



ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

COUNSEL/ENDORSEMENT SLIP

COURT FILE NO.: CV-25-00748799-00CL

DATE: August 15, 2025

NO. ON LIST: 1

TITLE OF PROCEEDING: London Valley IV Inc., by its Court-Appointed Receiver and Manager, KSV Restructuring Inc. v. Pilehvar et al.

BEFORE: Madam Justice J. Dietrich

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

For Plaintiff, Applicant, Moving Party:

Name of Person Appearing	Name of Party	Contact Info
Mark van Zandvoort	Plaintiff and Receiver KSV Restructuring	mvanzandvoort@airdberlis.com
Calvin Horsten	Plaintiff and Receiver KSV Restructuring	chorsten@airdberlis.com
David Sieradzki	Receiver	dsieradzki@ksvadvisory.com
Jordan Wong	Receiver	jwong@ksvadvisory.com

For Defendant, Respondent, Responding Party:

Name of Person Appearing	Name of Party	Contact Info
Behzad Pilehvar	Defendant, self-represented	ben@sandgecko.ca

ENDORSEMENT OF JUSTICE J. DIETRICH:

- [1] On August 7, 2025, I granted an order on ex parte basis against the defendants which included a Mareva injunction and Norwich order relief. As required by Rule 40.01 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure* RRO Reg 194 (the "**Rules**"), an interlocutory injunction or

mandatory order under section 101 of the CJA may include such terms as are just, and may be sought on motion made without notice for a period not exceeding 10 days.

- [2] Accordingly, my endorsement of August 7, 2025, required notice be provided to the defendants and a comeback hearing was scheduled for today.
- [3] Defined terms used but not defined herein have the meaning provided to them in my endorsement of August 7, 2025.
- [4] London Valley IV Inc. ("LV IV") by KSV Restructuring Inc. ("KSV") solely in its capacity as the Court- Appointed Receiver and Manager of LV IV, (the "**Receiver**"), being the Plaintiff in the matter served the defendant Behzad Pilehver on August 7, 2025 with the material and served the defendants Mahtab Nali and 2621598 Ontario Inc. doing business as Nali and Associates on August 8, 2025 with the material.
- [5] A Second Supplement to the Third Report of the Receiver dated August 13, 2025 (the "**Second Supplement**") was delivered later.
- [6] Yesterday, Mr. Pilehver filed written submissions with the Commercial List Office on behalf of himself and the other defendants requesting an adjournment of four weeks to permit the defendants to (i) retain and instruct counsel; (ii) prepare responding material; and (ii) consider the overlap of this matter with a 'pending class action process'.
- [7] During submissions, Mr. Pilehver advised that counsel was expected to be retained within one week. In the circumstances, I am adjourning the comeback hearing to be scheduled at a case conference following the expected retention of counsel. That case conference is scheduled for **August 26, 2025 for 30 min at 11:00 am.**
- [8] Aide Memoires outlining proposed schedules (or if agreed a proposed schedule) should be uploaded to Case Center no later than August 24, 2025.
- [9] Mr. Pilehver is to bring this endorsement to the attention of counsel as soon as possible.
- [10] Pending a determination of the comeback hearing, the August 7, 2025 Order remains in effect. As set out in the Second Supplement, the Receiver has identified a number of additional accounts into which proceeds have been deposited. To the extent those accounts are held by the Defendants they are also to be subject to the terms of the August 7, 2025 Order.
- [11] I note that although Mr. Pilehver requested an adjournment to address the 'pending class action process' that is not a matter that before me and it is not the basis on which an adjournment has been granted. As noted in the Second Supplement, following service of the material in this matter, the Receiver has become aware of a number of emails, a

website post, press release and additional correspondence to certain regulators and others making various allegations against the Receiver and others.

[12] Concerns regarding the conduct of the Receiver – who is a court-appointed officer – should be addressed within the existing receivership proceeding. Further, leave of the Court is required in that proceeding prior to commencing litigation against the Receiver or its counsel.

[13] Order to go in the form signed by me this day.

August 15, 2025

Justice J. Dietrich