



SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE  
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

**COUNSEL/ENDORSEMENT SLIP**

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

DATE: August 7, 2025

NO. ON LIST: 5

**TITLE OF PROCEEDING:**

London Valley IV, by Its Court-Appointed Receiver And Manager, KSV Restructuring  
Vs.  
Pilehver, Behzad / Nali, Mahtab / 2621598 Ontario Inc.

BEFORE: Justice J. Dietrich

**PARTICIPANT INFORMATION**

**For Plaintiff, Applicant, Moving Party:**

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

**For Defendant, Respondent, Responding Party:**

Name of Person Appearing	Name of Party	Contact Info

**For Other, Self-Represented:**

Name of Person Appearing	Name of Party	Contact Info

## **ENDORSEMENT OF JUSTICE J. DIETRICH:**

### **Introduction**

[1] 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**”) seeks on an ex parte basis a Mareva injunction and Norwich Order as against the Defendants, Behzad Pilehver (“**Pilehver**”), Mahtab Nali (“**Nali**”) and 2621598 Ontario Inc. doing business as Nali and Associates (“**Nali and Associates**”).

[2] Defined terms used but not otherwise defined herein have the meaning provided to them in the factum of the Receiver filed for use on this motion.

[3] As an initial matter, in support of this motion the Receiver filed the third Report of KSV dated August 1, 2025 as evidence. For the reasons set out in *Intercity Realty Inc v. PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc. et al.*, 2024 ONSC 2400 at para 51-53, I accept that a report of the Receiver as a court-officer is appropriate evidence in this context.

[4] For the reasons set out below, the relief requested by the Receiver is granted.

### **Background**

#### **The Receivership Proceedings and the Parties**

[5] On March 6, 2025, under Court File No. CV-25-00736577-00CL (the “**Receivership Proceedings**”), KSV was appointed as Receiver of the assets, undertakings and properties of, among others, LV IV, and the proceeds thereof, including with respect to the LV IV Property (as defined below) (the “**Appointment Order**”).

[6] The Receivership Proceedings were commenced by Mizue Fukiage, Akiko Kobayashi, Yoshiki Fukiage, Kobayashi Kyohodo Co., Ltd. and Toru Fukiage (collectively, the “**Kobayashi Group**”).

[7] The Kobayashi Group, other members of their family and numerous other investors (collectively, the “**Co-Owners**”) invested funds in certain land banking projects to finance the acquisition of real estate (the “**Land Banking Enterprise**”). Various companies (some of which are defined in the Appointment Order as the “**Nominee Respondents**”), including LV IV, were formed to hold title to various pieces of real estate in Ontario as nominees and bare trustees for the Co-Owners.

[8] As part of the Receiver’s powers under the Appointment Order, it was authorized to trace and follow the proceeds of any real property previously owned by any of the Nominee Respondents that was sold, transferred, assigned or conveyed on or after October 31, 2024, including in respect of the LV IV Property.

[9] LV IV is an Ontario corporation, and owned the property municipally known as 6211 Colonel Talbot Road, London, Ontario (the “**LV IV Property**”) until the property was sold and transferred to a third-party purchaser for consideration of \$2 million on February 5, 2025.

[10] At the time of the Receiver’s appointment, Pilehver was and remains a director and officer of certain Nominee Respondents in the Land Banking Enterprise, including LV IV of which he is the sole director and President.

[11] Nali is believed to be Pilehver’s wife, although this has not been confirmed by the Receiver.

[12] Nali and Associates is a business name registered by 2621598 Ontario Inc. (an Ontario Corporation). Nali is the President and sole director of Nali and Associates. In corporate filings, both Nali and Pilehver list their address for service as 48 Chelford Road, North York, Ontario.

## The LV IV Property

[13] The Kobayashi Group claims to have invested the aggregate amount of \$3.7 million to acquire an approximately 72% undivided beneficial interest in the LV IV Property. This interest was acquired pursuant to four sale agreements among the applicable member of the Kobayashi Group, as purchaser, LV IV, as nominee, and TSI-LV IV International Canada Inc., as vendor. Each of these sale agreements includes certain co-owner agreements, which require that, amongst other things, net income from the property be paid to Co-Owners and that Co-Owners holding at least 51% of the interests in the property approve any sale.

[14] On October 31, 2024, the Honourable Justice MacNeil issued an Order (the “**October 31, 2024 Injunction Order**”) in the proceedings under Court File No. CV-24-00087580-0000 (the “**Hamilton Proceedings**”) which includes at paragraph 5 of the Order provided that all persons with notice of the order were restrained from selling, removing, dissipating alienating, transferring, assigning, encumbering, or similarly dealing with their assets, or the assets of certain companies. The Receiver's reading of this Order is that the companies referenced included LV IV and therefore the restriction applied to the LV IV Property. Although the defined terms in the October 31, 2024 Injunction Order are not straightforward, it appears on the evidence that all parties understood that the LV IV Property was subject to the Order and that formed part of the basis set out in the Receivership Proceedings.

[15] Mr. Pilehver was aware of the October 31, 2024 Injunction Order as he attached it to an affidavit he swore in the Hamilton Proceedings on January 20, 2025 (prior to the transfer of the LVI IV Property on February 5, 2025).

[16] The Kobayashi Group, as a subset of the Co-Owners of the LV IV Property, filed evidence in support of the Appointment Order that the sale of the LV IV Property on February 5, 2025 was completed without the Kobayashi Group's knowledge or consent. Further, the Kobayashi Group asserted that they have not received any net income or other proceeds in connection with the LV IV Property.

## Sale of LV IV Property and Alleged Misappropriation of Funds

[17] The LV IV Property was sold without compliance with the co-owners agreement. Accepting the Receiver's interpretation of the October 31, 2024 Injunction Order, the LV IV Property was also sold in contravention of that Order and in the face of the pending Receivership Proceeding of which Pilehver was aware.

[18] Based on the terms of the Appointment Order the Receiver was provided with information that on February 5, 2025, the proceeds from the sale of the LV IV Property were deposited into the trust account (the “**Hundal Account**”) for the lawyer, Parminder Hundal (“**Hundal**”), who acted for LV IV on the sale transaction were subsequently disbursed by Hundal, at Pilehver's direction, to the following persons and entities who appear to have no connection to LV IV or the LV IV Property:

- a. on February 7, 2025, a payment was made from the Hundal Account to Nali in the amount of \$817,859.49, which payment was made by cheque and deposited into the Nali Bank Account. Initially, a wire in this amount was evidently sent to “Mahtab Nali” on February 6, 2025 with reference to an account number 1929-5023332 (together with the Nali Bank Account, the “**Nali Bank Accounts**”), but was evidently voided and did not go through;
- b. on February 18, 2025, a further \$80,800 was paid by cheque from the Hundal Account to Nali and Associates;
- c. on February 12, 2025, \$5,000 was wired by Hundal to Bally Hundal/Hundal Law Firm;
- d. on February 14, 2025, \$30,000 was wired by Hundal to Stockwoods LLP;

- e. payments totalling \$103,040.42 were paid to Hundal's law firm on February 10, 12, 20 and March 5, 2025 in purported satisfaction of accounts rendered, of which at least \$94,000. appears to have no connection to LV IV or the LV IV Property; and
- f. on March 5, 2025, one day prior to the Appointment Order, \$34,000 was wired by Hundal to a third law firm, Blaney McMurtry LLP.<sup>42</sup> On March 21, 2025, Blaney McMurtry LLP advised the service list in the Receivership Proceedings that it had been retained by Pilehver in his personal capacity, as well as by 2630306 Ontario Inc. o/a Paybank Financial ("**Paybank**") and TGP Canada (collectively, the "**Paybank Parties**"). Pilehver is an officer and director of Paybank and TGP Canada.

[19] Despite the Receiver's inquiries of Pilehver and his known lawyers as to what happened to the sale proceeds from the LV IV Property, no explanation or response has been provided by Pilehver.

## Issues

[20] The issues to be decided in this motion are whether:

- a. the Court should grant an ex parte interim and interlocutory Mareva injunction against the Defendants; and
- b. the Norwich relief requested ought to be granted.

## Analysis

### Mareva Order

[21] This Court has jurisdiction to grant an interlocutory injunction, including a Mareva injunction, pursuant to section 101 of the *Courts of Justice Act* (the "**CJA**"), where it appears just or convenient to do so. Pursuant to 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.

[22] A Mareva injunction is an exceptional remedy see *Aetna Financial Services v. Feigelman*, 1985 CanLII 55 (SCC).

[23] The factors to be ordinarily considered in determining whether to grant Mareva relief include:

- a. a strong prima facie case;
- b. particulars of its claim against the defendant, setting out the grounds of its claim and the amount thereof, and fairly stating the points that could be made against it by the defendant;
- c. some grounds for believing that the defendant has assets in Ontario (although this requirement has been modified by more recent jurisprudence discussed below, such that it is perhaps better expressed as: some grounds for believing that the defendant has assets within the jurisdiction of the Ontario Court);
- d. some grounds for believing that there is a serious risk of defendant's assets being removed from the jurisdiction or dissipated or disposed of before the judgment or award is satisfied;
- e. proof of irreparable harm if the injunctive relief is not granted;
- f. the balance of convenience favours the granting of the relief; and

g. an undertaking as to damages.

See *Original Traders Energy Ltd. (Re)*, 2023 ONSC 1887 [*Original Traders #1*] at para 22.

### Strong Prima Facie Case

[24] To find a strong prima facie case the court must be satisfied that upon a preliminary review of the case, there is a strong likelihood on the law and the evidence presented that, at trial, the applicant will be ultimately successful in proving the allegations set out in the originating notice see *R v Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, 2018 SCC 5 at para 17.

[25] Here, the Receiver claims fraud, breach of fiduciary duty, conversion, unjust enrichment, knowing assistance and knowing receipt as against the Defendants or any of them. Only one cause of action against each Defendant must show a strong prima facie case.

[26] With respect to Pilehver, the claim of breach of fiduciary duty is asserted. To establish a breach of fiduciary duty, a plaintiff must establish the following elements: (a) proof of the duty, including that the fiduciary has scope for the exercise of some discretion or power, the fiduciary can unilaterally exercise that power or discretion so as to affect the beneficiary's legal or practical interest, and the beneficiary is peculiarly vulnerable to or at the mercy of the fiduciary holding the discretion or power; and (b) breach of the duty, including concealment or failure to advise of material facts, breach of trust, making a secret profit or acting in a conflict of interest, a causal connection between the breach and the alleged damages and the fiduciary's profit from its actions see *Hodgkinson v Simms*, [1994] 3 SCR 377.

[27] Pilehver owed a fiduciary duty to LV IV, as the sole director thereof. By orchestrating a sale of the LV IV Property without proper authorization and then improperly transferring the proceeds to benefit the Defendants – the Receiver has established a strong prima facie case of breach of fiduciary duty.

[28] The tort of conversion is also asserted against all defendants. It involves a wrongful interference with the goods of another, such as taking, using or destroying the goods in a manner inconsistent with the owner's right to possession. The tort is one of strict liability, and accordingly, it is no defence that the wrongful act was committed in all innocence see *Wymor Construction Inc. v Gray*, 2012 ONSC 5022 at paras 18-19. In the present case, whether or not Nali knew about Pilehver's fraudulent activities is immaterial. The mere fact that she and Nali and Associates obtained funds belonging to LV IV (and, by virtue, its Co-Owners) without permission, and without any legal entitlement, amounts to strong prima facie case of conversion.

[29] It may be that strong prima facie cases are also established in additional causes of action asserted including fraud, unjust enrichment, knowing assistance and knowing receipt, however, given my finding that a strong prima facie causes of action have been established against each of the defendants above it is not necessary to consider each of the causes of action asserted.

### Full Disclosure of the Case

[30] I am satisfied that at this time the Receiver has provided full disclosure of the case. This matter will be subject to a comeback hearing and the Defendants will be provided an opportunity to challenge the order at that time.

### Grounds for Believing the Defendants have Assets in Ontario

[31] The evidence that each of the Defendants has assets in Ontario is limited.

[32] In *Borrelli*, in his Capacity as Trustee of the *SFC Litigation Trust v. Chan*, 2017 ONSC 1815 (CanLII) [*SFC Litigation Trust*], the Divisional Court reviewed a decision of Hainey J. where a worldwide Mareva

injunction was granted, despite a lack of evidence that the defendant had assets in Ontario. In reviewing the decision Justices Leitch and Sachs wrote:

[25] ...The appellant's position is that in order to obtain an injunction, there is a substantive requirement that a defendant have assets in the jurisdiction to be subject to the restraining order. The appellants say there must be assets in this jurisdiction to ensure the order of the court is capable of implementation.

[26] I do not accept the appellant's assertion. I recognize that in *Chitel* the injunction was sought to restrain the dissipation of assets in Ontario. Similarly, in virtually all of the cases referenced by counsel on this appeal, the assets which were at the risk of dissipation existed in Ontario.

[27] However, a court's in personam jurisdiction over a defendant justifying the issuance of a Mareva injunction is not dependant, related to or "tied to" a requirement that a defendant has some assets in the jurisdiction.

[28] Section 101(1) of the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43 provides the court with jurisdiction to grant an interlocutory junction or mandatory order "where it appears to a judge of the court to be just or convenient to do so".

[29] A Mareva injunction is an equitable remedy and as such I agree with the respondent's submission that this remedy evolves as facts and circumstances merit.

[33] As was recognized in *SFC Litigation Trust* (see para 38), although the usual case for a Maerva injunction is to prevent assets from leaving the jurisdiction, world-wide Maerva injunctions have been granted with increasing frequency to ensure that a judgment can be enforced in the exceptional circumstances where the plaintiff has established a strong prima facie case on the merits.

[34] The evidence shows that Pilehver and Nali are each directors of several Ontario corporations with addresses for service listed in the corporate profile reports for each of them in Richmond Hill and Toronto. As noted above, Nali & Associates is incorporated in Ontario and the corporate profile report shows a registered or head office in North York, Ontario.

[35] In addition, the evidence reflects that the cheque paid to Nali in the amount of \$817,859.49 was deposited into an account in the name of "NALI M" bearing Account No. 6177612 at The Toronto-Dominion Bank.

#### Risk of Dissipation of Assets

The risk of dissipation may be inferred by evidence suggestive of the defendants' fraudulent conduct see *Sibley & Associates LP v Ross*, 2011 ONSC 2951 [*Sibley*] at para 64. As in *Sibley*, here it is a reasonable inference given the following evidence that the Defendants are likely to attempt other means to put money out of the reach of the Receiver:

- a. Pilehver directed the sale of the LV IV Property and the distribution of sale proceeds therefrom despite having prior notice of the pending Receivership Proceedings concerning the LV IV Property and the October 31, 2024 Injunction Order restraining dealings with the LV IV Property, and despite being well aware of the consent and distribution requirements established by the relevant co-owner agreements (which requirements had not been complied with);
- b. the Defendants caused and/or facilitated the misappropriation of LV IV Property sale proceeds as evidenced by, among other things, (i) the payment of proceeds to Nali, Nali and Associates and

other third parties; and (ii) written directions signed by Pilehver authorizing such payments without compliance with the requirements of the co-owner agreements; and

- c. despite repeated requests to Pilehver and his counsel to provide information and documentation regarding the distribution of the LV IV Property sale proceeds, which requests have gone unanswered.

### Undertaking

[36] The Receiver has not provided an undertaking as to damages. As noted by Justice Osborne in *Original Traders #1* at para 51 " In my view, it is appropriate to dispense with the requirement for an undertaking as to damages where, as here, the case of the moving parties is strong and they are insolvent: *Sabourin & Sun Group of Cos. v. Laiken*, [2006] OJ No. 3847 at para. 16." Here LV IV is insolvent and the Receiver as a Court officer is pursuing the relief for the benefit of LV IV's creditors.

[37] As well, in *Business Development Bank of Canada v Aventura II Properties Inc*, 2016 ONCA 300, the Ontario Court of Appeal rejected that the court-appointed officer (a receiver) should be required to provide an undertaking as to damages in similar circumstances.

[38] Accordingly, I am satisfied that the requirement for an undertaking as to damages is not required in this case.

### Irreparable Harm & Balance of Convenience

[39] An analysis of the irreparable harm and the balance of convenience is also required given that injunctive nature of the relief requested. Irreparable harm is harm which either cannot be quantified in monetary terms or which cannot be cured, usually because one party cannot collect damages from the other. *RJR-MacDonald Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, [1994] 1 SCR at 341. 26.

[40] In cases where a strong prima facie case for fraud has been established, it has been recognized that if the assets of the defendant are not secured, the plaintiff will likely not be able to collect on a money judgment, if successful.

[41] LV IV stakeholders will suffer irreparable harm, and will be prevented from recovering their misappropriated funds and assets, and assets traceable thereto, or other exigible assets, if the Defendants are not prevented from further moving, dissipating or otherwise attempting to put their assets beyond the reach of LV IV and its stakeholders. Indeed, "the probability of irreparable harm increases as the probability of recovering damages decreases" see *Original Traders #1* at para 49, citing *Christian-Philip v Rajalingam*, 2020 ONSC 1925 at para 33.

### Norwich Order

[42] In addition to a Mareva injunction, the Plaintiffs also seek a Norwich Order requiring the Defendants to produce documents from financial institutions.

[43] The Supreme Court of Canada has confirmed the elements of the test for obtaining a Norwich Order: (a) a bona fide claim against the unknown alleged wrongdoer; (b) the person from whom discovery is sought must be in some way involved in the matter under dispute, he must be more than an innocent bystander; (c) the person from whom discovery is sought must be the only practical source of information available to the applicants; (d) the person from whom discovery is sought must be reasonably compensated for his expenses arising out of compliance with the discovery order; and (e) the public interests in favour of disclosure must outweigh the legitimate privacy concerns. See *Rogers Communications v. Voltage Pictures, LLC*, 2018 SCC 38 at para 18.

[44] As noted above, a *bone fide* claim has been established. Courts have emphasized that financial institutions are “innocently involved” third parties from whom Norwich relief is regularly sought in fraud cases: see *Carbone v. Boccia*, 2022 ONSC 6528 [*Carbone*] at para 20. Records at such financial institutions are necessary in order to trace the funds obtained by the Defendants and identify any others involved in the scheme. The need to identify and trace to be legitimate objectives on which a Norwich order can be based see *Carbone* at para 17.

[45] At this time, the order to produce documents is limited to The Toronto-Dominion Bank, however, the request for expanded relief may be made in the future on appropriate evidence.

### **Order and Comeback**

[46] Order to go in the form signed by me today with immediate effect and without the necessity of a formal order being taken out.

[47] Because the Mareva Order is being granted on a motion without notice, it can only be granted for a limited duration of up to ten days. Accordingly, the matter has been scheduled to return to court on Friday, **August 15, 2025, at 9:00 a.m** (virtually), at which time, the Receiver may ask for the Mareva Order to be extended.

[48] If they appear, the court will hear from the Defendants. They may file evidence for purposes of that return date, or they may appear and ask to schedule a further return date, to challenge the Order and have it dissolved or terminated.

[49] If none of the Defendants appear at the next return date, the Court will consider, based on the evidence to be provided by the Receiver about his efforts to serve them, whether to set a further return date or what further and other orders and directions might be appropriate regarding service and any future court appearances.

[50] To that end, the Receiver shall make reasonable efforts to serve, or at least bring to the attention of, the Defendants as soon as possible this endorsement and the Order signed by me today. The Receiver shall also provide to the defendants its motion record in support of this motion.

August 7, 2025



Justice J. Dietrich