the approval of Monitor's activities do not constitute approval of the activities of parties other than the Monitor.

[25] Further, limiting the effect of the approval does not impact on prior court orders which have approved other aspects of these CCAA proceedings, including the sales process and asset sales.

[26] The Monitor's Reports 3-18 are approved, but the approval is limited by the inclusion of the wording provided by counsel to Rio Can and KingSett, referenced at paragraph [7].

Regional Senior Justice G.B. Morawetz

Date: December 11, 2015