ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

(Commercial List)

IN THE MATTER OF THE SECURITIES ACT R.S.O. 1990, C. s. 5, AS AMENDED

BETWEEN:

ONTARIO SECURITIES COMMISSION

Applicant

and

PETER SBARAGLIA, MANDY SBARABLIA, CO CAPITAL GROWTH INC. AND 91 DAYS HYGIENE SERVICES INC.

Respondents

APPLICATION UNDER Section 129 of the Securities Act

FACTUM OF CERTAIN CREDITORS OF C.O. CAPITAL GROWTH INC.

(in respect of the Receiver's motion returnable September 7, 2011)

September 1, 2011

LENCZNER SLAGHT ROYCE SMITH GRIFFIN LLP

Barristers Suite 2600 130 Adelaide Street West Toronto ON M5H 3P5

J. Thomas Curry (25740V)

Tel:

(416) 865-9500

Fax: (416) 865-9010

Paul-Erik Veel (58167D)

Tel:

(416) 865-2842

Fax:

(416) 865-2861

Tel:

(416) 865-9500

Fax:

(416) 865-9010

Lawyers for certain creditors of C.O. Capital Growth Inc.

SERVICE LIST

TO: OGILVY RENAULT LLP

200 Bay Street Suite 3800, Box 84 Royal Bank Plaza, South Tower Toronto, ON M5J 2Z4

Alan Merskey

email: amerskey@ogilvyrenault.com

Evan Cobb

email: ecobb@ogilvyrenault.com

Tel: 416.216.4000 Fax: 416.216.3930

Lawyers for SA Capital Growth Corp.

AND TO: DAVIS & TURK LLP

340-1100 Sheppard Ave West North York, ON M3K 2B4

Stephen Turk

Tel: 416.630.5511 Fax: 416.630.7724 email: sturk@stephenturklaw.com

Lawyers for Pero Asset Inc.

AND TO: BELLMORE & MOORE LLP

1600-393 University Avenue Toronto, ON M5G 1E6

Brian Bellmore Tel: 416.581.1818 Fax: 416.581.1279

email: brian@bellmore.ca

Lawyers for Tasha Fluke

AND TO: J. S. Bradley Inc.

email: jbi@bellnet.ca

AND TO: COHEN SABSAY LLP

500 - 350 Bay Street Toronto, ON M5H 2S6

Lome Sabsay Tel: 416.364.7436 Fax: 416.364.0083

email: sabsay@cohensabsay.com

Lawyers for Heather Shantora

AND TO: DAVIES WARD PHILLIPS & VINEBERG

1 First Canadian Place, Suite 4400 Toronto, ON M5X 1B1

Matthew Gottlieb Tel: 416.863.0900 Fax: 416.863.0871

email: mgottlieb@dwpv.com

Lawyers for RSM Richter Inc.

AND TO: RSM RICHTER INC.

200 King Street West, Suite 1100 Toronto, ON M5H 3T4

Toronto, Orv Mistr 51

Robert Kofman,

email: bkofman@rsmrichter.com

Lana Bezner

email: lbezner@rsmrichter.com

Tel: 416.932.8000 Fax: 416.932.6200

Receiver

AND TO: GOWLING LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP

1 First Canadian Place

Suite 1600

Toronto, ON M5X 1G5

Stephen Johnston Tel: 416.862.5705 Fax: 416.862.7661

email: steve.johnston@gowlings.com

Lawyers for HSBC

AND TO: GOWLING LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP

1 First Canadian Place

Suite 1600

Toronto, ON M5X 1 G5

Boyd Balogh Tel: 416.369.7385 Fax: 416.862.7661

email: boyd.balogh@gowlings.com

Lawyers for Tonin & Co. LLP and Peter Tonin

AND TO: BORDEN LADNER GERVAIS

Scotia Plaza, 40 King Street West

Toronto, ON M5H 3Y4

Roger Jaipargas

email: rjaipargas@blgcanada.com

Douglas Smith

email: dsmith@blgcanada.com

Tel: 416.367.7000 Fax: 416.367.6749

Lawyers for Interactive Brokers

AND TO: HYACINTH SULPH

44 Tyrrel Avenue

Toronto, ON M6G 2G2 Tel: 416.875.1956

email: hyachinthsulph@hotmail.com

AND TO: COLLEEN AND JOHN AURIEMMA

Tel: 416.465.5747

email: jauriemma@rogers.com

AND TO: WARDLE DALEY BERNSTEIN LLP

401 Bay Street, Suite 2104

P.O. Box 21

Toronto, ON M5H 2Y4

Peter Wardle

email: pwardle@wdblaw.ca

Simon Bieber

email: sbieber@wdblaw.ca

Tel: 416.351.2770 Fax: 416.351.9196

Lawyers for Michael Miller and Julia Dublin

AND TO:

LERNERS LLP

130 Adelaide Street West Suite 2400 Toronto, ON M5H 3P5

Lucas Lung

email: <u>llung@lerners.ca</u>

William Pepall

email: wpepall@lerners.ca

Tel: 416.867.3076 Fax: 416.867.9192

Lawyers for Peter Welsh

AND TO:

CLIENT INTERFACE AND SERVICE DIVISION

Canada Revenue Agency Charities Division

320 Queen Street

Place de Ville, Tower A Ottawa, ON K1A OL5

Carl Juneau

Tel: 613.946.8967

email: carl.juneau@cra-arc.gc.ca

Director, Canada Revenue Agency, Charities Division

AND TO:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO AS REPRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

33 King Street West, 6th Floor

PO Box 620

Oshawa, ON L1H 8E9

Kevin J. O'Hara

e-mail: kevin.ohara@ontario.ca

AND TO:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ONTARIO REGIONAL OFFICE

PO Box 36, Exchange Tower 3400-130 King Street West Toronto, ON M5X 1K6

Diane Winters Tel: 416.973.3172 Fax: 416.973.0810

Email: diane.winters@justice.gc.ca

AND TO: O'CONNOR MACLEOD HANNA LLP

700 Kerr Street

Oakville, ON L6K 3W5

Megan Brown

Tel: 905.842.8030 Fax: 905.842.2460

email: mbrown@omh.ca

AND TO: ONTARIO SECURITIES COMMISSION

20 Queen Street West 19th Floor, Box 55 Toronto, ON M5H 3S8

Sean Horgan

Email: shorgan@osc.gov.on.ca

Pamela Foy

email: pfoy@osc.gov.on.ca

Tel: 416.593.2306 Fax: 416.593.2319 – 6

AND TO: CHRISTINE BROOKS

114 Laurendale Avenue Waterdown, ON LOR 2H3

email: cbrooks13@cogeco.ca

AND TO: AMANDA LOMBARDI

15570 Weston Road Kettleby, ON LOG 1JO

AND TO: CHAITONS LLP

5000 Yonge Street 10th Floor North York, ON M2N 7E9

Harvey Chaiton

email: harvey@chaitons.com

Tel: 416.222.8888 Fax: 416.222.8402

Claims Officer

AND TO: SIMPSON WIGLE LAW LLP

#501 - 390 Brant Street Burlington, ON L7R 4J4

Rosemary Fisher

email: fisherr@simpsonwigle.com

Tel: 905.639.1052 Fax: 905.333.3960

Lawyers for the BOO Dunwoody

AND TO: DEVRY SMITH FRANK LLP

95 Barber Greene Road Suite 100

Toronto, ON M3C 3E9

Mark Korn

email: mark.com@devrylaw.ca

Tel: 416-449-1400 Fax: 416-449-7071

Lawyers for RBC

AND TO: PETER AND MANDY SBARAGLIA

drmandy41@yahoo.com

Tel: 905.617.4543

ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

(Commercial List)

IN THE MATTER OF THE SECURITIES ACT R.S.O. 1990, C. s. 5, AS AMENDED

BETWEEN:

ONTARIO SECURITIES COMMISSION

Applicant

and

PETER SBARAGLIA, MANDY SBARABLIA, CO CAPITAL GROWTH INC. AND 91 DAYS HYGIENE SERVICES INC.

Respondents

APPLICATION UNDER Section 129 of the Securities Act

FACTUM OF CERTAIN CREDITORS OF C.O. CAPITAL GROWTH INC.

(in respect of the Receiver's motion returnable September 7, 2011)

PART I - INTRODUCTION

1. This is a motion by RSM Richter Inc. (the "Receiver"), receiver over the assets of Peter Sbaraglia, Mandy Sbaraglia, C.O. Capital Growth Inc., and 91 Days Hygiene Services Inc. (collectively the "CO Group"), for an Order transferring the remaining funds realized in the receivership over the CO Group to the estate of Robert Mander, E.M.B. Asset Group Inc. and related entities (collectively, the "Mander Debtors") for certain fees paid by the estate of the Mander Debtors.

2

2. The grounds for the motion are that funds from the estate of the Mander Debtors were

used to pay certain of the Receiver's fees in connection with the investigation of the CO Group.

Certain creditors of CO Capital oppose such a transfer of funds.

3. The investigation of the CO Group by the Receiver was undertaken for the benefit of

creditors of the Mander Estate and in connection with the receivership over the assets of the

Mander estate. Moreover, the transfer of funds would completely deplete the funds remaining

within the receivership of the CO Group and thereby deny the creditors of the CO Group any

recovery whatsoever.

4. For these reasons, the Receiver's motion to transfer the funds should not be granted.

PART II - SUMMARY OF FACTS

5. The Receiver was appointed as Receiver over the assets of the Mander Debtors on March

17, 2010. From March 17, 2010 until December 23, 2010, the Receiver acted solely as the

Receiver over the assets of the Mander Debtors.

Reference:

Receiver's Twelfth Report dated August 17, 2011, p. 1

The Fresh as Amended Receivership Order, Appendix A to the Receiver's

Twelfth Report dated August 17, 2011

6. In its Fourth Report dated July 2, 2010, filed in the Mander proceedings, the Receiver

advised the Court that issues identified during its investigation of the Mander Debtors suggested

that an investigation should be undertaken of the CO Group. This investigation was authorized

by an Order of the Honourable Justice Morawetz dated July 14, 2010.

Reference:

Receiver's Twelfth Report dated August 17, 2011, p. 4

The July 14, 2011 Order Authorizing and Directing the Receiver to Commence an Investigation into the Affairs of the CO Capital Debtors, Appendix B to the

Receiver's Twelfth Report dated August 17, 2011

7. The investigation into the affairs of the CO Group was begun on the basis of the Receiver's Fourth Report dated July 2, 2010, which suggested that the affairs of the Mander Debtors and the CO Group were intertwined and that CO Group had received a significant quantum of funds from the Mander Estate. The Fourth Report indicated that the Receiver wished to explore whether any proceedings should be taken against the CO Group.

Reference: Receiver's Fourth Report dated July 2, 2010, pp. 19-28

- 8. On or around September 8, 2010, the Ontario Securities Commission (the "OSC") brought an application pursuant to section 129 of the *Securities Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5, to have the Receiver appointed as receiver of the assets of the CO Group.
- 9. This Application was opposed by the CO Group. Certain creditors of CO Capital also made submissions at the hearing of the Application opposing the appointment of the Receiver over the CO Group.
- 10. On December 23, 2010, the Honourable Justice Morawetz granted the Order appointing the Receiver as Receiver over the assets of the CO Group.

Reference: Justice Morawetz's Reasons for Judgment, Appendix E to the Receiver's Twelfth Report dated August 17, 2011

11. According to the Receiver's Twelfth Report dated August 17, 2011, the Receiver and its counsel spent approximately \$386,000 and \$310,000, respectively, related to the investigation of the CO Capital in the period between July 14, 2010 and December 23, 2010.

Reference: Receiver's Twelfth Report dated August 17, 2011, p. 5

12. According to the Receiver's Twelfth Report, for the period from December 29, 2010, to July 19, 2011, the Receiver over the assets of the CO Group has realized \$1,095,819 in receipts

4

and has paid out \$425,531 in disbursements. As of July 19, 2011, there remained \$670,288 in

the Receiver's bank account relating to the CO Group.

Reference: Receiver's Twelfth Report dated August 17, 2011, p. 5

Schedule of Receipts and Disbursements re: CO Capital Debtors, as at July 19,

2011, Appendix B to the Receiver's Twelfth Report dated August 17, 2011

PART III - STATEMENT OF ISSUES, LAW & AUTHORITIES

13. Certain Creditors of CO Capital oppose the Receiver's motion insofar as the Receiver

seeks a motion transferring the remaining funds of the CO Group to the estate of the Mander

Debtors.

14. The Creditors oppose this motion for two reasons:

(a) The Receiver's investigation of CO Capital was authorized and conducted

incident to the receivership over the assets of the Mander Debtors and for the

benefit of estate of the Mander Debtors and its creditors. The estate of the

Mander Debtors should therefore bear the costs; and

(b) The transfer of funds would deny the creditors of CO Capital any recovery

whatsoever. This would be unjust and unfair to the Creditors of CO Capital.

The Actions of the Receiver Were for the Benefit of the Creditors of the Mander Estate

15. The investigations of the Receiver into the affairs of the CO Group were made for the

benefit of the creditors of the Mander Debtors. Consequently, the costs of such investigation are

appropriately paid from the estate of the Mander Debtors rather than the remaining funds of the

CO Group.

16. The ordinary rule for the payment of a receiver's fees is that the receiver's fees are to be

paid from the proceeds realized from the property of the debtor over which the receiver is

appointed.

17. In the present case, the Receiver seeks to transfer funds from the CO Group to the

Mander Estate in respect of fees incurred by the Receiver when it acted as receiver over the

assets of the Mander Estate.

18. The investigation begun by the Receiver into the affairs of the CO Group was authorized

by an Order of the Honourable Justice Morawetz dated July 14, 2010.

Reference: Receiver's Twel

Receiver's Twelfth Report dated August 17, 2011, p. 4

The July 14, 2011 Order Authorizing and Directing the Receiver to Commence an Investigation into the Affairs of the CO Capital Debtors, Appendix B to the

Receiver's Twelfth Report dated August 17, 2011

19. This Order was obtained largely on the basis of the Receiver's Fourth Report dated July

2, 2010, in the Mander Proceedings, which suggested that there were issues which warranted an

investigation of the CO Group. In particular, the Receiver's Fourth Report suggested that CO

Capital had received net proceeds of approximately \$3 million from the Mander Debtors.

Reference:

Receiver's Fourth Report dated July 2, 2010, p. 12

20. Moreover, in its concluding paragraph on the CO Group, the Receiver's Fourth Report

noted as follows:

Given the testimony of Peter Sbaraglia and Mander at the OSC examination, potentially deleted correspondence, the relationship between CO Capital and Mander and the significant amounts paid to CO Capital – amounts apparently sufficient to repay all principal loaned by CO Capital to EMB/Mander – the Receiver believes it is appropriate for it to investigate the business and affairs of CO Capital to determine whether any relief should be sought against CO Capital, including the scope of that relief. [emphasis added]

Reference:

Receiver's Fourth Report dated July 2, 2010, p. 28

6

21. The investigation of the CO Group was therefore commenced for the benefit of the

creditors of the Mander Debtors and as a corollary of the receivership over the estate of the

Mander Debtors.

Reference:

Receiver's Fourth Report dated July 2, 2010, p. 28

22. Indeed, as Receiver solely over the assets of the Mander Debtors at that time, the

Receiver's mandate would have been to investigate and take steps for the benefit of creditors of

the Mander Group. At that time, the Receiver would not have owed any duties towards creditors

of CO Group, but rather towards the estate of the Mander Debtors and its creditors.

Reference:

Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp. (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1 (C.A.)

23. Because the Receiver was acting for the benefit of the Mander Estate in investigating the

CO Group, the ordinary rule should apply that the Receiver's costs should be paid out of the

assets of the Mander Debtors. Consequently, funds should not be transferred from the CO Group

to the estate of the Mander Debtors.

24. Moreover, the Receiver was already investigating the affairs of the Mander Debtors.

Because the affairs of the Mander Debtors and the CO Group were "interwined", the Receiver

would already, of necessity, have needed to investigate transactions between the CO Group and

the Mander Estate. Such work would have had to have been done in the ordinary course of the

receivership over the Mander Estate, regardless of the fact that an Application was ultimately

made to extend the Receivership to the assets of the CO Group. Consequently, such costs were

incurred in the ordinary course of the receivership over the assets of the Mander Estate and

should therefore be paid from the estate of the Mander Debtors.

Reference:

Receiver's Fourth Report dated July 2, 2010, p. 19

The Transfer of Funds Would be Inequitable to the Creditors of CO Capital

- 25. The transfer of funds from the CO Group to the estate of the Mander Debtors would be inequitable to the creditors of CO Capital, as it would leave the creditors of CO Capital with absolutely no funds whatsoever. This would be an unjust result, as it would deny similarly situated creditors, who have been the victims in the same manner as have the creditors of the Mander Debtors, any recovery whatsoever in respect of their losses.
- 26. The Receiver indicates in its Twelfth Report that the CO Capital Debtors opposed the Application to appoint the Receiver over the CO Group for a substantial period of time, thereby increasing the costs of the proceedings.

Reference: Receiver's Twelfth Report dated August 17, 2011, p. 6

- 27. It is undoubtedly true that the Receiver had to incur additional costs, including additional legal costs, as a result of the opposition of the CO Capital Debtors to the OSC's application.
- 28. However, while it may be true that certain actions of the CO Capital Debtors resulted in additional costs for the Receiver, an Order transferring funds from the CO Group to the estate of the Mander Debtors would not impact the CO Capital Debtors themselves, but rather would deny any recovery whatsoever to the creditors of CO Capital. In other words, the transfer of funds from the CO Group to the estate of the Mander Debtors would, in effect, penalize the creditors of the CO Group for decisions made by members of the CO Group. It would be unjust to require the creditors of the CO Group to effectively bear any increased costs as a result of the CO Group's opposition to the receivership application.
- 29. Certain creditors of CO Capital also opposed the appointment of the Receiver. Indeed, they did so in part on the basis that a receivership over the assets of the CO Group would be expensive and could consume most, if not all, of the funds remaining within the CO Group.

However, the opposition of certain Creditors of CO Capital to the appointment of the Receiver over the CO Group was limited to merely making legal submissions at the hearing of the Application and was made in the context of the CO Group itself having launched a much larger

opposition to the Application.

30. Consequently, the mere fact that the CO Creditors made limited submissions in opposition to the Receivership the application to appoint the Receiver over the CO Group should not disentitle them from any recovery whatsoever. As indicated in the Receiver's Twelfth Report, the expenses incurred by the Receiver were incurred as a result of the opposition of the CO Group, and it is unfair to, in effect, penalize the Creditors of CO Capital for these costs being

PART IV – ORDER REQUESTED

31. Certain creditors of the CO Group request that the Receiver's motion for an Order transferring funds from the CO Group to the estate of the Mander Debtors be dismissed.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 1st day of September, 2011.

Paul-Erik Veel

September 1, 2011

incurred.

LENCZNER SLAGHT ROYCE SMITH GRIFFIN LLP

Barristers Suite 2600 130 Adelaide Street West Toronto ON M5H 3P5

J. Thomas Curry (25740V)

Tel: (416) 865-9500 Fax: (416) 865-9010 Paul-Erik Veel (58167D)

Tel: (416) 865-2842 Fax: (416) 865-2861

Lawyers for certain creditors of C.O. Capital

SCHEDULE A

CASES

1. Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp. (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1 (C.A.)

ONTARIO SECURITIES COMMISSION

-and-

PETER SBARAGLIA, MANDY SBARABLIA, CO CAPITAL GROWTH INC. AND 91 DAYS HYGIENE SERVICES INC.

Applicant

Respondents

Court File No. CV-10-8883-OOCL

ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT TORONTO

FACTUM OF CERTAIN CREDITORS OF C.O. CAPITAL GROWTH INC.

LENCZNER SLAGHT ROYCE SMITH GRIFFIN LLP

Barristers

Suite 2600

130 Adelaide Street West

Toronto ON M5H 3P5

J. Thomas Curry (25740V)

Tel: (416) 865-9500 Fax: (416) 865-9010

Paul-Erik Veel (58167D)

Tel: (416) 865-2842 Fax: (416) 865-2861 Tel: (416) 865-9500

Fax: (416) 865-9010

Lawyers for certain creditors of C.O. Capital