

Clerk's stamp:

COURT FILE NUMBER

2401-03404

COURT


COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA

JUDICIAL CENTRE

CALGARY

MATTER

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



AND IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF CANADIAN OVERSEAS PETROLEUM
LIMITED AND THOSE ENTITIES LISTED IN SCHEDULE "A"

DOCUMENT

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES TO THE BENCH BRIEF OF BP
ENERGY COMPANY**

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND
CONTACT INFORMATION OF
PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT

Dentons Canada LLP
15th Floor, Bankers Court
850 – 2nd Street SW
Calgary, AB T2P 0R8
Attention: Derek Pontin
Email: derek.pontin@dentons.com
Ph: (403) 268 7015 Fax: (403) 268-3100

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>TAB</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
1	<i>Companies Creditors Arrangement Act</i> , RSC, 1985, c C-36, [CCAA]
2	<i>Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.</i> , (1991), 4 OR (3d) 1 (CA)
3	<i>Third Eye Capital Corporation v Dianor Resources Inc.</i> , 2019 ONCA 508
4	<i>In the Matter of CannaPiece Group Inc.</i> , 2023 ONSC 841
5	<i>CannaPiece Group Inc v Marzilli</i> , 2023 ONSC 3291
6	<i>Medipure Pharmaceuticals Inc. (Re)</i> , 2022 BCSC 177
7	<i>Windsor Machine & Stamping Limited (Re)</i> , 2009 CanLII 3977

TAB 1



CANADA

CONSOLIDATION

CODIFICATION

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies

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

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

Current to April 1, 2024

À jour au 1 avril 2024

Last amended on April 27, 2023

Dernière modification le 27 avril 2023

OFFICIAL STATUS OF CONSOLIDATIONS

Subsections 31(1) and (2) of the *Legislation Revision and Consolidation Act*, in force on June 1, 2009, provide as follows:

Published consolidation is evidence

31 (1) Every copy of a consolidated statute or consolidated regulation published by the Minister under this Act in either print or electronic form is evidence of that statute or regulation and of its contents and every copy purporting to be published by the Minister is deemed to be so published, unless the contrary is shown.

Inconsistencies in Acts

(2) In the event of an inconsistency between a consolidated statute published by the Minister under this Act and the original statute or a subsequent amendment as certified by the Clerk of the Parliaments under the *Publication of Statutes Act*, the original statute or amendment prevails to the extent of the inconsistency.

LAYOUT

The notes that appeared in the left or right margins are now in boldface text directly above the provisions to which they relate. They form no part of the enactment, but are inserted for convenience of reference only.

NOTE

This consolidation is current to April 1, 2024. The last amendments came into force on April 27, 2023. Any amendments that were not in force as of April 1, 2024 are set out at the end of this document under the heading “Amendments Not in Force”.

CARACTÈRE OFFICIEL DES CODIFICATIONS

Les paragraphes 31(1) et (2) de la *Loi sur la révision et la codification des textes législatifs*, en vigueur le 1^{er} juin 2009, prévoient ce qui suit :

Codifications comme élément de preuve

31 (1) Tout exemplaire d'une loi codifiée ou d'un règlement codifié, publié par le ministre en vertu de la présente loi sur support papier ou sur support électronique, fait foi de cette loi ou de ce règlement et de son contenu. Tout exemplaire donné comme publié par le ministre est réputé avoir été ainsi publié, sauf preuve contraire.

Incompatibilité – lois

(2) Les dispositions de la loi d'origine avec ses modifications subséquentes par le greffier des Parlements en vertu de la *Loi sur la publication des lois* l'emportent sur les dispositions incompatibles de la loi codifiée publiée par le ministre en vertu de la présente loi.

MISE EN PAGE

Les notes apparaissant auparavant dans les marges de droite ou de gauche se retrouvent maintenant en caractères gras juste au-dessus de la disposition à laquelle elles se rattachent. Elles ne font pas partie du texte, n'y figurant qu'à titre de repère ou d'information.

NOTE

Cette codification est à jour au 1 avril 2024. Les dernières modifications sont entrées en vigueur le 27 avril 2023. Toutes modifications qui n'étaient pas en vigueur au 1 avril 2024 sont énoncées à la fin de ce document sous le titre « Modifications non en vigueur ».

TABLE OF PROVISIONS

An Act to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors

	Short Title
1	Short title
	Interpretation
2	Definitions
3	Application
	PART I
	Compromises and Arrangements
4	Compromise with unsecured creditors
5	Compromise with secured creditors
5.1	Claims against directors — compromise
6	Compromises to be sanctioned by court
7	Court may give directions
8	Scope of Act
	PART II
	Jurisdiction of Courts
9	Jurisdiction of court to receive applications
10	Form of applications
11	General power of court
11.001	Relief reasonably necessary
11.01	Rights of suppliers
11.02	Stays, etc. — initial application
11.03	Stays — directors
11.04	Persons obligated under letter of credit or guarantee
11.06	Member of the Canadian Payments Association
11.08	Restriction — certain powers, duties and functions
11.09	Stay — Her Majesty
11.1	Meaning of regulatory body
11.2	Interim financing
11.3	Assignment of agreements
11.4	Critical supplier

TABLE ANALYTIQUE

Loi facilitant les transactions et arrangements entre les compagnies et leurs créanciers

	Titre abrégé
1	Titre abrégé
	Définitions et application
2	Définitions
3	Application
	PARTIE I
	Transactions et arrangements
4	Transaction avec les créanciers chirographaires
5	Transaction avec les créanciers garantis
5.1	Transaction — réclamations contre les administrateurs
6	Homologation par le tribunal
7	Le tribunal peut donner des instructions
8	Champ d'application de la loi
	PARTIE II
	Juridiction des tribunaux
9	Le tribunal a juridiction pour recevoir des demandes
10	Forme des demandes
11	Pouvoir général du tribunal
11.001	Redressements normalement nécessaires
11.01	Droits des fournisseurs
11.02	Suspension : demande initiale
11.03	Suspension — administrateurs
11.04	Suspension — lettres de crédit ou garanties
11.06	Membre de l'Association canadienne des paiements
11.08	Restrictions : exercice de certaines attributions
11.09	Suspension des procédures : Sa Majesté
11.1	Définition de organisme administratif
11.2	Financement temporaire
11.3	Cessions
11.4	Fournisseurs essentiels

11.5	Removal of directors
11.51	Security or charge relating to director's indemnification
11.52	Court may order security or charge to cover certain costs
11.6	Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act matters
11.7	Court to appoint monitor
11.8	No personal liability in respect of matters before appointment
11.9	Disclosure of financial information
12	Fixing deadlines
13	Leave to appeal
14	Court of appeal
15	Appeals
16	Order of court of one province
17	Courts shall aid each other on request

PART III

General

Duty of Good Faith

18.6	Good faith
	Claims
19	Claims that may be dealt with by a compromise or arrangement
20	Determination of amount of claims
21	Law of set-off or compensation to apply
	Classes of Creditors
22	Company may establish classes
22.1	Class — creditors having equity claims

Monitors

23	Duties and functions
24	Right of access
25	Obligation to act honestly and in good faith

Powers, Duties and Functions of Superintendent of Bankruptcy

26	Public records
27	Applications to court and right to intervene
28	Complaints
29	Investigations

11.5	Révocation des administrateurs
11.51	Biens grevés d'une charge ou sûreté en faveur d'administrateurs ou de dirigeants
11.52	Biens grevés d'une charge ou sûreté pour couvrir certains frais
11.6	Lien avec la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité
11.7	Nomination du contrôleur
11.8	Immunité
11.9	Divulgence de renseignements financiers
12	Échéances
13	Permission d'en appeler
14	Cour d'appel
15	Appels
16	Ordonnance d'un tribunal d'une province
17	Les tribunaux doivent s'entraider sur demande

PARTIE III

Dispositions générales

Obligation d'agir de bonne foi

18.6	Bonne foi
	Réclamations
19	Réclamations considérées dans le cadre des transactions ou arrangements
20	Détermination du montant de la réclamation
21	Compensation
	Catégories de créanciers
22	Établissement des catégories de créanciers
22.1	Catégorie de créanciers ayant des réclamations relatives à des capitaux propres

Contrôleurs

23	Attributions
24	Droit d'accès aux biens
25	Diligence

Attributions du surintendant des faillites

26	Registres publics
27	Demande au tribunal et intervention
28	Plaintes
29	Investigations et enquêtes

30	Powers in relation to licence
31	Delegation
	Agreements
32	Disclaimer or resiliation of agreements
33	Collective agreements
34	Certain rights limited
	Obligations and Prohibitions
35	Obligation to provide assistance
36	Restriction on disposition of business assets
	Preferences and Transfers at Undervalue
36.1	Application of sections 38 and 95 to 101 of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act
	Her Majesty
37	Deemed trusts
38	Status of Crown claims
39	Statutory Crown securities
40	Act binding on Her Majesty
	Miscellaneous
41	Certain sections of Winding-up and Restructuring Act do not apply
42	Act to be applied conjointly with other Acts
43	Claims in foreign currency

PART IV

Cross-border Insolvencies

	Purpose
44	Purpose
	Interpretation
45	Definitions
	Recognition of Foreign Proceeding
46	Application for recognition of a foreign proceeding
47	Order recognizing foreign proceeding
48	Order relating to recognition of a foreign main proceeding
49	Other orders
50	Terms and conditions of orders
51	Commencement or continuation of proceedings

30	Décision relative à la licence
31	Pouvoir de délégation
	Contrats et conventions collectives
32	Résiliation de contrats
33	Conventions collectives
34	Limitation de certains droits
	Obligations et interdiction
35	Assistance
36	Restriction à la disposition d'actifs
	Traitements préférentiels et opérations sous-évaluées
36.1	Application des articles 38 et 95 à 101 de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité
	Sa Majesté
37	Fiducies présumées
38	Réclamations de la Couronne
39	Garanties créées par législation
40	Obligation de Sa Majesté
	Dispositions diverses
41	Inapplicabilité de certains articles de la Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations
42	Application concurrente d'autres lois
43	Créances en monnaies étrangères

PARTIE IV

Insolvabilité en contexte international

	Objet
44	Objet
	Définitions
45	Définitions
	Reconnaissance des instances étrangères
46	Demande de reconnaissance de l'instance étrangère
47	Ordonnance de reconnaissance
48	Effets de la reconnaissance d'une instance étrangère principale
49	Autre ordonnance
50	Conditions
51	Début et continuation de la procédure

	Obligations
52	Cooperation — court
53	Obligations of foreign representative
	Multiple Proceedings
54	Concurrent proceedings
55	Multiple foreign proceedings
	Miscellaneous Provisions
56	Authorization to act as representative of proceeding under this Act
57	Foreign representative status
58	Foreign proceeding appeal
59	Presumption of insolvency
60	Credit for recovery in other jurisdictions
61	Court not prevented from applying certain rules

PART V

Administration

62	Regulations
63	Review of Act

	Obligations
52	Collaboration — tribunal
53	Obligations du représentant étranger
	Instances multiples
54	Instances concomitantes
55	Plusieurs instances étrangères
	Dispositions diverses
56	Autorisation d'agir à titre de représentant dans toute procédure intentée sous le régime de la présente loi
57	Statut du représentant étranger
58	Instance étrangère : appel
59	Présomption d'insolvabilité
60	Sommes reçues à l'étranger
61	Application de règles étrangères

PARTIE V

Administration

62	Règlements
63	Rapport



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

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

An Act to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors

Loi facilitant les transactions et arrangements entre les compagnies et leurs créanciers

Short Title

Titre abrégé

Short title

1 This Act may be cited as the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 1.

Titre abrégé

1 *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 1.

Interpretation

Définitions et application

Definitions

2 (1) In this Act,

aircraft objects [Repealed, 2012, c. 31, s. 419]

bargaining agent means any trade union that has entered into a collective agreement on behalf of the employees of a company; (*agent négociateur*)

bond includes a debenture, debenture stock or other evidences of indebtedness; (*obligation*)

cash-flow statement, in respect of a company, means the statement referred to in paragraph 10(2)(a) indicating the company's projected cash flow; (*état de l'évolution de l'encaisse*)

claim means any indebtedness, liability or obligation of any kind that would be a claim provable within the meaning of section 2 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*; (*réclamation*)

collective agreement, in relation to a debtor company, means a collective agreement within the meaning of the jurisdiction governing collective bargaining between the debtor company and a bargaining agent; (*convention collective*)

Définitions

2 (1) Les définitions qui suivent s'appliquent à la présente loi.

accord de transfert de titres pour obtention de crédit

Accord aux termes duquel une compagnie débitrice transfère la propriété d'un bien en vue de garantir le paiement d'une somme ou l'exécution d'une obligation relativement à un contrat financier admissible. (*title transfer credit support agreement*)

actionnaire S'agissant d'une compagnie ou d'une fiducie de revenu assujetties à la présente loi, est assimilée à l'actionnaire la personne ayant un intérêt dans cette compagnie ou détenant des parts de cette fiducie. (*shareholder*)

administrateur S'agissant d'une compagnie autre qu'une fiducie de revenu, toute personne exerçant les fonctions d'administrateur, indépendamment de son titre, et, s'agissant d'une fiducie de revenu, toute personne exerçant les fonctions de fiduciaire, indépendamment de son titre. (*director*)

agent négociateur Syndicat ayant conclu une convention collective pour le compte des employés d'une compagnie. (*bargaining agent*)

biens aéronautiques [Abrogée, 2012, ch. 31, art. 419]

company means any company, corporation or legal person incorporated by or under an Act of Parliament or of the legislature of a province, any incorporated company having assets or doing business in Canada, wherever incorporated, and any income trust, but does not include banks, authorized foreign banks within the meaning of section 2 of the *Bank Act*, telegraph companies, insurance companies and companies to which the *Trust and Loan Companies Act* applies; (*compagnie*)

court means

(a) in Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, the Supreme Court,

(a.1) in Ontario, the Superior Court of Justice,

(b) in Quebec, the Superior Court,

(c) in New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the Court of Queen's Bench,

(c.1) in Newfoundland and Labrador, the Trial Division of the Supreme Court, and

(d) in Yukon and the Northwest Territories, the Supreme Court, and in Nunavut, the Nunavut Court of Justice; (*tribunal*)

debtor company means any company that

(a) is bankrupt or insolvent,

(b) has committed an act of bankruptcy within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or is deemed insolvent within the meaning of the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, whether or not proceedings in respect of the company have been taken under either of those Acts,

(c) has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, or

(d) is in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* because the company is insolvent; (*compagnie débitrice*)

director means, in the case of a company other than an income trust, a person occupying the position of director by whatever name called and, in the case of an income trust, a person occupying the position of trustee by whatever name called; (*administrateur*)

eligible financial contract means an agreement of a prescribed kind; (*contrat financier admissible*)

compagnie Toute personne morale constituée par une loi fédérale ou provinciale ou sous son régime et toute personne morale qui possède un actif ou exerce des activités au Canada, quel que soit l'endroit où elle a été constituée, ainsi que toute fiducie de revenu. La présente définition exclut les banques, les banques étrangères autorisées, au sens de l'article 2 de la *Loi sur les banques*, les compagnies de télégraphe, les compagnies d'assurances et les sociétés auxquelles s'applique la *Loi sur les sociétés de fiducie et de prêt*. (*company*)

compagnie débitrice Toute compagnie qui, selon le cas :

a) est en faillite ou est insolvable;

b) a commis un acte de faillite au sens de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou est réputée insolvable au sens de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, que des procédures relatives à cette compagnie aient été intentées ou non sous le régime de l'une ou l'autre de ces lois;

c) a fait une cession autorisée ou à l'encontre de laquelle une ordonnance de faillite a été rendue en vertu de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*;

d) est en voie de liquidation aux termes de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations* parce que la compagnie est insolvable. (*debtor company*)

contrat financier admissible Contrat d'une catégorie réglementaire. (*eligible financial contract*)

contrôleur S'agissant d'une compagnie, la personne nommée en application de l'article 11.7 pour agir à titre de contrôleur des affaires financières et autres de celle-ci. (*monitor*)

convention collective S'entend au sens donné à ce terme par les règles de droit applicables aux négociations collectives entre la compagnie débitrice et l'agent négociateur. (*collective agreement*)

créancier chirographaire Tout créancier d'une compagnie qui n'est pas un créancier garanti, qu'il réside ou soit domicilié au Canada ou à l'étranger. Un fiduciaire pour les détenteurs d'obligations non garanties, lesquelles sont émises en vertu d'un acte de fiducie ou autre acte fonctionnant en faveur du fiduciaire, est réputé un créancier chirographaire pour toutes les fins de la présente loi sauf la votation à une assemblée des créanciers relativement à ces obligations. (*unsecured creditor*)

equity claim means a claim that is in respect of an equity interest, including a claim for, among others,

- (a) a dividend or similar payment,
- (b) a return of capital,
- (c) a redemption or retraction obligation,
- (d) a monetary loss resulting from the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest or from the rescission, or, in Quebec, the annulment, of a purchase or sale of an equity interest, or
- (e) contribution or indemnity in respect of a claim referred to in any of paragraphs (a) to (d); (*réclamation relative à des capitaux propres*)

equity interest means

- (a) in the case of a company other than an income trust, a share in the company — or a warrant or option or another right to acquire a share in the company — other than one that is derived from a convertible debt, and
- (b) in the case of an income trust, a unit in the income trust — or a warrant or option or another right to acquire a unit in the income trust — other than one that is derived from a convertible debt; (*intérêt relatif à des capitaux propres*)

financial collateral means any of the following that is subject to an interest, or in the Province of Quebec a right, that secures payment or performance of an obligation in respect of an eligible financial contract or that is subject to a title transfer credit support agreement:

- (a) cash or cash equivalents, including negotiable instruments and demand deposits,
- (b) securities, a securities account, a securities entitlement or a right to acquire securities, or
- (c) a futures agreement or a futures account; (*garantie financière*)

income trust means a trust that has assets in Canada if

- (a) its units are listed on a prescribed stock exchange on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act, or
- (b) the majority of its units are held by a trust whose units are listed on a prescribed stock exchange on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act; (*fiducie de revenu*)

créancier garanti Détenteur d'hypothèque, de gage, charge, nantissement ou privilège sur ou contre l'ensemble ou une partie des biens d'une compagnie débitrice, ou tout transport, cession ou transfert de la totalité ou d'une partie de ces biens, à titre de garantie d'une dette de la compagnie débitrice, ou un détenteur de quelque obligation d'une compagnie débitrice garantie par hypothèque, gage, charge, nantissement ou privilège sur ou contre l'ensemble ou une partie des biens de la compagnie débitrice, ou un transport, une cession ou un transfert de tout ou partie de ces biens, ou une fiducie à leur égard, que ce détenteur ou bénéficiaire réside ou soit domicilié au Canada ou à l'étranger. Un fiduciaire en vertu de tout acte de fiducie ou autre instrument garantissant ces obligations est réputé un créancier garanti pour toutes les fins de la présente loi sauf la votation à une assemblée de créanciers relativement à ces obligations. (*secured creditor*)

demande initiale La demande faite pour la première fois en application de la présente loi relativement à une compagnie. (*initial application*)

état de l'évolution de l'encaisse Relativement à une compagnie, l'état visé à l'alinéa 10(2)a) portant, projections à l'appui, sur l'évolution de l'encaisse de celle-ci. (*cash-flow statement*)

fiducie de revenu Fiducie qui possède un actif au Canada et dont les parts sont inscrites à une bourse de valeurs mobilières visée par règlement à la date à laquelle des procédures sont intentées sous le régime de la présente loi, ou sont détenues en majorité par une fiducie dont les parts sont inscrites à une telle bourse à cette date. (*income trust*)

garantie financière S'il est assujéti soit à un intérêt ou, dans la province de Québec, à un droit garantissant le paiement d'une somme ou l'exécution d'une obligation relativement à un contrat financier admissible, soit à un accord de transfert de titres pour obtention de crédit, l'un ou l'autre des éléments suivants :

- a) les sommes en espèces et les équivalents de trésorerie — notamment les effets négociables et dépôts à vue;
- b) les titres, comptes de titres, droits intermédiés et droits d'acquérir des titres;
- c) les contrats à terme ou comptes de contrats à terme. (*financial collateral*)

intérêt relatif à des capitaux propres

initial application means the first application made under this Act in respect of a company; (*demande initiale*)

monitor, in respect of a company, means the person appointed under section 11.7 to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company; (*contrôleur*)

net termination value means the net amount obtained after netting or setting off or compensating the mutual obligations between the parties to an eligible financial contract in accordance with its provisions; (*valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation*)

prescribed means prescribed by regulation; (*Version anglaise seulement*)

secured creditor means a holder of a mortgage, hypothec, pledge, charge, lien or privilege on or against, or any assignment, cession or transfer of, all or any property of a debtor company as security for indebtedness of the debtor company, or a holder of any bond of a debtor company secured by a mortgage, hypothec, pledge, charge, lien or privilege on or against, or any assignment, cession or transfer of, or a trust in respect of, all or any property of the debtor company, whether the holder or beneficiary is resident or domiciled within or outside Canada, and a trustee under any trust deed or other instrument securing any of those bonds shall be deemed to be a secured creditor for all purposes of this Act except for the purpose of voting at a creditors' meeting in respect of any of those bonds; (*créancier garanti*)

shareholder includes a member of a company — and, in the case of an income trust, a holder of a unit in an income trust — to which this Act applies; (*actionnaire*)

Superintendent of Bankruptcy means the Superintendent of Bankruptcy appointed under subsection 5(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*; (*surintendant des faillites*)

Superintendent of Financial Institutions means the Superintendent of Financial Institutions appointed under subsection 5(1) of the *Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Act*; (*surintendant des institutions financières*)

title transfer credit support agreement means an agreement under which a debtor company has provided title to property for the purpose of securing the payment or performance of an obligation of the debtor company in respect of an eligible financial contract; (*accord de transfert de titres pour obtention de crédit*)

unsecured creditor means any creditor of a company who is not a secured creditor, whether resident or

a) S'agissant d'une compagnie autre qu'une fiducie de revenu, action de celle-ci ou bon de souscription, option ou autre droit permettant d'acquérir une telle action et ne provenant pas de la conversion d'une dette convertible;

b) s'agissant d'une fiducie de revenu, part de celle-ci ou bon de souscription, option ou autre droit permettant d'acquérir une telle part et ne provenant pas de la conversion d'une dette convertible. (*equity interest*)

obligation Sont assimilés aux obligations les débetures, stock-obligations et autres titres de créance. (*bond*)

réclamation S'entend de toute dette, de tout engagement ou de toute obligation de quelque nature que ce soit, qui constituerait une réclamation prouvable au sens de l'article 2 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*. (*claim*)

réclamation relative à des capitaux propres Réclamation portant sur un intérêt relatif à des capitaux propres et visant notamment :

a) un dividende ou un paiement similaire;

b) un remboursement de capital;

c) tout droit de rachat d'actions au gré de l'actionnaire ou de remboursement anticipé d'actions au gré de l'émetteur;

d) des pertes pécuniaires associées à la propriété, à l'achat ou à la vente d'un intérêt relatif à des capitaux propres ou à l'annulation de cet achat ou de cette vente;

e) une contribution ou une indemnité relative à toute réclamation visée à l'un des alinéas a) à d). (*equity claim*)

surintendant des faillites Le surintendant des faillites nommé au titre du paragraphe 5(1) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*. (*Superintendent of Bankruptcy*)

surintendant des institutions financières Le surintendant des institutions financières nommé en application du paragraphe 5(1) de la *Loi sur le Bureau du surintendant des institutions financières*. (*Superintendent of Financial Institutions*)

tribunal

domiciled within or outside Canada, and a trustee for the holders of any unsecured bonds issued under a trust deed or other instrument running in favour of the trustee shall be deemed to be an unsecured creditor for all purposes of this Act except for the purpose of voting at a creditors' meeting in respect of any of those bonds. (*créancier chirographaire*)

Meaning of *related and dealing at arm's length*

(2) For the purpose of this Act, section 4 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* applies for the purpose of determining whether a person is related to or dealing at arm's length with a debtor company.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 2; R.S., 1985, c. 27 (2nd Supp.), s. 10; 1990, c. 17, s. 4; 1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1993, c. 34, s. 52; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 1997, c. 12, s. 120(E); 1998, c. 30, s. 14; 1999, c. 3, s. 22, c. 28, s. 154; 2001, c. 9, s. 575; 2002, c. 7, s. 133; 2004, c. 25, s. 193; 2005, c. 3, s. 15, c. 47, s. 124; 2007, c. 29, s. 104, c. 36, ss. 61, 105; 2012, c. 31, s. 419; 2015, c. 3, s. 37; 2018, c. 10, s. 89.

Application

3 (1) This Act applies in respect of a debtor company or affiliated debtor companies if the total of claims against the debtor company or affiliated debtor companies, determined in accordance with section 20, is more than \$5,000,000 or any other amount that is prescribed.

Affiliated companies

(2) For the purposes of this Act,

(a) companies are affiliated companies if one of them is the subsidiary of the other or both are subsidiaries of the same company or each of them is controlled by the same person; and

(b) two companies affiliated with the same company at the same time are deemed to be affiliated with each other.

a) Dans les provinces de la Nouvelle-Écosse, de la Colombie-Britannique et de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard, la Cour suprême;

a.1) dans la province d'Ontario, la Cour supérieure de justice;

b) dans la province de Québec, la Cour supérieure;

c) dans les provinces du Nouveau-Brunswick, du Manitoba, de la Saskatchewan et d'Alberta, la Cour du Banc de la Reine;

c.1) dans la province de Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador, la Section de première instance de la Cour suprême;

d) au Yukon et dans les Territoires du Nord-Ouest, la Cour suprême et, au Nunavut, la Cour de justice du Nunavut. (*court*)

valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation La somme nette obtenue après compensation des obligations mutuelles des parties à un contrat financier admissible effectuée conformément à ce contrat. (*net termination value*)

Définition de *personnes liées*

(2) Pour l'application de la présente loi, l'article 4 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* s'applique pour établir si une personne est liée à une compagnie débitrice ou agit sans lien de dépendance avec une telle compagnie.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 2; L.R. (1985), ch. 27 (2^e suppl.), art. 10; 1990, ch. 17, art. 4; 1992, ch. 27, art. 90; 1993, ch. 34, art. 52; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 1997, ch. 12, art. 120(A); 1998, ch. 30, art. 14; 1999, ch. 3, art. 22, ch. 28, art. 154; 2001, ch. 9, art. 575; 2002, ch. 7, art. 133; 2004, ch. 25, art. 193; 2005, ch. 3, art. 15, ch. 47, art. 124; 2007, ch. 29, art. 104, ch. 36, art. 61 et 105; 2012, ch. 31, art. 419; 2015, ch. 3, art. 37; 2018, ch. 10, art. 89.

Application

3 (1) La présente loi ne s'applique à une compagnie débitrice ou aux compagnies débitrices qui appartiennent au même groupe qu'elle que si le montant des réclamations contre elle ou les compagnies appartenant au même groupe, établi conformément à l'article 20, est supérieur à cinq millions de dollars ou à toute autre somme prévue par les règlements.

Application

(2) Pour l'application de la présente loi :

a) appartiennent au même groupe deux compagnies dont l'une est la filiale de l'autre ou qui sont sous le contrôle de la même personne;

b) sont réputées appartenir au même groupe deux compagnies dont chacune appartient au groupe d'une même compagnie.

Company controlled

(3) For the purposes of this Act, a company is controlled by a person or by two or more companies if

(a) securities of the company to which are attached more than fifty per cent of the votes that may be cast to elect directors of the company are held, other than by way of security only, by or for the benefit of that person or by or for the benefit of those companies; and

(b) the votes attached to those securities are sufficient, if exercised, to elect a majority of the directors of the company.

Subsidiary

(4) For the purposes of this Act, a company is a subsidiary of another company if

(a) it is controlled by

(i) that other company,

(ii) that other company and one or more companies each of which is controlled by that other company, or

(iii) two or more companies each of which is controlled by that other company; or

(b) it is a subsidiary of a company that is a subsidiary of that other company.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 3; 1997, c. 12, s. 121; 2005, c. 47, s. 125.

PART I

Compromises and Arrangements

Compromise with unsecured creditors

4 Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its unsecured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company, of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors, and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 4.

Application

(3) Pour l'application de la présente loi, ont le contrôle d'une compagnie la personne ou les compagnies :

a) qui détiennent — ou en sont bénéficiaires —, autrement qu'à titre de garantie seulement, des valeurs mobilières conférant plus de cinquante pour cent du maximum possible des voix à l'élection des administrateurs de la compagnie;

b) dont lesdites valeurs mobilières confèrent un droit de vote dont l'exercice permet d'élire la majorité des administrateurs de la compagnie.

Application

(4) Pour l'application de la présente loi, une compagnie est la filiale d'une autre compagnie dans chacun des cas suivants :

a) elle est contrôlée :

(i) soit par l'autre compagnie,

(ii) soit par l'autre compagnie et une ou plusieurs compagnies elles-mêmes contrôlées par cette autre compagnie,

(iii) soit par des compagnies elles-mêmes contrôlées par l'autre compagnie;

b) elle est la filiale d'une filiale de l'autre compagnie.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 3; 1997, ch. 12, art. 121; 2005, ch. 47, art. 125.

PARTIE I

Transactions et arrangements

Transaction avec les créanciers chirographaires

4 Lorsqu'une transaction ou un arrangement est proposé entre une compagnie débitrice et ses créanciers chirographaires ou toute catégorie de ces derniers, le tribunal peut, à la requête sommaire de la compagnie, d'un de ces créanciers ou du syndic en matière de faillite ou liquidateur de la compagnie, ordonner que soit convoquée, de la manière qu'il prescrit, une assemblée de ces créanciers ou catégorie de créanciers, et, si le tribunal en décide ainsi, des actionnaires de la compagnie.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 4.

Compromise with secured creditors

5 Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its secured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company or of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors, and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 5.

Claims against directors — compromise

5.1 (1) A compromise or arrangement made in respect of a debtor company may include in its terms provision for the compromise of claims against directors of the company that arose before the commencement of proceedings under this Act and that relate to the obligations of the company where the directors are by law liable in their capacity as directors for the payment of such obligations.

Exception

(2) A provision for the compromise of claims against directors may not include claims that

- (a)** relate to contractual rights of one or more creditors; or
- (b)** are based on allegations of misrepresentations made by directors to creditors or of wrongful or oppressive conduct by directors.

Powers of court

(3) The court may declare that a claim against directors shall not be compromised if it is satisfied that the compromise would not be fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

Resignation or removal of directors

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

1997, c. 12, s. 122.

Compromises to be sanctioned by court

6 (1) If a majority in number representing two thirds in value of the creditors, or the class of creditors, as the case may be — other than, unless the court orders otherwise, a class of creditors having equity claims, — present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or

Transaction avec les créanciers garantis

5 Lorsqu'une transaction ou un arrangement est proposé entre une compagnie débitrice et ses créanciers garantis ou toute catégorie de ces derniers, le tribunal peut, à la requête sommaire de la compagnie, d'un de ces créanciers ou du syndic en matière de faillite ou liquidateur de la compagnie, ordonner que soit convoquée, de la manière qu'il prescrit, une assemblée de ces créanciers ou catégorie de créanciers, et, si le tribunal en décide ainsi, des actionnaires de la compagnie.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 5.

Transaction — réclamations contre les administrateurs

5.1 (1) La transaction ou l'arrangement visant une compagnie débitrice peut comporter, au profit de ses créanciers, des dispositions relativement à une transaction sur les réclamations contre ses administrateurs qui sont antérieures aux procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi et visent des obligations de celle-ci dont ils peuvent être, ès qualités, responsables en droit.

Restriction

(2) La transaction ne peut toutefois viser des réclamations portant sur des droits contractuels d'un ou de plusieurs créanciers ou fondées sur la fausse représentation ou la conduite injustifiée ou abusive des administrateurs.

Pouvoir du tribunal

(3) Le tribunal peut déclarer qu'une réclamation contre les administrateurs ne peut faire l'objet d'une transaction s'il est convaincu qu'elle ne serait ni juste ni équitable dans les circonstances.

Démission ou destitution des administrateurs

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

1997, ch. 12, art. 122.

Homologation par le tribunal

6 (1) Si une majorité en nombre représentant les deux tiers en valeur des créanciers ou d'une catégorie de créanciers, selon le cas, — mise à part, sauf ordonnance contraire du tribunal, toute catégorie de créanciers ayant des réclamations relatives à des capitaux propres —

meetings of creditors respectively held under sections 4 and 5, or either of those sections, agree to any compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at the meeting or meetings, the compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by the court and, if so sanctioned, is binding

(a) on all the creditors or the class of creditors, as the case may be, and on any trustee for that class of creditors, whether secured or unsecured, as the case may be, and on the company; and

(b) in the case of a company that has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or is in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, on the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator and contributories of the company.

Court may order amendment

(2) If a court sanctions a compromise or arrangement, it may order that the debtor's constating instrument be amended in accordance with the compromise or arrangement to reflect any change that may lawfully be made under federal or provincial law.

Restriction — certain Crown claims

(3) Unless Her Majesty agrees otherwise, the court may sanction a compromise or arrangement only if the compromise or arrangement provides for the payment in full to Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province, within six months after court sanction of the compromise or arrangement, of all amounts that were outstanding at the time of the application for an order under section 11 or 11.02 and that are of a kind that could be subject to a demand under

(a) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*;

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that Act, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts; or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any

présents et votant soit en personne, soit par fondé de pouvoir à l'assemblée ou aux assemblées de créanciers respectivement tenues au titre des articles 4 et 5, acceptent une transaction ou un arrangement, proposé ou modifié à cette ou ces assemblées, la transaction ou l'arrangement peut être homologué par le tribunal et, le cas échéant, lie :

a) tous les créanciers ou la catégorie de créanciers, selon le cas, et tout fiduciaire pour cette catégorie de créanciers, qu'ils soient garantis ou chirographaires, selon le cas, ainsi que la compagnie;

b) dans le cas d'une compagnie qui a fait une cession autorisée ou à l'encontre de laquelle une ordonnance de faillite a été rendue en vertu de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou qui est en voie de liquidation sous le régime de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, le syndic en matière de faillite ou liquidateur et les contributeurs de la compagnie.

Modification des statuts constitutifs

(2) Le tribunal qui homologue une transaction ou un arrangement peut ordonner la modification des statuts constitutifs de la compagnie conformément à ce qui est prévu dans la transaction ou l'arrangement, selon le cas, pourvu que la modification soit légale au regard du droit fédéral ou provincial.

Certaines réclamations de la Couronne

(3) Le tribunal ne peut, sans le consentement de Sa Majesté, homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement qui ne prévoit pas le paiement intégral à Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou d'une province, dans les six mois suivant l'homologation, de toutes les sommes qui étaient dues lors de la demande d'ordonnance visée aux articles 11 ou 11.02 et qui pourraient, de par leur nature, faire l'objet d'une demande aux termes d'une des dispositions suivantes :

a) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités ou autres charges afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme,

related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a *province providing a comprehensive pension plan* as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a *provincial pension plan* as defined in that subsection.

Restriction — default of remittance to Crown

(4) If an order contains a provision authorized by section 11.09, no compromise or arrangement is to be sanctioned by the court if, at the time the court hears the application for sanction, Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province satisfies the court that the company is in default on any remittance of an amount referred to in subsection (3) that became due after the time of the application for an order under section 11.02.

Restriction — employees, etc.

(5) The court may sanction a compromise or an arrangement only if

(a) the compromise or arrangement provides for payment to the employees and former employees of the company, immediately after the court's sanction, of

(i) amounts at least equal to the amounts that they would have been qualified to receive under paragraph 136(1)(d) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* if the company had become bankrupt on the day on which proceedings commenced under this Act, and

(ii) wages, salaries, commissions or compensation for services rendered after proceedings commence under this Act and before the court sanctions the compromise or arrangement, together with, in the case of travelling salespersons, disbursements properly incurred by them in and about the company's business during the same period; and

(b) the court is satisfied that the company can and will make the payments as required under paragraph (a).

ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités ou autres charges afférents, laquelle somme :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale a institué un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Défaut d'effectuer un versement

(4) Lorsqu'une ordonnance comporte une disposition autorisée par l'article 11.09, le tribunal ne peut homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement si, lors de l'audition de la demande d'homologation, Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou d'une province le convainc du défaut de la compagnie d'effectuer un versement portant sur une somme visée au paragraphe (3) et qui est devenue exigible après le dépôt de la demande d'ordonnance visée à l'article 11.02.

Restriction — employés, etc.

(5) Le tribunal ne peut homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement que si, à la fois :

a) la transaction ou l'arrangement prévoit le paiement aux employés actuels et anciens de la compagnie, dès son homologation, de sommes égales ou supérieures, d'une part, à celles qu'ils seraient en droit de recevoir en application de l'alinéa 136(1)d) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* si la compagnie avait fait faillite à la date à laquelle des procédures ont été introduites sous le régime de la présente loi à son égard et, d'autre part, au montant des gages, salaires, commissions ou autre rémunération pour services fournis entre la date de l'introduction des procédures et celle de l'homologation, y compris les sommes que le voyageur de commerce a régulièrement déboursées dans le cadre de l'exploitation de la compagnie entre ces dates;

b) il est convaincu que la compagnie est en mesure d'effectuer et effectuera les paiements prévus à l'alinéa a).

Restriction — pension plan

(6) If the company participates in a prescribed pension plan for the benefit of its employees, the court may sanction a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company only if

(a) the compromise or arrangement provides for payment of the following amounts that are unpaid to the fund established for the purpose of the pension plan:

(i) an amount equal to the sum of all amounts that were deducted from the employees' remuneration for payment to the fund,

(ii) if the prescribed pension plan is regulated by an Act of Parliament,

(A) an amount equal to the normal cost, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Pension Benefits Standards Regulations, 1985*, that was required to be paid by the employer to the fund, and

(A.1) an amount equal to the sum of all special payments, determined in accordance with section 9 of the *Pension Benefits Standards Regulations, 1985*, that were required to be paid by the employer to the fund referred to in sections 81.5 and 81.6 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* to liquidate an unfunded liability or a solvency deficiency,

(A.2) any amount required to liquidate any other unfunded liability or solvency deficiency of the fund as determined on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act,

(B) an amount equal to the sum of all amounts that were required to be paid by the employer to the fund under a defined contribution provision, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985*,

(C) an amount equal to the sum of all amounts that were required to be paid by the employer to the administrator of a pooled registered pension plan, as defined in subsection 2(1) of the *Pooled Registered Pension Plans Act*, and

(iii) in the case of any other prescribed pension plan,

(A) an amount equal to the amount that would be the normal cost, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Pension Benefits Standards Regulations, 1985*, that the employer would be

Restriction — régime de pension

(6) Si la compagnie participe à un régime de pension réglementaire institué pour ses employés, le tribunal ne peut homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement que si, à la fois :

a) la transaction ou l'arrangement prévoit que seront effectués des paiements correspondant au total des sommes ci-après qui n'ont pas été versées au fonds établi dans le cadre du régime de pension :

(i) les sommes qui ont été déduites de la rémunération des employés pour versement au fonds,

(ii) dans le cas d'un régime de pension réglementaire régi par une loi fédérale :

(A) les coûts normaux, au sens du paragraphe 2(1) du *Règlement de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension*, que l'employeur est tenu de verser au fonds,

(A.1) la somme égale au total des paiements spéciaux, établis conformément à l'article 9 du *Règlement de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension*, que l'employeur est tenu de verser au fonds visé aux articles 81.5 et 81.6 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* pour la liquidation d'un passif non capitalisé ou d'un déficit de solvabilité,

(A.2) toute somme requise pour la liquidation de tout autre passif non capitalisé ou déficit de solvabilité du fonds établi à la date à laquelle des procédures sont intentées sous le régime de la présente loi,

(B) les sommes que l'employeur est tenu de verser au fonds au titre de toute disposition à cotisations déterminées au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension*,

(C) les sommes que l'employeur est tenu de verser à l'administrateur d'un régime de pension agréé collectif au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi sur les régimes de pension agréés collectifs*,

(iii) dans le cas de tout autre régime de pension réglementaire :

(A) la somme égale aux coûts normaux, au sens du paragraphe 2(1) du *Règlement de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension*, que l'employeur serait tenu de verser au fonds si le régime était régi par une loi fédérale,

required to pay to the fund if the prescribed plan were regulated by an Act of Parliament, and

(A.1) an amount equal to the sum of all special payments, determined in accordance with section 9 of the *Pension Benefits Standards Regulations, 1985*, that would have been required to be paid by the employer to the fund referred to in sections 81.5 and 81.6 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* to liquidate an unfunded liability or a solvency deficiency if the prescribed plan were regulated by an Act of Parliament,

(A.2) any amount required to liquidate any other unfunded liability or solvency deficiency of the fund as determined on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act,

(B) an amount equal to the sum of all amounts that would have been required to be paid by the employer to the fund under a defined contribution provision, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985*, if the prescribed plan were regulated by an Act of Parliament,

(C) an amount equal to the sum of all amounts that would have been required to be paid by the employer in respect of a prescribed plan, if it were regulated by the *Pooled Registered Pension Plans Act*; and

(b) the court is satisfied that the company can and will make the payments as required under paragraph (a).

Non-application of subsection (6)

(7) Despite subsection (6), the court may sanction a compromise or arrangement that does not allow for the payment of the amounts referred to in that subsection if it is satisfied that the relevant parties have entered into an agreement, approved by the relevant pension regulator, respecting the payment of those amounts.

Payment — equity claims

(8) No compromise or arrangement that provides for the payment of an equity claim is to be sanctioned by the court unless it provides that all claims that are not equity claims are to be paid in full before the equity claim is to be paid.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 6; 1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 1997, c. 12, s. 123; 2004, c. 25, s. 194; 2005, c. 47, s. 126, 2007, c. 36, s. 106; 2009, c. 33, s. 27; 2012, c. 16, s. 82; 2023, c. 6, s. 5.

(A.1) la somme égale au total des paiements spéciaux, établis conformément à l'article 9 du *Règlement de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension*, que l'employeur serait tenu de verser au fonds visé aux articles 81.5 et 81.6 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* pour la liquidation d'un passif non capitalisé ou d'un déficit de solvabilité si le régime était régi par une loi fédérale,

(A.2) toute somme requise pour la liquidation de tout autre passif non capitalisé ou déficit de solvabilité du fonds établi à la date à laquelle des procédures sont intentées sous le régime de la présente loi,

(B) les sommes que l'employeur serait tenu de verser au fonds au titre de toute disposition à cotisations déterminées au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension* si le régime était régi par une loi fédérale,

(C) les sommes que l'employeur serait tenu de verser à l'égard du régime s'il était régi par la *Loi sur les régimes de pension agréés collectifs*;

b) il est convaincu que la compagnie est en mesure d'effectuer et effectuera les paiements prévus à l'alinéa a).

Non-application du paragraphe (6)

(7) Par dérogation au paragraphe (6), le tribunal peut homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement qui ne prévoit pas le versement des sommes mentionnées à ce paragraphe s'il est convaincu que les parties en cause ont conclu un accord sur les sommes à verser et que l'autorité administrative responsable du régime de pension a consenti à l'accord.

Paiement d'une réclamation relative à des capitaux propres

(8) Le tribunal ne peut homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement qui prévoit le paiement d'une réclamation relative à des capitaux propres que si, selon les termes de celle-ci, le paiement intégral de toutes les autres réclamations sera effectué avant le paiement de la réclamation relative à des capitaux propres.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 6; 1992, ch. 27, art. 90; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 1997, ch. 12, art. 123; 2004, ch. 25, art. 194; 2005, ch. 47, art. 126, 2007, ch. 36, art. 106; 2009, ch. 33, art. 27; 2012, ch. 16, art. 82; 2023, ch. 6, art. 5.

Court may give directions

7 Where an alteration or a modification of any compromise or arrangement is proposed at any time after the court has directed a meeting or meetings to be summoned, the meeting or meetings may be adjourned on such term as to notice and otherwise as the court may direct, and those directions may be given after as well as before adjournment of any meeting or meetings, and the court may in its discretion direct that it is not necessary to adjourn any meeting or to convene any further meeting of any class of creditors or shareholders that in the opinion of the court is not adversely affected by the alteration or modification proposed, and any compromise or arrangement so altered or modified may be sanctioned by the court and have effect under section 6.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 7.

Scope of Act

8 This Act extends and does not limit the provisions of any instrument now or hereafter existing that governs the rights of creditors or any class of them and has full force and effect notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in that instrument.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 8.

PART II

Jurisdiction of Courts

Jurisdiction of court to receive applications

9 (1) Any application under this Act may be made to the court that has jurisdiction in the province within which the head office or chief place of business of the company in Canada is situated, or, if the company has no place of business in Canada, in any province within which any assets of the company are situated.

Single judge may exercise powers, subject to appeal

(2) The powers conferred by this Act on a court may, subject to appeal as provided for in this Act, be exercised by a single judge thereof, and those powers may be exercised in chambers during term or in vacation.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 9.

Le tribunal peut donner des instructions

7 Si une modification d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement est proposée après que le tribunal a ordonné qu'une ou plusieurs assemblées soient convoquées, cette ou ces assemblées peuvent être ajournées aux conditions que peut prescrire le tribunal quant à l'avis et autrement, et ces instructions peuvent être données tant après qu'avant l'ajournement de toute ou toutes assemblées, et le tribunal peut, à sa discrétion, prescrire qu'il ne sera pas nécessaire d'ajourner quelque assemblée ou de convoquer une nouvelle assemblée de toute catégorie de créanciers ou actionnaires qui, selon l'opinion du tribunal, n'est pas défavorablement atteinte par la modification proposée, et une transaction ou un arrangement ainsi modifié peut être homologué par le tribunal et être exécutoire en vertu de l'article 6.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 7.

Champ d'application de la loi

8 La présente loi n'a pas pour effet de limiter mais d'étendre les stipulations de tout instrument actuellement ou désormais existant relativement aux droits de créanciers ou de toute catégorie de ces derniers, et elle est pleinement exécutoire et effective nonobstant toute stipulation contraire de cet instrument.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 8.

PARTIE II

Jurisdiction des tribunaux

Le tribunal a juridiction pour recevoir des demandes

9 (1) Toute demande prévue par la présente loi peut être faite au tribunal ayant juridiction dans la province où est situé le siège social ou le principal bureau d'affaires de la compagnie au Canada, ou, si la compagnie n'a pas de bureau d'affaires au Canada, dans la province où est situé quelque actif de la compagnie.

Un seul juge peut exercer les pouvoirs, sous réserve d'appel

(2) Les pouvoirs conférés au tribunal par la présente loi peuvent être exercés par un seul de ses juges, sous réserve de l'appel prévu par la présente loi. Ces pouvoirs peuvent être exercés en chambre, soit durant une session du tribunal, soit pendant les vacances judiciaires.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 9.

Form of applications

10 (1) Applications under this Act shall be made by petition or by way of originating summons or notice of motion in accordance with the practice of the court in which the application is made.

Documents that must accompany initial application

(2) An initial application must be accompanied by

- (a)** a statement indicating, on a weekly basis, the projected cash flow of the debtor company;
- (b)** a report containing the prescribed representations of the debtor company regarding the preparation of the cash-flow statement; and
- (c)** copies of all financial statements, audited or unaudited, prepared during the year before the application or, if no such statements were prepared in that year, a copy of the most recent such statement.

Publication ban

(3) The court may make an order prohibiting the release to the public of any cash-flow statement, or any part of a cash-flow statement, if it is satisfied that the release would unduly prejudice the debtor company and the making of the order would not unduly prejudice the company's creditors, but the court may, in the order, direct that the cash-flow statement or any part of it be made available to any person specified in the order on any terms or conditions that the court considers appropriate.

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

General power of court

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

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

Relief reasonably necessary

11.001 An order made under section 11 at the same time as an order made under subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection with respect to an initial application shall be

Forme des demandes

10 (1) Les demandes prévues par la présente loi peuvent être formulées par requête ou par voie d'assignation introductive d'instance ou d'avis de motion conformément à la pratique du tribunal auquel la demande est présentée.

Documents accompagnant la demande initiale

(2) La demande initiale doit être accompagnée :

- a)** d'un état portant, projections à l'appui, sur l'évolution hebdomadaire de l'encaisse de la compagnie débitrice;
- b)** d'un rapport contenant les observations réglementaires de la compagnie débitrice relativement à l'établissement de cet état;
- c)** d'une copie des états financiers, vérifiés ou non, établis au cours de l'année précédant la demande ou, à défaut, d'une copie des états financiers les plus récents.

Interdiction de mettre l'état à la disposition du public

(3) Le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, interdire la communication au public de tout ou partie de l'état de l'évolution de l'encaisse de la compagnie débitrice s'il est convaincu que sa communication causerait un préjudice indu à celle-ci et que sa non-communication ne causerait pas de préjudice indu à ses créanciers. Il peut toutefois préciser dans l'ordonnance que tout ou partie de cet état peut être communiqué, aux conditions qu'il estime indiquées, à la personne qu'il nomme.

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

Pouvoir général du tribunal

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

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

Redressements normalement nécessaires

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

limited to relief that is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

2019, c. 29, s. 136.

Rights of suppliers

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

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

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Stays, etc. — initial application

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

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

Stays, etc. — other than initial application

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

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

de la compagnie débitrice dans le cours ordinaire de ses affaires durant cette période.

2019, ch. 29, art. 136.

Droits des fournisseurs

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

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

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Suspension : demande initiale

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

- a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*;
- b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;
- c) interdire, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, l'introduction de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

Suspension : demandes autres qu'initiales

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

- a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime des lois mentionnées à l'alinéa (1)a);
- b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

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

Burden of proof on application

(3) The court shall not make the order unless

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

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

Restriction

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

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

Stays — directors

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

Exception

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

Persons deemed to be directors

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

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Persons obligated under letter of credit or guarantee

11.04 No order made under section 11.02 has effect on any action, suit or proceeding against a person, other than the company in respect of whom the order is made,

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

Preuve

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

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

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

Restriction

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

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

Suspension — administrateurs

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

Exclusion

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

Présomption : administrateurs

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

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Suspension — lettres de crédit ou garanties

11.04 L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 est sans effet sur toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la

who is obligated under a letter of credit or guarantee in relation to the company.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

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

Member of the Canadian Payments Association

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

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

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

Restriction — certain powers, duties and functions

11.08 No order may be made under section 11.02 that affects

- (a) the exercise or performance by the Minister of Finance or the Superintendent of Financial Institutions of any power, duty or function assigned to them by the *Bank Act*, the *Cooperative Credit Associations Act*, the *Insurance Companies Act* or the *Trust and Loan Companies Act*;
- (b) the exercise or performance by the Governor in Council, the Minister of Finance or the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation of any power, duty or function assigned to them by the *Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act*; or
- (c) the exercise by the Attorney General of Canada of any power, assigned to him or her by the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Stay — Her Majesty

11.09 (1) An order made under section 11.02 may provide that

- (a) Her Majesty in right of Canada may not exercise rights under subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* or any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that Act, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, in respect of the company if the company is a tax debtor

personne — autre que la compagnie visée par l'ordonnance — qui a des obligations au titre de lettres de crédit ou de garanties se rapportant à la compagnie.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

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

Membre de l'Association canadienne des paiements

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

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

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

Restrictions : exercice de certaines attributions

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

- a) l'exercice par le ministre des Finances ou par le surintendant des institutions financières des attributions qui leur sont conférées par la *Loi sur les banques*, la *Loi sur les associations coopératives de crédit*, la *Loi sur les sociétés d'assurances* ou la *Loi sur les sociétés de fiducie et de prêt*;
- b) l'exercice par le gouverneur en conseil, le ministre des Finances ou la Société d'assurance-dépôts du Canada des attributions qui leur sont conférées par la *Loi sur la Société d'assurance-dépôts du Canada*;
- c) l'exercice par le procureur général du Canada des pouvoirs qui lui sont conférés par la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Suspension des procédures : Sa Majesté

11.09 (1) L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 peut avoir pour effet de suspendre :

- a) l'exercice par Sa Majesté du chef du Canada des droits que lui confère le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* ou toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie à ce paragraphe et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, à l'égard d'une compagnie

under that subsection or provision, for the period that the court considers appropriate but ending not later than

- (i) the expiry of the order,
- (ii) the refusal of a proposed compromise by the creditors or the court,
- (iii) six months following the court sanction of a compromise or an arrangement,
- (iv) the default by the company on any term of a compromise or an arrangement, or
- (v) the performance of a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company; and

(b) Her Majesty in right of a province may not exercise rights under any provision of provincial legislation in respect of the company if the company is a debtor under that legislation and the provision has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

- (i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or
- (ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a *province providing a comprehensive pension plan* as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a *provincial pension plan* as defined in that subsection,

for the period that the court considers appropriate but ending not later than the occurrence or time referred to in whichever of subparagraphs (a)(i) to (v) that may apply.

When order ceases to be in effect

(2) The portions of an order made under section 11.02 that affect the exercise of rights of Her Majesty referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b) cease to be in effect if

- (a) the company defaults on the payment of any amount that becomes due to Her Majesty after the order is made and could be subject to a demand under
 - (i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

qui est un débiteur fiscal visé à ce paragraphe ou à cette disposition, pour la période se terminant au plus tard :

- (i) à l'expiration de l'ordonnance,
- (ii) au moment du rejet, par le tribunal ou les créanciers, de la transaction proposée,
- (iii) six mois après que le tribunal a homologué la transaction ou l'arrangement,
- (iv) au moment de tout défaut d'exécution de la transaction ou de l'arrangement,
- (v) au moment de l'exécution intégrale de la transaction ou de l'arrangement;

b) l'exercice par Sa Majesté du chef d'une province, pour la période que le tribunal estime indiquée et se terminant au plus tard au moment visé à celui des sous-alinéas a)(i) à (v) qui, le cas échéant, est applicable, des droits que lui confère toute disposition législative de cette province à l'égard d'une compagnie qui est un débiteur visé par la loi provinciale, s'il s'agit d'une disposition dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

- (i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,
- (ii) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Cessation d'effet

(2) Les passages de l'ordonnance qui suspendent l'exercice des droits de Sa Majesté visés aux alinéas (1)a) ou b) cessent d'avoir effet dans les cas suivants :

- a) la compagnie manque à ses obligations de paiement à l'égard de toute somme qui devient due à Sa Majesté après le prononcé de l'ordonnance et qui pourrait faire l'objet d'une demande aux termes d'une des dispositions suivantes :

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that Act, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a *province providing a comprehensive pension plan* as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a *provincial pension plan* as defined in that subsection; or

(b) any other creditor is or becomes entitled to realize a security on any property that could be claimed by Her Majesty in exercising rights under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that Act, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe;

b) un autre créancier a ou acquiert le droit de réaliser sa garantie sur un bien qui pourrait être réclamé par Sa Majesté dans l'exercice des droits que lui confère l'une des dispositions suivantes :

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2)

imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a *province providing a comprehensive pension plan* as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a *provincial pension plan* as defined in that subsection.

Operation of similar legislation

(3) An order made under section 11.02, other than the portions of that order that affect the exercise of rights of Her Majesty referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b), does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that Act, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a *province providing a comprehensive pension plan* as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation

de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Effet

(3) L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02, à l'exception des passages de celle-ci qui suspendent l'exercice des droits de Sa Majesté visés aux alinéas (1)a) ou b), n'a pas pour effet de porter atteinte à l'application des dispositions suivantes :

a) les paragraphes 224(1.2) et (1.3) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la

establishes a *provincial pension plan* as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2009, c. 33, s. 28.

Meaning of *regulatory body*

11.1 (1) In this section, *regulatory body* means a person or body that has powers, duties or functions relating to the enforcement or administration of an Act of Parliament or of the legislature of a province and includes a person or body that is prescribed to be a regulatory body for the purpose of this Act.

Regulatory bodies — order under section 11.02

(2) Subject to subsection (3), no order made under section 11.02 affects a regulatory body's investigation in respect of the debtor company or an action, suit or proceeding that is taken in respect of the company by or before the regulatory body, other than the enforcement of a payment ordered by the regulatory body or the court.

Exception

(3) On application by the company and on notice to the regulatory body and to the persons who are likely to be affected by the order, the court may order that subsection (2) not apply in respect of one or more of the actions, suits or proceedings taken by or before the regulatory body if in the court's opinion

(a) a viable compromise or arrangement could not be made in respect of the company if that subsection were to apply; and

(b) it is not contrary to the public interest that the regulatory body be affected by the order made under section 11.02.

Declaration — enforcement of a payment

(4) If there is a dispute as to whether a regulatory body is seeking to enforce its rights as a creditor, the court may,

province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Pour l'application de l'alinéa c), la disposition législative provinciale en question est réputée avoir, à l'encontre de tout créancier et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute autre règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(i), ou que le paragraphe 23(2) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(ii), et quant aux intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2009, ch. 33, art. 28.

Définition de *organisme administratif*

11.1 (1) Au présent article, *organisme administratif* s'entend de toute personne ou de tout organisme chargé de l'application d'une loi fédérale ou provinciale; y est assimilé toute personne ou tout organisme désigné à ce titre par règlement.

Organisme administratif — ordonnance rendue en vertu de l'article 11.02

(2) Sous réserve du paragraphe (3), l'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 ne porte aucunement atteinte aux mesures — action, poursuite ou autre procédure — prises à l'égard de la compagnie débitrice par ou devant un organisme administratif, ni aux investigations auxquelles il procède à son sujet. Elles n'ont d'effet que sur l'exécution d'un paiement ordonné par lui ou le tribunal.

Exception

(3) Le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur demande de la compagnie et sur préavis à l'organisme administratif et à toute personne qui sera vraisemblablement touchée par l'ordonnance, déclarer que le paragraphe (2) ne s'applique pas à l'une ou plusieurs des mesures prises par ou devant celui-ci, s'il est convaincu que, à la fois :

a) il ne pourrait être fait de transaction ou d'arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie si ce paragraphe s'appliquait;

b) l'ordonnance demandée au titre de l'article 11.02 n'est pas contraire à l'intérêt public.

Déclaration : organisme agissant à titre de créancier

(4) En cas de différend sur la question de savoir si l'organisme administratif cherche à faire valoir ses droits à

on application by the company and on notice to the regulatory body, make an order declaring both that the regulatory body is seeking to enforce its rights as a creditor and that the enforcement of those rights is stayed.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2001, c. 9, s. 576; 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 29, s. 106, c. 36, s. 65.

11.11 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 128]

Interim financing

11.2 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

Priority — secured creditors

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

Priority — other orders

(3) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.

Factors to be considered

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

- (a)** the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
- (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 in respect of the company;
- (e)** the nature and value of the company's property;

titre de créancier dans le cadre de la mesure prise, le tribunal peut déclarer, par ordonnance, sur demande de la compagnie et sur préavis à l'organisme, que celui-ci agit effectivement à ce titre et que la mesure est suspendue.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2001, ch. 9, art. 576; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 29, art. 106, ch. 36, art. 65.

11.11 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 128]

Financement temporaire

11.2 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis de la demande aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer que tout ou partie des biens de la compagnie sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté — d'un montant qu'il estime indiqué — en faveur de la personne nommée dans l'ordonnance qui accepte de prêter à la compagnie la somme qu'il approuve compte tenu de l'état de l'évolution de l'encaisse et des besoins de celle-ci. La charge ou sûreté ne peut garantir qu'une obligation postérieure au prononcé de l'ordonnance.

Priorité — créanciers garantis

(2) Le tribunal peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

Priorité — autres ordonnances

(3) Il peut également y préciser que la charge ou sûreté n'a priorité sur toute autre charge ou sûreté grevant les biens de la compagnie au titre d'une ordonnance déjà rendue en vertu du paragraphe (1) que sur consentement de la personne en faveur de qui cette ordonnance a été rendue.

Facteurs à prendre en considération

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

- a)** la durée prévue des procédures intentées à l'égard de la compagnie sous le régime de la présente loi;
- b)** la façon dont les affaires financières et autres de la compagnie seront gérées au cours de ces procédures;
- c)** la question de savoir si ses dirigeants ont la confiance de ses créanciers les plus importants;
- d)** la question de savoir si le prêt favorisera la conclusion d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie;
- e)** la nature et la valeur des biens de la compagnie;

- (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
- (g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

Additional factor – initial application

(5) When an application is made under subsection (1) at the same time as an initial application referred to in subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection, no order shall be made under subsection (1) unless the court is also satisfied that the terms of the loan are limited to what is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 65; 2019, c. 29, s. 138.

Assignment of agreements

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.

Exceptions

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of rights and obligations that are not assignable by reason of their nature or that arise under

- (a) an agreement entered into on or after the day on which proceedings commence under this Act;
- (b) an eligible financial contract; or
- (c) a collective agreement.

Factors to be considered

(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.

- f) la question de savoir si la charge ou sûreté causera un préjudice sérieux à l'un ou l'autre des créanciers de la compagnie;
- g) le rapport du contrôleur visé à l'alinéa 23(1)b).

Facteur additionnel : demande initiale

(5) Lorsqu'une demande est faite au titre du paragraphe (1) en même temps que la demande initiale visée au paragraphe 11.02(1) ou durant la période visée dans l'ordonnance rendue au titre de ce paragraphe, le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance visée au paragraphe (1) que s'il est également convaincu que les modalités du financement temporaire demandé sont limitées à ce qui est normalement nécessaire à la continuation de l'exploitation de la compagnie débitrice dans le cours ordinaire de ses affaires durant cette période.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 65; 2019, ch. 29, art. 138.

Cessions

11.3 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice et sur préavis à toutes les parties au contrat et au contrôleur, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, céder à toute personne qu'il précise et qui y a consenti les droits et obligations de la compagnie découlant du contrat.

Exceptions

(2) Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas aux droits et obligations qui, de par leur nature, ne peuvent être cédés ou qui découlent soit d'un contrat conclu à la date à laquelle une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi ou par la suite, soit d'un contrat financier admissible, soit d'une convention collective.

Facteurs à prendre en considération

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

- a) l'acquiescement du contrôleur au projet de cession, le cas échéant;
- b) la capacité de la personne à qui les droits et obligations seraient cédés d'exécuter les obligations;
- c) l'opportunité de lui céder les droits et obligations.

Restriction

(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.

Copy of order

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

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 29, s. 107, c. 36, ss. 65, 112.

11.31 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 128]

Critical supplier

11.4 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is satisfied that the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.

Obligation to supply

(2) If the court declares a person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.

Security or charge in favour of critical supplier

(3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied under the terms of the order.

Priority

(4) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2000, c. 30, s. 156; 2001, c. 34, s. 33(E); 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 65.

Removal of directors

11.5 (1) The court may, on the application of any person interested in the matter, make an order removing from office any director of a debtor company in respect of which an order has been made under this Act if the court

Restriction

(4) Il ne peut rendre l'ordonnance que s'il est convaincu qu'il sera remédié, au plus tard à la date qu'il fixe, à tous les manquements d'ordre pécuniaire relatifs au contrat, autres que ceux découlant du seul fait que la compagnie est insolvable, est visée par une procédure intentée sous le régime de la présente loi ou ne s'est pas conformée à une obligation non pécuniaire.

Copie de l'ordonnance

(5) Le demandeur envoie une copie de l'ordonnance à toutes les parties au contrat.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 29, art. 107, ch. 36, art. 65 et 112.

11.31 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 128]

Fournisseurs essentiels

11.4 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis de la demande aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer toute personne fournisseur essentiel de la compagnie s'il est convaincu que cette personne est un fournisseur de la compagnie et que les marchandises ou les services qu'elle lui fournit sont essentiels à la continuation de son exploitation.

Obligation de fourniture

(2) S'il fait une telle déclaration, le tribunal peut ordonner à la personne déclarée fournisseur essentiel de la compagnie de fournir à celle-ci les marchandises ou services qu'il précise, à des conditions compatibles avec les modalités qui régissaient antérieurement leur fourniture ou aux conditions qu'il estime indiquées.

Charge ou sûreté en faveur du fournisseur essentiel

(3) Le cas échéant, le tribunal déclare dans l'ordonnance que tout ou partie des biens de la compagnie sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté, en faveur de la personne déclarée fournisseur essentiel, d'un montant correspondant à la valeur des marchandises ou services fournis en application de l'ordonnance.

Priorité

(4) Il peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2000, ch. 30, art. 156; 2001, ch. 34, art. 33(A); 2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 65.

Révocation des administrateurs

11.5 (1) Sur demande d'un intéressé, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, révoquer tout administrateur de la compagnie débitrice à l'égard de laquelle une ordonnance a été rendue sous le régime de la présente loi s'il est

is satisfied that the director is unreasonably impairing or is likely to unreasonably impair the possibility of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company or is acting or is likely to act inappropriately as a director in the circumstances.

Filling vacancy

(2) The court may, by order, fill any vacancy created under subsection (1).

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Security or charge relating to director's indemnification

11.51 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company after the commencement of proceedings under this Act.

Priority

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

Restriction — indemnification insurance

(3) The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.

Negligence, misconduct or fault

(4) The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 66.

Court may order security or charge to cover certain costs

11.52 (1) On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in respect of the fees and expenses of

convaincu que ce dernier, sans raisons valables, compromet ou compromettra vraisemblablement la possibilité de conclure une transaction ou un arrangement viable ou agit ou agira vraisemblablement de façon inacceptable dans les circonstances.

Vacance

(2) Le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, combler toute vacance découlant de la révocation.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Biens grevés d'une charge ou sûreté en faveur d'administrateurs ou de dirigeants

11.51 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis de la demande aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer que tout ou partie des biens de celle-ci sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté, d'un montant qu'il estime indiqué, en faveur d'un ou de plusieurs administrateurs ou dirigeants pour l'exécution des obligations qu'ils peuvent contracter en cette qualité après l'introduction d'une procédure sous le régime de la présente loi.

Priorité

(2) Il peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

Restriction — assurance

(3) Il ne peut toutefois rendre une telle ordonnance s'il estime que la compagnie peut souscrire, à un coût qu'il estime juste, une assurance permettant d'indemniser adéquatement les administrateurs ou dirigeants.

Négligence, inconduite ou faute

(4) Il déclare, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté ne vise pas les obligations que l'administrateur ou le dirigeant assume, selon lui, par suite de sa négligence grave ou de son inconduite délibérée ou, au Québec, par sa faute lourde ou intentionnelle.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 66.

Biens grevés d'une charge ou sûreté pour couvrir certains frais

11.52 (1) Le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer que tout ou partie des biens de la compagnie débitrice sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté, d'un montant qu'il estime indiqué, pour couvrir :

- (a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;
- (b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and
- (c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

Priority

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 66.

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act matters

11.6 Notwithstanding the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*,

- (a) proceedings commenced under Part III of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* may be taken up and continued under this Act only if a proposal within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* has not been filed under that Part; and
- (b) an application under this Act by a bankrupt may only be made with the consent of inspectors referred to in section 116 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* but no application may be made under this Act by a bankrupt whose bankruptcy has resulted from

(i) the operation of subsection 50.4(8) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, or

(ii) the refusal or deemed refusal by the creditors or the court, or the annulment, of a proposal under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

1997, c. 12, s. 124.

Court to appoint monitor

11.7 (1) When an order is made on the initial application in respect of a debtor company, the court shall at the same time appoint a person to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company. The person so appointed must be a trustee, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

a) les débours et honoraires du contrôleur, ainsi que ceux des experts — notamment en finance et en droit — dont il retient les services dans le cadre de ses fonctions;

b) ceux des experts dont la compagnie retient les services dans le cadre de procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi;

c) ceux des experts dont tout autre intéressé retient les services, si, à son avis, la charge ou sûreté était nécessaire pour assurer sa participation efficace aux procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi.

Priorité

(2) Il peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 66.

Lien avec la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité

11.6 Par dérogation à la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* :

a) les procédures intentées sous le régime de la partie III de cette loi ne peuvent être traitées et continuées sous le régime de la présente loi que si une proposition au sens de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* n'a pas été déposée au titre de cette même partie;

b) le failli ne peut faire une demande au titre de la présente loi qu'avec l'aval des inspecteurs visés à l'article 116 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, aucune demande ne pouvant toutefois être faite si la faillite découle, selon le cas :

(i) de l'application du paragraphe 50.4(8) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*,

(ii) du rejet — effectif ou présumé — de sa proposition par les créanciers ou le tribunal ou de l'annulation de celle-ci au titre de cette loi.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124.

Nomination du contrôleur

11.7 (1) Le tribunal qui rend une ordonnance sur la demande initiale nomme une personne pour agir à titre de contrôleur des affaires financières ou autres de la compagnie débitrice visée par la demande. Seul un syndic au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* peut être nommé pour agir à titre de contrôleur.

Restrictions on who may be monitor

(2) Except with the permission of the court and on any conditions that the court may impose, no trustee may be appointed as monitor in relation to a company

(a) if the trustee is or, at any time during the two preceding years, was

(i) a director, an officer or an employee of the company,

(ii) related to the company or to any director or officer of the company, or

(iii) the auditor, accountant or legal counsel, or a partner or an employee of the auditor, accountant or legal counsel, of the company; or

(b) if the trustee is

(i) the trustee under a trust indenture issued by the company or any person related to the company, or the holder of a power of attorney under an act constituting a hypothec within the meaning of the *Civil Code of Quebec* that is granted by the company or any person related to the company, or

(ii) related to the trustee, or the holder of a power of attorney, referred to in subparagraph (i).

Court may replace monitor

(3) On application by a creditor of the company, the court may, if it considers it appropriate in the circumstances, replace the monitor by appointing another trustee, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 129.

No personal liability in respect of matters before appointment

11.8 (1) Despite anything in federal or provincial law, if a monitor, in that position, carries on the business of a debtor company or continues the employment of a debtor company's employees, the monitor is not by reason of that fact personally liable in respect of a liability, including one as a successor employer,

(a) that is in respect of the employees or former employees of the company or a predecessor of the company or in respect of a pension plan for the benefit of those employees; and

(b) that exists before the monitor is appointed or that is calculated by reference to a period before the appointment.

Personnes qui ne peuvent agir à titre de contrôleur

(2) Sauf avec l'autorisation du tribunal et aux conditions qu'il peut fixer, ne peut être nommé pour agir à titre de contrôleur le syndic :

a) qui est ou, au cours des deux années précédentes, a été :

(i) administrateur, dirigeant ou employé de la compagnie,

(ii) lié à la compagnie ou à l'un de ses administrateurs ou dirigeants,

(iii) vérificateur, comptable ou conseiller juridique de la compagnie, ou employé ou associé de l'un ou l'autre;

b) qui est :

(i) le fondé de pouvoir aux termes d'un acte constitutif d'hypothèque — au sens du *Code civil du Québec* — émanant de la compagnie ou d'une personne liée à celle-ci ou le fiduciaire aux termes d'un acte de fiducie émanant de la compagnie ou d'une personne liée à celle-ci,

(ii) lié au fondé de pouvoir ou au fiduciaire visé au sous-alinéa (i).

Remplacement du contrôleur

(3) Sur demande d'un créancier de la compagnie, le tribunal peut, s'il l'estime indiqué dans les circonstances, remplacer le contrôleur en nommant un autre syndic, au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, pour agir à ce titre à l'égard des affaires financières et autres de la compagnie.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 129.

Immunité

11.8 (1) Par dérogation au droit fédéral et provincial, le contrôleur qui, en cette qualité, continue l'exploitation de l'entreprise de la compagnie débitrice ou lui succède comme employeur est dégagé de toute responsabilité personnelle découlant de quelque obligation de la compagnie, notamment à titre d'employeur successeur, si celle-ci, à la fois :

a) l'oblige envers des employés ou anciens employés de la compagnie, ou de l'un de ses prédécesseurs, ou découle d'un régime de pension pour le bénéfice de ces employés;

b) existait avant sa nomination ou est calculée par référence à une période la précédant.

Status of liability

(2) A liability referred to in subsection (1) shall not rank as costs of administration.

Liability of other successor employers

(2.1) Subsection (1) does not affect the liability of a successor employer other than the monitor.

Liability in respect of environmental matters

(3) Notwithstanding anything in any federal or provincial law, a monitor is not personally liable in that position for any environmental condition that arose or environmental damage that occurred

- (a) before the monitor's appointment; or
- (b) after the monitor's appointment unless it is established that the condition arose or the damage occurred as a result of the monitor's gross negligence or wilful misconduct.

Reports, etc., still required

(4) Nothing in subsection (3) exempts a monitor from any duty to report or make disclosure imposed by a law referred to in that subsection.

Non-liability re certain orders

(5) Notwithstanding anything in any federal or provincial law but subject to subsection (3), where an order is made which has the effect of requiring a monitor to remedy any environmental condition or environmental damage affecting property involved in a proceeding under this Act, the monitor is not personally liable for failure to comply with the order, and is not personally liable for any costs that are or would be incurred by any person in carrying out the terms of the order,

- (a) if, within such time as is specified in the order, within ten days after the order is made if no time is so specified, within ten days after the appointment of the monitor, if the order is in effect when the monitor is appointed or during the period of the stay referred to in paragraph (b), the monitor
 - (i) complies with the order, or
 - (ii) on notice to the person who issued the order, abandons, disposes of or otherwise releases any interest in any real property affected by the condition or damage;
- (b) during the period of a stay of the order granted, on application made within the time specified in the order referred to in paragraph (a) or within ten days

Obligation exclue des frais

(2) L'obligation visée au paragraphe (1) ne fait pas partie des frais d'administration.

Responsabilité de l'employeur successeur

(2.1) Le paragraphe (1) ne dégage aucun employeur successeur, autre que le contrôleur, de sa responsabilité.

Responsabilité en matière d'environnement

(3) Par dérogation au droit fédéral et provincial, le contrôleur est, ès qualités, dégage de toute responsabilité personnelle découlant de tout fait ou dommage lié à l'environnement survenu, avant ou après sa nomination, sauf celui causé par sa négligence grave ou son inconduite délibérée.

Rapports

(4) Le paragraphe (3) n'a pas pour effet de soustraire le contrôleur à l'obligation de faire rapport ou de communiquer des renseignements prévus par le droit applicable en l'espèce.

Immunité — ordonnances

(5) Par dérogation au droit fédéral et provincial, mais sous réserve du paragraphe (3), le contrôleur est, ès qualités, dégage de toute responsabilité personnelle découlant du non-respect de toute ordonnance de réparation de tout fait ou dommage lié à l'environnement et touchant un bien visé par des procédures intentées au titre de la présente loi, et de toute responsabilité personnelle relativement aux frais engagés par toute personne exécutant l'ordonnance :

- a) si, dans les dix jours suivant l'ordonnance ou dans le délai fixé par celle-ci, dans les dix jours suivant sa nomination si l'ordonnance est alors en vigueur ou pendant la durée de la suspension visée à l'alinéa b) :
 - (i) il s'y conforme,
 - (ii) il abandonne, après avis à la personne ayant rendu l'ordonnance, tout intérêt dans l'immeuble en cause, en dispose ou s'en dessaisit;
- b) pendant la durée de la suspension de l'ordonnance qui est accordée, sur demande présentée dans les dix jours suivant l'ordonnance visée à l'alinéa a) ou dans le délai fixé par celle-ci, ou dans les dix jours suivant sa nomination si l'ordonnance est alors en vigueur :

after the order is made or within ten days after the appointment of the monitor, if the order is in effect when the monitor is appointed, by

(i) the court or body having jurisdiction under the law pursuant to which the order was made to enable the monitor to contest the order, or

(ii) the court having jurisdiction under this Act for the purposes of assessing the economic viability of complying with the order; or

(c) if the monitor had, before the order was made, abandoned or renounced any interest in any real property affected by the condition or damage.

Stay may be granted

(6) The court may grant a stay of the order referred to in subsection (5) on such notice and for such period as the court deems necessary for the purpose of enabling the monitor to assess the economic viability of complying with the order.

Costs for remedying not costs of administration

(7) Where the monitor has abandoned or renounced any interest in real property affected by the environmental condition or environmental damage, claims for costs of remedying the condition or damage shall not rank as costs of administration.

Priority of claims

(8) Any claim by Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province against a debtor company in respect of which proceedings have been commenced under this Act for costs of remedying any environmental condition or environmental damage affecting real property of the company is secured by a charge on the real property and on any other real property of the company that is contiguous thereto and that is related to the activity that caused the environmental condition or environmental damage, and the charge

(a) is enforceable in accordance with the law of the jurisdiction in which the real property is located, in the same way as a mortgage, hypothec or other security on real property; and

(b) ranks above any other claim, right or charge against the property, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or anything in any other federal or provincial law.

Claim for clean-up costs

(9) A claim against a debtor company for costs of remedying any environmental condition or environmental

(i) soit par le tribunal ou l'autorité qui a compétence relativement à l'ordonnance, en vue de permettre au contrôleur de la contester,

(ii) soit par le tribunal qui a compétence en matière de faillite, en vue d'évaluer les conséquences économiques du respect de l'ordonnance;

c) si, avant que l'ordonnance ne soit rendue, il avait abandonné tout intérêt dans le bien immeuble en cause ou y avait renoncé, ou s'en était dessaisi.

Suspension

(6) En vue de permettre au contrôleur d'évaluer les conséquences économiques du respect de l'ordonnance, le tribunal peut en ordonner la suspension après avis et pour la période qu'il estime indiqués.

Frais

(7) Si le contrôleur a abandonné tout intérêt dans le bien immeuble en cause ou y a renoncé, les réclamations pour les frais de réparation du fait ou dommage lié à l'environnement et touchant le bien ne font pas partie des frais d'administration.

Priorité des réclamations

(8) Dans le cas où des procédures ont été intentées au titre de la présente loi contre une compagnie débitrice, toute réclamation de Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou d'une province contre elle pour les frais de réparation du fait ou dommage lié à l'environnement et touchant un de ses biens immeubles est garantie par une sûreté sur le bien immeuble en cause et sur ceux qui sont contigus à celui où le dommage est survenu et qui sont liés à l'activité ayant causé le fait ou le dommage; la sûreté peut être exécutée selon le droit du lieu où est situé le bien comme s'il s'agissait d'une hypothèque ou autre garantie sur celui-ci et, par dérogation aux autres dispositions de la présente loi et à toute règle de droit fédéral et provincial, a priorité sur tout autre droit, charge ou réclamation visant le bien.

Précision

(9) La réclamation pour les frais de réparation du fait ou dommage lié à l'environnement et touchant un bien

damage affecting real property of the company shall be a claim under this Act, whether the condition arose or the damage occurred before or after the date on which proceedings under this Act were commenced.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2007, c. 36, s. 67.

Disclosure of financial information

11.9 (1) A court may, on any application under this Act in respect of a debtor company, by any person interested in the matter and on notice to any interested person who is likely to be affected by an order made under this section, make an order requiring that person to disclose any aspect of their economic interest in respect of a debtor company, on any terms that the court considers appropriate.

Factors to be considered

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

- (a)** whether the monitor approved the proposed disclosure;
- (b)** whether the disclosed information would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the debtor company; and
- (c)** whether any interested person would be materially prejudiced as a result of the disclosure.

Meaning of *economic interest*

(3) In this section, *economic interest* includes

- (a)** a claim, an eligible financial contract, an option or a mortgage, hypothec, pledge, charge, lien or any other security interest;
- (b)** the consideration paid for any right or interest, including those referred to in paragraph (a); or
- (c)** any other prescribed right or interest.

2019, c. 29, s. 139.

Fixing deadlines

12 The court may fix deadlines for the purposes of voting and for the purposes of distributions under a compromise or arrangement.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 12; 1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 2004, c. 25, s. 195; 2005, c. 47, s. 130; 2007, c. 36, s. 68.

Leave to appeal

13 Except in Yukon, any person dissatisfied with an order or a decision made under this Act may appeal from

immeuble de la compagnie débitrice constitue une réclamation, que la date du fait ou dommage soit antérieure ou postérieure à celle où des procédures sont intentées au titre de la présente loi.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2007, ch. 36, art. 67.

Divulgence de renseignements financiers

11.9 (1) Sur demande de tout intéressé sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard d'une compagnie débitrice et sur préavis de la demande à tout intéressé qui sera vraisemblablement touché par l'ordonnance rendue au titre du présent article, le tribunal peut ordonner à cet intéressé de divulguer tout intérêt économique qu'il a dans la compagnie débitrice, aux conditions que le tribunal estime indiquées.

Facteurs à prendre en considération

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

- a)** la question de savoir si le contrôleur acquiesce à la divulgation proposée;
- b)** la question de savoir si la divulgation proposée favorisera la conclusion d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie débitrice;
- c)** la question de savoir si la divulgation proposée causera un préjudice sérieux à tout intéressé.

Définition de *intérêt économique*

(3) Au présent article, *intérêt économique* s'entend notamment :

- a)** d'une réclamation, d'un contrat financier admissible, d'une option ou d'une hypothèque, d'un gage, d'une charge, d'un nantissement, d'un privilège ou d'un autre droit qui grève le bien;
- b)** de la contrepartie payée pour l'obtention, notamment, de tout intérêt ou droit visés à l'alinéa a);
- c)** de tout autre intérêt ou droit prévus par règlement.

2019, ch. 29, art. 139.

Échéances

12 Le tribunal peut fixer des échéances aux fins de votation et aux fins de distribution aux termes d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 12; 1992, ch. 27, art. 90; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 2004, ch. 25, art. 195; 2005, ch. 47, art. 130; 2007, ch. 36, art. 68.

Permission d'en appeler

13 Sauf au Yukon, toute personne mécontente d'une ordonnance ou décision rendue en application de la

the order or decision on obtaining leave of the judge appealed from or of the court or a judge of the court to which the appeal lies and on such terms as to security and in other respects as the judge or court directs.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 13; 2002, c. 7, s. 134.

Court of appeal

14 (1) An appeal under section 13 lies to the highest court of final resort in or for the province in which the proceeding originated.

Practice

(2) All appeals under section 13 shall be regulated as far as possible according to the practice in other cases of the court appealed to, but no appeal shall be entertained unless, within twenty-one days after the rendering of the order or decision being appealed, or within such further time as the court appealed from, or, in Yukon, a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, allows, the appellant has taken proceedings therein to perfect his or her appeal, and within that time he or she has made a deposit or given sufficient security according to the practice of the court appealed to that he or she will duly prosecute the appeal and pay such costs as may be awarded to the respondent and comply with any terms as to security or otherwise imposed by the judge giving leave to appeal.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 14; 2002, c. 7, s. 135.

Appeals

15 (1) An appeal lies to the Supreme Court of Canada on leave therefor being granted by that Court from the highest court of final resort in or for the province or territory in which the proceeding originated.

Jurisdiction of Supreme Court of Canada

(2) The Supreme Court of Canada shall have jurisdiction to hear and to decide according to its ordinary procedure any appeal under subsection (1) and to award costs.

Stay of proceedings

(3) No appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada shall operate as a stay of proceedings unless and to the extent ordered by that Court.

Security for costs

(4) The appellant in an appeal under subsection (1) shall not be required to provide any security for costs, but, unless he provides security for costs in an amount to be fixed by the Supreme Court of Canada, he shall not be awarded costs in the event of his success on the appeal.

présente loi peut en appeler après avoir obtenu la permission du juge dont la décision fait l'objet d'un appel ou après avoir obtenu la permission du tribunal ou d'un juge du tribunal auquel l'appel est porté et aux conditions que prescrit ce juge ou tribunal concernant le cautionnement et à d'autres égards.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 13; 2002, ch. 7, art. 134.

Cour d'appel

14 (1) Cet appel doit être porté au tribunal de dernier ressort de la province où la procédure a pris naissance.

Pratique

(2) Tous ces appels sont régis autant que possible par la pratique suivie dans d'autres causes devant le tribunal saisi de l'appel; toutefois, aucun appel n'est recevable à moins que, dans le délai de vingt et un jours après qu'a été rendue l'ordonnance ou la décision faisant l'objet de l'appel, ou dans le délai additionnel que peut accorder le tribunal dont il est interjeté appel ou, au Yukon, un juge de la Cour suprême du Canada, l'appellant n'y ait pris des procédures pour parfaire son appel, et à moins que, dans ce délai, il n'ait fait un dépôt ou fourni un cautionnement suffisant selon la pratique du tribunal saisi de l'appel pour garantir qu'il poursuivra dûment l'appel et payera les frais qui peuvent être adjugés à l'intimé et se conformera aux conditions relatives au cautionnement ou autres qu'impose le juge donnant la permission d'en appeler.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 14; 2002, ch. 7, art. 135.

Appels

15 (1) Un appel peut être interjeté à la Cour suprême du Canada sur autorisation à cet effet accordée par ce tribunal, du plus haut tribunal de dernier ressort de la province ou du territoire où la procédure a pris naissance.

Jurisdiction de la Cour suprême du Canada

(2) La Cour suprême du Canada a juridiction pour entendre et décider, selon sa procédure ordinaire, tout appel ainsi permis et pour adjuger des frais.

Suspension de procédures

(3) Un tel appel à la Cour suprême du Canada n'a pas pour effet de suspendre les procédures, à moins que ce tribunal ne l'ordonne et dans la mesure où il l'ordonne.

Cautionnement pour les frais

(4) L'appellant n'est pas tenu de fournir un cautionnement pour les frais; toutefois, à moins qu'il ne fournisse un cautionnement pour les frais au montant que fixe la Cour suprême du Canada, il ne lui est pas adjugé de frais en cas de réussite dans son appel.

Decision final

(5) The decision of the Supreme Court of Canada on any appeal under subsection (1) is final and conclusive.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 15; R.S., c. 44(1st Supp.), s. 10.

Order of court of one province

16 Every order made by the court in any province in the exercise of jurisdiction conferred by this Act in respect of any compromise or arrangement shall have full force and effect in all the other provinces and shall be enforced in the court of each of the other provinces in the same manner in all respects as if the order had been made by the court enforcing it.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 16.

Courts shall aid each other on request

17 All courts that have jurisdiction under this Act and the officers of those courts shall act in aid of and be auxiliary to each other in all matters provided for in this Act, and an order of a court seeking aid with a request to another court shall be deemed sufficient to enable the latter court to exercise in regard to the matters directed by the order such jurisdiction as either the court that made the request or the court to which the request is made could exercise in regard to similar matters within their respective jurisdictions.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 17.

18 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 131]

18.1 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 131]

18.2 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 131]

18.3 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 131]

18.4 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 131]

18.5 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 131]

PART III

General

Duty of Good Faith

Good faith

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

Décision finale

(5) La décision de la Cour suprême du Canada sur un tel appel est définitive et sans appel.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 15; S.R., ch. 44(1^{er} suppl.), art. 10.

Ordonnance d'un tribunal d'une province

16 Toute ordonnance rendue par le tribunal d'une province dans l'exercice de la juridiction conférée par la présente loi à l'égard de quelque transaction ou arrangement a pleine vigueur et effet dans les autres provinces, et elle est appliquée devant le tribunal de chacune des autres provinces de la même manière, à tous égards, que si elle avait été rendue par le tribunal la faisant ainsi exécuter.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 16.

Les tribunaux doivent s'entraider sur demande

17 Tous les tribunaux ayant juridiction sous le régime de la présente loi et les fonctionnaires de ces tribunaux sont tenus de s'entraider et de se faire les auxiliaires les uns des autres en toutes matières prévues par la présente loi, et une ordonnance du tribunal sollicitant de l'aide au moyen d'une demande à un autre tribunal est réputée suffisante pour permettre à ce dernier tribunal d'exercer, en ce qui concerne les questions prescrites par l'ordonnance, la juridiction que le tribunal ayant formulé la demande ou le tribunal auquel est adressée la demande pourrait exercer à l'égard de questions similaires dans les limites de leurs juridictions respectives.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 17.

18 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 131]

18.1 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 131]

18.2 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 131]

18.3 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 131]

18.4 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 131]

18.5 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 131]

PARTIE III

Dispositions générales

Obligation d'agir de bonne foi

Bonne foi

18.6 (1) Tout intéressé est tenu d'agir de bonne foi dans le cadre d'une procédure intentée au titre de la présente loi.

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.

1997, c. 12, s. 125; 2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2019, c. 29, s. 140.

Claims

Claims that may be dealt with by a compromise or arrangement

19 (1) Subject to subsection (2), the only claims that may be dealt with by a compromise or arrangement in respect of a debtor company are

(a) claims that relate to debts or liabilities, present or future, to which the company is subject on the earlier of

(i) the day on which proceedings commenced under this Act, and

(ii) if the company filed a notice of intention under section 50.4 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or commenced proceedings under this Act with the consent of inspectors referred to in section 116 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, the date of the initial bankruptcy event within the meaning of section 2 of that Act; and

(b) claims that relate to debts or liabilities, present or future, to which the company may become subject before the compromise or arrangement is sanctioned by reason of any obligation incurred by the company before the earlier of the days referred to in subparagraphs (a)(i) and (ii).

Exception

(2) A compromise or arrangement in respect of a debtor company may not deal with any claim that relates to any of the following debts or liabilities unless the compromise or arrangement explicitly provides for the claim's compromise and the creditor in relation to that debt has voted for the acceptance of the compromise or arrangement:

(a) any fine, penalty, restitution order or other order similar in nature to a fine, penalty or restitution order, imposed by a court in respect of an offence;

(b) any award of damages by a court in civil proceedings in respect of

Bonne foi — pouvoirs du tribunal

(2) S'il est convaincu que l'intéressé n'agit pas de bonne foi, le tribunal peut, à la demande de tout intéressé, rendre toute ordonnance qu'il estime indiquée.

1997, ch. 12, art. 125; 2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2019, ch. 29, art. 140.

Réclamations

Réclamations considérées dans le cadre des transactions ou arrangements

19 (1) Les seules réclamations qui peuvent être considérées dans le cadre d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement visant une compagnie débitrice sont :

a) celles se rapportant aux dettes et obligations, présentes ou futures, auxquelles la compagnie est assujettie à celle des dates ci-après qui est antérieure à l'autre :

(i) la date à laquelle une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard de la compagnie,

(ii) la date d'ouverture de la faillite, au sens de l'article 2 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, si elle a déposé un avis d'intention sous le régime de l'article 50.4 de cette loi ou qu'elle a intenté une procédure sous le régime de la présente loi avec le consentement des inspecteurs visés à l'article 116 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*;

b) celles se rapportant aux dettes et obligations, présentes ou futures, auxquelles elle peut devenir assujettie avant l'acceptation de la transaction ou de l'arrangement, en raison d'une obligation contractée antérieurement à celle des dates mentionnées aux sous-alinéas a)(i) et (ii) qui est antérieure à l'autre.

Exception

(2) La réclamation se rapportant à l'une ou l'autre des dettes ou obligations ci-après ne peut toutefois être ainsi considérée, à moins que la transaction ou l'arrangement ne prévoie expressément la possibilité de transiger sur cette réclamation et que le créancier intéressé n'ait voté en faveur de la transaction ou de l'arrangement proposé :

a) toute ordonnance d'un tribunal imposant une amende, une pénalité, la restitution ou une autre peine semblable;

b) toute indemnité accordée en justice dans une affaire civile :

(i) bodily harm intentionally inflicted, or sexual assault, or

(ii) wrongful death resulting from an act referred to in subparagraph (i);

(c) any debt or liability arising out of fraud, embezzlement, misappropriation or defalcation while acting in a fiduciary capacity or, in Quebec, as a trustee or an administrator of the property of others;

(d) any debt or liability resulting from obtaining property or services by false pretences or fraudulent misrepresentation, other than a debt or liability of the company that arises from an equity claim; or

(e) any debt for interest owed in relation to an amount referred to in any of paragraphs (a) to (d).

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 19; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 69.

Determination of amount of claims

20 (1) For the purposes of this Act, the amount represented by a claim of any secured or unsecured creditor is to be determined as follows:

(a) the amount of an unsecured claim is the amount

(i) in the case of a company in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, proof of which has been made in accordance with that Act,

(ii) in the case of a company that has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, proof of which has been made in accordance with that Act, or

(iii) in the case of any other company, proof of which might be made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, but if the amount so provable is not admitted by the company, the amount is to be determined by the court on summary application by the company or by the creditor; and

(b) the amount of a secured claim is the amount, proof of which might be made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* if the claim were unsecured, but the amount if not admitted by the company is, in the case of a company subject to pending proceedings under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* or the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, to be established by proof in the same manner as an unsecured claim

(i) pour des lésions corporelles causées intentionnellement ou pour agression sexuelle,

(ii) pour décès découlant d'un acte visé au sous-alinéa (i);

(c) toute dette ou obligation résultant de la fraude, du détournement, de la concussion ou de l'abus de confiance alors que la compagnie agissait, au Québec, à titre de fiduciaire ou d'administrateur du bien d'autrui ou, dans les autres provinces, à titre de fiduciaire;

(d) toute dette ou obligation résultant de l'obtention de biens ou de services par des faux-semblants ou la présentation erronée et frauduleuse des faits, autre qu'une dette ou obligation de la compagnie qui découle d'une réclamation relative à des capitaux propres;

(e) toute dette relative aux intérêts dus à l'égard d'une somme visée à l'un des alinéas a) à d).

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 19; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 69.

Détermination du montant de la réclamation

20 (1) Pour l'application de la présente loi, le montant de la réclamation d'un créancier garanti ou chirographaire est déterminé de la façon suivante :

(a) le montant d'une réclamation non garantie est celui :

(i) dans le cas d'une compagnie en voie de liquidation sous le régime de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, dont la preuve a été établie en conformité avec cette loi,

(ii) dans le cas d'une compagnie qui a fait une cession autorisée ou à l'encontre de laquelle une ordonnance de faillite a été rendue sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, dont la preuve a été établie en conformité avec cette loi,

(iii) dans le cas de toute autre compagnie, dont la preuve peut être établie sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, mais si le montant ainsi prouvable n'est pas admis par la compagnie, il est déterminé par le tribunal sur demande sommaire de celle-ci ou du créancier;

(b) le montant d'une réclamation garantie est celui dont la preuve pourrait être établie sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* si la réclamation n'était pas garantie, mais ce montant, s'il n'est pas admis par la compagnie, est, dans le cas où celle-ci est assujettie à une procédure pendante sous le régime de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations* ou de

under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* or the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, as the case may be, and, in the case of any other company, the amount is to be determined by the court on summary application by the company or the creditor.

Admission of claims

(2) Despite subsection (1), the company may admit the amount of a claim for voting purposes under reserve of the right to contest liability on the claim for other purposes, and nothing in this Act, the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* or the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* prevents a secured creditor from voting at a meeting of secured creditors or any class of them in respect of the total amount of a claim as admitted.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 20; 2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 70.

Law of set-off or compensation to apply

21 The law of set-off or compensation applies to all claims made against a debtor company and to all actions instituted by it for the recovery of debts due to the company in the same manner and to the same extent as if the company were plaintiff or defendant, as the case may be.

1997, c. 12, s. 126; 2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Classes of Creditors

Company may establish classes

22 (1) A debtor company may divide its creditors into classes for the purpose of a meeting to be held under section 4 or 5 in respect of a compromise or arrangement relating to the company and, if it does so, it is to apply to the court for approval of the division before the meeting is held.

Factors

(2) For the purpose of subsection (1), creditors may be included in the same class if their interests or rights are sufficiently similar to give them a commonality of interest, taking into account

(a) the nature of the debts, liabilities or obligations giving rise to their claims;

(b) the nature and rank of any security in respect of their claims;

(c) the remedies available to the creditors in the absence of the compromise or arrangement being sanctioned, and the extent to which the creditors would recover their claims by exercising those remedies; and

la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, établi par preuve de la même manière qu'une réclamation non garantie sous le régime de l'une ou l'autre de ces lois, selon le cas, et, s'il s'agit de toute autre compagnie, il est déterminé par le tribunal sur demande sommaire de celle-ci ou du créancier.

Admission des réclamations

(2) Malgré le paragraphe (1), la compagnie peut admettre le montant d'une réclamation aux fins de votation sous réserve du droit de contester la responsabilité quant à la réclamation pour d'autres objets, et la présente loi, la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations* et la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* n'ont pas pour effet d'empêcher un créancier garanti de voter à une assemblée de créanciers garantis ou d'une catégorie de ces derniers à l'égard du montant total d'une réclamation ainsi admis.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 20; 2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 70.

Compensation

21 Les règles de compensation s'appliquent à toutes les réclamations produites contre la compagnie débitrice et à toutes les actions intentées par elle en vue du recouvrement de ses créances, comme si elle était demanderesse ou défenderesse, selon le cas.

1997, ch. 12, art. 126; 2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Catégories de créanciers

Établissement des catégories de créanciers

22 (1) La compagnie débitrice peut établir des catégories de créanciers en vue des assemblées qui seront tenues au titre des articles 4 ou 5 relativement à une transaction ou un arrangement la visant; le cas échéant, elle demande au tribunal d'approuver ces catégories avant la tenue des assemblées.

Critères

(2) Pour l'application du paragraphe (1), peuvent faire partie de la même catégorie les créanciers ayant des droits ou intérêts à ce point semblables, compte tenu des critères énumérés ci-après, qu'on peut en conclure qu'ils ont un intérêt commun :

a) la nature des créances et obligations donnant lieu à leurs réclamations;

b) la nature et le rang de toute garantie qui s'y rattache;

c) les voies de droit ouvertes aux créanciers, abstraction faite de la transaction ou de l'arrangement, et la mesure dans laquelle il pourrait être satisfait à leurs réclamations s'ils s'en prévalaient;

(d) any further criteria, consistent with those set out in paragraphs (a) to (c), that are prescribed.

Related creditors

(3) A creditor who is related to the company may vote against, but not for, a compromise or arrangement relating to the company.

1997, c. 12, s. 126; 2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 71.

Class — creditors having equity claims

22.1 Despite subsection 22(1), creditors having equity claims are to be in the same class of creditors in relation to those claims unless the court orders otherwise and may not, as members of that class, vote at any meeting unless the court orders otherwise.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 71.

Monitors

Duties and functions

23 (1) The monitor shall

(a) except as otherwise ordered by the court, when an order is made on the initial application in respect of a debtor company,

(i) publish, without delay after the order is made, once a week for two consecutive weeks, or as otherwise directed by the court, in one or more newspapers in Canada specified by the court, a notice containing the prescribed information, and

(ii) within five days after the day on which the order is made,

(A) make the order publicly available in the prescribed manner,

(B) send, in the prescribed manner, a notice to every known creditor who has a claim against the company of more than \$1,000 advising them that the order is publicly available, and

(C) prepare a list, showing the names and addresses of those creditors and the estimated amounts of those claims, and make it publicly available in the prescribed manner;

(b) review the company's cash-flow statement as to its reasonableness and file a report with the court on the monitor's findings;

d) tous autres critères réglementaires compatibles avec ceux énumérés aux alinéas a) à c).

Créancier lié

(3) Le créancier lié à la compagnie peut voter contre, mais non pour, l'acceptation de la transaction ou de l'arrangement.

1997, ch. 12, art. 126; 2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 71.

Catégorie de créanciers ayant des réclamations relatives à des capitaux propres

22.1 Malgré le paragraphe 22(1), les créanciers qui ont des réclamations relatives à des capitaux propres font partie d'une même catégorie de créanciers relativement à ces réclamations, sauf ordonnance contraire du tribunal, et ne peuvent à ce titre voter à aucune assemblée, sauf ordonnance contraire du tribunal.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 71.

Contrôleurs

Attributions

23 (1) Le contrôleur est tenu :

a) à moins que le tribunal n'en ordonne autrement, lorsqu'il rend une ordonnance à l'égard de la demande initiale visant une compagnie débitrice :

(i) de publier, sans délai après le prononcé de l'ordonnance, une fois par semaine pendant deux semaines consécutives, ou selon les modalités qui y sont prévues, dans le journal ou les journaux au Canada qui y sont précisés, un avis contenant les renseignements réglementaires,

(ii) dans les cinq jours suivant la date du prononcé de l'ordonnance :

(A) de rendre l'ordonnance publique selon les modalités réglementaires,

(B) d'envoyer un avis, selon les modalités réglementaires, à chaque créancier connu ayant une réclamation supérieure à mille dollars les informant que l'ordonnance a été rendue publique,

(C) d'établir la liste des nom et adresse de chacun de ces créanciers et des montants estimés des réclamations et de la rendre publique selon les modalités réglementaires;

b) de réviser l'état de l'évolution de l'encaisse de la compagnie, en ce qui a trait à sa justification, et de déposer auprès du tribunal un rapport où il présente ses conclusions;

(c) make, or cause to be made, any appraisal or investigation the monitor considers necessary to determine with reasonable accuracy the state of the company's business and financial affairs and the cause of its financial difficulties or insolvency and file a report with the court on the monitor's findings;

(d) file a report with the court on the state of the company's business and financial affairs — containing the prescribed information, if any —

(i) without delay after ascertaining a material adverse change in the company's projected cash-flow or financial circumstances,

(ii) not later than 45 days, or any longer period that the court may specify, after the day on which each of the company's fiscal quarters ends, and

(iii) at any other time that the court may order;

(d.1) file a report with the court on the state of the company's business and financial affairs — containing the monitor's opinion as to the reasonableness of a decision, if any, to include in a compromise or arrangement a provision that sections 38 and 95 to 101 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* do not apply in respect of the compromise or arrangement and containing the prescribed information, if any — at least seven days before the day on which the meeting of creditors referred to in section 4 or 5 is to be held;

(e) advise the company's creditors of the filing of the report referred to in any of paragraphs (b) to (d.1);

(f) file with the Superintendent of Bankruptcy, in the prescribed manner and at the prescribed time, a copy of the documents specified in the regulations;

(f.1) for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy incurred in performing his or her functions under this Act, pay the prescribed levy at the prescribed time to the Superintendent for deposit with the Receiver General;

(g) attend court proceedings held under this Act that relate to the company, and meetings of the company's creditors, if the monitor considers that his or her attendance is necessary for the fulfilment of his or her duties or functions;

(h) if the monitor is of the opinion that it would be more beneficial to the company's creditors if proceedings in respect of the company were taken under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, so advise the court without delay after coming to that opinion;

(c) de faire ou de faire faire toute évaluation ou investigation qu'il estime nécessaire pour établir l'état des affaires financières et autres de la compagnie et les causes des difficultés financières ou de l'insolvabilité de celle-ci, et de déposer auprès du tribunal un rapport où il présente ses conclusions;

(d) de déposer auprès du tribunal un rapport portant sur l'état des affaires financières et autres de la compagnie et contenant les renseignements réglementaires :

(i) dès qu'il note un changement défavorable important au chapitre des projections relatives à l'encaisse ou de la situation financière de la compagnie,

(ii) au plus tard quarante-cinq jours — ou le nombre de jours supérieur que le tribunal fixe — après la fin de chaque trimestre d'exercice,

(iii) à tout autre moment fixé par ordonnance du tribunal;

d.1) de déposer auprès du tribunal, au moins sept jours avant la date de la tenue de l'assemblée des créanciers au titre des articles 4 ou 5, un rapport portant sur l'état des affaires financières et autres de la compagnie, contenant notamment son opinion sur le caractère raisonnable de la décision d'inclure dans la transaction ou l'arrangement une disposition prévoyant la non-application à celle-ci des articles 38 et 95 à 101 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, et contenant les renseignements réglementaires;

e) d'informer les créanciers de la compagnie du dépôt du rapport visé à l'un ou l'autre des alinéas b) à d.1);

f) de déposer auprès du surintendant des faillites, selon les modalités réglementaires, de temps et autre, une copie des documents précisés par règlement;

f.1) afin de défrayer le surintendant des faillites des dépenses engagées par lui dans l'exercice de ses attributions prévues par la présente loi, de lui verser, pour dépôt auprès du receveur général, le prélèvement réglementaire, et ce au moment prévu par les règlements;

g) d'assister aux audiences du tribunal tenues dans le cadre de toute procédure intentée sous le régime de la présente loi relativement à la compagnie et aux assemblées de créanciers de celle-ci, s'il estime que sa présence est nécessaire à l'exercice de ses attributions;

h) dès qu'il conclut qu'il serait plus avantageux pour les créanciers qu'une procédure visant la compagnie

(i) advise the court on the reasonableness and fairness of any compromise or arrangement that is proposed between the company and its creditors;

(j) make the prescribed documents publicly available in the prescribed manner and at the prescribed time and provide the company's creditors with information as to how they may access those documents; and

(k) carry out any other functions in relation to the company that the court may direct.

Monitor not liable

(2) 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.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 72.

Right of access

24 For the purposes of monitoring the company's business and financial affairs, the monitor shall have access to the company's property, including the premises, books, records, data, including data in electronic form, and other financial documents of the company, to the extent that is necessary to adequately assess the company's business and financial affairs.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Obligation to act honestly and in good faith

25 In exercising any of his or her powers or in performing any of his or her duties and functions, the monitor must act honestly and in good faith and comply with the Code of Ethics referred to in section 13.5 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Powers, Duties and Functions of Superintendent of Bankruptcy

Public records

26 (1) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy must keep, or cause to be kept, in the form that he or she considers appropriate and for the prescribed period, a public record of prescribed information relating to proceedings under this Act. On request, and on payment of the prescribed fee, the Superintendent of Bankruptcy must provide, or cause to be provided, any information contained in that public record.

soit intentée sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, d'en aviser le tribunal;

i) de conseiller le tribunal sur le caractère juste et équitable de toute transaction ou de tout arrangement proposés entre la compagnie et ses créanciers;

j) de rendre publics selon les modalités réglementaires, de temps et autres, les documents réglementaires et de fournir aux créanciers de la compagnie des renseignements sur les modalités d'accès à ces documents;

k) d'accomplir à l'égard de la compagnie tout ce que le tribunal lui ordonne de faire.

Non-responsabilité du contrôleur

(2) S'il agit de bonne foi et prend toutes les précautions voulues pour bien établir le rapport visé à l'un ou l'autre des alinéas (1)(b) à d.1), le contrôleur ne peut être tenu pour responsable des dommages ou pertes subis par la personne qui s'y fie.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 72.

Droit d'accès aux biens

24 Dans le cadre de la surveillance des affaires financières et autres de la compagnie et dans la mesure où cela s'impose pour lui permettre de les évaluer adéquatement, le contrôleur a accès aux biens de celle-ci, notamment les locaux, livres, données sur support électronique ou autre, registres et autres documents financiers.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Diligence

25 Le contrôleur doit, dans l'exercice de ses attributions, agir avec intégrité et de bonne foi et se conformer au code de déontologie mentionné à l'article 13.5 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Attributions du surintendant des faillites

Registres publics

26 (1) Le surintendant des faillites conserve ou fait conserver, en la forme qu'il estime indiquée et pendant la période réglementaire, un registre public contenant des renseignements réglementaires sur les procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi. Il fournit ou voit à ce qu'il soit fourni à quiconque le demande tous renseignements figurant au registre, sur paiement des droits réglementaires.

Other records

(2) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy must keep, or cause to be kept, in the form that he or she considers appropriate and for the prescribed period, any other records relating to the administration of this Act that he or she considers appropriate.

Agreement to provide compilation

(3) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy may enter into an agreement to provide a compilation of all or part of the information that is contained in the public record.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 73.

Applications to court and right to intervene

27 The Superintendent of Bankruptcy may apply to the court to review the appointment or conduct of a monitor and may intervene, as though he or she were a party, in any matter or proceeding in court relating to the appointment or conduct of a monitor.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Complaints

28 The Superintendent of Bankruptcy must receive and keep a record of all complaints regarding the conduct of monitors.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Investigations

29 (1) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy may make, or cause to be made, any inquiry or investigation regarding the conduct of monitors that he or she considers appropriate.

Rights

(2) For the purpose of the inquiry or investigation, the Superintendent of Bankruptcy or any person whom he or she appoints for the purpose

(a) shall have access to and the right to examine and make copies of the books, records, data, documents or papers — including those in electronic form — in the possession or under the control of a monitor under this Act; and

(b) may, with the leave of the court granted on an *ex parte* application, examine the books, records, data, documents or papers — including those in electronic form — relating to any compromise or arrangement in respect of which this Act applies that are in the possession or under the control of any other person designated in the order granting the leave, and for that purpose may under a warrant from the court enter and search any premises.

Autres dossiers

(2) Il conserve également, ou fait conserver, en la forme qu'il estime indiquée et pendant la période réglementaire, les autres dossiers qu'il estime indiqués concernant l'application de la présente loi.

Accord visant la fourniture d'une compilation

(3) Enfin, il peut conclure un accord visant la fourniture d'une compilation de tout ou partie des renseignements figurant au registre public.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 73.

Demande au tribunal et intervention

27 Le surintendant des faillites peut demander au tribunal d'examiner la nomination ou la conduite de tout contrôleur et intervenir dans toute affaire ou procédure devant le tribunal se rapportant à ces nomination ou conduite comme s'il y était partie.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Plaintes

28 Le surintendant des faillites reçoit et note toutes les plaintes sur la conduite de tout contrôleur.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Investigations et enquêtes

29 (1) Le surintendant des faillites effectue ou fait effectuer au sujet de la conduite de tout contrôleur les investigations ou les enquêtes qu'il estime indiquées.

Droit d'accès

(2) Pour les besoins de ces investigations ou enquêtes, le surintendant des faillites ou la personne qu'il nomme à cette fin :

a) a accès aux livres, registres, données, documents ou papiers, sur support électronique ou autre, se trouvant, en vertu de la présente loi, en la possession ou sous la responsabilité du contrôleur et a droit de les examiner et d'en tirer des copies;

b) peut, avec la permission du tribunal donnée *ex parte*, examiner les livres, registres, données, documents ou papiers, sur support électronique ou autre, qui sont en la possession ou sous la responsabilité de toute autre personne désignée dans l'ordonnance et se rapportent aux transactions ou arrangements auxquels la présente loi s'applique et peut, en vertu d'un mandat du tribunal et aux fins d'examen, pénétrer dans tout lieu et y faire des perquisitions.

Staff

(3) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy may engage the services of persons having technical or specialized knowledge, and persons to provide administrative services, to assist the Superintendent of Bankruptcy in conducting an inquiry or investigation, and may establish the terms and conditions of their engagement. The remuneration and expenses of those persons, when certified by the Superintendent of Bankruptcy, are payable out of the appropriation for the office of the Superintendent.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 74.

Powers in relation to licence

30 (1) If, after making or causing to be made an inquiry or investigation into the conduct of a monitor, it appears to the Superintendent of Bankruptcy that the monitor has not fully complied with this Act and its regulations or that it is in the public interest to do so, the Superintendent of Bankruptcy may

- (a)** cancel or suspend the monitor's licence as a trustee under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*; or
- (b)** place any condition or limitation on the licence that he or she considers appropriate.

Notice to trustee

(2) Before deciding whether to exercise any of the powers referred to in subsection (1), the Superintendent of Bankruptcy shall send the monitor written notice of the powers that the Superintendent may exercise and the reasons why they may be exercised and afford the monitor a reasonable opportunity for a hearing.

Summons

(3) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy may, for the purpose of the hearing, issue a summons requiring the person named in it

- (a)** to appear at the time and place mentioned in it;
- (b)** to testify to all matters within their knowledge relative to the subject matter of the inquiry or investigation into the conduct of the monitor; and
- (c)** to bring and produce any books, records, data, documents or papers — including those in electronic form — in their possession or under their control relative to the subject matter of the inquiry or investigation.

Effect throughout Canada

(4) A person may be summoned from any part of Canada by virtue of a summons issued under subsection (3).

Personnel

(3) Le surintendant des faillites peut retenir les services des experts ou autres personnes et du personnel administratif dont il estime le concours utile à l'investigation ou l'enquête et fixer leurs fonctions et leurs conditions d'emploi. La rémunération et les indemnités dues à ces personnes sont, une fois certifiées par le surintendant, imputables sur les crédits affectés à son bureau.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 74.

Décision relative à la licence

30 (1) Si, au terme d'une investigation ou d'une enquête sur la conduite du contrôleur, il estime que ce dernier n'a pas observé la présente loi ou les règlements ou que l'intérêt public le justifie, le surintendant des faillites peut annuler ou suspendre la licence que le contrôleur détient, en vertu de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, à titre de syndic ou soumettre sa licence aux conditions ou restrictions qu'il estime indiquées.

Avis au syndic

(2) Avant de prendre l'une des mesures visées au paragraphe (1), le surintendant des faillites envoie au syndic un avis écrit et motivé de la ou des mesures qu'il peut prendre et lui donne la possibilité de se faire entendre.

Convocation de témoins

(3) Le surintendant des faillites peut, aux fins d'audition, convoquer des témoins par assignation leur enjoignant :

- a)** de comparaître aux date, heure et lieu indiqués;
- b)** de témoigner sur tous faits connus d'eux se rapportant à l'investigation ou à l'enquête sur la conduite du contrôleur;
- c)** de produire tous livres, registres, données, documents ou papiers, sur support électronique ou autre, qui sont pertinents et dont ils ont la possession ou la responsabilité.

Effet

(4) Les assignations visées au paragraphe (3) ont effet sur tout le territoire canadien.

Fees and allowances

(5) Any person summoned under subsection (3) is entitled to receive the like fees and allowances for so doing as if summoned to attend before the Federal Court.

Procedure at hearing

(6) At the hearing, the Superintendent of Bankruptcy

- (a)** has the power to administer oaths;
- (b)** is not bound by any legal or technical rules of evidence in conducting the hearing;
- (c)** shall deal with the matters set out in the notice of the hearing as informally and expeditiously as the circumstances and a consideration of fairness permit; and
- (d)** shall cause a summary of any oral evidence to be made in writing.

Record

(7) The notice referred to in subsection (2) and, if applicable, the summary of oral evidence referred to in paragraph (6)(d), together with any documentary evidence that the Superintendent of Bankruptcy receives in evidence, form the record of the hearing, and that record and the hearing are public unless the Superintendent of Bankruptcy is satisfied that personal or other matters that may be disclosed are of such a nature that the desirability of avoiding public disclosure of those matters, in the interest of a third party or in the public interest, outweighs the desirability of the access by the public to information about those matters.

Decision

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

Review by Federal Court

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

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

Delegation

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

Frais et indemnités

(5) Toute personne assignée reçoit les frais et indemnités accordés aux témoins assignés devant la Cour fédérale.

Procédure de l'audition

(6) Lors de l'audition, le surintendant :

- a)** peut faire prêter serment;
- b)** n'est lié par aucune règle de droit ou de procédure en matière de preuve;
- c)** règle les questions exposées dans l'avis d'audition avec célérité et sans formalisme, eu égard aux circonstances et à l'équité;
- d)** fait établir un résumé écrit de toute preuve orale.

Dossier et audition

(7) L'audition et le dossier de celle-ci sont publics à moins que le surintendant ne juge que la nature des révélations possibles sur des questions personnelles ou autres est telle que, en l'occurrence, l'intérêt d'un tiers ou l'intérêt public l'emporte sur le droit du public à l'information. Le dossier comprend l'avis prévu au paragraphe (2), le résumé de la preuve orale prévu à l'alinéa (6)d) et la preuve documentaire reçue par le surintendant des faillites.

Décision

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

Examen de la Cour fédérale

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

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

Pouvoir de délégation

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

of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy under sections 29 and 30.

Notification to monitor

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

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Agreements

Disclaimer or rescission of agreements

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

Court may prohibit disclaimer or rescission

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

Court-ordered disclaimer or rescission

(3) If the monitor does not approve the proposed disclaimer or rescission, the company may, on notice to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor, apply to a court for an order that the agreement be disclaimed or rescinded.

Factors to be considered

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

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

Date of disclaimer or rescission

(5) An agreement is disclaimed or rescinded

Notification

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

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Contrats et conventions collectives

Résiliation de contrats

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

Contestation

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

Absence d'acquiescement du contrôleur

(3) Si le contrôleur n'acquiesce pas au projet de résiliation, la compagnie peut, sur préavis aux autres parties au contrat et au contrôleur, demander au tribunal d'ordonner la résiliation du contrat.

Facteurs à prendre en considération

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

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

Résiliation

(5) Le contrat est résilié :

(a) if no application is made under subsection (2), on the day that is 30 days after the day on which the company gives notice under subsection (1);

(b) if the court dismisses the application made under subsection (2), on the day that is 30 days after the day on which the company gives notice under subsection (1) or on any later day fixed by the court; or

(c) if the court orders that the agreement is disclaimed or resiliated under subsection (3), on the day that is 30 days after the day on which the company gives notice or on any later day fixed by the court.

Intellectual property

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

Loss related to disclaimer or resiliation

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

Reasons for disclaimer or resiliation

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

Exceptions

(9) This section does not apply in respect of

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

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

a) trente jours après la date à laquelle la compagnie donne le préavis mentionné au paragraphe (1), si aucune demande n'est présentée en vertu du paragraphe (2);

b) trente jours après la date à laquelle la compagnie donne le préavis mentionné au paragraphe (1) ou à la date postérieure fixée par le tribunal, si ce dernier rejette la demande présentée en vertu du paragraphe (2);

c) trente jours après la date à laquelle la compagnie donne le préavis mentionné au paragraphe (3) ou à la date postérieure fixée par le tribunal, si ce dernier ordonne la résiliation du contrat en vertu de ce paragraphe.

Propriété intellectuelle

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

Pertes découlant de la résiliation

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

Motifs de la résiliation

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

Exceptions

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

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

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

Collective agreements

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

Application for authorization to serve notice to bargain

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

Conditions for issuance of order

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

- (a)** a viable compromise or arrangement could not be made in respect of the company, taking into account the terms of the collective agreement;
- (b)** the company has made good faith efforts to renegotiate the provisions of the collective agreement; and
- (c)** a failure to issue the order is likely to result in irreparable damage to the company.

No delay on vote

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

Claims arising from termination or amendment

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

Conventions collectives

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

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

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

Cas où l'autorisation est accordée

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

- a)** qu'une transaction ou un arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie ne pourrait être fait compte tenu des dispositions de la convention collective;
- b)** que la compagnie a tenté de bonne foi d'en négocier de nouveau les dispositions;
- c)** qu'elle subirait vraisemblablement des dommages irréparables si l'ordonnance n'était pas rendue.

Vote sur la proposition

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

Réclamation consécutive à la révision

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

Order to disclose information

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

Parties

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

Unrevised collective agreements remain in force

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

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Certain rights limited

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

Lease

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

Public utilities

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

Certain acts not prevented

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

Ordonnance de communication

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

Parties

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

Maintien en vigueur des conventions collectives

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

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Limitation de certains droits

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

Baux

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

Entreprise de service public

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

Exceptions

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

(a) prohibiting a person from requiring payments to be made in cash for goods, services, use of leased property or other valuable consideration provided after the commencement of proceedings under this Act;

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

(c) [Repealed, 2012, c. 31, s. 421]

Provisions of section override agreement

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

Powers of court

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

Eligible financial contracts

(7) Subsection (1) does not apply

(a) in respect of an eligible financial contract; or

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

Permitted actions

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

(a) the netting or setting off or compensation of obligations between the company and the other parties to the eligible financial contract; and

(b) any dealing with financial collateral including

(i) the sale or foreclosure or, in the Province of Quebec, the surrender of financial collateral, and

(ii) the setting off or compensation of financial collateral or the application of the proceeds or value of financial collateral.

a) d'empêcher une personne d'exiger que soient effectués des paiements en espèces pour toute contrepartie de valeur — marchandises, services, biens loués ou autres — fournie après l'introduction d'une procédure sous le régime de la présente loi;

b) d'exiger la prestation de nouvelles avances de fonds ou de nouveaux crédits.

c) [Abrogé, 2012, ch. 31, art. 421]

Incompatibilité

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

Pouvoirs du tribunal

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

Contrats financiers admissibles

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

Opérations permises

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

a) la compensation des obligations entre la compagnie et les autres parties au contrat;

b) toute opération à l'égard de la garantie financière afférente, notamment :

(i) la vente, la demande en forclusion ou, dans la province de Québec, la demande en délaissement,

(ii) la compensation, ou l'affectation de son produit ou de sa valeur.

Restriction

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

Net termination values

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

Priority

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

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

Obligations and Prohibitions

Obligation to provide assistance

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

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

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

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Restriction on disposition of business assets

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

Notice to creditors

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

Restriction

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

Valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation

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

Rang

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

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

Obligations et interdiction

Assistance

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

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

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

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Restriction à la disposition d'actifs

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

Avis aux créanciers

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

Factors to be considered

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

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

Additional factors — related persons

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

- (a)** good faith efforts were made to sell or otherwise dispose of the assets to persons who are not related to the company; and
- (b)** the consideration to be received is superior to the consideration that would be received under any other offer made in accordance with the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition.

Related persons

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

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

Facteurs à prendre en considération

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

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

Autres facteurs

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

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

Personnes liées

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

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

Assets may be disposed of free and clear

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

Restriction — employers

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

Restriction — intellectual property

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

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

Preferences and Transfers at Undervalue

Application of sections 38 and 95 to 101 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*

36.1 (1) Sections 38 and 95 to 101 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* apply, with any modifications that the circumstances require, in respect of a compromise or arrangement unless the compromise or arrangement provides otherwise.

Interpretation

(2) For the purposes of subsection (1), a reference in sections 38 and 95 to 101 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*

(a) to “date of the bankruptcy” is to be read as a reference to “day on which proceedings commence under this Act”;

Autorisation de disposer des actifs en les libérant de restrictions

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

Restriction à l'égard des employeurs

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

Restriction à l'égard de la propriété intellectuelle

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

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

Traitements préférentiels et opérations sous-évaluées

Application des articles 38 et 95 à 101 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*

36.1 (1) Les articles 38 et 95 à 101 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* s'appliquent, avec les adaptations nécessaires, à la transaction ou à l'arrangement sauf disposition contraire de ceux-ci.

Interprétation

(2) Pour l'application du paragraphe (1), la mention, aux articles 38 et 95 à 101 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, de la date de la faillite vaut mention de la date à laquelle une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi, celle du syndic vaut mention du contrôleur et celle du failli, de la personne insolvable ou du débiteur vaut mention de la compagnie débitrice.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 78.

(b) to “trustee” is to be read as a reference to “monitor”; and

(c) to “bankrupt”, “insolvent person” or “debtor” is to be read as a reference to “debtor company”.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 78.

Her Majesty

Deemed trusts

37 (1) Subject to subsection (2), despite any provision in federal or provincial legislation that has the effect of deeming property to be held in trust for Her Majesty, property of a debtor company shall not be regarded as being held in trust for Her Majesty unless it would be so regarded in the absence of that statutory provision.

Exceptions

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan* or subsection 86(2) or (2.1) of the *Employment Insurance Act* (each of which is in this subsection referred to as a “federal provision”), nor does it apply in respect of amounts deemed to be held in trust under any law of a province that creates a deemed trust the sole purpose of which is to ensure remittance to Her Majesty in right of the province of amounts deducted or withheld under a law of the province if

(a) that law of the province imposes a tax similar in nature to the tax imposed under the *Income Tax Act* and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as the amounts referred to in subsection 227(4) or (4.1) of the *Income Tax Act*, or

(b) the province is a *province providing a comprehensive pension plan* as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan*, that law of the province establishes a *provincial pension plan* as defined in that subsection and the amounts deducted or withheld under that law of the province are of the same nature as amounts referred to in subsection 23(3) or (4) of the *Canada Pension Plan*,

and for the purpose of this subsection, any provision of a law of a province that creates a deemed trust is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as the corresponding federal provision.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Sa Majesté

Fiducies présumées

37 (1) Sous réserve du paragraphe (2) et par dérogation à toute disposition législative fédérale ou provinciale ayant pour effet d'assimiler certains biens à des biens détenus en fiducie pour Sa Majesté, aucun des biens de la compagnie débitrice ne peut être considéré comme tel par le seul effet d'une telle disposition.

Exceptions

(2) Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas à l'égard des sommes réputées détenues en fiducie aux termes des paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, des paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou des paragraphes 86(2) ou (2.1) de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* (chacun étant appelé « disposition fédérale » au présent paragraphe) ou à l'égard des sommes réputées détenues en fiducie aux termes de toute loi d'une province créant une fiducie présumée dans le seul but d'assurer à Sa Majesté du chef de cette province la remise de sommes déduites ou retenues aux termes d'une loi de cette province, si, dans ce dernier cas, se réalise l'une des conditions suivantes :

a) la loi de cette province prévoit un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à celui prévu par la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, et les sommes déduites ou retenues au titre de cette loi provinciale sont de même nature que celles visées aux paragraphes 227(4) ou (4.1) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

b) cette province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, la loi de cette province institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe, et les sommes déduites ou retenues au titre de cette loi provinciale sont de même nature que celles visées aux paragraphes 23(3) ou (4) du *Régime de pensions du Canada*.

Pour l'application du présent paragraphe, toute disposition de la loi provinciale qui crée une fiducie présumée est réputée avoir, à l'encontre de tout créancier de la compagnie et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute règle de droit, la même portée et le même

Status of Crown claims

38 (1) In relation to a proceeding under this Act, all claims, including secured claims, of Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province or any body under an enactment respecting workers' compensation, in this section and in section 39 called a "workers' compensation body", rank as unsecured claims.

Exceptions

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply

(a) in respect of claims that are secured by a security or charge of a kind that can be obtained by persons other than Her Majesty or a workers' compensation body

(i) pursuant to any law, or

(ii) pursuant to provisions of federal or provincial legislation if those provisions do not have as their sole or principal purpose the establishment of a means of securing claims of Her Majesty or a workers' compensation body; and

(b) to the extent provided in subsection 39(2), to claims that are secured by a security referred to in subsection 39(1), if the security is registered in accordance with subsection 39(1).

Operation of similar legislation

(3) Subsection (1) does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that Act, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts if the sum

effet que la disposition fédérale correspondante, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Réclamations de la Couronne

38 (1) Dans le cadre de toute procédure intentée sous le régime de la présente loi, les réclamations de Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou d'une province ou d'un organisme compétent au titre d'une loi sur les accidents du travail, y compris les réclamations garanties, prennent rang comme réclamations non garanties.

Exceptions

(2) Sont soustraites à l'application du paragraphe (1) :

a) les réclamations garanties par un type de charge ou de sûreté dont toute personne, et non seulement Sa Majesté ou l'organisme, peut se prévaloir au titre de dispositions législatives fédérales ou provinciales n'ayant pas pour seul ou principal objet l'établissement de mécanismes garantissant les réclamations de Sa Majesté ou de l'organisme, ou au titre de toute autre règle de droit;

b) les réclamations garanties et enregistrées aux termes du paragraphe 39(1), dans la mesure prévue au paragraphe 39(2).

Effet

(3) Le paragraphe (1) n'a pas pour effet de porter atteinte à l'application des dispositions suivantes :

a) les paragraphes 224(1.2) et (1.3) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a *province providing a comprehensive pension plan* as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a *provincial pension plan* as defined in that subsection,

and, for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2009, c. 33, s. 29.

Statutory Crown securities

39 (1) In relation to proceedings under this Act in respect of a debtor company, a security provided for in federal or provincial legislation for the sole or principal purpose of securing a claim of Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province or a workers' compensation body is valid in relation to claims against the company only if, before the day on which proceedings commence, the security is registered under a system of registration of securities that is available not only to Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province or a workers' compensation body, but also to any other creditor who holds a security, and that is open to the public for information or the making of searches.

Effect of security

(2) A security referred to in subsection (1) that is registered in accordance with that subsection

(a) is subordinate to securities in respect of which all steps necessary to setting them up against other creditors were taken before that registration; and

(b) is valid only in respect of amounts owing to Her Majesty or a workers' compensation body at the time of that registration, plus any interest subsequently accruing on those amounts.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 79.

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Pour l'application de l'alinéa c), la disposition législative provinciale en question est réputée avoir, à l'encontre de tout créancier et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute autre règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(i), ou que le paragraphe 23(2) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(ii), et quant aux intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2009, ch. 33, art. 29.

Garanties créées par législation

39 (1) Dans le cadre de toute procédure intentée à l'égard d'une compagnie débitrice sous le régime de la présente loi, les garanties créées aux termes d'une loi fédérale ou provinciale dans le seul but — ou principalement dans le but — de protéger des réclamations de Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou d'une province ou d'un organisme compétent au titre d'une loi sur les accidents du travail ne sont valides que si elles ont été enregistrées avant la date d'introduction de la procédure et selon un système d'enregistrement des garanties qui est accessible non seulement à Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou de la province ou à l'organisme, mais aussi aux autres créanciers détenant des garanties, et qui est accessible au public à des fins de consultation ou de recherche.

Rang

(2) Les garanties enregistrées conformément au paragraphe (1) :

a) prennent rang après toute autre garantie à l'égard de laquelle les mesures requises pour la rendre opposable aux autres créanciers ont toutes été prises avant l'enregistrement;

b) ne sont valides que pour les sommes dues à Sa Majesté ou à l'organisme lors de l'enregistrement et les intérêts échus depuis sur celles-ci.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 79.

Act binding on Her Majesty

40 This Act is binding on Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Miscellaneous

Certain sections of *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* do not apply

41 Sections 65 and 66 of the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* do not apply to any compromise or arrangement to which this Act applies.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Act to be applied conjointly with other Acts

42 The provisions of this Act may be applied together with the provisions of any Act of Parliament, or of the legislature of any province, that authorizes or makes provision for the sanction of compromises or arrangements between a company and its shareholders or any class of them.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Claims in foreign currency

43 If a compromise or an arrangement is proposed in respect of a debtor company, a claim for a debt that is payable in a currency other than Canadian currency is to be converted to Canadian currency as of the date of the initial application in respect of the company unless otherwise provided in the proposed compromise or arrangement.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

PART IV

Cross-border Insolvencies

Purpose

Purpose

44 The purpose of this Part is to provide mechanisms for dealing with cases of cross-border insolvencies and to promote

(a) cooperation between the courts and other competent authorities in Canada with those of foreign jurisdictions in cases of cross-border insolvencies;

(b) greater legal certainty for trade and investment;

Obligation de Sa Majesté

40 La présente loi lie Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou d'une province.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Dispositions diverses

Inapplicabilité de certains articles de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*

41 Les articles 65 et 66 de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations* ne s'appliquent à aucune transaction ni à aucun arrangement auxquels la présente loi est applicable.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Application concurrente d'autres lois

42 Les dispositions de la présente loi peuvent être appliquées conjointement avec celles de toute loi fédérale ou provinciale, autorisant ou prévoyant l'homologation de transactions ou arrangements entre une compagnie et ses actionnaires ou une catégorie de ces derniers.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Créances en monnaies étrangères

43 Dans le cas où une transaction ou un arrangement est proposé à l'égard d'une compagnie débitrice, la réclamation visant une créance en devises étrangères doit être convertie en monnaie canadienne au taux en vigueur à la date de la demande initiale, sauf disposition contraire de la transaction ou de l'arrangement.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

PARTIE IV

Insolvabilité en contexte international

Objet

Objet

44 La présente partie a pour objet d'offrir des moyens pour traiter des cas d'insolvabilité en contexte international et de promouvoir les objectifs suivants :

a) assurer la coopération entre les tribunaux et les autres autorités compétentes du Canada et ceux des ressorts étrangers intervenant dans de tels cas;

(c) the fair and efficient administration of cross-border insolvencies that protects the interests of creditors and other interested persons, and those of debtor companies;

(d) the protection and the maximization of the value of debtor company's property; and

(e) the rescue of financially troubled businesses to protect investment and preserve employment.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Interpretation

Definitions

45 (1) The following definitions apply in this Part.

foreign court means a judicial or other authority competent to control or supervise a foreign proceeding. (*tribunal étranger*)

foreign main proceeding means a foreign proceeding in a jurisdiction where the debtor company has the centre of its main interests. (*principale*)

foreign non-main proceeding means a foreign proceeding, other than a foreign main proceeding. (*secondaire*)

foreign proceeding means a judicial or an administrative proceeding, including an interim proceeding, in a jurisdiction outside Canada dealing with creditors' collective interests generally under any law relating to bankruptcy or insolvency in which a debtor company's business and financial affairs are subject to control or supervision by a foreign court for the purpose of reorganization. (*instance étrangère*)

foreign representative means a person or body, including one appointed on an interim basis, who is authorized, in a foreign proceeding respect of a debtor company, to

(a) monitor the debtor company's business and financial affairs for the purpose of reorganization; or

(b) act as a representative in respect of the foreign proceeding. (*représentant étranger*)

(b) garantir une plus grande certitude juridique dans le commerce et les investissements;

(c) administrer équitablement et efficacement les affaires d'insolvabilité en contexte international, de manière à protéger les intérêts des créanciers et des autres parties intéressées, y compris les compagnies débitrices;

(d) protéger les biens des compagnies débitrices et en optimiser la valeur;

(e) faciliter le redressement des entreprises en difficulté, de manière à protéger les investissements et préserver les emplois.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Définitions

Définitions

45 (1) Les définitions qui suivent s'appliquent à la présente partie.

instance étrangère Procédure judiciaire ou administrative, y compris la procédure provisoire, régie par une loi étrangère relative à la faillite ou à l'insolvabilité qui touche les droits de l'ensemble des créanciers et dans le cadre de laquelle les affaires financières et autres de la compagnie débitrice sont placées sous la responsabilité ou la surveillance d'un tribunal étranger aux fins de réorganisation. (*foreign proceeding*)

principale Qualifie l'instance étrangère qui a lieu dans le ressort où la compagnie débitrice a ses principales affaires. (*foreign main proceeding*)

représentant étranger Personne ou organe qui, même à titre provisoire, est autorisé dans le cadre d'une instance étrangère à surveiller les affaires financières ou autres de la compagnie débitrice aux fins de réorganisation, ou à agir en tant que représentant. (*foreign representative*)

secondaire Qualifie l'instance étrangère autre que l'instance étrangère principale. (*foreign non-main proceeding*)

tribunal étranger Autorité, judiciaire ou autre, compétente pour contrôler ou surveiller des instances étrangères. (*foreign court*)

Centre of debtor company's main interests

(2) For the purposes of this Part, in the absence of proof to the contrary, a debtor company's registered office is deemed to be the centre of its main interests.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Recognition of Foreign Proceeding

Application for recognition of a foreign proceeding

46 (1) A foreign representative may apply to the court for recognition of the foreign proceeding in respect of which he or she is a foreign representative.

Documents that must accompany application

(2) Subject to subsection (3), the application must be accompanied by

(a) a certified copy of the instrument, however designated, that commenced the foreign proceeding or a certificate from the foreign court affirming the existence of the foreign proceeding;

(b) a certified copy of the instrument, however designated, authorizing the foreign representative to act in that capacity or a certificate from the foreign court affirming the foreign representative's authority to act in that capacity; and

(c) a statement identifying all foreign proceedings in respect of the debtor company that are known to the foreign representative.

Documents may be considered as proof

(3) The court may, without further proof, accept the documents referred to in paragraphs (2)(a) and (b) as evidence that the proceeding to which they relate is a foreign proceeding and that the applicant is a foreign representative in respect of the foreign proceeding.

Other evidence

(4) In the absence of the documents referred to in paragraphs (2)(a) and (b), the court may accept any other evidence of the existence of the foreign proceeding and of the foreign representative's authority that it considers appropriate.

Translation

(5) The court may require a translation of any document accompanying the application.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Lieu des principales affaires

(2) Pour l'application de la présente partie, sauf preuve contraire, le siège social de la compagnie débitrice est présumé être le lieu où elle a ses principales affaires.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Reconnaissance des instances étrangères

Demande de reconnaissance de l'instance étrangère

46 (1) Le représentant étranger peut demander au tribunal de reconnaître l'instance étrangère dans le cadre de laquelle il a qualité.

Documents accompagnant la demande de reconnaissance

(2) La demande de reconnaissance est accompagnée des documents suivants :

a) une copie certifiée conforme de l'acte — quelle qu'en soit la désignation — introductif de l'instance étrangère ou le certificat délivré par le tribunal étranger attestant l'introduction de celle-ci;

b) une copie certifiée conforme de l'acte — quelle qu'en soit la désignation — autorisant le représentant étranger à agir à ce titre ou le certificat délivré par le tribunal étranger attestant la qualité de celui-ci;

c) une déclaration faisant état de toutes les instances étrangères visant la compagnie débitrice qui sont connues du représentant étranger.

Documents acceptés comme preuve

(3) Le tribunal peut, sans preuve supplémentaire, accepter les documents visés aux alinéas (2)a) et b) comme preuve du fait qu'il s'agit d'une instance étrangère et que le demandeur est le représentant étranger dans le cadre de celle-ci.

Autre preuve

(4) En l'absence des documents visés aux alinéas (2)a) et b), il peut accepter toute autre preuve — qu'il estime indiquée — de l'introduction de l'instance étrangère et de la qualité du représentant étranger.

Traduction

(5) Il peut exiger la traduction des documents accompagnant la demande de reconnaissance.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Order recognizing foreign proceeding

47 (1) If the court is satisfied that the application for the recognition of a foreign proceeding relates to a foreign proceeding and that the applicant is a foreign representative in respect of that foreign proceeding, the court shall make an order recognizing the foreign proceeding.

Nature of foreign proceeding to be specified

(2) The court shall specify in the order whether the foreign proceeding is a foreign main proceeding or a foreign non-main proceeding.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Order relating to recognition of a foreign main proceeding

48 (1) Subject to subsections (2) to (4), on the making of an order recognizing a foreign proceeding that is specified to be a foreign main proceeding, the court shall make an order, subject to any terms and conditions it considers appropriate,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken against the debtor company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;

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

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

(d) prohibiting the debtor company from selling or otherwise disposing of, outside the ordinary course of its business, any of the debtor company's property in Canada that relates to the business and prohibiting the debtor company from selling or otherwise disposing of any of its other property in Canada.

Scope of order

(2) The order made under subsection (1) must be consistent with any order that may be made under this Act.

When subsection (1) does not apply

(3) Subsection (1) does not apply if any proceedings under this Act have been commenced in respect of the debtor company at the time the order recognizing the foreign proceeding is made.

Ordonnance de reconnaissance

47 (1) S'il est convaincu que la demande de reconnaissance vise une instance étrangère et que le demandeur est un représentant étranger dans le cadre de celle-ci, le tribunal reconnaît, par ordonnance, l'instance étrangère en cause.

Nature de l'instance

(2) Il précise dans l'ordonnance s'il s'agit d'une instance étrangère principale ou secondaire.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Effets de la reconnaissance d'une instance étrangère principale

48 (1) Sous réserve des paragraphes (2) à (4), si l'ordonnance de reconnaissance précise qu'il s'agit d'une instance étrangère principale, le tribunal, par ordonnance, selon les modalités qu'il estime indiquées :

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

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

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

d) interdit à la compagnie de disposer, notamment par vente, des biens de son entreprise situés au Canada hors du cours ordinaire des affaires ou de ses autres biens situés au Canada.

Compatibilité

(2) L'ordonnance visée au paragraphe (1) doit être compatible avec les autres ordonnances rendues sous le régime de la présente loi.

Non-application du paragraphe (1)

(3) Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas si au moment où l'ordonnance de reconnaissance est rendue une procédure a déjà été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi contre la compagnie débitrice.

Application of this and other Acts

(4) Nothing in subsection (1) precludes the debtor company from commencing or continuing proceedings under this Act, the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* in respect of the debtor company.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Other orders

49 (1) If an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made, the court may, on application by the foreign representative who applied for the order, if the court is satisfied that it is necessary for the protection of the debtor company's property or the interests of a creditor or creditors, make any order that it considers appropriate, including an order

- (a)** if the foreign proceeding is a foreign non-main proceeding, referred to in subsection 48(1);
- (b)** respecting the examination of witnesses, the taking of evidence or the delivery of information concerning the debtor company's property, business and financial affairs, debts, liabilities and obligations; and
- (c)** authorizing the foreign representative to monitor the debtor company's business and financial affairs in Canada for the purpose of reorganization.

Restriction

(2) If any proceedings under this Act have been commenced in respect of the debtor company at the time an order recognizing the foreign proceeding is made, an order made under subsection (1) must be consistent with any order that may be made in any proceedings under this Act.

Application of this and other Acts

(3) The making of an order under paragraph (1)(a) does not preclude the commencement or the continuation of proceedings under this Act, the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* in respect of the debtor company.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Terms and conditions of orders

50 An order under this Part may be made on any terms and conditions that the court considers appropriate in the circumstances.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Application de la présente loi et d'autres lois

(4) Le paragraphe (1) n'a pas pour effet d'empêcher la compagnie débitrice d'intenter ou de continuer une procédure sous le régime de la présente loi, de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Autre ordonnance

49 (1) Une fois l'ordonnance de reconnaissance rendue, le tribunal, sur demande présentée par le représentant étranger demandeur, peut, s'il est convaincu que la mesure est nécessaire pour protéger les biens de la compagnie débitrice ou les intérêts d'un ou plusieurs créanciers, rendre toute ordonnance qu'il estime indiquée, notamment pour :

- a)** s'il s'agit d'une instance étrangère secondaire, imposer les interdictions visées au paragraphe 48(1);
- b)** régir l'interrogatoire des témoins et la manière de recueillir des preuves ou fournir des renseignements concernant les biens, affaires financières et autres, dettes, obligations et engagements de la compagnie débitrice;
- c)** autoriser le représentant étranger à surveiller les affaires financières et autres de la compagnie débitrice qui se rapportent à ses opérations au Canada.

Restriction

(2) Si, au moment où l'ordonnance de reconnaissance est rendue, une procédure a déjà été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi contre la compagnie débitrice, l'ordonnance prévue au paragraphe (1) doit être compatible avec toute ordonnance qui peut être rendue dans le cadre de cette procédure.

Application de la présente loi et d'autres lois

(3) L'ordonnance rendue au titre de l'alinéa (1)a) n'a pas pour effet d'empêcher que soit intentée ou continuée, contre la compagnie débitrice, une procédure sous le régime de la présente loi, de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Conditions

50 Le tribunal peut assortir les ordonnances qu'il rend au titre de la présente partie des conditions qu'il estime indiquées dans les circonstances.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Commencement or continuation of proceedings

51 If an order is made recognizing a foreign proceeding, the foreign representative may commence and continue proceedings under this Act in respect of a debtor company as if the foreign representative were a creditor of the debtor company, or the debtor company, as the case may be.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Obligations

Cooperation – court

52 (1) If an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made, the court shall cooperate, to the maximum extent possible, with the foreign representative and the foreign court involved in the foreign proceeding.

Cooperation – other authorities in Canada

(2) If any proceedings under this Act have been commenced in respect of a debtor company and an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made in respect of the debtor company, every person who exercises powers or performs duties and functions under the proceedings under this Act shall cooperate, to the maximum extent possible, with the foreign representative and the foreign court involved in the foreign proceeding.

Forms of cooperation

(3) For the purpose of this section, cooperation may be provided by any appropriate means, including

- (a)** the appointment of a person to act at the direction of the court;
- (b)** the communication of information by any means considered appropriate by the court;
- (c)** the coordination of the administration and supervision of the debtor company's assets and affairs;
- (d)** the approval or implementation by courts of agreements concerning the coordination of proceedings; and
- (e)** the coordination of concurrent proceedings regarding the same debtor company.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 80.

Obligations of foreign representative

53 If an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made, the foreign representative who applied for the order shall

- (a)** without delay, inform the court of

Début et continuation de la procédure

51 Une fois l'ordonnance de reconnaissance rendue, le représentant étranger en cause peut intenter ou continuer la procédure visée par la présente loi comme s'il était créancier de la compagnie débitrice ou la compagnie débitrice elle-même, selon le cas.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Obligations

Collaboration – tribunal

52 (1) Une fois l'ordonnance de reconnaissance rendue, le tribunal collabore dans toute la mesure possible avec le représentant étranger et le tribunal étranger en cause dans le cadre de l'instance étrangère reconnue.

Collaboration – autres autorités compétentes

(2) Si une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi contre une compagnie débitrice et qu'une ordonnance a été rendue reconnaissant une instance étrangère visant cette compagnie, toute personne exerçant des attributions dans le cadre de cette procédure collabore dans toute la mesure possible avec le représentant étranger et le tribunal étranger en cause.

Moyens d'assurer la collaboration

(3) Pour l'application du présent article, la collaboration peut être assurée par tout moyen approprié, notamment :

- a)** la nomination d'une personne chargée d'agir suivant les instructions du tribunal;
- b)** la communication de renseignements par tout moyen jugé approprié par celui-ci;
- c)** la coordination de l'administration et de la surveillance des biens et des affaires de la compagnie débitrice;
- d)** l'approbation ou l'application par les tribunaux des accords concernant la coordination des procédures;
- e)** la coordination de procédures concurrentes concernant la même compagnie débitrice.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 80.

Obligations du représentant étranger

53 Si l'ordonnance de reconnaissance est rendue, il incombe au représentant étranger demandeur :

- a)** d'informer sans délai le tribunal :

(i) any substantial change in the status of the recognized foreign proceeding,

(ii) any substantial change in the status of the foreign representative's authority to act in that capacity, and

(iii) any other foreign proceeding in respect of the same debtor company that becomes known to the foreign representative; and

(b) publish, without delay after the order is made, once a week for two consecutive weeks, or as otherwise directed by the court, in one or more newspapers in Canada specified by the court, a notice containing the prescribed information.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Multiple Proceedings

Concurrent proceedings

54 If any proceedings under this Act in respect of a debtor company are commenced at any time after an order recognizing the foreign proceeding is made, the court shall review any order made under section 49 and, if it determines that the order is inconsistent with any orders made in the proceedings under this Act, the court shall amend or revoke the order.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Multiple foreign proceedings

55 (1) If, at any time after an order is made in respect of a foreign non-main proceeding in respect of a debtor company, an order recognizing a foreign main proceeding is made in respect of the debtor company, the court shall review any order made under section 49 in respect of the foreign non-main proceeding and, if it determines that the order is inconsistent with any orders made under that section in respect of the foreign main proceedings, the court shall amend or revoke the order.

Multiple foreign proceedings

(2) If, at any time after an order is made in respect of a foreign non-main proceeding in respect of the debtor company, an order recognizing another foreign non-main proceeding is made in respect of the debtor company, the court shall, for the purpose of facilitating the coordination of the foreign non-main proceedings, review any order made under section 49 in respect of the first recognized proceeding and amend or revoke the order if it considers it appropriate.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

(i) de toute modification sensible du statut de l'instance étrangère reconnue,

(ii) de toute modification sensible de sa qualité,

(iii) de toute autre procédure étrangère visant la compagnie débitrice qui a été portée à sa connaissance;

b) de publier, sans délai après le prononcé de l'ordonnance, une fois par semaine pendant deux semaines consécutives, ou selon les modalités qui y sont prévues, dans le journal ou les journaux au Canada qui y sont précisés, un avis contenant les renseignements réglementaires.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Instances multiples

Instances concomitantes

54 Si, après qu'a été rendue une ordonnance de reconnaissance à l'égard d'une instance étrangère visant une compagnie débitrice, une procédure est intentée sous le régime de la présente loi contre cette compagnie, le tribunal examine toute ordonnance rendue au titre de l'article 49 et, s'il conclut qu'elle n'est pas compatible avec toute ordonnance rendue dans le cadre des procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi, il la modifie ou la révoque.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Plusieurs instances étrangères

55 (1) Si, après qu'a été rendue une ordonnance de reconnaissance à l'égard d'une instance étrangère secondaire visant une compagnie débitrice, une ordonnance de reconnaissance est rendue à l'égard d'une instance étrangère principale visant la même compagnie, toute ordonnance rendue au titre de l'article 49 dans le cadre de l'instance étrangère secondaire doit être compatible avec toute ordonnance qui peut être rendue au titre de cet article dans le cadre de l'instance étrangère principale.

Plusieurs instances étrangères

(2) Si, après qu'a été rendue une ordonnance de reconnaissance à l'égard d'une instance étrangère secondaire visant une compagnie débitrice, une autre ordonnance de reconnaissance est rendue à l'égard d'une instance étrangère secondaire visant la même compagnie, le tribunal examine, en vue de coordonner les instances étrangères secondaires, toute ordonnance rendue au titre de l'article 49 dans le cadre de la première procédure reconnue et la modifie ou la révoque s'il l'estime indiqué.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Miscellaneous Provisions

Authorization to act as representative of proceeding under this Act

56 The court may authorize any person or body to act as a representative in respect of any proceeding under this Act for the purpose of having them recognized in a jurisdiction outside Canada.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Foreign representative status

57 An application by a foreign representative for any order under this Part does not submit the foreign representative to the jurisdiction of the court for any other purpose except with regard to the costs of the proceedings, but the court may make any order under this Part conditional on the compliance by the foreign representative with any other order of the court.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Foreign proceeding appeal

58 A foreign representative is not prevented from making an application to the court under this Part by reason only that proceedings by way of appeal or review have been taken in a foreign proceeding, and the court may, on an application if such proceedings have been taken, grant relief as if the proceedings had not been taken.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Presumption of insolvency

59 For the purposes of this Part, if an insolvency or a reorganization or a similar order has been made in respect of a debtor company in a foreign proceeding, a certified copy of the order is, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, proof that the debtor company is insolvent and proof of the appointment of the foreign representative made by the order.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Credit for recovery in other jurisdictions

60 (1) In making a compromise or an arrangement of a debtor company, the following shall be taken into account in the distribution of dividends to the company's creditors in Canada as if they were a part of that distribution:

(a) the amount that a creditor receives or is entitled to receive outside Canada by way of a dividend in a foreign proceeding in respect of the company; and

(b) the value of any property of the company that the creditor acquires outside Canada on account of a provable claim of the creditor or that the creditor acquires

Dispositions diverses

Autorisation d'agir à titre de représentant dans toute procédure intentée sous le régime de la présente loi

56 Le tribunal peut autoriser toute personne ou tout organe à agir à titre de représentant dans le cadre de toute procédure intentée sous le régime de la présente loi en vue d'obtenir la reconnaissance de celle-ci dans un ressort étranger.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Statut du représentant étranger

57 Le représentant étranger n'est pas soumis à la juridiction du tribunal pour le motif qu'il a présenté une demande au titre de la présente partie, sauf en ce qui touche les frais de justice; le tribunal peut toutefois subordonner toute ordonnance visée à la présente partie à l'observation par le représentant étranger de toute autre ordonnance rendue par lui.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Instance étrangère : appel

58 Le fait qu'une instance étrangère fait l'objet d'un appel ou d'une révision n'a pas pour effet d'empêcher le représentant étranger de présenter toute demande au tribunal au titre de la présente partie; malgré ce fait, le tribunal peut, sur demande, accorder des redressements.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Présomption d'insolvabilité

59 Pour l'application de la présente partie, une copie certifiée conforme de l'ordonnance d'insolvabilité ou de réorganisation ou de toute ordonnance semblable, rendue contre une compagnie débitrice dans le cadre d'une instance étrangère, fait foi, sauf preuve contraire, de l'insolvabilité de celle-ci et de la nomination du représentant étranger au titre de l'ordonnance.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Sommes reçues à l'étranger

60 (1) Lorsqu'une transaction ou un arrangement visant la compagnie débitrice est proposé, les éléments énumérés ci-après doivent être pris en considération dans la distribution des dividendes aux créanciers d'un débiteur au Canada comme s'ils faisaient partie de la distribution :

a) les sommes qu'un créancier a reçues — ou auxquelles il a droit — à l'étranger, à titre de dividende, dans le cadre d'une instance étrangère le visant;

b) la valeur de tout bien de la compagnie que le créancier a acquis à l'étranger au titre d'une créance prouvable ou par suite d'un transfert qui, si la présente loi

outside Canada by way of a transfer that, if it were subject to this Act, would be a preference over other creditors or a transfer at undervalue.

Restriction

(2) Despite subsection (1), the creditor is not entitled to receive a dividend from the distribution in Canada until every other creditor who has a claim of equal rank in the order of priority established under this Act has received a dividend whose amount is the same percentage of that other creditor's claim as the aggregate of the amount referred to in paragraph (1)(a) and the value referred to in paragraph (1)(b) is of that creditor's claim.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Court not prevented from applying certain rules

61 (1) Nothing in this Part prevents the court, on the application of a foreign representative or any other interested person, from applying any legal or equitable rules governing the recognition of foreign insolvency orders and assistance to foreign representatives that are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

Public policy exception

(2) Nothing in this Part prevents the court from refusing to do something that would be contrary to public policy.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 81.

PART V

Administration

Regulations

62 The Governor in Council may make regulations for carrying out the purposes and provisions of this Act, including regulations

(a) specifying documents for the purpose of paragraph 23(1)(f); and

(b) prescribing anything that by this Act is to be prescribed.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 82.

Review of Act

63 (1) Within five years after the coming into force of this section, the Minister shall cause to be laid before both Houses of Parliament a report on the provisions and operation of this Act, including any recommendations for amendments to those provisions.

lui était applicable, procurerait à un créancier une préférence sur d'autres créanciers ou constituerait une opération sous-évaluée.

Restriction

(2) Le créancier n'a toutefois pas le droit de recevoir un dividende dans le cadre de la distribution faite au Canada tant que les titulaires des créances venant au même rang que la sienne dans l'ordre de collocation prévu par la présente loi n'ont pas reçu un dividende dont le pourcentage d'acquittement est égal au pourcentage d'acquittement des éléments visés aux alinéas (1)a) et b).

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Application de règles étrangères

61 (1) La présente partie n'a pas pour effet d'empêcher le tribunal d'appliquer, sur demande faite par le représentant étranger ou tout autre intéressé, toute règle de droit ou d'équité relative à la reconnaissance des ordonnances étrangères en matière d'insolvabilité et à l'assistance à prêter au représentant étranger, dans la mesure où elle n'est pas incompatible avec les dispositions de la présente loi.

Exception relative à l'ordre public

(2) La présente partie n'a pas pour effet d'empêcher le tribunal de refuser de prendre une mesure contraire à l'ordre public.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 81.

PARTIE V

Administration

Règlements

62 Le gouverneur en conseil peut, par règlement, prendre toute mesure d'application de la présente loi, notamment :

a) préciser les documents pour l'application de l'alinéa 23(1)f);

b) prendre toute mesure d'ordre réglementaire prévue par la présente loi.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 82.

Rapport

63 (1) Dans les cinq ans suivant l'entrée en vigueur du présent article, le ministre présente au Sénat et à la Chambre des communes un rapport sur les dispositions de la présente loi et son application dans lequel il fait état des modifications qu'il juge souhaitables.

Reference to parliamentary committee

(2) The report stands referred to the committee of the Senate, the House of Commons or both Houses of Parliament that is designated or established for that purpose, which shall

(a) as soon as possible after the laying of the report, review the report; and

(b) report to the Senate, the House of Commons or both Houses of Parliament, as the case may be, within one year after the laying of the report of the Minister, or any further time authorized by the Senate, the House of Commons or both Houses of Parliament.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Examen parlementaire

(2) Le comité du Sénat, de la Chambre des communes, ou mixte, constitué ou désigné à cette fin, est saisi d'office du rapport et procède dans les meilleurs délais à l'étude de celui-ci et, dans l'année qui suit le dépôt du rapport ou le délai supérieur accordé par le Sénat, la Chambre des communes ou les deux chambres, selon le cas, leur présente son rapport.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

RELATED PROVISIONS

— R.S., 1985, c. 27 (2nd Supp.), s. 11

Transitional: proceedings

11 Proceedings to which any of the provisions amended by the schedule apply that were commenced before the coming into force of section 10 shall be continued in accordance with those amended provisions without any further formality.

— 1990, c. 17, s. 45(1)

Transitional: proceedings

45 (1) Every proceeding commenced before the coming into force of this subsection and in respect of which any provision amended by this Act applies shall be taken up and continued under and in conformity with that amended provision without any further formality.

— 1997, c. 12, s. 127

Application

127 Section 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125 or 126 applies to proceedings commenced under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* after that section comes into force.

— 1998, c. 30, s. 10

Transitional — proceedings

10 Every proceeding commenced before the coming into force of this section and in respect of which any provision amended by sections 12 to 16 applies shall be taken up and continued under and in conformity with that amended provision without any further formality.

— 2000, c. 30, s. 156(2)

(2) Subsection (1) applies to proceedings commenced under the Act after September 29, 1997.

— 2000, c. 30, s. 157(2)

(2) Subsection (1) applies to proceedings commenced under the Act after September 29, 1997.

— 2000, c. 30, s. 158(2)

(2) Subsection (1) applies to proceedings commenced under the Act after September 29, 1997.

DISPOSITIONS CONNEXES

— L.R. (1985), ch. 27 (2^e suppl.), art. 11

Disposition transitoire : procédure

11 Les procédures intentées en vertu des dispositions modifiées en annexe avant l'entrée en vigueur de l'article 10 se poursuivent en conformité avec les nouvelles dispositions sans autres formalités.

— 1990, ch. 17, par. 45(1)

Disposition transitoire : procédures

45 (1) Les procédures intentées avant l'entrée en vigueur du présent paragraphe et auxquelles s'appliquent des dispositions visées par la présente loi se poursuivent sans autres formalités en conformité avec ces dispositions dans leur forme modifiée.

— 1997, ch. 12, art. 127

Application

127 Les articles 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125 ou 126 s'appliquent aux procédures intentées sous le régime de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies* après l'entrée en vigueur de l'article en cause.

— 1998, ch. 30, art. 10

Procédures

10 Les procédures intentées avant l'entrée en vigueur du présent article et auxquelles s'appliquent des dispositions visées par les articles 12 à 16 se poursuivent sans autres formalités en conformité avec ces dispositions dans leur forme modifiée.

— 2000, ch. 30, par. 156(2)

(2) Le paragraphe (1) s'applique aux procédures intentées en vertu de la même loi après le 29 septembre 1997.

— 2000, ch. 30, par. 157(2)

(2) Le paragraphe (1) s'applique aux procédures intentées en vertu de la même loi après le 29 septembre 1997.

— 2000, ch. 30, par. 158(2)

(2) Le paragraphe (1) s'applique aux procédures intentées en vertu de la même loi après le 29 septembre 1997.

— 2001, c. 34, s. 33(2)

(2) Subsection (1) applies to proceedings commenced under the Act after September 29, 1997.

— 2005, c. 47, s. 134, as amended by 2007, c. 36, s. 107

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

134 An amendment to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* that is enacted by any of sections 124 to 131 of this Act applies only to a debtor company in respect of whom proceedings commence under that Act on or after the day on which the amendment comes into force.

— 2007, c. 29, s. 119

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

119 An amendment to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* made by section 104 or 106 of this Act applies only to a debtor company in respect of which proceedings under that Act are commenced on or after the day on which the amendment comes into force.

— 2007, c. 36, s. 111

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

111 The amendment to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* that is enacted by section 67 of this Act applies only to a debtor company in respect of whom proceedings commence under that Act on or after the day on which the amendment comes into force.

— 2018, c. 27, s. 271

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

271 Subsection 36(8) of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, as enacted by section 269, applies only in respect of proceedings that are commenced under that Act on or after the day on which this section comes into force.

— 2001, ch. 34, par. 33(2)

(2) Le paragraphe (1) s'applique aux procédures intentées en vertu de la même loi après le 29 septembre 1997.

— 2005, ch. 47, art. 134, modifié par 2007, ch. 36, art. 107

Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies

134 Toute modification à la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies* édictée par l'un des articles 124 à 131 de la présente loi ne s'applique qu'aux compagnies débitrices à l'égard desquelles une procédure est intentée sous le régime de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies* à la date d'entrée en vigueur de la modification ou par la suite.

— 2007, ch. 29, art. 119

Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies

119 La modification apportée à la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies* par les articles 104 ou 106 de la présente loi ne s'applique qu'aux compagnies débitrices à l'égard desquelles une procédure est intentée sous le régime de cette loi à la date d'entrée en vigueur de la modification ou par la suite.

— 2007, ch. 36, art. 111

Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies

111 La modification à la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies* édictée par l'article 67 de la présente loi ne s'applique qu'aux compagnies débitrices à l'égard desquelles une procédure est intentée sous le régime de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies* à la date d'entrée en vigueur de la modification ou par la suite.

— 2018, ch. 27, art. 271

Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies

271 Le paragraphe 36(8) de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*, édicté par l'article 269, ne s'applique qu'à l'égard des procédures intentées sous le régime de cette loi à la date d'entrée en vigueur du présent article ou par la suite.

— 2019, c. 29, s. 150

150 Section 11.001, subsections 11.02(1) and 11.2(5) and sections 11.9 and 18.6 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, as enacted by sections 136 to 140, apply only in respect of proceedings that are commenced under that Act on or after the day on which that section or subsection, as the case may be, comes into force.

— 2023, c. 6, s. 7(2)

Exception — companies

7 (2) Subsections 5(1) and (2) do not apply in respect of a company that, on the day before the day on which those subsections come into force, participated in a prescribed pension plan for the benefit of its employees until the fourth anniversary of the day on which this Act comes into force.

— 2019, ch. 29, art. 150

150 L'article 11.001, les paragraphes 11.02(1) et 11.2(5) et les articles 11.9 et 18.6 de la *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies*, édictés par les articles 136 à 140, ne s'appliquent qu'à l'égard des procédures intentées sous le régime de cette loi à la date d'entrée en vigueur de l'article ou du paragraphe, selon le cas, ou par la suite.

— 2023, ch. 6, par. 7(2)

Exception — compagnies

7 (2) Les paragraphes 5(1) et (2) ne s'appliquent pas à la compagnie qui, la veille de leur entrée en vigueur, participait à un régime de pension réglementaire institué pour ses employés, et ce, jusqu'au quatrième anniversaire de l'entrée en vigueur de la présente loi.

TAB 2

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

Goodman, McKinlay and Galligan JJ.A.

91186 003

B E T W E E N :

THE ROYAL BANK OF CANADA)	
Plaintiff/Respondent)	<u>J.B. Berkow and S.H. Goldman</u>
)	for the appellants
- and -)	
)	<u>J.T. Morin, O.C.</u> for Air Canada
SOUNDAIR CORPORATION,)	
CANADIAN PENSION CAPITAL)	<u>L.A.J. Barnes and L.E. Ritchie</u>
LIMITED and CANADIAN)	for the Royal Bank of Canada
INSURERS' CAPITAL CORPORATION)	
Defendants)	<u>S.F. Dunphy and G.K. Ketcheson</u>
(Canadian Pension Capital)	for Ernst & Young Inc., Receiver
Limited and Canadian)	of Soundair Corporation
Insurers' Capital Corporation)	(Respondent)
(collectively "CCFL"))	
- Appellants))	<u>W.G. Horton</u> for Ontario Express
)	Limited
(Soundair Corporation)	
- Respondent))	<u>N.J. Spies</u> for Frontier Air
)	Limited
)	
)	<u>Heard:</u> June 11, 12, 13 and 14,
)	1991
)	

GALLIGAN J.A. :

This is an appeal from the order of Rosenberg J. made on May 1st, 1991. 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 dollars. 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

91186005

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 Company v. Rosenberg (1986), 60 O.R. (2d) 87 at pp.92-94 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 10 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:

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 N.S. (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1 at 11

(N.S.S.C.A.D.):

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 10 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 hypothesis 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, 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 at 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 at 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 at 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 v. Rosenberg, supra, and Re Selkirk, supra, (Saunders J.). However, as Saunders J. pointed out in Re Beauty Counsellors, supra, at p.244 "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 v. Rosenberg, supra, Re Selkirk (1986), supra, Re Beauty Counsellors, supra, Re Selkirk (1987), 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, supra, where Saunders J. said at p.246:

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 binding 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), 21 D.L.R. (4th) 473 at 476, 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 v. Rosenberg, supra, at p.124:

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 v. Rosenberg, supra, at p.109:

...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, that 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 v. Rosenberg, supra, which I adopt as my own. The first is at p.109:

...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 the approval.

The second is at p.111:

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:

They created a situation as of March 8th, 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 and the Environmental Protection Act, 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-client scale. I would make no order as to the costs of any of the other parties or intervenors.

R. Y. Galligan J. A.

McKinlay J.A.:

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 v. Rosenberg. 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.

Dwight K. Kinsley 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 OEL and that of 922, a company incorporated for the purpose of acquiring Air Toronto. Its shares were owned equally by 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. 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 Developments Corporation v. Spun Cast Industries Ltd. et al. (1978), 26 C.B.R. (N.S.) 28, Berger J. said at p.30:

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. 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:

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 downpayment 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 N.S. (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1 (N.S.S.C.A.D.) Hart J.A., speaking for the majority of the court, said at p.10:

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.S.C.) 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.S.C.) Saunders J. heard an application for court approval of 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:

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, 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:

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:

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 1st. 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 in so far 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 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 that 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 inter-lender 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 downpayment 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:

They created a situation as of March 8, where the receiver was faced with two offers, one of which was acceptable in 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 inter-lender 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 downpayment in the 922 offer constitutes approximately two-thirds of the contemplated sale price whereas the cash downpayment in the OEL transaction constitutes approximately 20-25% of the contemplated sale price. In terms of absolute dollars, the downpayment 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:

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 downpayment and the provision or lack thereof to secure payment of the balance of the purchase price over and above the downpayment 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 downpayment. 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 that 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-client basis. I would make no order as to costs of any of the other parties or intervenors.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. A. Rosenberg", is written in a cursive style on the right side of the page.

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

Goodman, McKinlay and Galligan J.J.A.

B E T W E E N :

THE ROYAL BANK OF CANADA

Plaintiff/Respondent

- and -

SOUNDAIR CORPORATION, CANADIAN PENSION
CAPITAL LIMITED AND CANADIAN INSURERS'
CAPITAL CORPORATION

Defendants
(Canadian Pension Capital
Limited and Canadian Insurers'
Capital Corporation
(collectively "CCFL") -
Appellants)

(Soundair Corporation -
Respondent)

J U D G M E N T

Released: *July 3, 1991*

*acm

M. Goodman
P.D.

57

TAB 3

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

CITATION: Third Eye Capital Corporation v. Ressources Dianor Inc./Dianor
Resources Inc., 2019 ONCA 508
DATE: 20190619
DOCKET: C62925

Pepall, Lauwers and Huscroft JJ.A.

BETWEEN

Third Eye Capital Corporation

Applicant
(Respondent)

and

Ressources Dianor Inc. /Dianor Resources Inc.

Respondent
(Respondent)

and

2350614 Ontario Inc.

Interested Party
(Appellant)

Peter L. Roy and Sean Grayson, for the appellant 2350614 Ontario Inc.

Shara Roy and Nilou Nezhat, for the respondent Third Eye Capital Corporation

Stuart Brotman and Dylan Chochla, for the receiver of the respondent
Ressources Dianor Inc./Dianor Resources Inc., Richter Advisory Group Inc.

Nicholas Kluge, for the monitor of Essar Steel Algoma Inc., Ernst & Young Inc.

Steven J. Weisz, for the intervener Insolvency Institute of Canada

Heard: September 17, 2018

On appeal from the order of Justice Frank J.C. Newbould of the Superior Court of Justice dated October 5, 2016, with reasons reported at 2016 ONSC 6086, 41 C.B.R. (6th) 320.

Pepall J.A.:

Introduction

[1] There are two issues that arise on this appeal. The first issue is simply stated: can a third party interest in land in the nature of a Gross Overriding Royalty (“GOR”) be extinguished by a vesting order granted in a receivership proceeding? The second issue is procedural. Does the appeal period in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (“BIA”) or the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C. 43 (“CJA”) govern the appeal from the order of the motion judge in this case?

[2] These reasons relate to the second stage of the appeal from the decision of the motion judge. The first stage of the appeal was the subject matter of the first reasons released by this court: see *Third Eye Capital Corporation v. Ressources Dianor Inc./ Dianor Resources Inc.*, 2018 ONCA 253, 141 O.R. (3d) 192 (“First Reasons”). As a number of questions remained unanswered, further submissions were required. These reasons resolve those questions.

Background

[3] The facts underlying this appeal may be briefly outlined.

[4] On August 20, 2015, the court appointed Richter Advisory Group Inc. (“the Receiver”) as receiver of the assets, undertakings and properties of Dianor Resources Inc. (“Dianor”), an insolvent exploration company focused on the acquisition and exploitation of mining properties in Canada. The appointment was made pursuant to s. 243 of the BIA and s. 101 of the CJA, on the application of Dianor’s secured lender, the respondent Third Eye Capital Corporation (“Third Eye”) who was owed approximately \$5.5 million.

[5] Dianor’s main asset was a group of mining claims located in Ontario and Quebec. Its flagship project is located near Wawa, Ontario. Dianor originally entered into agreements with 3814793 Ontario Inc. (“381 Co.”) to acquire certain mining claims. 381 Co. was a company controlled by John Leadbetter, the original prospector on Dianor’s properties, and his wife, Paulette A. Mousseau-Leadbetter. The agreements provided for the payment of GORs for diamonds and other metals and minerals in favour of the appellant 2350614 Ontario Inc. (“235 Co.”), another company controlled by John Leadbetter.¹ The

¹ The original agreement provided for the payment of the GORs to 381 Co. and Paulette A. Mousseau-Leadbetter. The motion judge noted that the record was silent on how 235 Co. came to be the holder of these royalty rights but given his conclusion, he determined that there was no need to resolve this issue: at para. 6.

mining claims were also subject to royalty rights for all minerals in favour of Essar Steel Algoma Inc. (“Algoma”). Notices of the agreements granting the GORs and the royalty rights were registered on title to both the surface rights and the mining claims. The GORs would not generate any return to the GOR holder in the absence of development of a producing mine. Investments of at least \$32 million to determine feasibility, among other things, are required before there is potential for a producing mine.

[6] Dianor also obtained the surface rights to the property under an agreement with 381 Co. and Paulette A. Mousseau-Leadbetter. Payment was in part met by a vendor take-back mortgage in favour of 381 Co., Paulette A. Mousseau-Leadbetter, and 1584903 Ontario Ltd., another Leadbetter company. Subsequently, though not evident from the record that it was the mortgagee, 1778778 Ontario Inc. (“177 Co.”), another Leadbetter company, demanded payment under the mortgage and commenced power of sale proceedings. The notice of sale referred to the vendor take-back mortgage in favour of 381 Co., Paulette A. Mousseau-Leadbetter, and 1584903 Ontario Ltd. A transfer of the surface rights was then registered from 177 Co. to 235 Co. In the end result, in

addition to the GORs, 235 Co. purports to also own the surface rights associated with the mining claims of Dianor.²

[7] Dianor ceased operations in December 2012. The Receiver reported that Dianor's mining claims were not likely to generate any realization under a liquidation of the company's assets.

[8] On October 7, 2015, the motion judge sitting on the Commercial List, and who was supervising the receivership, made an order approving a sales process for the sale of Dianor's mining claims. The process generated two bids, both of which contained a condition that the GORs be terminated or impaired. One of the bidders was Third Eye. On December 11, 2015, the Receiver accepted Third Eye's bid conditional on obtaining court approval.

[9] The purchase price consisted of a \$2 million credit bid, the assumption of certain liabilities, and \$400,000 payable in cash, \$250,000 of which was to be distributed to 235 Co. for its GORs and the remaining \$150,000 to Algoma for its royalty rights. The agreement was conditional on extinguishment of the GORs and the royalty rights. It also provided that the closing was to occur within two days after the order approving the agreement and transaction and no later than August 31, 2016, provided the order was then not the subject of an appeal. The agreement also made time of the essence. Thus, the agreement

² The ownership of the surface rights is not in issue in this appeal.

contemplated a closing prior to the expiry of any appeal period, be it 10 days under the BIA or 30 days under the CJA. Of course, assuming leave to appeal was not required, a stay of proceedings could be obtained by simply serving a notice of appeal under the BIA (pursuant to s. 195 of the BIA) or by applying for a stay under r. 63.02 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194.

[10] On August 9, 2016, the Receiver applied to the court for approval of the sale to Third Eye and, at the same time, sought a vesting order that purported to extinguish the GORs and Algoma's royalty rights as required by the agreement of purchase and sale. The agreement of purchase and sale, which included the proposed terms of the sale, and the draft sale approval and vesting order were included in the Receiver's motion record and served on all interested parties including 235 Co.

[11] The motion judge heard the motion on September 27, 2016. 235 Co. did not oppose the sale but asked that the property that was to be vested in Third Eye be subject to its GORs. All other interested parties including Algoma supported the proposed sale approval and vesting order.

[12] On October 5, 2016, the motion judge released his reasons. He held that the GORs did not amount to interests in land and that he had jurisdiction under the BIA and the CJA to order the property sold and on what terms: at para. 37. In any event, he saw "no reason in logic ... why the jurisdiction would not be the

same whether the royalty rights were or were not an interest in land”: at para. 40. He granted the sale approval and vesting order vesting the property in Third Eye and ordering that on payment of \$250,000 and \$150,000 to 235 Co. and Algoma respectively, their interests were extinguished. The figure of \$250,000 was based on an expert valuation report and 235 Co.’s acknowledgement that this represented fair market value.³

[13] Although it had in its possession the terms of the agreement of purchase and sale including the closing provision, upon receipt of the motion judge’s decision on October 5, 2016, 235 Co. did nothing. It did not file a notice of appeal which under s. 195 of the BIA would have entitled it to an automatic stay. Nor did it advise the other parties that it was planning to appeal the decision or bring a motion for a stay of the sale approval and vesting order in the event that it was not relying on the BIA appeal provisions.

[14] For its part, the Receiver immediately circulated a draft sale approval and vesting order for approval as to form and content to interested parties. A revised draft was circulated on October 19, 2016. The drafts contained only minor variations from the draft order included in the motion materials. In the

³ Although in its materials filed on this appeal, 235 Co. stated that the motion judge erred in making this finding, in oral submissions before this court, Third Eye’s counsel confirmed that this was the position taken by 235 Co.’s counsel before the motion judge, and 235 Co.’s appellate counsel, who was not counsel below, stated that this must have been the submission made by counsel for 235 Co. before the motion judge.

absence of any response from 235 Co., the Receiver was required to seek an appointment to settle the order. However, on October 26, 2016, 235 Co. approved the order as to form and content, having made no changes. The sale approval and vesting order was issued and entered on that same day and then circulated.

[15] On October 26, 2016, for the first time, 235 Co. advised counsel for the Receiver that “an appeal is under consideration” and asked the Receiver for a deferral of the cancellation of the registered interests. In two email exchanges, counsel for the Receiver responded that the transaction was scheduled to close that afternoon and 235 Co.’s counsel had already had ample time to get instructions regarding any appeal. Moreover, the Receiver stated that the appeal period “is what it is” but that the approval order was not stayed during the appeal period. Counsel for 235 Co. did not respond and took no further steps. The Receiver, on the demand of the purchaser Third Eye, closed the transaction later that same day in accordance with the terms of the agreement of purchase and sale. The mining claims of Dianor were assigned by Third Eye to 2540575 Ontario Inc. There is nothing in the record that discloses the relationship between Third Eye and the assignee. The Receiver was placed in funds by Third Eye, the sale approval and vesting order was registered on title and the GORs and the royalty interests were expunged from title. That same

day, the Receiver advised 235 Co. and Algoma that the transaction had closed and requested directions regarding the \$250,000 and \$150,000 payments.

[16] On November 3, 2016, 235 Co. served and filed a notice of appeal of the sale approval and vesting order. It did not seek any extension of time to appeal. 235 Co. filed its notice of appeal 29 days after the motion judge's October 5, 2016 decision and 8 days after the order was signed, issued and entered.

[17] Algoma's Monitor in its *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA") proceedings received and disbursed the funds allocated to Algoma. The \$250,000 allocated to 235 Co. are held in escrow by its law firm pending the resolution of this appeal.

Proceedings Before This Court

[18] On appeal, this court disagreed with the motion judge's determination that the GORs did not amount to interests in land: see First Reasons, at para. 9. However, due to an inadequate record, a number of questions remained to be answered and further submissions and argument were requested on the following issues:

- (1) Whether and under what circumstances and limitations a Superior Court judge has jurisdiction to extinguish a third party's interest in land, using a vesting order, under s. 100 of the CJA and s. 243 of the BIA, where s. 65.13(7) of the BIA; s. 36(6) of the CCAA; ss. 66(1.1) and 84.1 of the BIA; or s. 11.3 of the CCAA do not apply;

- (2) If such jurisdiction does not exist, should this court order that the Land Title register be rectified to reflect 235 Co.'s ownership of the GORs or should some other remedy be granted; and
- (3) What was the applicable time within which 235 Co. was required to appeal and/or seek a stay and did 235 Co.'s communication that it was considering an appeal affect the rights of the parties.

[19] The Insolvency Institute of Canada was granted intervener status. It describes itself as a non-profit, non-partisan and non-political organization comprised of Canada's leading insolvency and restructuring professionals.

A. Jurisdiction to Extinguish an Interest in Land Using a Vesting Order

(1) Positions of Parties

[20] The appellant 235 Co. initially took the position that no authority exists under s. 100 of the CJA, s. 243 of BIA, or the court's inherent jurisdiction to extinguish a real property interest that does not belong to the company in receivership. However, in oral argument, counsel conceded that the court did have jurisdiction under s. 100 of the CJA but the motion judge exercised that jurisdiction incorrectly. 235 Co. adopted the approach used by Wilton-Siegel J. in *Romspen Investment Corporation v. Woods Property Development Inc.*, 2011 ONSC 3648, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 109, at para. 190, rev'd on other grounds, 2011 ONCA 817, 286 O.A.C. 189. It took the position that if the real property interest is worthless, contingent, or incomplete, the court has jurisdiction to extinguish

the interest. However here, 235 Co. held complete and non-contingent title to the GORs and its interest had value.

[21] In response, the respondent Third Eye states that a broad purposive interpretation of s. 243 of the BIA and s. 100 of the CJA allows for extinguishment of the GORs. Third Eye also relies on the court's inherent jurisdiction in support of its position. It submits that without a broad and purposive approach, the statutory insolvency provisions are unworkable. In addition, the *Conveyancing and Law of Property Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C. 34 ("CLPA") provides a mechanism for rights associated with an encumbrance to be channelled to a payment made into court. Lastly, Third Eye submits that if the court accedes to the position of 235 Co., Dianor's asset and 235 Co.'s GORs will waste. In support of this argument, Third Eye notes there were only two bids for Dianor's mining claims, both of which required the GORs to be significantly reduced or eliminated entirely. For its part, Third Eye states that "there is no deal with the GORs on title" as its bid was contingent on the GORs being vested off.

[22] The respondent Receiver supports the position taken by Third Eye that the motion judge had jurisdiction to grant the order vesting off the GORs and that he appropriately exercised that jurisdiction in granting the order under s. 243 of the BIA and, in the alternative, the court's inherent jurisdiction.

[23] The respondent Algoma supports the position advanced by Third Eye and the Receiver. Both it and 235 Co. have been paid and the Monitor has disbursed the funds paid to Algoma. The transaction cannot now be unwound.

[24] The intervener, the Insolvency Institute of Canada, submits that a principled approach to vesting out property in insolvency proceedings is critical for a properly functioning restructuring regime. It submits that the court has inherent and equitable jurisdiction to extinguish third party proprietary interests, including interests in land, by utilizing a vesting order as a gap-filling measure where the applicable statutory instrument is silent or may not have dealt with the matter exhaustively. The discretion is a narrow but necessary power to prevent undesirable outcomes and to provide added certainty in insolvency proceedings.

(2) Analysis

(a) Significance of Vesting Orders

[25] To appreciate the significance of vesting orders, it is useful to describe their effect. A vesting order “effects the transfer of purchased assets to a purchaser on a *free and clear* basis, while preserving the relative priority of competing claims against the debtor vendor with respect to the proceeds generated by the sale transaction” (emphasis in original): David Bish & Lee Cassey, “Vesting Orders Part 1: The Origins and Development” (2015) 32:4

Nat'l. Insolv. Rev. 41, at p. 42 (“Vesting Orders Part 1”). The order acts as a conveyance of title and also serves to extinguish encumbrances on title.

[26] A review of relevant literature on the subject reflects the pervasiveness of vesting orders in the insolvency arena. Luc Morin and Nicholas Mancini describe the common use of vesting orders in insolvency practice in “Nothing Personal: the *Bloom Lake* Decision and the Growing Outreach of Vesting Orders Against *in personam* Rights” in Janis P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2017* (Toronto: Thomson Reuters, 2018) 905, at p. 938:

Vesting orders are now commonly being used to transfer entire businesses. Savvy insolvency practitioners have identified this path as being less troublesome and more efficient than having to go through a formal plan of arrangement or *BIA* proposal.

[27] The significance of vesting orders in modern insolvency practice is also discussed by Bish and Cassey in “Vesting Orders Part 1”, at pp. 41-42:

Over the past decade, a paradigm shift has occurred in Canadian corporate insolvency practice: there has been a fundamental transition in large cases from a dominant model in which a company restructures its business, operations, and liabilities through a plan of arrangement approved by each creditor class, to one in which a company instead conducts a sale of all or substantially all of its assets on a going concern basis outside of a plan of arrangement ...

Unquestionably, this profound transformation would not have been possible without the *vesting order*. It is the cornerstone of the modern “restructuring” age of corporate asset sales and secured creditor realizations ... The vesting order is the holy grail sought by every

purchaser; it is the carrot dangled by debtors, court officers, and secured creditors alike in pursuing and negotiating sale transactions. If Canadian courts elected to stop granting vesting orders, the effect on the insolvency practice would be immediate and extraordinary. Simply put, the system could not function in its present state without vesting orders. [Emphasis in original.]

[28] The authors emphasize that a considerable portion of Canadian insolvency practice rests firmly on the granting of vesting orders: see David Bish & Lee Cassey, “Vesting Orders Part 2: The Scope of Vesting Orders” (2015) 32:5 Nat’l Insolv. Rev. 53, at p. 56 (“Vesting Orders Part 2”). They write that the statement describing the unique nature of vesting orders reproduced from Houlden, Morawetz and Sarra (and cited at para. 109 of the reasons in stage one of this appeal)⁴ which relied on 1985 and 2003 decisions from Saskatchewan is remarkable and bears little semblance to the current practice. The authors do not challenge or criticize the use of vesting orders. They make an observation with which I agree, at p. 65, that: “a more transparent and conscientious

⁴ To repeat, the statement quoted from Lloyd W. Houlden, Geoffrey B. Morawetz & Janis P. Sarra, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada*, 4th ed., loose-leaf (Toronto: Carswell, 2009), at Part XI, L§21, said:

A vesting order should only be granted if the facts are not in dispute and there is no other available or reasonably convenient remedy; or in exceptional circumstances where compliance with the regular and recognized procedure for sale of real estate would result in an injustice. In a receivership, the sale of the real estate should first be approved by the court. The application for approval should be served upon the registered owner and all interested parties. If the sale is approved, the receiver may subsequently apply for a vesting order, but a vesting order should not be made until the rights of all interested parties have either been relinquished or been extinguished by due process. [Citations omitted.]

application of the formative equitable principles and considerations relating to vesting orders will assist in establishing a proper balancing of interests and a framework understood by all participants.”

(b) Potential Roots of Jurisdiction

[29] In analysing the issue of whether there is jurisdiction to extinguish 235 Co.’s GORs, I will first address the possible roots of jurisdiction to grant vesting orders and then I will examine how the legal framework applies to the factual scenario engaged by this appeal.

[30] As mentioned, in oral submissions, the appellant conceded that the motion judge had jurisdiction; his error was in exercising that jurisdiction by extinguishing a property interest that belonged to 235 Co. Of course, a party cannot confer jurisdiction on a court on consent or otherwise, and I do not draw on that concession. However, as the submissions of the parties suggest, there are various potential sources of jurisdiction to vest out the GORs: s. 100 of the CJA, s. 243 of the BIA, s. 21 of the CLPA, and the court’s inherent jurisdiction. I will address the first three potential roots for jurisdiction. As I will explain, it is unnecessary to resort to reliance on inherent jurisdiction.

(c) The Hierarchical Approach to Jurisdiction in the Insolvency

Context

[31] Before turning to an analysis of the potential roots of jurisdiction, it is important to consider the principles which guide a court's determination of questions of jurisdiction in the insolvency context. In *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2010 SCC 60, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, at para. 65, Deschamps J. adopted the hierarchical approach to addressing the court's jurisdiction in insolvency matters that was espoused by Justice Georgina R. Jackson and Professor Janis Sarra in their article "Selecting the Judicial Tool to Get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters" in Janis P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007* (Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2008) 41. The authors suggest that in addressing under-inclusive or skeletal legislation, first one "should engage in statutory interpretation to determine the limits of authority, adopting a broad, liberal and purposive interpretation that may reveal that authority": at p. 42. Only then should one turn to inherent jurisdiction to fill a possible gap. "By determining first whether the legislation can bear a broad and liberal interpretation, judges may avoid the difficulties associated with the exercise of inherent jurisdiction": at p. 44. The authors conclude at p. 94:

On the authors' reading of the commercial jurisprudence, the problem most often for the court to resolve is that the legislation in question is under-

inclusive. It is not ambiguous. It simply does not address the application that is before the court, or in some cases, grants the court the authority to make any order it thinks fit. While there can be no magic formula to address this recurring situation, and indeed no one answer, it appears to the authors that practitioners have available a number of tools to accomplish the same end. In determining the right tool, it may be best to consider the judicial task as if in a hierarchy of judicial tools that may be deployed. The first is examination of the statute, commencing with consideration of the precise wording, the legislative history, the object and purposes of the Act, perhaps a consideration of Driedger's principle of reading the words of the Act in their entire context, in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament, and a consideration of the gap-filling power, where applicable. It may very well be that this exercise will reveal that a broad interpretation of the legislation confers the authority on the court to grant the application before it. Only after exhausting this statutory interpretative function should the court consider whether it is appropriate to assert an inherent jurisdiction. Hence, inherent jurisdiction continues to be a valuable tool, but not one that is necessary to utilize in most circumstances.

[32] Elmer A. Driedger's now famous formulation is that the words of an Act are to be read in their entire context, in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament: *The Construction of Statutes* (Toronto: Butterworth's, 1974), at p. 67. See also *Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd. (Re)*, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 27, at para. 21; *Montréal (City) v. 2952-1366 Québec Inc.*, 2005 SCC 62, [2005] 3 S.C.R. 141,

at para. 9. This approach recognizes that “statutory interpretation cannot be founded on the wording of the legislation alone”: *Rizzo*, at para. 21.

(d) Section 100 of the CJA

[33] This brings me to the CJA. In Ontario, the power to grant a vesting order is conferred by s. 100 of the CJA which states that:

A court may by order vest in any person an interest in real or personal property that the court has authority to order be disposed of, encumbered or conveyed.

[34] The roots of s. 100 and vesting orders more generally, can be traced to the courts of equity. Vesting orders originated as a means to enforce an order of the Court of Chancery which was a court of equity. In 1857, *An Act for further increasing the efficiency and simplifying the proceedings of the Court of Chancery*, c. 1857, c. 56, s. VIII was enacted. It provided that where the court had power to order the execution of a deed or conveyance of a property, it now also had the power to make a vesting order for such property.⁵ In other words, it is a power to vest property from one party to another in order to implement the order of the court. As explained by this court in *Chippewas of Sarnia Band v. Canada (Attorney General)* (2000), 51 O.R. (3d) 641 (C.A.), at para. 281, leave

⁵ Such orders were subsequently described as vesting orders in *An Act respecting the Court of Chancery*, C.S.U.C. 1859, c. 12, s. 63. The authority to grant vesting orders was inserted into the *The Judicature Act*, R.S.O. 1897, c. 51, s. 36 in 1897 when the Courts of Chancery were abolished. Section 100 of the CJA appeared in 1984 with the demise of *The Judicature Act*: see *An Act to revise and consolidate the Law respecting the Organization, Operation and Proceedings of Courts of Justice in Ontario*, S.O. 1984, c. 11, s. 113.

to appeal refused, [2001] S.C.C.A. No. 63, the court's statutory power to make a vesting order supplemented its contempt power by allowing the court to effect a change of title in circumstances where the parties had been directed to deal with property in a certain manner but had failed to do so. Vesting orders are equitable in origin and discretionary in nature: *Chippewas*, at para. 281.

[35] Blair J.A. elaborated on the nature of vesting orders in *Re Regal Constellation Hotel Ltd.* (2004), 71 O.R. (3d) 355 (C.A.), at para. 33:

A vesting order, then, had a dual character. It is on the one hand a court order ("allowing the court to effect the change of title directly"), and on the other hand a conveyance of title (vesting "an interest in real or personal property" in the party entitled thereto under the order).

[36] Frequently vesting orders would arise in the context of real property, family law and wills and estates. *Trick v. Trick* (2006), 81 O.R. (3d) 241 (C.A.), leave to appeal refused, [2006] S.C.C.A. No. 388, involved a family law dispute over the enforcement of support orders made under the *Divorce Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 3 (2nd Supp.). The motion judge in *Trick* had vested 100 per cent of the appellant's private pension in the respondent in order to enforce a support order. In granting the vesting order, the motion judge relied in part on s. 100 of the CJA. On appeal, the appellant argued that the vesting order contravened s. 66(4) of the *Pension Benefits Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 8 which permitted execution against a pension benefit to enforce a support order only up to a

maximum of 50 per cent of the benefit. This court allowed the appeal and held that a vesting order under s. 100 of the CJA could not be granted where to do so would contravene a specific provision of the *Pension Benefits Act*: at para. 16. Lang J.A. stated at para. 16 that even if a vesting order was available in equity, that relief should be refused where it would conflict with the specific provisions of the *Pension Benefits Act*. In *obiter*, she observed that s. 100 of the CJA “does not provide a free standing right to property simply because the court considers that result equitable”: at para. 19.

[37] The motion judge in the case under appeal rejected the applicability of *Trick* stating, at para. 37:

That case [*Trick*] i[s] not the same as this case. In that case, there was no right to order the CPP and OAS benefits to be paid to the wife. In this case, the BIA and the *Courts of Justice Act* give the Court that jurisdiction to order the property to be sold and on what terms. Under the receivership in this case, Third Eye is entitled to be the purchaser of the assets pursuant to the bid process authorized by the Court.

[38] It is unclear whether the motion judge was concluding that either statute provided jurisdiction or that together they did so.

[39] Based on the *obiter* in *Trick*, absent an independent basis for jurisdiction, the CJA could not be the sole basis on which to grant a vesting order. There had to be some other root for jurisdiction in addition to or in place of the CJA.

[40] In their article “Vesting Orders Part 1”, Bish and Cassey write at p. 49:

Section 100 of the CJA is silent as to any transfer being on a *free and clear* basis. There appears to be very little written on this subject, but, presumably, the power would flow from the court being a court of equity and from the very practical notion that it, pursuant to its equitable powers, can issue a vesting order transferring assets and should, correspondingly, have the power to set the terms of such transfer so long as such terms accord with the principles of equity. [Emphasis in original.]

[41] This would suggest that provided there is a basis on which to grant an order vesting property in a purchaser, there is a power to vest out interests on a free and clear basis so long as the terms of the order are appropriate and accord with the principles of equity.

[42] This leads me to consider whether jurisdiction exists under s. 243 of the BIA both to sell assets and to set the terms of the sale including the granting of a vesting order.

(e) Section 243 of the BIA

[43] The BIA is remedial legislation and should be given a liberal interpretation to facilitate its objectives: *Ford Motor Company of Canada, Limited v. Welcome Ford Sales Ltd.*, 2011 ABCA 158, 505 A.R. 146, at para. 43; *Nautical Data International Inc., Re*, 2005 NLTD 104, 249 Nfld. & P.E.I.R. 247, at para. 9; *Re Bell*, 2013 ONSC 2682, at para. 125; and *Scenna v. Gurizzan* (1999), 11 C.B.R. (4th) 293 (Ont. S.C.), at para. 4. Within this context, and in order to understand

the scope of s. 243, it is helpful to review the wording, purpose, and history of the provision.

The Wording and Purpose of s. 243

[44] Section 243 was enacted in 2005 and came into force in 2009. It authorizes the court to appoint a receiver where it is “just or convenient” to do so. As explained by the Supreme Court in *Saskatchewan (Attorney General) v. Lemare Lake Logging Ltd.*, 2015 SCC 53, [2015] 3 S.C.R. 419, prior to 2009, receivership proceedings involving assets in more than one province were complicated by the simultaneous proceedings that were required in different jurisdictions. There had been no legislative provision authorizing the appointment of a receiver with authority to act nationally. Rather, receivers were appointed under provincial statutes, such as the CJA, which resulted in a requirement to obtain separate appointments in each province or territory where the debtor had assets. “Because of the inefficiency resulting from this multiplicity of proceedings, the federal government amended its bankruptcy legislation to permit their consolidation through the appointment of a national receiver”: *Lemare Lake Logging*, at para. 1. Section 243 was the outcome.

[45] Under s. 243, the court may appoint a receiver to, amongst other things, take any other action that the court considers advisable. Specifically, s. 243(1) states:

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

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

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

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

[46] "Receiver" is defined very broadly in s. 243(2), the relevant portion of which states:

243(2) [I]n this Part, **receiver** means a person who

(a) is appointed under subsection (1); or

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

(i) an agreement under which property becomes subject to a security (in this Part referred to as a "security agreement"), or

(ii) a court order made under another Act of Parliament, or an Act of a legislature of a province, that provides for or authorizes the appointment of a receiver or a receiver – manager. [Emphasis in original.]

[47] *Lemare Lake Logging* involved a constitutional challenge to Saskatchewan's farm security legislation. The Supreme Court concluded, at para. 68, that s. 243 had a simple and narrow purpose: the establishment of a

regime allowing for the appointment of a national receiver and the avoidance of a multiplicity of proceedings and resulting inefficiencies. It was not meant to circumvent requirements of provincial laws such as the 150 day notice of intention to enforce requirement found in the Saskatchewan legislation in issue.

The History of s. 243

[48] The origins of s. 243 can be traced back to s. 47 of the BIA which was enacted in 1992. Before 1992, typically in Ontario, receivers were appointed privately or under s. 101 of the CJA and s. 243 was not in existence.

[49] In 1992, s. 47(1) of the BIA provided for the appointment of an interim receiver when the court was satisfied that a secured creditor had or was about to send a notice of intention to enforce security pursuant to s. 244(1). Section 47(2) provided that the court appointing the interim receiver could direct the interim receiver to do any or all of the following:

47(2) The court may direct an interim receiver appointed under subsection (1) to do any or all of the following:

- (a) take possession of all or part of the debtor's property mentioned in the appointment;
- (b) exercise such control over that property, and over the debtor's business, as the court considers advisable; and
- (c) take such other action as the court considers advisable.

[50] The language of this subsection is similar to that now found in s. 243(1).

[51] Following the enactment of s. 47(2), the courts granted interim receivers broad powers, and it became common to authorize an interim receiver to both operate and manage the debtor's business, and market and sell the debtor's property: Frank Bennett, *Bennett on Bankruptcy*, 21st ed. (Toronto: LexisNexis, 2019), at p. 205; Roderick J. Wood, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Irwin Law, 2015), at pp. 505-506.

[52] Such powers were endorsed by judicial interpretation of s. 47(2). Notably, in *Canada (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) v. Curragh, Inc.* (1994), 114 D.L.R. (4th) 176 (Ont. Ct. (Gen. Div.)), Farley J. considered whether the language in s. 47(2)(c) that provided that the court could "direct an interim receiver ... to ... take such other action as the court considers advisable", permitted the court to call for claims against a mining asset in the Yukon and bar claims not filed by a specific date. He determined that it did. He wrote, at p. 185:

It would appear to me that Parliament did not take away any inherent jurisdiction from the Court but in fact provided, with these general words, that the Court could enlist the services of an interim receiver to do not only what "justice dictates" but also what "practicality demands." It should be recognized that where one is dealing with an insolvency situation one is not dealing with matters which are neatly organized and operating under predictable discipline. Rather the condition of

insolvency usually carries its own internal seeds of chaos, unpredictability and instability.

See also *Re Loewen Group Inc.* (2001), 22 B.L.R. (3d) 134 (Ont. S.C.)⁶.

[53] Although Farley J. spoke of inherent jurisdiction, given that his focus was on providing meaning to the broad language of the provision in the context of Parliament's objective to regulate insolvency matters, this might be more appropriately characterized as statutory jurisdiction under Jackson and Sarra's hierarchy. Farley J. concluded that the broad language employed by Parliament in s. 47(2)(c) provided the court with the ability to direct an interim receiver to do not only what "justice dictates" but also what "practicality demands".

[54] In the intervening period between the 1992 amendments which introduced s. 47, and the 2009 amendments which introduced s. 243, the BIA receivership regime was considered by the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce ("Senate Committee"). One of the problems identified by the Senate Committee, and summarized in *Lemare Lake Logging*, at para. 56, was that "in many jurisdictions, courts had extended the power of interim receivers to such an extent that they closely resembled those of court-appointed receivers." This was a deviation from the original intention that interim receivers serve as "temporary watchdogs" meant to "protect and preserve" the debtor's estate and

⁶ This case was decided before s. 36 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangements Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA") was enacted but the same principles are applicable.

the interests of the secured creditor during the 10 day period during which the secured creditor was prevented from enforcing its security: *Re Big Sky Living Inc.*, 2002 ABQB 659, 318 A.R. 165, at paras. 7-8; Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, *Debtors and Creditors Sharing the Burden: A Review of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (Ottawa: Senate of Canada, 2003), at pp. 144-145 ("Senate Committee Report").⁷

[55] Parliament amended s. 47(2) through the *Insolvency Reform Act 2005* and the *Insolvency Reform Act 2007* which came into force on September 18, 2009.⁸ The amendment both modified the scope and powers of interim receivers, and introduced a receivership regime that was national in scope under s. 243.

[56] Parliament limited the powers conferred on interim receivers by removing the jurisdiction under s. 47(2)(c) authorizing an interim receiver to "take such other action as the court considers advisable". At the same time, Parliament

⁷ This 10 day notice period was introduced following the Supreme Court's decision in *R.E. Lister Ltd. v. Dunlop Canada Ltd.*, [1982] 1 S.C.R. 726 (S.C.C.) which required a secured creditor to give reasonable notice prior to the enforcement of its security.

⁸ *An Act to establish the Wage Earner Protection Program Act, to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts*, S.C. 2005, c. 47 ("*Insolvency Reform Act 2005*"); *An Act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, the Wage Earner Protection Program Act and chapter 47 of the Statutes of Canada, 2005*, S.C. 2007, c. 36 ("*Insolvency Reform Act 2007*").

introduced s. 243. Notably Parliament adopted substantially the same broad language removed from the old s. 47(2)(c) and placed it into s. 243. To repeat,

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

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

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

(c) take any other action that the court considers advisable. [Emphasis added.]

[57] When Parliament enacted s. 243, it was evident that courts had interpreted the wording “take such other action that the court considers advisable” in s. 47(2)(c) as permitting the court to do what “justice dictates” and “practicality demands”. As the Supreme Court observed in *ATCO Gas & Pipelines Ltd. v. Alberta (Energy & Utilities Board)*, 2006 SCC 4, [2006] 1 S.C.R. 140: “It is a well-established principle that the legislature is presumed to have a mastery of existing law, both common law and statute law”. Thus, Parliament’s deliberate choice to import the wording from s. 47(2)(c) into s. 243(1)(c) must be considered in interpreting the scope of jurisdiction under s. 243(1) of the BIA.

[58] Professor Wood in his text, at p. 510, suggests that in importing this language, Parliament's intention was that the wide-ranging orders formerly made in relation to interim receivers would be available to s. 243 receivers:

The court may give the receiver the power to take possession of the debtor's property, exercise control over the debtor's business, and take any other action that the court thinks advisable. This gives the court the ability to make the same wide-ranging orders that it formerly made in respect of interim receivers, including the power to sell the debtor's property out of the ordinary course of business by way of a going-concern sale or a break-up sale of the assets. [Emphasis added.]

[59] However, the language in s. 243(1) should also be compared with the language used by Parliament in s. 65.13(7) of the BIA and s. 36 of the CCAA. Both of these provisions were enacted as part of the same 2009 amendments that established s. 243.

[60] In s. 65.13(7), the BIA contemplates the sale of assets during a proposal proceeding. This provision expressly provides authority to the court to: (i) authorize a sale or disposition (ii) free and clear of any security, charge or other restriction, and (iii) if it does, order 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.

[61] The language of s. 36(6) of the CCAA which deals with the sale or disposition of assets of a company under the protection of the CCAA is identical to that of s. 65.13(7) of the BIA.

[62] Section 243 of the BIA does not contain such express language. Rather, as mentioned, s. 243(1)(c) simply uses the language “take any other action that the court considers advisable”.

[63] This squarely presents the problem identified by Jackson and Sarra: the provision is not ambiguous. It simply does not address the issue of whether the court can issue a vesting order under s. 243 of the BIA. Rather, s. 243 uses broad language that grants the court the authority to authorize any action it considers advisable. The question then becomes whether this broad wording, when interpreted in light of the legislative history and statutory purpose, confers jurisdiction to grant sale and vesting orders in the insolvency context. In answering this question, it is important to consider whether the omission from s. 243 of the language found in 65.13(7) of the BIA and s. 36(6) of the CCAA impacts the interpretation of s. 243. To assist in this analysis, recourse may be had to principles of statutory interpretation.

[64] In some circumstances, an intention to exclude certain powers in a legislative provision may be implied from the express inclusion of those powers in another provision. The doctrine of implied exclusion (*expressio unius est*

exclusio alterius) is discussed by Ruth Sullivan in her leading text *Statutory Interpretation*, 3rd ed. (Toronto: Irwin Law, 2016), at p. 154:

An intention to exclude may legitimately be implied whenever a thing is not mentioned in a context where, if it were meant to be included, one would have expected it to be expressly mentioned. Given an expectation of express mention, the silence of the legislature becomes meaningful. An expectation of express reference legitimately arises whenever a pattern or practice of express reference is discernible. Since such patterns and practices are common in legislation, reliance on implied exclusion reasoning is also common.

[65] However, Sullivan notes that the doctrine of implied exclusion “[l]ike the other presumptions relied on in textual analysis ... is merely a presumption and can be rebutted.” The Supreme Court has acknowledged that when considering the doctrine of implied exclusion, the provisions must be read in light of their context, legislative histories and objects: see *Marche v. Halifax Insurance Co.*, 2005 SCC 6, [2005] 1 S.C.R. 47, at para. 19, *per* McLachlin C.J.; *Copthorne Holdings Ltd. v. R.*, 2011 SCC 63, [2011] 3 S.C.R. 721, at paras. 110-111.

[66] The Supreme Court noted in *Turgeon v. Dominion Bank*, [1930] S.C.R. 67, at pp. 70-71, that the maxim *expressio unius est exclusio alterius* “no doubt ... has its uses when it aids to discover intention; but, as has been said, while it is often a valuable servant, it is a dangerous master to follow. Much depends upon the context.” In this vein, Rothstein J. stated in *Copthorne*, at paras. 110-111:

I do not rule out the possibility that in some cases the underlying rationale of a provision would be no broader

than the text itself. Provisions that may be so construed, having regard to their context and purpose, may support the argument that the text is conclusive because the text is consistent with and fully explains its underlying rationale.

However, the implied exclusion argument is misplaced where it relies exclusively on the text of the ... provisions without regard to their underlying rationale.

[67] Thus, in determining whether the doctrine of implied exclusion may assist, a consideration of the context and purpose of s. 65.13 of the BIA and s. 36 of the CCAA is relevant. Section 65.13 of the BIA and s. 36 of the CCAA do not relate to receiverships but to restructurings and reorganizations.

[68] In its review of the two statutes, the Senate Committee concluded that, in certain circumstances involving restructuring proceedings, stakeholders could benefit from an insolvent company selling all or part of its assets, but felt that, in approving such sales, courts should be provided with legislative guidance “regarding minimum requirements to be met during the sale process”: Senate Committee Report, pp. 146-148.

[69] Commentators have noted that the purpose of the amendments was to provide “the debtor with greater flexibility in dealing with its property while limiting the possibility of abuse”: Lloyd W. Houlden, Geoffrey B. Morawetz & Janis P. Sarra, *The 2018-2019 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (Toronto: Thomson Reuters, 2018), at p. 294.

[70] These amendments and their purpose must be read in the context of insolvency practice at the time they were enacted. The nature of restructurings under the CCAA has evolved considerably over time. Now liquidating CCAAs, as they are described, which involve sales rather than a restructuring, are commonplace. The need for greater codification and guidance on the sale of assets outside of the ordinary course of business in restructuring proceedings is highlighted by Professor Wood's discussion of the objective of restructuring law. He notes that while at one time, the objective was relatively uncontested, it has become more complicated as restructurings are increasingly employed as a mechanism for selling the business as a going concern: Wood, at p. 337.

[71] In contrast, as I will discuss further, typically the nub of a receiver's responsibility is the liquidation of the assets of the insolvent debtor. There is much less debate about the objectives of a receivership, and thus less of an impetus for legislative guidance or codification. In this respect, the purpose and context of the sales provisions in s. 65.13 of the BIA and s. 36 of the CCAA are distinct from those of s. 243 of the BIA. Due to the evolving use of the restructuring powers of the court, the former demanded clarity and codification, whereas the law governing sales in the context of receiverships was well established. Accordingly, rather than providing a detailed code governing sales, Parliament utilized broad wording to describe both a receiver and a receiver's powers under s. 243. In light of this distinct context and legislative purpose, I do

not find that the absence of the express language found in s. 65.13 of the BIA and s. 36 of the CCAA from s. 243 forecloses the possibility that the broad wording in s. 243 confers jurisdiction to grant vesting orders.

Section 243 – Jurisdiction to Grant a Sales Approval and Vesting Order

[72] This brings me to an analysis of the broad language of s. 243 in light of its distinct legislative history, objective and purposes. As I have discussed, s. 243 was enacted by Parliament to establish a receivership regime that eliminated a patchwork of provincial proceedings. In enacting this provision, Parliament imported into s. 243(1)(c) the broad wording from the former s. 47(2)(c) which courts had interpreted as conferring jurisdiction to direct an interim receiver to do not only what “justice dictates” but also what “practicality demands”. Thus, in interpreting s. 243, it is important to elaborate on the purpose of receiverships generally.

[73] The purpose of a receivership is to “enhance and facilitate the preservation and realization of the assets for the benefit of creditors”: *Hamilton Wentworth Credit Union Ltd. v. Courtcliffe Parks Ltd.* (1995), 23 O.R. (3d) 781 (Gen. Div.), at p. 787. Such a purpose is generally achieved through a liquidation of the debtor’s assets: Wood, at p. 515. As the Appeal Division of the Nova Scotia Supreme Court noted in *Bayhold Financial Corp. v. Clarkson Co. Ltd. and Scouler* (1991), 108 N.S.R. (2d) 198 (N.S.C.A.), at para. 34, “the essence of a

receiver's powers is to liquidate the assets". The receiver's "primary task is to ensure that the highest value is received for the assets so as to maximise the return to the creditors": *1117387 Ontario Inc. v. National Trust Company*, 2010 ONCA 340, 262 O.A.C. 118, at para. 77.

[74] This purpose is reflected in commercial practice. Typically, the order appointing a receiver includes a power to sell: see for example the Commercial List Model Receivership Order, at para. 3(k). There is no express power in the BIA authorizing a receiver to liquidate or sell property. However, such sales are inherent in court-appointed receiverships and the jurisprudence is replete with examples: see e.g. *bcIMC Construction Fund Corp. v. Chandler Homer Street Ventures Ltd.*, 2008 BCSC 897, 44 C.B.R. (5th) 171 (in Chambers), *Royal Bank v. Fracmaster Ltd.*, 1999 ABCA 178, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 230, *Skyepharma PLC v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp.* (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 87 (Ont. S.C.), *aff'd* (2000), 47 O.R. (3d) 234 (C.A.).

[75] Moreover, the mandatory statutory receiver's reports required by s. 246 of the BIA direct a receiver to file a "statement of all property of which the receiver has taken possession or control that has not yet been sold or realized" during the receivership (emphasis added): *Bankruptcy and Insolvency General Rules*, C.R.C. c. 368, r. 126 ("BIA Rules").

[76] It is thus evident from a broad, liberal, and purposive interpretation of the BIA receivership provisions, including s. 243(1)(c), that implicitly the court has the jurisdiction to approve a sale proposed by a receiver and courts have historically acted on that basis. There is no need to have recourse to provincial legislation such as s.100 of the CJA to sustain that jurisdiction.

[77] Having reached that conclusion, the question then becomes whether this jurisdiction under s. 243 extends to the implementation of the sale through the use of a vesting order as being incidental and ancillary to the power to sell. In my view it does. I reach this conclusion for two reasons. First, vesting orders are necessary in the receivership context to give effect to the court's jurisdiction to approve a sale as conferred by s. 243. Second, this interpretation is consistent with, and furthers the purpose of, s. 243. I will explain.

[78] I should first indicate that the case law on vesting orders in the insolvency context is limited. In *Re New Skeena Forest Products Inc.*, 2005 BCCA 154, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 267, the British Columbia Court of Appeal held, at para. 20, that a court-appointed receiver was entitled to sell the assets of New Skeena Forest Products Inc. free and clear of the interests of all creditors and contractors. The court pointed to the receivership order itself as the basis for the receiver to request a vesting order, but did not discuss the basis of the court's jurisdiction to grant the order. In 2001, in *Re Loewen Group Inc.*, Farley J. concluded, at para. 6, that in the CCAA context, the court's inherent jurisdiction formed the

basis of the court's power and authority to grant a vesting order. The case was decided before amendments to the CCAA which now specifically permit the court to authorize a sale of assets free and clear of any charge or other restriction. The Nova Scotia Supreme Court in *Enterprise Cape Breton Corp. v. Crown Jewel Resort Ranch Inc.*, 2014 NSSC 420, 353 N.S.R. (2d) 194 stated that neither provincial legislation nor the BIA provided authority to grant a vesting order.

[79] In *Anglo Pacific Group PLC v. Ernst & Young Inc.*, 2013 QCCA 1323, the Quebec Court of Appeal concluded that pursuant to s. 243(1)(c) of the BIA, a receiver can ask the court to sell the property of the bankrupt debtor, free of any charge. In that case, the judge had discharged a debenture, a royalty agreement and universal hypothecs. After reciting s. 243, Thibault J.A., writing for the court stated, at para 98: "It is pursuant to paragraph 243(1) of the BIA that the receiver can ask the court to sell the property of a bankrupt debtor, free of any charge." Although in that case, unlike this appeal, the Quebec Court of Appeal concluded that the instruments in issue did not represent interests in land or 'real rights', it nonetheless determined that s. 243(1)(c) provided authority for the receiver to seek to sell property free of any charge(s) on the property.

[80] The necessity for a vesting order in the receivership context is apparent. A receiver selling assets does not hold title to the assets and a receivership does

not effect a transfer or vesting of title in the receiver. As Bish and Cassey state in “Vesting Orders Part 2”, at p. 58, “[a] vesting order is a vital legal ‘bridge’ that facilitates the receiver’s giving good and undisputed title to a purchaser. It is a document to show to third parties as evidence that the purported conveyance of title by the receiver – which did not hold the title – is legally valid and effective.” As previously noted, vesting orders in the insolvency context serve a dual purpose. They provide for the conveyance of title and also serve to extinguish encumbrances on title in order to facilitate the sale of assets.

[81] The Commercial List’s Model Receivership Order authorizes a receiver to apply for a vesting order or other orders necessary to convey property “free and clear of any liens or encumbrances”: see para. 3(l). This is of course not conclusive but is a reflection of commercial practice. This language is placed in receivership orders often on consent and without the court’s advertence to the authority for such a term. As Bish and Cassey note in “Vesting Orders Part 1”, at p. 42, the vesting order is the “holy grail” sought by purchasers and has become critical to the ability of debtors and receivers to negotiate sale transactions in the insolvency context. Indeed, the motion judge observed that the granting of vesting orders in receivership sales is “a near daily occurrence on the Commercial List”: at para. 31. As such, this aspect of the vesting order assists in advancing the purpose of s. 243 and of receiverships generally, being the realization of the debtor’s assets. It is self-evident that purchasers of assets

do not wish to acquire encumbered property. The use of vesting orders is in essence incidental and ancillary to the power to sell.

[82] As I will discuss further, while jurisdiction for this aspect of vesting orders stems from s. 243, the exercise of that jurisdiction is not unbounded.

[83] The jurisdiction to vest assets in a purchaser in the context of a national receivership is reflective of the objective underlying s. 243. With a national receivership, separate sales approval and vesting orders should not be required in each province in which assets are being sold. This is in the interests of efficiency and if it were otherwise, the avoidance of a multiplicity of proceedings objective behind s. 243 would be undermined, as would the remedial purpose of the BIA.

[84] If the power to vest does not arise under s. 243 with the appointment of a national receiver, the sale of assets in different provinces would require a patchwork of vesting orders. This would be so even if the order under s. 243 were on consent of a third party or unopposed, as jurisdiction that does not exist cannot be conferred.

[85] In my view, s. 243 provides jurisdiction to the court to authorize the receiver to enter into an agreement to sell property and in furtherance of that power, to grant an order vesting the purchased property in the purchaser. Thus, here the Receiver had the power under s. 243 of the BIA to enter into an

agreement to sell Dianor's property, to seek approval of that sale, and to request a vesting order from the court to give effect to the sale that was approved.

[86] Lastly, I would also observe that this conclusion supports the flexibility that is a hallmark of the Canadian system of insolvency – it facilitates the maximization of proceeds and realization of the debtor's assets, but as I will explain, at the same time operates to ensure that third party interests are not inappropriately violated. This conclusion is also consonant with contemporary commercial realities; realities that are reflected in the literature on the subject, the submissions of counsel for the intervener, the Insolvency Institute of Canada, and the model Commercial List Sales Approval and Vesting Order. Parliament knew that by importing the broad language of s. 47(2)(c) into s. 243(1)(c), the interpretation accorded s. 243(1) would be consistent, thus reflecting a desire for the receivership regime to be flexible and responsive to evolving commercial practice.

[87] In summary, I conclude that jurisdiction exists under s. 243(1) of the BIA to grant a vesting order vesting property in a purchaser. This jurisdiction extends to receivers who are appointed under the provisions of the BIA.

[88] This analysis does not preclude the possibility that s. 21 of the CLPA also provides authority for vesting property in the purchaser free and clear of

encumbrances. The language of this provision originated in the British *Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, 1881*, 44 & 45 Vict. ch. 41 and has been the subject matter of minimal judicial consideration. In a nutshell, s. 21 states that where land subject to an encumbrance is sold, the court may direct payment into court of an amount sufficient to meet the encumbrance and declare the land to be free from the encumbrance. The word “encumbrance” is not defined in the CLPA.

[89] G. Thomas Johnson in Anne Warner La Forest, ed., *Anger & Honsberger Law of Real Property*, 3rd ed., loose-leaf (Toronto: Thomson Reuters, 2017), at §34:10 states:

The word “encumbrance” is not a technical term. Rather, it is a general expression and must be interpreted in the context in which it is found. It has a broad meaning and may include many disparate claims, charges, liens or burdens on land. It has been defined as “every right to or interest in land granted to the diminution of the value of the land but consistent with the passing of the fee”.

[90] The author goes on to acknowledge however, that even this definition, broad as it is, is not comprehensive enough to cover all possible encumbrances.

[91] That said, given that s. 21 of the CLPA was not a basis advanced before the motion judge, for the purposes of this appeal, it is unnecessary to conclusively determine this issue.

B. Was it Appropriate to Vest out 235 Co's GORs?

[92] This takes me to the next issue – the scope of the sales approval and vesting order and whether 235 Co.'s GORs should have been extinguished.

[93] Accepting that the motion judge had the jurisdiction to issue a sales approval and vesting order, the issue then becomes not one of “jurisdiction” but rather one of “appropriateness” as Blair J.A. stated in *Re Canadian Red Cross Society/Société canadienne de la Croix-Rouge* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Ct. (Gen. Div.)), at para. 42, leave to appeal refused, (1998), 32 C.B.R. (4th) 21 (Ont. C.A.). Put differently, should the motion judge have exercised his jurisdiction to extinguish the appellant's GORs from title?

[94] In the first stage of this appeal, this court concluded that the GORs constituted interests in land. In the second stage, I have determined that the motion judge did have jurisdiction to grant a sales approval and vesting order. I must then address the issue of scope and determine whether the motion judge erred in ordering that the GORs be extinguished from title.

(1) Review of the Case Law

[95] As illustrated in the first stage of this appeal and as I will touch upon, a review of the applicable jurisprudence reflects very inconsistent treatment of vesting orders.

[96] In some cases, courts have denied a vesting order on the basis that the debtor's interest in the property circumscribes a receiver's sale rights. For example, in *1565397 Ontario Inc., Re* (2009), 54 C.B.R. (5th) 262 (Ont. S.C.), the receiver sought an order authorizing it to sell the debtor's property free of an undertaking the debtor gave to the respondents to hold two lots in trust if a plan of subdivision was not registered by the closing date. Wilton-Siegel J. found that the undertaking created an interest in land. He stated, at para. 68, that the receiver had taken possession of the property of the debtor only and could not have any interest in the respondents' interest in the property and as such, he was not prepared to authorize the sale free of the undertaking. Wilton-Siegel J. then went on to discuss five "equitable considerations" that justified the refusal to grant the vesting order.

[97] Some cases have weighed "equitable considerations" to determine whether a vesting order is appropriate. This is evident in certain decisions involving the extinguishment of leasehold interests. In *Meridian Credit Union v. 984 Bay Street Inc.*, [2005] O.J. No. 3707 (S.C.), the court-appointed receiver had sought a declaration that the debtor's land could be sold free and clear of three non-arm's length leases. Each of the lease agreements provided that it was subordinate to the creditor's security interest, and the lease agreements were not registered on title. This court remitted the matter back to the motion judge and directed him to consider the equities to determine whether it was

appropriate to sell the property free and clear of the leases: see *Meridian Credit Union Ltd. v. 984 Bay Street Inc.*, [2006] O.J. No. 1726 (C.A.). The motion judge subsequently concluded that the equities supported an order terminating the leases and vesting title in the purchaser free and clear of any leasehold interests: *Meridian Credit Union v. 984 Bay Street Inc.*, [2006] O.J. No. 3169 (S.C.).

[98] An equitable framework was also applied by Wilton-Siegel J. in *Romspen*. In *Romspen*, Home Depot entered into an agreement of purchase and sale with the debtor to acquire a portion of the debtor's property on which a new Home Depot store was to be constructed. The acquisition of the portion of property was contingent on compliance with certain provisions of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13. The debtor defaulted on its mortgage over its entire property and a receiver was appointed.

[99] The receiver entered into a purchase and sale agreement with a third party and sought an order vesting the property in the purchaser free and clear of Home Depot's interest. Home Depot took the position that the receiver did not have the power to convey the property free of Home Depot's interest. Wilton-Siegel J. concluded that a vesting order could be granted in the circumstances. He rejected Home Depot's argument that the receiver took its interest subject to Home Depot's equitable property interest under the agreement of purchase and

sale and the ground lease, as the agreement was only effective to create an interest in land if the provisions of the *Planning Act* had been complied with.

[100] He then considered the equities between the parties. The mortgage had priority over Home Depot's interest and Home Depot had failed to establish that the mortgagee had consented to the subordination of its mortgage to the leasehold interest. In addition, the purchase and sale agreement contemplated a price substantially below the amount secured by the mortgage, thus there would be no equity available for Home Depot's subordinate interest in any event. Wilton-Siegel J. concluded that the equities favoured a vesting of the property in the purchaser free and clear of Home Depot's interests.⁹

[101] As this review of the case law suggests, and as indicated in the First Reasons, there does not appear to be a consistently applied framework of analysis to determine whether a vesting order extinguishing interests ought to be granted. Generally speaking, outcomes have turned on the particular circumstances of a case accounting for factors such as the nature of the property interest, the dealings between the parties, and the relative priority of the competing interests. It is also clear from this review that many cases have

⁹ This court allowed an appeal of the motion judge's order in *Romspen* and remitted the matter back to the motion judge for a new hearing on the basis that the motion judge applied an incorrect standard of proof in making findings of fact by failing to draw reasonable inferences from the evidence, and in particular, on the issue of whether Romspen had expressly or implicitly consented to the construction of the Home Depot stores: see *Romspen Investment Corporation v. Woods Property Development Inc.*, 2011 ONCA 817, 286 O.A.C. 189.

considered the equities to determine whether a third party interest should be extinguished.

(2) Framework for Analysis to Determine if a Third Party Interest Should be Extinguished

[102] In my view, in considering whether to grant a vesting order that serves to extinguish rights, a court should adopt a rigorous cascade analysis.

[103] First, the court should assess the nature and strength of the interest that is proposed to be extinguished. The answer to this question may be determinative thus obviating the need to consider other factors.

[104] For instance, I agree with the Receiver's submission that it is difficult to think of circumstances in which a court would vest out a fee simple interest in land. Not all interests in land share the same characteristics as a fee simple, but there are lesser interests in land that would also defy extinguishment due to the nature of the interest. Consider, for example, an easement in active use. It would be impractical to establish an exhaustive list of interests or to prescribe a rigid test to make this determination given the broad spectrum of interests in land recognized by the law.

[105] Rather, in my view, a key inquiry is whether the interest in land is more akin to a fixed monetary interest that is attached to real or personal property subject to the sale (such as a mortgage or a lien for municipal taxes), or whether the interest is more akin to a fee simple that is in substance an

ownership interest in some ascertainable feature of the property itself. This latter type of interest is tied to the inherent characteristics of the property itself; it is not a fixed sum of money that is extinguished when the monetary obligation is fulfilled. Put differently, the reasonable expectation of the owner of such an interest is that its interest is of a continuing nature and, absent consent, cannot be involuntarily extinguished in the ordinary course through a payment in lieu.

[106] Another factor to consider is whether the parties have consented to the vesting of the interest either at the time of the sale before the court, or through prior agreement. As Bish and Cassey note, vesting orders have become a routine aspect of insolvency practice, and are typically granted on consent: “Vesting Orders Part 2”, at pp. 60, 65.

[107] The more complex question arises when consent is given through a prior agreement such as where a third party has subordinated its interest contractually. *Meridian, Romspen, and Firm Capital Mortgage Funds Inc. v. 2012241 Ontario Ltd.*, 2012 ONSC 4816, 99 C.B.R. (5th) 120 are cases in which the court considered the appropriateness of a vesting order in circumstances where the third party had subordinated its interests. In each of these cases, although the court did not frame the subordination of the interests as the overriding question to consider before weighing the equities, the decisions all acknowledged that the third parties had agreed to subordinate their interest to that of the secured creditor. Conversely, in *Winick v. 1305067*

Ontario Ltd. (2008), 41 C.B.R. (5th) 81 (Ont. S.C.), the court refused to vest out a leasehold interest on the basis that the purchaser had notice of the lease and the purchaser acknowledged that it would purchase the property subject to the terms and conditions of the leases.

[108] The priority of the interests reflected in freely negotiated agreements between parties is an important factor to consider in the analysis of whether an interest in land is capable of being vested out. Such an approach ensures that the express intention of the parties is given sufficient weight and allows parties to contractually negotiate and prioritize their interests in the event of an insolvency.

[109] Thus, in considering whether an interest in land should be extinguished, a court should consider: (1) the nature of the interest in land; and (2) whether the interest holder has consented to the vesting out of their interest either in the insolvency process itself or in agreements reached prior to the insolvency.

[110] If these factors prove to be ambiguous or inconclusive, the court may then engage in a consideration of the equities to determine if a vesting order is appropriate in the particular circumstances of the case. This would include: consideration of the prejudice, if any, to the third party interest holder; whether the third party may be adequately compensated for its interest from the

proceeds of the disposition or sale; whether, based on evidence of value, there is any equity in the property; and whether the parties are acting in good faith. This is not an exhaustive list and there may be other factors that are relevant to the analysis.

(3) The Nature of the Interest in Land of 235 Co.'s GORs

[111] Turning then to the facts of this appeal, in the circumstances of this case, the issue can be resolved by considering the nature of the interest in land held by 235 Co. Here the GORs cannot be said to be a fee simple interest but they certainly were more than a fixed monetary interest that attached to the property. They did not exist simply to secure a fixed finite monetary obligation; rather they were in substance an interest in a continuing and an inherent feature of the property itself.

[112] While it is true, as the Receiver and Third Eye emphasize, that the GORs are linked to the interest of the holder of the mining claims and depend on the development of those claims, that does not make the interest purely monetary. As explained in stage one of this appeal, the nature of the royalty interest as described by the Supreme Court in *Bank of Montreal v. Dynex Petroleum Ltd.*, 2002 SCC 7, [2002] 1 S.C.R. 146, at para. 2 is instructive:

... [R]oyalty arrangements are common forms of arranging exploration and production in the oil and gas industry in Alberta. Typically, the owner of minerals *in situ* will lease to a potential producer the right to extract such minerals. This right is known as a working interest.

A royalty is an unencumbered share or fractional interest in the gross production of such working interest. A lessor's royalty is a royalty granted to (or reserved by) the initial lessor. An overriding royalty or a gross overriding royalty is a royalty granted normally by the owner of a working interest to a third party in exchange for consideration which could include, but is not limited to, money or services (e.g., drilling or geological surveying) (G. J. Davies, "The Legal Characterization of Overriding Royalty Interests in Oil and Gas" (1972), 10 *Alta. L. Rev.* 232, at p. 233). The rights and obligations of the two types of royalties are identical. The only difference is to whom the royalty was initially granted. [Italics in original; underlining added.]

[113] Thus, a GOR is an interest in the gross product extracted from the land, not a fixed monetary sum. While the GOR, like a fee simple interest, may be capable of being valued at a point in time, this does not transform the substance of the interest into one that is concerned with a fixed monetary sum rather than an element of the property itself. The interest represented by the GOR is an ownership in the product of the mining claim, either payable by a share of the physical product or a share of revenues. In other words, the GOR carves out an overriding entitlement to an amount of the property interest held by the owner of the mining claims.

[114] The Receiver submits that the realities of commerce and business efficacy in this case are that the mining claims were unsaleable without impairment of the GORs. That may be, but the imperatives of the mining claim owner should not necessarily trump the interest of the owner of the GORs.

[115] Given the nature of 235 Co.'s interest and the absence of any agreement that allows for any competing priority, there is no need to resort to a consideration of the equities. The motion judge erred in granting an order extinguishing 235 Co.'s GORs.

[116] Having concluded that the court had the jurisdiction to grant a vesting order but the motion judge erred in granting a vesting order extinguishing an interest in land in the nature of the GORs, I must then consider whether the appellant failed to preserve its rights such that it is precluded from persuading this court that the order granted by the motion judge ought to be set aside.

C. 235 Co.'s Appeal of the Motion Judge's Order

[117] 235 Co. served its notice of appeal on November 3, 2016, more than a week after the transaction had closed on October 26, 2016.

[118] Third Eye had originally argued that 235 Co.'s appeal was moot because the vesting order was spent when it was registered on title and the conveyance was effected. It relied on this court's decision in *Regal Constellation* in that regard.

[119] Justice Lauwers wrote that additional submissions were required in the face of the conclusion that 235 Co.'s GORs were interests in land: First Reasons, at para. 21. He queried whether it was appropriate for the court-

appointed receiver to close the transaction when the parties were aware that 235 Co. was considering an appeal prior to the closing of the transaction: at para. 22.

[120] There are three questions to consider in addressing what, if any, remedy is available to 235 Co. in these circumstances:

- (1) What appeal period applies to 235 Co.'s appeal of the sale approval and vesting order;
- (2) Was it permissible for the Receiver to close the transaction in the face of 235 Co.'s October 26, 2016 communication to the Receiver that "an appeal is under consideration"; and
- (3) Does 235 Co. nonetheless have a remedy available under the *Land Titles Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. L.5?

(1) The Applicable Appeal Period

[121] The Receiver was appointed under s. 101 of the CJA and s. 243 of the BIA. The motion judge's decision approving the sale and vesting the property in Third Eye was released through reasons dated October 5, 2016.

[122] Under the CJA, the appeal would be governed by the *Rules of Civil Procedure*, r. 61.04(1) which provides for a 30 day period from which to appeal a final order to the Court of Appeal. In addition, the appellant would have had to have applied for a stay of proceedings.

[123] In contrast, under the BIA, s. 183(2) provides that courts of appeal are “invested with power and jurisdiction at law and in equity, according to their ordinary procedures except as varied by” the BIA or the BIA Rules, to hear and determine appeals. An appeal lies to the Court of Appeal if the point at issue involves future rights; if the order or decision is likely to affect other cases of a similar nature in the bankruptcy proceedings; if the property involved in the appeal exceeds in value \$10,000; from the grant of or refusal to grant a discharge if the aggregate unpaid claims of creditors exceed \$5,000; and in any other case by leave of a judge of the Court of Appeal: BIA, s. 193. Given the nature of the dispute and the value in issue, no leave was required and indeed, none of the parties took the position that it was. There is therefore no need to address that issue.

[124] Under r. 31 of the BIA Rules, a notice of appeal must be filed “within 10 days after the day of the order or decision appealed from, or within such further time as a judge of the court of appeal stipulates.”

[125] The 10 days runs from the day the order or decision was rendered: *Moss (Bankrupt), Re* (1999), 138 Man. R. (2d) 318 (C.A., in Chambers), at para. 2; *Re Koska*, 2002 ABCA 138, 303 A.R. 230, at para. 16; *CWB Maxium Financial Inc. v. 6934235 Manitoba Ltd. (c.o.b. White Cross Pharmacy Wolseley)*, 2019 MBCA 28 (in Chambers), at para. 49. This is clear from the fact that both r. 31 and s. 193 speak of “order or decision” (emphasis added). If an

entered and issued order were required, there would be no need for this distinction.¹⁰ Accordingly, the “[t]ime starts to run on an appeal under the *BIA* from the date of pronouncement of the decision, not from the date the order is signed and entered”: *Re Koska*, at para. 16.

[126] Although there are cases where parties have conceded that the *BIA* appeal provisions apply in the face of competing provincial statutory provisions (see e.g. *Ontario Wealth Management Corp. v. SICA Masonry and General Contracting Ltd.*, 2014 ONCA 500, 323 O.A.C. 101 (in Chambers), at para. 36 and *Impact Tool & Mould Inc. v. Impact Tool & Mould Inc. Estate*, 2013 ONCA 697, at para. 1), until recently, no Ontario case had directly addressed this point.

[127] Relying on first principles, as noted by Donald J.M. Brown in *Civil Appeals* (Toronto: Carswell, 2019), at 2:1120, “where federal legislation occupies the field by providing a procedure for an appeal, those provisions prevail over provincial legislation providing for an appeal.” Parliament has jurisdiction over procedural law in bankruptcy and hence can provide for appeals: *Re Solloway Mills & Co. Ltd., In Liquidation, Ex Parte I.W.C. Solloway*

¹⁰ *Ontario Wealth Managements Corporation v. Sica Masonry and General Contracting Ltd.*, 2014 ONCA 500, 323 O.A.C. 101 (in Chambers) a decision of a single judge of this court, states, at para. 5, that a signed, issued, and entered order is required. This is generally the case in civil proceedings unless displaced, as here by a statutory provision. *Re Smoke* (1989), 77 C.B.R. (N.S.) 263 (Ont. C.A.), that is relied upon and cited in *Ontario Wealth Managements Corporation*, does not address this issue.

(1934), [1935] O.R. 37 (C.A.). Where there is an operational or purposive inconsistency between the federal bankruptcy rules and provincial rules on the timing of an appeal, the doctrine of federal paramountcy applies and the federal bankruptcy rules govern: see *Canada (Superintendent of Bankruptcy) v. 407 ETR Concession Company Limited.*, 2013 ONCA 769, 118 O.R. (3d) 161, at para. 59, aff'd 2015 SCC 52, [2015] 3 S.C.R. 397; *Alberta (Attorney General) v. Moloney*, 2015 SCC 51, [2015] 3 S.C.R. 327, at para. 16.

[128] In *Business Development Bank of Canada v. Astoria Organic Matters Ltd.*, 2019 ONCA 269, Zarnett J.A. wrote that the appeal route is dependent on the jurisdiction pursuant to which the order was granted. In that case, the appellant was appealing from the refusal of a judge to grant leave to sue the receiver who was stated to have been appointed pursuant to s. 101 of the CJA and s. 243 of the BIA. There was no appeal from the receivership order itself. Thus, to determine the applicable appeal route for the refusal to grant leave, the court was required to determine the source of the power to impose a leave to sue requirement in a receivership order. Zarnett J.A. determined that by necessary implication, Parliament must be taken to have clothed the court with the power to require leave to sue a receiver appointed under s. 243(1) of the BIA and federal paramountcy dictated that the BIA appeal provisions apply.

[129] Here, 235 Co.'s appeal is from the sale approval order, of which the vesting order is a component. Absent a sale, there could be no vesting order.

The jurisdiction of the court to approve the sale, and thus issue the sale approval and vesting order, is squarely within s. 243 of the BIA.

[130] Furthermore, as 235 Co. had known for a considerable time, there could be no sale to Third Eye in the absence of extinguishment of the GORs and Algoma's royalty rights; this was a condition of the sale that was approved by the motion judge. The appellant was stated to be unopposed to the sale but in essence opposed the sale condition requiring the extinguishment. Clearly the jurisdiction to grant the approval of the sale emanated from the BIA, and as I have discussed, so did the vesting component; it was incidental and ancillary to the approval of the sale. It would make little sense to split the two elements of the order in these circumstances. The essence of the order was anchored in the BIA.

[131] Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal period was 10 days as prescribed by r. 31 of the BIA Rules and ran from the date of the motion judge's decision of October 5, 2016. Thus, on a strict application of the BIA Rules, 235 Co.'s appeal was out of time. However, in the circumstances of this case it is relevant to consider first whether it was appropriate for the Receiver to close the transaction in the face of 235 Co.'s assertion that an appeal was under consideration and, second, although only sought in oral submissions in reply at the hearing of the second stage of this appeal, whether 235 Co. should be granted an extension of time to appeal.

(2) The Receiver's Conduct

[132] The Receiver argues that it was appropriate for it to close the transaction in the face of a threatened appeal because the appeal period had expired when the appellant advised the Receiver that it was contemplating an appeal (without having filed a notice of appeal or a request for leave) and the Receiver was bound by the provisions of the purchase and sale agreement and the order of the motion judge, which was not stayed, to close the transaction.

[133] Generally speaking, as a matter of professional courtesy, a potentially preclusive step ought not to be taken when a party is advised of a possible pending appeal. However, here the Receiver's conduct in closing the transaction must be placed in context.

[134] 235 Co. had known of the terms of the agreement of purchase and sale and the request for an order extinguishing its GORs for over a month, and of the motion judge's decision for just under a month before it served its notice of appeal. Before October 26, 2016, it had never expressed an intention to appeal either informally or by serving a notice of appeal, nor did it ever bring a motion for a stay of the motion judge's decision or seek an extension of time to appeal.

[135] Having had the agreement of purchase and sale at least since it was served with the Receiver's motion record seeking approval of the transaction, 235 Co. knew that time was of the essence. Moreover, it also knew that the

Receiver was directed by the court to take such steps as were necessary for the completion of the transaction contemplated in the purchase and sale agreement approved by the motion judge pursuant to para. 2 of the draft court order included in the motion record.

[136] The principal of 235 Co. had been the original prospector of Dianor. 235 Co. never took issue with the proposed sale to Third Eye. The Receiver obtained a valuation of Dianor's mining claims and the valuator concluded that they had a total value of \$1 million to \$2 million, with 235 Co.'s GORs having a value of between \$150,000 and \$300,000, and Algoma's royalties having a value of \$70,000 to \$140,000. No evidence of any competing valuation was adduced by 235 Co.

[137] Algoma agreed to a payment of \$150,000 but 235 Co. wanted more than the \$250,000 offered. The motion judge, who had been supervising the receivership, stated that 235 Co. acknowledged that the sum of \$250,000 represented the fair market value: at para. 15. He made a finding at para. 38 of his reasons that the principal of 235 Co. was "not entitled to exercise tactical positions to tyrannize the majority by refusing to agree to a reasonable amount for the royalty rights." In *obiter*, the motion judge observed that he saw "no reason in logic ... why the jurisdiction would not be the same whether the royalty rights were or were not an interest in land": at para. 40. Furthermore, the appellant knew of the motion judge's reasons for decision since October 5,

2016 and did nothing that suggested any intention to appeal until about three weeks later.

[138] As noted by the Receiver, it is in the interests of the efficient administration of receivership proceedings that aggrieved stakeholders act promptly and definitively to challenge a decision they dispute. This principle is in keeping with the more abbreviated time period found in the BIA Rules. Blair J.A. in *Regal Constellation*, at para. 49, stated that “[t]hese matters ought not to be determined on the basis that ‘the race is to the swiftest’”. However, that should not be taken to mean that the race is adjusted to the pace of the slowest.

[139] For whatever reasons, 235 Co. made a tactical decision to take no steps to challenge the motion judge’s decision and took no steps to preserve any rights it had. It now must absorb the consequences associated with that decision. This is not to say that the Receiver’s conduct would always be advisable. Absent some emergency that has been highlighted in its Receiver’s report to the court that supports its request for a vesting order, a Receiver should await the expiry of the 10 day appeal period before closing the sale transaction to which the vesting order relates.

[140] Given the context and history of dealings coupled with the actual expiry of the appeal period, I conclude that it was permissible for the Receiver to close the transaction. In my view, the appeal by 235 Co. was out of time.

(3) Remedy is not Merited

[141] As mentioned, in oral submissions in reply, 235 Co. sought an extension of time to appeal *nunc pro tunc*. It further requested that this court exercise its discretion and grant an order pursuant to ss. 159 and 160 of the *Land Titles Act* rectifying the title and granting an order directing the Minings Claim Recorder to rectify the provincial register so that 235 Co.'s GORs are reinstated. The Receiver resists this relief. Third Eye does not oppose the relief requested by 235 Co. provided that the compensation paid to 235 Co. and Algoma is repaid. However, counsel for the Monitor for Algoma states that the \$150,000 it received for Algoma's royalty rights has already been disbursed by the Monitor to Algoma.

[142] The rules and jurisprudence surrounding extensions of time in bankruptcy proceedings is discussed in Lloyd W. Houlden, Geoffrey B. Morawetz & Janis P. Sarra, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada*, 4th ed., loose-leaf (Toronto: Thomson Reuters, 2009). Rule 31(1) of the BIA Rules provides that a judge of the Court of Appeal may extend the time to appeal. The authors write, at pp. 8-20-8-21:

The court ought not lightly to interfere with the time limit fixed for bringing appeals, and special circumstances are required before the court will enlarge the time ...

In deciding whether the time for appealing should be extended, the following matters have been held to be relevant:

- (1) The appellant formed an intention to appeal before the expiration of the 10 day period;
- (2) The appellant informed the respondent, either expressly or impliedly, of the intention to appeal;
- (3) There was a continuous intention to appeal during the period when the appeal should have been commenced;
- (4) There is a sufficient reason why, within the 10 day period, a notice of appeal was not filed...;
- (5) The respondent will not be prejudiced by extending the time;
- (6) There is an arguable ground or grounds of appeal;
- (7) It is in the interest of justice, i.e., the interest of the parties, that an extension be granted.
[Citations omitted.]

[143] These factors are somewhat similar to those considered by this court when an extension of time is sought under r. 3.02 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*: did the appellant form a *bona fide* intention to appeal within the relevant time period; the length of and explanation for the delay; prejudice to the respondents; and the merits of the appeal. The justice of the case is the overarching principle: see *Enbridge Gas Distributions Inc. v. Froese*, 2013 ONCA 131, 114 O.R. (3d) 636 (in Chambers), at para. 15.

[144] There is no evidence that 235 Co. formed an intention to appeal within the applicable appeal period, and there is no explanation for that failure. The appellant did not inform the respondents either expressly or impliedly that it

was intending to appeal. At best, it advised the Receiver that an appeal was under consideration 21 days after the motion judge released his decision. The fact that it, and others, might have thought that a longer appeal period was available is not compelling seeing that 235 Co. had known of the position of the respondents and the terms of the proposed sale since at least August 2016 and did nothing to suggest any intention to appeal if 235 Co. proved to be unsuccessful on the motion. Although the merits of the appeal as they relate to its interest in the GORs favour 235 Co.'s case, the justice of the case does not. I so conclude for the following reasons.

1. 235 Co. sat on its rights and did nothing for too long knowing that others would be relying on the motion judge's decision.
2. 235 Co. never opposed the sale approval despite knowing that the only offers that ever resulted from the court approved bidding process required that the GORs and Algoma's royalties be significantly reduced or extinguished.
3. Even if I were to accept that the *Rules of Civil Procedure* governed the appeal, which I do not, 235 Co. never sought a stay of the motion judge's order under the *Rules of Civil Procedure*. Taken together, this supports the inference that 235 Co. did not form an intention to appeal at the relevant time and ultimately only served a notice of appeal as a tactical manoeuvre to engineer a

bigger payment from Third Eye. As found by the motion judge, 235 Co. ought not to be permitted to take tyrannical tactical positions.

4. The Receiver obtained a valuation of the mining claims that concluded that the value of 235 Co.'s GORs was between \$150,000 and \$300,000. Before the motion judge, 235 Co. acknowledged that the payment of \$250,000 represented the fair market value of its GORs. Furthermore, it filed no valuation evidence to the contrary. Any prejudice to 235 Co. is therefore attenuated. It has been paid the value of its interest.

5. Although there are no subsequent registrations on title other than Third Eye's assignee, Algoma's Monitor has been paid for its royalty interest and the funds have been distributed to Algoma. Third Eye states that if the GORs are reinstated, so too should the payments it made to 235 Co. and Algoma. Algoma has been under CCAA protection itself and, not surprisingly, does not support an unwinding of the transaction.

[145] I conclude that the justice of the case does not warrant an extension of time. I therefore would not grant 235 Co. an extension of time to appeal *nunc pro tunc*.

[146] While 235 Co. could have separately sought a discretionary remedy under the *Land Titles Act* for rectification of title in the manner contemplated in *Regal Constellation*, at paras. 39, 45, for the same reasons I also would not

exercise my discretion or refer the matter back to the motion judge to grant an order pursuant to ss. 159 and 160 of the *Land Titles Act* rectifying the title and an order directing the Mining Claims Recorder to rectify the provincial register so that 235 Co.'s GORs are reinstated.

Disposition

[147] In conclusion, the motion judge had jurisdiction pursuant to s. 243(1) of the BIA to grant a sale approval and vesting order. Given the nature of the GORs the motion judge erred in concluding that it was appropriate to extinguish them from title. However, 235 Co. failed to appeal on a timely basis within the time period prescribed by the BIA Rules and the justice of the case does not warrant an extension of time. I also would not exercise my discretion to grant any remedy to 235 Co. under any other statutory provision. Accordingly, it is entitled to the \$250,000 payment it has already received and that its counsel is holding in escrow.

[148] For these reasons, the appeal is dismissed. As agreed by the parties, I would order Third Eye to pay costs of \$30,000 to 235 Co. in respect of the first stage of the appeal and that all parties with the exception of the Receiver bear their own costs of the second stage of the appeal. I would permit the Receiver to make brief written submissions on its costs within 10 days of the

release of these reasons and the other parties to reply if necessary within 10 days thereafter.

Released: "SEP" JUN 19, 2019

"S.E. Pepall J.A."
"I agree. P. Lauwers J.A."
"I agree. Grant Huscroft J.A."

TAB 4

CITATION: In the Matter of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*
And
In the Matter of CannaPiece Group Inc., 2023 ONSC 841
COURT FILE NO.: CV-22-689631
DATE: 20230202

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

RE: **In the Matter of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act***

AND

In the Matter of CannaPiece Group Inc. et al

BEFORE: Osborne J.

COUNSEL: *David S. Ward, Larry Ellis, Sam Massie and Monica Faheim*, for the Applicants

Clifton Prophet, Heather Fisher, Haddon Murray, for 2125028 Ontario Inc.
David Preger, Lisa S. Corne and David Seifer, for Carmela Marzilli and
1000420548 Ontario Inc.

Jeremy Dacks, for Dream Industrial (GP) Inc.

Edward Park, Ministry of Finance

Robert Kennedy and Daniel Loberto, Monitor

Rory McGovern, Cardinal Advisory Services Limited

HEARD: January 31, 2023

ENDORSEMENT

1. The Applicants move for an approval and vesting order that would, among other things:
 - a. Extend the stay up to and including February 17, 2023;
 - b. approve the Share Purchase Agreement (“SPA”) entered into between CannaPiece Group Inc. as Vendor, CPC, and 1000420548 Ontario Inc. (“548” or the “Purchaser”) and the transaction contemplated therein;
 - c. authorize and direct the Applicants to perform their obligations under the SPA and complete it;

- d. vest all of Applicants' right, title and interest in the Excluded Assets, Excluded Contracts and Excluded Liabilities in a newly formed entity, 14707117 Canada Inc. ("Residualco");
 - e. vest in the Purchaser the Purchased Shares free and clear of Encumbrances other than Permitted Encumbrances upon the filing of the Monitor's Certificate;
 - f. approving a distribution to Cardinal Advisory Services Limited ("Cardinal") in respect of amounts owing pursuant to the DIP Term Sheet and Deposit Facility;
 - g. approving certain requested releases and expanding the powers and the duties of the Monitor to effectively perform those remaining steps in order that this proceeding might be concluded.
2. In the circumstances in which the Applicants find themselves, particularly from a cash flow position, this motion was heard on an urgent basis yesterday and the parties have implored the Court to release a decision on the motion as quickly as possible. Accordingly, these reasons have been prepared in the very limited time available. Defined terms in these reasons have the meaning given to them in the motion materials, the Second Report of the Monitor or the relevant agreements, unless otherwise indicated.
3. I indicated at the conclusion of the hearing yesterday that I was satisfied that the requested extension of the stay of proceedings (which was due to expire imminently) was appropriate in the circumstances. That relief was unopposed. Accordingly, I extended the stay to and including February 17, 2023. I took under reserve my decision with respect to the balance of the relief sought, all of which is opposed.
4. In short, the Applicants seek a reverse vesting order to transfer ownership of the Purchased Shares to the Purchaser free and clear, while transferring the Excluded Assets and Excluded Liabilities to Residualco.
5. For the reasons that follow, I decline to grant the reverse vesting order.

Background and Context

6. The Applicants operate a cannabis manufacturing business in Pickering, Ontario. There are two principal creditors or groups of creditors, and it is in many respects the competing priorities of those two groups that give rise to the motion today.
7. The first relevant creditor is 2125028 Ontario Inc. ("212"),. It advanced funds for manufacturing and processing equipment used by the Applicants in their day-to-day operations. The funds were advanced under two finance facilities, each for \$3 million. According to the Monitor, the 212 debt owing as of November, 2022 is approximately \$4 million.
8. 212 holds a first priority security interest over that equipment pledged as collateral. It registered that priority over that equipment on May 19, 2020.

9. The second relevant creditor is Carmela Marzilli (“Marzilli”). Marzilli entered into a loan agreement with CPC as of February 10, 2022 in connection with which and pursuant to related general security agreement, obtained a first ranking security interest in all of the present or after-acquired property of CPC, excluding certain excluded assets. Those excluded assets, in turn, carve out the 212 security over its equipment collateral. The debt owed to Marzilli is approximately \$6.8 million as of November 2022, according to the Monitor.

10. The result is that 212 has a first position security interest over its equipment collateral but nothing else, while Marzilli has a first position security interest over effectively all other assets. The security interest of 212 over the equipment collateral was registered more than a year prior to the security interest of Marzilli.

11. It should be noted that Marzilli is related to 548, the Purchaser, which is an entity incorporated for the purpose of completing the transaction for which approval is sought today.

Relevant Events

12. The Applicants sought and received protection under the CCAA on November 3, 2022. Pursuant to the initial order of Penny J., interim DIP financing advanced by Cardinal was approved in the amount of \$500,000. The typical charges were also approved. The relief sought and granted was unopposed.

13. The Applicants returned to Court one week later on November 10, 2022 at which time Penny J. extended the stay of proceedings and, among other things, approved a sales and investment solicitation process (the “SISP”), a central feature of which was a stalking horse agreement dated as of November 8, 2022 between CannaPiece Group Inc. as vendor, CPC, and Cardinal (or its nominee) as purchaser (the “Stalking Horse SPA”). That Stalking Horse SPA included an approved break fee and priorities for professional fees.

14. In addition, Cardinal, in its capacity as Stalking Horse Bidder, was granted a priority charge. Other charges previously granted or increased to an aggregate total of \$3,500,000, of which most (\$3 million) was a Deposit Facility that ranked in priority to all other claims against the Applicants.

15. The relief sought and granted on November 10, 2022, was also unopposed, although what occurred behind the scenes literally during that hearing is in part the beginning of the chronology giving rise to the opposition today.

16. However, as is not atypical in real time CCAA proceedings, the hearing in court was not the only event that occurred on November 10, 2022. 212 submits today that it indicated that it intended to oppose the relief sought on November 10, and particularly the increase in the priority charges, unless its debt was assumed by Cardinal, the Stalking Horse Bidder.

17. While there is a dispute among the parties today about the extent to which 212 indicated (to the Applicants and other parties, if not to the Court) its intended opposition absent the

assumption of its debt by Cardinal, there is no dispute that ultimately the relief was granted on an unopposed basis.

18. 212 submits that the reason for its ultimate lack of opposition on November 10 was the fact that, literally as the hearing before Penny, J. was underway, it entered into an assumption agreement (the “Assumption Agreement”) with Cardinal pursuant to which Cardinal agreed to assume the 212 debt, pay to 212 the sum of \$500,000 within six months of the stalking horse transaction closing, and issue to 212 certain shares in the Applicants.

19. The Monitor, as authorized and directed by the order made on November 10, 2022, then set about to implement the SISP, with the Stalking Horse SPA as the floor or minimum.

20. The Stalking Horse SPA, as approved, contemplated a purchase price of \$3,500,000, together with “Assumed Liabilities” that, once finalized, would be made available to Potential Bidders. This feature flowed from the fact that, as of November 10 when the SISP was approved, Cardinal, as Stalking Horse Bidder, had not yet determined which liabilities of the Applicants it would be prepared to assume. Not surprisingly, featured in those negotiations were the liabilities comprised of the debt owed to the two principal creditors described above - 212 and Marzilli.

21. The SISP procedures are set out in a Schedule to the November 10, 2022 order, and included those steps generally applicable to such a sales process approved by this Court. Those steps included the following:

- a. The Monitor would host a virtual data room with all relevant information made available to potential bidders;
- b. the Monitor would evaluate, with the assistance of a Sales Agent and in consultation with the Applicants, all bids received to determine whether or not each bid was a Qualified Bid; and
- c. the Monitor would then conduct an auction between or among Qualified Bidders and identify, in consultation with the Applicants and the Sales Agent, the highest or otherwise best bid received which would in turn be identified as the Successful Bid.

22. Qualified Bids were to be evaluated by the Monitor in consultation with the Applicants considering the factors set out in [the procedure approved in the order]. Those factors included: the amount of consideration being offered, and if applicable, the proposed form, composition and allocation of same; and the value of any assumption of liabilities or waiver of liabilities.

23. The sales process required the repayment of \$3.7 million to Cardinal at closing, in the event another Qualified Bid was selected over the Stalking Horse Bid.

24. Ultimately, only one Qualified Bid was received despite extensive efforts by the Monitor to generate and maximize interest in the auction.

25. Marzilli submitted a bid comprised of the cash component of \$4 million plus assumed liabilities. The assumed liabilities in the Marzilli Bid included the assumption of the Marzilli debt of the Applicants described above. It did not, however, include an assumption of the 212 debt.

26. The bid submitted by Marzilli provided, as required, for the repayment of \$3.7 million to the DIP lender and Stalking Horse Bidder, Cardinal.

27. Since, according to the terms of the Marzilli Bid, the 212 debt would not be assumed by the Purchaser, it would be transferred to Residualco. There is no evidence in the record as to what, if any, assets or value Residualco will have.

28. The Monitor, in consultation with the Applicants, selected the Marzilli Bid as the Successful Bid. It is the Marzilli Bid that is the subject of the proposed transaction and reverse vesting order relief sought today.

Analysis

29. The primary issue is whether the approval and vesting order (which is a reverse vesting order) should be granted.

30. 212 submits that the requested relief should not be granted for a number of reasons, the principal ones of which are these:

- a. the test for the extraordinary remedy of a reverse vesting order cannot be met here;
- b. the test for determining whether a third party interest should be extinguished in a vesting order cannot be met here;
- c. the Marzilli Bid was not the Superior Bid; and
- d. neither the CCAA nor the doctrine of equitable subordination should apply so as to defeat the regime established by the *Personal Property Security Act*, which would be the effect of granting the order since the security interest of 212 over its equipment collateral ranks first and was registered more than a year before the registration of the security interest of Marzilli over what is effectively the balance of the assets.

31. Perhaps most fundamentally, 212 acknowledges that it did not oppose the approval of the SISP process, but argues that it took that course of action in express reliance on the Assumption Agreement entered into that same day with the Stalking Horse Bidder pursuant to which its debt was agreed to be assumed, and that when that debt assumption is considered to be part of the Stalking Horse Bid, it is clearly superior to the Marzilli Bid.

32. The Applicants submit that the Monitor ran a fair and transparent sales process and concluded that the Marzilli Bid was the Superior Bid and that 212 simply gambled on a bidder that was not ultimately successful. They argue that 212 supported the SISP process and that the bid requirements preserved “optionality” for bidders in terms of which liabilities would be assumed and which would not.

33. The Applicants further submit that the reverse vesting order is required to maintain the going concern value of the Applicants’ business, and is in the best interests of stakeholders generally, whether or not 212 is in a less favourable position than it would be had the Stalking Horse Bid been determined to be the Superior Bid.

34. The Applicants submit in their factum and in argument that “the Transaction provides for the seamless continuity of the Applicants’ business operations, preserves CPC’s structure of operations, maintains its licences, and preserves the economic activity of supplier and customer relationships.... it secures enterprise value and preserves the jobs of approximately 150 employees.” They state that “the Monitor believes that the transaction will be more beneficial to creditors than a bankruptcy”.

35. The Applicants agree that the 212 debt would, together with other liabilities not assumed by the Purchaser, be vested out and transferred to Residualco, and claims against Residualco (which would include the claim of 212 for its debt) could then be addressed through “a distribution order, a bankruptcy or other similar process”. They submit that the Purchase Price stands in place of the assets and is available to satisfy creditor claims, in whole or in part, in accordance with their pre-existing priority.

36. As noted, Cardinal fully supports the relief sought by the Applicants. It submitted a factum and made submissions at the hearing of the motion, both to the effect that it has been a critical part of this restructuring by providing interim financing, as a result of which “a transparent and fair sales and investment solicitation process resulted in the cannabis business of the Applicants living to see better days”.

37. At paragraph 26 of its factum, Cardinal states that 212 initially opposed the SISP and took issue with the Purchaser’s Charge. It goes on to state that subsequent to learning of 212 sought opposition to the SISP, Cardinal entered into negotiations with 212 to assume the debt owing to 212 by the Applicants under the Assumption Agreement, but that its obligation to assume the 212 debt was subject to a condition precedent - namely, that Cardinal would be the successful bidder.

38. Cardinal submits that 212 “was aware or should have been aware” that there was a possibility that Cardinal would not be the successful bidder and there were no guarantees that any other bidder would assume the 212 debt.

39. Finally, if oddly in my view, Cardinal submits that the equities favour Cardinal and that “if the relief requested by 212 is granted, Cardinal will suffer irreparable financial and reputational harm” (factum, para. 60).

40. Naturally, Marzilli/548 support the motion.
41. The Monitor has filed the Second Report dated January 28, 2023 in connection with this motion and as noted at paragraph 7, it is filed for the purpose of providing information to the Court with respect to, among other things, its recommendations with respect t
42. Beginning at paragraph 24, the Monitor describes the SISP process undertaken pursuant to which potential purchasers were identified, marketed to, and given an opportunity to acquire or invest in CPC.
43. At paragraph 27, the Monitor describes the initial key dates in the process, including November 30, 2022 as the deadline to finalize the schedule of Assumed Liabilities in the Stalking Horse SPA and the bid deadline of January 9, 2023. The steps conclude with the motion before me now - the hearing of the sale approval motion. I observe that last step only to highlight the obvious; namely that the process is not complete unless and until a sale is approved by the Court.
44. The Monitor reports that of 14 potential bidders who executed non-disclosure agreements, only three were, according to the terms of the SISP, ultimately granted access to the data room upon providing their Statement of Qualifications.
45. Ultimately, however, and notwithstanding extensions to the SISP timetable (further described below), the only bid received was the Marzilli Bid.
46. The Monitor, the Sales Agent and the Applicants then evaluated the Marzilli Bid, clarified certain points, confirmed that it was a Qualified Bid, and determined on January 24, 2023 that it was the lead bid in the process.
47. The Marzilli Bid contemplated a cash purchase price of \$4 million (being \$500,000 higher than the Stalking Horse Bid) and other terms including that the Assumed Liabilities were composed of the Marzilli debt. It did not include assumption of the 212 debt.
48. The Monitor summarized the key differences between the Marzilli Bid in the Stalking Horse Bid in the c
49. The Monitor then inquired of Cardinal, as the Stalking Horse Bidder, whether it wished to increase the Stalking Horse Bid “by topping up (at minimum) the cash consideration portion”. Cardinal advised the Monitor that it declined to participate in the auction, with the result that the Marzilli Bid was determined to be the Successful Bid.
50. The Monitor recommends approval of the Marzilli Bid and that the transaction be completed pursuant to a reverse vesting order. Part of the ancillary relief requested by the Applicants and recommended by the Monitor is the expansion of the Monitor’s powers to, among other things, assign Residualco into bankruptcy and act if it wishes as a trustee in such bankruptcy and otherwise facilitate or assist the winding down of that entity.

The Applicable Tests

51. All parties are in general agreement about the legal tests to be applied here where the relief sought includes a reverse vesting order that has the additional feature of affecting third party rights (in this case, those of 212) as part of that vesting order.

52. This Court has jurisdiction to make a vesting order pursuant to section 100 of *the Courts of Justice Act*.

53. Beyond the general jurisdiction of the Court found in s. 11 of the CCAA to make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances, s.36(3) of the CCAA sets out the factors the Court is to consider in deciding whether to grant authorization to dispose of assets:

- (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.

54. Moreover, the well-known *Soundair* factors to be considered for approval of a transaction following a Court-supervised sales process, not surprisingly track many of the same principles. (see *Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp.*, (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 16):

- (a) whether the party made a sufficient effort to obtain the best price and to not act improvidently;
- (b) the interests of all parties;
- (c) the efficacy and integrity of the process by which the party obtained offers; and
- (d) whether the working out of the process was unfair.

55. The Court of Appeal for Ontario considered in *Third Eye Capital Corporation v. Dianor Resources Inc.*, 2019 ONCA 508 (“*Third Eye*”) what it described as a “cascading analysis” of the factors to be considered when determining whether a third party interest should be extinguished in a vesting order:

- (a) first, the nature and strength of the interest that is proposed to be extinguished;
- (b) second, whether the interest holder has consented to the vesting out of their interest either in the insolvency process itself or in agreements reached prior to the insolvency; and
- (c) third, if the first two steps proved to be ambiguous or inconclusive, a consideration of the equities to determine if a vesting order is appropriate in the circumstances.

(see paras. 102-110)

56. A consideration of the equities contemplated in the third step includes consideration of the prejudice, if any, to the third party interest holder; whether the third party may be adequately compensated for its interest from the proceeds of the disposition or sale; whether, based on evidence of value, there is any equity in the property; and whether the parties are acting in good faith (*Third Eye*, para. 110).

57. Finally, Penny, J. considered the factors applicable to a determination of whether a reverse vesting order should be approved, in *Harte Gold Corp. (Re)*, 2022 ONSC 653. In that case, the Court considered the s.36(3) factors set out above, “making provision or adjustment, as appropriate, for the unique aspects of a reverse vesting transaction” since the very nature of a reverse vesting order is such that it does not contemplate a typical sale of assets.

58. Justice Penny observed that a reverse vesting order was both an equitable and an extraordinary remedy, and one that ought not to be regarded as the “norm” and concluded that the following factors are applicable to consideration of whether a reverse vesting order is appropriate in the circumstances:

- (a) Why is the RVO necessary in this case?
- (b) Does the RVO structure produce an economic result at least as favourable as any other viable alternative?
- (c) Is any stakeholder worse off under the RVO structure than they would have been under any other viable alternative? and
- (d) does the consideration being paid for the debtor’s business reflect the importance and value of the licenses and permits (or other intangible assets) being preserved under the RVO structure?

(see *Harte Gold*, para. 38).

The Approvals Sought

59. In considering what relief is appropriate here, I recognize that I must address the art of the possible rather than a theoretical perfect outcome which is antithetical to the very fact of the insolvency of the Applicants in the first place. Here, an analysis of the possible outcomes necessarily recognizes that not all stakeholders will enjoy a perfect result, and not all creditors will recover 100% of their debt.

60. If the Marzilli Bid and resulting transaction is approved, the 212 debt will not be assumed by the Purchaser and will be transferred to Residualco. If the Marzilli Bid is not approved, the SISP process yields the result that the Stalking Horse Bid of Cardinal will be the Successful Bid since there were no other bids, with the opposite result: the Marzilli debt will be transferred to Residualco.

61. The fact that this motion is so vigorously contested, the fact that the expanded powers sought for the Monitor contemplate a possible bankruptcy and winding down of Residualco, and the economics of either bid, are all indicative of the expectation that there will be little if any recovery through Residualco. There is no evidence before me that there will be any significant assets in that entity available for distribution.

62. That said, the prejudice to any one creditor is obviously not itself a determinative factor of whether a transaction should be approved. That is clear from the tests set out above. The effect on creditors, and other stakeholders, is certainly a factor to be taken into account, but it is only one of several factors.

63. All parties agree in this case that a reverse vesting order structure is necessary and appropriate since there is no other way to preserve the going-concern value of the business and particularly the continuity of the relevant cannabis licenses that are central to its operation and therefore the maximization of recovery for stakeholders. I accept that. Both the Stalking Horse Bid and the Marzilli Bid contemplate a reverse vesting order structure.

64. The SISP process approved by Penny J. on November 10, 2022 set out the steps to be followed to test the market and yield a bid that represented the best possible outcome for stakeholders in difficult circumstances. It contemplated an auction between or among competing bidders, although ultimately, only one bid was received.

65. Importantly, however, the SISP was carried out against a minimum, or floor, in the form of the Stalking Horse Bid. That provided certainty to stakeholders that even if the SISP did not yield a single bid, there was still a viable transaction that provided for a going concern outcome through a reverse vesting order structure.

66. Considering the *Third Eye* factors, I find they favour the position advanced by 212.

67. First, the nature and strength of 212's interest is significant, although limited to the equipment to which its security interest applies. It ranks in first position. The PPSA registration is

first in time as compared to the registration of the security for the Marzilli debt, although the two interests are not competing in the sense that the latter carves out the former.

68. I recognize that the 212 interest that would be vested out is a security interest, and further one that is limited only to certain assets, unlike the interests in land being considered by the Court of Appeal in *Third Eye* (mineral rights and surface rights). However, in my view, the same analysis applies since a third party interest is being extinguished. It cannot be that the *Third Eye* factors apply only to an interest in land or another proprietary right: the nature and quality of the right sought to be extinguished is exactly the first of the three factors to be considered.

69. Moreover, I reject the submission of the Applicants that the rights of 212 are not being extinguished, as occurred in *Third Eye*, but rather they are merely being transferred to Residualco. For the reasons noted above in respect of the evidence before me as to the assets in that entity, it cannot be argued on this motion that the rights of 212 are not being extinguished but rather continue on albeit through a new entity. That is not the practical reality here.

70. Second, 212 has not consented to the vesting out of its interest either in the insolvency process itself or in agreements reached prior to the insolvency. It is urged upon me by the Applicants and those parties who support them that by ultimately not opposing approval of the SISP process, 212 accepted and agreed to the vesting out of its interest in the event that the Successful Bid did not include an assumption of its debt.

71. They submit that the Assumption Agreement entered into between 212 and Cardinal as the Stalking Horse Bidder was a bilateral agreement between those two parties that effectively amounted to a wager on the part of 212 that the stalking horse bid would ultimately be the Successful Bid. It follows, they say, that since the Assumption Agreement was conditional upon the stalking horse bid being the Successful Bid, it was of no effect if that did not occur.

72. The Applicants, Marzilli and Cardinal all disagree with 212 that, fundamentally, the assumption of the 212 debt became an Assumed Liability as contemplated in the Stalking Horse SPA with the result that it became one component of the floor or minimum that other bids would be evaluated against.

73. I do not accept this submission. The SISP process was predicated on the Stalking Horse SPA. When both of those were approved on November 10, 2022, the ultimate value represented by the Stalking Horse SPA was not yet determined. It had a minimum value of \$3.5 million (and other terms) but the Assumed Liabilities had not yet been agreed by Cardinal. The relevant schedule in the Stalking Horse SPA was blank.

74. The timetable of key milestones in the SISP process recognized this and set a deadline of November 30 for the finalization of the quantum of Assumed Liabilities if any. Accordingly, I find that all stakeholders and potential bidders knew that the ultimate value of that Stalking Horse Bid could not be determined until the time.

75. Cardinal, as the Stalking Horse Bidder, agreed on November 10, 2022 to assume the 212 debt. I do not find persuasive the submission by the Applicants to the effect that this commitment is irrelevant since it was of no force or effect if Cardinal was ultimately not the Successful Bidder. That is an accurate statement, considering the terms of the Assumption Agreement. However, it does not advance the analysis at all since, naturally, Cardinal had no obligation to close the transaction at all unless and until it was determined to be the Successful Bidder.

76. I do not have to address the hypothetical issue of whether the intended objections of 212 to the approval of the SISP in November would have been successful or whether the SISP would have been approved in any event. It was approved, and the Assumption Agreement was entered into.

77. Moreover, the chronology of how the SISP process in fact unfolded over the subsequent weeks supports, in my view, the position of 212 that the assumption of its debt became a component of the Stalking Horse Bid.

78. The Second Report of the Monitor sets out the SISP Results beginning at paragraph 33. Importantly, it states at paragraph 38 that on November 30, 2022, the Stalking Horse Bidder confirmed that it was assuming the 212 debt, and further, that it was in ongoing negotiations regarding the Marzilli debt. For that reason, it requested that the deadline to finalize the schedule of Assumed Liabilities be extended from November 30 to December 7, 2022.

79. The Monitor, in consultation with the Applicants and Sale Agent, approved this. Its website was updated and potential bidders were updated by the Sales Agent.

80. Then, on December 7 (the new deadline), the Stalking Horse Bidder requested a further extension to finalize the assumption of the Marzilli debt for an additional two days, and this also was approved. On December 12, the Stalking Horse Bidder confirmed to the Monitor that the Stalking Horse SPA was now inclusive of the \$3,500,000 cash, and the assumption of the debt of both 212 and Marzilli. The website and potential bidders were updated accordingly.

81. However, that was not to be the ultimate result, since on December 23, 2022, the Stalking Horse Bidder informed the Monitor that the debt assumption agreement with Marzilli had been terminated and accordingly, the Marzilli debt no longer formed part of the consideration contained in the Stalking Horse SPA. As a result, the final consideration to be paid by the Stalking Horse Bidder was \$3,500,000 in cash and the assumption of the 212 debt (Second Report, para. 41).

82. A copy of the final executed Stalking Horse SPA dated November 8 and revised January 9, 2023 to account for the removal of the Marzilli debt, was provided and included in the data room, reflected on the Monitor's website and again, the Sales Agent informed potential bidders.

83. Necessarily and appropriately given the turn of events, the Monitor extended the bid deadline until January 18, 2023, to provide additional time for this information to be disseminated to the market and bidders.

84. I pause here in the chronology to observe that as against these events, I have no difficulty in concluding that the assumption of the 212 debt was a component of the Stalking horse SPA consideration and further that it was recognized as such by all stakeholders and the Monitor. As to whether then, 212 could be said to have consented to the vesting out of its interest as contemplated in the second factor of the *Third Eye* analysis, I find that it did not.

85. However, further relevant events were yet to occur. On January 9, 2023, new counsel for Marzilli advised the Monitor, for the first time, that Marzilli wished to participate in the SISP. Marzilli ultimately requested another extension to the bid deadline to finalize due diligence and allow it to submit a bid. This too was agreed by the Monitor and conveyed to potential bidders. As set out above, Marzilli then submitted its bid which is sought to be approved today.

86. The third factor in the *Third Eye* analysis contemplates an evaluation of the equities, to the extent it is applicable here at all since it is to be considered if there is ambiguity resulting from a consideration of the first two factors.

87. For the above reasons, and in particular its first ranking security interest, the fact that the assumption of its debt was, to the knowledge of all stakeholders (importantly including but not limited to Marzilli) and Assumed Liability as part of the consideration of the Stalking Horse Bid, I find that the equities favour 212.

88. 212 relied on the SISP procedures. Those contemplated a finalization of Assumed Liabilities and that was both agreed to by Cardinal and conveyed through the Monitor to all stakeholders so that they could act accordingly. The sales process was extended repeatedly to accommodate exactly that. Marzilli participated in and benefited from this process and the extensions, the final extensions being sought by, and granted for, it.

89. The effect on 212, as a creditor, is of course also a factor to be considered under both the applicable CCAA test for the sale of assets (see s.36(3)(e)) and the reverse vesting order factors enumerated by Penny J. (i.e., is any stakeholder worse off?). As noted, it is certainly not the only factor, but it is one of the factors to be considered. Here, 212 is clearly and materially worse off.

90. I find that the process here was fair and reasonable, and indeed the Monitor did the best it could in a shifting landscape to maintain the integrity of the process but yield the best recovery for stakeholders. The process was fair and reasonable, however, only if it is understood that the assumption of the 212 debt is part of the consideration payable pursuant to the Stalking Horse Bid.

91. In the Second Report, the Monitor sets out the key terms of each of the Stalking Horse Bid and the Marzilli Bid and summarizes the differences between the two, ultimately recommending approval of the Marzilli Bid. It recognizes the fact that the Marzilli Bid contemplates an additional \$500,000 as part of the Purchase Price as against the \$3.5 million amount contemplated in the Stalking Horse Bid.

92. However, there is no real analysis of whether and how that compares to the consideration payable pursuant to the Stalking Horse Bid enhanced by the assumption of the \$3.5 million value

of the 212 debt. This makes the conclusion that the Marzilli Bid is a Superior Bid, challenging in the circumstances.

93. Finally, it was urged upon me that the overall equities of the situation, and indeed the best interests of the stakeholders, favour approval of the Marzilli Bid since it represents an outcome materially more favourable for all stakeholders than a bankruptcy with the consequent loss of all that is dependent upon the Applicants continuing as a going concern. Consideration of the benefits of an asset sale as against the alternative of a bankruptcy is one of the factors specifically enumerated in s.36(3).

94. I reject this submission also. Bankruptcy is not the alternative here. It was precisely to guard against this potential (catastrophic) outcome that the SISP process included the Stalking Horse Bid. As recognized throughout - by the Applicants, by Penny J. in his November 10, 2022 endorsement approving the Stalking Horse SPA, and by the Monitor as reaffirmed in its Second Report, the whole point of the Stalking Horse SPA was to provide a minimum outcome for stakeholders.

95. The SISP was conducted against the backdrop of that minimum. Stakeholders knew that even if the SISP yielded no bids, they had the certainty of the knowledge that at least there would be a going concern through completion of the stalking horse transaction.

96. Similarly, other potential bidders knew that the consideration in the Stalking Horse SPA (which, as I have found, included the assumption of the 212 debt), was the minimum against which their potential bids would be measured and evaluated as part of the overall economics of any proposed transaction. Clearly, the quantum of consideration was not the only factor to be considered but it certainly was a significant factor.

97. Cardinal provided interim DIP financing. It was entitled to a break fee in the event that it was not the Successful Bidder.

98. The entire premise of the SISP process, and the expectation of this Court as well as the stakeholders, was and is that if no other bid is determined to be the Successful Bid, Cardinal will complete and perform the Stalking Horse SPA.

99. Accordingly, the stakeholders ought not to be left with the only alternative being a bankruptcy.

100. Considering both the process by which the Marzilli Bid was ultimately selected, as well as the original priority of the 212 security interest, all of which is referred to above, I cannot conclude that it is equitable in all the circumstances to approve this asset sale pursuant to a reverse vesting order.

101. For all of the above reasons, I decline to grant the proposed reverse vesting order vesting the assets of the Applicants in the Marzilli purchaser entity (548) and transferring the 212 debt to Residualco.

102. The motion is dismissed, save for the requested stay extension which as noted above is granted on the consent of all parties.

103. If the parties are unable to agree on the costs of this motion, any party seeking costs may provide to the other parties and to me written submissions not exceeding two pages in length within five days. Responding submissions, also not exceeding two pages in length, will be due five days thereafter.

Osborne, J.

Date: February 2, 2023

TAB 5

CITATION: CannaPiece Group Inc v Marzilli, 2023 ONSC 3291
COURT FILE NO.: CV-22-689631-00CL
DATE: 20230210

**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
CANNAPIECE GROUP INC., CANNAPIECE CORP., CANADIAN CRAFT GROWERS
CORP., 2666222 ONTARIO LTD., 2580385 ONTARIO INC. AND 2669673 ONTARIO INC.

BEFORE: Osborne J.

COUNSEL: *David S. Ward, Monica Faheim and Sam Massie*, for the Applicants

Clifton Prophet, and Heather Fisher, for 2125028 Ontario Inc.

Rory McGovern, Cardinal Advisory Services Ltd.

Lisa Corne, for the Purchaser

HEARD: February 10, 2023

ENDORSEMENT

JUSTICE OSBORNE:

[1] The Applicants seek an approval and vesting order approving the amended and restated Share Purchase Agreement (“SPA”), authorizing and directing the Applicants to perform and complete the SPA, transferring to and vesting in a new entity those Excluded Assets, Contracts, and Liabilities, and vesting in the Purchaser ownership of the Purchased Shares.

[2] The motion for approval of an earlier share purchase agreement was before me on January 31, 2023 and I decided to approve the transaction and the related vesting order for the reasons set out in my Endorsement of February 2, 2023. Defined terms in this Endorsement have the meaning given to them in my Endorsement of February 2, and/or the motion materials in respect of the January 30 motion, today’s motion and the Second Report and Supplementary Report of the Monitor.

[3] On January 30, the relief sought by the Applicants was opposed by one of the senior secured creditors, 212. The parties have in the interim period continued discussions and negotiations, resulting in an amended transaction which is reflected in the SPA for which approval is sought today.

[4] Accordingly, none of the relief sought by the Applicants today is opposed, and it is supported and recommended by all parties who appeared in Court to make submissions today, including but not limited to Cardinal, 212, Marzilli and the Monitor. I observe that the Lawyer's Certificate of Service from counsel to the Monitor confirms that the Service List was served.

[5] The Service List was also served with the motion materials in respect of the January 31 motion, at which time the only party in opposition was 212. As noted above, that opposition has now been withdrawn.

[6] In the circumstances, I will not repeat all of the facts informing the background to and context for the motion before me today, as they are set out more fully in my Endorsement of February 2.

[7] The SISP was conducted according to the order of Justice Penny made earlier in this proceeding, and overseen by the Monitor with the assistance of the Sales Agent, in consultation with the Applicants. Cardinal acted as a stalking horse bidder to provide a baseline in the process. Ultimately, the Marzilli Bid was the only Qualified Bid received notwithstanding that 83 parties were invited to participate in the process, 14 of which signed non-disclosure agreements.

[8] The SPA before me today provides for the assumption by the Purchaser of the liabilities of the Applicants to both 212 and Marzilli, and those parties are the two senior secured creditors – each in first position: 212 as to the Equipment Collateral only and Marzilli as to, effectively, all other assets of the Applicants.

[9] The primary benefit of the proposed transaction reflected in the Spa is the seamless continuity of business operations, which in turn ensures the structure of operations, importantly maintains the current cannabis licenses, and preserves economic activity including customer and supply arrangements. Importantly, the Purchaser is assuming approximately 95% of the 150 employees and the preservation of those jobs is important.

[10] The key cannabis licences include the standard processing and sale licence in respect of cannabis for medical purposes as well as the license issued by the CRA under the excise duty framework. Those are critical to the continued operation of the business.

[11] Fundamentally, the proposed transaction achieves the purpose of this CCAA proceeding. Indeed, it ensures that the business emerges in a form stronger than it was prior to filing, and in a manner that preserves enterprise value and employment for as many employees as is reasonably possible. The business will continue, post-closing, as a going concern.

[12] The SISP process was robust, yet yielded only one Qualified Bid, reflective of the challenging circumstances in which the cannabis sector generally finds itself at present.

[13] I am satisfied that the transaction reflected in the SPA represents the best outcome for all stakeholders in very challenging circumstances.

[14] As is clear from my Endorsement of the February 2, the motion materials and as I have noted above, the relief is in the form of a reverse vesting order (“RVO”). Effectively, the Purchaser becomes the sole shareholder of the debtor company, which retains its assets including key contracts and licences, and those liabilities not assumed by the Purchaser are vested out and transferred, together with any excluded assets, into a newly incorporated entity referred to as Residualco.

[15] This Court has jurisdiction to approve the transaction, including an RVO, as part of its general jurisdiction found in section 11 of the CCAA. (See *Just Energy Group Inc. et al*, 2022 ONSC 6354 at para. 27 and *Re Harte Gold Corp.*, 2022 ONSC 653at paras. 31-32)

[16] While, as those authorities noted above make clear, RVOs should not be the norm, they can be approved where the circumstances justify such a structure. As noted by Justice McEwen in *Just Energy*, the Court should be satisfied that the RVO was *prima facie* appropriate for use in the case at hand and that the factors set out in section 36 of the CCAA as informed by the *Soundair* Principles (*Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp.*, [1991] 4 O.R. (3d) 1), are met.

[17] Further, the factors set out by Justice Penny in *Harte Gold* provide a useful framework within which to determine whether an RVO should be approved.

[18] Considering all of those factors, I am satisfied that the relief sought today should be granted for the reasons set out above, including but not limited to the fact that the relief is unopposed by an stakeholder, strongly supported by the two senior secured creditors and strongly recommended by the Monitor.

[19] Simply put, there is no other reasonable alternative, and the relief sought provides for the continued operation of the business as a going concern and, critically, the continuation of the required cannabis licences. As observed by the Monitor, the transaction will be materially more beneficial to creditors and other stakeholders than would a bankruptcy. The section 36 factors, the *Soundair* Principles, and the factors applicable to proposed approval of an RVO, are all satisfied here.

[20] For the same reasons, and as part of the approval of the transaction, I am also satisfied that the ancillary relief sought today should be granted. None of that ancillary relief is opposed, and all of it is supported by the senior secured creditors and strongly recommended by the Monitor

[21] Adding Residualco as an Applicant, authorizing the Monitor to distribute the Deposit Repayment and granting the Monitor certain enhanced powers and extending the stay are all appropriate in the circumstances.

[22] As part of the transaction, the Applicants seek third-party releases. I am satisfied that all of the parties in respect of which releases are sought were necessary to the restructuring of the Applicants; the claims to be released are rationally connected to the purpose of the restructuring

and necessary for it; the restructuring could not succeed without the releases; the parties being released contributed to the restructuring; and the releases benefit the debtors as well as the creditors generally. (See *Blackrock Metals Inc.*, 2022 QCCS 2828 at para. 128, *Just Energy*, *supra* at para. 67 and *Green Relief Inc. (Re)*, 2020 ONSC 6837 at para. 23-29).

[23] In particular, I observe that Cardinal, which acted as the stalking horse bidder in the SISP, is proposed to be released. While it may not be appropriate in every case (or indeed in many cases) to approve a third-party release to a stalking horse bidder since, among other things, that party is typically compensated for the risk it undertook and the cost of its proposed offer by the terms of a stalking horse agreement, I am satisfied that in this particular case, the relief should be granted.

[24] Cardinal acted as more than a stalking horse bidder, and indeed its provision of the interim financing permitted the Applicants to continue as a going concern, “keep the lights on”, and thereby preserve the value of the business as a going concern which is the underpinning of the ability of the business to emerge as a going concern in the first place.

[25] Moreover, Cardinal agreed to waive, as part of the negotiations leading to the amended SPA for which approval is sought today and which resulted in there being no opposition, its break fee and professional fees to which it otherwise would have been entitled pursuant to the terms of the stalking horse agreement. This was part of the matrix of consideration flowing between and among the various affected stakeholders resulting in the revised SPA and the consensus achieved today.

[26] Finally, both senior secured creditors support the release, and the Monitor strongly recommends it, in large part for the reasons I have set out above. In the circumstances, I am satisfied that it is appropriate.

[27] The Monitor’s activities as reflected in the Second Report and Supplementary Report are appropriate, are unopposed and are approved.

[28] The stay period is extended to including March 17, 2023 to give the Applicants sufficient time following the closing of the transaction reflected in the SPA to complete post-closing matters.

[29] Both orders (approval and vesting order and ancillary order) to go in the form signed by me today. The orders are effective immediately and without the necessity of issuing and entering.

[30] I am grateful to all of the parties and their counsel for their cooperation and compromise which has resulted in the unopposed motion for approval SPA today.

Osborne J.

Date: February 10, 2023

TAB 6

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Citation: *Medipure Pharmaceuticals Inc. (Re)*,
2022 BCSC 1771

Date: 20221007
Docket: S226773
Registry: Vancouver

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

And

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

And

In the Matter of Medipure Pharmaceuticals Inc. and Medipure Holdings Inc.

Petitioners

- and -

Docket: B220180
Registry: Vancouver

**In the Matter of the *Bankruptcy of Medipure Pharmaceuticals Inc.*
*and Medipure Holdings Inc.***

- and -

Docket: B220220
Registry: Vancouver

**In the Matter of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, as
Amended**

And

**In the Matter of the Notice of Intention to Make a Proposal of
Medipure Pharmaceuticals Inc., of the City of Vancouver,
in the Province of British Columbia**

- and -

Docket: B220221
Registry: Vancouver

**In the Matter of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, as
Amended**

And

**In the Matter of the Notice of Intention to Make a Proposal of
Medipure Holdings Inc., of the City of Vancouver,
in the Province of British Columbia**

Before: The Honourable Justice Walker

Reasons for Judgment

Counsel for Medipure Pharmaceuticals Inc.
and Medipure Holdings Inc.: M.C. Sennott

Counsel for the Creditor, SHP Capital, LLC: D.E. Gruber

Counsel for the Monitor, Deloitte
Restructuring Inc.: C.J. Ramsay

Counsel for the Attendee, Attorney General
of Canada: A. Sabzevari

Place and Date of Hearing: Vancouver, B.C.
September 8, 2022

Place and Date of Judgment: Vancouver, B.C.
October 7, 2022

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 4
THE *BIA* PROCEEDINGS 8
ANALYSIS..... 13
DISPOSITION..... 25

Introduction

[1] Medipure Pharmaceuticals Inc. (“MPI”) and Medipure Holdings Inc. (“MHI”) seek an order in this proceeding governed by the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1986, c. C-36 [CCAA] approving interim debtor-in-possession financing (“DIP”) offered on terms that are said by the parties to raise an issue of first instance. Specifically, whether some of the new money to come from the proposed DIP lender, who is a pre-filing secured creditor, can be used to pay off that lender’s secured pre-filing loan in priority to the deemed trust claim of the Canada Revenue Agency (“CRA”) and in priority to a different DIP lender, HFS Management Inc. (“HFS”), who provided interim financing in related proceedings commenced under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 [BIA].

[2] Given the urgency of the application, I advised the parties of my decision on September 15, 2022, with reasons to follow. These are my reasons.

[3] MPI and MHI are affiliated companies incorporated in British Columbia. When I refer to MHI and MPI collectively, it is as “Medipure”. A related company known as Medipure d.o.o. Croatia (“Medipure Croatia”) is located in Croatia.

[4] MHI is a publicly traded company, subject to the requirements of, *inter alia*, the BC Securities Commission. MPI is wholly owned by MHI. MPI’s capital needs and ongoing expenses are funded by MHI. In their various application materials, Medipure describes the nature of its research and development business to be “committed to creating new drugs in the health industry by engaging in research and development on various potential medicines.” MPI is described as engaged in scientific research to develop “endocannabinoid prescription drugs for numerous diseases”, employing 16 employees (some of its key employees are scientists, doctors, and pharmaceutical professionals), with a number of research projects in various states of development. Some members of Medipure’s board of directors are volunteers.

[5] It is an understatement to say that Medipure is in dire financial distress. The companies have no funds in which to meet their outstanding and future liabilities, let

alone carry on business. Compounding their difficulties, which I was told is also impeding their ability to raise funds, is an outstanding cease trade order issued by the BC Securities Commission against MHI for failing to meet its ongoing filing requirements.

[6] The proposed interim DIP lender in this CCAA proceeding is SHP Capital, LLC (“SHP”), an American-based company. SHP has offered to loan US\$4.6 million (excluding fees) to MHI of new money with super-priority for its security over the assets of MHI, MPI, and Medipure Croatia, described below.

[7] SHP’s offer includes certain conditions. Key among those conditions offered by SHP are these:

- (a) The DIP will charge all of MHI’s assets.
- (b) The loan is to be guaranteed by MPI, as it owns or holds certain key assets including intellectual property and licenses issued by Health Canada, and Medipure Croatia, which holds property at a facility in Croatia.
- (c) The sum of US\$2.75 million (which is approximately 60%) of the new money advanced by SHP under the proposed DIP will be used solely to pay out in full the amount owing under SHP’s pre-filing secured loan. Interest on this portion of the advance is to be charged at 15% per annum.
- (d) SHP will advance working capital up to US\$1.85 million, in minimum installments of US\$25,000, with interest charged at 8% per annum. The remaining amount of the DIP will be held back as a contingency.
- (e) SHP will be paid an origination fee equal to 1.75% of the US\$1.4 million advanced as working capital, which will be added to the principal amount due under the DIP.
- (f) The maturity date is the earlier of September 30, 2022 or upon defaults set out in SHP’s loan agreement.

- (g) SHP has the right to submit a stalking horse bid for the property of MHI for approval by the court as soon as reasonably practicable.
- (h) In terms of its super-priority, except for the administration charge granted under the initial CCAA order (“CCAA Administration Charge”) and an administration charge and charge granted in favour of a chief restructuring officer granted in the *BIA* proceedings (“*BIA* Administration Charge” and “CRO Charge”, respectively), SHP will prime all other charges and claims, including all deemed trust claims (such as those of the CRA) and financing provided by HFS in the *BIA* proceedings. As a consequence of the guarantees to be provided from MPI and Medipure Croatia, SHP requires its charge to have super-priority over their assets as well.
- (i) Lastly, most employees will be terminated, with outstanding salaries paid net of funds they are entitled to receive under the *Wage Earner Protection Program Act*, S.C. 2005, c. 47.

[8] Although the notice of application seeking approval of the proposed DIP from SHP was filed by Medipure, it was in reality brought by SHP since MHI and MPI (along with Medipure Croatia) are now entirely without funds. SHP also took the lead at the hearing of the application.

[9] SHP’s position is that it is prepared to advance funds under its proposed interim DIP in order for MHI and MPI (it did not specifically address Medipure Croatia) to continue in business, albeit with fewer employees and reduced overhead and expenses, while the Monitor seeks new ownership through a sales and investment solicitation process (“SISP”). SHP candidly acknowledged that it wants to acquire MHI and MPI through the SISP but will not advance funds unless all claims, other than the CCAA Administration Charge, the *BIA* Administration Charge, and the CRO Charge are subordinated and its pre-filing secured claim is paid out in full. SHP said it is not prepared to advance funds for Medipure’s working capital net of the amount outstanding under its pre-filing secured loan as it is concerned that it could be outbid in the SISP if relying on DIP on the net amount as a credit bid. SHP

advised that it believes it will be in a much better position to acquire MHI and MPI through a credit bid using its DIP of US\$4.6 million.

[10] SHP also candidly acknowledged that it is a sophisticated investor who has made a conscious decision to offer DIP on the terms outlined above, aware of the risks to Medipure, itself, and other stakeholders, if the application is not approved.

[11] SHP and Medipure submit that the DIP offered by SHP promotes the purposes of the CCAA as it is the best and only means at this time to preserve value. Otherwise, they submit that if the application is not granted, Medipure's assets will be liquidated on a fire sale basis. They contend that the terms of the proposed DIP do not fall afoul of the CCAA. They say that the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in *Canada v. Canada North Group Inc.*, 2021 SCC 30, makes it clear that in appropriate circumstances, such as instant case, a CCAA judge may grant super-priority to a DIP lender over deemed trust claims. SHP also submits that HFS' unilateral conduct, falling outside court-approved financing during the course of the BIA proceedings, is a clear basis to prime its post-filing secured charge. Insofar as reordering of pre-filing priorities is concerned, they contend SHP's insistence on super-priority does not fall afoul of the CCAA (in particular, s. 11) as it involves an advance of entirely new money as opposed to incorporating SHP's pre-existing secured loan as a credit.

[12] The CRA, represented by the Attorney General of Canada ("Attorney General"), opposes the application because, it says, paying out SHP's pre-filing secured loan with new money is prohibited by s. 11.2 of the CCAA. Even if it were not prohibited, the Attorney General argued that granting the proposed DIP is not appropriate in the circumstances.

[13] HFS was served with the notice of application. It did not attend the hearing, even though I was told by counsel for SHP and Medipure that it understood HFS opposed the application and that both it and its counsel were aware of the hearing date (during the hearing, I was advised that counsel for HFS asked that a message be conveyed that it had no instructions to appear).

The BIA Proceedings

[14] A summary of the *BIA* proceedings leading up to this *CCAA* proceeding provides useful background and context for issues raised on the instant application.

[15] The commonality of interest between Medipure and SHP is recent, and only in respect of the DIP now offered by SHP. Until that point, Medipure and SHP were adversaries, both in this *CCAA* proceeding and in the prior *BIA* proceedings.

[16] SHP took the first step in litigation with Medipure when it filed a notice of motion for bankruptcy order in this Court on May 2, 2022 (VA B220180), on the basis that Medipure had committed acts of bankruptcy contemplated by s. 42 of the *BIA*. In addition to a bankruptcy order, SHP sought the appointment of Crowe MacKay LLP as the trustee of the estate of Medipure.

[17] SHP did not ground its application on its status as a secured creditor based on the amount due of US\$2.1 million under its secured promissory note. SHP applied as an unsecured creditor who took an assignment of the outstanding rent claims of MPI's landlord (said to be \$372,910.72) and as the purchaser of a note issued by MHI to one of its investors (US\$178,000 is said to be owing on the note).

[18] SHP relied on Medipure's failure to meet its liabilities as they became due, including employees' salaries, amounts due under promissory notes to investors, rent, and the amount owing to SHP under its security instrument. In its application materials, SHP said the financial statements established that MHI was not generating revenue. SHP also pointed to MHI's consolidated financial statements for the years ending June 30, 2020 and 2021, showing that as of June 30, 2021, MHI had:

- (a) incurred losses since inception;
- (b) a working capital deficiency of over \$15 million; and
- (c) an accumulated deficit of over \$23 million.

[19] In its written submissions, SHP contended that as of December 31, 2021, Medipure would need to raise a minimum of \$19.35 million to satisfy the liabilities reflected in its own liability summary of that date. This estimate excluded lease claim liabilities, potential liabilities posed by civil claims, working capital needs, and future operating expenses.

[20] Medipure agreed that it has been and continues to be unable to meet its liabilities. It did not, however, agree to the relief sought by SHP. Instead, on May 11, 2022, Medipure issued a notice to all of its creditors of its intention to make a proposal per s. 50.4(1) of the *BIA* (invoking a short-term stay of proceedings) and named Deloitte Restructuring Inc. (“Deloitte”) as the proposal trustee.

[21] On June 7, 2022, Medipure filed two notices of application (MHI, VA B220221; MPI, VA B220220), seeking the following orders:

- (a) extending the stay of proceedings and the time for filing a proposal to July 25, 2022;
- (b) granting an administration charge in favour of Deloitte in the amount of \$200,000; and
- (c) approving interim financing from HFS.

[22] HFS was prepared to provide financing limited to \$2.4 million at 6% interest with a priority charge over all of Medipure’s assets to allow Medipure to meet its past and ongoing obligations until later this year. If HFS’ proposed financing was approved, it would have had priority over SHP’s pre-filing secured claim but not over any deemed trust claims.

[23] I presided over the hearing of the competing *BIA* applications, which were heard at the same time on an urgent basis.

[24] SHP opposed the relief sought by Medipure, including the appointment of Deloitte. Its position was that it had lost faith in Medipure’s management and board of directors to properly operate Medipure’s business. SHP sought the appointment of

a trustee of its own choice to administer the bankrupt estates, saying it wanted “an adult in the room” to be in charge. Advising that it did not want to liquidate Medipure through its *BIA* application, SHP said that it had no other choice at that time than to bring its application under the *BIA* in light of forbearance terms contained in its security instrument. Otherwise, SHP said, it would have preferred to seek relief under the *CCAA* or through a receivership application.

[25] In the *BIA* proceedings, Medipure contended that SHP’s motives were not in the best interests of Medipure and its stakeholders. Medipure adduced evidence in order to demonstrate that SHP’s goal was to acquire what it described as its highly valuable assets (including licenses issued by Health Canada) at heavily discounted pricing through a forced sales process akin to liquidation and then sell them off at a significant profit. According to Medipure, if SHP succeeded, its business would be shut down.

[26] For its part, SHP objected to any order permitting HFS to advance funds with any priority, and accused HFS of being the *alter ego* of GCB Capital LLC (“GCB”), one of Medipure’s pre-filing creditors. Echoing the allegations made against it by Medipure, SHP claimed that GCB, through HFS, was attempting to secure Medipure’s assets at bargain basement prices. SHP also suggested that not only was Medipure’s support of HFS’ proposed DIP naïve, certain of its board members were being directed behind-the-scenes by Medipure’s former chief executive officer who had allied himself with the principal of HFS and GCB out of self-interest.

[27] Accusations continued to be traded back and forth concerning the motives and trustworthiness of the individuals in control of SHP, on the one hand, and HFS and GCB, on the other.

[28] At one point during the hearing, SHP offered interim financing with a priority charge in order to allow Medipure to meet its short-term obligations and to carry on business until further sources of capital could be secured.

[29] Neither SHP nor HFS sought to prime any of CRA's deemed trust claims nor use their proposed interim financing to pay their pre-filing secured loans.

[30] Over the objections of SHP, I agreed with Medipure that the terms of its HFS' interim financing were superior to those offered by SHP (for example, HFS' financing rate was offered at 6% as opposed to SHP's 12%). I approved two interim financings, at different stages in the hearing, with priority charges in favour of HFS.

[31] The first financing was approved on June 17, 2022 for \$200,000, ranking behind the *BIA* Administration Charge and in priority to all pre-filing secured charges except for deemed trust claims. HFS advanced those funds almost immediately after the financing was approved.

[32] The second financing was approved on June 24, 2022 for an additional \$1.36 million on the same basis. I also approved other charges, such as a \$65,000 charge in favour of the directors and officers and the CRO Charge.

[33] After advancing only some \$335,000 of funds related to the second financing, HFS imposed additional terms on Medipure before it would advance any more funds. Without seeking court approval, HFS advised Medipure that it would not make further advances unless MHI entered into a complex share subscription agreement ("GEM Agreement") with companies incorporated in Luxembourg and the Bahamas, known as GEM Global Yield LLC SCS ("GEM Global"), GEM Yield Bahamas Limited ("GYBL"), respectively, and certain lenders (called "share lenders") to be identified. The GEM Agreement provided, *inter alia*, GEM Global would subscribe, as an investor, for common shares of MHI for an aggregate purchase price of \$65 million, with funds to be advanced after numerous conditions precedent were met. The share lenders would "intervene" in the GEM Agreement by signing a deed of adherence, acquire the shares, and then lend them to GEM Global. It also provided that once the cease trade order is lifted, MHI would be obligated to pay GYBL a fee in the sum of \$1 million, either in cash or in freely tradable common shares. The GEM Agreement also provided that approval of MHI's shareholders was not

required. Without seeking court approval, MHI's board of directors complied and entered into the GEM Agreement on August 3, 2022.

[34] Once it learned of the GEM Agreement, SHP asserted that GEM Global and GYBL were related to companies owned by the principal of GCB and HFS, and that the GEM Agreement was that individual's improvident attempt to gain control of Medipure.

[35] For reasons not explained in evidence or submissions, HFS declined to advance any further funds even though the GEM Agreement was signed.

[36] This left Medipure without funds to meet its obligations, and of critical importance, its pressing short-term obligations to pay for employees' salaries, medical research, and rent.

[37] In those dire financial circumstances, MHI and MPI brought companion applications seeking to convert their two *BIA* proposal proceedings to a single *CCAA* proceeding to avoid bankruptcy and what it maintained would be the disastrous consequences of liquidation. Except for the appointment of the Monitor, Medipure's applications were granted, unopposed by SHP, on August 19, 2022. Deloitte was appointed as Monitor over the objection of SHP, who suggested the Monitor should be Crowe MacKay since Deloitte might be in a position of conflict (SHP failed to establish its position at the hearing).

[38] In the midst of what all parties referred to as a funding crisis consequent on HFS' failure to advance funds under its second court-approved financing arrangement, one of Medipure's shareholders, who had only recently learned of the *BIA* proceedings, reached out to other shareholders to raise funds for shareholder-led DIP, to be offered at 6%, with a priority charge ranking behind all administration charges, HFS' advances under its interim financing, and deemed trust claims. Very quickly, over \$3 million was raised and sent to Medipure's solicitors, Boughton and Co. ("Boughton") to hold in trust pending court approval of DIP on those terms.

[39] Just as matters appeared to be coming to a favourable resolution for Medipure, backed by shareholder-led DIP, the largest investor, who had placed approximately \$2 million with Boughton, asked for additional time to carry out due diligence on Medipure's science and research efforts. That led to a short delay, with Medipure unable to meet its liabilities (for example, employees had not been paid for approximately six weeks by that point). That shareholder eventually pulled its funds from Boughton's trust account; others did likewise shortly thereafter. However, there were sufficient funds in Boughton's trust account from other shareholders who remained prepared to advance DIP in the amount of \$215,000, on the same terms outlined above.

[40] The Monitor expressed significant reservations about Medipure's ability to carry on operations for much longer in the absence of much greater funding. Disagreement amongst the parties ensued, resulting in evolving and highly fractious competing positions between the parties in a fast-moving environment. Ultimately, I was advised that the remaining funds from shareholders were no longer available for interim financing. At that point, SHP offered to provide DIP on the terms summarized at the outset of these reasons, adding for the first time its requirement that new money advanced under its DIP must be used to pay out its all of its pre-filing secured loan, priming the CRA's deemed trust claims and the funds advanced by HFS in the *BIA* proceedings.

Analysis

[41] During their submissions, the parties addressed the following issues:

- (a) the purposes of the *CCAA*;
- (b) the circumstances in which super-priority may be granted to prime deemed trust claims;
- (c) the proper interpretation of s. 11.2 of the *CCAA* (e.g., whether it prohibited new money from the DIP to be used to pay out SHP's pre-filing secured debt);
and

(d) whether the terms of SHP's proposed DIP are appropriate in the circumstances (including whether its proposed DIP should prime HFS' charges in the *BIA* proceedings in light of its conduct surrounding the second interim financing).

[42] SHP correctly points out that the Court's decision in *Canada North* allows CCAA judges to grant an interim financing charge in priority to statutory deemed trust claims: *Canada North* at paras. 20-31, 141-142. In discussing the legislative policy behind the CCAA, Justice Cote highlighted that debtor companies retain more value as going concerns as opposed to liquidation. The CCAA confers "vast" power to judges to make orders appropriate in the circumstances where truly necessary:

[20] The view underlying the entire CCAA regime is thus that debtor companies retain more value as going concerns than in liquidation scenarios (*Century Services*, at para. 18). The survival of a going-concern business is ordinarily the result with the greatest net benefit. It often enables creditors to maximize returns while simultaneously benefiting shareholders, employees, and other firms that do business with the debtor company (para. 60). Thus, this Court recently held that the CCAA embraces "the simultaneous objectives of maximizing creditor recovery, preservation of going-concern value where possible, preservation of jobs and communities affected by the firm's financial distress . . . and enhancement of the credit system generally" (*9354-9186 Québec inc. v. Callidus Capital Corp.*, 2020 SCC 10, at para. 42, quoting J. P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (2nd ed. 2013), at p. 14).

[21] The most important feature of the CCAA — and the feature that enables it to be adapted so readily to each reorganization — is the broad discretionary power it vests in the supervising court (*Callidus Capital*, at paras. 47-48). Section 11 of the CCAA confers jurisdiction on the supervising court to "make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances". This power is vast. As the Chief Justice and Moldaver J. recently observed in their joint reasons, "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'" (*Callidus Capital*, at para. 67). Keeping in mind the centrality of judicial discretion in the CCAA regime, our jurisprudence has developed baseline requirements of appropriateness, good faith and due diligence in order to exercise this power. The supervising judge must be satisfied that the order is appropriate and that the applicant has acted in good faith and with due diligence (*Century Services*, at para. 69). The judge must also be satisfied as to appropriateness, which is assessed by considering whether the order would advance the policy and remedial objectives of the CCAA (para. 70). For instance, given that the purpose of the CCAA is to facilitate the survival of going concerns, when crafting an initial order, "[a]

court must first of all provide the conditions under which the debtor can attempt to reorganize” (para. 60).

...

[25] In *Sun Indalex Finance, LLC v. United Steelworkers*, 2013 SCC 6, [2013] 1 S.C.R. 271, at para. 60, quoting the amended initial order in that case, this Court confirmed that a court-ordered financing charge with priority over “all other security interests, trusts, liens, charges and encumbrances, statutory or otherwise”, had priority over a deemed trust established by the *Personal Property Security Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.10 (“PPSA”), to protect employee pensions. Justice Deschamps wrote for a unanimous Court on this point. She found that the existence of a deemed trust did not preclude orders granting first priority to financiers: “This will be the case only if the provincial priorities provided for in s. 30(7) of the PPSA ensure that the claim of the Salaried Plan’s members has priority over the [debtor-in-possession (“DIP”)] charge” (para. 48).

[26] Justice Deschamps first assessed the supervising judge’s order to determine whether it had truly been necessary to give the financing charge priority over the deemed trust. Even though the supervising judge had not specifically considered the deemed trust in the order authorizing a super-priority charge, he had found that there was no alternative but to make the order. Financing secured by a super priority was necessary if the company was to remain a going concern (para. 59). Justice Deschamps rejected the suggestion “that the DIP lenders would have accepted that their claim ranked below claims resulting from the deemed trust”, because “[t]he harsh reality is that lending is governed by the commercial imperatives of the lenders, not by the interests of the plan members or the policy considerations that lead provincial governments to legislate in favour of pension fund beneficiaries” (para. 59).

[Emphasis added]

[43] Justice Cote also discussed the crucial role of interim financing to the restructuring process:

[142] Interim financing is crucial to the restructuring process. It allows the debtor to continue to operate on a day-to-day basis while a workout solution is being arranged. A plan of compromise would be futile if, in the interim six months, the debtor was forced to close its doors. For this reason, Farley J., in *Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re* (1999), 7 C.B.R. (4th) 293 (Ont. C.J. (Gen. Div.)), at para. 1, quoting *Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re* (1999), 6 C.B.R. (4th) 314 (Ont. C.J. (Gen. Div.)), at para. 24, observed that interim financing helps “keep the lights . . . on”. Similarly, in *Indalex*, Deschamps J. explained that giving interim lenders super-priority “is a key aspect of the debtor’s ability to attempt a workout” (para. 59, quoting J. P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (2007), at p. 97). Without interim financing and the ability to prime (i.e., to give it priority) the interim lender’s loan, the remedial purposes of the CCAA can be frustrated (para. 58).

[44] In that vein, Medipure and SHP stress the importance of the proposed DIP as the last remaining option to preserve value for Medipure and its stakeholders (and stave off liquidation), albeit dismissing most employees and operating Medipure as a scaled-down business to be sold through a SISP.

[45] SHP and Medipure contend that the CCAA does not prohibit the proposed use of new money from the DIP. In this respect, they submit the prohibitory language in s. 11.2(1) is inapplicable. That section provides:

Interim financing

11.2 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

[Bold in original; underlining added]

[46] SHP characterizes the underlined words in the section as prohibiting only DIP that would secure a pre-existing obligation or charge (e.g., if SHP sought to use its pre-filing secured charge as a credit in the DIP). SHP submits that the CCAA does not prohibit the use of new money advanced from the DIP to pay out a pre-existing charge. They also point to *9354-9186 Quebec inc. v. Callidus Capital Corp.*, 2020 SCC 10, at para. 86, where the Court said that the security or charge provided to the DIP lender may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

[47] However, *Callidus* does not specifically address the issue raised in this case. It does not hold, as is suggested, that the CCAA does not prohibit paying out pre-filing debt with new money because it does not secure the prior charge.

[48] The weight of the authorities interpreting s. 11.2(1) of the CCAA confirms that SHP's requirement that new money from the proposed DIP must pay out its pre-filing secured loan priming all pre-filing charges, including deemed trust claims, is prohibited.

[49] The case authorities, discussed below, support the Attorney General's position, set out in the beginning of its written submissions and excerpted below, that an important protection provided under s. 11.2(1) is to prevent an interim financing charge from securing pre-filing obligations through roll-up or take-out provisions (called "roll-up" or "take-out" DIP) to the prejudice of other creditors:

1. The underlying premise of interim financing is that it is a benefit to all stakeholders as it allows the debtor to protect going-concern value and continue its essential operations while devising a plan of compromise or arrangement acceptable to creditors. Courts have wide discretion in approving interim financing pursuant to s. 11.2 of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, RSC 1985, c. C-36 ("CCCA"), subject to certain protections Parliament has mandated. An important protection under subsection 11.2(1) is the prevention of the interim financing charge from securing pre-filing obligations because partial "roll up" provisions prejudice other creditors and do not benefit the debtor. In enacting this restriction, Parliament has chosen to protect debtors when they are at their most vulnerable and to prevent the abuse of interim financing charges provided under the CCAA.

[Footnote omitted]

[50] In *Structured Solutions Inc. c. Gestion Rer inc.*, 2015 QCCS 4114, Justice Hamilton said Parliament's rationale and intention for s. 11.2(1) is to provide special status or priority to interim financing only to money lent to the debtor company during the period of distress, such that the DIP cannot "cover" a pre-filing obligation:

[22] The final sentence [of s. 11.2(1)] appears to suggest that the charge in favour of the interim lender can only secure amounts advanced after the order authorizing the interim financing and the charge. However, SSI has produced authorities that satisfy the Court that the proper interpretation of the word "order" in that last sentence is the initial order, such that the last sentence ensures that the interim financing cannot cover a pre-filing obligation, i.e. an obligation that exists before the initial order is made: ...

[Italics in original; underlining added]

[51] The same point is made in *Performance Sports Group Ltd. (Re)*, 2016 ONSC 6800. In his oft-cited decision, Justice Newbould said that s. 11.2 allowed for creeping DIP, i.e., funds from operational receipts to repay certain pre-filing amounts (called "creeping" DIP), but prohibited advances to be used to repay pre-filing obligations:

22 Section 11.2(1) of the CCAA provides that security for a DIP facility may not secure an obligation that existed before the order authorizing the security

was made. The effect of this provision is that advances under a DIP facility may not be used to repay pre-filing obligations. In this case, the ABL DIP Facility is a revolving facility. Under its terms, receipts from operations of the PSG Entities post-filing may be used to pay down the existing ABL Facility. The applicants submit that in this case, the ABL DIP Facility preserves the pre-filing status quo by upholding the relative pre-stay priority position of each secured creditor. By requiring that the PSG Entities only use post-filing cash receipts to pay down the accrued balance under the revolving credit facility, the ABL DIP Lenders are in no better position with respect to the priority of their pre-filing debt relative to other creditors. I accept that no advances under the ABL DIP Facility will be used to pay pre-filing obligations and there has been inserted in the Initial Order a provision that expressly prevents that. The provision that receipts from operations of the PSG Entities post-filing may be used to pay down the existing ABL Facility is approved.

[Emphasis added]

[52] In *Comark Inc. (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 2010, 2015 CarswellOnt 20810, Regional Senior Justice Morawetz (as he then was) considered the parameters of s. 11.2(1) when approving DIP which expressly provided that the debtor may not use any advances to repay pre-filing obligations but allowed creeping DIP:

28 In providing its recommendation, the proposed Monitor specifically stated that it has considered the provisions of section 11.2(1) of the CCAA which prohibit the DIP Lender's Charge from securing an obligation that exists before the requested order is made. The Monitor reports that having consulted with its counsel, it is of the view that since the pre-filing Revolving Credit Facility is being reduced by the use of the Applicant's cash generated from its business, the DIP Lender's Charge is only securing advances made post-filing under the DIP Facility.

29 For the purposes of this application, I accept the foregoing submissions and recommendation of the Monitor and, specifically, its view that the form of DIP Facility being proposed, does not contravene the provisions of section 11.2(1) of the CCAA.

...

40 With respect to the request to approve the DIP Facility and to grant a DIP Financing Charge on a priority basis, the authority to approve same is found in section 11.2 of the CCAA. In its factum, the Applicant specifically references section 11.2(1) and submits that it is clear on the facts that the DIP Lender's Charge meets this requirement. Counsel submits that the DIP Facility expressly provides that Comark may not use any advances under the DIP Facility to repay pre-filing obligations. Counsel goes on to state that to the extent that Salus is repaid pre-filing amounts owing to it, this repayment will be made from operational receipts as a result of lending, security and enforcement arrangements in place prior to the CCAA filing. Further, the repayment is not made out of proceeds of the DIP Facility. Rather, the payments to Salus simply maintain the status quo as of the CCAA filing date under the existing Salus asset-based lending credit facility.

[Emphasis added]

[53] Justice Fitzpatrick took the same approach when approving DIP in *Mountain Equipment Co-Operative (Re)*, 2020 BCSC 1586:

[47] Firstly, I was satisfied that the Interim Financing Charge complied with s. 11.2(1) of the CCAA in that it did not secure any of MEC's pre-filing obligations to the Lenders, as prohibited by that provision.

[48] The Interim Financing agreements are amendments to the Credit Facility, pursuant to which the Lenders will provide further liquidity to MEC despite any defaults under the Credit Facility. It is an express term of the Interim Financing that advances made under the Interim Financing cannot be used to satisfy pre-filing obligations under the Credit Facility or any other pre-filing debt. In addition, the Interim Financing Charge does not secure any of MEC's pre-filing obligations and includes a "carve out" to ensure that other secured creditors (such as those with Purchase Money Security Interests (PMSIs)) are not primed by the Charge.

[49] While the terms of the Interim Financing provide that post-filing receipts collected by MEC will be applied to pay down MEC's pre-filing debt under the Credit Facility, I agreed with MEC that mechanisms in interim financing agreements by which pre-filing obligations are paid from proceeds derived by post-filing operations do not contravene s. 11.2(1) of the CCAA.

[50] In *Performance Sports Group Ltd. (Re)*, 2016 ONSC 6800, Justice Newbould concluded that a similarly crafted interim lending facility did not offend s. 11.2(1):

[22] Section 11.2(1) of the CCAA provides that security for a DIP facility may not secure an obligation that existed before the order authorizing the security was made. The effect of this provision is that advances under a DIP facility may not be used to repay pre-filing obligations. In this case, the ABL DIP Facility is a revolving facility. Under its terms, receipts from operations of the PSG Entities post-filing may be used to pay down the existing ABL Facility. The applicants submit that in this case, the ABL DIP Facility preserves the pre-filing status quo by upholding the relative pre-stay priority position of each secured creditor. By requiring that the PSG Entities only use post-filing cash receipts to pay down the accrued balance under the revolving credit facility, the ABL DIP Lenders are in no better position with respect to the priority of their pre-filing debt relative to other creditors. I accept that no advances under the ABL DIP Facility will be used to pay pre-filing obligations and there has been inserted in the Initial Order a provision that expressly prevents that. The provision that receipts from operations of the PSG Entities post-filing may be used to pay down the existing ABL Facility is approved.

[51] Similar conclusions were reached in *Comark Inc. (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 2010 at paras. 17-29. Regional Senior Justice Morawetz (as he then was) accepted that the proposed interim financing facility would not result in a greater level of secured debt than was contemplated under the pre-filing facilities and would not prime PMSIs. Effectively, the court found that, since

the proposed charge would increase while the pre-filing facility would be paid down by the use of the debtor's cash generated from its business, the proposed charge only secured post-filing advances made under the interim facility in compliance with s. 11.2(1) of the CCAA.

[52] In May 2020, Justice Romaine reached the same conclusion in a recent CCAA proceeding involving ENTREC Corporation (Alta QB, Calgary Judicial Centre; File No. 2001 06423).

[Emphasis added]

[54] In approving a form of creeping DIP in the initial order, Fitzpatrick J. said she was satisfied that no secured creditor would be materially prejudiced since the charge preserved the pre-filing *status quo*: para. 54(e).

[55] The reasons in *ENTREC* concerning DIP and s. 11.2(1) referred to in the reasons of Fitzpatrick J. above were not provided to me. Instead, only Justice Romaine's reasons for judgment concerning proposed releases, *ENTREC Corporation (Re)*, 2020 ABQB 751, were provided.

[56] To the extent that SHP suggested the *dicta* in *Structured Solutions*, *Performance Sports*, *Comark*, and *Mountain Equipment Co-Op* specifically prohibits the use of new money to pay pre-filing obligations misconstrues the prohibition in s. 11.2(1), SHP did not cite any authorities addressing statutory interpretation. For that matter, neither SHP nor the Attorney General engaged in a statutory interpretation analysis or cited interpretative aids such as *Hansard* and text authorities such as those authored by Professor Janis Sarra.

[57] No basis to depart from *Mountain Equipment Co-Op* per *Hansard Spruce Mills*, 1954 CarswellBC 6, [1954] 4. D.L.R. 590 (which was not referred to in argument by any of the parties) was shown.

[58] SHP points out that in *Re TOYS "R" US (CANADA) LTD.*, 2017 ONSC 5571, Justice Myers allowed funds from the DIP to pay or "take-out" the debtor's pre-filing obligations to the DIP lender. The decision is the only one cited to me that expressly permitted it. In that case, the DIP lender had first priority over all pre-filing claims, such that its security would not be improved if the DIP was approved:

[10] The applicant asks for the approval of a debtor in possession (DIP) lending facility to repay its pre-filing ABL indebtedness and to fund its cash flow needs as it bulks up its inventory for holiday sales and then throughout its restructuring. Section 11.2 of the CCAA provides for the court to grant security to DIP loans ahead of existing unsecured and secured claims upon a balancing of listed factors. Granting DIP security is a fairly standard and often necessary practice in CCAA cases. The section also makes it clear however, that security cannot be granted for pre-filing claims. Here, while it is proposed for DIP funding to be used to pay out pre-filing lenders (a "takeout DIP") all of the loans that will be secured are fresh advances by the DIP lenders. Moreover, the Monitor has obtained an independent legal opinion that the pre-filing ABL security is valid and prior to all claims that will be primed by the court-ordered DIP security. The DIP funds are replacing existing secured collateral. The court-ordered charge is not being used to improve the security of the pre-filing ABL lenders or to fill any gaps in their security coverage. In my view therefore, the takeout DIP is not prohibited by s. 11.2.

[Emphasis added]

[59] The reasons do not mention *dicta* in the prior decisions in *Performance Sports* and *Comark* stating that funds advanced under DIP may not be used to pay out pre-filing claims. Those cases are not referred to in the reasons and not cited in the list of authorities before Myers J. and it may well be that they were not cited to him. That said, Myers J.'s reasons emphasize that the DIP must not be used to reorder pre-filing priorities. I also note that in the instant proceeding, the Monitor has not obtained an opinion concerning the validity of SHP's security (as was done in *TOYS "R" US*).

[60] *In the Matter of a Plan of Arrangement of UrtheCast Corp.*, 2020 BCSC 2024, also cited by SHP, does not support the position of Medipure and SHP. In that case, Justice Sharma approved interim financing that paid out earlier interim financing provided by different lenders ordered during the course of the CCAA proceeding as opposed to a pre-filing obligation. The approved financing also improved the debtor's circumstances and the position of pre-filing creditors in light of its less onerous terms and lower interest rate: see, e.g., paras. 11-12, 26, 34.

[61] SHP also relies on the second of two decisions issued by Justice Mongeon in *White Birch Paper Holding Company (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2010 QCCS 1176 [*White Birch No. 2*], in support of its application. SHP submits that a roll-up charge was approved in that case. That decision must be read in conjunction with

Mongeon J.'s prior decision in that case, *White Birch Paper Holding Company (Arrangement relatif à)*, 2010 QCCS 764 [*White Birch No. 1*], to understand what was approved and the basis for it.

[62] In *White Birch No. 1*, Mongeon J. described the nature and purpose of the proposed DIP sought by lenders different from a pre-filing lender proposed to be paid: part of the new money advanced under the DIP would be used to pay off a pre-existing revolving asset-based facility to that different lender (under which US\$50 million was outstanding for principal and interest).

[63] As I read the reasons, Mongeon J. did not specifically address whether the advance of new money contravened s. 11.2(1). He considered the request for the DIP through the lens of appropriateness per the factors set out in s. 11.2(4) of the CCAA. In approving the DIP, Mongeon J. determined that the amount of financing, cost of borrowing, and fees were appropriate in the circumstances and minimized to reduce the impact on all other secured creditors:

[67] In order to continue to operate, the WB Group, therefore, needs significant additional liquidity. To this end, the WB Group retained the services of Lazard Frères & Co LLC as financial advisors, who were able to convince a group of First Term Loan lenders to advance and cover said liquidity requirements in the form of a "DIP" loan secured by a priming charge. A copy of the Interim Financing Credit Agreement was filed as Exhibit P-3 (the "DIP Loan").

[68] Essentially, the DIP Loan is for an aggregate amount of US\$140 million, from which an amount of approximately US\$50 million will be deducted and applied to the full payment and discharge of the Asset Based Revolving Credit Facility.

[69] After earmarking a further amount of approximately US\$16 million to cover the Administrative and D&O priming charge (as explained below), the DIP Loan will provide some US\$74 million in additional liquidity which, according to the Monitor, should permit a orderly and appropriate restructuring. The DIP Loan will bear interest at the rate of approximately 17.5% to 19% per annum and is entirely supported by the Monitor (see Monitor's Initial Report Exhibit P-4).

[70] After reviewing the allegations of paragraphs 128 to 159 of the Petition as well as the evidence of the representative of the Petitioners and the Monitor, the undersigned is satisfied that:

- d) the priming charge will not secure any obligations that were owing prior to the filing;

- e) the interim financing proposed is intended to permit the WB Group to restructure over a period of approximately nine to twelve months;
- f) the interim financing is crucial to the survival of the Petitioners and Partnerships over the said restructuring period;
- g) the sizing of the interim financing, cost of borrowing and fees are reasonable and have been minimized in order to reduce the impact on all other secured creditors;
- h) the interim financing will enhance the prospects of a viable restructuring;

[71] Furthermore, I am advised that management has the confidence of its major creditors and shall remain in place over the restructuring period;

[72] As a result, I am prepared to approve same.

[64] The reasons in *White Birch No. 2* are the result of rehearing the DIP aspect of the prior application because a group of different pre-filing lenders, collectively described by Mongeon J. as “Dune”, had not been given notice of the application. Dune was the majority lender under a secured second lien term loan to the extent of US\$61.5 million. Funds had already been advanced from the DIP by the time the second hearing occurred. Dune asked for the DIP to be rescinded in its application materials. However, the only argument Dune raised in support of that position, Mongeon J. said, was lack of notice. It appears from the reasons that the relief Dune actually sought was to reduce the size of the DIP, production of further financial information from the debtors, and to have its pre-filing and post-filing expenses (including legal expenses) paid. Dune did not object in principle to the DIP that had been approved, including paying out the pre-filing lender. Dune complained that the amount originally approved was excessive and argued that only funds sufficient to “keep the lights on” should be approved. Dune also claimed it could not accurately assess the debtors’ financial position because it had been deprived of financial information. Despite its complaints about the size of the DIP and lack of information, Dune sought an order reducing the DIP to US\$115 million, and as mentioned above, approval for funds still available from the DIP facility to be used to pay its own claim for expenses: *White Birch No. 2* at paras. 13, 19-23.

[65] Applying the factors in s. 11.2(4), Justice Mongeon rejected Dune's request to rescind or vary DIP order he had made. He also dismissed Dune's request to pay its expenses. He found that Dune was pursuing its own advantage and was not concerned with the viability of the debtors: paras. 29, 39, 46. In respect of Dune's contested request for its pre-filing legal expenses to be paid out of the DIP, Mongeon J. said it was prohibited by s. 11 since it would satisfy a pre-filing obligation: para. 46.

[66] I disagree with SHP that *White Birch No. 2* is authority for its proposition that paying out pre-filing obligations with new money advanced under a DIP is permitted under the CCAA.

[67] The Attorney General submits that Mongeon J.'s analysis, excerpted below, supports its interpretation of s. 11.2(1) and is consistent with the approach taken in *Structured Solutions, Performance Sports, Comark, and Mountain Equipment Co-Op*:

46 Sections 11, 11.01 and 11.02 CCAA are quite clear. The only exception to this general rule is the protection of rights of suppliers under Section 11.02 when payment for goods and services provided after the Stay Order, or requiring the further advance of money or credit. Clearly, the fees, costs and expenses of Dune do not fall within this exception. Dune does not ask for payment for goods and/or services sold, delivered or rendered after the Initial Order. It is asking for the payment of a pre-filing obligation, i.e. to pay for certain expenses incurred or to be incurred by Dune for its own benefit and advantage, including but without limitation, the costs of acting against the interests of the Debtors and for the sole interests of Dune.

[Emphasis added]

[68] The prohibition in s. 11.2(1) discussed by Mongeon J. at para. 46 (i.e., using DIP to payout the debtors' pre-filing obligation) appears to have been avoided because the order was initially made by consent and was unopposed by Dune at the second hearing.

[69] To conclude, the weight of the case authorities – *Structured Solutions, Performance Sports, Comark, and Mountain Equipment Co-Op* – is clear that take-out or roll-up DIP, even facilitated new money advanced under the DIP, in contrast to creeping DIP, is prohibited by s. 11.2(1) of the CCAA.

[70] If the CCAA permits roll-up or take-out DIP with new money where the order is sought on consent or unopposed by all interested parties (as in *TOYS “R” US* and *White Birch No. 2*), those circumstances are not present in this case.

Disposition

[71] I am mindful that without funding from SHP, Medipure is at the moment left without funds, to the detriment of its stakeholders, including its unpaid employees. However, the DIP in terms proposed by SHP is prohibited by s. 11.2(1) of the CCAA.

[72] The application seeking approval of DIP financing on terms proposed by SHP is dismissed.

“Walker J.”

TAB 7

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

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

**AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF WINDSOR MACHINE & STAMPING
LIMITED, LIPEL INVESTMENTS LTD., WMSL HOLDINGS LTD.,
442260 ONTARIO LTD., WINMACH CANADA LTD., PRODUCTION
MACHINE SERVICES LTD., 538185 ONTARIO LTD., SOUTHERN
WIRE PRODUCTS LIMITED, PELLUS MANUFACTURING LTD.,
TILBURY ASSEMBLY LTD., ST. CLAIR FORMS INC., CENTROY
ASSEMBLY LTD., PIONEER POLYMERS INC., G&R COLD
FORGING INC., WINDSOR MACHINE DE MEXICO, WINMACH
INC., WINDSOR MACHINE PRODUCTS, INC. WAYNE
MANUFACTURING INC. AND 383301 ONTARIO LIMITED**

Applicants

BEFORE: MORAWETZ J.

**COUNSEL: Andrew Hatnay & Andrea McKinnon, for United Auto Workers Local
251**

Daniel Dowdall & Jane Dietrich, for Bank of Montreal

Joseph Marin, for the Applicants

Tony Reyes, for RSM Richter Inc., Monitor

Raong Phalavong, for Saginaw Pattern

HEARD: MARCH 6 and 10, 2009

ENDORSEMENT

INTRODUCTION

[1] International Union, United Automobile Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America (“United Auto Workers, Local 251” or the “Union”) bring this motion for an order requiring the Applicants to pay termination and severance pay that is due and owing to the unionized employees of Tilbury Assembly Ltd. (“Tilbury”) and Pellus Manufacturing Limited (“Pellus”) under the *Employment Standards Act, 2000* (“ESA”) as result of terminations that occurred subsequent to the filing of proceedings by the Applicants under the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (“CCAA”).

[2] The motion was opposed by Bank of Montreal (the “Bank”), the secured creditor of the Applicants and by the Applicants.

[3] The amount owing to the Tilbury employees for termination pay is approximately \$23,000 and the amount owing for severance pay is approximately \$216,000. These amounts are not in dispute.

[4] The amount claimed to be owing to the Pellus employees (assuming that the employees were terminated on February 20, 2009) is approximately \$132,000 and the amount claimed to be owing for severance pay as of that date is approximately \$326,000. This amount is disputed by Pellus.

[5] The Union submits that the Applicants should be required to pay the termination pay and severance pay owing to the Tilbury and Pellus employees for the following reasons:

- (a) The ESA sets out a comprehensive code that requires an employer who terminates an employee to give the employee prior notice of termination, or if such notice is not given, pay in lieu of notice (commonly referred to as “termination pay”). The ESA also requires that an additional amount (referred to as “severance pay”) be paid to certain long service employees if criteria in the ESA are met.
- (b) The Amended and Restated Initial CCAA Order and the consent orders issued by this Court dated October 29, 2008, do not authorize the company to avoid paying termination pay and severance pay. The October 29, 2008 consent orders state that “the *Employment Standards Act, 2000* continues to apply”.
- (c) Section 5 of the ESA expressly states that no employer can contract out or waive an employment standard in the ESA and that any such contracting out or waiver is void.
- (d) The Supreme Court of Canada has held that federally regulated bankruptcy and insolvency proceedings cannot be used to subvert provincially regulated property and civil rights, as long as the doctrine of paramountcy is not triggered. In the

absence of paramountcy, a provincial law such as the ESA continues to apply in insolvency proceedings.

- (e) For the Tilbury and Pellus employees who continued to work for the Company after it went into CCAA protection and who were subsequently terminated, the payment of termination pay and severance pay is an ordinary course payment by the Company. It is to be paid the same way wages, benefits and other aspects of employee compensation are paid.
- (f) The payment of termination pay and severance pay in a CCAA proceeding is not a re-ordering of priorities among creditors nor is it giving a higher rank to unsecured employee creditors. Termination pay and severance pay that arises on the termination of employees post-CCAA filing is not pre-filing debt. It is an ordinary course payment.
- (g) The payment of termination pay and severance pay in the case at bar is within the reasonable expectations of the parties because:
 - (i) Company management represented to the Union employees from the outset of the CCAA proceedings that it would continue to pay all contractual amounts due to employees who worked during the CCAA proceedings, which would include amounts for termination pay and severance pay; and
 - (ii) The Company, the Bank and the Monitor consented to the terms of court orders that expressly state that the “*Employment Standards Act 2000* continues to apply”.
- (h) The employees have no recourse to be compensated for the unpaid termination pay and severance pay. There will be no Plan of Compromise.
- (i) The *Wage Earner Protection Plan* (WEPP) is not available to the employees because the Company is in CCAA proceedings and the WEPP is only available to terminated employees if their employer is a bankrupt or in receivership.
- (j) The amount of termination pay and severance pay owing is relatively low.
- (k) The Company has the cash to pay the termination pay and severance pay that is owing.
- (l) The payment of termination pay and severance pay will not jeopardize the Company’s restructuring which is to be a Proposed Transaction involving a purchase of the company by its controlling shareholders.
- (m) The Company has not drawn on the DIP Facility throughout the CCAA proceedings.

- (n) The Company should not be able to use the CCAA to avoid its employee termination pay and severance pay obligations under the ESA.

(Note: In the excerpt from the factum, counsel to the Union references “Applicants”, and the “Company”. Hereafter, the collective reference is to “Applicants”.)

[6] The Bank submits that the Union’s motion for the payment of termination and severance claims should be dismissed because:

- (a) the termination and severance claims are unsecured obligations of Tilbury and Pellus which are not afforded any priority under the Amended and Restated Initial Order, or any other orders that have been made in the CCAA proceeding, and are therefore unsecured claims subordinate to the claims of the Bank as a secured creditor. Any amount paid in respect of the termination and severance claims is a direct deduction from recoveries for the secured creditors; and
- (b) the provisions of the Amended and Restated Initial Order granted by this Court on September 2, 2009 (the “Amended and Restated Initial Order”) do not permit the Applicants to pay termination and severance claims at this time.

[7] The Applicants submit that the Union’s motion should be dismissed because:

- (a) the provisions of the Amended and Restated Initial Order do not permit the Applicants to pay the termination and severance claims in the circumstances in which the Union is seeking such payment;
- (b) the Union has not sought to amend the Amended and Restated Initial Order at any time during these proceedings to require the Applicants to pay the termination and severance claims; and
- (c) the effect of granting the relief to the Union would be to accord termination and severance claims a special status over the claims of other unsecured creditors of the Applicants and would result in the payment of such claims in priority to the claims of the Applicants’ secured creditors.

FACTS

[8] The Union represents employees at four facilities of the Applicants: Tilbury, Pellus, G&R Cold Forging Inc. and Pioneer Polymers Inc. The Union represents approximately 180 employees out of the total workforce of 300 employees.

[9] On August 1, 2008, Windsor Machine & Stamping Ltd. (“WMSL”), 538185 Ontario Ltd. (Pellus Tool), Pellus, Tilbury, G&R Cold Forging Inc. and 383301 Ontario Limited (the “BIA Proposal Proponents”) each filed a notice of intention (“NOI”) to make a proposal pursuant to s. 50.4(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (“BIA”).

[10] On August 6, 2008, the Applicants (including the BIA Proposal Proponents) were granted protection under the CCAA.

[11] As of the date of the initial CCAA order on August 6, 2008, the Monitor reported that the Bank was owed approximately \$16.25 million comprised of approximately \$8.1 million under an operating line of credit and approximately \$8.15 million under a term loan. The Bank agreed to make available up to an additional \$2 million to fund the Applicants' operations during the CCAA proceedings under a DIP Loan Agreement.

[12] The amount owing to various vendors as of the date of the NOI Filing was approximately \$6.5 million.

[13] The DIP Facility was extended to the Applicants under the terms of a DIP Loan Agreement. The DIP Facility was approved under the terms of the Initial Order at the outset of the CCAA proceedings.

[14] The provisions of the DIP Loan Agreement provide that advances from the Bank to WMSL could be loaned to Pellus and Tilbury, (among other Applicants) to fund ordinary course operations of those affiliates. Counsel to the Applicants submits that as Tilbury and Pellus have no funds to pay any termination or severance pay to the employees at Tilbury and Pellus represented by the Union (the "Tilbury Union Employees" and "Pellus Union Employees"), respectively, and they would have to ask that WMSL lend them sufficient funds for that purpose.

[15] Under the terms of the Amended and Restated Initial Order, counsel to the Applicants submit that the right of the Applicants to negotiate the terms on which termination and severance payments may be made upon termination of the employment of the Applicants' employees was subject to the covenants which are contained in the DIP Loan Agreement and that the Applicants, with limited exceptions that do not include the making of termination and severance payments, are not permitted to do anything which adversely affects the ranking of the obligations of WMSL to the Bank under either the DIP Loan Agreement or under the Amended and Restated Credit Agreement that governs the terms of loans made by the Bank to the WMSL prior to the commencement of the CCAA proceedings.

[16] On October 8, 2008 a sales process was approved by court order. The deadline for submission of offers to the Monitor was November 18, 2008. On November 18, 2008 there were no offers received, however, certain parties continued to express an interest in the Applicants' operations.

[17] Orders were made in these proceedings on October 29, 2008 (the "October 29 Orders") at the time that access agreements with two major customers of the Applicants were approved by the court. The October 29 Orders included provisions stating that the notice of one week for termination of the employment of employees on the expiry of the access periods under the Access Agreements would not operate to neutralize or suspend the provisions of the ESA.

[18] In September or October, 2008, the Union was informed of the possibility of the closure of the Tilbury facility. The Union advised the Applicants at that time that should the

employment of any Tilbury Union Employees be terminated, those employees should be paid termination and severance pay as required under the ESA.

[19] The efforts of the Applicants in October and early November, 2008, were directed to securing sources of funding for the Applicants' restructuring initiatives from prospective purchasers, financial institutions and other providers of capital as strategic partners and investors. The Applicants submit that they considered filing a plan of arrangement during that period if their efforts to secure funding had been successful.

[20] When no offer was received to purchase the assets of the Applicants, the principals of WMSL (the "Shareholders") negotiated with the Bank and with Export Development Canada ("EDC") to obtain financing from the Bank and from EDC for two newly incorporated corporations ("New Cos") to be controlled by the Shareholders which would purchase the Applicants' assets, properties and undertakings on a going-concern basis (the "Proposed Sale").

[21] The Applicants were of the view that the Proposed Sale was the only alternative to a liquidation sale or auction of the Applicants' assets and properties.

[22] The Applicants acknowledge that they are not in a position to proceed with a plan of arrangement that would see value paid to their unsecured creditors.

[23] At the end of November 2008, the management of Tilbury determined that a transfer of the employment of any of the Tilbury Union Employees was no longer economically feasible because of the decline in current and projected volume for the Applicants. The Union was advised of this decision and effective December 5, 2008, the Applicants terminated 47 Tilbury Union Employees at the Tilbury plant. The Tilbury Union Employees did not receive termination pay and severance pay.

[24] On January 21, 2009, the Applicants informed the Pellus Union Employees that the operations of Pellus would be closed down and that their employment would be terminated. The closure date was subsequently extended to late February 2009. The number of Pellus Union Employees whose employment will be terminated as a result of the closure of the Pellus facility is 43, of whom 40 are Pellus Union Employees.

[25] Pellus advised the Union of its position that under the provisions of the ESA, the Pellus Union Employees are not entitled to be paid severance pay because each Pellus Union Employee is not one of 50 or more employees who will have had the employment relationship with Pellus severed within a six-month period and Pellus does not have a payroll of \$2.5 million or more. The adjudication of this issue is not before me at this time.

[26] In January 2009, the Applicants paid \$2.8 million toward the Bank operating line as a repayment of pre-filing debt. In addition, as a result of asset sales and collections a further \$1.2 million was also paid to the Bank toward its term loan facilities.

[27] The Monitor's Sixth Report is dated February 23, 2009 and at that date, the Applicants had approximately \$3.4 million in cash and at the end of April 2009, the Applicants were

expected to have \$3 million. The Applicants has not drawn the DIP Facility throughout the CCAA proceedings.

[28] Periodically during the CCAA proceedings, the Applicants returned to court and obtained orders extending the CCAA proceedings. Extensions were granted, under s. 11(4) of the CCAA based upon the court making required findings that the Applicants were operating in good faith and with due diligence such as to justify an extension of the stay.

ISSUES AND ANALYSIS

[29] The issue to be determined on this motion is: Should the Applicants, in these CCAA proceedings, be required to pay termination pay and severance pay to the Tilbury Union Employees and the Pellus Union Employees.

[30] This issue was recently considered in *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, 2009 CanLII 31600 (On. S.C.) in the context of proceedings commenced by Nortel Networks Corp., et al (the “Nortel Applicants”) under the CCAA (the “Nortel CCAA Proceedings”).

[31] In the Nortel CCAA Proceedings, both unionized and non-unionized employees brought motions seeking an order to vary the Initial Order to require the Nortel Applicants to pay, among other things, termination pay and severance pay, in accordance with the applicable collective agreement and/or the *Employment Standards Act*. The motions were dismissed.

[32] The initial order in the Nortel CCAA Proceedings (the “Nortel Initial Order”) was similar to the Amended and Restated Initial Order. Both were based on the Model Order.

[33] The applicable order in each case, (a) entitles but did not require the Applicants to pay outstanding and future wages, salaries, vacation pay,...., in each case incurred in the ordinary course of business; (b) provides that the Applicants were entitled to terminate the employment or lay off any of its employees and to deal with the consequences in the Plan.

[34] Many of the submissions raised by the Union at [5], were considered in the Nortel decision.

[35] Included in the conclusions in Nortel were statements to the effect that:

- (i) claims for termination pay and severance pay are unsecured claims. These claims do not have any statutory priority;
- (ii) Section 11.3 of the CCAA is an exception to the general stay provisions authorized by Section 11 and as such should be narrowly construed;
- (iii) Section 11.3 applies to services provided after the date of the Initial Order;
- (iv) the triggering of the payment obligations for termination and severance pay may have arisen after the Initial Order but it does not follow that a service was

provided after the Initial Order. The claims for termination and severance pay are based, for the most part, on services that were provided pre-filing.

- (v) a key factor is whether the employee provided services after the date of the Initial Order. If so, he or she, is entitled to compensation benefits for such services.
- (vi) the court has the jurisdiction to order a stay of outstanding termination pay and severance pay obligations under Section 11 of the CCAA.
- (vii) the failure to pay outstanding termination pay and severance pay obligations does not amount to a case of contracting out of the ESA. Rather, it is a case of whether immediate payout resulting from a breach of the ESA is required to be made. The ESA applies, but during the stay period, there is a stay of the enforcement of the payment obligation.

[36] In my view, these conclusions are equally applicable to this motion.

[37] The submissions of the Union which are addressed in the Nortel decision are as follows:

- (i) Payment of termination pay and severance pay are subject to the stay provisions.
- (ii) The failure to pay outstanding termination pay and severance pay obligations does not amount to a contracting out of the ESA. Rather, it is a case of whether immediate payout resulting from a breach of the ESA is required to be made. The ESA applies, but during the stay period, there is a stay of the enforcement of the payment obligations.
- (iii) The ESA continues to apply but there is a stay of the enforcement of the payment obligations.
- (iv) The triggering of the payment obligations for termination and severance pay may have arisen after the Initial Order but it does not follow that a service was provided after the Initial Order. The claims for termination and severance pay are based, for the most part, on services that were provided pre-filing.
- (v) A key factor is whether the employee provided services after the date of the Initial Order. If so, he or see, is entitled to compensation benefits for such services.

[38] Two additional points that are not directly addressed in the Nortel decision are as follows:

- (i) Counsel to the Union submitted that the recent case of *Re West Bay SonShip Yachts Ltd.* (2009) B.C.C.A. 31 stands for the proposition that claims for termination and severance pay becomes owing to the employees at the point where their employment was terminated during the post-filing period and

therefore such claims are post-filing claims. In my view, this case can be distinguished. The claim in *West Bay* involved a common law claim for damages for wrongful dismissal. This type of claim is distinct from a claim for severance pay or termination pay under employment standards legislation, as noted by Levine J.A. at paragraph [14].

(ii) Tilbury Union Employees and Pellus Union Employees did provide services after the date of the CCAA application. Any incremental increase in termination pay and severance pay attributable to the period of time after the Applicants went into CCAA protection may justify treatment as a post-filing claim.

[39] This motion raises an interesting question. Should the Applicants be faulted for commencing proceedings under the CCAA, even though it turns out that no plan can be proposed which provides value to the unsecured creditors. In this case, the alternative to filing under the CCAA would have been to continue with the NOI under the BIA. In light of the acknowledgment that no CCAA plan can be presented which would be of benefit for the unsecured creditors, it follows that no viable proposal could have been made under the BIA. The failure to file a proposal under the BIA would have resulted in a bankruptcy and likely a receivership. In a receivership/bankruptcy, the termination pay and severance pay claims of the Tilbury Union Employees and the Pellus Union Employees would rank as unsecured claims and subordinate to the secured creditors.

[40] In turn, this raises a further question. Should the priority status of the Tilbury Union Employees and Pellus Union Employees be different in the context of CCAA proceedings as opposed to a receivership or bankruptcy.

[41] In this case, the Monitor reports that certain secured creditors will suffer a loss. Any amount paid in respect of termination and severance pay claims would be as a result of a direct deduction from recoveries for the secured creditors. In my view, the effect of granting the requested relief would be to accord the termination and severance pay claims special status over the claims of other unsecured creditors of the Applicants and would also result in the payment of such claims in priority to the claims of the Applicants' secured creditors.

[42] In addition to my conclusions as set out in *Nortel*, I have not been persuaded that the requested relief can be justified in this case on the following grounds.

[43] First, the priority of secured creditors must, in my view, be recognized. Counsel to the Union made the submission that the Applicants and the Bank are advancing a priority argument that may be relevant in a bankruptcy or receivership proceeding but not in a CCAA proceeding, as there is no priority distribution scheme in the CCAA. In my view this submission is misguided. Although there is no specific priority distribution scheme in the CCAA, that does not mean that priority issues should not be considered. An initial order under the CCAA usually results in a stay of proceedings as against secured creditors as well as unsecured creditors. The stay prevents secured creditors from taking enforcement proceedings which would confirm their

priority position. The inability of a secured creditor to take such enforcement proceedings should not result in an enhanced position for unsecured creditors. There is no basis, in my view, for the argument that somehow the absence of a statutory distribution scheme entitles unsecured creditors to obtain enhanced priority over secured creditors for pre-filing obligations. To give effect to this argument would result in a situation where secured creditors would be prejudiced by participating in CCAA proceedings as opposed to receivership/bankruptcy proceedings. This could very well result in a situation where secured creditors would prefer the receivership/bankruptcy option as opposed to the CCAA option as it would recognize their priority position. Such an outcome would undermine certain key objectives of the CCAA, namely, (i) maintain the *status quo* during the proceedings; and (ii) to facilitate the ability of a debtor to restructure its affairs. In my view, it is essential, in a court supervised process, to give due consideration to the priority rights of secured creditors. In this case, the secured creditors have priority over the termination pay and severance pay claims of the Tilbury Union Employees and the Pellus Union Employees.

[44] Second, counsel to the Union also submits that based on the rationale in the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Re 1231640 Ontario Inc. (State Group)* (2007), 37 C.B.R. (5th) 185 (Ont. C.A.), priority rules do not crystallize in a CCAA proceeding. I do not accept this argument. *State Group* addressed a priority issue as between competing PPSA secured creditors in the context of a interim receivership under s. 47 of the BIA. The issue in *State Group* was whether a s. 47 BIA receiver was a person who represents creditors of the debtor under s. 20(1)(b) of the PPSA. The Court of Appeal held that an interim receiver was not such a person. The issue in *State Group* governs the relationship as between competing interests under the PPSA. In my view, it does not stand for the proposition that the priority position of a secured creditor vis-à-vis unsecured creditors should not be recognized in the context of a CCAA proceeding.

[45] Third, the Union put forth submissions to the effect that, in this particular situation, the amount of termination pay and severance pay is relatively low and the Applicants have the cash to pay the amounts owing and, further, that such payments would not jeopardize the Proposed Sale.

[46] In my view, the fact that the Applicants may have available cash does not mean that the Applicants can use the cash as they see fit. The asset is to be used in accordance with credit agreements and court authorized purposes, including those set out in the Amended and Restated Initial Order. I am in agreement with these submissions of counsel to the Applicants as set out at [15]. This Order placed restrictions on the use of cash, which restrictions are consistent with legal priorities. In my view, the fact that the Applicants have cash does not justify an alteration of legal priorities. The legal priority position is that the claims for termination pay and severance pay are unsecured claims which rank *pari passu* with other unsecured creditors and subordinate to the interests of the secured creditors. (See also *Indalex Limited CV-09-8122-00CL* – July 24, 2009 on this point.)

[47] I acknowledge that the situation facing the employees is unfortunate and that in Nortel, a hardship exception was made. However, this exception was predicated, in part, on the

reasonable expectation that there will be a meaningful distribution to unsecured creditors, including the former employees. Such is not the case in this matter.

[48] Counsel to the Union also submitted that paragraph 11(d) of the Amended and Restated Initial Order only allows the company to terminate employees on terms agreed to by the employees or “to deal with the consequences thereof in the plan”. Counsel to the Union submits that there is no agreement in this case and there is no plan and consequently paragraph 11(d) does not authorize the company not to pay termination pay and severance pay.

[49] In my view, the Applicants provide a complete response to this argument in their submission summarized at [15] which I accept and at paragraph 32 of their factum by noting that the Applicants could have proposed a Plan that would not have seen value paid to the unsecured creditors and that could have effected the Proposed Sale through a Plan, and to require that the Applicants propose a Plan in order to effect the sale would be an overly technical requirement inconsistent with the CCAA’s remedial objective. I also accept these submissions. In my view, this is not a case where the Applicants have used the CCAA to avoid termination and severance pay obligations under the ESA. The fact that these claims will not be paid is a result of legal priorities as opposed to any specific action of the Applicants.

[50] I also note the CCAA proceedings are ongoing and the Applicants have brought forth a motion to propose a plan directed only at the secured creditors, but such a plan has been accepted in other cases. (See *Anvil Range Mining Corp.* (2001), 25 C.B.R. (4th) page 1 (Ont. S.C.J.), aff’d 2002, 34 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. C.A.)) This motion has yet to be heard.

DISPOSITION

[51] In the result, I have not been persuaded that the facts of this case are such that would justify an outcome different from that of *Nortel*. The claims for termination pay and severance pay are unsecured claims and enforcement proceedings are stayed, save and except for any incremental amount of termination pay and severance pay attributable to the period of time after the Applicants went into CCAA protection.

[52] Counsel to the Bank also raised the issue that Tilbury and Pellus do not have the funds to pay the termination and severance claims as all cash is held by WMSL. Counsel to the Bank submits that if an order were to be made that WMSL were required to pay or to loan money to Tilbury or Pellus so that they could then pay the termination and severance pay claims, such would be equivalent to a common employer finding without a proper trial of such issue. I accept this position and to the extent that I have erred in my conclusions and this issue becomes relevant, it would be necessary, in my view, to have a hearing to determine whether WMSL, Tilbury and Pellus are a common employer. This possibility is recognized at paragraph 38 of the Reply Factum served by counsel to the Union.

[53] For the foregoing reasons, subject to the caveat in [51], the motion is dismissed.

MORAWETZ J.

DATE: July 27, 2009