

**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 LABRADOR IRON MINES HOLDINGS LIMITED, LABRADOR IRON MINES  
LIMITED and SCHEFFERVILLE MINES INC. (the "Applicants")**

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF APPLICANTS  
(Claims Procedure Motion, Returnable April 18, 2016)**

April 8, 2016

**Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP**  
155 Wellington Street West  
35th Floor  
Toronto ON M5V 3H1  
Tel: 416.646.4300  
Fax: 416.646.4301

**Kenneth T. Rosenberg (LSUC #21102H)**  
Email: ken.rosenberg@paliareroland.com

**Massimo Starnino (LSUC #41048G)**  
Email: max.starnino@paliareroland.com

**Lindsay Scott (LSUC #60275G)**  
Email: lindsay.scott@paliareroland.com

Lawyers for the Applicants

TO: THE SERVICE LIST

# INDEX

## INDEX

1. *ScoZinc Ltd. (Re)*, 2009 NSSC 136
2. *Timminco Limited (Re)*, 2014 ONSC 3393

**TAB 1**

**SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA**  
**Citation: ScoZinc Ltd. (Re), 2009 NSSC 136**

**Date:** 20090403  
**Docket:** Hfx No.305549  
**Registry:** Halifax

**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 ScoZinc  
Ltd.

Applicant

**Judge:**                    The Honourable Justice Duncan R. Beveridge

**Heard:**                    April 3, 2009 in Halifax, Nova Scotia

**Written Reasons of  
Oral Decision:**        April 28, 2009

**Counsel:**                John G. Stringer, Q.C., and Mr. Ben R. Durnford, for the  
applicant  
Robert MacKeigan, Q.C., for Grant Thornton

**By the Court:**

[1] On December 22, 2008 ScoZinc Ltd. was granted protection by way of a stay of proceedings of all claims against it pursuant to s.11 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36. The stay has been extended from time to time. Grant Thornton was appointed as the Monitor of the business and financial affairs of ScoZinc pursuant to s.11.7 of the *CCAA*.

[2] The determination of creditors' claims was set by a Claims Procedure Order. This order set dates for the submission of claims to the Monitor, and for the Monitor to assess the claims. The Monitor brought a motion seeking directions from the court on whether it has the necessary authority to allow a revision of a claim after the claim's bar date but before the date set for the Monitor to complete its assessment of claims.

[3] The motion was heard on April 3, 2009. At the conclusion of the hearing of the motion I concluded that the Monitor did have the necessary authority. I granted the requested order with reasons to follow. These are my reasons.

**BACKGROUND**

[4] The procedure for the identification and quantification of claims was established pursuant to my order of February 18, 2009. Any persons asserting a claim was to deliver to the Monitor a Proof of Claim by 5:00 p.m. on March 16, 2009, including a statement of account setting out the full details of the claim. Any claimant that did not deliver a Proof of Claim by the claims bar date, subject to the Monitor's agreement or as the court may otherwise order, would have its claim forever extinguished and barred from making any claim against ScoZinc.

[5] The Monitor was directed to review all Proofs of Claim filed on or before March 16, 2009 and to accept, revise or disallow the claims. Any revision or disallowance was to be communicated by Notice of Revision or Disallowance, no later than March 27, 2009. If a creditor disagreed with the assessment of the Monitor, it could dispute the assessment before a Claims Officer and ultimately to a judge of the Supreme Court.

[6] The three claims that have triggered the Monitor's motion for directions were submitted by Acadian Mining Corporation, Royal Roads Corp., and Komatsu International (Canada) Inc.

[7] ScoZinc is 100% owned by Acadian Mining Corp. These two corporations share office space, managerial staff, and have common officers and directors. Acadian Mining is a substantial shareholder in Royal Roads and also have some common officers and directors.

[8] Originally Royal Roads asserted a claim as a secured creditor on the basis of a first charge security held by it on ScoZinc's assets for a loan in the amount of approximately \$2.3 million. Acadian Mining also claimed to be a secured creditor due to a second charge on ScoZinc's assets securing approximately \$23.5 million of debt. Both Royal Roads and Acadian Mining have released their security. Each company submitted Proofs of Claim dated March 4, 2009 as unsecured creditors.

[9] Royal Roads claim was for \$579,964.62. The claim by Acadian Mining was for \$23,761,270.20. John Rawding, Financial Officer for Acadian Mining and ScoZinc, prepared the Proofs of Claim for both Royal Roads and Acadian Mining. It appears from the affidavit and materials submitted, and the Monitor's fifth report dated March 31, 2009 that there were errors in each of the Proofs of Claim.

[10] Mr. Rawding incorrectly attributed \$1,720,035.38 as debt by Acadian Mining to Royal Roads when it should have been debt owed by ScoZinc to Royal Roads. In addition, during year end audit procedures for Royal Roads, Acadian Mining and ScoZinc, other erroneous entries were discovered. The total claim that should have been advanced by Royal Roads was \$2,772,734.19.

[11] The appropriate claim that should have been submitted by Acadian Mining was \$22,041,234.82, a reduction of \$1,720,035.38. Both Royal Roads and Acadian Mining submitted revised Proofs of Claim on March 25, 2009 with supporting documentation.

[12] The third claim is by Komatsu. Its initial Proof of Claim was dated March 16, 2009 for both secured and unsecured claims of \$4,245,663.78. The initial claim did not include a secured claim for the equipment that had been returned to Komatsu, nor include a claim for equipment that was still being used by ScoZinc. A revised Proof of Claim was filed by Komatsu on March 26, 2009.

[13] The Monitor, sets out in its fifth report dated March 31, 2009, that after reviewing the relevant books and records, the errors in the Proofs of Claim by Royal Roads, Acadian Mining and Komatsu were due to inadvertence. For all of these claims it issued a Notice of Revision or Disallowance on March 27, 2009, allowing the claims as revised “if it is determined by the court that the Monitor has the power to do so”.

[14] The request for directions and the circumstances pose the following issue:

#### ISSUE

[15] Does the Monitor have the authority to allow the revision of a claim by increasing it based on evidence submitted by a claimant within the time period set for the monitor to carry out its assessment of claims?

#### ANALYSIS

[16] The jurisdiction of the Monitor stems from the jurisdiction of the court granted to it by the *CCAA*. Whenever an order is made under s.11 of the *CCAA* the court is required to appoint a monitor. Section 11.7 of the *CCAA* provides:

11.7 (1) When an order is made in respect of a company by the court under section 11, the court shall at the same time appoint a person, in this section and in section 11.8 referred to as "the monitor", to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company while the order remains in effect.

(2) Except as may be otherwise directed by the court, the auditor of the company may be appointed as the monitor.

(3) The monitor shall

(a) for the purposes of monitoring the company's business and financial affairs, have access to and examine 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 necessary to adequately assess the company's business and financial affairs;



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

(i) forthwith after ascertaining any material adverse change in the company's projected cash-flow or financial circumstances,

(ii) at least seven days before any meeting of creditors under section 4 or 5, or

(iii) at such other times as the court may order;

(c) advise the creditors of the filing of the report referred to in paragraph (b) in any notice of a meeting of creditors referred to in section 4 or 5; and

(d) carry out such other functions in relation to the company as the court may direct.

...

[17] It appears that the purpose of the *CCAA* is to grant to an insolvent company protection from its creditors in order to permit it a reasonable opportunity to restructure its affairs in order to reach a compromise or arrangement between the company and its creditors. The court has the power to order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors for them to consider a compromise or arrangement proposed by the debtor company ( s. 4, 5 ). Where a majority of the creditors representing two thirds value of the creditors or class of creditors agree to a compromise or arrangement, the court may sanction it and thereafter such compromise or arrangement is binding on all creditors, or class of creditors (s. 6).

[18] Section 12 of the *Act* defines a claim to mean “any indebtedness, liability or obligation of any kind that, if unsecured, would be a debt provable in bankruptcy within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.” However, as noted by McElcheran in *Commercial Insolvency in Canada* (LexisNexis Canada Inc., Markham, Ontario, 2005 at p. 279-80) the *CCAA* does not set out a process for identification or determination of claims; instead, the Court creates a claims process by court order.

[19] The only guidance provided by the *CCAA* is that in the event of a disagreement the amount of a claim shall be determined by the court on summary application by the company or by the creditor. Section 12(2) of the *Act* provides:

Determination of amount of claim

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

(a) the amount of an unsecured claim shall be 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 shall be determined by the court on summary application by the company or by the creditor; and

(b) the amount of a secured claim shall be the amount, proof of which might be made in respect thereof under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act if the claim were unsecured, but the amount if not admitted by the company shall, in the case of a company subject to pending proceedings under the Winding-up and Restructuring Act or the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, be established by proof in the same manner as an unsecured claim 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 shall be determined by the court on summary application by the company or the creditor.

[20] The only parties who appeared on this motion were the Monitor, ScoZinc and Komatsu. No specific submissions were requested nor made by the parties with respect to the nature of the court's jurisdiction to determine the mechanism and time lines to classify and quantify claims against the debtor company.

[21] Under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* the Trustee is the designated gatekeeper who first determines whether a Proof of Claim submitted by a creditor is valid. The trustee may admit the claim or disallow it in whole or in part (s.135(2) *BIA*). A creditor who is dissatisfied with a decision by the trustee may appeal to a judge of the Bankruptcy Court.

[22] In contrast, the *CCAA* does not set out the procedure beyond the language in s.12. The language only accomplishes two things. The first is that the debtor company can agree on the amount of a secured or unsecured claim; and secondly, if there is a disagreement, then on application of either the company or the creditor, the amount shall be determined by the court on “summary application”.

[23] The practice has arisen for the court to create by order a claims process that is both flexible and expeditious. The Monitor identifies, by review of the debtor’s records, all potential claimants and sends to them a claim package. To ensure that all creditors come forward and participate on a timely basis, there is a provision in the claims process order requiring creditors to file their claims by a fixed date. If they do not, subject to further relief provided by the claims process order, or by the court, the creditor’s claim is barred.

[24] If the Monitor disagrees with the claim, and the disagreement cannot be resolved, then a claimant can present its case to a claims officer who is usually given the power to adjudicate disputed claims, with the right of appeal to a judge of the court overseeing the *CCAA* proceedings.

[25] The establishment of a claims process utilizing the monitor and or a claims officer by court order appears to be a well accepted practice ( See for example *Federal Gypsum Co., (Re)* 2007 NSSC 384; *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Re)* ( 1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. S.C.J.); *Air Canada, (Re)* ( 2004) 2 C.B.R. (5<sup>th</sup>) 23 ( Ont.S.C.J.); *Triton Tubular Components v. Steelcase Inc.*, [2005] O.J. No. 3926 (Ont.S.C.J.); *Muscletech Research & Development Inc., ( Re)*, [2006] O.J. No. 4087 (Ont.S.C.J.); *Pine Valley Mining Corp., (Re)* 2008 BCSC 356; *Blue Range Resource Corp., Re* 2000 ABCA 285; *Carlen Transport Inc. v. Juniper Lumber Co. ( Monitor of)* (2001), 21 C.B.R. (4<sup>th</sup>) 222 ( N.B.Q.B.).)

[26] I could find no reported case that doubt the authority of the court to create a claims process. Kenneth Kraft in his article “The *CCAA* and the Claims Bar Process”, (2000), 13 Commercial Insolvency Reporter 6, endorsed the utilization

of a claims process on the basis of reliance on the court's inherent jurisdiction, provided the process adhered to the specific mandates of the *CCAA*. In unrelated contexts, caution has been expressed with respect to reliance on the inherent jurisdiction of the superior court as the basis for dealing with the myriad issues that can arise under the *CCAA* (See: *Clear Creek Contracting v. Skeena Cellulous Inc.*, (2003), 43 C.B.R (4<sup>th</sup>) 187 (B.C.C.A.) and *Stelco Inc.(Re)*, [2005] O.J. No. 1171 (CA.)).

[27] Sir J.H. Jacob, Q.C. in his seminal article "The Inherent Jurisdiction of the Court", (1970) Current Legal Problems 23, concluded that it has been clear law from the earliest times that superior courts of justice, as part of their inherent jurisdiction, have the power to control their own proceedings and process. He wrote:

Under its inherent jurisdiction, the court has power to control and regulate its process and proceedings, and it exercises this power in a great variety of circumstances and by many different methods. Some of the instances of the exercise of this power have been of far-reaching importance, others have dealt with matters of detail or have been of transient value. Some have involved the exercise of administrative powers, others of judicial powers. Some have been turned into rules of law, others by long usage or custom may have acquired the force of law, and still others remain mere rules of practice. The exercise of this power has been pervasive throughout the whole legal machinery and has been extended to all stages of proceedings, pre-trial, trial and post-trial. Indeed, it is difficult to set the limits upon the powers of the court in the exercise of its inherent jurisdiction to control and regulate its process, for these limits are coincident with the needs of the court to fulfil its judicial functions in the administration of justice.

p. 32-33

[28] The *CCAA* gives no specific guidance to the court on how to determine the existence, nature, validity or extent of a claim against a debtor company. As noted earlier, the only reference is in s. 12 of the *Act* that if there is a dispute as to the amount of a claim, then the amount shall be determined by the court "on summary application". In *Re Freeman Estate*, [1922] N.S.J. No. 15, [1923] 1 D.L.R. 378 (en banc) the court considered the words "on summary application" as they appeared in the *Probate Act* R.S.N.S. 1900 c.158. Harris C.J. wrote:

[17] The words "summary application" do not mean without notice, but simply imply that the proceedings before the Court are not to be conducted in the ordinary way, but in a concise way.

[18] The Oxford Dictionary p. 140 gives as one of the meanings of "summary" dispensing with needless details or formalities-- done with despatch.

[19] In the case of the *Western &c R. Co. v. Atlanta* (1901), 113 Ga. 537, the meaning of the words "summary proceeding" is discussed at some length and the Court held at pp. 543-544:--

"In a summary manner does not at all mean that they may be abated without notice or hearing, but simply that it may be done without a trial in the ordinary forms prescribed by law for a regular judicial procedure."

[20] I cite this not because it is a binding authority, but because its reasoning commends itself to my judgment and I adopt it.

[29] In my opinion, whatever process may be appropriate and necessary to adjudicate disputed claims that ultimately end up before a judge of the superior court, the determination by the court that claims must initially be identified and assessed by the Monitor, and heard first by a Claims Officer, is a valid exercise of the court's inherent jurisdiction.

[30] The *CCAA* gives to the court the express and implied jurisdiction to do a variety of things. They need not all be enumerated. The court is required to appoint a monitor (s.11.7). Once appointed, the monitor is required to monitor the company's business and financial affairs. The *Act* mandates that the monitor have access to and examine the company's property including all records. The monitor must file a report with the court on the state of the company's business and financial affairs and contain prescribed information. In addition, the monitor shall carry out such other functions in relation to the company as the court may direct (s.11.7(3)(d)).

[31] In these circumstances, it is not only logical, but eminently practical that the monitor, as an officer of the court, be directed by court order to fulfil the analogous role to that of the trustee under the *BIA*. The Claims Procedure Order of February 18, 2009 accomplishes this.

## POWER OF THE MONITOR

[32] The Monitor was required by the Order to publish a notice to claimants in the newspaper regarding the claims procedure. It was also required to send a claims package to known potential claimants identified by the Monitor through its review of the books and records of ScoZinc. The claims bar date was set as March 16, 2009, or such later date as may be ordered by the court.

[33] The duties of the Monitor, once a claim was received by it, were set out in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Claims Procedure Order. They provide as follows:

9. Upon receipt of a Proof of Claim:

- a. The Monitor is hereby authorized and directed to use reasonable discretion as to the adequacy of compliance as to the manner in which Proofs of Claim are completed and executed and may, where it is satisfied that a Claim has been adequately proven, waive strict compliance with the requirements of this Order as to the completion and the execution of a Proof of Claim. A Claim which is accepted by the Monitor shall constitute a Proven Claim;
- b. the Monitor and ScoZinc may attempt to consensually resolve the classification and amount of any Claim with the claimant prior to accepting, revising or disallowing such Claim; and

...

10. The Monitor shall review all Proofs of Claim filed on or before the Claims Bar Date. The Monitor shall accept, revise or disallow such Proofs of Claim as contemplated herein. The Monitor shall send a Notice of Revision or Disallowance and the form of Notice of Dispute to the Claimant as soon as the Claim has been revised or disallowed but in any event no later than 11:59 p.m. (Halifax time) on March 27, 2009 or such later date as the Court may order. Where the Monitor does not send a Notice of Revision or Disallowance by the aforementioned date to a Claimant who has submitted a Proof of Claim, the Monitor shall be deemed to have accepted such Claim.

[34] Any person who wished to dispute a Notice of Revision or Disallowance was required to file a notice to the monitor and to the Claims Officer no later than April 6, 2009. The Claims Officer was designated to be Richard Cregan, Q.C., serving in his personal capacity and not as Registrar in Bankruptcy. Subject to the direction of the court, the Claims Officer was given the power to determine how evidence would be brought before him and any other procedural matters that may arise with respect to the claim. A claimant or the Monitor may appeal the Claims Officer's decision to the court.

[35] The Monitor suggests that the power given to it under paragraph 9(a) and 10 is sufficient to permit it to accept the revised Proofs of Claim filed after the claim's bar date of March 16, 2009, but before its assessment date of March 27, 2009.

[36] Reliance is also placed on the decision of the Alberta Court of Appeal in *Blue Range Resource Corp.* 2000 ABCA 285. As noted by the Monitor, the decision in *Blue Range* did not directly deal with the issue on which the Monitor here seeks directions. In *Blue Range*, the claims procedure established by the court set the claims bar date of June 15, 1999. Claims of creditors not proven in accordance with the procedures set out were deemed to be forever barred. Some creditors filed their Notice of Claim after the claims bar date. The monitor disallowed their claims. There were a second group of creditors who filed their Notice of Claim prior to the applicable claims bar date, but then sought to amend their claims after the claims bar date had passed. The monitor also disallowed these claims as late. What is not clear from the reported decisions is whether this second group of creditors requested amendments of their claims during the time period granted to the Monitor to carry out its assessment.

[37] The chambers judge allowed the late and amended claims to be filed. Enron Capital Corp. and the creditor's committee sought leave to appeal that decision. Leave to appeal was granted on January 14, 2000 with respect to the following question:

What criteria in the circumstances of these cases should the Court use to exercise its discretion in deciding whether to allow late claimants to file claims which, if proven, may be recognized, notwithstanding a previous claims bar order containing a claims bar date which would otherwise bar the claim of the late claimants, and applying the criteria to each case, what is the result?

*Re Blue Range Resources Corp.*, 2000 ABCA 16

[38] Wittmann J.A. delivered the judgment of the court. He noted that all counsel conceded that the court had the authority to allow the late filing of claims and that the appeal was really a matter of what criteria the court should use in exercising that power. Accordingly, a Claims Procedure Order that contains a claims bar date should not purport to forever bar a claim without a saving provision. Wittmann J.A. set out the test for determining when a late claim may be included to be as follows:

[26] Therefore, the appropriate criteria to apply to the late claimants is as follows:

1. Was the delay caused by inadvertence and if so, did the claimant act in good faith?
2. What is the effect of permitting the claim in terms of the existence and impact of any relevant prejudice caused by the delay?
3. If relevant prejudice is found can it be alleviated by attaching appropriate conditions to an order permitting late filing?
4. If relevant prejudice is found which cannot be alleviated, are there any other considerations which may nonetheless warrant an order permitting late filing?

[27] In the context of the criteria, "inadvertent" includes carelessness, negligence, accident, and is unintentional. I will deal with the conduct of each of the respondents in turn below and then turn to a discussion of potential prejudice suffered by the appellants.

2000 ABCA 285

[39] The appellants claimed that they would be prejudiced if the late claims were allowed because if they had known the late claims would be allowed they would have voted differently. This assertion was rejected by the chambers judge. With respect to what is meant by prejudiced, Wittmann J.A. wrote:

40 In a CCAA context, as in a BIA context, the fact that Enron and the other Creditors will receive less money if late and late amended claims are allowed is



not prejudice relevant to this criterion. Re-organization under the CCAA involves compromise. Allowing all legitimate creditors to share in the available proceeds is an integral part of the process. A reduction in that share can not be characterized as prejudice: *Re Cohen* (1956), 36 C.B.R. 21 (Alta. C.A.) at 30-31. Further, I am in agreement with the test for prejudice used by the British Columbia Court of Appeal in 312630 British Columbia Ltd. It is: did the creditor(s) by reason of the late filings lose a realistic opportunity to do anything that they otherwise might have done? Enron and the other creditors were fully informed about the potential for late claims being permitted, and were specifically aware of the existence of the late claimants as creditors. I find, therefore, that Enron and the Creditors will not suffer any relevant prejudice should the late claims be permitted.

[40] In considering how the Monitor should carry out its duties and responsibilities under the Claims Procedure Order it is important to note that the Monitor is an officer of the court and is obliged to ensure that the interests of the stakeholders are considered including all creditors, the company and its shareholders ( See *Laidlaw Inc Re* (2002), 34 C.B.R. (4<sup>th</sup>) 72 (Ont. S.C.J.).

[41] In a different context Turnball J.A. in *Siscoe & Savoie v. Royal Bank* (1994), 29 C.B.R. (3<sup>rd</sup>) 1 commented that the monitor is an agent of the court and as a result is responsible and accountable to the court, owing a fiduciary duty to all of the parties (para. 28).

[42] In my opinion, para. 9(a) is not of assistance in determining the authority of the Monitor to revise upward a claim filed after the claim's bar date but before the assessment date. Paragraph 9(a) authorizes the Monitor to use reasonable discretion as to the adequacy of compliance as to **the manner** to which Proofs of Claim are completed and executed. If it satisfied that the claim has been adequately proven it may waive strict compliance with the requirements of the order as to **completion** and the **execution** of a Proof of Claim.

[43] Paragraph 10 of the Claims Procedure Order mandates the Monitor shall review all Proofs of Claim filed on or before the claims bar date. It shall "accept, revise or disallow such Proofs of Claim as contemplated herein". While normally a monitor's revision would be to reduce a Proof of Claim, there is in fact nothing in the Claims Procedure Order that so restricts the Monitor's authority. It is obviously contemplated by para. 10 that the monitor is to carry out some assessment of the claims that are submitted.

[44] In my view, the Proofs of Claim that are filed act both as a form of pleading and an opportunity for the claimant to provide supporting documents to evidence its claim. In the case before me, the creditors discovered that the claims they had submitted were inaccurate and further evidence was tendered to the Monitor to demonstrate. The Monitor, after reviewing the evidence, accepted the validity of the claims.

[45] Courts in a general way are engaged in dispensing justice. They do so by setting up and applying procedural rules to ensure that litigants are afforded a fair hearing. The resolution of disputes through the litigation process, including the ultimate hearing, is fundamentally a truth-seeking process to determine the facts and to apply the law to those facts. Can it be any different where the process is not in the court but under its supervision pursuant to a claims process under the *CCAA*?

[46] To suggest that the monitor does not have the authority to receive evidence and submissions and to consider them is to say that it does not have any real authority to carry out its court appointed role to assess the claims that have been submitted. The notion that the monitor cannot look at documentary evidence on its own initiative or at the instance of a claimant, and even consider submissions, is to deny it any real power to consider and make a preliminary determination of the merits of a claim.

[47] The Claims Procedure Order contains a number of provisions that anticipate the exchange of information between the Monitor, the company and a creditor. Paragraph 9(b) authorizes the Monitor and ScoZinc to attempt to consensually resolve the classification and the amount of any claim with a claimant prior to accepting, revising or disallowing such claim. Paragraph 17 of the Claims Procedure Order directs that the Monitor shall at all times be authorized to enter into negotiations with claimants and settle any claim on such terms as the Monitor may consider appropriate.

[48] In my opinion, it does not matter that revised claims were submitted after the claims bar date. In essence, the Monitor simply acted to revise the Proofs of Claim already submitted to conform with the evidence elicited by the Monitor, or submitted to it. The Monitor had the necessary authority to revise the claims, either as to classification or amount.

[49] If a claimant seeks to revise or amend its claim after the assessment date set out in the Claims Procedure Order, different considerations may come into play. The appropriate procedure will depend on the provisions of the Claims Procedure Order. In addition, the court, as the ultimate arbiter of disputed claims under s. 12 of the *CCAA*, should always be viewed as having the jurisdiction to permit appropriate revision of claims.

---

Beveridge, J.



**TAB 2**

**CITATION:** Timminco Limited (Re), 2014 ONSC 3393  
**COURT FILE NO.:** CV-12-9539-00CL  
**DATE:** 2014-07-07

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO**

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR  
ARRANGEMENT OF TIMMINCO LIMITED AND BÉCANCOUR SILICON  
INC.

**BEFORE:** Regional Senior Justice Morawetz

**COUNSEL:** *Jane Dietrich* and *Kate Stigler*, for the Board of Directors, except John Walsh

*Kenneth D. Kraft*, for Chubb Insurance Company of Canada

*James C. Orr*, for St. Clair Pennyfeather, Plaintiff in the Class Action

*Maria Konyukhova*, for Timminco Entities

*Robert Staley*, for John Walsh

*Linc Rogers*, for the Monitor

**HEARD:** July 22, 2013

**SUPPLEMENTARY WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED MARCH 2014**

**ENDORSEMENT**

**Introduction**

[1] On May 14, 2009, Kim Orr Barristers PC, counsel to the representative plaintiff Mr. St. Clair Pennyfeather (“Plaintiff’s Counsel”), initiated the proposed class action (the “Class Action”), which names as defendants Timminco Limited (“Timminco”), a third party, Photon Consulting LLC, and certain of the directors and officers of Timminco, (the “Directors”).

[2] The Class Action focusses on alleged public misrepresentations that Timminco possessed a proprietary metallurgical process that provided a significant cost advantage in manufacturing solar grade silicon for use in manufacturing solar cells.

[3] Mr. Pennyfeather alleges that the representations were first made in March 2008, after which the shares of Timminco gained rapidly in value to more than \$18 per share by June 5,

2008. Subsequently, Mr. Pennyfeather alleges that as Timminco began to acknowledge problems with the alleged proprietary process, the share price fell to the point where the equity was described as “penny stock” prior to its delisting in January 2012.

[4] In the initial order, granted January 3, 2012 in the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act.*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the “CCAA”) proceedings, Timminco sought and obtained stays of all proceedings including the Class Action as against Timminco and the Directors (the “Initial Order”).

[5] Timminco also obtained a Claims Procedure Order on June 15, 2012 (the “CPO”). Among other things, the CPO established a claims-bar date of July 23, 2012 for claims against the Directors. Mr. Pennyfeather did not file a proof of claim by this date.

[6] No CCAA plan has been put forward by Timminco and there is no intention to advance a CCAA plan.

[7] Mr. Pennyfeather moves to lift the stay to allow the Class Action to be dealt with on the merits against all named defendants and, if necessary, for an order amending the CPO to exclude the Class Action from the CPO or to allow the filing of a proof of claim relating to those claims.

[8] The Class Action seeks to access insurance moneys and potentially the assets of Directors.

[9] The respondents on this motion, (the Directors named in the Class Action), contend that the failure to file a claim under the CPO bars any claim against officers and directors or insurance proceeds.

[10] Neither Timminco nor the Monitor take any position on this motion.

[11] For the reasons that follow, the motion of Mr. Pennyfeather is granted and the stay is lifted so as to permit Mr. Pennyfeather to proceed with the Class Action.

### The Stay and CPO

[12] The Initial Order contains the relevant stay provision (as extended in subsequent orders):

24. This Court Orders that during the Stay Period... no Proceeding may be commenced or continued against any former, current or future directors or officers of the Timminco Entities with respect to any claim against the directors or officers that arose before the date hereof and that relates to any obligations of the Timminco Entities whereby the directors or officers are alleged under any law to be liable in their capacities as directors or officers for the payment or performance of such obligations, **until a compromise or arrangement in respect of the Timminco Entities, if one is filed, is sanctioned by this court or is refused by the creditors of the Timminco Entities or this Court.**

[emphasis added]

[13] In May and June 2012, The Court approved sales transactions comprising substantially all of the Timminco Entities' assets. In their June 7, 2012 Motion, the Timminco Entities sought an extension of the Stay Period to "give the Timminco Entities sufficient time to, among other things, close the transactions relating to the Successful Bid and carry out the Claims Procedure". The Timminco Entities sought court approval of a proposed claims procedure to "identify claims which may be entitled to distributions of potential proceeds of the ... transactions..." The Timminco entities took the position that the Claims Procedure was "a fair and reasonable method of determining the potential distribution rights of creditors of the Timminco Entities".

[14] The mechanics of the CPO are as follows. Paragraph 2(h) of the CPO defines the Claims Bar Date as 5:00 p.m. on July 23, 2012. "D&O Claims" are defined in para. 2(f)(iii):

Any existing or future right or claim of any person against one or more of the directors and/or officers of the Timminco Entity which arose or arises as a result of such directors or officers position, supervision, management or involvement as a director or officer of a Timminco Entity, whether such right, or the circumstances giving rise to it arose before or after the Initial Order up to and including this Claims Procedure whether enforceable in any civil, administrative, or criminal proceeding (each a "D&O Claim") (and collectively the "D&O Claims"), including any right:

- a. relating to any of the categories of obligations described in paragraph 9 of the Initial Order, whether accrued or falling due before or after the Initial Order, in respect of which a director or officer may be liable in his or her capacity as such;
- b. in respect of which a director or officer may be liable in his or her capacity as such concerning employee entitlements to wages or other debts for services rendered to the Timminco Entities or any one of them or for vacation pay, pension contributions, benefits or other amounts related to employment or pension plan rights or benefits or for taxes owing by the Timminco Entities or amounts which were required by law to be withheld by the Timminco Entities;
- c. in respect of which a director or officer may be liable in his or her capacity as such as a result of any act, omission or breach of duty; or
- d. that is or is related to a penalty, fine or claim for damages or costs.

Provided however that in any case "Claim" shall not include an Excluded Claim.

[15] The CPO appears to bar a person who fails to file a D&O Claim by the Claims Bar Date from asserting or enforcing the claim:

19. This Court orders that any Person who does not file a proof of a D&O Claim in accordance with this order by the claims-bar date **or such other later date as may be**



ordered by the Court, shall be forever barred from asserting or enforcing such D&O Claim against the directors and officers and the directors and officers shall not have any liability whatsoever in respect of such D&O Claim and such D&O Claim shall be extinguished without any further act or notification. [emphasis added]

### Mr. Pennyfeather's Position

[16] Mr. Pennyfeather advances a number of arguments. Most significantly, he argues that it is not fair and reasonable to allow the defendants to bar and extinguish the Class Actions claims through the use of an interim and procedural court order. He submits that the respondents attempt to use the CCAA in a tactical and technical fashion to achieve a result unrelated to any legitimate aspect of either a restructuring or orderly liquidation. The operation of the fair and reasonable standard under the CCAA calls for the exercise of the Court's discretion to lift the stay and, if necessary, amend the CPO to either exclude the Class Action claims or permit submissions of a class proof of claim.

[17] In support of this argument, Mr. Pennyfeather adds that there is no evidence that any of the Directors who are defendants in the class action contributed anything to the CCAA process, and that the targeted insurance proceeds are not available to other creditors. Thus, he submits, a bar against pursuing these funds benefits only the insurance companies who are not stakeholders in the restructuring or liquidation.

[18] Mr. Pennyfeather advances a number of additional arguments. Because I am persuaded by this first submission, it is not necessary to discuss the additional arguments in great detail. However, I will give a brief summary of these additional arguments below.

[19] First, Mr. Pennyfeather submits, since the stay was ordered, he has attempted to have the stay lifted as it relates to the Class Action.

[20] Second, Mr. Pennyfeather submits that the CPO did not permit the filing of representative claims, unlike, for example, claims processed in *Labourers' Pension Fund of Canada and Eastern Canada v. Sino-Forest Corporation*, 2013 ONSC 1078, 100 C.B.R. (5th) 30. Representative claims are generally not permitted under the CCAA and the solicitors for the representative plaintiff do not act for class members prior to certification (see: *Muscletech Research and Development Inc. (Re)* (2006), 25 C.B.R. (5th) 218 (Ont. S.C.)). Therefore, Mr. Pennyfeather submits that the omission in the order obtained by the Timminco entities, of the type of provision contained in the *Sino-Forest* Claims Order, precluded the action that they now assert should have been taken.

[21] Third, Mr. Pennyfeather responds to the significant argument made by the responding parties that the CPO bars the claim. He submits that the Class Action, which alleges, *inter alia*, misrepresentations and breaches of the *Securities Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. S.5, is unaffected by the CPO. There are several reasons for this. First, the CPO excludes claims that cannot be compromised as a result of the provisions of s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA. Alternatively, even if Mr. Pennyfeather and other class members are not creditors pursuant to section 5.1(2), he submits that Parliament has clearly intended to exclude claims for misrepresentation by directors

regardless of who brought them. In addition, insofar as the Class Action seeks to recover insurance proceeds, the CPO did not, according to Mr. Pennyfeather, affect that claim.

[22] In summary, Mr. Pennyfeather's most significant argument is that the CCAA process should not be used in a tactical manner to achieve a result collateral to the proper purposes of the legislation. The rights of putative class members should be determined on the merits of the Class Action, which are considerable given the evidence. Further, the lifting of the stay is fair and reasonable in all of the circumstances.

### **Directors' Position**

[23] Counsel to directors and officers named in the proposed class action, other than Mr. Walsh (the "Defendant Directors") submit there are three issues to be considered on the motion: (a) should the CPO be amended to grant Mr. Pennyfeather the authority to file a claim on behalf of the class members in the D&O Claims Procedure? (b) if Mr. Pennyfeather is granted the authority to file a claim on behalf of the class members, should the claims-bar date be extended to allow him the opportunity to file a late claim against the Defendant Directors? and (c) if Mr. Pennyfeather is permitted to file a late claim against the Defendant Directors, should the D&O stay be lifted to allow the proposed class action to proceed against the Defendant Directors?

[24] The Defendant Directors take the position that: (a) Mr. Pennyfeather does not have the requisite authority and/or right to file a claim on behalf of the class action members and the CPO and should not be amended to permit such; (b) if Mr. Pennyfeather is granted the authority to file a claim on behalf of the class members, the claims-bar date should not be extended to allow Mr. Pennyfeather to file a late claim; and (c) if Mr. Pennyfeather is permitted to file a late claim, the D&O stay should not be lifted to allow the proposed class action to proceed against the Defendant Directors.

[25] The Defendant Directors counter Mr. Pennyfeather's arguments with a number of points. They take the position that while they were holding office, they assisted with every aspect of the CCAA process, including (i) the sales process through which the Timminco Entities sold substantially all of their assets and obtained recoveries for the benefit of their creditors; and (ii) the establishment of the claims procedure, resigning only after the claims-bar date passed.

[26] The Defendant Directors also submit that Mr. Pennyfeather has been aware of, and participated in, the CCAA proceedings since the weeks following the granting of the Initial Order. They submit that at no time prior to this motion did Mr. Pennyfeather take any position on the claims procedures established to seek the authority to file a claim on behalf of the class members. They submit that, at this point, Mr. Pennyfeather is asking the court to exercise its discretion to (i) amend the CPO to grant him the authority to file a claim on behalf of the class members; (ii) extend the claims-bar date to allow him to file such claim; and (iii) lift the stay of proceedings. They submit that Mr. Pennyfeather asks this discretion be exercised to allow him to pursue a claim against the Defendant Directors which remains uncertified, is in part statute barred, and lacks merit.

[27] Counsel to the Defendant Directors submits that the D&O Claims Procedure was initiated for the purpose of determining, with finality, the claims against the directors and officers. They submit that the D&O Claims Procedure has at no time been contingent on, tied to, or dependent on the filing of a Plan of Arrangement by the Timminco Entities.

[28] Simply put, the Defendant Directors submit that the CPO sets a claims-bar date of July 23, 2012 for claims against Directors and Mr. Pennyfeather did not file any Proof of Claim against the Defendant Directors by the claims-bar date. Accordingly, they submit that the claims against the Defendant Directors contemplated by the Class Action are currently barred and extinguished by the CPO.

[29] The arguments put forward by Mr. Walsh are similar.

[30] Counsel to Mr. Walsh attempts to draw similarities between this case and *Sino-Forest*. Counsel submits this is a case where Mr. Pennyfeather intentionally refused to file a Proof of Claim in support of a securities misrepresentation claim against Timminco and its directors and officers.

[31] They further submit that Mr. Pennyfeather is asking for the Court to exercise its discretion in his favour to lift the stay of proceedings, in order to allow him to pursue a proceeding which has been largely, if not entirely neutered by the Court of Appeal (leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada dismissed). They point out that just like in *Sino-Forest*, to lift the stay would be an exercise in futility where the Court commented that “there is no right to opt out of any CCAA process...by virtue of deciding, on their own volition, not to participate in the CCAA process”, the objectors relinquished their right to file a claim and take steps, in a timely way, to assert their rights to vote in the CCAA proceeding.

[32] Counsel to Mr. Walsh also takes the position that Mr. Pennyfeather’s only argument is a strained effort to avoid the plain language of the CPO in an effort to say that his claim is an “excluded claim” and therefore a Proof of Claim was never required. Even if Mr. Pennyfeather was right, counsel to Mr. Walsh submits that Mr. Pennyfeather still would have been required to file a Proof of Claim, failing which his claim would have been barred. Under the CPO, proofs of such claims were still called for, even if they were not to be adjudicated.

[33] They note that Mr. Pennyfeather was aware of the CCAA proceeding and the Initial Order. As early as January 17, 2012, counsel to Mr. Pennyfeather contacted counsel for Timminco, asking for consent to lift the Stay.

[34] Counsel contends that the “excluded claim” language that Mr. Pennyfeather relies on is not found in the definition of D&O Claim. Under the terms of the CPO, the language is a carve-out from the larger definition of “claim”, not the subset definition of D&O Claim. As a result, counsel submits that proofs of claim are still required for D&O Claims, regardless of whether they are excluded claims. In that way, the universe of D&O Claims would be known, even if excluded claims would ultimately not be part of a plan.

[35] Mr. Walsh also takes the position that Mr. Pennyfeather made an intentional decision not to file a claim. Mr. Walsh emphasizes that Mr. Pennyfeather had full notice of the motion for the CPO and chose not to oppose or appear on the motion. Further, at no time did Mr. Pennyfeather request the Monitor apply to court for directions with respect to the terms of the CPO.

[36] Mr. Walsh submits he is prejudiced by the continuation of the Class Action and he wants to get on with his life but is unable to do so while the claim is extant.

### **Law and Analysis**

[37] For the purposes of this motion, I must decide whether the CPO bars Mr. Pennyfeather from proceeding with the Class Action and whether I should lift the stay of proceedings as it applies to the Class Action. For the reasons that follow, I conclude that the CPO should not serve as a bar to proceeding with the Class Action and that the stay should be lifted.

[38] As I explain below, the application of the claims bar order and lifting the stay are discretionary. This discretion should be exercised in light of the purposes of both claims-bar orders and stays under the CCAA. A claim bar order and a stay under the CCAA are intended to assist the debtor in the restructuring process, which may encompass asset realizations. At this point, Timminco's assets have been sold, distributions made to secured creditors, no CCAA plan has been put forward by Timminco, and there is no intention to advance a CCAA plan. It seems to me that neither the stay, nor the claims bar order continue to serve their functional purposes in these CCAA proceedings by barring the Class Action. In these circumstances, I fail to see why the stay and the claim bar order should be utilized to obstruct the plaintiff from proceeding with its Class Action.

#### *The Purpose of Stay Orders and Claims-Bar Orders*

[39] For the purposes of this motion, it is necessary to consider the objective of the CCAA stay order. The stay of proceedings restrains judicial and extra-judicial conduct that could impair the ability of the debtor company to continue in business and the debtor's ability to focus and concentrate its efforts on negotiating of a compromise or arrangement: *Campeau v. Olympia & York Developments Ltd.* (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 303 (Ont. S.C.).

[40] Sections 2, 12 and 19 of the CCAA provide the definition of a "Claim" for the purposes of the CCAA and also provide guidance as to how claims are to be determined. Section 12 of the CCAA states

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

The use of the word "may" in s. 12 indicates that fixing deadlines, which includes granting a claims bar order, is discretionary. Additionally, as noted above the CPO provided at para. 19 that a D&O Claim could be filed on "such other later date as may be ordered by the Court".

[41] It is also necessary to return to first principles with respect to claims-bar orders. The CCAA is intended to facilitate a compromise or arrangement between a debtor company and its creditors and shareholders. For a debtor company engaged in restructuring under the CCAA, which may include a liquidation of its assets, it is of fundamental importance to determine the quantum of liabilities to which the debtor and, in certain circumstances, third parties are subject. It is this desire for certainty that led to the development of the practice by which debtors apply to court for orders which establish a deadline for filing claims.

[42] Adherence to the claims-bar date becomes even more important when distributions are being made (in this case, to secured creditors), or when a plan is being presented to creditors and a creditors' meeting is called to consider the plan of compromise. These objectives are recognized by s. 12 of the CCAA, in particular the references to "voting" and "distribution".

[43] In such circumstances, stakeholders are entitled to know the implications of their actions. The claims-bar order can assist in this process. By establishing a claims-bar date, the debtor can determine the universe of claims and the potential distribution to creditors, and creditors are in a position to make an informed choice as to the alternatives presented to them. If distributions are being made or a plan is presented to creditors and voted upon, stakeholders should be able to place a degree of reliance in the claims bar process.

[44] Stakeholders in this context can also include directors and officers, as it is not uncommon for debtor applicants to propose a plan under the CCAA that compromises certain claims against directors and officers. In this context, the provisions of s. 5.1 of the CCAA must be respected.

[45] In the case of Timminco, there have been distributions to secured creditors which are not the subject of challenge. The Class Action claim is subordinate in ranking to the claims of the secured creditors and has no impact on the distributions made to secured creditors. Further, there is no CCAA plan. There will be no compromise of claims against directors and officers. I accept that at the outset of the CCAA proceedings there may very well have been an intention on the part of the debtor to formulate a CCAA plan and further, that plan may have contemplated the compromise of certain claims against directors and officers. However, these plans did not come to fruition. What we are left with is to determine the consequence of failing to file a timely claim in these circumstances.

[46] In the circumstances of this case, i.e., in the absence of a plan, the purpose of the claims bar procedure is questionable. Specifically, in this case, should the claims bar procedure be used to determine the Class Action?

[47] In my view, it is not the function of the court on this motion to determine the merits of Mr. Pennyfeather's claim. Rather, it is to determine whether or not the claims-bar order operates as a bar to Mr. Pennyfeather being able to put forth a claim. It does not act as such a bar.

[48] It seems to me that CCAA proceedings should not be used, in these circumstances, as a tool to bar Mr. Pennyfeather from proceeding with the Class Action claim. In the absence of a CCAA proceeding, Mr. Pennyfeather would be in position to move forward with the Class Action in the usual course. On a principled basis, a claims bar order in a CCAA proceeding,

where there will be no CCAA plan, should not be used in such a way as to defeat the claim of Mr. Pennyfeather. The determination of the claim should be made on the merits in the proper forum. In these circumstances, where there is no CCAA plan, the CCAA proceeding is, in my view, not the proper forum.

[49] Similar considerations apply to the Stay Order. With no prospect of a compromise or arrangement, and with the sales process completed, there is no need to maintain the status quo to allow the debtor to focus and concentrate its efforts on negotiating a compromise or arrangement. In this regard, the fact that neither Timminco nor the Monitor take a position on this motion or argue prejudice is instructive.

#### *Applicability of Established Tests*

[50] The lifting of a stay is discretionary. In determining whether to lift the stay, the court should consider whether there are sound reasons for doing so consistent with the objectives of the CCAA, including a consideration of (a) the balance of convenience; (b) the relative prejudice to the parties; and (c) where relevant, the merits of the proposed action: *Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re*, 2011 ONSC 2215, 75 C.B.R. (5th) 156, at para. 27.

[51] Counsel to Mr. Walsh submit that courts have historically considered the following factors in determining whether to exercise their discretion to consider claims after the claims-bar date: (a) was the delay caused by inadvertence and, if so, did the claimant act in good faith? (b) what is the effect of permitting the claim in terms of the existence and impact of any relevant prejudice caused by the delay; (c) if relevant prejudice is found, can it be alleviated by attaching appropriate conditions to an order permitting late filing? and (d) if relevant prejudice is found which cannot be alleviated, are there any other considerations which may nonetheless warrant an order permitting late filing?

[52] These are factors that have been considered by the courts on numerous occasions (see, for example, *Sino-Forest; Re Sammi Atlas Inc.* (1998), 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Gen. Div.), *Blue Range Resource Corp. (Re)*, 2000 ABCA 285, 193 D.L.R. (4<sup>th</sup>) 314, leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused, [2000] SCCA No. 648; *Canadian Red Cross Society (Re)* (2000), 48 C.B.R. (5th) 41 (Ont. S.C.); and *Ivorylane Corp. v. Country Style Realty Ltd.*, [2004] O.J. No. 2662 (S.C.)).

[53] However, it should be noted that all of these cases involved a CCAA Plan that was considered by creditors.

[54] In the present circumstances, it seems to me there is an additional factor to take into account: there is no CCAA Plan.

[55] I have noted above that certain delay can be attributed to the CCAA proceedings and the impact of *Green v. Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce*, 2014 ONCA 90, at the Court of Appeal. That is not a full answer for the delay but a partial explanation.

[56] The prejudice experienced by a director not having a final resolution to the proposed Class Action has to be weighed as against the rights of the class action plaintiff to have this matter heard in court. To the extent that time constitutes a degree of prejudice to the defendants, it can be alleviated by requiring the parties to agree upon a timetable to have this matter addressed on a timely basis with case management.

[57] I have not addressed in great detail whether the CPO requires excluded claims to be filed. In my view, it is not necessary to embark on an analysis of this issue, nor have I embarked on a review of the merits. Rather, the principles of equity and fairness dictate that the class action plaintiff can move forward with the claim. The claim may face many hurdles. Some of these have been outlined in the factum submitted by counsel to Mr. Walsh. However, that does not necessarily mean that the class action plaintiff should be disentitled from proceeding.

[58] In the result, the motion of Mr. Pennyfeather is granted and the stay is lifted so as to permit Mr. Pennyfeather to proceed with the Class Action. The CPO is modified so as to allow Mr. Pennyfeather to file his claim.

---

Morawetz, R.S.J.

**Date:** July 7, 2014



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 LABRADOR IRON MINES HOLDINGS LIMITED, LABRADOR IRON MINES LIMITED and SCHEFFERVILLE MINES INC.

**ONTARIO  
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE  
(COMMERCIAL LIST)**

PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT  
TORONTO

**MOTION RECORD OF THE APPLICANTS  
(Claims Procedure Motion, Returnable April 18, 2016)**

**PALIARE ROLAND ROSENBERG ROTHSTEIN LLP**  
Barristers  
155 Wellington St. W., 35<sup>th</sup> floor  
Toronto ON M5V 3H1  
Tel: 416.646.4300  
Fax: 416.646.4301

**Kenneth T. Rosenberg (LSUC #21102H)**  
Email: ken.rosenberg@paliareroland.com

**Massimo Starnino (LSUC #41048G)**  
Email: max.starnino@paliareroland.com

**Lindsay Scott (LSUC #60275G)**  
Email: lindsay.scott@paliareroland.com

Lawyers for the Applicants