Court File No. CV-15-10926-00CL

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 THE APPLICANTS
(Meeting Order)
Returnable November 10, 2016

November 9, 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)
Tel: 416.646.4304
Email: ken.rosenberg@paliareroland.com

Massimo Starnino (LSUC #41048G)
Tel: 416.646.7431
Email: max.starnino@paliareroland.com

Lindsay Scott (LSUC #60275G)
Tel: 416.646.7442
Email: lindsay.scott@paliareroland.com

Lawyers for the Applicants

TO: THE SERVICE LIST

INDEX

TAB

TAB 1

Para 90

1990 CarswellOnt 139
Ontario Court of Appeal

Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)

1990 CarswellOnt 139, 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, 1 O.R. (3d) 289, 23 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1192, 41 O.A.C. 282

ELAN CORPORATION et al. v. COMISKEY (TRUSTEE OF) et al.

Finlayson, Krever and Doherty JJ.A.

Heard: October 30 and 31, 1990
Judgment: November 2, 1990
Docket: Doc. Nos. CA 684/90 and CA 685/90

Counsel: *F.J.C. Newbould*, Q.C., and *G.B. Morawetz*, for appellant The Bank of Nova Scotia.
John Little, for respondents Elan Corporation and Nova Metal Products Inc.
Michael B. Rotsztain, for RoyNat Inc.
Kim Twohig and *Mel Olanow*, for Ontario Development Corp.
K.P. McElcheran, for monitor Ernst & Young.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

APPEAL from order of Hoolihan J. dated September 11, 1990, allowing application under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36.

***FINLAYSON J.A. (KREVER J.A.* concurring) (orally):**

1 This is an appeal by the Bank of Nova Scotia (the "bank") from orders made by Mr. Justice Hoolihan [(11 September 1990), Doc. Nos. Toronto RE 1993/90 and RE 1994/90 (Ont. Gen. Div.)] as hereinafter described. The Bank of Nova Scotia was the lender to two related companies, namely, Elan Corporation ("Elan") and Nova Metal Products Inc. ("Nova"), which commenced proceedings under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the "CCAA"), for the purposes of having a plan of arrangement put to a meeting of secured creditors of those companies.

2 The orders appealed from are:

(i) An order of September 11, 1990, which directed a meeting of the secured creditors of Elan and Nova to consider the plan of arrangement filed, or other suitable plan.

The order further provided that for 3 days until September 14, 1990, the bank be prevented from acting on any of its security or paying down any of its loans from accounts receivable collected by Elan and Nova, and that Elan and Nova could spend the accounts receivable assigned to the bank that would be received.

(ii) An order dated September 14, 1990, extending the terms of the order of September 11, 1990, to remain in effect until the plan of arrangement was presented to the Court no later than October 24, 1990. This order continued the stay against the bank and the power of Elan and Nova to spend the accounts receivable assigned to the bank. Further orders dated September 27, 1990, and October 18, 1990, have extended the stay, and the power of Elan and Nova to spend the accounts receivable that have been assigned to the bank. The date of the meetings of creditors has been extended to November 9, 1990. The application to sanction the plan of arrangement must be heard by November 14, 1990.

(iii) An order dated October 18, 1990, directing that there be two classes of secured creditors for the purposes of voting at the meeting of secured creditors. The first class is to be comprised of the bank, RoyNat Inc. ("RoyNat"), the Ontario Development Corporation ("O.D.C."), the city of Chatham and the village of Glencoe. The second class is to be comprised of persons related to Elan and Nova that acquired debentures to enable the companies to apply under the CCAA.

3 There is very little dispute about the facts in this matter, but the chronology of events is important and I am setting it out in some detail.

4 The bank has been the banker to Elan and Nova. At the time of the application in August 1990, it was owed approximately $1,900,000. With interest and costs, including receivers' fees, it is now owed in excess of $2,300,000. It has a first registered charge on the accounts receivable and inventory of Elan and Nova, and a second registered charge on the land, buildings and equipment. It also has security under s. 178 of the *Bank Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-1, as am. R.S.C. 1985 (3rd Supp.), c. 25, s. 26. The terms of credit between the bank and Elan as set out in a commitment agreement provide that Elan and Nova may not encumber their assets without the consent of the bank.

5 RoyNat is also a secured creditor of Elan and Nova, and it is owed approximately $12 million. It holds a second registered charge on the accounts receivable and inventory of Elan and Nova, and a first registered charge on the land, buildings and equipment. The bank and RoyNat entered into a priority agreement to define with certainty the priority which each holds over the assets of Elan and Nova.

6 The O.D.C. guaranteed payment of $500,000 to RoyNat for that amount lent by RoyNat to Elan. The O.D.C. holds debenture security from Elan and secure the guarantee which it gave to RoyNat. That security ranks third to the bank and RoyNat. The O.D.C. has not been

called upon by RoyNat to pay under its guarantee. O.D.C. has not lent any money directly to Elan or Nova.

7 Elan owes approximately $77,000 to the City of Chatham for unpaid municipal taxes. Nova owes approximately $18,000 to the Village of Glencoe for unpaid municipal taxes. Both municipalities have a lien on the real property of the respective companies in priority to every claim except the Crown under s. 369 of the *Municipal Act*, R.S.O. 1980, c. 302.

8 On May 8, 1990, the bank demanded payment of all outstanding loans owing by Elan and Nova to be made by June 1, 1990. Extensions of time were granted and negotiations directed to the settlement of the debt took place thereafter. On August 27, 1990, the bank appointed Coopers & Lybrand Limited as receiver and manager of the assets of Elan and Nova, and as agent under the bank's security to realize upon the security. Elan and Nova refused to allow the receiver and manager to have access to their premises, on the basis that insufficient notice had been provided by the bank before demanding payment.

9 Later on August 27, 1990, the bank brought a motion in an action against Elan and Nova (Court File No. 54033/90) for an order granting possession of the premises of Elan and Nova to Coopers & Lybrand. On the evening of August 27, 1990, at approximately 9 p.m., Mr. Justice Saunders made an order adjourning the motion on certain conditions. The order authorized Coopers & Lybrand access to the premises to monitor Elan's business, and permitted Elan to remain in possession and carry on its business in the ordinary course. The bank was restrained in the order, until the motion could be heard, from selling inventory, land, equipment or buildings or from notifying account debtors to collect receivables, but was not restrained from applying accounts receivable that were collected against outstanding bank loans.

10 On Wednesday, August 29, 1990, Elan and Nova each issued a debenture for $10,000 to a friend of the principals of the companies, Joseph Comiskey, through his brother Michael Comiskey as trustee, pursuant to a trust deed executed the same day. The terms were not commercial and it does not appear that repayment was expected. It is conceded by counsel for Elan that the sole purpose of issuing the debentures was to qualify as a "debtor company" within the meaning of s. 3 of the CCAA. Section 3 reads as follows:

> 3. This Act does not apply in respect of a debtor company unless
>
> (a) the debtor company has outstanding an issue of secured or unsecured bonds of the debtor company or of a predecessor in title of the debtor company issued under a trust deed or other instrument running in favour of a trustee; and

(b) the compromise or arrangement that is proposed under section 4 or 5 in respect of the debtor company includes a compromise or an arrangement between the debtor company and the holders of an issue referred to in paragraph (a).

11 The debentures conveyed the personal property of Elan and Nova as security to Michael Comiskey as trustee. No consent was obtained from the bank as required by the loan agreements, nor was any consent obtained from the receiver. Cheques for $10,000 each, representing the loans secured in the debentures, were given to Elan and Nova on Wednesday, August 29, 1990, but not deposited until 6 days later on September 4, 1990, after an interim order had been made by Mr. Justice Farley in favour of Elan and Nova staying the bank from taking proceedings.

12 On August 30, 1990 Elan and Nova applied under s. 5 of the CCAA for an order directing a meeting of secured creditors to vote on a plan of arrangement. Section 5 provides:

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

13 The application was heard by Farley J. on Friday, August 31, 1990, at 8 a.m. Farley J. dismissed the application on the grounds that the CCAA required that there be more than one debenture issued by each company. Later on the same say, August 31, 1990, Elan and Nova each issued two debentures for $500 to the wife of the principal of Elan through her sister as trustee. The debentures provided for payment of interest to commence on August 31, 1992. Cheques for $500 were delivered that day to the companies but not deposited in the bank account until September 4, 1990. These debentures conveyed the personal property in the assets of Elan and Nova to the trustee as security. Once again it is conceded that the debentures were issued for the sole purpose of meeting the requirements of s. 3 of the CCAA. No consent was obtained from the bank as required by the loan terms, nor was any consent obtained from the receiver.

14 On August 31, 1990, following the creation of the trust deeds and the issuance of the debentures, Elan and Nova commenced new applications under the CCAA which were heard late in the day by Farley J. He adjourned the applications to September 10, 1990, on certain terms, including a stay preventing the bank from acting on its security and allowing Elan to spend up to $321,000 from accounts receivable collected by it.

15 The plan of arrangement filed with the application provided that Elan and Nova would carry on business for 3 months, that secured creditors would not be paid and could take no action on their security for 3 months, and that the accounts receivable of Elan and Nova assigned to the bank could be utilized by Elan and Nova for purposes of its day-to-day operations. No compromise of any sort was proposed.

16 On September 11, 1990, Hoolihan J. ordered that a meeting of the secured creditors of Elan and Nova be held no later than October 22, 1990, to consider the plan of arrangement that had been filed, or other suitable plan. He ordered that the plan of arrangement be presented to the secured creditors no later than September 27, 1990. He made further orders effective for 3 days until September 14, 1990, including orders:

(i) that the companies could spend the accounts receivable assigned to the bank that would be collected in accordance with a cash flow forecast filed with the Court providing for $1,387,000 to be spent by September 30, 1990; and

(ii) a stay of proceedings against the bank acting on any of its security or paying down any of its loans from accounts receivable collected by Elan and Nova.

17 On September 14, 1990, Hoolihan J. extended the terms of his order of September 11, 1990, to remain in effect until the plan of arrangement was presented to the Court no later than October 24, 1990 for final approval. This order continued the power of Elan and Nova to spend up to $1,387,000 of the accounts receivable assigned to the bank in accordance with the projected cash flow to September 30, 1990, and to spend a further amount to October 24, 1990, in accordance with a cash flow to be approved by Hoolihan J. prior to October 1, 1990. Further orders dated September 27 and October 18 have extended the power to spend the accounts receivable to November 14, 1990.

18 On September 14, 1990, the bank requested Hoolihan J. to restrict his order so that Elan and Nova could use the accounts receivable assigned to the bank only so long as they continued to operate within the borrowing guidelines contained in the terms of the loan agreements with the bank. These guidelines require a certain ratio to exist between bank loans and the book value of the accounts receivable and inventory assigned to the bank, and are designed in normal circumstances to ensure that there is sufficient value in the security assigned to the bank. Hoolihan J. refused to make the order.

19 On October 18, 1990, Hoolihan J. ordered that the composition of the classes of secured creditors for the purposes of voting at the meeting of secured creditors shall be as follows:

(a) The bank, RoyNat, O.D.C., the City of Chatham and the Village of Glencoe shall comprise one class.

(b) The parties related to the principal of Elan that acquired their debentures to enable the companies to apply under the CCAA shall comprise a second class.

20 On October 18, 1990, at the request of counsel for Elan and Nova, Hoolihan J. further ordered that the date for the meeting of creditors of Elan and Nova be extended to November 9, 1990, in order to allow a new plan of arrangement to be sent to all creditors, including unsecured creditors of those companies. Elan and Nova now plan to offer a plan of compromise or arrangement to the unsecured creditors of Elan and Nova as well as to the secured creditors.

21 There are five issues in this appeal.

(1) Are the debentures issued by Elan and Nova for the purpose of permitting the companies to qualify as applicants under the CCAA debentures within the meaning of s. 3 of the CCAA?

(2) Did the issue of the debentures contravene the provisions of the loan agreements between Elan and Nova and the bank? If so, what are the consequences for CCAA purposes?

(3) Did Elan and Nova have the power to issue the debentures and make application under the CCAA after the bank had appointed a receiver and after the order of Saunders J.?

(4) Did Hoolihan J. have the power under s. 11 of the CCAA to make the interim orders that he made with respect to the accounts receivable?

(5) Was Hoolihan J. correct in ordering that the bank vote on the proposed plan of arrangement in a class with RoyNat and the other secured creditors?

22 It is well established that the CCAA is intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both. Such a resolution can have significant benefits for the company, its shareholders and employees. For this reason the debtor companies, Elan and Nova, are entitled to a broad and liberal interpretation of the jurisdiction of the Court under the CCAA. Having said that, it does not follow that in exercising its discretion to order a meeting of creditors under s. 5 of the CCAA that the Court should not consider the equities in this case as they relate to these companies and to one of its principal secured creditors, the bank.

23 The issues before Hoolihan J. and this Court were argued on a technical basis. Hoolihan J. did not give effect to the argument that the debentures described above were a "sham" and could not be used for the purposes of asserting jurisdiction. Unfortunately, he did not address

any of the other arguments presented to him on the threshold issue of the availability of the CCAA. He appears to have acted on the premise that if the CCAA can be made available, it should be utilized.

24 If Hoolihan J. did exercise any discretion overall, it is not reflected in his reasons. I believe, therefore, that we are in a position to look at the uncontested chronology of these proceedings and exercise our own discretion. To me, the significant date is August 27, 1990 when the bank appointed Coopers & Lybrand Limited as receiver and manager of the undertaking, property and assets mortgaged and charged under the demand debenture and of the collateral under the general security agreement, both dated June 20, 1979. On the same date, it appointed the same company as receiver and manager for Nova under a general security agreement dated December 5, 1988. The effect of this appointment is to divest the companies and their boards of directors of their power to deal with the property comprised in the appointment: Raymond Walton, *Kerr on the Law and Practice as to Receivers*, 16th ed. (London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1983), p. 292. Neither Elan nor Nova had the power to create further indebtedness, and thus to interfere with the ability of the receiver to manage the two companies: *Alberta Treasury Branches v. Hat Development Ltd.* (1988), 71 C.B.R. (N.S.) 264, 64 Alta. L.R. (2d) 17 (Q.B.), aff'd (1989), 65 Alta. L.R. (2d) 374 (C.A.).

25 Counsel for the debtor companies submitted that the management powers of the receiver were stripped from the receiver by Saunders J. in his interim order, when he allowed the receiver access to the companies' properties but would not permit it to realize on the security of the bank until further order. He pointed out that the order also provided that the companies were entitled to remain in possession and "to carry on business in the ordinary course" until further order.

26 I do not agree with counsel's submission covering the effect of the order. It certainly restricted what the receiver could do on an interim basis, but it imposed restrictions on the companies as well. The issue of these disputed debentures in support of an application for relief as insolvent companies under the CCAA does not comply with the order of Saunders J. This is not carrying on business in the ordinary course. The residual power to take all of these initiatives for relief under the CCAA remained with the receiver, and if trust deeds were to be issued, an order of the Court in Action 54033/90 was required permitting their issuance and registration.

27 There is another feature which, in my opinion, affects the exercise of discretion, and that is the probability of the meeting achieving some measure of success. Hoolihan J. considered the calling of the meeting at one hearing, as he was asked to do, and determined the respective classes of creditors at another. This latter classification is necessary because of the provisions of s. 6(a) of the CCAA, which reads as follows:

> 6. Where a majority in number representing three-fourths in value of the creditors, or class of creditors, as the case may be, present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or meetings thereof respectively held pursuant to sections 4 and 5, or either of those sections, agree to any compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at the meeting or meetings, the compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by the court, and if so sanctioned is binding
>
> (a) on all the creditors or the class of creditors, as the case may be, and on any trustee for any such class of creditors, whether secured or unsecured, as the case may be, and on the company.

28 If both matters had been considered at the same time, as in my view they should have been, and if what I regard as a proper classification of the creditors had taken place, I think it is obvious that the meeting would not be a productive one. It was improper, in my opinion, to create one class of creditors made up of all the secured creditors save the so-called "sham" creditors. There is no true community of interest among them, and the motivation of Elan and Nova in striving to create a single class is clearly designed to avoid the classification of the bank as a separate class.

29 It is apparent that the only secured creditors with a significant interest in the proceeding under the CCAA are the bank and RoyNat. The two municipalities have total claims for arrears of taxes of less than $100,000. They have first priority in the lands of the companies. They are in no jeopardy whatsoever. The O.D.C. has a potential liability in that it can be called upon by RoyNat under its guarantee to a maximum of $500,000, and this will trigger default under its debentures with the companies, but its interests lie with RoyNat.

30 As to RoyNat, it is the largest creditor with a debt of some $12 million. It will dominate any class it is in because, under s. 6 of the CCAA, the majority in a class must represent three-quarters in value of that class. It will always have a veto by reason of the size of its claim, but requires at least one creditor to vote for it to give it a majority in number (I am ignoring the municipalities). It needs the O.D.C.

31 I do not base my opinion solely on commercial self-interest, but also on the differences in legal interest. The bank has first priority on the receivables referred to as the "quick assets", and RoyNat ranks second in priority. RoyNat has first priority on the buildings and realty, the "fixed assets", and the bank has second priority.

32 It is in the commercial interests of the bank, with its smaller claim and more readily realizable assets, to collect and retain the accounts receivable. It is in the commercial interests of RoyNat to preserve the cash flow of the business and sell the enterprise as a going concern. It can only do that by overriding the prior claim of the bank to these receivables. If it can vote

with the O.D.C. in the same class as the bank, it can achieve that goal and extinguish the prior claim of the bank to realize on the receivables. This it can do, despite having acknowledged its legal relationship to the bank in the priority agreement signed by the two. I can think of no reason why the legal interest of the bank as the holder of the first security on the receivables should be overridden by RoyNat as holder of the second security.

33 The classic statement on classes of creditors is that of Lord Esher M.R. in *Sovereign Life Assurance Co. v. Dodd*, [1892] 2 Q.B. 573, [1891-4] All E.R. 246 (C.A.), at pp. 579-580 [Q.B.]:

> The Act [*Joint Stock Companies Arrangement Act, 1870*] says that the persons to be summoned to the meeting (all of whom, be it said in passing, are creditors) are persons who can be divided into different classes — classes which the Act of Parliament recognises, though it does not define them. This, therefore, must be done: they must be divided into different classes. What is the reason for such a course? It is because the creditors composing the different classes have different interests; and, therefore, if we find a different state of facts existing among different creditors which may differently affect their minds and their judgment, they must be divided into different classes.

34 The *Sovereign Life* case was quoted with approval by Kingstone J. in *Re Wellington Building Corp.*, [1934] O.R. 653, 16 C.B.R. 48, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 626, [1934] O.W.N. 562 (S.C.), at p. 659 [O.R.]. He also quoted another English authority at p. 658:

> In *In re Alabama, New Orleans, Texas and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.*, [1891] 1 Ch. 213, a scheme and arrangement under the Joint Stock Companies Arrangement Act (1870), was submitted to the Court for approval. Lord Justice Bowen, at p. 243, says:
>
> > Now, I have no doubt at all that it would be improper for the Court to allow an arrangement to be forced on any class of creditors, if the arrangement cannot reasonably be supposed by sensible business people to be for the benefit of that class as such, otherwise the sanction of the Court would be a sanction to what would be a scheme of confiscation. The object of this section is not confiscation ... Its object is to enable compromises to be made which are for the common benefit of the creditors as creditors, or for the common benefit of some class of creditors as such.

35 Kingstone J. set aside a meeting where three classes of creditors were permitted to vote together. He said at p. 660:

> It is clear that Parliament intended to give the three-fourths majority of any class power to bind that class, but I do not think the Statute should be construed so as to permit holders of subsequent mortgages power to vote and thereby destroy the priority rights and security of a first mortgagee.

36 We have been referred to more modern cases, including two decisions of Trainor J. of the British Columbia Supreme Court, both entitled *Re Northland Properties Ltd.* One case is reported in (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 166, 31 B.C.L.R. (2d) 35, and the other in the same volume at p. 175 [C.B.R.]. Trainor J. was upheld on appeal on both judgments. The first judgment of the British Columbia Court of Appeal is unreported (16 September, 1988) [Doc. No. Vancouver CA009772, Taggart, Lambert and Locke JJ.A.]. The judgment in the second appeal is reported at 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 195, [1989] 3 W.W.R. 363, 34 B.C.L.R. (2d) 122.

37 In the first *Northland* case, Trainor J. held that the difference in the terms of parties to and priority of different bonds meant that they should be placed in separate classes. He relied upon *Re Wellington Building Corp.*, supra. In the second *Northland* case, he dealt with 15 mortgagees who were equal in priority but held different parcels of land as security. Trainor J. held that their relative security positions were the same, notwithstanding that the mortgages were for the most part secured by charges against separate properties. The nature of the debt was the same, the nature of the security was the same, the remedies for default were the same, and in all cases they were corporate loans by sophisticated lenders. In specifically accepting the reasoning of Trainor J., the Court of Appeal held that the concern of the various mortgagees as to the quality of their individual securities was "a variable cause arising not by any difference in legal interests, but rather as a consequence of bad lending, or market values, or both" (p. 203).

38 In *Re NsC Diesel Power Inc.* (1990), 79 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 97 N.S.R. (2d) 295, 258 A.P.R. 295 (T.D.), the Court stressed that a class should be made up of persons "'whose rights are not so dissimilar as to make it impossible for them to consult together with a view to their common interest'" (p. 8 [of C.B.R.]).

39 My assessment of these secured creditors is that the bank should be in its own class. This being so, it is obvious that no plan of arrangement can succeed without its approval. There is no useful purpose to be served in putting a plan of arrangement to a meeting of creditors if it is known in advance that it cannot succeed. This is another cogent reason for the Court declining to exercise its discretion in favour of the debtor companies.

40 For all the reasons given above, the application under the CCAA should have been dismissed. I do not think that I have to give definitive answers to the individual issues numbered (1) and (2). They can be addressed in a later case, where the answers could be dispositive of an application under the CCAA. The answer to (3) is that the combined effect of the receivership and the order of Saunders J. disentitled the companies to issue the debentures and bring the application under the CCAA. It is not necessary to answer issue (4), and the answer to (5) is no.

41 Accordingly, I would allow the appeal, set aside the three orders of Hoolihan J., and, in their place, issue an order dismissing the application under the CCAA. The bank should receive its costs of this appeal, the applications for leave to appeal, and the proceedings before Farley and Hoolihan JJ., to be paid by Elan, Nova and RoyNat.

42 Ernst & Young were appointed monitor in the order of Hoolihan J. dated September 14, 1990, to monitor the operations of Elan and Nova and give effect to and supervise the terms and conditions of the stay of proceedings in accordance with Appendix "C" appended to the order. The monitor should be entitled to be paid for all services performed to date, including whatever is necessary to complete its reports for past work, as called for in Appendix "C".

***DOHERTY J.A.* (dissenting in part):**

I Background

43 On November 2, 1990, this Court allowed the appeal brought by the Bank of Nova Scotia (the "bank") and vacated several orders made by Hoolihan J. Finlayson J.A. delivered oral reasons on behalf of the majority. At the same time, I delivered brief oral reasons dissenting in part from the conclusion reached by the majority and undertook to provide further written reasons. These are those reasons.

44 The events relevant to the disposition of this appeal are set out in some detail in the oral reasons of Finlayson J.A. I will not repeat that chronology, but will refer to certain additional background facts before turning to the legal issues.

45 Elan Corporation ("Elan") owns the shares of Nova Metal Products Inc. ("Nova Inc."). Both companies have been actively involved in the manufacture of automobile parts for a number of years. As of March 1990, the companies had total annual sales of about $30 million, and employed some 220 people in plants located in Chatham and Glencoe, Ontario. The operation of these companies no doubt plays a significant role in the economy of these two small communities.

46 In the 4 years prior to 1989, the companies had operated at a profit ranging from $287,000 (1987) to $1,500,000 (1986). In 1989, several factors, including large capital expenditures and a downturn in the market, combined to produce an operational loss of about $1,333,000. It is anticipated that the loss for the year ending June 30, 1990, will be about $2.3 million. As of August 1, 1990, the companies continued in full operation, and those in control anticipated that the financial picture would improve significantly later in 1990, when the companies would be busy filling several contracts which had been obtained earlier in 1990.

47 The bank has provided credit to the companies for several years. In January 1989, the bank extended an operating line of credit to the companies. The line of credit was by way of a demand loan that was secured in the manner described by Finlayson J.A. Beginning in May 1989, and from time to time after that, the companies were in default under the terms of the loan advanced by the bank. On each occasion, the bank and the companies managed to work out some agreement so that the bank continued as lender and the companies continued to operate their plants.

48 Late in 1989, the companies arranged for a $500,000 operating loan from RoyNat Inc. It was hoped that this loan, combined with the operating line of $2.5 million from the bank, would permit the company to weather its fiscal storm. In March 1990, the bank took the position that the companies were in breach of certain requirements under their loan agreements, and warned that if the difficulties were not rectified the bank would not continue as the company's lender. Mr. Patrick Johnson, the president of both companies, attempted to respond to these concerns in a detailed letter to the bank dated March 15, 1990. The response did not placate the bank. In May 1990, the bank called its loan and made a demand for immediate payment. Mr. Spencer, for the bank, wrote: "We consider your financial condition continues to be critical and we are not prepared to delay further making formal demand." He went on to indicate that, subject to further deterioration in the companies' fiscal position, the bank was prepared to delay acting on its security until June 1, 1990.

49 As of May 1990, Mr. Johnson, to the bank's knowledge, was actively seeking alternative funding to replace the bank. At the same time, he was trying to convince the union which represented the workers employed at both plants to assist in a co-operative effort to keep the plants operational during the hard times. The union had agreed to discuss amendment of the collective bargaining agreement to facilitate the continued operation of the companies.

50 The June 1, 1990 deadline set by the bank passed without incident. Mr. Johnson continued to search for new financing. A potential lender was introduced to Mr. Spencer of the bank on August 13, 1990, and it appeared that the bank, through Mr. Spencer, was favourably impressed with this potential lender. However, on August 27, 1990, the bank decided to take action to protect its position. Coopers & Lybrand was appointed by the bank as receiver-manager under the terms of the security agreements with the companies. The companies denied the receiver access to their plants. The bank then moved before the Honourable Mr. Justice E. Saunders for an order giving the receiver possession of the premises occupied by the companies. On August 27, 1990, after hearing argument from counsel for the bank and the companies, Mr. Justice Saunders refused to install the receivers and made the following interim order:

1. THIS COURT ORDERS that the receiver be allowed access to the property to monitor the operations of the defendants but shall not take steps to realize on the security of The Bank of Nova Scotia until further Order of the Court.

2. THIS COURT ORDERS that the defendants shall be entitled to remain in possession and to carry on business in the ordinary course until further Order of this Court.

3. THIS COURT ORDERS that until further order the Bank of Nova Scotia shall not take steps to notify account debtors of the defendants for the purpose of collecting outstanding accounts receivable. This Order does not restrict The Bank of Nova Scotia from dealing with accounts receivable of the defendants received by it.

4. THIS COURT ORDERS that the motion is otherwise adjourned to a date to be fixed.

51 The notice of motion placed before Saunders J. by the bank referred to "an intended action" by the bank. It does not appear that the bank took any further steps in connection with this "intended action."

52 Having resisted the bank's efforts to assume control of the affairs of the companies on August 27, 1990, and realizing that their operations could cease within a matter of days, the companies turned to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the "Act"), in an effort to hold the bank at bay while attempting to reorganize their finances. Finlayson J.A. has described the companies' efforts to qualify under that Act, the two appearances before the Honourable Mr. Justice Farley on August 31, 1990, and the appearances before the Honourable Mr. Justice Hoolihan in September and October 1990, which resulted in the orders challenged on this appeal.

II The Issues

53 The dispute between the bank and the companies when this application came before Hoolihan J. was a straightforward one. The bank had determined that its best interests would be served by the immediate execution of the rights it had under its various agreements with the companies. The bank's best interest was not met by the continued operation of the companies as going concerns. The companies and their other two substantial secured creditors considered that their interests required that the companies continue to operate, at least for a period which would enable the companies to place a plan of reorganization before its creditors.

54 All parties were pursuing what they perceived to be their commercial interests. To the bank, these interests entailed the "death" of the companies as operating entities. To the

companies, these interests required "life support" for the companies through the provisions of the Act to permit a "last ditch" effort to save the companies and keep them in operation.

55 The issues raised on this appeal can be summarized as follows:

(i) Did Hoolihan J. err in holding that the companies were entitled to invoke the Act?

(ii) Did Hoolihan J. err in exercising his discretion in directing that a meeting of creditors should be held under the Act?

(iii) Did Hoolihan J. err in directing that the bank and RoyNat Inc. should be placed in the same class of creditors for the purposes of the Act?

(iv) Did Hoolihan J. err in the terms of the interim orders he made pending the meeting of creditors and the submission to the court of a plan of reorganization?

III The Purpose and Scheme of the Act

56 Before turning to these issues, it is necessary to understand the purpose of the Act, and the scheme established by the Act for achieving that purpose. The Act first appeared in the midst of the Great Depression (S.C. 1932-33, c. 36). The Act was intended to provide a means whereby insolvent companies could avoid bankruptcy and continue as ongoing concerns through a reorganization of their financial obligations. The reorganization contemplated required the cooperation of the debtor companies' creditors and shareholders: *Re Avery Construction Co.*, 24 C.B.R. 17, [1942] 4 D.L.R. 558 (Ont. S.C.); Stanley E. Edwards, "Reorganizations under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1947) 25 Can. Bar Rev. 587, at pp. 592-593; David H. Goldman, "Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada)" (1985) 55 C.B.R. (N.S.) 36, at pp. 37-39.

57 The legislation is remedial in the purest sense in that it provides a means whereby the devastating social and economic effects of bankruptcy- or creditor-initiated termination of ongoing business operations can be avoided while a court-supervised attempt to reorganize the financial affairs of the debtor company is made.

58 The purpose of the Act was artfully put by Gibbs J.A., speaking for the British Columbia Court of Appeal, in *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.*, an unreported judgment released October 29, 1990 [Doc. No. Vancouver CA12944, Carrothers, Cumming and Gibbs JJ.A., now reported [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136, 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84], at pp. 11 and 6 [unreported, pp. 91 and 88 B.C.L.R.]. In referring to the purpose for which the Act was initially proclaimed, he said:

> Almost inevitably liquidation destroyed the shareholders' investment, yielded little by way of recovery to the creditors, and exacerbated the social evil of devastating levels of

unemployment. The government of the day sought, through the C.C.A.A. ['the Act'], to create a regime whereby the principals of the company and the creditors could be brought together under the supervision of the court to attempt a reorganization or compromise or arrangement under which the company could continue in business.

59 In an earlier passage, His Lordship had said:

The purpose of the C.C.A.A. is to facilitate the making of a compromise or arrangement between an insolvent debtor company and its creditors to the end that the company is able to continue in business.

60 Gibbs J.A. also observed (at p. 13) that the Act was designed to serve a "broad constituency of investors, creditors and employees." Because of that "broad constituency", the Court must, when considering applications brought under the Act, have regard not only to the individuals and organizations directly affected by the application, but also to the wider public interest. That interest is generally, but not always, served by permitting an attempt at reorganization: see S.E. Edwards, "Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act," at p. 593.

61 The Act must be given a wide and liberal construction so as to enable it to effectively serve this remedial purpose: *Interpretation Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-21, s. 12; *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.*, supra, at p. 14 [unreported, p. 92 B.C.L.R.].

62 The Act is available to all insolvent companies, provided the requirements of s. 3 of the Act are met. That section provides:

3. This Act does not apply in respect of a debtor company unless

(a) the debtor company has outstanding an issue of secured or unsecured bonds of the debtor company or of a predecessor in title of the debtor company issued under a trust deed or other instrument running in favour of a trustee; and

(b) the compromise or arrangement that is proposed under section 4 or 5 in respect of the debtor company includes a compromise or an arrangement between the debtor company and the holders of an issue referred to in paragraph (a).

63 A debtor company, or a creditor of that company, invokes the Act by way of summary application to the Court under s. 4 or s. 5 of the Act. For present purposes, s. 5 is the relevant section:

5. Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its secured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company or of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator

of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors, and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

64 Section 5 does not require that the Court direct a meeting of creditors to consider a proposed plan. The Court's power to do so is discretionary. There will no doubt be cases where no order will be made, even though the debtor company qualifies under s. 3 of the Act.

65 If the Court determines that a meeting should be called, the creditors must be placed into classes for the purpose of that meeting. The significance of this classification process is made apparent by s. 6 of the Act:

> 6. Where a majority in number representing three-fourths in value of the creditors, or class of creditors, as the case may be, present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or meetings thereof respectively held pursuant to sections 4 and 5, or either of those sections, agree to any compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at the meeting or meetings, the compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by the court, and if so sanctioned is binding
>
> (a) on all the creditors or the class of creditors, as the case may be, and on any trustee for any such class of creditors, whether secured or unsecured, as the case may be, and on the company; and
>
> (b) in the case of a company that has made an authorized assignment or against which a receiving order has been made under the *Bankruptcy Act* or is in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-up Act*, on the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator and contributories of the company.

66 If the plan of reorganization is approved by the creditors as required by s. 6, it must then be presented to the Court. Once again, the Court must exercise a discretion, and determine whether it will ap prove the plan of reorganization. In exercising that discretion, the Court is concerned not only with whether the appropriate majority has approved the plan at a meeting held in accordance with the Act and the order of the Court, but also with whether the plan is a fair and reasonable one: *Re Northland Properties Ltd.* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 175 at 182-185 (S.C.), aff'd 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 195, [1989] 3 W.W.R. 363, 34 B.C.L.R. (2d) 122 (C.A.).

67 If the Court chooses to exercise its discretion in favour of calling a meeting of creditors for the purpose of considering a plan of reorganization, the Act provides that the rights and remedies available to creditors, the debtor company, and others during the period between the making of the initial order and the consideration of the proposed plan may be suspended or otherwise controlled by the Court.

68 Section 11 gives a court wide powers to make any interim orders:

> 11. Notwithstanding anything in the *Bankruptcy Act* or the *Winding-up Act*, whenever an application has been made under this Act in respect of any company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit,
>
> (a) make an order staying, until such time as the court may prescribe or until any further order, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy Act* and the *Winding-up Act* or either of them;
>
> (b) restrain further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company on such terms as the court sees fit; and
>
> (c) make an order that no suit, action or other proceeding shall be proceeded with or commenced against the company except with the leave of the court and subject to such terms as the court imposes.

69 Viewed in its totality, the Act gives the Court control over the initial decision to put the reorganization plan before the creditors, the classification of creditors for the purpose of considering the plan, conduct affecting the debtor company pending consideration of that plan, and the ultimate acceptability of any plan agreed upon by the creditors. The Act envisions that the rights and remedies of individual creditors, the debtor company and others may be sacrificed, at least temporarily, in an effort to serve the greater good by arriving at some acceptable reorganization which allows the debtor company to continue in operation: *Icor Oil & Gas Co. v. Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce* (1989), 102 A.R. 161 at p. 165 (Q.B.).

IV Did Hoolihan J. Err in Holding that the Debtor Companies were Entitled to Invoke the Act?

70 The appellant advances three arguments in support of its contention that Elan and Nova Inc. were not entitled to seek relief under the Act. It argues first that the debentures issued by the companies after August 27, 1990, were "shams" and did not fulfil the requirements of s. 3 of the Act. The appellant next contends that the issuing of the debentures by the companies contravened their agreements with the bank, in which they undertook not to further encumber the assets of the companies without the consent of the bank. Lastly, the appellant maintains that once the bank had appointed a receiver-manager over the affairs of the companies on August 27, 1990, the companies had no power to create further indebtedness by way of debentures or to bring an application on behalf of the companies under the Act.

(i) Section 3 and "Instant" Trust Deeds

71 The debentures issued in August 1990, after the bank had moved to install a receiver-manager, were issued solely and expressly for the purpose of meeting the requirements of s. 3 of the Act. Indeed, it took the companies two attempts to meet those requirements. The debentures had no commercial purpose. The transactions did, however, involve true loans in the sense that moneys were advanced and debt was created. Appropriate and valid trust deeds were also issued.

72 In my view, it is inappropriate to refer to these transactions as "shams." They are neither false nor counterfeit, but rather are exactly what they appear to be, transactions made to meet jurisdictional requirements of the Act so as to permit an application for reorganization under the Act. Such transactions are apparently well known to the commercial Bar: B. O'Leary, "A Review of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1987) 4 Nat. Insolvency Rev. 38, at p. 39; C. Ham, " 'Instant' Trust Deeds Under the C.C.A.A." (1988) 2 Commercial Insolvency Reporter 25; G.B. Morawetz, "Emerging Trends in the Use of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1990) Proceedings, First Annual General Meeting and Conference of the Insolvency Institute of Canada.

73 Mr. Ham writes, at pp. 25 and 30:

> Consequently, some companies have recently sought to bring themselves within the ambit of the C.C.A.A. by creating 'in stant' trust deeds, i.e., trust deeds which are created solely for the purpose of enabling them to take advantage of the C.C.A.A.

74 Applications under the Act involving the use of "instant" trust deeds have been before the Courts on a number of occasions. In no case has any court held that a company cannot gain access to the Act by creating a debt which meets the requirements of s. 3 for the express purpose of qualifying under the Act. In most cases, the use of these "instant" trust deeds has been acknowledged without comment.

75 The decision of Chief Justice Richard in *Re United Maritime Fishermen Co-op.* (1988), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 44, 84 N.B.R. (2d) 415, 214 A.P.R. 415 (Q.B.), varied on reconsideration (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 170, 87 N.B.R. (2d) 333, 221 A.P.R. 333 (Q.B.), at 55-56 [67 C.B.R.], speaks directly to the use of "instant" trust deeds. The Chief Justice refused to read any words into s. 3 of the Act which would limit the availability of the Act depending on the point at which, or the purpose for which, the debenture or bond and accompanying trust deed were created. He accepted [at p. 56 C.B.R.] the debtor company's argument that the Act:

> does not impose any time restraints on the creation of the conditions as set out in s. 3 of the Act, nor does it contain any prohibition against the creation of the conditions set out in s. 3 for the purpose of obtaining jurisdiction.

76 It should, however, be noted that in *Re United Maritime Fishermen Co-op.*, supra, the debt itself was not created for the purpose of qualifying under the Act. The bond and the trust deed, however, were created for that purpose. The case is therefore factually distinguishable from the case at Bar.

77 The Court of Appeal reversed the ruling of the Chief Justice ((1988), 69 C.B.R. (N.S.) 161, 51 D.L.R. (4th) 618, 88 N.B.R. (2d) 253, 224 A.P.R. 253) on the basis that the bonds required by s. 3 of the Act had not been issued when the application was made, so that on a precise reading of the words of s. 3 the company did not qualify. The Court did not go on to consider whether, had the bonds been properly issued, the company would have been entitled to invoke the Act. Hoyt J.A., for the majority, did, however, observe without comment that the trust deeds had been created specifically for the purpose of bringing an application under the Act.

78 The judgment of MacKinnon J. in *Re Stephanie's Fashions Ltd.*, unreported, Doc. No. Vancouver A893427, released January 24, 1990 (B.C. S.C.) [now reported 1 C.B.R. (3d) 248], is factually on all fours with the present case. In that case, as in this one, it was acknowledged that the sole purpose for creating the debt was to effect compliance with s. 3 of the Act. After considering the judgment of Chief Justice Richard in *Re United Maritime Fishermen Co-op.*, supra, MacKinnon J. held, at p. 251:

> The reason for creating the trust deed is not for the usual purposes of securing a debt but, when one reads it, on its face, it does that. I find that it is a genuine trust deed and not a fraud, and that the petitioners have complied with s. 3 of the statute.

79 *Re Metals & Alloys Co.* (16 February 1990) is a recent example of a case in this jurisdiction in which "instant" trust deeds were successfully used to bring a company within the Act. The company issued debentures for the purpose of permitting the company to qualify under the Act, so as to provide it with an opportunity to prepare and submit a reorganization plan. The company then applied for an order, seeking, inter alia, a declaration that the debtor company was a corporation within the meaning of the Act. Houlden J.A., hearing the matter at first instance, granted the declaration request in an order dated February 16, 1990. No reasons were given. It does not appear that the company's qualifications were challenged before Houlden J.A.; however, the nature of the debentures issued and the purpose for their issue was fully disclosed in the material before him. The requirements of s. 3 of the Act are jurisdictional in nature, and the consent of the parties cannot vest a court with jurisdiction it

does not have. One must conclude that Houlden J.A. was satisfied that "instant" trust deeds suffice for the purposes of s. 3 of the Act.

80 A similar conclusion is implicit in the reasons of the British Columbia Court of Appeal in *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.*. In that case, a debt of $50, with an accompanying debenture and trust deed, was created specifically to enable the company to make application under the Act. The Court noted that the debt was created solely for that purpose in an effort to forestall an attempt by the bank to liquidate the assets of the debtor company. The Court went on to deal with the merits, and to dismiss an appeal from an order granting a stay pending a reorganization meeting. The Court could not have reached the merits without first concluding that the $50 debt created by the company met the requirements of s. 3 of the Act.

81 The weight of authority is against the appellant. Counsel for the appellant attempts to counter that authority by reference to the remarks of the Minister of Justice when s. 3 was introduced as an amendment to the Act in the 1952-53 sittings of Parliament (House of Commons Debates, 1-2 Eliz. II (1952-53), vol. II, pp. 1268-1269). The interpretation of words found in a statute, by reference to speeches made in Parliament at the time legislation is introduced, has never found favour in our Courts: *Reference Re Residential Tenancies Act (Ontario)*, [1981] 1 S.C.R. 714, 123 D.L.R. (3d) 554, 37 N.R. 138, at 721 [S.C.R.], 561 [D.L.R.]. Nor, with respect to Mr. Newbould's able argument, do I find the words of the Minister of Justice at the time the present s. 3 was introduced to be particularly illuminating. He indicated that the amendment to the Act left companies with complex financial structures free to resort to the Act, but that it excluded companies which had only unsecured mercantile creditors. The Minister does not comment on the intended effect of the amendment on the myriad situations between those two extremes. This case is one such situation. These debtor companies had complex secured debt structures, but those debts were not, prior to the issuing of the debentures in August 1990, in the form contemplated by s. 3 of the Act. Like Richard C.J.Q.B. in *Re United Maritime Fishermen Co-op.*, supra, at pp. 52-53, I am not persuaded that the comments of the Minister of Justice assist in interpreting s. 3 of the Act in this situation.

82 The words of s. 3 are straightforward. They require that the debtor company have, at the time an application is made, an outstanding debenture or bond issued under a trust deed. No more is needed. Attempts to qualify those words are not only contrary to the wide reading the Act deserves, but can raise intractable problems as to what qualifications or modifications should be read into the Act. Where there is a legitimate debt which fits the criteria set out in s. 3, I see no purpose in denying a debtor company resort to the Act because the debt and the accompanying documentation was created for the specific purpose of bringing the application. It must be remembered that qualification under s. 3 entitles the debtor company to nothing more than consideration under the Act. Qualification under s. 3 does not mean

that relief under the Act will be granted. The circumstances surrounding the creation of the debt needed to meet the s. 3 requirement may well have a bearing on how a court exercises its discretion at various stages of the application, but they do not alone interdict resort to the Act.

83 In holding that "instant" trust deeds can satisfy the requirements of s. 3 of the Act, I should not be taken as concluding that debentures or bonds which are truly shams, in that they do not reflect a transaction which actually occurred and do not create a real debt owed by the company, will suffice. Clearly, they will not. I do not, however, equate the two. One is a tactical device used to gain the potential advantages of the Act. The other is a fraud.

84 Nor does my conclusion that "instant" trust deeds can bring a debtor company within the Act exclude considerations of the good faith of the debtor company in seeking the protection of the Act. A debtor company should not be allowed to use the Act for any purpose other than to attempt a legitimate reorganization. If the purpose of the application is to advantage one creditor over another, to defeat the legitimate interests of creditors, to delay the inevitable failure of the debtor company, or for some other improper purpose, the Court has the means available to it, apart entirely from s. 3 of the Act, to prevent misuse of the Act. In cases where the debtor company acts in bad faith, the Court may refuse to order a meeting of creditors, it may deny interim protection, it may vary interim protection initially given when the bad faith is shown, or it may refuse to sanction any plan which emanates from the meeting of the creditors: see Lawrence J. Crozier, "Good Faith and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act" (1989) 15 Can. Bus. L.J. 89.

(ii) Section 3 and the Prior Agreement with the Bank Limiting Creation of New Debt

85 The appellant also argues that the debentures did not meet the requirements of s. 3 of the Act because they were issued in contravention of a security agreement made between the companies and the bank. Assuming that the debentures were issued in contravention of that agreement, I do not understand how that contravention affects the status of the debentures for the purposes of s. 3 of the Act. The bank may well have an action against the debtor company for issuing the debentures, and it may have remedies against the holders of the debentures if they attempted to collect on their debt or enforce their security. Neither possibility, however, negates the existence of the debentures and the related trust deeds. Section 3 does not contemplate an inquiry into the effectiveness or enforceability of the s. 3 debentures, as against other creditors, as a condition precedent to qualification under the Act. Such inquiries may play a role in a judge's determination as to what orders, if any, should be made under the Act.

(iii) Section 3 and the Appointment of a Receiver-Manager

86 The third argument made by the bank relies on its installation of a receiver-manager in both companies prior to the issue of the debentures. I agree with Finlayson J.A. that the placement of a receiver, either by operation of the terms of an agreement or by court order, effectively removes those formerly in control of the company from that position, and vests that control in the receiver-manager: *Alberta Treasury Branches v. Hat Development Ltd.* (1988), 71 C.B.R. (N.S.) 264, 64 Alta. L.R. (2d) 17 (Q.B.), aff'd without deciding this point (1989), 65 Alta. L.R. (2d) 374 (C.A.). I cannot, however, agree with his interpretation of the order of Saunders J. I read that order as effectively turning the receiver into a monitor with rights of access, but with no authority beyond that. The operation of the business is specifically returned to the companies. The situation created by the order of Saunders J. can usefully be compared to that which existed when the application was made in *Hat Development Ltd.* Forsyth J., at p. 268 C.B.R., states:

> The receiver-manager in this case and indeed in almost all cases is charged by the court with the responsibility of managing the affairs of a corporation. It is true that it is appointed pursuant, in this case, to the existence of secured indebtedness and at the behest of a secured creditor to realize on its security and retire the indebtedness. Nonetheless, this receiver-manager was court-appointed and not by virtue of an instrument. As a court-appointed receiver it owed the obligation and the duty to the court to account from time to time and to come before the court for the purposes of having some of its decisions ratified or for receiving advice and direction. *It is empowered by the court to manage the affairs of the company and it is completely inconsistent with that function to suggest that some residual power lies in the hands of the directors of the company to create further indebtedness of the company and thus interfere, however slightly, with the receiver-manager's ability to manage.*

[Emphasis added.]

87 After the order of Saunders J., the receiver-manager in this case was not obligated to manage the companies. Indeed, it was forbidden from doing so. The creation of the "instant" trust deeds and the application under the Act did not interfere in any way with any power or authority the receiver-manager had after the order of Saunders J. was made.

88 I also find it somewhat artificial to suggest that the presence of a receiver-manager served to vitiate the orders of Hoolihan J. Unlike many applications under s. 5 of the Act, the proceedings before Hoolihan J. were not ex parte and he was fully aware of the existence of the receiver-manager, the order of Saunders J., and the arguments based on the presence of the receiver-manager. Clearly, Hoolihan J. considered it appropriate to proceed with a plan of reorganization despite the presence of the receiver-manager and the order of Saunders J. Indeed, in his initial order he provided that the order of Saunders J. "remains extant."

Hoolihan J. did not, as I do not, see that order as an impediment to the application or the granting of relief under the Act. Had he considered that the receiver-manager was in control of the affairs of the company, he could have varied the order of Saunders J. to permit the applications under the Act to be made by the companies: *Hat Development Ltd.*, at pp. 268-269 C.B.R. It is clear to me that he would have done so had he felt it necessary. If the installation of the receiver-manager is to be viewed as a bar to an application under this Act, and if the orders of Hoolihan J. were otherwise appropriate, I would order that the order of Saunders J. should be varied to permit the creation of the debentures and the trust deeds and the bringing of this application by the companies. I take this power to exist by the combined effect of s. 14(2) of the Act and s. 144(1) of the *Courts of Justice Act*, 1984, S.O. 1984, c. 11.

89 In my opinion, the debentures and "instant" trust deeds created in August 1990 sufficed to bring the company within the requirements of s. 3 of the Act, even if in issuing those debentures the companies breached a prior agreement with the bank. I am also satisfied that, given the terms of the order of Saunders J., the existence of a receiver-manager installed by the bank did not preclude the application under s. 3 of the Act.

V Did Hoolihan J. Err in Exercising his Discretion in Favour of Directing that a Creditors' Meeting be Held to Consider the Proposed Plan of Reorganization?

90 As indicated earlier, the Act provides a number of points at which the Court must exercise its discretion. I am concerned with the initial exercise of discretion contemplated by s. 5 of the Act, by which the Court may order a meeting of creditors for purposes of considering a plan of reorganization. Hoolihan J. exercised that discretion in favour of the debtor companies. The factors relevant to the exercise of that discretion are as variable as the fact situations which may give rise to the application. Finlayson J.A. has concentrated on one such factor, the chance that the plan, if put before a properly constituted meeting of the creditors, could gain the required approval. I agree that the feasibility of the plan is a relevant and significant factor to be considered in determining whether to order a meeting of creditors: S.E. Edwards, "Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act," at pp. 594-595. I would not, however, impose a heavy burden on the debtor company to establish the likelihood of ultimate success from the outset. As the Act will often be the last refuge for failing companies, it is to be expected that many of the proposed plans of reorganization will involve variables and contingencies which will make the plan's ultimate acceptability to the creditors and the Court very uncertain at the time the initial application is made.

91 On the facts before Hoolihan J., there were several factors which supported the exercise of his discretion in favour of directing a meeting of the creditors. These included the apparent support of two of the three substantial secured creditors, the companies' continued operation, and the prospect (disputed by the bank) that the companies' fortunes would take a turn for the better in the near future, the companies' ongoing efforts — that eventually met with some

success — to find alternate financing, and the number of people depending on the operation of the company for their livelihood. There were also a number of factors pointing in the other direction, the most significant of which was the likelihood that a plan of reorganization acceptable to the bank could not be developed.

92 I see the situation which presented itself to Hoolihan J. as capable of a relatively straightforward risk-benefit analysis. If the s. 5 order had been refused by Hoolihan J., it was virtually certain that the operation of the companies would have ceased immediately. There would have been immediate economic and social damage to those who worked at the plants, and those who depended on those who worked at the plants for their well-being. This kind of damage cannot be ignored, especially when it occurs in small communities like those in which these plants are located. A refusal to grant the application would also have put the investments of the various creditors, with the exception of the bank, at substantial risk. Finally, there would have been obvious financial damage to the owner of the companies. Balanced against these costs inherent in refusing the order would be the benefit to the bank, which would then have been in a position to realize on its security in accordance with its agreements with the companies.

93 The granting of the s. 5 order was not without its costs. It has denied the bank the rights it had bargained for as part of its agreement to lend substantial amounts of money to the companies. Further, according to the bank, the order has put the bank at risk of having its loans become undersecured because of the diminishing value of the accounts receivable and inventory which it holds as security and because of the ever-increasing size of the companies' debt to the bank. These costs must be measured against the potential benefit to all concerned if a successful plan of reorganization could be developed and implemented.

94 As I see it, the key to this analysis rests in the measurement of the risk to the bank inherent in the granting of the s. 5 order. If there was a real risk that the loan made by the bank would become undersecured during the operative period of the s. 5 order, I would be inclined to hold that the bank should not have that risk forced on it by the Court. However, I am unable to see that the bank is in any real jeopardy. The value of the security held by the bank appears to be well in excess of the size of its loan on the initial application. In his affidavit, Mr. Gibbons of Coopers & Lybrand asserted that the companies had overstated their cash flow projections, that the value of the inventory could diminish if customers of the companies looked to alternate sources for their product, and that the value of the accounts receivable could decrease if customers began to claim set-offs against those receivables. On the record before me, these appear to be no more than speculative possibilities. The bank has had access to all of the companies' financial data on an ongoing basis since the order of Hoolihan J. was made almost 2 months ago. Nothing was placed before this Court to suggest that any of the possibilities described above had come to pass.

95 Even allowing for some overestimation by the companies of the value of the security held by the bank, it would appear that the bank holds security valued at approximately $4 million for a loan that was, as of the hearing of this appeal, about $2.3 million. The order of Hoolihan J. was to terminate no later than November 14, 1990. I am not satisfied that the bank ran any real risk of having the amount of the loan exceed the value of the security by that date. It is also worth noting that the order under appeal provided that any party could apply to terminate the order at any point prior to November 14. This provision provided further protection for the bank in the event that it wished to make the case that its loan was at risk because of the deteriorating value of its security.

96 Even though the chances of a successful reorganization were not good, I am satisfied that the benefits flowing from the making of the s. 5 order exceeded the risk inherent in that order. In my view, Hoolihan J. properly exercised his discretion in directing that a meeting of creditors should be held pursuant to s. 5 of the Act.

VI Did Hoolihan J. Err in Directing that the Bank and RoyNat Inc. Should be Placed in the Same Class for the Purposes of the Act?

97 I agree with Finlayson J.A. that the bank and RoyNat Inc., the two principal creditors, should not have been placed in the same class of secured creditors for the purposes of ss. 5 and 6 of the Act. Their interests are not only different, they are opposed. The classification scheme created by Hoolihan J. effectively denied the bank any control over any plan of reorganization.

98 To accord with the principles found in the cases cited by Finlayson J.A., the secured creditors should have been grouped as follows:

— Class 1 — The City of Chatham and the Village of Glencoe

— Class 2 — The Bank of Nova Scotia

— Class 3 — RoyNat Inc., Ontario Development Corporation, and those holding debentures issued by the company on August 29 and 31, 1990.

VII Did Hoolihan J. Err in Making the Interim Orders He Made?

99 Hoolihan J. made a number of orders designed to control the conduct of all of the parties, pending the creditors' meeting and the placing of a plan of reorganization before the Court. The first order was made on September 11, 1990, and was to expire on or before October 24, 1990. Subsequent orders varied the terms of the initial order somewhat, and extended its effective date until November 14, 1990.

100 These orders imposed the following conditions pending the meeting:

(a) all proceedings with respect to the debtor companies should be stayed, including any action by the bank to realize on its security;

(b) the bank could not reduce its loan by applying incoming receipts to those debts;

(c) the bank was to be the sole banker for the companies;

(d) the companies could carry on business in the normal course, subject to certain very specific restrictions;

(e) a licensed trustee was to be appointed to monitor the business operations of the companies and to report to the creditors on a regular basis; and

(f) any party could apply to terminate the interim orders, and the orders would be terminated automatically if the companies defaulted on any of the obligations imposed on them by the interim orders.

101 The orders placed significant restrictions on the bank for a 2-month period, but balanced those restrictions with provisions limiting the debtor companies' activities, and giving the bank ongoing access to up-to-date financial information concerning the companies. The bank was also at liberty to return to the Court to request any variation in the interim orders which changes in financial circumstances might merit.

102 These orders were made under the wide authority granted to the court by s. 11 of the Act. L.W. Houlden and C.H. Morawetz, in *Bankruptcy Law of Canada*, 3d ed. (Toronto: Carswell, 1989), at pp. 2-102 to 2-103, describe the purpose of the section:

> The legislation is intended to have wide scope and allows a judge to make orders which will effectively maintain the status quo for a period while the insolvent company attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for a proposed arrangement which will enable the company to remain in operation for what is, hopefully, the future benefit of both the company and it creditors. This aim is facilitated by s. 11 of the Act, which enables the court to restrain further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company upon such terms as the court sees fit.

103 A similar sentiment appears in *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.*. Gibbs J.A., in discussing the scope of s. 11, said at p. 7 [unreported, pp. 88-89 B.C.L.R.]:

> When a company has recourse to the C.C.A.A. the court is called upon to play a kind of supervisory role to preserve the status quo and to move the process along to the

point where a compromise or arrangement is approved or it is evident that the attempt is doomed to failure. Obviously time is critical. Equally obviously, if the attempt at compromise or arrangement is to have any prospect of success, there must be a means of holding the creditors at bay, hence the powers vested in the court under s. 11.

104 Similar views of the scope of the power to make interim orders covering the period when reorganization is being attempted are found in *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto-Dominion Bank; Meridian Developments Inc. v. Nu-West Ltd.*, 52 C.B.R. (N.S.) 109, [1984] 5 W.W.R. 215, 32 Alta. L.R. (2d) 150, 11 D.L.R. (4th) 576, 53 A.R. 39 (Q.B.) at 114-118 [C.B.R.]; *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361, 92 A.R. 81 (Q.B.) at 12-15 [C.B.R.]; *Quintette Coal Ltd. v. Nippon Steel Corp.*, an unreported judgment of Thackray J., released June 18, 1990 [since reported (1990), 47 B.C.L.R. (2d) 193 (S.C.)], at pp. 5-9 [pp. 196-198 B.C.L.R.]; and B. O'Leary, "A Review of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act," at p. 41.

105 The interim orders made by Hoolihan J. are all within the wide authority created by s. 11 of the Act. The orders were crafted to give the company the opportunity to continue in operation, pending its attempt to reorganize, while at the same time providing safeguards to the creditors, including the bank, during that same period. I find no error in the interim relief granted by Hoolihan J.

VIII Conclusion

106 In the result, I would allow the appeal in part, vacate the order of Hoolihan J. of October 18, 1990, insofar as it purports to settle the class of creditors for the purpose of the Act, and I would substitute an order establishing the three classes referred to in Part VI of these reasons. I would not disturb any of the other orders made by Hoolihan J.

Appeal allowed.

End of Document

TAB 2

Para 7

2009 NSSC 163
Nova Scotia Supreme Court

ScoZinc Ltd., Re

2009 CarswellNS 283, 2009 NSSC 163, 177 A.C.W.S. (3d) 294, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 205

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 Limited

D.R. Beveridge J.

Heard: May 1, 2009
Judgment: May 1, 2009
Written reasons: May 20, 2009
Docket: Hfx 305549

Counsel: John D. Stringer, Q.C., Ben Durnford for Applicant
Robbie MacKeigan, Q.C. for Daniel Rozon
John McFarlane, Q.C. for Kamatsu

Subject: Insolvency

MOTION by company for order for meeting of creditors pursuant to ss. 4 and 5 of *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, further extension of stay of proceedings granted to company under *Act*, and approval of notice of motion being given only to certain defined creditors.

***D.R. Beveridge J.*:**

1 ScoZinc brings a motion seeking an order to accomplish three things. The first is for a meeting of the creditors pursuant to ss. 4 and 5 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. The second is a further extension of the stay of proceedings initially ordered by this Court on December 22, 2008 and extended from time to time. The third is approval of notice of this motion being given only to certain defined creditors.

2 The company has filed an affidavit of William Felderhof referred to as his seventh affidavit, sworn April 28, 2009 and the Monitor has filed its sixth report dated April 30, 2009.

3 As part of its submissions the company notes that there is nothing in the *CCAA* which requires the Court to give prior preliminary approval of ScoZinc's proposed plan before it is presented to the creditors. It notes that the jurisprudence establishes that this approval is generally desirable prior to calling a meeting of the creditors. Some, but not all of this jurisprudence was reviewed by MacAdam J. in *Federal Gypsum Co., Re*, 2007 NSSC 384 (N.S. S.C.).

4 Justice MacAdam in *Federal Gypsum Co., Re* did refer to the two different standards that have been proposed or referred to in cases from Ontario and British Columbia. Some of these cases have expressed the view that the debtor company should establish that the plan has "a reasonable chance" that it would be accepted by the creditors. Other cases have referred to the appropriate test as simply a determination as to whether or not the proposed plan is one that would be "doomed to failure".

5 In a different context, Glube C.J.T.D. (as she then was) in *Fairview Industries Ltd., Re* (1991), 11 C.B.R. (3d) 43 (N.S. T.D.) cautioned that it would be impractical and extremely costly to continue to prepare a plan when "there is no hope that it would be approved".

6 I think it fair to say that MacAdam J., although not expressly but by necessary implication, preferred the lower standard facing a debtor company in submitting its plan to the Court for a preliminary approval. At para. 12 he wrote:

> [12] In view of the relatively low threshold on the Company in seeking Court approval to have a plan of arrangement submitted to the creditors for a vote, I am satisfied the plan should proceed and the creditors should determine whether they do, or do not accept the plan as finally filed.

7 In my opinion it should not be up to the Court to second guess the probability of success of a proposed plan of arrangement. Businessmen are free to make their own views known before and ultimately at the creditors' meeting. It seems to me that the Court should only decline to give preliminary approval and refuse to order a meeting if it was of the view that there was no hope that the plan would be approved by the creditors or, if it was approved by the creditors, it would not, for some other reason, be approved by the Court.

8 The Monitor in its sixth report says that the proposed plan is reasonable under the circumstances. This opinion appears to flow from its conclusion that if the plan is rejected and the company forced into receivership or bankruptcy, unsecured creditors will not recover the amount offered in the plan and it is highly unlikely that the secured creditors will recover the amount offered to them. I see no reason to disagree with the opinion offered by the Monitor.

9 Given that opinion and in light of the terms that are set out in the proposed plan I am certainly satisfied that the plan is far from one that is doomed to failure. It is one that should be put to the creditors for their consideration. It is therefore appropriate that I exercise the discretion that is set out in ss. 4 and 5 of the *CCAA* and order a meeting of the creditors on the terms set out in the proposed meeting order.

10 With respect to the extension of the stay of proceedings, as I noted at the outset there had been an initial order of this Court under s.11 of the *CCAA*. This order was granted on December 22, 2008. It was, as required by the statute, limited to a period of 30 days. It has been extended on two previous occasions. It is now due to expire May 22nd, 2009. The meeting of the creditors is scheduled for May 21, 2009. There is a tentative return date scheduled for May 28, 2009 for the Court to consider sanctioning the plan, should it be approved by the creditors.

11 The test with respect to extending the stay of proceedings has been set out in a number of cases that have considered ss. 11(4) and (6) of the *CCAA*. These were reviewed by me in *ScoZinc Ltd., Re*, 2009 NSSC 108 (N.S. S.C.). In these circumstances there is no need to review the test and the evidence in support of that test.

12 In light of my conclusion that the company had met the threshold for ordering a meeting of the creditors under ss. 4 and 5 of the *CCAA* the appropriateness of a further extension permitting the company to return to the Court within a very short period of time following that meeting of the creditors is patently obvious. The extension is therefore granted.

13 The last issue is the approval of notice of this motion being given only to certain defined creditors. Given the number of creditors that appeared early on in the proceedings it was somewhat impractical to give notice to each of them with the volumes of materials that would be required to be produced and served. With respect to the prior motions it was required that notice be given to all creditors asserting claims against the debtor company in excess of $100,000.00 and all creditors asserting builders liens. In addition all creditors were apprised of these proceedings by way of the mail out to each and every creditor as required by the *CCAA* leading to filing of proofs of claim. The status of the proceedings, including this motion, have been posted on the Monitor's website. I see no reason to depart from the previous practice and this aspect of the motion is also granted.

Motion granted.

End of Document

TAB 3

Paras 68-69

2016 ONSC 316
Ontario Superior Court of Justice

Target Canada Co., Re

2016 CarswellOnt 589, 2016 ONSC 316, 263 A.C.W.S. (3d) 298, 32 C.B.R. (6th) 48

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-36, as Amended

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Target Canada Co., Target Canada Health Co., Target Canada Mobile GP Co., Target Canada Pharmacy (BC) Corp., Target Canada Pharmacy (Ontario) Corp., Target Canada Pharmacy Corp., Target Canada Pharmacy (SK) Corp., and Target Canada Property LLC.

G.B. Morawetz R.S.J.

Heard: December 21-22, 2015
Judgment: January 15, 2016
Docket: CV-15-10832-00CL

Counsel: Jeremy Dacks, Shawn Irving, Tracy Sandler, for Applicants, Target Canada Co., Target Canada Health Co., Target Canada Mobile GP Co., Target Canada Pharmacy (BC) Corp., Target Canada Pharmacy (Ontario) Corp., Target Canada Pharmacy Corp., Target Canada Pharmacy (SK) Corp., and Target Canada Property LLC
Linda Galessiere, Gus Camelino, for 20 VIC Management Inc. (on behalf of various landlords), Morguard Investments Limited (on behalf of various landlords), Calloway Real Estate Investment Trust (on behalf of Calloway REIT (Hopedale) Inc.), Calloway REIT (Laurentian Inc.), Crombie REIT, Triovest Realty Advisors Inc. (on behalf of various landlords), Brad-Lea Meadows Limited and Blackwood Partners Management Corporation (on behalf of Surrey CC Properties Inc.)
Laura M. Wagner, Mathew P. Gottlieb, for KingSett Capital Inc.
Yannick Katirai, Daniel Hamson, for Eleven Points Logistics Inc.
Daniel Walker, for M.E.T.R.O. (Manufacture, Export, Trade, Research Office) Incorporated / Kerson Invested Limited
Jay A. Schwartz, Robin Schwill, for Target Corporation
Miranda Spence, for CREIT
Jay Carfagnini, Jesse Mighton, Alan Mark, Melaney Wagner, for Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc. in its capacity as Monitor
James Harnum, for Employee

Harvey Chaiton, for Directors and Officers of the Applicants
Stephen M. Raicek, Mathew Maloley, for Faubourg Boisbriand Shopping Centre Limited and Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada
Vern W. DaRe, for Doral Holdings Limited and 430635 Ontario Inc.
Stuart Brotman, for Sobeys Capital Incorporated
Catherine Francis, for Primaris Reit
Kyla Mahar, for Centerbridge Partners and Davidson Kempner
William V. Sasso, for Pharmacist
Varoujan C. Arman, for Nintendo of Canada Ltd., Universal Studios Canada Inc., Thyssenkrupp Elevator (Canada) Limited, RPI Consulting Group Inc.
Brian Parker, for Montez (Cornerbrook) Inc., Admns Meadowlands Investment Corp, and Valiant Rental Inc.
Roger Jaipargas, for Glentel Inc., Bell Canada and BCE Nexxia
Nancy Tourgis for Issi Inc.

Subject: Insolvency

MOTION to accept joint plan and compromise, to establish class of affected creditors to vote on plan, and authority to hold meeting of those creditors and vote on plan and related procedures, and to set date for hearing of sanction of plan of it was accepted.

***G.B. Morawetz R.S.J.*:**

1 The Applicants Target Canada Co., Target Canada Health Co., Target Canada Mobile GP Co., Target Canada Pharmacy (BC) Corp, Target Canada Pharmacy (Ontario) Corp, Target Canada Pharmacy Corp, Target Canada Pharmacy (Sk) Corp, and Target Canada Property LLC ("Target Canada") bring this motion for an order, *inter alia*:

(a) accepting the filing of a Joint Plan Compromise and Arrangement in respect of Target Canada Entities (defined below) dated November 27, 2015 (the "Plan");

(b) authorizing the Target Canada Entities to establish one class of Affected Creditors (as defined in the Plan) for the purpose of considering and voting on the Plan (the "Unsecured Creditors' Class");

(c) authorizing the Target Canada Entities to call, hold and conduct a meeting of the Affected Creditors (the "Creditors' Meeting") to consider and vote on a resolution to approve the Plan, and approving the procedures to be followed with respect to the Creditors' Meeting;

(d) setting the date for the hearing of the Target Canada Entities' motion seeking sanction of the Plan should the Plan be approved by the required majority of Affected Creditors of the Creditors Meeting.

2 On January 13, 2016, the Record was endorsed as follows: "The Plan is not accepted for filing. The Motion is dismissed. Reasons to follow."

3 These are the reasons.

4 The Applicants and Partnerships listed on Schedule "A" to the Initial Order (the "Target Canada Entities") were granted protection from their creditors under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") pursuant to the Initial Order dated January 15, 2015 (as Amended and Restated, the "Initial Order"). Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc. was appointed in the Initial Order to act as the Monitor. [1]

5 The Target Canada Entities, with the support of Target Corporation as Plan Sponsor, have now developed a Plan to present to Affected Creditors.

6 The Target Canada Entities propose that the Creditors' Meeting will be held on February 2, 2016.

7 The requested relief sought by Target Canada is supported by Target Corporation, Employee Representative Counsel, Centerbridge Partners, L.P. and Davidson Kempner, CREIT, Glentel Inc., Bell Canada and BCE Nexxia, M.E.T.R.O. Incorporated, Eleven Points Logistics Inc., Issi Inc. and Sobeys Capital Incorporated.

8 The Monitor also supports the motion.

9 The motion was opposed by KingSett Capital, Morguard Investments Limited, Morguard Investment REIT, Smart REIT, Crombie REIT, Triovest, Faubourg Boisbriand and Sun Life Assurance, Primaris REIT, and Doral Holdings Limited (the "Objecting Landlords").

Background

10 In February 2015, the court approved the Inventory Liquidation Process and the Real Property Portfolio Sale Process ("RPPSP") to enable the Target Canada Entities to maximize the value of their assets for distribution to creditors.

11 By the summer of 2015, the processes were substantially concluded and a claims process was undertaken. The Target Canada Entities began to develop a plan that would distribute the proceeds and complete the orderly wind-down of their business.

12 The Target Canada Entities discussed the development of the Plan with representatives of Target Corporation.

13 The Target Canada Entities negotiated a structure with Target Corporation whereby Target Corporation would subordinate significant intercompany claims for the benefit of remaining creditors and would make other contributions under the Plan.

14 Target Corporation maintained that it would only consider subordinating these intercompany claims and making other contributions as part of a global settlement of all issues relating to the Target Canada Entities including a settlement and release of all Landlord Guarantee Claims where Target Corporation was the Guarantor.

15 The Plan as structured, if approved, sanctioned and implemented will

(i) complete the wind-down of the Target Canada Entities;

(ii) effect a compromise, settlement and payment of all Proven Claims; and

(iii) grant releases of the Target Canada Entities and Target Corporation, among others.

16 The Plan provides that, for the purposes of considering and voting on the plan, the Affected Creditors will constitute a single class (the "Unsecured Creditors' Class").

17 In the majority of CCAA proceedings, motions of this type are procedural in nature and more often than not they proceed without any significant controversy. This proceeding is, however, not the usual proceeding and this motion has attracted significant controversy. The Objecting Landlords have raised concerns about the terms of the Plan.

18 The Objecting Landlords take the position that this motion deals with not only procedural issues but substantive rights. The Objecting Landlords have two major concerns.

Objection # 1 — Breach of paragraph 19A of the Amended and Restated Order

19 First, in February 2015, an Amended and Restated Order was sought by Target Canada. Paragraph 19A was incorporated into the Amended and Restated Order, which provides that the claims of any landlord against Target Corporation relating to any lease of real property (the "Landlord Guarantee Claims") shall not be determined in this CCAA proceeding and shall not be released or affected in any way in any plan filed by the Applicants.

20 Paragraph 19A provides as follows:

> 19A. THIS COURT ORDERS that, without in any way altering, increasing, creating or eliminating any obligation or duty to mitigate losses or damages, the rights, remedies and claims (collectively, the "Landlord Guarantee Claims") of any landlord against Target US pursuant to any indemnity, guarantee, or surety relating to a lease of real property, including, without limitation, the validity, enforceability or quantum of such Landlord Guarantee Claims: (a) shall be determined by a judge of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice (Commercial List), whether or not the within proceeding under the CCAA continue (without altering the applicable and operative governing law of such indemnity, guarantee or surety) and notwithstanding the provisions of any federal or provincial statutes with respect to procedural matters relating to the Landlord Guarantee Claims; provided that any landlord holding such guarantees, indemnities or sureties that has not consented to the foregoing may, within fifteen (15) days of the making of this Order, bring a motion to have the matter of the venue for the determination of its Landlord Guarantee Claim adjudicated by the Court; (b) shall not be determined, directly or indirectly, in the within CCAA proceedings; (c) shall be unaffected by any determination (including any findings of fact, mixed fact and law or conclusions of law) of any rights, remedies and claims of such landlords as against Target Canada Entities, whether made in the within proceedings under the CCAA or in any subsequent proposal or bankruptcy proceedings under the BIA, other than that any recoveries under such proceedings received by such landlords shall constitute a reduction and offset to any Landlord Guarantee Claims; and (d) shall be treated as unaffected and shall not be released or affected in any way in any Plan filed by the Target Canada Entities, or any of them, under the CCAA, or any proposal filed by the Target Canada Entities, or any of them, under the BIA.

21 The evidence of Target Canada in support of the requested change consisted of the Affidavit of Mark Wong, who stated at the time:

> A component of obtaining the consent of the Landlord Group for approval of the Real Property Portfolio Sales Process ("RPPSP") was the agreement of The Target Canada Entities to seek approval of certain changes to the initial order in the form of an amended and restated initial order...[T]hese proposed changes were the subject of significant negotiation between the Landlord Group and The Target Canada Entities, with the assistance and input of the Monitor and Target Corporation.

22 The Monitor, in its second report dated February 9, 2015, stated:

> (3.4) Counsel to the Landlord Group advised that the Real Property Portfolio Sales Process proceeding on a consensual basis as described below is conditional on the proposed changes to the initial order.

(3.5) The Monitor recommends approval of the amended and restated initial order as it reflects;

(a) revisions negotiated as among The Target Canada Entities, the Landlord Group and Target U.S. (in conjunction with revisions to the Real Property Portfolio Sales Process), with the assistance of the Monitor; and

(b) a fair and reasonable balancing of interests.

23 Thus, Objecting Landlords contend that the agreement resulting in Paragraph 19A of the Amended and Restated Initial Order was not just a condition of the Landlord Group's agreement to the RPPSP — it was also a condition of the Landlord Group withdrawing both its opposition to the CCAA process and its intention to commence a bankruptcy application to put the Applicants into bankruptcy at the come back hearing.

24 The Objecting Landlords contend that the Applicants now seek to file a plan that releases the Landlord Guarantee Claims. This, in their view, is a clear breach of paragraph 19A, which Target Canada sought and the Monitor supported.

Objection # 2 — Breach of paragraph 55 of the Claim Procedure Order

25 Second, the Objecting Landlords contend that the Plan violates the Claims Procedure Order and the CCAA. They argue that the Claims Procedure Order was also settled after prolonged negotiations between the Target Canada Entities and their creditors, including the landlords and that this order sets out a comprehensive claims process for determining all claims, including landlords' claims.

26 The Objecting Landlords contend that Paragraph 55 of the Claims Procedure Order expressly excludes Landlord Guarantee Claims and provides that nothing in the Claims Procedure Order shall prejudice, limit, or otherwise affect any claims, including under any guarantee, against Target Corporation or any predecessor tenant. Paragraph 55 also ends with the *proviso* that "[f]or greater certainty, this Order is subject to and shall not derogate from paragraph 19A of the Initial Order."

27 The Objecting Landlords take the position that, in clear breach of Paragraph 55 and of the Claims Procedure Order generally, the Plan provides for a set formula to determine landlord claims, including claims against Target Corporation under its guarantees. KingSett further contends that the formula not only purports to determine landlords' claims for distribution purposes, it also purports to determine their claims for voting purposes, with no ability to challenge either. KingSett contends that this violates the terms of the Claims Procedure Order that was sought by the Applicants and supported by the Monitor.

28 In summary, the Objecting Landlords take the position that the foregoing issues are crucial threshold issues and are not merely "procedural" questions and as such the court has to determine whether it can accept a plan for filing if that plan in effect permits Target Canada to renege on their agreements with creditors, violate court orders and the CCAA.

29 In my view the issues raised by the Objecting Landlords are significant and they should be determined at this time.

Position of Target Canada

30 Target Canada takes the position that the threshold for the court to authorize Target Canada to hold the creditors meeting is low and that Target Canada meets this threshold.

31 Target Canada submits that the Plan has been the subject of numerous discussions and/or negotiations with Target Corporation (leading to a structure based on Target Corporation serving as Plan Sponsor), the Monitor and a wide variety of stakeholders. Target Canada states that if approved, the Plan will effect a compromise, settlement and payment of all proven claims in the near term in a manner that maximizes and accelerates stakeholder recovery.

32 Target Corporation, as Plan Sponsor and a creditor of Target Canada, has agreed to subordinate approximately $5 billion in intercompany claims to the claims of other Affected Creditors. Based on the Monitor's preliminary analysis, the Plan provides for recoveries for Affected Creditors generally in the range of 75% to 85% of their proven claims.

33 Target Canada contends that recent case law supports the jurisdiction of the CCAA court to provide that third party claims be addressed within the CCAA and leaves it open to a debtor company to address such claims in a plan.

34 The Plan provides that Affected Creditors will vote on the Plan as a single unsecured class. Target Canada submits that this is appropriate on the basis that all Affected Creditors have the required commonality of interest (i.e. an unsecured claim) in relation to the claims against Target Canada and the Plan will compromise and release all of their claims.

35 Target Canada is of the view that fragmentation of these creditors into separate classes would jeopardize the ability to achieve a successful plan.

36 The Plan values the Landlord Restructuring Period Claims of landlords whose leases have been disclaimed by applying a formula ("Landlord Formula Amount") derived from the formula provided under s. 65.2 (3) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 ("BIA" and "BIA Formula"). The Landlord Formula Amount enhances the BIA Formula by permitting recovery of an additional year of rent. Target Corporation intends to contribute

funds necessary to pay this enhancement (the "Landlord Guarantee Top-Up Amounts") Target Canada contends that the use of the BIA Formula to value landlord claims for voting and distribution purposes has been approved in other CCAA proceedings.

37 With respect to the Landlord Formula Amount to calculate the Landlord Restructuring Period Claims, the formula provides for, in effect, Landlord Restructuring Period Claims to be valued at the lesser of either:

(i) rent payable under the lease for the two years following the disclaimer plus 15% of the rent for the remainder of the lease term; or

(ii) four years rent.

38 Target Canada further contends that the court has the jurisdiction to modify the Initial Order on Plan Implementation to permit the Target Canada Entities to address Landlord Guarantee Claims in the Plan and that it is appropriate to do so in these circumstances. This justification is based on the premise that the landscape of the proceedings has been significantly altered since the filing date, particularly in light of the material contributions that Target Corporation prepared to make as Plan Sponsor in order to effect a global resolution of issues. Further, they argue that Landlord Guarantee Creditors are appropriately compensated under the Plan for their Landlord Guarantee Claims by means of the Landlord Guarantee Creditor Top-Up amounts, which will be funded by Target Corporation. As such, Landlord Guarantee Creditors will be paid 100% of their Landlord Restructuring Period Claims, valued in accordance with the Landlord Formula Amount.

39 The Applicants contend that they seek to achieve a fair and equitable balance in the Plan. The Applicants submit that questions as to whether the Plan is in fact balanced, and fair and reasonable towards particular stakeholders, are matters best assessed by Affected Creditors who will exercise their business judgment in voting for or against the Plan. Until Affected Creditors have expressed their views, considerations of fairness are premature and are not matters that are required to be considered by the court in granting the requested Creditors' Meeting. If the Plan is approved by the requisite majority of the Affected Creditors, the court will then be in a position to fully evaluate the fairness and reasonableness of the Plan as a whole, with the benefit of the business judgment of Affected Creditors as reflected in the vote of the Creditors' Meeting.

40 The significant features of the Plan include:

(i) the Plan contemplates that a single class of Affected Creditors will consider and vote on the plan.

(ii) the Plan entitles Affected Creditors holding proven claims that are less than or equal to $25,000 ("Convenience Class Creditors") to be paid in full;

(iii) the Plan provides that all Landlord Restructuring Period Claims will be calculated using the Landlord Formula Amount derived from the BIA Formula;

(iv) As a result of direct funding from Target Corporation of the Landlord Guarantee Creditor Top-Up amounts, Landlord Guarantee Creditors will be paid the full value of their Landlord Restructuring Period Claims;

(v) Intercompany Claims will be valued at the amount set out in the Monitor's Intercompany Claims Report;

(vi) If approved and sanctioned, the Plan will require an amendment to Paragraph 19A of the Initial Order which currently provides that the Landlord Guarantee Claims are to be dealt with outside these CCAA proceedings. The Plan provides that this amendment will be addressed at the sanction hearing once it has been determined whether the Affected Creditors support the Plan.

(vii) In exchange for Target Corporations' economic contributions, Target Corporation and certain other third parties (including Hudson's Bay Company and Zellers, which have indemnities from Target Corporation) will be released, including in relation to all Landlord Guarantee Claims.

41 If the Plan is approved and implemented, Target Corporation will be making economic contributions to the Plan. In particular:

(a) In addition to the subordination of the $3.1 billion intercompany claim that Target Corporation agreed to subordinate at the outset of these CCAA proceedings, on Plan Implementation Date, Target Corporation will cause Property LLP to subordinate almost all of the Property LLP ("Propco") Intercompany Claim which was filed against Propco in an additional amount of approximately $1.4 billion;

(b) In turn, Propco will concurrently subordinate the Propco Intercompany Claim filed against TCC in an amount of approximately $1.9 billion (adjusted by the Monitor to $1.3 billion);

(c) Target Corporation will contribute funds necessary to pay the Landlord Guarantee Creditor Top-Up Amounts.

42 Target Canada points out that in discussions with Target Corporation to establish the structure for the Plan, Target Corporation maintained that it would only consider

subordinating these remaining intercompany claims as part of a global settlement of all issues relating to the Target Canada Entities, including all Landlord Guarantee Claims.

43 The issue on this motion is whether the requested Creditors' Meeting should be granted. Section 4 of the CCAA provides:

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

44 Counsel cites *Nova Metal Products* for the proposition that the feasibility of a plan is a relevant significant factor to be considered in determining whether to order a meeting of creditors. However, the court should not impose a heavy burden on a debtor company to establish the likelihood of ultimate success at the outset (*Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282 (Ont. C.A.).

45 Counsel submit that the court should order a meeting of creditors unless there is no hope that the plan will be approved by the creditors or, if approved, the plan would not for some other reason be approved by the court (*ScoZinc Ltd., Re*, 2009 NSSC 163, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 205 (N.S. S.C.)).

46 Counsel also submits that the court has described the granting of the Creditors' Meeting as essentially a "procedural step" that does not engage considerations of whether the debtors' plan is fair and reasonable. Thus, counsel contends, unless it is abundantly clear the plan will not be approved by its creditors, the debtor company is entitled to put its plan before those creditors and to allow the creditors to exercise their business judgment in determining whether to support or reject it.

47 Target Canada takes the position that there is no basis for concluding that the Plan has, no hope of success and the court should therefore exercise its discretion to order the Creditors Meeting.

48 Counsel to Target Canada submits that the flexibility of the CCAA allows the Target Canada Entities to apply a uniform formula for valuing Landlord Restructuring Period Claims for voting and distribution purposes, including Landlord Guarantee Claims, in the interests of ensuring expeditious distributions to all Affected Creditors

49 Counsel contends that if each Landlord Restructuring Period Claim had to be individually calculated based on the unique facts applicable to each lease, including future

prospects for mitigation and uncertain collateral damage, the resulting disputes would embroil disputes between landlords and the Target Canada Entities in lengthy proceedings. Counsel contends that the issue relating to the Landlord Guarantee Claims is more properly a matter of the overall fairness and reasonableness of the Plan and should be addressed at the sanction hearing.

50 The Plan also contemplates releases for the benefit of Target Corporation and other third parties to recognize the material economic contribution that have resulted in favourable recoveries for Affected Creditors. These releases, Target Canada contends, satisfy the well established test for the CCAA court to approve third party releases. (*ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 42 C.B.R. (5th) 90 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), affirmed 2008 ONCA 587 (Ont. C.A.), (sub nom. Re *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*)

51 Likewise, the issue of Third Party Claims and Third Party Releases is a matter that can be addressed at sanction.

52 With respect to the amendment to Paragraph 19A of the Initial Order, counsel submits that since the date of the Initial Order, and since this paragraph was included in the Initial Order, the landscape of the restructuring has shifted considerably, most notably in the form of the economic contributions that are being offered by Target Corporation, as Plan Sponsor.

53 The Target Entities propose that on Plan Implementation, Paragraph 19A of the Initial Order will be deleted. Counsel submits that the court has the jurisdiction to amend the Initial Order through its broad jurisdiction under s. 11 of the CCAA to make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances and further, the court would be exercising its discretion to amend its own order, on the basis that it is just and appropriate to do so in these particular circumstances. Counsel submits that the requested amendment is essential to the success of the Plan and to maximize and expedite recoveries for all stakeholders. Further, the notion that a post-filing contract cannot be amended despite subsequent events fails to do justice to the flexible and "real time" nature of a CCAA proceeding.

54 As such, counsel contends that no further information is necessary in order for the landlords to determine whether the Plan is fair and reasonable and they are in a position to vote for or against the Plan.

Position of the Objecting Landlords

55 At the outset of this proceeding, Target Canada, Target Corporation and Target Canada's landlords agreed that Landlord Guarantee Claims would not be affected by any Plan. In exchange, several landlords with Landlord Guarantee Claims agreed to withdraw

their opposition to Target Canada proceeding with the liquidation under the CCAA and the RPPSP.

56 Counsel to the landlords submit that 10 months after having received the benefit of the landlords not opposing the RPPSP and the continuation of the CCAA, Target Canada seeks the court's approval to unequivocally renege on the agreement that violates the Amended Order by filing a Plan that compromises Landlord Guarantee Claims.

57 The Objecting Landlords also contend that the proposed plan violates the Amended Order and the Claims Procedure Order by purporting to the value the landlords' claims, including all Landlord Guarantee Claims, using a formula.

58 Objecting Landlords take the position that they have claims against Target Canada as a result of its disclaimer of long term leases, guaranteed by Target Corporation, in excess of the amount that the Plan values these claim. One example is the claim of KingSett. KingSett insists they have a claim of at least $26 million which has been valued for Plan purposes at $4 million plus taxes.

59 The Objecting Landlords submit that the court cannot and should not allow a plan to be filed that violates the court's orders and agreements made by the Applicant. Further, if the motion is granted, the CCAA will no longer allow for a reliable process pursuant to which creditors can expect to negotiate with an Applicant in good faith. Counsel contends that the amendment of the Initial Order to buttress the agreement between the parties not to compromise the Landlord Guarantee Claims was intended to strengthen, not weaken, the landlords' ability to enforce Target Canada and Target Corporation's contractual obligation not to file a plan that compromises Landlord Guarantee Claims and it would be a perverse outcome for the court to hold otherwise.

60 With respect to claims procedure, the Claims Procedure Order provides in Paragraph 32 that a claim that is subject to a dispute "shall" be referred to a claims officer of the court for adjudication. The Objecting Landlords submit that the Claims Procedure Order reaffirms the agreement between Target Canada, Target Corporation and the Landlord Group with respect to Landlord Guarantee Claims; they refer to Paragraph 55 which specifically provides that nothing in the order shall prejudice, limit, bar, extinguish or otherwise affect any rights or claims, including under any guarantee or indemnity, against Target Corporation or any predecessor tenant.

61 Counsel for the Objecting Landlords submit that the Plan provides the basis for Target Corporation to avoid its obligation to honour guarantees to landlords, which Target Corporation agreed would not be compromised as part of the CCAA proceedings. Counsel contends that the Plan seeks to use the leverage of the "Plan Sponsor" against the creditors

to obtain approval to renege on its obligations. This, according to counsel, amounts to an economic decision by Target Corporation in its own financial interest.

62 In support of its proposition that the court cannot accept a plan's call for a meeting where the plan cannot be sanctioned, counsel references *Crystallex International Corp., Re*, 2013 ONSC 823, 2013 CarswellOnt 3043 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) . Counsel submits that the court should not allow the Applicants to file a plan that from the outset cannot be sanctioned because it violates court orders or is otherwise improper.

63 In this case, counsel submits that the Plan cannot be accepted for filing because it violates Paragraph 19A of the Amended Order and Paragraph 55 of the Claims Procedure Order. The Objecting Landlords stated as follows:

> Paragraph 19A of the Amended Order is unequivocal. Landlord Guarantee Claims:
>
> (a) shall not be determined, directly or indirectly, in the CCAA proceeding;
>
> (b) shall be unaffected by any determination of claims of landlords against Target Canada; and,
>
> (c) shall be treated as unaffected and shall not be released or affected in any way in any Plan filed by Target Canada under the CCAA.
>
> Likewise, the Claims Procedure Order, as amended, clearly provides that:
>
> (a) disputed creditors' claims shall be adjudicated by a Claims Officer or the Court;
>
> (b) creditors have until February 12, 2016 to object to intercreditor claims; and,
>
> (c) the claims process shall not affect Landlord Guarantee Claims and shall not derogate from paragraph 19A of the Amended Order.
>
> There is no dispute that the Plan that Target Canada now seeks to file violates these terms of the Amended Order and the Claims Procedure Order...

64 With respect to the issue of Paragraph 19A, counsel submits that this provision benefits Target Canada's creditors who have guarantees from Target Corporation. Further, under the plan, these creditors gain nothing from subordination of Target Corporation's intercompany claim, which only benefits creditors who did not obtain guarantees from Target Corporation. Counsel referred to *Alternative Fuel Systems Inc., Re*, 2003 ABQB 745, 20 Alta. L.R. (4th) 264 (Alta. Q.B.), aff'd 2004 ABCA 31, 346 A.R. 28 (Alta. C.A.), where both courts emphasized the importance of following a claims procedure and complying with ss. 20(1)(a)(iii) to determine landlord claims.

65 Accordingly, counsel submits that barring landlord consent at the claims process stage of the CCAA proceeding, the court cannot unilaterally impose a cookie cutter formula to determine landlord claims at the plan stage.

Analysis

66 Target Canada submits that the threshold for the court to authorize Target Canada to hold the creditors meeting is low and that Target Canada meets this threshold.

67 In my view, it is not necessary to comment on this submission insofar as this Plan is flawed to the extent that even the low threshold test has not been met.

68 Simply put, I am of the view that this Plan does not have even a reasonable chance of success, as it could not, in this form, be sanctioned.

69 As such, I see no point in directing Target Canada to call and conduct a meeting of creditors to consider this Plan, as proceeding with a meeting in these circumstances would only result in a waste of time and money.

70 Even if the Affected Creditors voted in favour of the Plan in the requisite amounts, the court examines three criteria at the sanction hearing:

(i) Whether there has been strict compliance with all statutory requirements;

(ii) Whether all materials filed and procedures carried out were authorized by the CCAA;

(iii) Whether the Plan is fair and reasonable.

(See *Quintette Coal Ltd., Re* (1992), 13 C.B.R. (3d) 146 (B.C. S.C.); *Dairy Corp. of Canada Ltd., Re*, [1934] O.R. 436 (Ont. C.A.); *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Northland Properties Ltd., Re* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 175 (B.C. S.C.) at p. 182, aff'd (1989), (1989), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 195 (B.C. C.A.); *BlueStar Battery Systems International Corp., Re* (2000), 25 C.B.R. (4th) 216 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

71 As explained below, the Plan cannot meet the required criteria.

72 It is incumbent upon the court, in its supervisory role, to ensure that the CCAA process unfolds in a fair and transparent manner. It is in this area that this Plan falls short. In considering whether to order a meeting of creditors to consider this Plan, the relevant question to consider is the following: Should certain landlords, who hold guarantees from Target Corporation, a non-debtor, be required, through the CCAA proceedings of Target

Canada, to release Target Corporation from its guarantee in exchange for consideration in the Plan in the form of the Landlord Formula Amount?

73 The CCAA proceedings of Target Canada were commenced a year ago. A broad stay of proceedings was put into effect. Target Canada put forward a proposal to liquidate its assets. The record establishes that from the outset, it was clear that the Objecting Landlords were concerned about whether the CCAA proceedings would be used in a manner that would affect the guarantees they held from Target Corporation.

74 The record also establishes that the Objecting Landlords, together with Target Canada and Target Corporation, reached an understanding which was formalized through the addition of paragraph 19A to the Initial and Restated Order. Paragraph 19A provides that these CCAA proceedings would not be used to compromise the guarantee claims that those landlords have as against Target Corporation.

75 The Objecting Landlords take the position that in the absence of paragraph 19A, they would have considered issuing bankruptcy proceedings as against Target Canada. In a bankruptcy, landlord claims against Target Canada would be fixed by the BIA Formula and presumably, the Objecting Landlords would consider their remedies as against Target Corporation as guarantor. Regardless of whether or not these landlords would have issued bankruptcy proceedings, the fact remains that paragraph 19A was incorporated into the Initial and Restated Order in response to the concerns raised by the Objecting Landlords at the motion of the Target Corporation, and with the support of Target Corporation and the Monitor.

76 Target Canada developed a liquidation plan, in consultation with its creditors and the Monitor, that allowed for the orderly liquidation of its inventory and established the sale process for its real property leases. Target Canada liquidated its assets and developed a plan to distribute the proceeds to its creditors. The proceeds are being made available to all creditors having Proven Claims. The creditors include trade creditors and landlords. In addition, Target Corporation agreed to subordinate its claim. The Plan also establishes a Landlord Formula Amount. If this was all that the Plan set out to do, in all likelihood a meeting of creditors would be ordered.

77 However, this is not all that the plan accomplishes. Target Canada proposes that paragraph 19A be varied so that the Plan can address the guarantee claims that landlords have as against Target Corporation. In other words, Target Canada has proposed a Plan which requires the court to completely ignore the background that led to paragraph 19A and the reliance that parties placed in paragraph 19A.

78 Target Canada contends that it is necessary to formulate the plan in this matter to address a change in the landscape. There may very well have been changes in the economic

landscape, but I fail to see how that justifies the departure from the agreed upon course of action as set out in paragraph 19A. Even if the current landscape is not favourable for Target Corporation, this development does not justify this court endorsing a change in direction over the objections the Objecting Landlords.

79 This is not a situation where a debtor is using the CCAA to compromise claims of creditor. Rather, this is an attempt to use the CCAA as a means to secure a release of Target Corporation from its liabilities under the guarantees in exchange for allowing claims of Objecting Landlords in amounts calculated under the Landlord Formula Amount. The proposal of Target Canada and Target Corporation clearly contravenes the agreement memorialized and enforced in paragraph 19A.

80 Paragraph 19A arose in a post-CCAA filing environment, with each interested party carefully negotiating its position. The fact that the agreement to include paragraph 19A in the Amended and Restated Order was reached in a post-filing environment is significant (see *Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada (Trustees of) v. Sino-Forest Corp.*, 2015 ONSC 4004, 27 C.B.R. (6th) 134 (Ont. S.C.J.) at paras. 33-35). In my view, there was never any doubt that Target Canada and Target Corporation were aware of the implications of paragraph 19A and by proposing this Plan, Target Canada and Target Corporation seek to override the provisions of paragraph 19A. They ask the court to let them back out of their binding agreement after having received the benefit of performance by the landlords. They ask the court to let them try to compromise the Landlord Guarantee Claims against Target Corporation after promising not to do that very thing in these proceedings. They ask the court to let them eliminate a court order to which they consented without proving that they having any grounds to rescind the order. In my view, it is simply not appropriate to proceed with the Plan that requires such an alteration.

81 The CCAA process is one of building blocks. In this proceedings, a stay has been granted and a plan developed. During these proceedings, this court has made number of orders. It is essential that court orders made during CCAA proceedings be respected. In this case, the Amended Restated Order was an order that was heavily negotiated by sophisticated parties. They knew that they were entering into binding agreements supported by binding orders. Certain parties now wish to restate the terms of the negotiated orders. Such a development would run counter to the building block approach underlying these proceedings since the outset.

82 The parties raised the issue of whether the court has the jurisdiction to vary paragraph 19A. In view of my decision that it is not appropriate to vary the Order, it is not necessary to address the issue of jurisdiction.

83 A similar analysis can also be undertaken with respect to the Claims Procedure Order. The Claims Procedure Order establishes the framework to be followed to quantify claims. The Plan changes the basis by which landlord claims are to be quantified. Instead of following the process set forth in the Claims Procedure Order, which provides for appeal rights to the court or claims officer, the Plan provides for quantification of landlord claims by use of Landlord Formula Amount, proposed by Target Canada.

84 In my view, it is clear that this Plan, in its current form, cannot withstand the scrutiny of the test to sanction a Plan. It is, in my view, not appropriate to change the rules to suit the applicant and the Plan Sponsor, in midstream.

85 It cannot be fair and reasonable to ignore post-filing agreements concerning the CCAA process after they have been relied upon by counter-parties or to rescind consent orders of the court without grounds to do so.

86 Target Canada submits that the foregoing issues can be the subject of debate at the sanction hearing. In my view, this is not an attractive alternative. It merely postpones the inevitable result, namely the conclusion that this Plan contravenes court orders and cannot be considered to be fair and reasonable in its treatment of the Objecting Landlords. In my view, this Plan is improper (see *Crystallex*).

Disposition

87 Accordingly, the Plan is not accepted for filing and this motion is dismissed.

88 The Monitor is directed to review the implications of this Endorsement with the stakeholders within 14 days and is to schedule a case conference where various alternatives can be reviewed.

89 At this time, it is not necessary to address the issue of classification of creditors' claim, nor is it necessary to address the issue of non-disclosure of the RioCan Settlement.

Motion dismissed.

Footnotes

1 Capitalized terms not defined herein have the same meaning as set out in the Plan.

End of Document

TAB 4

Para 12

2007 NSSC 384
Nova Scotia Supreme Court

Federal Gypsum Co., Re

2007 CarswellNS 630, 2007 NSSC 384, [2007] N.S.J. No. 559, 163 A.C.W.S. (3d) 687, 261 N.S.R. (2d) 314, 40 C.B.R. (5th) 39, 835 A.P.R. 314

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 the Applicant, Federal Gypsum Company

A.D. MacAdam J.

Heard: November 29, 2007; December 14, 2007
Judgment: December 14, 2007
Written reasons: January 29, 2008
Docket: S.H. 285667

Counsel: Maurice P. Chaisson, Graham Lindfield for Federal Gypsum Company
Carl Holm, Q.C for BDO Dunwoody Goodman Rosen Inc.
Thomas Boyne, Q.C. for Royal Bank of Canada
Robert Sampson, Robert Risk for Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, Cape Breton Growth Fund Corporation
Michael Pugsley for Her Majesty in Right of the Province of Nova Scotia (Nova Scotia Economic Development), Nova Scotia Business Incorporated
Michael Ryan, Q.C., Michael Schweiger for Black & McDonald Limited

Subject: Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

APPLICATION by debtor for preliminary approval of plan of arrangement and related relief and for permission to increase debtor in possession financing.

A.D. MacAdam J.:

1 By Order dated September 18, 2007, the Applicant, Federal Gypsum Company, (herein "the Company" or "the Applicant"), obtained an Order providing for a stay of proceedings pursuant to s.11 of the *Companies Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C 1985, c. C-36, (the "CCAA"). BDO Dunwoody Goodman Rosen Inc. was appointed monitor, (herein "the

Monitor"). On September 24, 2007 the Applicant successfully applied for approval of debtor in possession, (herein "DIP") financing, in the amount of $350,000.00. The initial Order provided for a stay of proceedings against the Applicant up to and including October 18, 2007, or such later date as the court may by further order determine, and on October 18, 2007 the stay date was extended to November 29, 2007. On November 5, 2007 the Company made a further application for additional DIP borrowing powers, with approval, from the financing, to retire the creditor holding security on the operating line. DIP financing in the amount of $1,500,000.00 was granted, subject to a restriction on the amount to be advanced. The application to pay out the operating line creditor was denied. On November 22, 2007 a further application was made to establish the Claims Bar process which, with minor changes, was approved.

2 At issue is

> 1. Preliminary approval of the plan of arrangement (the "Plan") prepared by Federal Gypsum Company (the "Company") for the purposes of presenting the Plan to the Company's creditors;
>
> 2. Classification of the creditors for the purpose of voting on the Plan;
>
> 3. Calling of a meeting of the Company's creditors pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (the "CCAA");
>
> 4. Extension of the Stay Termination Date set out in the initial order made by this Court on September 18, 2007 (the "Initial Order") pursuant to the CCAA and extended by the subsequent Order of this Court to November 29, 2007 at 4:00 p.m.; and
>
> 5. Arrangements for additional debtor in possession ("DIP") financing to the Company pursuant to the CCAA.

1. Preliminary Court Approval

3 Counsel for the Company, noting there is nothing in the CCAA requiring the approval of the court for the Company's plan, acknowledges that "...the jurisprudence establishes that such approval is generally necessary prior to calling a meeting of such creditors...". Recognizing the burden is on the Applicant, Counsel suggests the standard to be met is whether the plan is "doomed to failure" as suggested by the British Columbia Court of Appeal in *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 (B.C. C.A.) at p.88; *Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 9 C.B.R. (3d) 25 (B.C. C.A.) at para 7; and *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re*, [1992] B.C.J. No. 2309 (B.C. C.A. [In Chambers]) at para.25.

4 In his written submission Counsel references the decision of Austin J. in *Bargain Harold's Discount Ltd. v. Paribas Bank of Canada* (1992), 10 C.B.R. (3d) 23 (Ont. Gen. Div.). Citing Doherty J.A. in *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101 (Ont. C.A.), Austin J. at paras. 37, 38 and 39 stated:

> 37. As to the degree of persuasion required, Doherty J.A. in Elan said at p.316 [O.R.]:
>
> > I agree that the feasibility of the plan is a relevant and significant factor to be considered in determining whether to order a meeting of creditors: Edwards, 'Reorganizations under the Companies' 'Creditors Arrangement Act', supra, at pp. 594-595. <u>I would not, however, impose a heavy burden on the debtor company to establish the likelihood of ultimate success from the outset</u>. As the Act will often be the last refuge for failing companies, it is to be expected that many of the proposed plans of reorganization will involve variables and contingencies which will make the plan's ultimate acceptability to the creditors and the court very uncertain at the time the initial application is made.
>
> 38. In *Ultracare Management Inc. v. Zevenberger (Trustee of)* (1990), 3 C.B.R. (3d) 151, (sub nom. *Ultracare Management Inc. v. Gammon*) 1 O.R. (3d) 321 (Gen.Div.), Hoilett J., at p.330 f [O.R.], suggests that the test is whether the plan, or in the present case, any plan, 'has a probable chance of acceptance.'
>
> 39 These two standards are in conflict, Ultracare requiring the probability of success, and Elan requiring something less. <u>Having regard to the nature of the legislation, I prefer the test enunciated by Doherty J.A. in Elan</u>. In *First TreasuryFinancial Inc. v. Cango Petroleums Inc.* (1991), 3 C.B.R. (3d) 232 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p.238, I expressed the view that the statute required 'a reasonable chance' that a plan would be accepted. [emphasis added by counsel]

5 Also referenced by counsel is *Fairview Industries Ltd., Re* (1991), 11 C.B.R. (3d) 43 (N.S. T.D.), where, at para. 80, Glube, C.J.T.D., (as she then was), observed:

> 80 I have no hesitation in accepting the line of cases which are concerned with the concept of requiring a reasonable probability of success in the meetings to be held to deal with any proposal. (See *Diemaster Tool*, supra, and *First Treasury FinancialInc. v. Cango Petroleums Inc.* (1991), 3 C.B.R. (3d) 232, 78 D.L.R. (4^{th}) 585 (Ont. Gen. Div.)). In my opinion, it would seem to be totally impractical and extremely costly to continue to prepare a plan <u>when there is no hope that it will be approved</u>. [emphasis added by counsel]

6 In his submission, counsel notes the reference to an article by Stanley E. Edwards by Osborn J. in *Ursel Investments Ltd., Re* (1990), 2 C.B.R. (3d) 260 (Sask. Q.B.), at para.47, (reversed on other grounds at (1992), 10 C.B.R. (3d) 61 (Sask. C.A.)).

> 47 Stanley E. Edwards in his article 'Reorganizations Under the Companies' 'Creditors Arrangement Act' which appeared in (1947) 25 the Can. Bar Rev., 587 outlined the main problems which counsel and the courts will face in applying the Act. This article suggests that the Court before it orders a meeting of the creditors under ss. 4 and 5 of the Act must first be satisfied that:
>
> (a) The companies should be kept going despite insolvency.
>
> (b) The public has an interest in the continuation of the enterprise, particularly if the companies supply commodities or services that are necessary or desirable to large numbers of consumers, or if they employ large numbers of workers who would be thrown out of employment by its liquidation.
>
> (c) The plan of reorganization is so framed that it is likely to accomplish its purpose.
>
> (d) The plan should embrace all parties, if possible, but particularly secured creditors.
>
> (e) The reorganization plan should be fair and equitable as between the parties.

7 Counsel says the Company has been in "significant discussions" with the term lenders, Cape Breton Growth Corporation, (herein "CBGC"), and Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, (herein "ECBC"), (herein collectively referred to as the "Federal Crown Corporations"); Nova Scotia Business Inc., (herein "NSBI") and Nova Scotia — Office of Economic Development, (herein "NSOED"), (herein collectively referred to as the "Nova Scotia Crown Corporations"), each of whom hold or purport to hold, first secured charges on some of the fixed assets of the Company, as do the Federal Crown Corporations. Counsel anticipated, that in view of the plan proposing to retire the operating line provided by Royal Bank of Canada (herein "Royal Bank"), their acceptance of the plan.

8 In fact, the Royal Bank by its counsel in both written and oral submissions indicated its objection to the proposed extension of the stay termination date and the request for additional DIP financing. Counsel for the Royal Bank noted that in the affidavit of Rhyne Simpson, Jr., Director and President of the Applicant, that the Federal Crown Corporations and the Nova Scotia Crown Corporations did not appear to be on side with the proposed plan, and as the Royal Bank had repeatedly taken the position it did not support the process and would object to the plan of arrangement accordingly, "...it would seem clear that the

proposed plan of compromise will not be approved." Counsel also suggests the court should consider whether, even if adopted by the creditors, the Plan has a reasonable probability of success. In this respect counsel suggests that to continue the process for another two months would involve "...significant expense and risk to the secured lenders, when it appears that the Company would not be able to successfully implement the plan even if accepted by the creditors." The Plan, in the submission of counsel, is deficient in that notwithstanding the proposal to repay the Royal Bank on the implementation date, the Company did not have the resources to do so. Counsel, referencing the report of the Monitor, and taking into account the extent of the DIP financing and the amount of the outstanding operating loan of the Royal Bank, says the Company would not have sufficient funds in place, on approval of the Plan, to retire the Royal Bank operating loan.

9 Through the course of the Application, counsel for the Federal Crown Corporations and the Nova Scotia Crown Corporations indicated they had no objection to either the extension of the stay termination date or the request for additional DIP financing. In doing so, counsel made it clear that they were not agreeing with the Plan as filed but rather were prepared to provide the Company with an opportunity to continue dialogue and discussions with the creditors concerning the nature and content of the final plan that would be submitted to a vote of the creditors.

10 In respect to the Royal Bank's concern the company would not have the necessary resources to retire its operating loan, even if the plan was approved by the creditors, counsel indicated the Company is in negotiations both with the DIP financing lender and other potential lenders to arrange financing to take effect upon approval of the plan, and presumably would, as a result, have the necessary resources to retire the Royal Bank operating loan.

11 A further concern raised by counsel for the Royal Bank related to the allocation of responsibility for administrative and operating expenses during the stay, as between the various secured creditors. In the earlier applications, it had been stipulated that the share of such expenses would be borne by the secured creditors in proportion to their respective indebtedness. Counsel for the Royal Bank suggested the possibility that some of the other secured creditors could enter into agreements whereby only one or two would recover on their assets and therefore a limitation of responsibility to share any expenses to the amount recovered could adversely affect the share of such expenses borne by the Royal Bank. Counsel for the Monitor advised that although there were agreements between various secured lenders involving a sharing of recovery, there was no agreement suggesting that any of the secured creditors had foregone their entitlement to repayment of their share of any realization on assets on which they held security. Therefore the concern, as acknowledged by counsel for the Royal Bank, was ameliorated.

12 In view of the relatively low threshold on the Company in seeking Court approval to have a plan of arrangement submitted to the creditors for a vote, I am satisfied the plan should proceed and the creditors should determine whether they do, or do not accept the plan as finally filed.

2. Classification of Creditors

13 The proposed Classification of Creditors, as set out in s. 3.3 of the Plan, is as follows:

(a) Operating Lender — This category will consist of Royal Bank of Canada for the amounts owing under its operating line of credit as of the Filing Date;

(b) Term Lenders — This category will consist of Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, Cape Breton Growth Fund Corporation, Her Majesty in Right of the Province of Nova Scotia (Nova Scotia Economic Development) and Nova Scotia Business Incorporated (collectively, the 'Term Lenders');

(c) Lease Lenders — This category will consist of Royal Bank of Canada for its leases on rolling stock, Ford Credit Canada Limited, National Leasing Limited, First Union Rail Corporation and Nova Scotia Business Incorporated for its lease on the premises located in Port Hawkesbury, Nova Scotia in which the Business operates (collectively, the 'Lease Lenders');

(d) Unsecured Creditors;

(e) Shareholders of the Company — This category will consist of Federal Gypsum Inc. and Blue Thunder Construction Ltd. (collectively, the 'Shareholders')

14 Counsel for Black and MacDonald Limited, (herein "BML") who purport to hold a subordinate secured charge on assets of the Company, objected to the classification of BML as an unsecured creditor. Counsel for the Federal Crown Corporations and for the Nova Scotia Crown Corporations also indicated a potential concern with the proposed classification and, in particular, the classification of the Royal Bank as a separate secured class. Counsel were invited to submit further written submissions as to their concerns.

15 In his written submission, counsel for the Company references *Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 15 C.B.R. (5th) 307 (Ont. C.A.), and the observations of Blair, J.A., at paras.23-25:

> 23 In *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 12 (Alta. Q.B.), Paperny J. nonetheless extracted a number of principles to be considered by the courts in dealing with the commonality of interest test. At para. 31 she said:

In summary, the cases establish the following principles applicable to assessing commonality of interest:

1. Commonality of interest should be viewed based on the non-fragmentation test, not on an identity of interest test;

2. The interests to be considered are the legal interests that a creditor holds qua creditor in relationship to the debtor company prior to and under the plan as well as on liquidation.

3. The commonality of interests are to be viewed purposively, bearing in mind the object of the C.C.C.A., namely to facilitate reorganizations if possible.

4. In placing a broad and purposive interpretation on the C.C.C.A., the court should be careful to resist classification approaches that would potentially jeopardize viable plans.

5. Absent bad faith, the motivations of creditors to approve or disapprove [of the Plan] are irrelevant.

6. The requirement of creditors being able to consult together means being able to assess their legal entitlement as creditors before or after the plan in a similar manner.

. . . . .

25 In the passage from his reasons cited above (paragraphs 13 and 14) the supervising judge in this case applied those principles. In our view he was correct in law in doing so.

16 In his written submission, counsel also references *NsC Diesel Power Inc., Re* (1990), 79 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1 (N.S. T.D.) and the comments of Davison, J., at paras. 27-29.

27 In my view the court should avoid putting in the same class parties with a potential conflict of interest. I see that such a conflict could arise as between subcontractors and those with direct contracts with the owner. They have different contractual rights. A subcontractor may vote for a reduced amount of claim knowing he could still claim the deficiency from the general contractor, and this is cited as only an example of the possibility of conflict.

28 The test that was suggested by Bowen L.J. in *Sovereign Life Assur. Co. v. Dodd*, [1892] 2 Q.B. 573 (C.A.), dealing with the English legislation, is to place in one class persons 'whose rights are not so dissimilar as to make it impossible for them to consult together with a view to their common interest.'

29 With those principles in mind, I would direct the subcontractors with liens to comprise a separate class.

17 Counsel then references from the further comments of Justice Blair in *Stelco Inc.*, *supra*, at paras. 30 and 35-36:

30 We agree with the line of authorities summarized in *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re* and applied by the supervising judge in this case which stipulate that the classification of creditors is determined by their legal rights in relation to the debtor company, as opposed to their rights as creditors in relation to each other. To the extent that other authorities at the trial level in other jurisdictions may suggest to the contrary — see, for example *NsC Diesel Power Inc., Re, supra* — we prefer the Alberta [ie. *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re* (*supra*)] approach.

. . . . .

35 Finally, to hold the classification and voting process hostage to the vagaries of a potentially infinite variety of disputes as between already disgruntled creditors who have been caught in the maelstrom of a CCAA restructuring, runs the risk of hobbling that process unduly. It could lead to the very type of fragmentation and multiplicity of discrete classes or sub-classes of classes that judges and legal writers have warned might well defeat the purpose of the Act: ...

36 In the end, it is important to remember that classification of creditors, like most other things pertaining to the CCAA, must be crafted with the underlying purpose of the CCAA in mind, namely facilitation of the reorganization of an insolvent company through the negotiation and approval of a plan of compromise or arrangement between the debtor company and its creditors, so that the debtor company can continue to carry on its business to the benefit of all concerned. As Paperny J. noted in *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 'the Court should be careful to resist classification approaches that would potentially jeopardize viable Plans.'

[emphasis added by counsel]

18 Counsel for the Company suggested the concerns raised by Davison, J. in *NsC Diesel*, *supra*, were not present here and that the proposed classification system was based on a "commonality of interest" and was appropriate. Any minor deficiencies, counsel suggests are "...clearly outweighed by the purposive benefits of the classes as presented in the Plan", referencing the comments of Justice Blair at para. 6 in *Stelco Inc.*, *supra*.

3. The Black and MacDonald Limited Classification

19 BML claims as secured creditor of the company, and objects to the classification placing it in the unsecured class. Counsel for BML asserts his client holds a security agreement "... charging all of the companies right, title, and interest in and to all equipment and proceeds thereof", excluding only the leased equipment. Counsel acknowledges BML executed a postponement and subordination agreement in favour of both the term lenders and the operating lender such that it holds a subordinate security on the assets charged in favour of both the term lender and the operating lender. After noting the six principles outlined by Paperny, J. in *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re* [2000 CarswellAlta 623 (Alta. Q.B.)], *supra*, counsel references para 22:

> ... the commonality test cannot be considered without also considering the underlying purpose of the C.C.A.A. which is to facilitate reorganizations of insolvent companies. To that end, the court should not approve a classification scheme which would make a reorganization difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. At the same time, while the C,C.A.A. grants the court the authority to alter the legal rights of parties other than the debtor company without their consent, the court will not permit a confiscation of rights or an injustice to occur. (emphasis added)

20 Paul G. Goodman, President of the Monitor, in an Affidavit filed in this application, deposes:

> ... it is the Monitor's opinion that, subject to the currently intervening charge of the DIP lender and the Administrative Charge, as at the date of the Initial Order and as at December 7:
>
> (a) the assets on which RBC holds security are sufficient to provide for a 100% payout of its Operating Loan;
>
> (b) the assets on which NSBI, OED, CBGF & ECBC hold security, if realized on, would leave each of these creditors with a significant deficiency;
>
> (c) as B & M's security interest is subordinated to those of RBC, NSBI, OED, CBGF & ECBC there would be no assets remaining to be realized on by B & M under its security and in the result its security has no value.

21 The flexibility afforded the Court, in respect to CCAA applications, is to ensure that Plans of Arrangement and Compromise are fair and reasonable as well as designed to faciliate debtor reorganization. Justice Romaine, in *Ontario v. Canadian Airlines Corp.*, 2001 ABQB 983 (Alta. Q.B.), at paras. 36-38 stated:

> [36] The aim of minimizing prejudice to creditors embodied in the CCAA is a reflection of the cardinal principle of insolvency law: that relative entitlements created before insolvency are preserved: *R. v. Goode, Principles of Corporate Insolvency Law*, 2nd ed. (London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1997) at 54. While the CCAA may qualify this principle, it does so only when it is consistent with the purpose of facilitating debtor reorganization and ongoing survival, and in the spirit of what is fair and reasonable.
>
> [37] Paperny J. (as she then was) also discussed the purpose of the CCAA in *Re Canadian Airlines Corp.* (2000), 265 A.R. 201 (Q.B.), aff'd [2000] A. J. No. 1028 (C.A.), online: QL (AJ) (C.A.), leave refused [2001] S.C.C.A. No. 60. At para. 95, she stated that the purpose of the CCAA is to facilitate the reorganization of debtor companies for the benefit of a broad range of constituents.
>
> [38] Paperny J. also noted in para. 95 that, in dealing with applications under the CCAA, the court has a wide discretion to ensure the objectives of the CCAA are met. At para. 94, she identified guidance for the exercise of the discretion in *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. Gen.Div.) at p. 9 as follows:
>
>> Fairness' and 'reasonableness' are, in my opinion, the two keynote concepts underscoring the philosophy and workings of the Companies Creditors Arrangement Act. Fairness is the quintessential expression of the court's equitable jurisdiction — although the jurisdiction is statutory, the broad discretionary powers given to the judiciary by the legislation which make its exercise in equity — and 'reasonableness' is what lends objectivity to the process.

22 Counsel for BML suggests the Court should give weight to its status as a secured creditor. In fact, however, on the evidence presented to date, it would appear that BML's claim has no value, other than as an unsecured claim against the Company. In the opinion of the Monitor, there would be no assets available to BML, in the event of a liquidation of the Company's assets and therefore its security has "no value". I am satisfied that in classifying BML as an unsecured creditor, there is no "confiscation of rights or ... injustice". This security, having no apparent value, they are therefore unsecured and their classification as an unsecured creditor is both fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

4. The Royal Bank Classification

23 The term lenders, being the Nova Scotia Crown Corporations and the Federal Crown Corporations, object to the classification of the operating lender, being the Royal Bank, in a separate class. Counsel for the Federal Crown Corporations references *Stelco Inc., Re, supra*, and the observations of Blair, J. A., at paras 21-22:

21 Everyone agrees that the classification of creditors for CCAA voting purposes is to be determined generally on the basis of a 'commonality of interest' (or a 'common interest') between creditors of the same class. Most analyses of this approach start with a reference to *Sovereign Life Assurance Co. v. Dodd* (1892), [1891-94] All E.R. Rep. 246 (Eng. C.A.), which dealt with the classification of creditors for voting purposes in a winding-up proceeding. Two passages from the judgments in that decision are frequently cited:

At pp. 249-350 Lord Esher said:

> The Act provides that the persons to be summoned to the meeting, all of whom, is to be observed, are creditors, are persons who can be divided into different classes, classes which the Act [FN3] recognizes, though it does not define. The creditors, therefore, must be divided into different classes. What is the reason for prescribing such a course? It is because the creditors composing the different classes have different interests, and, therefore, it a different state of facts exists with respect to different creditors, which may affect their minds and judgments differently, they must be separated into different classes.

At. p. 251, Bowen L.J. stated:

> The word 'class' used in the statute is vague, and to find out what it means we must look at the general scope of the section, which enables the court to order a meeting of a class of creditors to be summoned. It seems to me that we must give such a meeting to the term 'class' as will prevent the section being so worked as to produce confiscation and injustice, and that we must confine its meaning to those persons whose rights are not so dissimilar as to make it impossible for them to consult together with a view to their common interest.

22 These views have been applied in the CCAA context. But what comprises those 'not so dissimilar' rights and what are the components of that 'common interest' have been the subject of debate and evolution over time. It is clear that classification is a fact-driven exercise, dependent upon the circumstances of each particular case. Moreover, given the nature of the CCAA process and the underlying flexibility of that process — a flexibility which is its genius — there can be no fixed rules that must apply in all cases.

24 Counsel for the Federal Crown Corporations, as well as for the Nova Scotia Crown Corporations, suggest that carving out a separate class for Royal Bank, from the remaining secured creditors, runs contrary to the principles outlined by Justice Paperny in *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re, supra.* Although not disputing the appropriateness of the creation of a class of creditors of "lease lenders", "unsecured creditors", and "shareholders", Counsel

suggest the classification of two classes of secured creditors would create fragmentation that is unnecessary and contrary to the "commonality of interest" principle. Secured creditors are, in the submission of counsel, secured creditors and there is no reasonable, logical, rational and practical reason not to have all the secured debt within the same class.

25 Counsel for the Federal Crown Corporations refers to *Keddy Motor Inns Ltd., Re* (1992), 13 C.B.R. (3d) 245 (N.S. C.A.), and the decision of Justice Freeman, where at paras. 21-22, he notes an article by Ronald N. Robertson, Q.C., in a publication entitled "Legal Problems on Reorganization of Major Financial and Commercial Debtors", Canadian Bar Association — Ontario Continuing Legal Education, April 5, 1983. The author comments to the effect that the CCAA authorizes the Court to alter the legal rights of parties, other than the debtor company, without their consent, and secondly that the purpose of the Act is to facilitate reorganizations and this is a factor to be considered at every stage of the process, including in the classification of creditors. As such, to accept "identity of interest" in classification of creditors would result in a "multiplicity of discreet classes" making reorganizations difficult, if not impossible.

26 Counsel's submission also refers to *Fairview Industries Ltd., Re* (1991), 11 C.B.R. (3d) 71, 1991 CarswellNS 36 (N.S. T.D.), where Glube, C.J.T.D., (as she then was), at paras. 32-33, commented as follows:

> I have no difficulty in rationalizing the decisions in *Norcen* and *Elan*. In my opinion, whether the security is on 'quick' assets or 'fixed' assets, the companies listed under Fairview secured creditors and Shelburne secured creditors, except for Central Capital, all have a first charge. There does not have to be a commonality of interest of the debts involved, provided the legal interests are the same. In addition, it does not automatically follow that those who have different commercial interests, that is, those who hold security on 'quick' assets, are necessarily in conflict with those who hold security on hard or fixed assets. Just saying there is a conflict is insufficient to warrant putting them into separate classes.
>
> In the present case, all the secured creditors of Fairview and all the secured creditors of Shelburne, except Central Capital, have a first charge of some sort, even though the security of each differs. They have a common legal interest, excluding Central Capital. I find that there is a commonality or community of interest of the secured creditors of Fairview and the secured creditors of Shelburne. Based on this position, I find that the Fairview secured creditors shall continue as one group.

27 The submission by counsel for the Federal Crown Corporations continues:

> Like the situation in Fairview, both RBC and the Term Lenders each have a first charge of some sort, even though the type of asset differs. There is clearly a common legal

interest in the debtor Company amongst each of the secured creditors. The distinction between security on 'quick' assets such as accounts receivable and inventory as opposed to security on hard or fixed assets as has been put forward by RBC (herein referred to as Royal), throughout is clearly not determinative.

28 Counsel also references the additional comments of Chief Justice Glube, at para. 19:

> I suggest that all counsel are reading too much into the two decisions *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. V. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 20, 64 AltaL.R. (2d) 139,[1989] 2 W.W.R. 566 (Q.B.) and *Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101, (sub nom. *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey*) 41 O.A.C. 282, 1 O.R. (3d) 289 [hereinafter *Elan*]. In my opinion the two cases do not set up two 'lines' of cases reaching different conclusions. I suggest that each was decided on their particular facts. The court should be wary about setting up rigid guidelines which 'must' be followed. The *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the 'C.C.A.A.') is intended to be a fairly summary procedure and should not be stretched out over months and years with protracted litigation. Quite definitely, each case must be decided on its own unique set of circumstances.

29 One of the circumstances considered in the Company's proposal to separately classify the term lenders and the operating lender is the opinion of the Monitor that upon liquidation the operating lender would recover the full amount of its operating loan, while there would be a substantial shortfall in respect to the term lenders. This opinion reflects the reported levels of receivables and inventory outlined in the various Monitor's reports, as compared with the indebtedness to the operating lender, and suggests that on a liquidation the operating lender would be successful in retiring its outstanding indebtedness. Also, the appraisal of the fixed assets, on the basis of an orderly liquidation, would appear to suggest a substantial shortfall in realization by the term lenders. Clearly, in respect to the relationship to the Company by the operating lender and the term lenders, the prospects for recovery on an orderly liquidation, being considerably different, would not be consistent with the "commonality" principle, at least, as it may relate to the prospects for recovery. There is also a very real difference in the nature of the assets on which they are secured, in that in the one instance the security is on fixed real assets and in the other on receivable and inventory. The latter are subject to ongoing fluctuations as the Company continues in operation.

5. Conclusion on Classification

30 There is nothing in the submission of Counsel, nor in the circumstances to warrant altering the classification proposed by the Company. BML's security has, apparently, little or no value. Each of the Federal Crown Corporations and the Nova Scotia Crown Corporations appear to have sufficient votes to derail the proposed Plan. There is no reason to deny the

Royal Bank, who would then not have such a veto over the Plan, inclusion in the fixed asset lenders security classification. The Company has not suggested they be in the same class, and no reason has been advanced to warrant departing from the Company's proposed classification.

3. The Creditors' Meeting

31 Sections 4 and 5 of the CCAA provide:

> 4. Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its unsecured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company, of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors, and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.
>
> 5. Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its secured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company or of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors, and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

32 Counsel for the Company references the observation of Paperny J. in *Fracmaster Ltd., Re* (1999), 11 C.B.R. (4th) 204 (Alta. Q.B.), at para.24:

> 24 I also note the principle that even where a plan is proposed, the court need not order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors. That is because ss.4 and 5 of the CCAA, which provide for such meetings, are permissive, not mandatory. As Houlden and Morawetz state at 10A-11: 'If the court believes that the proposed plan or arrangement is not in the best interests of creditors, it may refuse to make the order...[I]f the plan lacks economic reality, the court will also refuse to make the order.'

33 In the circumstances and having regard to my earlier comments, I am satisfied there should be a meeting of creditors to consider and vote on the Plan.

4. Extension of Stay of Proceedings

34 In view of the preliminary approval of the Plan and the calling of a meeting of creditors to consider and vote on the Plan, it necessarily follows that there should be an extension of the stay to enable the Company to present the Plan to the creditors, to conduct the claims process as previously ordered and to determine whether the creditors have voted in favour

or against the Plan. In *Cansugar Inc., Re*, 2004 NBQB 7 (N.B. Q.B.), Justice Glennie, in referencing s.11(6) of the CCAA, noted:

> In my opinion, the requirements of section 11(6) of the C.C.A.A. have been satisfied in this case. The continuation of the stay is supported by the overriding purpose of the C.C.A.A., which is to allow an insolvent company a reasonable period of time to reorganize and propose a plan of arrangement to its creditors and the Court, and to prevent maneuvers for positioning among creditors in the interim. [emphasis added by counsel]

35 To similar effect, Topolniski J. in *San Francisco Gifts Ltd., Re*, 2005 ABQB 91 (Alta. Q.B.), at para. 28 observed:

> The court's role during the stay period has been described as a supervisory one, meant to: '...preserve the status quo and to move the process along to the point where an arrangement or compromise is approved or it is evident that the attempt is doomed to failure.' That is not to say that the supervising judge is limited to a myopic view of balance sheets, scheduling of creditors' meetings and the like. On the contrary, this role requires attention to changing circumstances and vigilance in ensuring that a delicate balance of interests is maintained. [emphasis added by counsel]

36 Notwithstanding the objection by the Royal Bank, including the potential prejudice as outlined by counsel in the event there is a deterioration in the value of the assets securing its operating loan, continuation of the stay is to be supported in view of the overriding purpose of the CCAA "...to allow an insolvent company a reasonable period of time to reorganize and propose a plan of arrangement to its creditors and the court...".

5. Additional DIP Financing

37 According to counsel, providing the court approves presentation of the Plan to the creditors and the extension is granted, the Company will require additional DIP financing. In referencing the cash flow projections and the anticipated need for additional financing, counsel notes that the proposed increase is somewhat smaller than the earlier cash flow projections had anticipated. The reason, counsel suggests, is "...due in part to a slower than anticipated growth in sales which has reduced the Company's cash requirements." Counsel continues:

> It is clear from the cash flow reports prepared by the Company, however, that there is indeed a growth in sales which will require additional financing.

38 Although approval has already been made for initial DIP financing, with its "super-priority" security in favour of the DIP lender and later for additional DIP financing, each

application must be considered on its own merits and in the circumstances then existing. In respect to this Application, counsel again references the observations of C. Campbell J. In *Manderley Corp., Re* (2005), 10 C.B.R. (5th) 48 (Ont. S.C.J.), at para.18:

> 18 The operative legal principles are set out in the following quotations from Houlden and Morawetz' Bankruptcy & Insolvency Analysis (Carswell, 2004), section N16 — Stay of Proceedings — CCAA — at page 18:
>
>> Although the C.C.A.A. makes no provision for DIP financing, it seems to be well established that, under its inherent powers, the court may give a priority for such financing and for professional fees incurred in connection with the working out of a C.C.A.A. plan.

Also referenced is *Hunters Trailer & Marine Ltd., Re* (2001), 295 A.R. 113 (Alta. Q.B.), and the comment by Wachowich J., at para. 32:

> 32 Having reviewed the jurisprudence on this issue, I am satisfied that the Court has the inherent or equitable jurisdiction to grant a super-priority for DIP financing and administrative charges, including the fees and disbursements of the professional advisors who guide a debtor company through the CCAA process.

Counsel notes the three issues outlined by Glennie J. in *Simpson's Island Salmon Ltd., Re* [2005 CarswellNB 781 (N.B. Q.B.)], *supra*, at paras.16-17 and 19:

> 16 In order for DIP financing with super-priority status to be authorized pursuant to the CCAA, there must be cogent evidence that the benefit of such financing clearly outweighs the potential prejudice to secured creditors whose security is being eroded. See *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re*, [1999] B.C.J. No. 2754 (B.C.S.C. [In Chambers]), affirmed [2000] B.C.J. No. 409 (B.C.C.A.)
>
> 17 DIP financing ought to be restricted to what is reasonably necessary to meet the debtor's urgent needs while a plan of arrangement or compromises is being developed.
>
> 19 A Court should not authorize DIP financing pursuant to the CCAA unless there is a reasonable prospect that the debtor will be able to make an arrangement with its creditors and rehabilitate itself.

39 Counsel recognizes the court is engaged in a "balancing act that is the hallmark of DIP financing" as declared by C. Campbell J. in *Manderley, supra*, at para.27. At para.18, in *Simpson's Island Salmon Ltd., supra*, Justice Glennie observed:

> Failure to grant an increase in the Administrative Charge would result in the Applicants no longer being able to continue their attempts at restructuring.

40 Counsel suggests a similar result would occur if the proposed additional DIP was not approved and that so long as a reasonable chance of rehabilitation remains,

> ...a company under CCAA protection should be afforded what measures are available to aid that rehabilitation, despite the concomitant prejudice to its creditors. A successful restructuring continues to be in the best interest of both the Company and its creditors.

In counsel's submission, the "small additional prejudice to creditors" in allowing the additional DIP financing is "far outweighed by the potential benefits to all of the Company's stakeholders of allowing the Company the opportunity to present the Plan." Counsel's written submission concludes by referencing *Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) and the comment by Farley, J., to the effect that "...the mere fact that a significant secured creditor objects to such financing in no way precludes the Court's ability to allow DIP financing." The submission continues by noting the observation of Wachowich J. in *Hunters, supra*, at para. 32:

> ...If super-priority cannot be granted without the consent of secured creditors, the protection of the CCAA effectively would be denied a debtor company in many cases.

41 In his objection, counsel for the Royal Bank reiterates the bank's concern that DIP financing will erode its security. Counsel speculates that the increase in DIP financing means the margin of its debt to the current assets secured by its security would be reduced and indeed, applying a 50 per cent margin rate, would be eliminated. In his written submission, counsel observed:

> Although there is no evidence before the Court as to the estimated diminution in value of current assets in the event of liquidation, there is such evidence regarding the fixed assets. The appraisal provided by Universal Worldwide LLC estimates the value of the fixed assets on 'orderly liquidation' at $2,850,000US but only $950,000 on 'quick/forced sale', a drop of 2/3 in the later case. A drop in value of 50% in the case of the current assets would see the Bank get nothing in the event that the additional DIP financing sought were granted and that a liquidation ensued. This is without consideration of any impact from the Administration Charge.

42 It is clear the value of the security held by the Royal Bank is at risk by the continuation of the stay and the granting of additional DIP financing to enable the Company to present its Plan to its creditors for their consideration. However, the latest report of the Monitor does not reflect a substantial erosion in the value of the assets secured by the Royal Bank. Exhibit 3 to the Monitor's Report of November 26, 2007 shows accounts receivable of $778,383.00, while on November 23 the amount was $958,232.00. With respect to inventory, the raw materials at September 21 are reported at $944,393.00 and finished

goods at $561,220.00, for a total of $1,505,613.00. The totals for November 23 were raw materials at $723,465.00 and finished goods at $438,165.00, for a total of $1,161,630.00. Although there has been a decline, it would not appear to be substantial and no evidence was submitted to suggest any greater concern about a potential deterioration during the period encompassed by the request to extend the stay. Although the additional DIP, together with the additional administrative charges, will impact on any recovery on realization of assets in general, there is, notwithstanding the speculation of counsel for the Royal Bank, no evidence the bank's security will be rendered valueless in the event of an eventual liquidation, particularly in view of the allocation of approximately 95 per cent of the burden of the DIP and administrative charges to the assets secured to the Federal Crown Corporations and the Nova Scotia Crown Corporations. In the initial report by the Monitor, the preliminary calculation of secured creditor percentages was 5.53 per cent for the Royal Bank, (taking into account both its operating loan and lease loan), with the remainder to the other secured creditors, including creditors holding leases. Although counsel for the Nova Scotia Crown Corporations suggested he would be submitting a revised figure for their loans, he further indicated it would not materially affect the percentages as outlined in the Monitor's Report. As such, the responsibility of the Royal Bank for the expenses of the restructuring are slightly over five per cent, and absent evidence of a material deterioration in the value of the assets secured under its security, as well as the value of the assets held by the other secured creditors, and in view of the need for the additional DIP financing to permit the Company to meet with and present to its creditors the Plan, I am satisfied to approve the additional financing and to grant the necessary priority contemplated by it.

Application granted.

End of Document

TAB 5

Para 48

2014 ONSC 494
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Jaguar Mining Inc., Re

2013 CarswellOnt 18630, 2014 ONSC 494, 12 C.B.R. (6th) 290, 236 A.C.W.S. (3d) 820

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as Amended

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or
Arrangement of Jaguar Mining Inc., Applicant

Morawetz R.S.J.

Heard: December 23, 2013
Judgment: December 23, 2013
Written reasons: January 16, 2014
Docket: CV-13-10383-00CL

Counsel: Tony Reyes, Evan Cobb for Applicant, Jaguar Mining Inc.
Robert J. Chadwick, Caroline Descours for Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders
Joseph Bellissimo for Secured Lender, Global Resource Fund
Jeremy Dacks for Proposed Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.
Robin B. Schwill for Special Committee of the Board of Directors

Subject: Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

APPLICATION by debtor for prection under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act.*

Morawetz J. **(orally):**

1 On December 23, 2013, I heard the CCAA application of Jaguar Mining Inc. ("Jaguar") and made the following three endorsements:

> 1. CCAA protection granted. Initial Order signed. Reasons will follow. It is expected that parties will utilize the e-Service Protocol which can be confirmed on comeback motion. Sealing Order of confidential exhibits granted.
>
> 2. Meeting Order granted in form submitted.
>
> 3. Claims Procedure Order granted in form submitted.

2 These are my reasons.

3 Jaguar sought protection from its creditors under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") and requested authorization to commence a process for the approval and implementation of a plan of compromise and arrangement affecting its unsecured creditors.

4 Jaguar also requested certain protections in favour of its wholly-owned subsidiaries that are not applicants (the "Subsidiaries" and, together with the Applicant, the "Jaguar Group").

5 Counsel to Jaguar submits that the principal objective of these proceedings is to effect a recapitalization and financing transaction (the "Recapitalization") on an expedited basis through a plan of compromise and arrangement (the "Plan") to provide a financial foundation for the Jaguar Group going forward and additional liquidity to allow the Jaguar Group to continue to work towards its operational and financial goals. The Recapitalization, if implemented, is expected to result in a reduction of over $268 million of debt and new liquidity upon exit of approximately $50 million.

6 Jaguar's senior unsecured convertible notes (the "Notes") are the primary liabilities affected by the Recapitalization. Any other affected liabilities of Jaguar, which is a holding company with no active business operations, are limited and identifiable.

7 The Recapitalization is supported by an Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders of the Notes (the "Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders") and other Consenting Noteholders, who collectively represent approximately 93% of the Notes.

8 The background facts are set out in the affidavit of David M. Petrov sworn December 23, 2013 (the "Petrov Affidavit"), the important points of which are summarized below.

9 Jaguar is a corporation existing under the *Business Corporations Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c. B.16, with a registered office in Toronto, Ontario. Jaguar has assets in Canada.

10 Jaguar is the public parent corporation of other corporations in the Jaguar Group that carry on active gold mining and exploration in Brazil, employing in excess of 1,000 people. Jaguar itself does not carry on active gold mining operations.

11 Jaguar has three wholly-owned Brazilian operating subsidiaries: MCT Mineração Ltda. ("MCT"), Mineração Serras do Oeste Ltda. ("MSOL") and Mineração Turmalina Ltda. ("MTL") (and, together with MCT and MSOL, the "Subsidiaries"), all incorporated in Brazil.

12 The Subsidiaries' assets include properties in the development stage and in the production stage.

13 Jaguar has been the main corporate vehicle through which financing has been raised for the operations of the Jaguar Group. The Subsidiaries have guaranteed repayment of certain funds borrowed by Jaguar.

14 Jaguar has raised debt financing by (a) issuing notes, and (b) borrowing from Renvest Mercantile Bank Corp. Inc., through its global resource fund ("Renvest").

15 In aggregate, Jaguar has issued a principal amount of $268.5 million of Notes through two transactions, known as the "2014 Notes" and the "2016 Notes".

16 Interest is paid semi-annually on the 2014 Notes and the 2016 Notes. Jaguar has not paid the last interest payment due on November 1, 2013. Under the 2014 Notes, the grace period has lapsed and an event of default has occurred.

17 Jaguar is also the borrower under a fully drawn $30 million secured facility (the "Renvest Facility") with Renvest. The obligations under the Renvest Facility are secured by a general security agreement from Jaguar as well as guarantees and collateral security granted by each of the Subsidiaries.

18 Jaguar has identified another potential liability. Mr. Daniel Titcomb, former chief executive officer of Jaguar, and certain other associated parties, have instituted a legal proceeding against Jaguar and certain of its current and former directors that is currently proceeding in the United States Federal Court. Counsel to Jaguar submits that this lawsuit alleges certain employment-related claims and other claims in respect of equity interests in Jaguar that are held by Mr. Titcomb and others. Counsel to Jaguar advises that Jaguar and its board of directors believe this lawsuit to be without merit.

19 Counsel also advises that, aside from the lawsuit and professional service fees incurred by Jaguar, the unsecured liabilities of Jaguar are not material.

20 The Jaguar Group's mines are not low-cost gold producers and the recent decline in the price of gold has negatively impacted the Jaguar Group.

21 Based on current world prices and Jaguar Group's current level of expenditures, the Jaguar Group is expected to cease to have sufficient cash resources to continue operations early in the first quarter of 2014.

22 Counsel also submits that, as a result of Jaguar's event of default under the 2014 Notes, certain remedies have become available, including the possible acceleration of the principal amount and accrued and unpaid interest on the 2014 Notes. As of November 13, 2013, that principal and accrued interest totalled approximately $169.3 million.

23 Jaguar's unaudited consolidated financial statements for the nine months ending September 30, 2013 show that Jaguar had an accumulated deficit of over $317 million and a net loss of over $82 million for the nine months ending September 30, 2013. Jaguar's current liabilities (at book value) exceed Jaguar's current assets (at book value) by approximately $40 million.

24 I accept that Jaguar faces a liquidity crisis and is insolvent.

25 Jaguar has been involved in a strategic review over the past two years. Counsel submits that the efforts of Jaguar and its advisors have shown that a comprehensive restructuring plan involving a debt-to-equity exchange and an investment of new money is the best available alternative to address Jaguar's financial issues.

26 Counsel to Jaguar advises that the board of directors of Jaguar has determined that the Recapitalization is the best available option to Jaguar and, further, that the plan cannot be implemented outside of a CCAA proceeding. Counsel emphasizes that without the protection of the CCAA, Jaguar is exposed to the immediate risk that enforcement steps may be taken under a variety of debt instruments. Further, Jaguar is not in a position to satisfy obligations that may result from such enforcement steps.

27 Jaguar requests a stay of proceedings in favour of non-applicant Subsidiaries contending that, because of Jaguar's dependence upon its Subsidiaries for their value generating capacity, the commencement of any proceedings or the exercise of rights or remedies against these Subsidiaries would be detrimental to Jaguar's restructuring efforts and would undermine a process that would otherwise benefit Jaguar Group's stakeholders as a whole.

28 Jaguar also seeks a charge on its current and future assets (the "Property") in the maximum amount of $5 million (a $500,000 first-ranking charge (the "Primary Administration Charge") and a $4.5 million fourth-ranking charge (the "Subordinated Administration Charge") (together, the "Administration Charge")). The purpose of the charge is to secure the fees and disbursements incurred in connection with services rendered both before and after the commencement of the CCAA proceedings by various professionals, as well as Canaccord Genuity and Houlihan Lokey, as financial advisors to the Ad Hoc Committee (collectively, the "Financial Advisors").

29 Counsel advises that the Financial Advisors' monthly work fees (but not their success fees) will be secured by the Primary Administration Charge, while the Financial Advisors' success fees will be secured solely by the Subordinated Administration Charge.

30 Counsel further advises that the Proposed Initial Order contemplates the establishment of a charge on Jaguar's Property in the amount of $150,000 (the "Director's Charge") to

protect the directors and officers. Counsel further advises that the benefit of the Director's Charge will only be available to the extent that a liability is not covered by existing directors and officers insurance. The directors and officers have indicated that, due to the potential for personal liability, they may not continue their service in this restructuring unless the Initial Order grants the Director's Charge.

31 Counsel to Jaguar further advises that the proposed monitor is of the view that the Director's Charge and the Administration Charge are reasonable in these circumstances.

32 Jaguar is unaware of any secured creditors, other than those who have received notice of the application, who are likely to be affected by the court-ordered charges.

33 In addition to the Initial Order, Jaguar also seeks a Claims Procedure Order and a Meeting Order, submitting that it must complete the Recapitalization on an expedited timeline.

34 Each of the Claims Procedure Order and Meeting Order include a comeback provision.

35 Having reviewed the record and upon hearing submissions, I am satisfied the Applicant is a company to which the CCAA applies. It is insolvent and faces a looming liquidity crisis. The Applicant is subject to claims in excess of $5 million and has assets in Canada. I am also satisfied that the application is properly before me as the Applicant's registered office and certain of its assets are situated in Toronto, Ontario.

36 I am also satisfied that the Applicant has complied with the obligations of s. 10(2) of the CCAA.

37 I am also satisfied that an extension of the stay of proceedings to the Subsidiaries of Jaguar is appropriate in the circumstances. Further, I am also satisfied that it is reasonable and appropriate to grant the Administration Charge and the Director's Charge over the Property of the Applicant. In these circumstances, I am also prepared to approve the Engagement Letters and to seal the terms of the Engagement Letters. In deciding on the sealing provision, I have taken into account that the Engagement Letters contain sensitive commercial information, the disclosure of which could be harmful to the parties at issue. However, as I indicated at the hearing, this issue should be revisited at the comeback hearing.

38 I am also satisfied that Jaguar should be authorized to comply with the pre-filing obligations to the extent provided in the Initial Order.

39 In arriving at the foregoing conclusions, I reviewed the argument submitted by counsel to Jaguar that the stay of proceedings against non-applicants is appropriate. The Jaguar Group operates in a fully integrated manner and depends upon its Subsidiaries for their value

generating capacity. Absent a stay of proceedings not only in favour of Jaguar but also in favour of the Subsidiaries, various creditors would be in a position to take enforcement steps which could conceivably lead to a failed restructuring, which would not be in the best interests of Jaguar's stakeholders.

40 The court has jurisdiction to extend the stay in favour of Jaguar's Subsidiaries. See *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]); *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re*, 2006 ABQB 153, 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187 (Alta. Q.B.); *SkyLink Aviation Inc., Re*, 2013 ONSC 1500, 3 C.B.R. (6th) 150 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

41 The authority to grant the court-ordered Administration Charge and Director's Charge is contained in ss. 11.51 and 11.52 of the CCAA.

42 In granting the Administration Charge, I am satisfied that:

(i) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge;

(ii) the amount is appropriate; and

(iii) the charges should extend to all of the proposed beneficiaries.

43 In considering both the amount of the Administration Charge and who should be entitled to its benefit, the following factors can also be considered:

(a) the size and complexity of the business being restructured; and

(b) whether there is an unwarranted duplication of roles.

See *Canwest Publishing Inc./Publications Canwest Inc., Re*, 2010 ONSC 222, 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

44 In this case, the proposed restructuring involves the proposed beneficiaries of the charge. I accept that many have played a significant role in the negotiation of the Recapitalization to date and will continue to play a role in the implementation of the Recapitalization. I am satisfied that there is no unwarranted duplication of roles among those who benefit from the proposed Administration Charge.

45 With respect to the Director's Charge, the court must be satisfied that:

(i) notice has been given to the secured creditors likely to be affected by the charge;

(ii) the amount is appropriate;

(iii) the applicant could not obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost; and

(iv) the charge does not apply in respect of any obligation incurred by a director or officer as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct.

46 A review of the evidence satisfies me that it is appropriate to grant the Director's Charge as requested.

47 Jaguar requested that the Initial Order authorize it to perform certain pre-filing obligations in respect of professional service providers and third parties who provide services in respect of Jaguar's public listing agreement. In the circumstances, I find it to be reasonable that Jaguar be authorized to perform these pre-filing obligations.

48 In view of Jaguar's desire to move quickly to implement the Recapitalization, I have also been persuaded that it is both necessary and appropriate to grant the Claims Procedure Order and the Meeting Order at this time. These are procedural steps in the CCAA process and do not require any assessment by the court as to the fairness and reasonableness of the Plan at this stage.

49 Counsel to Jaguar submits that Jaguar's approach to classification of the affected unsecured creditors is appropriate in these circumstances, citing a commonality of interest. Counsel also references s. 22(2) of the CCAA. For the purposes of today's motion, I am prepared to accept this argument. However, this is an issue that can, if raised, be reviewed at the comeback hearing.

50 In the result, an Initial Order is granted together with a Meeting Order and Claims Procedure Order. All orders have been signed in the form presented.

Application granted.

End of Document

TAB 6

Para 29

2011 ABQB 214
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Kerr Interior Systems Ltd., Re

2011 CarswellAlta 508, 2011 ABQB 214, [2011] 10 W.W.R. 159, [2011] A.W.L.D. 2318, 200 A.C.W.S. (3d) 930, 43 Alta. L.R. (5th) 386, 517 A.R. 186, 79 C.B.R. (5th) 1

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended

And In the Matter of the Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Kerr Interior Systems Ltd. and Composite Building Systems Inc.

J.E. Topolniski J.

Judgment: March 30, 2011
Docket: Edmonton 0703-14357

Counsel: Darren Bieganek for Applicant
James Hanley for Respondent

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial

APPLICATION by debtors for further meeting of creditors to reconsider plan of arrangement made pursuant to *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* after court sanction and part performance.

J.E. Topolniski J.:

I. Introduction

1 This case concerns the court's jurisdiction to authorize debtors to call a further meeting of creditors to reconsider a plan of arrangement (the "Plan") made pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("*CCAA*") after court sanction and part performance. The Plan called for payment of $2,600,000.00, including a first installment of $260,000.00 (the "Payment").

2 Kerr Interior Systems Ltd. ("Kerr") and Composite Building Systems Inc. ("Composite") (collectively the "Debtors") obtained an initial *CCAA* order granting them the usual stay of proceedings and protections on November 7, 2007 ("Initial Order"). Kerr's primary business is the supply and installation of commercial steel stud and drywall load bearing frames.

Composite was in the business of fabricating the steel panels installed by Kerr, but ceased operating and transferred its assets to Kerr sometime between the fall of 2009 and the spring of 2010. It is unclear whether Composite is back in business today.

3 The restructuring followed a fairly typical course of proceedings under the *CCAA*. There was a period of time dedicated to reorganization and formulating the Plan, followed by a favourable creditor vote and an order sanctioning the Plan (the "Sanction Order"). The restructuring went sideways when the Debtors defaulted after making the first of four instalment payments due under the Plan.

4 Claiming that an unexpected downturn in the economy, difficulty collecting accounts receivable, the strain of servicing secured debt, and the obligations of a related entity (that is not part of the *CCAA* proceeding) have created insurmountable impediments to their ability to carry on in business and to satisfy their obligations under the Plan, the Debtors want to present another offer to their creditors. If successful in their bid for another creditors' meeting, they propose to ask their creditors to accept a global payment of $520,000.00 (comprised of the Payment and an additional $260,000.00 to be paid at a later unspecified date). The Debtors are cognizant that they can pursue restructuring under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 or by making a further *CCAA* filing, but they consider those avenues too expensive and unnecessary.

5 In a rather cursory report to the court, BDO Canada Limited (the "Monitor") expressed the view that the Debtors appear to be acting in good faith and their application "does not seem to be unreasonable" in light of economic conditions.

6 Two creditors oppose the application, Winroc, a division of Superior Plus LP ("Winroc"), and Descon Mechanical Protostatix Engineering. A third creditor, Kenroc Building Materials Ltd. ("Kenroc"), voiced support for Winroc's position (collectively the "Opposing Creditors"). The Opposing Creditors argue that the court does not have jurisdiction to call a further meeting of creditors at the post-sanction stage of the proceedings and, in any event, the relief sought is a collateral attack on the Sanction Order. They submit that to authorize a further meeting of the creditors would open the floodgates to such applications and result in uncertainty in *CCAA* proceedings.

7 There are no reported cases directly on point. The outcome of this application hinges on statutory interpretation and the analysis of reported cases involving analogous situations.

II. The Issues

8 The following two issues arise on this application:

1. Does the court have jurisdiction to call a further meeting of creditors following the court's sanctioning of the Plan?

2. If yes, should the court direct a further meeting of creditors on the facts of this case?

III. Factual Context

9 On January 31, 2008, the Debtors' unsecured creditors voted in favour of the Plan, which provided for a global payment of $2,600,000.00 to be paid in four instalments of varying amounts. On the application for court approval of the Plan, Kenroc and Winroc were unsuccessful in arguing that they should not be listed under the Plan as unsecured creditors but rather as secured creditors with builders' lien claims in Saskatchewan or, alternatively that they should be put in a separate voting class and, in any event, were entitled to the $150,000.00 paid into court by a third party to discharge their builders' liens. On April 4, 2008, Bielby J. (as she then was) granted the Sanction Order (2008 ABQB 286, 449 A.R. 185 (Alta. Q.B.)).

10 Kenroc and Winroc appealed the Sanction Order to the Alberta Court of Appeal, which ruled (2009 ABCA 240, 457 A.R. 274 (Alta. C.A.)) that they met the test for classification as secured creditors (by way of lien or trust) and that they were entitled to the $150,000.00 that had been paid into court. The Sanction Order and Plan otherwise remained unaffected.

11 The Debtors made the first instalment payment under the Plan, the $260,000.00 Payment, but failed to make the second instalment of $720,000.00. They have since unsuccessfully sought informal creditor approval to alter the Plan. One year later and despite the Debtors' default, no creditor has sought to vacate the stay of proceedings.

12 In November 2007, when the Debtors crafted their proposal to the creditors, their combined value was $2,700,000.00, comprised of accounts receivable ($1,900,000.00) and other assets ($800,000.00). They considered that an offer of $2,400,000.00 (or 50 cents on the dollar) was reasonable for all concerned. At the creditors' meeting, they topped up the offer by $200,000.00, offering a global payment of $2,600,000.00. The creditors agreed to that deal.

13 What is known of the Debtors' affairs since the Sanction Order includes the following:

(a) Kerr had 13 to 15 salaried employees in 2008-2009. That number increased to 50 by the fall of 2010.

(b) The Debtors' combined 2008 revenue was $14,000,000. Profits were two to three percent.

(c) Kerr's asset value in 2009 was $4,800,000.00. The Debtors' combined revenue in 2009 was $8,000,000.00. Kerr enjoyed a $167,055.00 profit, while Composite lost $571,307.00 that year.

(d) By May 31, 2010:

(i) Composite was out of business;

(ii) Kerr had revenue of $6,500,000.00, with a profit of $79,809.00;

(ii) Kerr's accounts receivable stood at $1,790,000.00, $600,000.00 to $700,000.00 of which likely was stale dated. Kerr considers all but $100,000.00 of its three major accounts receivable (totalling $585,000.00) to be potentially collectible; and

(iv) $2,200,000.00 of Kerr's accounts payables are owed to related parties, either to Composite or numbered companies owned or controlled by Kerr's shareholders.

(e) At present, Kerr has work in progress and is cautiously optimistic about future revenues. It is unclear whether Composite is operating again.

14 The Debtors point to the obligations of 1005559 Alberta Ltd. ("1005559"), a related company, as another impediment to their ability to fulfill the terms of the Plan. They submit that the following transactions are germane to the present application:

(a) 1005559 borrowed $3,900,000.00 to buy and renovate a building for the Debtors' use (the "Building"). Of that amount, $3,000,000.00 was still owing at the date of the Initial Order. 1005559 sold the Building for an unknown sum. It also created a $100,000.00 builders' lien fund for persons claiming for work done on renovations to the Building.

(b) 1005559 pledged its assets in favour of the Royal Bank of Canada under a general security agreement to secure a $1,800,000.00 loan to the Debtors (the general security agreement subsequently was assigned to a takeout financier).

(c) 1005559 granted a $2,000,000.00 mortgage to an investor group that had threatened litigation. The court was not advised as to the composition of this investor group or the party threatened by litigation.

15 Darryl Wiebe, a shareholder, director and officer of Kerr, was questioned about why Kerr wanted to reduce the Debtors' obligations under the Plan when it had saleable assets to

fund the Plan and the economy was improving. His response was: "[w]ell, frankly we'd like to get it out of our hair."

IV. Legislative Context

16 Sections 4 to 7 and 11 of the *CCAA* are relevant to this application.

17 Section 4, which concerns the court ordering a meeting of creditors to consider compromises with unsecured creditors, reads:

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

18 Section 5 is identical except that it concerns a compromise or an arrangement between the debtor company and its secured creditors.

19 Section 6 deals with court sanction of compromises. It outlines a number of restrictions on when a plan of arrangement can be sanctioned, none of which are relevant to this inquiry. However, ss. 6(1)(a) is of relevance. It refers to modification of a proposed compromise or arrangement at a meeting of creditors, stating:

> 6(1) If a majority in number representing two thirds in value of the creditors, or the class of creditors, as the case may be - other than, unless the court orders otherwise, a class of creditors having equity claims, - present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or meetings of creditors respectively held under sections 4 and 5, or either of those sections, agree to any compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at the meeting or meetings, the compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by the court and, if so sanctioned, is binding
>
> > (a) on all the creditors or the class of creditors, as the case may be, and on any trustee for that class of creditors, whether secured or unsecured, as the case may be, and on the company; and ...

20 Section 7 concerns the adjournment of creditors' meetings when amendments to a compromise or plan of arrangement are proposed. It reads:

> 7. Where an alteration or a modification of any compromise or arrangement is proposed at any time after the court has directed a meeting or meetings to be summoned, the meeting or meetings may be adjourned on such term as to notice and otherwise as the

court may direct, and those directions may be given after as well as before adjournment of any meeting or meetings, and the court may in its discretion direct that it is not necessary to adjourn any meeting or to convene any further meeting of any class of creditors or shareholders that in the opinion of the court is not adversely affected by the alteration or modification proposed, and any compromise or arrangement so altered or modified may be sanctioned by the court and have effect under section 6.

21 Section 11, which describes the court's plenary jurisdiction, provides that:

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

V. Analysis

22 Statutes are to be interpreted purposively and contextually. The words used are to be read in their entire context and in their grammatical and ordinary sense harmoniously with the scheme of the legislation, its object and with Parliament's intention (*Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd., Re*, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 27 (S.C.C.) at para. 21, (1998), 221 N.R. 241 (S.C.C.); *Bell ExpressVu Ltd. Partnership v. Rex*, 2002 SCC 42 (S.C.C.) at para. 26, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 559 (S.C.C.)). Every word is presumed to make sense and to have a specific role to play in advancing the *CCAA*'s purpose (*Placer Dome Canada Ltd. v. Ontario (Minister of Finance)*, 2006 SCC 20 (S.C.C.) at para 45, [2006] 1 S.C.R. 715 (S.C.C.), citing R. Sullivan, *Driedger on the Construction of Statutes*, 3rd ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 1994) at p. 159).

23 The *CCAA* is remedial legislation. Its goals include the following:

> (i) permitting debtors to continue in business and, where possible, avoid the social and economic costs of liquidation (*Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re*, 2010 SCC 60 (S.C.C.) at para. 15 [hereinafter Century Services Inc.]);
>
> (ii) balancing stakeholder interests (*Nova Metal Products Inc. v. Comiskey (Trustee of)* (1990), 1 O.R. (3d) 289, 1 C.B.R. (3d) 101 (Ont. C.A.); *Air Canada, Re* (2004), 47 C.B.R. (4th) 189 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); and
>
> (iii) protecting creditors' interests and permitting an orderly administration of the debtor's affairs (*Meridian Development Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank* (1984), 53 A.R. 39, 52 C.B.R. (N.S.) 109 (Alta. Q.B.)).

> (iv) rehabilitating companies that are key elements in a complex web of interdependent economic relationships in order to avoid the negative consequences of liquidation (*Century Services Inc.* at para. 18).

24 In this vein, Parliament is said to have understood in adopting the *CCAA* that liquidation of an insolvent company is harmful for most of those it affects, notably creditors and employees. Corporate reorganization under the *CCAA* serves the public interest by facilitating corporate survival (*Century Services Inc.* at paras. 17 and 18).

25 Proceedings under the *CCAA* are designed to be flexible and responsive, with a view to providing fairness, certainty and stability for the stakeholders. The *CCAA* is to be liberally interpreted to achieve those ends.

26 *CCAA* jurisdiction is conferred on superior courts vested with inherent and equitable jurisdiction. The present jurisprudential trend is for courts to employ their inherent and equitable jurisdiction only as a tool of last resort when the language of the *CCAA* cannot be interpreted to anchor an intended measure to be taken in the *CCAA* proceedings (G. R. Jackson and J. Sarra, "Selecting the Judicial Tool to Get the Job Done: An Examination of Statutory Interpretation, Discretionary Power and Inherent Jurisdiction in Insolvency Matters" in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2007* (Toronto: Thomson Carswell, 2008) 41 at 42, cited in *Century Services Inc.* at para. 65).

27 Extensive amendments to the *CCAA* in 2008 (2007, c. 36) codified various measures previously undertaken by the court through the exercise of what was referred to in *Century Services Inc.*. at paras. 62 and 63 as "creative use of authority" and "judicial innovation;" for example, imposing priority charges for critical suppliers or debtor in possession ("DIP") financing (now termed "interim financing") and releasing claims against third parties.

28 With these contextual considerations and directives in mind, I now turn to an analysis of ss. 4 to 7 and 11 of the *CCAA* and the relevant authorities in order to assess whether this court has the discretion to call a further meeting of the Debtors' creditors and, if it does, whether the court should exercise that discretion in the circumstances of this case.

29 Calling a meeting of creditors pursuant to s. 4 or 5 is discretionary. A refusal to summon a creditors' meeting often is attributable to the court's determination that the compromise or plan of arrangement is contrary to the creditors' interests (*Avery Construction Co., Re*, [1942] 4 D.L.R. 558, 24 C.B.R. 17 (Ont. S.C.)), it is doomed to failure due to a lack of creditor support (*Fracmaster Ltd., Re*, 1999 ABQB 379, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 204 (Alta. Q.B.), aff'd 1999 ABCA 178, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 230 (Alta. C.A.)), or there is no reasonable chance the debtor will be able to continue in business (*First Treasury Financial Inc. v. Cango Petroleums Inc.* (1991), 78 D.L.R. (4th) 585, 3 C.B.R. (3d) 232 (Ont. Gen. Div.)).

30 The court's sanction of a compromise or plan of arrangement under s. 6 also is discretionary. A compromise or plan of arrangement is enforceable only if and when sanctioned by the court (*Cable Satisfaction International Inc. v. Richter & Associés inc.* (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 205 (C.S. Que.)), although court sanction is not necessary to bind the parties to an inter-creditor agreement in a compromise or plan of arrangement (*Air Canada, Re* (2004), 2 C.B.R. (5th) 4 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 6).

31 Section 6 expressly permits court sanction of a compromise or plan of arrangement amended at the creditors' meeting, so long as the required majority of those voting in person or by proxy at the creditors' meeting agreed to the amended plan. It is clear from this section that amendments to the plan may be proposed at the meeting and the plan as amended may be put to a vote.

32 Pursuant to s. 7, where an amendment to the plan is proposed after the creditors' meeting has been scheduled, the meeting may be adjourned on such term as to notice or otherwise as directed by the court, presumably to allow the creditors more time to consider the proposed amendment. Use of the term "adjourned" implies that the creditors' meeting has not yet been held or that the vote has not yet been taken as otherwise there would be nothing to adjourn.

33 If the court is of the opinion that the proposed amendment does not adversely affect a particular class of creditors, the court has the discretion under s. 7 to direct that the meeting of that class need not be adjourned or a further meeting of that class need not be convened. Again, the reference to adjournment implies that the meeting of and voting by the creditors or class of creditors have not yet occurred, whereas use of the phrase "convene any further meeting" suggests that the meeting and vote of the creditors or particular class of creditors have taken place. It is not clear whether the provisions of s. 7 relating to proposed non-prejudicial amendments apply once the court has sanctioned the plan.

34 Section 7 does not address whether the court can convene a further meeting of creditors to consider a proposed substantive amendment once the creditors' meeting and vote have taken place. Further, the section is silent as to whether the court can convene a further meeting of the creditors to consider such a proposal once the plan has received court sanction - the issue which arises on this application.

35 A review of case law relating to amendments made under s. 7 is instructive as to the nature and timing of permissible court intervention after the creditors' vote has taken place.

36 Section 7 has been interpreted as allowing substantive (i.e prejudicial) amendments only at the pre-vote stage. In *Central Guaranty Trustco Ltd., Re* (1993), 21 C.B.R. (3d) 139 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List])), Farley J. commented (at para. 11):

> ... In ***Algoma Steel Corp. v. Royal Bank of Canada*** (1992), 8 O.R. (3d) 449, the Court of Appeal determined that there were exceptional circumstances (unrelated to the Plan) which allowed it to adjust a Plan where no interest was adversely affected. The same cannot be said here. FSTQ aside from s. 11(c) of the *CCAA* also raised s. 7. I am of the view that s. 7 allows an amendment after an adjournment — but not after a vote has been taken.

37 Section 7 also has been interpreted as permitting judicial amendments of a technical non-prejudicial nature at the sanction stage (*Wandlyn Inns Ltd., Re* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 316 (N.B. Q.B.)). Even then, the court's jurisdiction to allow a judicial amendment must be exercised sparingly, in exceptional circumstances, and only if permitted by the *CCAA* (*Algoma Steel Corp. v. Royal Bank* (1992), 11 C.B.R. (3d) 11 (Ont. C.A.), at 15; *Sammi Atlas Inc., Re* (1998), 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at para. 6). The court's jurisdiction does not extend to modifying plans of arrangement simply because a person is dissatisfied with the existing plan (*Daon Development Corp., Re* (1984), 10 D.L.R. (4th) 216 (B.C. S.C.) at para. 9.

38 In Houlden and Morawetz's *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada*, 4th ed., vol. 4 (Toronto: Carswell, 2009) at p. 11-69, N§48, the authors observe that: "[a]lthough it would seem that once the plan has been sanctioned by the court, the court has no power to make any alterations or modifications in it, there are cases where orders have been made altering or modifying a plan after it has been sanctioned." They then cite a number of authorities, including those discussed below.

39 In *Northland Properties Ltd., Re* (1989), 74 C.B.R. (N.S.) 231 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]), a *CCAA* debtor successfully applied five months after the sanction order to rectify a unilateral mistake made by it in electing a mortgage rate under the plan of arrangement. The court focussed its analysis on whether this type of unilateral mistake was subject to rectification. In any event, the circumstances in that case are distinguishable from the situation here of a default at the implementation stage of *CCAA* proceedings.

40 *Royal Heaters Ltd., Re* (1947), 30 C.B.R. 199 (C.S. Que.) concerned a series of post-sanction applications by a *CCAA* debtor for orders extending the time to make payments and temporarily suspending payments under the plan of arrangement. The debtor in that case, like the Debtors here, claimed that economic conditions had impaired its ability to honour its obligations under the plan. While the amendments clearly were prejudicial, the majority of the creditors in number and value consented to at least one of the extensions. Without discussing its jurisdiction to approve the amendments, the court granted the extensions, observing that it was in the interest of the creditors to do so.

41 In *Keddy Motor Inns Ltd., Re* (1992), 13 C.B.R. (3d) 262, 113 N.S.R. (2d) 431 (N.S. T.D. [In Chambers]), a sanctioned plan of arrangement specified certain payment dates that could not be complied with because of an extant appeal. Without reference to ss. 7 or 11, the court approved a change in those dates.

42 In *Algoma Steel Corp. v. Royal Bank* (1992), 8 O.R. (3d) 449 (Ont. C.A.), leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused (1992), 10 O.R. (3d) xv (note) (S.C.C.), the Ontario Court of Appeal considered whether the existence of a sanctioned plan of arrangement under the *CCAA* prevented the court from permitting the applicant to sue the debtor to the limited extent of certain insurance proceeds. The court determined that the power to amend the plan in the manner sought could be found, by inference, in what is now s. 11.02 (the stay provision) of the *CCAA*. It was argued in that case that having regard to the commercial realities reflected by the *CCAA*, the power to allow an action to proceed could only be exercised before the creditors' vote. The court held that, as a matter of principle, there was no reason to suggest the court's power was limited in that way, although given "the primacy accorded by the Act to agreement among the affected actors, the jurisdiction of the court is to be exercised sparingly and in exceptional circumstances only, if the result of the exercise is to amend the plan, even in merely a technical way." It commented that it would be an unacceptable exercise of jurisdiction if the effect of granting the applicant leave to sue the debtor would be to make any assets other than the insurance proceeds vulnerable to possible execution. It noted that the proposed amendment to the plan was insignificant and technical only as far as the other creditors were concerned.

43 The applicant creditor in *Ontario v. Canadian Airlines Corp.*, 2001 ABQB 983, 306 A.R. 124 (Alta. Q.B.) sought a declaration that the portion of the debt owed to it which was secured by letters of credit was not compromised by the plan of arrangement which had received court sanction. In the alternative, it asked for an order varying the plan to permit the liability secured by the letters of credit to be considered a secured claim and directing that the debtor was liable for the full amount of that liability up to the value of the letters of credit. The court dealt with the issue as one of interpretation and application of the plan, rather than its amendment.

44 However, in *obiter dicta*, Madam Justice Romaine expressed the view (at para. 61) that the court retains jurisdiction at the post-sanction stage to direct amendment to the plan, reasoning that:

> The *CCAA* authorizes the court to amend a plan in appropriate circumstances, where there are compelling reasons to do so. Although the Act does not expressly state that such amendment could take place after the Plan is sanctioned, as pointed out in ***Algoma***, *supra* there is no reason to suggest that the *CCAA* "contemplates a role

> for the court as a mere rubber stamp or one that is simply administrative rather than judicial" (p.103). While the circumstances justifying an amendment after a sanction hearing ought to be truly exceptional, in recognition of the potential violence done to the laudable goal of commercial certainty, there is no reason why subsequent amendments should be conclusively foreclosed in every case, without examination of the particular circumstances.

45 Romaine J. commented at para. 56 that ss. 6 and 7 offer no guidance on whether a court-sanctioned plan may subsequently be amended. However, at para. 57, she noted:

> As mentioned, the *CCAA* confers broad discretion on the court and is to be afforded a large and liberal interpretation: ***Re Canadian Airlines Corp.***, *supra* at para 95 (Q.B); ***Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada*** (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84 (C.A.). It is silent, however, on many procedural issues. Given the lack of legislative guidance, the courts have used the basic purpose of the *CCAA* as a guide to its application and the exercise of its discretion in disposing of applications under the Act: ***Re Canadian Airlines Corp.***, *supra* at para. 95. The keynote concepts of fairness and reasonableness have been recognized as the driving force behind the *CCAA* and the court's interpretation and application of the Act: ***Re Canadian Airlines Corp.*** at para. 95, ***Re Canadian Airlines Corp.***, *supra* at p. 9.

46 In concluding that amendment of the plan would recognize the concepts of fairness and reasonableness to a greater extent than would interpreting the plan in the manner advocated by the debtor, Romaine J. took into consideration that the claims procedure in that case had been unique in that it allowed the debtor to unilaterally categorize its creditors and required that any creditor which did not agree with the classification file a dispute note. She also considered that the applicant creditor had not become aware that the debtor was rejecting its claim as being out of time until the last day and that no evidence of the creditor's position was presented to the court at the sanction hearing. In addition, she noted that no creditor or debtor prejudice would result from the sought after amendment.

47 As the proposed amendment in *Ontario* was non-prejudicial to the debtor and creditors, the court's jurisdiction to make the amendment might have been based on s. 7 or the court's plenary jurisdiction as set out in s. 11.

48 Madam Justice Romaine again was asked to consider amending a plan of arrangement at the post-sanction stage in *Teragol Investments Ltd. v. Hurricane Hydrocarbons Ltd.*, 2005 ABQB 324, 382 A.R. 383 (Alta. Q.B.). In refusing the application, she commented (at para. 21) that a post-sanction amendment should be limited to truly exceptional circumstances as such an amendment has the potential to do violence to the goal of commercial certainty.

49 In *Century Services Inc.*, the first case in which the Supreme Court of Canada was asked to directly interpret the provisions of the *CCAA*, Deschamps J., for the majority, discussed the source of the court's authority during *CCAA* proceedings and the boundary between the court's statutory authority under the Act and the residual authority under its inherent and equitable jurisdiction when supervising a reorganization. She noted that appellate courts were of the view that while lower courts might be purporting to rely on their inherent jurisdiction, in fact they were simply construing the authority supplied by the *CCAA* itself, citing *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re*, 2003 BCCA 344, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236 (B.C. C.A.) at paras. 45-47 and *Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (Ont. C.A.) at paras. 31-33. She affirmed that the appropriate approach for a court to take is to rely first on a purposive and liberal interpretation of the *CCAA* text before turning to inherent or equitable jurisdiction to anchor measures taken in a *CCAA* proceeding. She accepted (at para. 66) that in most cases the issuance of an order in a *CCAA* proceeding should be considered to be an exercise in statutory interpretation, given the expansive interpretation the language of the statute is capable of supporting. The example she referred to was s. 11 of the *CCAA*, which was amended to make explicit the discretionary authority of the court under the *CCAA* and to endorse the broad reading of *CCAA* authority developed by the jurisprudence.

50 Deschamps J. instructed (at paras. 69 and 70) that while the *CCAA* explicitly provides for certain orders, the general language of the Act should not be read as being restricted by the availability of more specific orders. She indicated that the court should take into consideration appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence when exercising *CCAA* authority, explaining that:

> Appropriateness under the *CCAA* is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the *CCAA*. The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to achieve the remedial purpose of the *CCAA* — avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company. I would add that appropriateness extends not only to the purpose of the order, but also to the means it employs. Courts should be mindful that chances for successful reorganizations are enhanced where participants achieve common ground and all stakeholders are treated as advantageously and fairly as the circumstances permit.

51 Given a plain and contextual reading of the *CCAA*, augmented by guidance provided by the case law, I conclude that:

> (a) The courts' supervisory function ends only when the plan has been fully implemented or has failed. Parliament must have intended that the court retain jurisdiction to address issues that could arise during implementation of the plan, including whether to summon a further creditors' meeting after the creditors' vote

or court sanction. Section 7 does not grant that jurisdiction. However, the court's discretionary authority under s. 11 is broad enough to encompass such a direction.

(b) In accordance with *Century Services Inc.*, the court's general discretionary authority under s. 11 should not be interpreted as being restricted by the more specific authority set out in s. 7.

(c) When exercising its authority under s. 11, the court must consider the good faith of the applicant, whether due diligence has been exercised and the appropriateness of making the order sought. In regard to the latter, the court should consider whether the relief sought advances the objectives of the *CCAA* and all relevant policy concerns.

(d) Parliament's intention could not have been to introduce uncertainty and instability to the process. On the contrary, stability, certainty and fairness for all are the recognized goals of the *CCAA*. The effect of the sanction order is relevant as it binds the parties and cements commercial certainty. Once sanctioned, creditors can take their contract with the debtor "to the bank" (for all that may be worth where, as in the present case, plan implementation is staged). In balancing the policy objectives of the *CCAA*, Parliament must have intended that while calling a further meeting of the creditors should remain an option, under certain circumstances, at any stage of the proceedings, once the creditors have voted and the plan has been sanctioned, the court should do so only in exceptional circumstances - circumstances well beyond foreseeable risks such as ordinary business risks.

(e) While each case must be determined on its unique facts, at a minimum, the court should consider the following non-exhaustive list of considerations (many of which overlap and all of which rest on the applicant to establish) before summoning a further meeting of the creditors at the post-sanction stage to vote on a proposed amendment to the plan:

(i) Is the plea for relief made in good faith?

(ii) Has it been made in a timely fashion?

(iii) Would granting the relief advance the policy objectives underlying the *CCAA*?

(iv) Would granting the relief enhance the public's confidence in the *CCAA* process?

(v) Would granting the relief otherwise serve the ends of justice?

(vi) What is the level of creditor support?

VI. Application to the Present Case

A. Is the Plea for Relief Made in Good Faith?

52 There was a lack of cogent evidence establishing that the Debtors have no hope of meeting their obligations under the Plan unless the creditors' meeting is allowed and the proposed amendment is passed.

53 It appears that the Debtors banked on a steady flow of work and the payment of certain receivables to fund the second installment due under the Plan. Neither transpired. However, since the fall of 2010, Kerr has experienced an increase in its work. It is unclear whether Composite is back in business today.

54 Mr. Weibe indicated that he is "cautiously optimistic" about the Debtors' future and, as evidenced by his answers given during cross-examination on his affidavit, the Debtors want matters with their pre-*CCAA* creditors to end; they want to get it "out of [their] hair." Doubtless, this is a common sentiment for any company in the process of restructuring.

55 While I accept that the Debtors have suffered some negative effects from a downturn in the economy, nevertheless I find it curious, and indeed troubling, that:

(i) since formulating the Plan their workforce has more than quadrupled;

(ii) they chose to rely (at least in part) on the impact of 1005559's debts to support their plea for relief;

(iii) the evidence fails to show that they have taken all reasonable steps to fund the Plan, including downsizing and selling non-essential assets.

56 In the result, despite the Monitor's comment (as stated in its fifth report to the court) that it is "... unaware of any facts to suggest that the Management of the Companies are not acting in good faith with respect to their creditors...", I am not so certain. In this regard, I am mindful that the Monitor's comment preceded the cross-examination on affidavit of Mr. Weibe that fleshed out much of the evidence that I have referred to in relation to this factor.

B. Is the Application Timely?

57 There is no suggestion that the Debtors delayed in bringing this application. The real concern is whether it is premature.

C. Would Granting the Relief Advance the Policy Objectives Underlying the CCAA?

58 The facts of this case reveal a tension between the objectives of facilitating restructuring and providing stability, certainty and fairness for all of the stakeholders. Avoiding a second, costly insolvency proceeding by allowing the Debtors to present a revised compromise, proposal, or plan of arrangement is a laudable goal. However, this would involve a tradeoff. The creditors voted on the Plan. Their agreement was cemented by the Sanction Order. They were entitled to rely on the deal and may have altered their own circumstances as a result of it. The Plan amendment proposed by the Debtors would see an eighty percent reduction in the amount the creditors originally accepted. So radical is this proposed change that it is more reasonably viewed as a completely new deal rather than an amendment.

59 While granting the relief would permit the creditors the opportunity to say whether the Debtors' proposed new deal is acceptable, other considerations also must be weighed. A non-exhaustive list of those considerations includes:

(i) the creditors' right to receive current financial information prepared in accordance with the requirements of s. 10(2);

(ii) meaningful compliance with the Monitor's duty to review the Debtors' s. 10(2) financial information as to its reasonableness (s.23(1)(b));

(iii) meaningful compliance with the Monitor's duty to report to the court about the fairness and reasonableness of the proposal (s. 23(1)(i));

(vi) the court's consideration of whether the proposal is workable (see *Royal Bank v. Fracmaster Ltd.*, 1999 ABCA 178, 244 A.R. 93 (Alta. C.A.), confirming *Royal Bank v. Fracmaster Ltd.*, 1999 ABQB 425, 245 A.R. 138 (Alta. Q.B.) in relation to a ss. 4 or 5 application).

These deficiencies might well be addressed by imposing conditions, but the benefit of that approach should be assessed contextually.

60 The demise of the Debtors is not a certainty if the relief is not granted. They can attempt to make another deal with their creditors in alternate insolvency proceedings, whether under the *BIA* or possibly another filing under the *CCAA*. As noted in L.W. Houlden and G.B. Morawetz's *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada* (Toronto: Carswell, 2009), 4th ed. (rev'd), vol. 4, p. 11-28, there is nothing in the statute barring a second application. While the court in *Norseman Products Ltd., Re* (1949), 30 C.B.R. 71, [1950] O.W.N. 81 (Ont. S.C.) commented that a debtor company cannot claim the benefit of the *CCAA* more than once as this would lead to abuse, relying on *Comptoir coopératif du combustible Ltée, Re* (1935), 17

C.B.R. 124 (C.S. Que.), restructuring cases such as *Algoma Steel* suggest that a subsequent filing is appropriate where the statute affords an opportunity for a company to attempt to devise a revised business plan to address its financial distress. Such proceedings come at a price, but given the Debtors' work on its propose revised deal to date and the cost of complying with conditions to address informational concerns, that price is likely less than might otherwise be incurred.

61 In the result, the Debtors have not shown that the policy objectives underlying the *CCAA* would be advanced or that the process would be served by granting them the opportunity to present their proposal to their creditors.

D. Would Granting the Relief Enhance the Public's Confidence in the CCAA Process?

62 The Debtors have experienced economic trouble which has been caused, at least in part, by a downturn in the condominium development industry. However, downturns in the condominium market, especially in the boom and bust economy of Alberta, are a foreseeable and ordinary business risk. There has been insufficient evidence presented establishing that this downturn is truly exceptional or was unforeseeable.

63 Similarly, the impact of the Debtors' secured obligations is not a basis for finding exceptional circumstances. These obligations were known long ago when the Plan was formulated. Although 1005559 is not a part of the group which sought *CCAA* protection, it is a related entity and its performance influences that of the Debtors. Alone or in combination with the Debtors' secured obligations, the obligations of 1005559 do not constitute an extraordinary circumstance.

64 The public's confidence in the *CCAA* process is necessarily grounded in fairness and stability for all of the stakeholders. Allowing the Debtors an opportunity for what, essentially, would be a second kick at the *CCAA* can after defaulting on their obligations would not, in all of the circumstances, further this objective.

E. Would Granting the Relief Serve the Ends of Justice?

65 Assessing whether the relief sought would serve the ends of justice entails many of the same considerations as determining whether it would advance the policy objectives underlying the *CCAA*. In addition, factors such as whether a unilateral mistake has been made may be taken into account, as in *Northland Properties Ltd., Re*

66 In the present case, directing a further meeting of the creditors is not necessary to meet the ends of justice.

F. What is the Level of Creditor Support?

67 The Opposing Creditors oppose granting of the application. There is no evidence of the level of creditor support to the proposed amendment. However, I understand that the creditors were canvassed informally, an approach which presumably failed.

68 After weighing the various factors, I find that the Debtors have failed to meet the high threshold required of them on this application.

VII. Conclusion

69 The Debtors are in default of their obligations under the Plan. Claiming that a downturn in the economy, the weight of secured debt and the obligations of a related party preclude them from living up to their obligations, they want another chance to escape bankruptcy by presenting their creditors with a proposed amendment to the Plan. The proposed amendment is to reduce the Debtors' obligation under the Plan by eighty percent. In essence, it is a new deal.

70 A purposive and contextual interpretation of s. 11 of the *CCAA* vests the court with discretion to grant the relief sought. However, the threshold for summoning a further meeting of creditors after court sanction is high and to succeed the debtor must establish truly extraordinary circumstances.

71 In making its determination, the court should consider whether the debtor's application is made in good faith and whether granting the relief would advance the policy objectives of the *CCAA*, serve and enhance the public's confidence in the process or otherwise serve the ends of justice. The court should also consider the degree of creditor support for the application.

72 The Debtors in the present case have not met the high threshold required for the court to exercise its discretion to order a further meeting of the creditors to be called at this late juncture. Accordingly, the application is dismissed and the creditors are at liberty to apply to lift the stay and pursue their remedies. The parties may speak to me within 30 days if they are unable to agree on costs.

Application dismissed.

End of Document

TAB 7

Para 16

2009 ABQB 490
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

SemCanada Crude Co., Re

2009 CarswellAlta 1269, 2009 ABQB 490, [2009] A.W.L.D. 3785, 180 A.C.W.S. (3d) 374, 479 A.R. 318, 57 C.B.R. (5th) 205

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 SemCanada Crude Company, SemCAMS ULC, SemCanada Energy Company, A.E. Sharp Ltd., CEG Energy Options, Inc., 319278 Nova Scotia Company and 1380331 Alberta ULC

B.E. Romaine J.

Heard: August 5, 2009
Judgment: August 24, 2009
Docket: Calgary 0801-08510

Counsel: A. Robert Anderson, Q.C., Rupert Chartrand, Michael De Lellis, Cynthia L. Spry, Douglas Schweitzer for Applicants
David R. Byers, for Bank of America
Patrick T. McCarthy, Josef A. Krüger for Monitor
Douglas S. Nishimura for ARC Resources Ltd., City of Medicine Hat, Black Rider Resources Inc. Wolf Coulee Resources Inc., Orleans Energy Ltd., Crew Energy Inc., Trilogy Energy LP
Brendan O'Neill, Jason Wadden for Fortis Capital Corp.
Sean Fitzgerald for Tri-Ocean Engineering Ltd.
Dean Hutchison for Crescent Point Energy Trust, Enbridge Pipelines Inc.
Caireen Hanert for Bellamount Exploration Ltd., Enersul Limited Partnership
Bryce McLean for DPH Focus Corporation
Aubrey Kauffman for BNP Paribas

Subject: Insolvency

APPLICATION for orders authorizing establishment of single class of creditors for three plans to restructure and distribute assets for purpose of considering and voting on plans.

B.E. Romaine J.:

Introduction

1 The SemCanada Group applied for various relief related to the holding of meetings of creditors to consider three plans to restructure and distribute assets of the CCAA applicants, including applications for orders authorizing the establishment of a single class of creditors for each plan for the purpose of considering and voting on the plans. I granted the applications, and these are my reasons.

Relevant Facts

2 On July 22, 2008, SemCanada Crude Company ("SemCanada Crude") and SemCAMS ULC ("SemCAMS") were granted initial Orders pursuant to s. 11(1) of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c.C-36, as amended (the "CCAA").

3 On July 30, 2008, the CCAA proceedings of SemCAMS and SemCanada Crude and the bankruptcy proceedings of SemCanada Energy Company ("SemCanada Energy") A.E. Sharp Ltd. ("AES") and CEG Energy Options, Inc. ("CEG") which had been commenced on July 24, 2008 were procedurally consolidated for the purpose of administrative convenience.

4 In addition, CCAA protection was granted to two affiliated companies, 3191278 Nova Scotia Company (A319") and 1380331 Alberta ULC ("138"). SemCanada Energy, AES, CEG, 319 and 138 are collectively referred to as the "SemCanada Energy Companies". The CCAA applicants are collectively referred to as the "SemCanada Group".

5 On July 22, 2008, SemGroup L.P. and its direct and indirect subsidiaries in the United States (the "U.S. Debtors") filed voluntary petitions to restructure under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware.

6 According to the second report of the Monitor, the financial problems of the SemGroup arose from a failed trading strategy and the volatility of petroleum products prices, leading to material margin calls related to large futures and options positions on the NYMEX and OTC markets, resulting in a severe liquidity crisis. SemGroup's credit facilities were insufficient to accommodate its capital needs, and the corporate group sought protection under Chapter 11 and the CCAA.

7 The SemCanada Group are indirect, wholly-owned subsidiaries of SemGroup LP. The SemCanada Group is comprised of three separate businesses:

(a) SemCanada Crude, a crude oil marketing and blending operation;

(b) the SemCanada Energy Companies, whose business was gas marketing, including the purchase and sale of gas to certain of its four subsidiaries as well as to SemCAMS; and

(c) SemCAMS, whose business consists of ownership interests in large gas processing facilities located in Alberta, as well as agreements to operate these facilities.

8 SemCrude, L.P. as U.S. borrower and a predecessor company of SemCAMS as Canadian borrower, certain U.S. SemGroup corporations and Bank of America as administrative agent for a syndicate of lenders (the "Secured Lenders") entered into a credit agreement in 2005 (the "Credit Agreement"). The Credit Agreement provides four different credit facilities. There are no advances outstanding with respect to the Canadian term loan facility, but in excess of U.S. $2.9 billion is owing under the U.S. term loan facility, the working capital loan facility and the revolver loan.

9 Five of the SemCanada Group, including SemCanada Crude, SemCanada Energy and SemCAMS, have provided a guarantee of all obligations under the Credit Agreement to the Secured Lenders, who rank as senior secured lenders, and under a US $600 million bond indenture issued by SemGroup. The guarantee is secured by a security and pledge agreement (the "Security Agreement") signed by the five members of the SemCanada Group.

10 The SemCanada Energy Companies were liquidated or have ceased operations and no longer have significant ongoing operations. As a result of liquidation proceedings and the collection of outstanding accounts receivable, the SemCanada Energy Companies hold approximately $113 million in cash. An application to distribute that cash to the Secured Lenders was adjourned *sine die* on January 19, 2009: *SemCanada Crude Co., Re*, 2009 ABQB 90 (Alta. Q.B.).

11 Originally, SemCAMS and SemCanada Crude proposed to restructure their businesses as stand-alone operations without further affiliation with the U.S. Debtors and accordingly sought bids in a solicitation process undertaken in early 2009. Unfortunately, no acceptable bids were received. It also became apparent that, as SemCanada Crude's business was closely integrated with certain North Dakota transportation rights and assets owned by the U.S. Debtors, restructuring SemCanada Crude's operations on a stand alone basis would be problematic. The SemCanada Group turned to the alternative of joining in the restructuring of the entire SemGroup through concurrent and integrated plans of arrangement in both Canada and the United States.

Summary of the U.S. and Canadian Plans

12 The U.S. and Canadian plans are complex and need not be described in their entirety in these reasons. For the purpose of these reasons, the relevant aspects of the plans are as follows:

1. The disclosure statement relating to a joint plan of affiliated U.S. Debtors was approved for distribution to creditors by the U.S. Bankruptcy Court on July 21, 2009. Under the Chapter 11 process, meetings of creditors are not necessary. Voting takes place through a notice and balloting mechanism that has been approved by the U.S. Court and September 3, 2009 has been set as the voting deadline for acceptance or rejection of the U.S. plan.

2. The total distributable value of the SemGroup for the purpose of the plans is expected to be US $2.3 billion, consisting of US $965 million in cash, US $300 million in second lien term loan interests and US $1.035 billion in new common stock and warrants of the U.S. Debtors.

3. The SemCanada Group will contribute approximately US $161 million in available cash to the U.S. plan and US $54 million is expected to be received from SemCanada Crude relating to crude oil settlements that will occur after the effective date of the plans, being cash received from prepayments that are outstanding on the implementation date which will be replaced with letters of credit or other post-plan financing.

4. Approximately US $50 million will be retained by the corporate group for working capital and general corporate purposes, including for the post plan cash needs of SemCAMS and SemCanada Crude.

5. Certain U.S. causes of action will be contributed to a "litigation trust" and will be distributed through the U.S. Plan, including to the Secured Lenders on their deficiency claims. No value has been placed on the litigation trust by the U.S. Debtors. The Monitor reports that it is unable to make an informed assessment of the value of the litigation trust assets as the trust is a complicated legal mechanism that will likely require the expenditure of significant time and professional fees before there will be any recovery.

6. The U.S. plan contains a condition precedent that, on the effective date of the plan, the restructured corporate group will enter into a US $500 million exit financing facility, which will apply to all post-restructuring affiliates, including SemCAMS and SemCanada Crude, and which will allow the corporate group to re-enter the crude marketing business in the United States and to continue operations in Canada.

7. It is expected that the Secured Lenders will receive cash, second lien term loan interests and equity in priority to unsecured creditors on their secured guarantee claims of US $2.9 billion, which will leave them with a deficiency of approximately US $1.07 billion on the secured loans. The Secured Lenders are entitled under the U.S. Plan to a share in the litigation trust on their deficiency claim. If certain other classes of creditors do not vote to approve the U.S. plan, the Secured Lenders may also receive equity of a value up to 4.53% of their deficiency, subject to other contingencies. The Monitor reports that the Secured Lenders are thus estimated to recover approximately 57.1% of their estimated claims of US $2.1 billion on secured working capital claims and 73.3% of their estimated claims of US $811 million on secured revolver/term claims. The Monitor estimates that the Secured Lenders will recover no value on their deficiency claims, assuming no reallocation of equity from other categories of debtors and no value for the litigation trust.

8. The holders of the US $600 million bonds (the "Noteholders") are entitled to receive common shares and warrants in the restructured corporate group, plus an interest in the litigation trust and certain trustee fees, for an estimated recovery of 8.34% on their claims of US $610 million under the U.S. plan, assuming all classes of Noteholders approve the plan and no value is given to the litigation trust. Depending on certain contingencies, the range of recovery is 0.44$ to 11.02% of their claim. Noteholders are treated more advantageously under the plans than general unsecured creditors in recognition that the Senior Notes are jointly and severally guaranteed by 23 U.S. debtors and the Canadian debtors, while in most instances only one SemGroup debtor is liable with respect to each ordinary unsecured creditor. In addition, the Noteholders have waived their right to receive distributions under the Canadian plans.

9. Under the U.S. Plan, general unsecured creditors will receive common shares, warrants and an interest in the litigation trust. Depending on the level of approval, recovery levels will range from 0.08% to 8.03% on claims of US $811 million. The Monitor reports that it expects recovery to general unsecured creditors under the U.S. Plan to be 2.09% of their claim.

10. Pursuant to section 503(b)(9) of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code, entities that provided goods to the U.S. Debtors in the ordinary course of business that were received within 20 days of the filing of Chapter 11 proceedings are entitled to a priority claim that ranks above the claims of the Secured Lenders.

11. There are 3 Canadian plans. As the Secured Lenders will be entitled to some recovery in respect of their deficiency claim and the Noteholders will be entitled to

some recovery on their unsecured claim under the U.S. Plan, the Secured Lenders and the Noteholders are deemed to have waived their rights to any additional recovery under the Canadian plans for the most part. However, the votes of the Secured Lenders and the Noteholders entitled to vote on the U.S. Plan are deemed to be votes for the purpose of the Canadian plans, both with respect to numbers of parties and value of claims, and are to be included in the single class of "Affected Creditors" entitled to vote on the Canadian plans. Originally, the Canadian plans provided that the value attributable to the Secured Lenders' votes would be based on the full amount of their guarantee claim, approximately US $2.9 billion, and not only on their deficiency claim of approximately US $1.07 billion. Thus, the aggregate value of the Secured Lenders' voting claims would be:

a) US $2.939 billion for the SemCAMS plan;

b) US $2.939 billion less C $145 million for the SemCanada Crude plan, recognizing that the Secured Lenders would be entitled to receive C $145 million in respect of a negotiated Lenders' Secured Claim under the SemCanada Crude plan; and

c) US $2.939 billion less C $108 million for the SemCanada Energy plan, recognizing that the Secured Lenders will receive that amount in respect of a negotiated Lenders' Secured Claim under the SemCanada Energy plan.

At the conclusion of the classification hearing, the CCAA applicants proposed a revision to the proposed orders which stipulates that, if the approval of a plan by the creditors would be determined by the portion of the votes cast by the Secured Lenders that represents an amount of indebtedness that is greater than their estimated aggregate deficiency after taking into consideration the payments they are to receive under the U.S. plan and the Canadian plans, the Court shall determine whether the voting claim of the Secured Lenders should be limited to their estimated deficiency claim.

12. Only "Ordinary Creditors" receive any distribution under the Canadian Plans. Ordinary Creditors are defined as creditors holding "Affected Claims" other than the Secured Lenders, Noteholders, CCAA applicants and U.S. Debtors. Each plan provides that the Affected Creditors of the CCAA applicant will vote at the Creditors' Meeting as a single class.

13. The SemCAMS plan will be funded by a cash advance from SemCanada Crude and establishes two pools of cash. One pool will fund the full amount of secured claims which have not been paid prior to the implementation date of the plan up to the realizable value of the property secured, and the other pool will fund

distributions to ordinary unsecured creditors. Ordinary unsecured creditors will receive cash subject to a maximum total payment of 4% of their proven claims. The Monitor estimates that the distribution will equal 4% of claims unless claims in excess of the current highest estimate are established.

14. The SemCanada Crude plan also establishes two pools of cash, one for secured claims and one for ordinary unsecured creditors. Again, the distribution to ordinary unsecured creditors is estimated to be 4% of claims unless claims in excess of the current highest estimate against SemCanada Crude are established.

15. Any cash remaining in SemCanada Crude after deducting amounts necessary to fund the above-noted payments to secured and unsecured ordinary creditors of SemCAMS and SemCanada Crude, unaffected claims and administrative costs, less a reserve for disputed claims, will be paid to the Secured Lenders through the U.S. plan as part of the payment on secured debt.

16. The SemCanada Energy distribution plan is funded from the cash received from the liquidation of the assets of the companies. It also establishes two pools of cash, one of which will be used to pay secured ordinary creditors and a one of which will be used to pay cash distributions to ordinary unsecured creditors. The Monitor estimates that the distribution to ordinary unsecured creditors will be in the range of 2.16% to 2.27% of their claims, unless claims in excess of the current maximum estimate are established. Any amounts outstanding after payment of these claims, unaffected claims and administration costs will be paid to the Secured Lenders. The proposed lower amount of recovery is stated to be in recognition of the fact that the SemCanada Energy Companies have been liquidated and have no going concern value.

17. As this summary indicates, the U.S. Plan and the Canadian plans are closely integrated and economically interdependent. Each of the plans requires that the other plans be approved by the requisite number of creditors and implemented on the same date in order to become effective. The receipt of at least $160 million from the SemCanada Group is a condition precedent to the implementation of the U.S. Plan.

18. The Monitor reports that the SemCanada Group has indicated that there is no viable option to the proposed plans and that a formal liquidation under bankruptcy legislation would provide a lower recovery to creditors. The Monitor notes that the rationale for the treatment of the Secured Lenders and the ordinary unsecured creditors under the plans is that the Secured Lenders have valid and enforceable secured claims, and that, in the event of the liquidation of the Canadian companies,

the Secured Lenders would be entitled to all proceeds, resulting in no recovery to ordinary creditors. Therefore, reports the Monitor, the CCAA plans are considered to be better than the alternative of a liquidation. The Secured Lenders derive some benefit from the plans through the preservation of the going concern value of SemCAMS and SemCanada Crude and by having a prompt distribution of funds held by the SemCanada Energy Companies.

19. The Monitor notes that the distribution to the SemGroup unsecured creditors under the U.S. plan is viewed as better than a liquidation, and that, therefore, given the effect of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code's "cram-down" provisions, it is likely that the U.S. plan will be confirmed. The Monitor comments that the proposed distribution to ordinary unsecured creditors under the CCAA plans is considered to be fair as it is comparable to and potentially slightly more favourable than the distributions being made to the U.S. ordinary unsecured creditors.

Positions of Various Parties

13 The SemCanada Group applied for orders

a) accepting the filing of, in the case of SemCAMS and SemCanada Crude, proposed plans of arrangement and compromise, and in the case of SemCanada Energy, a proposed plan of distribution;

b) authorizing the calling and holding of meetings of the Canadian creditors of these three CCAA applicants;

c) authorizing the establishment of a single class of creditors for each plan for the purpose of considering and voting on the plans;

d) approving procedures with respect to the calling and conduct of such meetings; and

e) other non-contentious enabling relief.

14 Certain unsecured creditors of the applicants objected to the proposed classification of creditors, submitting that the Secured Lenders should not be allowed a vote in the same class as the unsecured creditors either with respect to the secured portion of their overall claim or any deficiency in their claims that would remain unpaid, and that the Noteholders should not be allowed a vote in the same class as the rest of the unsecured creditors.

15 As noted previously, the CCAA applicants proposed a revision to the proposed orders at the conclusion of the classification hearing which would allow the Court to consider whether the voting claim of the Secured Lenders should be limited to their estimated deficiency claim.

The objecting creditors continued to object to the proposed classification, even if eligible votes were limited to the deficiency claim of the Secured Lenders.

Analysis

16 Section 6 of the CCAA provides that, where a majority in number representing two-thirds in value of "the creditors or class of creditors, as the case may be" vote in favour of a plan of arrangement or compromise at a meeting or meetings, the plan of arrangement may be sanctioned by the Court. There is little by way of specific statutory guidance on the issue of classification of claims, leaving the development of this issue in the CCAA process to case law. Prior decisions have recognized that the starting point in determining classification is the statute itself and the primary purpose of the statute is to facilitate the reorganization of insolvent companies: Paperny, J. in *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re* (2000), 20 C.B.R. (4th) 46 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]), leave to appeal refused (2000), 20 C.B.R. (4th) 46 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]), affirmed [2001] 4 W.W.R. 1 (Alta. C.A.), leave to appeal to SCC refused [2001] S.C.C.A. No. 60 (S.C.C.) at para. 14. As first noted by Forsyth, J. in *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 20, 64 Alta. L.R. (2d) 139, [1989] 2 W.W.R. 566 (Alta. Q.B.) at page 28, and often repeated in classification decisions since, "this factor must be given due consideration at every stage of the process, including the classification of creditors..."

17 Classification is a key issue in CCAA proceedings, as a proposed plan must achieve the requisite level of creditor support in order to proceed to the stage of a sanction hearing. The CCAA debtor seeks to frame a class or classes in order to ensure that the plan receives the maximum level of support. Creditors have an interest in classifications that would allow them enhanced bargaining power in the negotiation of the plan, and creditors aggrieved by the process may seek to ensure that classification will give them an effective veto (see *Rescue: The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, Janis P. Sarra, 2007 ed. Thomson Carswell at page 234). Case law has developed from the comments of the British Columbia Court in *Woodward's Ltd., Re* (1993), 84 B.C.L.R. (2d) 206 (B.C. S.C.) warning against the danger of fragmenting the voting process unnecessarily, through the identification of principles applicable to the concept of "commonality of interest" articulated in *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re* and elaborated further in Alberta in *San Francisco Gifts Ltd., Re*, 2004 CarswellAlta 1241, [2004] A.J. No. 1062 (Alta. Q.B.), leave to appeal refused (2004), 5 C.B.R. (5th) 300 (Alta. C.A.).

18 The parties in this case agree that "commonality of interest" is the key consideration in determining whether the proposed classification is appropriate, but disagree on whether the plans as proposed with their single class of voters meet that requirement. It is clear that classification is a fact-driven inquiry, and that the principles set out in the case law, while useful in considering whether commonality of interest has been achieved by the proposed

classification, should not be applied rigidly: *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re* at para. 18; *San Francisco Gifts Ltd., Re* at para. 12; *Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 15 C.B.R. (5th) 307 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 22.

19 Although there are no fixed rules, the principles set out by Paperny, J. in para. 31 of *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re* provide a useful structure for discussion of whether to the proposed classification is appropriate:

1. Commonality of interest should be viewed based on the non-fragmentation test, not on the identity of interest test.

20 Under the now-rejected "identity of interest" test, all members of the class had to have identical interests. Under the non-fragmentation test, interests need not be identical. The interests of the creditors in the class need only be sufficiently similar to allow them to vote with a common interest: *Woodward's Ltd., Re* at para. 8.

21 The objecting creditors submit that the creation of two classes rather than one cannot be considered to be fragmentation. The issue, however, is not the number of classes, but the effect that fragmentation of classes may have on the ability to achieve a viable reorganization. As noted by Farley, J. in para. 13 of his reasons relating to the classification of creditors in *Stelco Inc., Re*, as endorsed by the Ontario Court of Appeal:

> ...absent valid reason to have separate classes it would be reasonable, logical, rational and practical to have all this unsecured debt in the same class. Certainly that would avoid fragmentation - and in this respect multiplicity of classes does not mean that fragmentation starts only when there are many classes. Unless more than one class is necessary, fragmentation would start at two classes. Fragmentation if necessary, but not necessarily fragmentation.

2. The interests to be considered are the legal interests that a creditor holds qua creditor in relationship to the debtor company prior to and under the plan as well as on liquidation.

22 The classification of creditors is viewed with respect to the legal rights they hold in relation to the debtor company in the context of the proposed plan, as opposed to their rights as creditors in relation to each other: *Woodward's Ltd., Re* at para. 27, 29; *Stelco Inc., Re* at para. 30. In the proposed single classification, the rights of the creditors in the class against the debtor companies are unsecured (other than the proposed votes attributable to the secured portion of the debt of the Secured Lenders, which will be discussed separately).

23 With respect to the Secured Lenders' deficiency claim, there is a clear precedent for permitting a secured creditor to vote a substantial deficiency claim as part of the unsecured

class: *Campeau Corp., Re* (1991), 10 C.B.R. (3d) 100 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, supra.

24 The classification issues in the *Campeau Corp., Re* restructuring were similar to the present issues. In *Campeau Corp., Re*, a secured creditor, Olympia & York, was included in the class of unsecured creditors for the deficiency in its secured claim, which represented approximately 88% of the value of the unsecured class. The Court rejected the submission that the legal interests of Olympia & York were different from other unsecured creditors in the class. Montgomery, J. noted at para. 16 that Olympic & York's involvement in the negotiation of the plan was necessary and appropriate given that the size of its claims would allow it a veto no matter how the classes were constituted and that its co-operation was necessary for the success of both the U.S. and Canadian plans.

25 In the same way, the size and scope of the Secured Lenders claim makes their participation in the negotiation and endorsement of the proposed plans essential. That participation does not disqualify them from a vote in the process, nor necessitate their isolation in a special class. While under the integrated plans, the Secured Lenders will receive a different kind of distribution on their unsecured deficiency claim (a share of the litigation trust), that is an issue of fairness for the sanction hearing and does not warrant the establishment of a separate class.

26 The interests of the Noteholders are unsecured. While it is true that under the integrated plans, the Noteholders would be entitled to a higher share of the distribution of assets than ordinary unsecured creditors, the rationale for such difference in treatment relates to the multiplicity of debtor companies that are indebted to the Noteholders, as compared to the position of the ordinary unsecured creditors. That difference, while it may be subject to submissions at the sanction hearing, is an issue of fairness, and not a difference material enough to warrant a separate class for the Noteholders in this case. A separate class for the Noteholders would only be necessary if, after considering all the relevant factors, it appeared that this difference would preclude reasonable consultation among the creditors of the class: *San Francisco Gifts Ltd., Re* at para. 24.

27 The question arises whether the fact that the Secured Lenders and the Noteholders have waived their rights to recover under the Canadian plans should result in either the requirement of separate classes or the forfeiture of their right to vote on the Canadian plans at all.

28 This is a unique case: a cross-border restructuring with separate but integrated and interdependent plans that are designed to comply with the restructuring legislation of two jurisdictions. As the applicants point out, the co-ordinated structure of the plans is designed to ensure that the Secured Lenders and the Noteholders receive sufficient recoveries under

the U.S. plan to justify the sacrifices in recovery that result from their waiver of distributions under the Canadian plans. In considering the context of the proposed classification, it would be unrealistic and artificial to consider the Canadian plans in isolation, without regard to the commercial outcome to the creditors resulting from the implementation of the plans in both jurisdictions. Thus, the fact that the distributions to Secured Lenders and Noteholders will take place through the operation of the U.S. plan, and that the effective working of the plans require them to waive their rights to receive distributions under the Canadian plans does not deprive them of the right to an effective voice in the consideration of the Canadian plans through a meaningful vote.

29 It is not sufficient to say that the Secured Lenders and the Noteholders have a vote in the U.S. plans. The "cram down" power which exists under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code includes a "best interests test" that requires that if a class of holders of impaired claims rejects the plan, they can be "crammed down" and their claims will be satisfied if they receive property of a value that is not less than the value that the class would receive or retain if the debtor were liquidated under Chapter 7 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code. Thus, the votes available to the Secured Lenders and the Noteholders with respect to their claims under the U.S. Plan do not give them the right available to creditors under Canadian restructuring law to vote on whether a proposed plan should proceed to the next step of a sanction hearing There is no reason to deprive the Secured Lenders and the Noteholders of that right as creditors of the Canadian debtors, even if the distributions they would be entitled to flow through the U.S. plan. The question becomes, then, whether that right should be exercised in a class with other unsecured creditors as proposed or in a separate class.

30 It is noteworthy that the proposed single classification does not have the effect of confiscating the legal rights of any of the unsecured creditors, or adversely affecting any existing security position. It is in fact arguable that seeking to exclude the Secured Lenders and the Noteholders from the class prejudices these similarly-placed creditors by denying them a meaningful voice in the approval or rejection of the plans in Canada.

31 A number of cases suggest that the Court should also consider the rights of the parties in liquidation in determining whether a proposed classification is appropriate: *Woodward's Ltd., Re* at para. 14; *San Francisco Gifts Ltd., Re* at para. 12.

32 Under a liquidation scenario, the Secured Lenders would be entitled to nearly all of the proceeds of the liquidated corporate group, other than the relatively few secured claims that have priority. This suggests that the Secured Lenders are entitled to a meaningful vote with respect to both the U.S. plan and the Canadian plans.

3. The commonality of interests is to be viewed purposively, bearing in mind the object of the CCAA, namely to facilitate organizations if possible.

4. In placing a broad and purposive interpretation on the CCAA, the Court should be careful to resist classification approaches that would potentially jeopardize viable plans.

33 The Ontario Court of Appeal in *Stelco Inc., Re* cautioned that, in addition to considering commonality of interest issues, the court in a classification application should be alert to concerns about the confiscation of legal rights and should avoid "a tyranny of the minority", citing the comments of Borins, J. in *Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1991), 86 D.L.R. (4th) 621 (Ont. Gen. Div.), where he warned against creating "a special class simply for the benefit of the opposing creditor, which would give that creditor the potential to exercise an unwarranted degree of power": *Stelco Inc., Re* at para 28.

34 Excluding of the Secured Lenders and the Noteholders from the proposed single class would allow the objecting creditors to influence the voting process to a degree not warranted by their status. It is true that if the Secured Lenders and the Noteholders are not excluded from the class, even if only the votes related to the Secured Lenders' deficiency claim are tabulated, the positive vote will likely be enough to allow the proposed plans to proceed to a sanction hearing. It is also true that the Secured Lenders and the Noteholders may have been part of the negotiations that led to the proposed plans. Neither of those factors standing alone is sufficient to warrant a separate class unless rights are being confiscated or the classification creates an injustice.

35 The structure of the classification as proposed creates in effect what was imposed by the Court in *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, a method of allowing the "voice" of ordinary unsecured creditors to be heard without the necessity of a separate classification, thus permitting rather than ruling out the possibility that the plans might proceed to a sanction hearing. Given that the votes of the Secured Lenders and the Noteholders on the U.S. plan will be deemed to be votes of those creditors on the Canadian plans, there will be perforce a separate tabulation of those votes from the votes of the remaining unsecured creditors. In accordance with the revision to the plans made at the end of the classification hearing, there will be a separate tabulation of the votes of the Secured Lenders relating to the secured portion of their claims and the votes relating to the unsecured deficiency.

36 The situation in this classification dispute is essentially the same as that which faced Paperny, J. in *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*. Fragmenting the classification prior to the vote raises the possibility that the plans may not reach the stage of a sanction hearing where fairness issues can be fully canvassed. This would be contrary to the purpose of the CCAA. This is particularly an issue recognizing that the U.S. plan and the Canadian plans must all be approved in order for any one of them to be implemented. Conrad, J.A. in denying leave to appeal in *San Francisco Gifts Ltd., Re*, 2004 ABCA 386 (Alta. C.A.) at para. 9 noted that the right to vote in a separate class and thereby defeat a proposed plan

of arrangement is the statutory protection provided to the different classes of creditors, and thus must be determined reasonably at the classification stage. However, she also noted that "it is important to carefully examine classes with a view of protecting against injustice": para. 10. In this case, the goals of preventing confiscation of rights and protecting against injustice favour the proposed single classification.

37 This is the "pragmatic" factor referred to in *Campeau Corp., Re* at para. 21.The CCAA judge must keep in mind the interests of all stakeholders in reviewing the proposed classification, as in any step in the process. If a classification prevents the danger of a veto of a plan that promises some better return to creditors than the alternative of a liquidating insolvency, it should not be interfered with absent good reason. The classification hearing is not the only avenue of relief for aggrieved creditors. If a plan received the minimum required level of approval by vote of creditors, it must still be approved at a hearing where issues of fairness must be addressed.

5. Absent bad faith, the motivations of the creditors to approve or disapprove [of the Plan] are irrelevant.

38 As noted in *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re* at para. 35, fragmenting a class because of an alleged conflict of interest not based on legal rights is an error. The issue of the motivation of a party to vote for or against a plan is an issue for the fairness hearing. There is no doubt that the various affected creditors in the proposed single class may have differing financial or strategic interests. To recognize such differences at the classification stage, unless the proposed classification confiscates rights, results in an injustice or creates a situation where meaningful consultation is impossible, would lead to the type of fragmentation that may jeopardize the CCAA process and be counter-productive to the legislative intent to facilitate viable reorganizations.

6. The requirement of creditors being able to consult together means being able to assess their legal entitlement as creditors before or after the plan in a similar manner.

39 The issue of meaningful consultation was addressed by both the supervising justice and the Court of Appeal in *San Francisco Gifts Ltd., Re*. In that case, Topolniski, J. noted that two corporate insiders that the proposed plan had included in the classification of affected creditors held claims that were uncompromised by the plan, that they gave up nothing, and that it "stretches the imagination to think other creditors in the class could have meaningful consultation [with them] about the Plan": para. 49. Her decision to place these parties in a separate class was confirmed by the Court of Appeal, which commented that Topolniski, J. was "absolutely correct" to find no ability to consult "between shareholders whose debts would not be cancelled and other unsecured creditors whose debts would be": para. 14.

40 That is not the situation here. The deficiency claims of the Secured Lenders and the unsecured claims of the Noteholders are being compromised in the U.S. plan, and there is nothing to block consultations among affected creditors on the basis of dissimilarity of legal interests. While there are differences in the proposed distributions on the unsecured claims, they are not so major that they would preclude consultation.

41 The objecting creditors point to statements made by counsel for the Secured Lenders during the classification application about the alternatives to approval of the plans, which they submit indicates the impossibility of consultation. These comments were made in the context of advocacy on behalf of the proposed classification, and I do not take them as a clear statement by the Secured Lenders that they would refuse to consult with the other creditors.

Secured Portion of Secured Lenders' Claim

42 The CCAA applicants and the Secured Lenders submit that it would be unfair and inappropriate to limit the votes of the Secured Lenders in the Canadian plans to the amount of the deficiency in their secured claim, rather than the entire amount owing under the guarantee. They argue that, by endorsing the plans, the Secured Lenders have in effect elected to treat their entire claim under the guarantee as unsecured with respect to the Canadian plans, except for relatively small negotiated secured claims under the SemCanada Crude plan and the SemCanada Energy plan. They also submit that the fact that under bankruptcy law, a creditor of a bankrupt debtor is entitled to prove for the full amount of its debt in the estates of both the debtor and a bankrupt guarantor of the debt justifies granting the Secured Lenders the right to vote the full amount of the guarantee claim, even if part of the claim is to be recovered through the U.S. plan, as long as they do not actually recover more than 100 cents on the dollar.

43 It became apparent during the course of the classification hearing that it may not matter whether the plans are approved by the requisite number of creditors and value of their claims if the Secured Lenders are only entitled to vote the deficiency portion of their claims or the full amount of their claims. It was this that led to the revision in the language of the voting provisions of the plans. I defer a decision on the question of whether or not the Secured Lenders are entitled to vote the entire amount of their guarantee claims until after the vote has been conducted and the votes separately tabulated as directed. As noted by the Court of Appeal in *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re* (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 33 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]) at para. 39, such a deferral of a voting issue is not an error of law and is in fact consistent with the purpose of the CCAA.

Recent Amendments

44 The following amendment to the CCAA that has been proclaimed in effect from September 18, 2009 sets out certain factors that may be considered in approving a classification for voting purposes:

> 22.2 (2)**Factors** - For the purpose of subsection (1), creditors may be included in the same class if their interests or rights are sufficiently similar to give them a commonality of interest, taking into account:
>
> (a) the nature of the debts, liabilities or obligations giving rise to their claims;
>
> (b) the nature and rank of any security in respect of their claims;
>
> (c) the remedies available to the creditors in the absence of the compromise or arrangement being sanctioned, and the extent to which the creditors would recover their claims by exercising those remedies; and
>
> (d) any further criteria, consistent with those set out in paragraphs (a) to (c), that are prescribed. (R.S.C. 2005, c. 47, s. 131, amended R.S.C. 2007, Bill C -12, c.36, s.71)

45 These factors do not change in any material way the factors that have been identified in the case law and discussed in these reasons nor would they have a material effect on the consideration of the proposed classification in this case.

Creditors with Claims in Process

46 Two creditors advised that, because their claims of secured status had not yet been resolved with the applicants and the Monitor, they were not in a position to evaluate whether or not to object to the proposed classification. The plans were revised to ensure that the votes of creditors whose status as secured creditors remains unresolved until after the meetings of creditors be recorded with votes of creditors with disputed claims and reported to the Court by the Monitor if these votes affect the approval or non-approval of the plan in question.

Conclusion

47 In summary, I have concluded that there is no good reason to exclude the Secured Lenders and the Noteholders from the single classification of voters in the proposed plans, nor to create a separate class for their votes. There are no material distinctions between the claims of these two creditors and the claims of the remaining unsecured creditors that are not more properly the subject of the sanction hearing, apart from the deferred issue of whether the Secured Lenders are entitled to vote their entire guarantee claim. No rights of the remaining unsecured creditors are being confiscated by the proposed classification, and no injustice arises, particularly given the separate tabulation of votes which enables the voice of

the remaining unsecured creditors to be heard and measured at the sanction hearing. There are no conflicts of interest so over-riding as to make consultation impossible. While there are differences of interests and treatment among the affected creditors in the class, these are issues that will be addressed at the sanction hearing. Approval of the proposed classification in the context of the integrated plans is in accordance with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA.

Applications granted.

End of Document

TAB 8

Para 95

2000 ABQB 442
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Canadian Airlines Corp., Re

2000 CarswellAlta 662, 2000 ABQB 442, [2000] 10 W.W.R. 269, [2000] A.W.L.D. 654, [2000] A.J. No. 771, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 1, 265 A.R. 201, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, 98 A.C.W.S. (3d) 334, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 41

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as Amended

In the Matter of the Business Corporations Act (Alberta) S.A. 1981, c. B-15, as Amended, Section 185

In the Matter of Canadian Airlines Corporation and Canadian Airlines International Ltd.

Paperny J.

Heard: June 5-19, 2000
Judgment: June 27, 2000 *
Docket: Calgary 0001-05071

Counsel: *A.L. Friend, Q.C.*, *H.M. Kay, Q.C.*, *R.B. Low, Q.C.*, and *L. Goldbach*, for Petitioners.
S.F. Dunphy, *P. O'Kelly*, and *E. Kolers*, for Air Canada and 853350 Alberta Ltd.
D.R. Haigh, Q.C., *D.N. Nishimura*, *A.Z.A. Campbell* and *D. Tay*, for Resurgence Asset Management LLC.
L.R. Duncan, Q.C., and *G. McCue*, for Neil Baker, Michael Salter, Hal Metheral, and Roger Midiaty.
F.R. Foran, Q.C., and *P.T. McCarthy, Q.C.*, for Monitor, PwC.
G.B. Morawetz, *R.J. Chadwick* and *A. McConnell*, for Senior Secured Noteholders and the Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Co.
C.J. Shaw, Q.C., for Unionized Employees.
T. Mallett and *C. Feasby*, for Amex Bank of Canada.
E.W. Halt, for J. Stephens Allan, Claims Officer.
M. Hollins, for Pacific Costal Airlines.
P. Pastewka, for JHHD Aircraft Leasing No. 1 and No. 2.
J. Thom, for Royal Bank of Canada.

J. Medhurst-Tivadar, for Canada Customs and Revenue Agency.
R. Wilkins, Q.C., for Calgary and Edmonton Airport Authority.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

APPLICATION by airline for approval of plan of arrangement; COUNTER-APPLICATION by investment corporation for declaration that plan constituted merger or transfer of airline's assets to AC Corp., that plan would not affect investment corporation, and directing repurchase of notes pursuant to trust indenture, and that actions of airline and AC Corp. in formulating plan were oppressive and unfairly prejudicial; COUNTER-APPLICATION by minority shareholders.

***Paperny J.*:**

I. Introduction

1 After a decade of searching for a permanent solution to its ongoing, significant financial problems, Canadian Airlines Corporation ("CAC") and Canadian Airlines International Ltd. ("CAIL") seek the court's sanction to a plan of arrangement filed under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") and sponsored by its historic rival, Air Canada Corporation ("Air Canada"). To Canadian, this represents its last choice and its only chance for survival. To Air Canada, it is an opportunity to lead the restructuring of the Canadian airline industry, an exercise many suggest is long overdue. To over 16,000 employees of Canadian, it means continued employment. Canadian Airlines will operate as a separate entity and continue to provide domestic and international air service to Canadians. Tickets of the flying public will be honoured and their frequent flyer points maintained. Long term business relationships with trade creditors and suppliers will continue.

2 The proposed restructuring comes at a cost. Secured and unsecured creditors are being asked to accept significant compromises and shareholders of CAC are being asked to accept that their shares have no value. Certain unsecured creditors oppose the plan, alleging it is oppressive and unfair. They assert that Air Canada has appropriated the key assets of Canadian to itself. Minority shareholders of CAC, on the other hand, argue that Air Canada's financial support to Canadian, before and during this restructuring process, has increased the value of Canadian and in turn their shares. These two positions are irreconcilable, but do reflect the perception by some that this plan asks them to sacrifice too much.

3 Canadian has asked this court to sanction its plan under s. 6 of the CCAA. The court's role on a sanction hearing is to consider whether the plan fairly balances the interests of all the stakeholders. Faced with an insolvent organization, its role is to look forward and ask: does this plan represent a fair and reasonable compromise that will permit a viable commercial

entity to emerge? It is also an exercise in assessing current reality by comparing available commercial alternatives to what is offered in the proposed plan.

II. Background

Canadian Airlines and its Subsidiaries

4 CAC and CAIL are corporations incorporated or continued under the *Business Corporations Act* of Alberta, S.A. 1981, c. B-15 ("ABCA"). 82% of CAC's shares are held by 853350 Alberta Ltd.("853350") and the remaining 18% are held publicly. CAC, directly or indirectly, owns the majority of voting shares in and controls the other Petitioner, CAIL and these shares represent CAC's principal asset. CAIL owns or has an interest in a number of other corporations directly engaged in the airline industry or other businesses related to the airline industry, including Canadian Regional Airlines Limited ("CRAL"). Where the context requires, I will refer to CAC and CAIL jointly as "Canadian" in these reasons.

5 In the past fifteen years, CAIL has grown from a regional carrier operating under the name Pacific Western Airlines ("PWA") to one of Canada's two major airlines. By mid-1986, Canadian Pacific Air Lines Limited ("CP Air"), had acquired the regional carriers Nordair Inc. ("Nordair") and Eastern Provincial Airways ("Eastern"). In February, 1987, PWA completed its purchase of CP Air from Canadian Pacific Limited. PWA then merged the four predecessor carriers (CP Air, Eastern, Nordair, and PWA) to form one airline, "Canadian Airlines International Ltd.", which was launched in April, 1987.

6 By April, 1989, CAIL had acquired substantially all of the common shares of Wardair Inc. and completed the integration of CAIL and Wardair Inc. in 1990.

7 CAIL and its subsidiaries provide international and domestic scheduled and charter air transportation for passengers and cargo. CAIL provides scheduled services to approximately 30 destinations in 11 countries. Its subsidiary, Canadian Regional Airlines (1998) Ltd. ("CRAL 98") provides scheduled services to approximately 35 destinations in Canada and the United States. Through code share agreements and marketing alliances with leading carriers, CAIL and its subsidiaries provide service to approximately 225 destinations worldwide. CAIL is also engaged in charter and cargo services and the provision of services to third parties, including aircraft overhaul and maintenance, passenger and cargo handling, flight simulator and equipment rentals, employee training programs and the sale of Canadian Plus frequent flyer points. As at December 31, 1999, CAIL operated approximately 79 aircraft.

8 CAIL directly and indirectly employs over 16,000 persons, substantially all of whom are located in Canada. The balance of the employees are located in the United States, Europe, Asia, Australia, South America and Mexico. Approximately 88% of the active employees of CAIL are subject to collective bargaining agreements.

Events Leading up to the CCAA Proceedings

9 Canadian's financial difficulties significantly predate these proceedings.

10 In the early 1990s, Canadian experienced significant losses from operations and deteriorating liquidity. It completed a financial restructuring in 1994 (the "1994 Restructuring") which involved employees contributing $200,000,000 in new equity in return for receipt of entitlements to common shares. In addition, Aurora Airline Investments, Inc. ("Aurora"), a subsidiary of AMR Corporation ("AMR"), subscribed for $246,000,000 in preferred shares of CAIL. Other AMR subsidiaries entered into comprehensive services and marketing arrangements with CAIL. The governments of Canada, British Columbia and Alberta provided an aggregate of $120,000,000 in loan guarantees. Senior creditors, junior creditors and shareholders of CAC and CAIL and its subsidiaries converted approximately $712,000,000 of obligations into common shares of CAC or convertible notes issued jointly by CAC and CAIL and/or received warrants entitling the holder to purchase common shares.

11 In the latter half of 1994, Canadian built on the improved balance sheet provided by the 1994 Restructuring, focussing on strict cost controls, capacity management and aircraft utilization. The initial results were encouraging. However, a number of factors including higher than expected fuel costs, rising interest rates, decline of the Canadian dollar, a strike by pilots of Time Air and the temporary grounding of Inter-Canadien's ATR-42 fleet undermined this improved operational performance. In 1995, in response to additional capacity added by emerging charter carriers and Air Canada on key transcontinental routes, CAIL added additional aircraft to its fleet in an effort to regain market share. However, the addition of capacity coincided with the slow-down in the Canadian economy leading to traffic levels that were significantly below expectations. Additionally, key international routes of CAIL failed to produce anticipated results. The cumulative losses of CAIL from 1994 to 1999 totalled $771 million and from January 31, 1995 to August 12, 1999, the day prior to the issuance by the Government of Canada of an Order under Section 47 of the *Canada Transportation Act* (relaxing certain rules under the *Competition Act* to facilitate a restructuring of the airline industry and described further below), the trading price of Canadian's common shares declined from $7.90 to $1.55.

12 Canadian's losses incurred since the 1994 Restructuring severely eroded its liquidity position. In 1996, Canadian faced an environment where the domestic air travel market saw increased capacity and aggressive price competition by two new discount carriers based in western Canada. While Canadian's traffic and load factor increased indicating a positive response to Canadian's post-restructuring business plan, yields declined. Attempts by Canadian to reduce domestic capacity were offset by additional capacity being introduced by the new discount carriers and Air Canada.

13 The continued lack of sufficient funds from operations made it evident by late fall of 1996 that Canadian needed to take action to avoid a cash shortfall in the spring of 1997. In November 1996, Canadian announced an operational restructuring plan (the "1996 Restructuring") aimed at returning Canadian to profitability and subsequently implemented a payment deferral plan which involved a temporary moratorium on payments to certain lenders and aircraft operating lessors to provide a cash bridge until the benefits of the operational restructuring were fully implemented. Canadian was able successfully to obtain the support of its lenders and operating lessors such that the moratorium and payment deferral plan was able to proceed on a consensual basis without the requirement for any court proceedings.

14 The objective of the 1996 Restructuring was to transform Canadian into a sustainable entity by focussing on controllable factors which targeted earnings improvements over four years. Three major initiatives were adopted: network enhancements, wage concessions as supplemented by fuel tax reductions/rebates, and overhead cost reductions.

15 The benefits of the 1996 Restructuring were reflected in Canadian's 1997 financial results when Canadian and its subsidiaries reported a consolidated net income of $5.4 million, the best results in 9 years.

16 In early 1998, building on its 1997 results, Canadian took advantage of a strong market for U.S. public debt financing in the first half of 1998 by issuing U.S. $175,000,000 of senior secured notes in April, 1998 ("Senior Secured Notes") and U.S. $100,000,000 of unsecured notes in August, 1998 ("Unsecured Notes").

17 The benefits of the 1996 Restructuring continued in 1998 but were not sufficient to offset a number of new factors which had a significant negative impact on financial performance, particularly in the fourth quarter. Canadian's eroded capital base gave it limited capacity to withstand negative effects on traffic and revenue. These factors included lower than expected operating revenues resulting from a continued weakness of the Asian economies, vigorous competition in Canadian's key western Canada and the western U.S. transborder markets, significant price discounting in most domestic markets following a labour disruption at Air Canada and CAIL's temporary loss of the ability to code-share with American Airlines on certain transborder flights due to a pilot dispute at American Airlines. Canadian also had increased operating expenses primarily due to the deterioration of the value of the Canadian dollar and additional airport and navigational fees imposed by NAV Canada which were not recoverable by Canadian through fare increases because of competitive pressures. This resulted in Canadian and its subsidiaries reporting a consolidated loss of $137.6 million for 1998.

18 As a result of these continuing weak financial results, Canadian undertook a number of additional strategic initiatives including entering the *oneworldTM* Alliance, the introduction of its new "Proud Wings" corporate image, a restructuring of CAIL's Vancouver hub, the sale and leaseback of certain aircraft, expanded code sharing arrangements and the implementation of a service charge in an effort to recover a portion of the costs relating to NAV Canada fees.

19 Beginning in late 1998 and continuing into 1999, Canadian tried to access equity markets to strengthen its balance sheet. In January, 1999, the Board of Directors of CAC determined that while Canadian needed to obtain additional equity capital, an equity infusion alone would not address the fundamental structural problems in the domestic air transportation market.

20 Canadian believes that its financial performance was and is reflective of structural problems in the Canadian airline industry, most significantly, over capacity in the domestic air transportation market. It is the view of Canadian and Air Canada that Canada's relatively small population and the geographic distribution of that population is unable to support the overlapping networks of two full service national carriers. As described further below, the Government of Canada has recognized this fundamental problem and has been instrumental in attempts to develop a solution.

Initial Discussions with Air Canada

21 Accordingly, in January, 1999, CAC's Board of Directors directed management to explore all strategic alternatives available to Canadian, including discussions regarding a possible merger or other transaction involving Air Canada.

22 Canadian had discussions with Air Canada in early 1999. AMR also participated in those discussions. While several alternative merger transactions were considered in the course of these discussions, Canadian, AMR and Air Canada were unable to reach agreement.

23 Following the termination of merger discussions between Canadian and Air Canada, senior management of Canadian, at the direction of the Board and with the support of AMR, renewed its efforts to secure financial partners with the objective of obtaining either an equity investment and support for an eventual merger with Air Canada or immediate financial support for a merger with Air Canada.

Offer by Onex

24 In early May, the discussions with Air Canada having failed, Canadian focussed its efforts on discussions with Onex Corporation ("Onex") and AMR concerning the basis upon which a merger of Canadian and Air Canada could be accomplished.

25 On August 23, 1999, Canadian entered into an Arrangement Agreement with Onex, AMR and Airline Industry Revitalization Co. Inc. ("AirCo") (a company owned jointly by Onex and AMR and controlled by Onex). The Arrangement Agreement set out the terms of a Plan of Arrangement providing for the purchase by AirCo of all of the outstanding common and non-voting shares of CAC. The Arrangement Agreement was conditional upon, among other things, the successful completion of a simultaneous offer by AirCo for all of the voting and non-voting shares of Air Canada. On August 24, 1999, AirCo announced its offers to purchase the shares of both CAC and Air Canada and to subsequently merge the operations of the two airlines to create one international carrier in Canada.

26 On or about September 20, 1999 the Board of Directors of Air Canada recommended against the AirCo offer. On or about October 19, 1999, Air Canada announced its own proposal to its shareholders to repurchase shares of Air Canada. Air Canada's announcement also indicated Air Canada's intention to make a bid for CAC and to proceed to complete a merger with Canadian subject to a restructuring of Canadian's debt.

27 There were several rounds of offers and counter-offers between AirCo and Air Canada. On November 5, 1999, the Quebec Superior Court ruled that the AirCo offer for Air Canada violated the provisions of the *Air Canada Public Participation Act*. AirCo immediately withdrew its offers. At that time, Air Canada indicated its intention to proceed with its offer for CAC.

28 Following the withdrawal of the AirCo offer to purchase CAC, and notwithstanding Air Canada's stated intention to proceed with its offer, there was a renewed uncertainty about Canadian's future which adversely affected operations. As described further below, Canadian lost significant forward bookings which further reduced the company's remaining liquidity.

Offer by 853350

29 On November 11, 1999, 853350 (a corporation financed by Air Canada and owned as to 10% by Air Canada) made a formal offer for all of the common and non-voting shares of CAC. Air Canada indicated that the involvement of 853350 in the take-over bid was necessary in order to protect Air Canada from the potential adverse effects of a restructuring of Canadian's debt and that Air Canada would only complete a merger with Canadian after the completion of a debt restructuring transaction. The offer by 853350 was conditional upon, among other things, a satisfactory resolution of AMR's claims in respect of Canadian and a satisfactory resolution of certain regulatory issues arising from the announcement

made on October 26, 1999 by the Government of Canada regarding its intentions to alter the regime governing the airline industry.

30 As noted above, AMR and its subsidiaries and affiliates had certain agreements with Canadian arising from AMR's investment (through its wholly owned subsidiary, Aurora Airline Investments, Inc.) in CAIL during the 1994 Restructuring. In particular, the Services Agreement by which AMR and its subsidiaries and affiliates provided certain reservations, scheduling and other airline related services to Canadian provided for a termination fee of approximately $500 million (as at December 31, 1999) while the terms governing the preferred shares issued to Aurora provided for exchange rights which were only retractable by Canadian upon payment of a redemption fee in excess of $500 million (as at December 31, 1999). Unless such provisions were amended or waived, it was practically impossible for Canadian to complete a merger with Air Canada since the cost of proceeding without AMR's consent was simply too high.

31 Canadian had continued its efforts to seek out all possible solutions to its structural problems following the withdrawal of the AirCo offer on November 5, 1999. While AMR indicated its willingness to provide a measure of support by allowing a deferral of some of the fees payable to AMR under the Services Agreement, Canadian was unable to find any investor willing to provide the liquidity necessary to keep Canadian operating while alternative solutions were sought.

32 After 853350 made its offer, 853350 and Air Canada entered into discussions with AMR regarding the purchase by 853350 of AMR's shareholding in CAIL as well as other matters regarding code sharing agreements and various services provided to Canadian by AMR and its subsidiaries and affiliates. The parties reached an agreement on November 22, 1999 pursuant to which AMR agreed to reduce its potential damages claim for termination of the Services Agreement by approximately 88%.

33 On December 4, 1999, CAC's Board recommended acceptance of 853350's offer to its shareholders and on December 21, 1999, two days before the offer closed, 853350 received approval for the offer from the Competition Bureau as well as clarification from the Government of Canada on the proposed regulatory framework for the Canadian airline industry.

34 As noted above, Canadian's financial condition deteriorated further after the collapse of the AirCo Arrangement transaction. In particular:

a) the doubts which were publicly raised as to Canadian's ability to survive made Canadian's efforts to secure additional financing through various sale-leaseback transactions more difficult;

b) sales for future air travel were down by approximately 10% compared to 1998;

c) CAIL's liquidity position, which stood at approximately $84 million (consolidated cash and available credit) as at September 30, 1999, reached a critical point in late December, 1999 when it was about to go negative.

35 In late December, 1999, Air Canada agreed to enter into certain transactions designed to ensure that Canadian would have enough liquidity to continue operating until the scheduled completion of the 853350 take-over bid on January 4, 2000. Air Canada agreed to purchase rights to the Toronto-Tokyo route for $25 million and to a sale-leaseback arrangement involving certain unencumbered aircraft and a flight simulator for total proceeds of approximately $20 million. These transactions gave Canadian sufficient liquidity to continue operations through the holiday period.

36 If Air Canada had not provided the approximate $45 million injection in December 1999, Canadian would likely have had to file for bankruptcy and cease all operations before the end of the holiday travel season.

37 On January 4, 2000, with all conditions of its offer having been satisfied or waived, 853350 purchased approximately 82% of the outstanding shares of CAC. On January 5, 1999, 853350 completed the purchase of the preferred shares of CAIL owned by Aurora. In connection with that acquisition, Canadian agreed to certain amendments to the Services Agreement reducing the amounts payable to AMR in the event of a termination of such agreement and, in addition, the unanimous shareholders agreement which gave AMR the right to require Canadian to purchase the CAIL preferred shares under certain circumstances was terminated. These arrangements had the effect of substantially reducing the obstacles to a restructuring of Canadian's debt and lease obligations and also significantly reduced the claims that AMR would be entitled to advance in such a restructuring.

38 Despite the $45 million provided by Air Canada, Canadian's liquidity position remained poor. With January being a traditionally slow month in the airline industry, further bridge financing was required in order to ensure that Canadian would be able to operate while a debt restructuring transaction was being negotiated with creditors. Air Canada negotiated an arrangement with the Royal Bank of Canada ("Royal Bank") to purchase a participation interest in the operating credit facility made available to Canadian. As a result of this agreement, Royal Bank agreed to extend Canadian's operating credit facility from $70 million to $120 million in January, 2000 and then to $145 million in March, 2000. Canadian agreed to supplement the assignment of accounts receivable security originally securing Royal's $70 million facility with a further Security Agreement securing certain unencumbered assets of Canadian in consideration for this increased credit availability. Without the support

of Air Canada or another financially sound entity, this increase in credit would not have been possible.

39 Air Canada has stated publicly that it ultimately wishes to merge the operations of Canadian and Air Canada, subject to Canadian completing a financial restructuring so as to permit Air Canada to complete the acquisition on a financially sound basis. This pre-condition has been emphasized by Air Canada since the fall of 1999.

40 Prior to the acquisition of majority control of CAC by 853350, Canadian's management, Board of Directors and financial advisors had considered every possible alternative for restoring Canadian to a sound financial footing. Based upon Canadian's extensive efforts over the past year in particular, but also the efforts since 1992 described above, Canadian came to the conclusion that it must complete a debt restructuring to permit the completion of a full merger between Canadian and Air Canada.

41 On February 1, 2000, Canadian announced a moratorium on payments to lessors and lenders. As a result of this moratorium Canadian defaulted on the payments due under its various credit facilities and aircraft leases. Absent the assistance provided by this moratorium, in addition to Air Canada's support, Canadian would not have had sufficient liquidity to continue operating until the completion of a debt restructuring.

42 Following implementation of the moratorium, Canadian with Air Canada embarked on efforts to restructure significant obligations by consent. The further damage to public confidence which a CCAA filing could produce required Canadian to secure a substantial measure of creditor support in advance of any public filing for court protection.

43 Before the Petitioners started these CCAA proceedings, Air Canada, CAIL and lessors of 59 aircraft in its fleet had reached agreement in principle on the restructuring plan.

44 Canadian and Air Canada have also been able to reach agreement with the remaining affected secured creditors, being the holders of the U.S. $175 million Senior Secured Notes, due 2005, (the "Senior Secured Noteholders") and with several major unsecured creditors in addition to AMR, such as Loyalty Management Group Canada Inc.

45 On March 24, 2000, faced with threatened proceedings by secured creditors, Canadian petitioned under the CCAA and obtained a stay of proceedings and related interim relief by Order of the Honourable Chief Justice Moore on that same date. Pursuant to that Order, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Inc. was appointed as the Monitor, and companion proceedings in the United States were authorized to be commenced.

46 Since that time, due to the assistance of Air Canada, Canadian has been able to complete the restructuring of the remaining financial obligations governing all aircraft to be retained

by Canadian for future operations. These arrangements were approved by this Honourable Court in its Orders dated April 14, 2000 and May 10, 2000, as described in further detail below under the heading "The Restructuring Plan".

47 On April 7, 2000, this court granted an Order giving directions with respect to the filing of the plan, the calling and holding of meetings of affected creditors and related matters.

48 On April 25, 2000 in accordance with the said Order, Canadian filed and served the plan (in its original form) and the related notices and materials.

49 The plan was amended, in accordance with its terms, on several occasions, the form of Plan voted upon at the Creditors' Meetings on May 26, 2000 having been filed and served on May 25, 2000 (the "Plan").

The Restructuring Plan

50 The Plan has three principal aims described by Canadian:

(a) provide near term liquidity so that Canadian can sustain operations;

(b) allow for the return of aircraft not required by Canadian; and

(c) permanently adjust Canadian's debt structure and lease facilities to reflect the current market for asset values and carrying costs in return for Air Canada providing a guarantee of the restructured obligations.

51 The proposed treatment of stakeholders is as follows:

1. Unaffected Secured Creditors- Royal Bank, CAIL's operating lender, is an unaffected creditor with respect to its operating credit facility. Royal Bank holds security over CAIL's accounts receivable and most of CAIL's operating assets not specifically secured by aircraft financiers or the Senior Secured Noteholders. As noted above, arrangements entered into between Air Canada and Royal Bank have provided CAIL with liquidity necessary for it to continue operations since January 2000.

Also unaffected by the Plan are those aircraft lessors, conditional vendors and secured creditors holding security over CAIL's aircraft who have entered into agreements with CAIL and/or Air Canada with respect to the restructuring of CAIL's obligations. A number of such agreements, which were initially contained in the form of letters of intent ("LOIs"), were entered into prior to the commencement of the CCAA proceedings, while a total of 17 LOIs were completed after that date. In its Second and Fourth Reports the Monitor reported to the court on these agreements. The LOIs entered into after the proceedings commenced were reviewed and approved by the court on April 14, 2000 and May 10, 2000.

The basis of the LOIs with aircraft lessors was that the operating lease rates were reduced to fair market lease rates or less, and the obligations of CAIL under the leases were either assumed or guaranteed by Air Canada. Where the aircraft was subject to conditional sale agreements or other secured indebtedness, the value of the secured debt was reduced to the fair market value of the aircraft, and the interest rate payable was reduced to current market rates reflecting Air Canada's credit. CAIL's obligations under those agreements have also been assumed or guaranteed by Air Canada. The claims of these creditors for reduced principal and interest amounts, or reduced lease payments, are Affected Unsecured Claims under the Plan. In a number of cases these claims have been assigned to Air Canada and Air Canada disclosed that it would vote those claims in favour of the Plan.

2. Affected Secured Creditors- The Affected Secured Creditors under the Plan are the Senior Secured Noteholders with a claim in the amount of US$175,000,000. The Senior Secured Noteholders are secured by a diverse package of Canadian's assets, including its inventory of aircraft spare parts, ground equipment, spare engines, flight simulators, leasehold interests at Toronto, Vancouver and Calgary airports, the shares in CRAL 98 and a $53 million note payable by CRAL to CAIL.

The Plan offers the Senior Secured Noteholders payment of 97 cents on the dollar. The deficiency is included in the Affected Unsecured Creditor class and the Senior Secured Noteholders advised the court they would be voting the deficiency in favour of the Plan.

3. Unaffected Unsecured Creditors-In the circular accompanying the November 11, 1999 853350 offer it was stated that:

> The Offeror intends to conduct the Debt Restructuring in such a manner as to seek to ensure that the unionized employees of Canadian, the suppliers of new credit (including trade credit) and the members of the flying public are left unaffected.
>
> The Offeror is of the view that the pursuit of these three principles is essential in order to ensure that the long term value of Canadian is preserved.

Canadian's employees, customers and suppliers of goods and services are unaffected by the CCAA Order and Plan.

Also unaffected are parties to those contracts or agreements with Canadian which are not being terminated by Canadian pursuant to the terms of the March 24, 2000 Order.

4. Affected Unsecured Creditors- CAIL has identified unsecured creditors who do not fall into the above three groups and listed these as Affected Unsecured Creditors under the Plan. They are offered 14 cents on the dollar on their claims. Air Canada would fund this payment.

The Affected Unsecured Creditors fall into the following categories:

a. Claims of holders of or related to the Unsecured Notes (the "Unsecured Noteholders");

b. Claims in respect of certain outstanding or threatened litigation involving Canadian;

c. Claims arising from the termination, breach or repudiation of certain contracts, leases or agreements to which Canadian is a party other than aircraft financing or lease arrangements;

d. Claims in respect of deficiencies arising from the termination or re-negotiation of aircraft financing or lease arrangements;

e. Claims of tax authorities against Canadian; and

f. Claims in respect of the under-secured or unsecured portion of amounts due to the Senior Secured Noteholders.

52 There are over $700 million of proven unsecured claims. Some unsecured creditors have disputed the amounts of their claims for distribution purposes. These are in the process of determination by the court-appointed Claims Officer and subject to further appeal to the court. If the Claims Officer were to allow all of the disputed claims in full and this were confirmed by the court, the aggregate of unsecured claims would be approximately $1.059 million.

53 The Monitor has concluded that if the Plan is not approved and implemented, Canadian will not be able to continue as a going concern and in that event, the only foreseeable alternative would be a liquidation of Canadian's assets by a receiver and/or a trustee in bankruptcy. Under the Plan, Canadian's obligations to parties essential to ongoing operations, including employees, customers, travel agents, fuel, maintenance and equipment suppliers, and airport authorities are in most cases to be treated as unaffected and paid in full.

In the event of a liquidation, those parties would not, in most cases, be paid in full and, except for specific lien rights and statutory priorities, would rank as ordinary unsecured creditors. The Monitor estimates that the additional unsecured claims which would arise if Canadian were to cease operations as a going concern and be forced into liquidation would be in excess of $1.1 billion.

54 In connection with its assessment of the Plan, the Monitor performed a liquidation analysis of CAIL as at March 31, 2000 in order to estimate the amounts that might be recovered by CAIL's creditors and shareholders in the event of disposition of CAIL's assets by a receiver or trustee. The Monitor concluded that a liquidation would result in a shortfall to certain secured creditors, including the Senior Secured Noteholders, a recovery by ordinary unsecured creditors of between one cent and three cents on the dollar, and no recovery by shareholders.

55 There are two vociferous opponents of the Plan, Resurgence Asset Management LLC ("Resurgence") who acts on behalf of its and/or its affiliate client accounts and four shareholders of CAC. Resurgence is incorporated pursuant to the laws of New York, U.S.A. and has its head office in White Plains, New York. It conducts an investment business specializing in high yield distressed debt. Through a series of purchases of the Unsecured Notes commencing in April 1999, Resurgence clients hold $58,200,000 of the face value of or 58.2% of the notes issued. Resurgence purchased 7.9 million units in April 1999. From November 3, 1999 to December 9, 1999 it purchased an additional 20,850,000 units. From January 4, 2000 to February 3, 2000 Resurgence purchased an additional 29,450,000 units.

56 Resurgence seeks declarations that: the actions of Canadian, Air Canada and 853350 constitute an amalgamation, consolidation or merger with or into Air Canada or a conveyance or transfer of all or substantially all of Canadian's assets to Air Canada; that any plan of arrangement involving Canadian will not affect Resurgence and directing the repurchase of their notes pursuant to the provisions of their trust indenture and that the actions of Canadian, Air Canada and 853350 are oppressive and unfairly prejudicial to it pursuant to section 234 of the Business Corporations Act.

57 Four shareholders of CAC also oppose the plan. Neil Baker, a Toronto resident, acquired 132,500 common shares at a cost of $83,475.00 on or about May 5, 2000. Mr. Baker sought to commence proceedings to "remedy an injustice to the minority holders of the common shares". Roger Midiaty, Michael Salter and Hal Metheral are individual shareholders who were added as parties at their request during the proceedings. Mr. Midiaty resides in Calgary, Alberta and holds 827 CAC shares which he has held since 1994. Mr. Metheral is also a Calgary resident and holds approximately 14,900 CAC shares in his RRSP and has held them since approximately 1994 or 1995. Mr. Salter is a resident of Scottsdale, Arizona and is the beneficial owner of 250 shares of CAC and is a joint beneficial owner of

250 shares with his wife. These shareholders will be referred in the Decision throughout as the "Minority Shareholders".

58 The Minority Shareholders oppose the portion of the Plan that relates to the reorganization of CAIL, pursuant to section 185 of the *Alberta Business Corporations Act* ("ABCA"). They characterize the transaction as a cancellation of issued shares unauthorized by section 167 of the ABCA or alternatively is a violation of section 183 of the ABCA. They submit the application for the order of reorganization should be denied as being unlawful, unfair and not supported by the evidence.

III. Analysis

59 Section 6 of the CCAA provides that:

> 6. Where a majority in number representing two-thirds in value of the creditors, or class of creditors, as the case may be, present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or meetings thereof respectively held pursuant to sections 4 and 5, or either of those sections, agree to any compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at the meeting or meetings, the compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by the court, and if so sanctioned is binding
>
> > (a) on all the creditors or the class of creditors, as the case may be, and on any trustee for any such class of creditors, whether secured or unsecured, as the case may be, and on the company; and
> >
> > (b) in the case of a company that has made an authorized assignment or against which a receiving order has been made under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act or is in the course of being wound up under the Winding-up and Restructuring Act, on the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator and contributories of the company.

60 Prior to sanctioning a plan under the CCAA, the court must be satisfied in regard to each of the following criteria:

> (1) there must be compliance with all statutory requirements;
>
> (2) all material filed and procedures carried out must be examined to determine if anything has been done or purported to be done which is not authorized by the CCAA; and
>
> (3) the plan must be fair and reasonable.

61 A leading articulation of this three-part test appears in *Re Northland Properties Ltd.* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 175 (B.C. S.C.) at 182-3, aff'd (1989), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 195 (B.C.

C.A.) and has been regularly followed, see for example *Re Sammi Atlas Inc.* (1998), 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at 172 and *Re T. Eaton Co.* (1999), 15 C.B.R. (4th) 311 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paragraph 7. Each of these criteria are reviewed in turn below.

1. Statutory Requirements

62 Some of the matters that may be considered by the court on an application for approval of a plan of compromise and arrangement include:

(a) the applicant comes within the definition of "debtor company" in section 2 of the CCAA;

(b) the applicant or affiliated debtor companies have total claims within the meaning of section 12 of the CCAA in excess of $5,000,000;

(c) the notice calling the meeting was sent in accordance with the order of the court;

(d) the creditors were properly classified;

(e) the meetings of creditors were properly constituted;

(f) the voting was properly carried out; and

(g) the plan was approved by the requisite double majority or majorities.

63 I find that the Petitioners have complied with all applicable statutory requirements. Specifically:

(a) CAC and CAIL are insolvent and thus each is a "debtor company" within the meaning of section 2 of the CCAA. This was established in the affidavit evidence of Douglas Carty, Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of Canadian, and so declared in the March 24, 2000 Order in these proceedings and confirmed in the testimony given by Mr. Carty at this hearing.

(b) CAC and CAIL have total claims that would be claims provable in bankruptcy within the meaning of section 12 of the CCAA in excess of $5,000,000.

(c) In accordance with the April 7, 2000 Order of this court, a Notice of Meeting and a disclosure statement (which included copies of the Plan and the March 24 th and April 7 th Orders of this court) were sent to the Affected Creditors, the directors and officers of the Petitioners, the Monitor and persons who had served a Notice of Appearance, on April 25, 2000.

(d) As confirmed by the May 12, 2000 ruling of this court (leave to appeal denied May 29, 2000), the creditors have been properly classified.

(e) Further, as detailed in the Monitor's Fifth Report to the Court and confirmed by the June 14, 2000 decision of this court in respect of a challenge by Resurgence Asset Management LLC ("Resurgence"), the meetings of creditors were properly constituted, the voting was properly carried out and the Plan was approved by the requisite double majorities in each class. The composition of the majority of the unsecured creditor class is addressed below under the heading "Fair and Reasonable".

2. Matters Unauthorized

64 This criterion has not been widely discussed in the reported cases. As recognized by Blair J. in *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. Gen. Div.) and Farley J. in *Re Cadillac Fairview Inc.* (February 6, 1995), Doc. B348/94 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), within the CCAA process the court must rely on the reports of the Monitor as well as the parties in ensuring nothing contrary to the CCAA has occurred or is contemplated by the plan.

65 In this proceeding, the dissenting groups have raised two matters which in their view are unauthorized by the CCAA: firstly, the Minority Shareholders of CAC suggested the proposed share capital reorganization of CAIL is illegal under the ABCA and Ontario Securities Commission Policy 9.1, and as such cannot be authorized under the CCAA and secondly, certain unsecured creditors suggested that the form of release contained in the Plan goes beyond the scope of release permitted under the CCAA.

a. Legality of proposed share capital reorganization

66 Subsection 185(2) of the ABCA provides:

(2) If a corporation is subject to an order for reorganization, its articles may be amended by the order to effect any change that might lawfully be made by an amendment under section 167.

67 Sections 6.1(2)(d) and (e) and Schedule "D" of the Plan contemplate that:

a. All CAIL common shares held by CAC will be converted into a single retractable share, which will then be retracted by CAIL for $1.00; and

b. All CAIL preferred shares held by 853350 will be converted into CAIL common shares.

68 The Articles of Reorganization in Schedule "D" to the Plan provide for the following amendments to CAIL's Articles of Incorporation to effect the proposed reorganization:

(a) consolidating all of the issued and outstanding common shares into one common share;

(b) redesignating the existing common shares as "Retractable Shares" and changing the rights, privileges, restrictions and conditions attaching to the Retractable Shares so that the Retractable Shares shall have attached thereto the rights, privileges, restrictions and conditions as set out in the Schedule of Share Capital;

(c) cancelling the Non-Voting Shares in the capital of the corporation, none of which are currently issued and outstanding, so that the corporation is no longer authorized to issue Non-Voting Shares;

(d) changing all of the issued and outstanding Class B Preferred Shares of the corporation into Class A Preferred Shares, on the basis of one (1) Class A Preferred Share for each one (1) Class B Preferred Share presently issued and outstanding;

(e) redesignating the existing Class A Preferred Shares as "Common Shares" and changing the rights, privileges, restrictions and conditions attaching to the Common Shares so that the Common Shares shall have attached thereto the rights, privileges, restrictions and conditions as set out in the Schedule of Share Capital; and

(f) cancelling the Class B Preferred Shares in the capital of the corporation, none of which are issued and outstanding after the change in paragraph (d) above, so that the corporation is no longer authorized to issue Class B Preferred Shares;

Section 167 of the ABCA

69 Reorganizations under section 185 of the ABCA are subject to two preconditions:

a. The corporation must be "subject to an order for re-organization"; and

b. The proposed amendments must otherwise be permitted under section 167 of the ABCA.

70 The parties agreed that an order of this court sanctioning the Plan would satisfy the first condition.

71 The relevant portions of section 167 provide as follows:

167(1) Subject to sections 170 and 171, the articles of a corporation may by special resolution be amended to

(e) change the designation of all or any of its shares, and add, change or remove any rights, privileges, restrictions and conditions, including rights to accrued dividends, in respect of all or any of its shares, whether issued or unissued,

(f) change the shares of any class or series, whether issued or unissued, into a different number of shares of the same class or series into the same or a different number of shares of other classes or series,

(g.1) cancel a class or series of shares where there are no issued or outstanding shares of that class or series,

72 Each change in the proposed CAIL Articles of Reorganization corresponds to changes permitted under s. 167(1) of the ABCA, as follows:

Proposed Amendment in Schedule "D"	**Subsection 167(1), ABCA**
(a) — consolidation of Common Shares	167(1)(f)
(b) — change of designation and rights	167(1)(e)
(c) — cancellation	167(1)(g.1)
(d) — change in shares	167(1)(f)
(e) — change of designation and rights	167(1)(e)
(f) — cancellation	167(1)(g.1)

73 The Minority Shareholders suggested that the proposed reorganization effectively cancels their shares in CAC. As the above review of the proposed reorganization demonstrates, that is not the case. Rather, the shares of CAIL are being consolidated, altered and then retracted, as permitted under section 167 of the ABCA. I find the proposed reorganization of CAIL's share capital under the Plan does not violate section 167.

74 In R. Dickerson et al, *Proposals for a New Business Corporation Law for Canada*, Vol.1: Commentary (the "Dickerson Report") regarding the then proposed Canada Business Corporations Act, the identical section to section 185 is described as having been inserted with the object of enabling the "court to effect any necessary amendment of the articles of the corporation in order to achieve the objective of the reorganization without having to comply with the formalities of the Draft Act, particularly shareholder approval of the proposed amendment".

75 The architects of the business corporation act model which the ABCA follows, expressly contemplated reorganizations in which the insolvent corporation would eliminate the interest

of common shareholders. The example given in the Dickerson Report of a reorganization is very similar to that proposed in the Plan:

> For example, the reorganization of an insolvent corporation may require the following steps: first, reduction or even elimination of the interest of the common shareholders; second, relegation of the preferred shareholders to the status of common shareholders; and third, relegation of the secured debenture holders to the status of either unsecured Noteholders or preferred shareholders.

76 The rationale for allowing such a reorganization appears plain; the corporation is insolvent, which means that on liquidation the shareholders would get nothing. In those circumstances, as described further below under the heading "Fair and Reasonable", there is nothing unfair or unreasonable in the court effecting changes in such situations without shareholder approval. Indeed, it would be unfair to the creditors and other stakeholders to permit the shareholders (whose interest has the lowest priority) to have any ability to block a reorganization.

77 The Petitioners were unable to provide any case law addressing the use of section 185 as proposed under the Plan. They relied upon the decisions of *Re Royal Oak Mines Inc.* (1999), 14 C.B.R. (4th) 279 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) and *T. Eaton Co.*, *supra* in which Farley J.of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice emphasized that shareholders are at the bottom of the hierarchy of interests in liquidation or liquidation related scenarios.

78 Section 185 provides for amendment to articles by court order. I see no requirement in that section for a meeting or vote of shareholders of CAIL, quite apart from shareholders of CAC. Further, dissent and appraisal rights are expressly removed in subsection (7). To require a meeting and vote of shareholders and to grant dissent and appraisal rights in circumstances of insolvency would frustrate the object of section 185 as described in the Dickerson Report.

79 In the circumstances of this case, where the majority shareholder holds 82% of the shares, the requirement of a special resolution is meaningless. To require a vote suggests the shares have value. They do not. The formalities of the ABCA serve no useful purpose other than to frustrate the reorganization to the detriment of all stakeholders, contrary to the CCAA.

Section 183 of the ABCA

80 The Minority Shareholders argued in the alternative that if the proposed share reorganization of CAIL were not a cancellation of their shares in CAC and therefore allowed under section 167 of the ABCA, it constituted a "sale, lease, or exchange of substantially all the property" of CAC and thus required the approval of CAC shareholders pursuant to section 183 of the ABCA. The Minority Shareholders suggested that the common shares in

CAIL were substantially all of the assets of CAC and that all of those shares were being "exchanged" for $1.00.

81 I disagree with this creative characterization. The proposed transaction is a reorganization as contemplated by section 185 of the ABCA. As recognized in *Savage v. Amoco Acquisition Co.* (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 154 (Alta. C.A.) aff'd (1988), 70 C.B.R. (N.S.) xxxii (S.C.C.), the fact that the same end might be achieved under another section does not exclude the section to be relied on. A statute may well offer several alternatives to achieve a similar end.

Ontario Securities Commission Policy 9.1

82 The Minority Shareholders also submitted the proposed reorganization constitutes a "related party transaction" under Policy 9.1 of the Ontario Securities Commission. Under the Policy, transactions are subject to disclosure, minority approval and formal valuation requirements which have not been followed here. The Minority Shareholders suggested that the Petitioners were therefore in breach of the Policy unless and until such time as the court is advised of the relevant requirements of the Policy and grants its approval as provided by the Policy.

83 These shareholders asserted that in the absence of evidence of the going concern value of CAIL so as to determine whether that value exceeds the rights of the Preferred Shares of CAIL, the Court should not waive compliance with the Policy.

84 To the extent that this reorganization can be considered a "related party transaction", I have found, for the reasons discussed below under the heading "Fair and Reasonable", that the Plan, including the proposed reorganization, is fair and reasonable and accordingly I would waive the requirements of Policy 9.1.

b. Release

85 Resurgence argued that the release of directors and other third parties contained in the Plan does not comply with the provisions of the CCAA.

86 The release is contained in section 6.2(2)(ii) of the Plan and states as follows:

> As of the Effective Date, each of the Affected Creditors will be deemed to forever release, waive and discharge all claims, obligations, suits, judgments, damages, demands, debts, rights, causes of action and liabilities...that are based in whole or in part on any act, omission, transaction, event or other occurrence taking place on or prior to the Effective Date in any way relating to the Applicants and Subsidiaries, the CCAA Proceedings, or the Plan against:(i) The Applicants and Subsidiaries; (ii) The Directors, Officers and

employees of the Applicants or Subsidiaries in each case as of the date of filing (and in addition, those who became Officers and/or Directors thereafter but prior to the Effective Date); (iii) The former Directors, Officers and employees of the Applicants or Subsidiaries, or (iv) the respective current and former professionals of the entities in subclauses (1) to (3) of this s.6.2(2) (including, for greater certainty, the Monitor, its counsel and its current Officers and Directors, and current and former Officers, Directors, employees, shareholders and professionals of the released parties) acting in such capacity.

87 Prior to 1997, the CCAA did not provide for compromises of claims against anyone other than the petitioning company. In 1997, section 5.1 was added to the CCAA. Section 5.1 states:

> 5.1 (1) A compromise or arrangement made in respect of a debtor company may include in its terms provision for the compromise of claims against directors of the company that arose before the commencement of proceedings under this Act and relate to the obligations of the company where the directors are by law liable in their capacity as directors for the payment of such obligations.
>
> (2) A provision for the compromise of claims against directors may not include claims that:
>
> (a) relate to contractual rights of one or more creditors; or
>
> (b) are based on allegations of misrepresentations made by directors to creditors or of wrongful or oppressive conduct by directors.
>
> (3) The Court may declare that a claim against directors shall not be compromised if it is satisfied that the compromise would not be fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

88 Resurgence argued that the form of release does not comply with section 5.1 of the CCAA insofar as it applies to individuals beyond directors and to a broad spectrum of claims beyond obligations of the Petitioners for which their directors are "by law liable". Resurgence submitted that the addition of section 5.1 to the CCAA constituted an exception to a long standing principle and urged the court to therefore interpret s. 5.1 cautiously, if not narrowly. Resurgence relied on *Crabtree (Succession de) c. Barrette*, [1993] 1 S.C.R. 1027 (S.C.C.) at 1044 and *Bruce Agra Foods Inc. v. Everfresh Beverages Inc. (Receiver of)* (1996), 45 C.B.R. (3d) 169 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 5 in this regard.

89 With respect to Resurgence's complaint regarding the breadth of the claims covered by the release, the Petitioners asserted that the release is not intended to override section

5.1(2). Canadian suggested this can be expressly incorporated into the form of release by adding the words "*excluding the claims excepted by s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA*" immediately prior to subsection (iii) and clarifying the language in Section 5.1 of the Plan. Canadian also acknowledged, in response to a concern raised by Canada Customs and Revenue Agency, that in accordance with s. 5.1(1) of the CCAA, directors of CAC and CAIL could only be released from liability arising before March 24, 2000, the date these proceedings commenced. Canadian suggested this was also addressed in the proposed amendment. Canadian did not address the propriety of including individuals in addition to directors in the form of release.

90 In my view it is appropriate to amend the proposed release to expressly comply with section 5. 1(2) of the CCAA and to clarify Section 5.1 of the Plan as Canadian suggested in its brief. The additional language suggested by Canadian to achieve this result shall be included in the form of order. Canada Customs and Revenue Agency is apparently satisfied with the Petitioners' acknowledgement that claims against directors can only be released to the date of commencement of proceedings under the CCAA, having appeared at this hearing to strongly support the sanctioning of the Plan, so I will not address this concern further.

91 Resurgence argued that its claims fell within the categories of excepted claims in section 5.1(2) of the CCAA and accordingly, its concern in this regard is removed by this amendment. Unsecured creditors JHHD Aircraft Leasing No. 1 and No. 2 suggested there may be possible wrongdoing in the acts of the directors during the restructuring process which should not be immune from scrutiny and in my view this complaint would also be caught by the exception captured in the amendment.

92 While it is true that section 5.2 of the CCAA does not authorize a release of claims against third parties other than directors, it does not prohibit such releases either. The amended terms of the release will not prevent claims from which the CCAA expressly prohibits release. Aside from the complaints of Resurgence, which by their own submissions are addressed in the amendment I have directed, and the complaints of JHHD Aircraft Leasing No. 1 and No. 2, which would also be addressed in the amendment, the terms of the release have been accepted by the requisite majority of creditors and I am loathe to further disturb the terms of the Plan, with one exception.

93 Amex Bank of Canada submitted that the form of release appeared overly broad and might compromise unaffected claims of affected creditors. For further clarification, Amex Bank of Canada's potential claim for defamation is unaffected by the Plan and I am prepared to order Section 6.2(2)(ii) be amended to reflect this specific exception.

3. Fair and Reasonable

94 In determining whether to sanction a plan of arrangement under the CCAA, the court is guided by two fundamental concepts: "fairness" and "reasonableness". While these

concepts are always at the heart of the court's exercise of its discretion, their meanings are necessarily shaped by the unique circumstances of each case, within the context of the Act and accordingly can be difficult to distill and challenging to apply. Blair J. described these concepts in *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.*, *supra*, at page 9:

> "Fairness" and "reasonableness" are, in my opinion, the two keynote concepts underscoring the philosophy and workings of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act. Fairness is the quintessential expression of the court's equitable jurisdiction — although the jurisdiction is statutory, the broad discretionary powers given to the judiciary by the legislation which make its exercise an exercise in equity — and "reasonableness" is what lends objectivity to the process.

95 The legislation, while conferring broad discretion on the court, offers little guidance. However, the court is assisted in the exercise of its discretion by the purpose of the CCAA: to facilitate the reorganization of a debtor company for the benefit of the company, its creditors, shareholders, employees and, in many instances, a much broader constituency of affected persons. Parliament has recognized that reorganization, if commercially feasible, is in most cases preferable, economically and socially, to liquidation: *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.* (1988), [1989] 2 W.W.R. 566 (Alta. Q.B.) at 574; *Northland Properties Ltd. v. Excelsior Life Insurance Co. of Canada*, [1989] 3 W.W.R. 363 (B.C. C.A.) at 368.

96 The sanction of the court of a creditor-approved plan is not to be considered as a rubber stamp process. Although the majority vote that brings the plan to a sanction hearing plays a significant role in the court's assessment, the court will consider other matters as are appropriate in light of its discretion. In the unique circumstances of this case, it is appropriate to consider a number of additional matters:

a. The composition of the unsecured vote;

b. What creditors would receive on liquidation or bankruptcy as compared to the Plan;

c. Alternatives available to the Plan and bankruptcy;

d. Oppression;

e. Unfairness to Shareholders of CAC; and

f. The public interest.

a. Composition of the unsecured vote

97 As noted above, an important measure of whether a plan is fair and reasonable is the parties' approval and the degree to which it has been given. Creditor support creates an inference that the plan is fair and reasonable because the assenting creditors believe that their interests are treated equitably under the plan. Moreover, it creates an inference that the arrangement is economically feasible and therefore reasonable because the creditors are in a better position then the courts to gauge business risk. As stated by Blair J. at page 11 of *Olympia & York Developments Ltd.*, *supra*:

> As other courts have done, I observe that it is not my function to second guess the business people with respect to the "business" aspect of the Plan or descending into the negotiating arena or substituting my own view of what is a fair and reasonable compromise or arrangement for that of the business judgment of the participants. The parties themselves know best what is in their interests in those areas.

98 However, given the manner of voting under the CCAA, the court must be cognizant of the treatment of minorities within a class: see for example *Re Quintette Coal Ltd.* (1992), 13 C.B.R. (3d) 146 (B.C. S.C.) and *Re Alabama, New Orleans, Texas & Pacific Junction Railway* (1890), 60 L.J. Ch. 221 (Eng. C.A.). The court can address this by ensuring creditors' claims are properly classified. As well, it is sometimes appropriate to tabulate the vote of a particular class so the results can be assessed from a fairness perspective. In this case, the classification was challenged by Resurgence and I dismissed that application. The vote was also tabulated in this case and the results demonstrate that the votes of Air Canada and the Senior Secured Noteholders, who voted their deficiency in the unsecured class, were decisive.

99 The results of the unsecured vote, as reported by the Monitor, are:

> 1. For the resolution to approve the Plan: 73 votes (65% in number) representing $494,762,304 in claims (76% in value);
>
> 2. Against the resolution: 39 votes (35% in number) representing $156,360,363 in claims (24% in value); and
>
> 3. Abstentions: 15 representing $968,036 in value.

100 The voting results as reported by the Monitor were challenged by Resurgence. That application was dismissed.

101 The members of each class that vote in favour of a plan must do so in good faith and the majority within a class must act without coercion in their conduct toward the minority. When asked to assess fairness of an approved plan, the court will not countenance secret

agreements to vote in favour of a plan secured by advantages to the creditor: see for example, *Hochberger v. Rittenberg* (1916), 36 D.L.R. 450 (S.C.C.)

102 In *Re Northland Properties Ltd.* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 175 (B.C. S.C.) at 192-3 aff'd (1989), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 195 (B.C. C.A.), dissenting priority mortgagees argued the plan violated the principle of equality due to an agreement between the debtor company and another priority mortgagee which essentially amounted to a preference in exchange for voting in favour of the plan. Trainor J. found that the agreement was freely disclosed and commercially reasonable and went on to approve the plan, using the three part test. The British Columbia Court of Appeal upheld this result and in commenting on the minority complaint McEachern J.A. stated at page 206:

> In my view, the obvious benefits of settling rights and keeping the enterprise together as a going concern far outweigh the deprivation of the appellants' wholly illusory rights. In this connection, the learned chambers judge said at p.29:
>
> > I turn to the question of the right to hold the property after an order absolute and whether or not this is a denial of something of that significance that it should affect these proceedings. There is in the material before me some evidence of values. There are the principles to which I have referred, as well as to the rights of majorities and the rights of minorities.
> >
> > Certainly, those minority rights are there, but it would seem to me that in view of the overall plan, in view of the speculative nature of holding property in the light of appraisals which have been given as to value, that this right is something which should be subsumed to the benefit of the majority.

103 Resurgence submitted that Air Canada manipulated the indebtedness of CAIL to assure itself of an affirmative vote. I disagree. I previously ruled on the validity of the deficiency when approving the LOIs and found the deficiency to be valid. I found there was consideration for the assignment of the deficiency claims of the various aircraft financiers to Air Canada, namely the provision of an Air Canada guarantee which would otherwise not have been available until plan sanction. The Monitor reviewed the calculations of the deficiencies and determined they were calculated in a reasonable manner. As such, the court approved those transactions. If the deficiency had instead remained with the aircraft financiers, it is reasonable to assume those claims would have been voted in favour of the plan. Further, it would have been entirely appropriate under the circumstances for the aircraft financiers to have retained the deficiency and agreed to vote in favour of the Plan, with the same result to Resurgence. That the financiers did not choose this method was explained by the testimony of Mr. Carty and Robert Peterson, Chief Financial Officer for Air Canada; quite simply it amounted to a desire on behalf of these creditors to shift the "deal

risk" associated with the Plan to Air Canada. The agreement reached with the Senior Secured Noteholders was also disclosed and the challenge by Resurgence regarding their vote in the unsecured class was dismissed There is nothing inappropriate in the voting of the deficiency claims of Air Canada or the Senior Secured Noteholders in the unsecured class. There is no evidence of secret vote buying such as discussed in *Re Northland Properties Ltd.*

104 If the Plan is approved, Air Canada stands to profit in its operation. I do not accept that the deficiency claims were devised to dominate the vote of the unsecured creditor class, however, Air Canada, as funder of the Plan is more motivated than Resurgence to support it. This divergence of views on its own does not amount to bad faith on the part of Air Canada. Resurgence submitted that only the Unsecured Noteholders received 14 cents on the dollar. That is not accurate, as demonstrated by the list of affected unsecured creditors included earlier in these Reasons. The Senior Secured Noteholders did receive other consideration under the Plan, but to suggest they were differently motivated suggests that those creditors did not ascribe any value to their unsecured claims. There is no evidence to support this submission.

105 The good faith of Resurgence in its vote must also be considered. Resurgence acquired a substantial amount of its claim after the failure of the Onex bid, when it was aware that Canadian's financial condition was rapidly deteriorating. Thereafter, Resurgence continued to purchase a substantial amount of this highly distressed debt. While Mr. Symington maintained that he bought because he thought the bonds were a good investment, he also acknowledged that one basis for purchasing was the hope of obtaining a blocking position sufficient to veto a plan in the proposed debt restructuring. This was an obvious ploy for leverage with the Plan proponents

106 The authorities which address minority creditors' complaints speak of "substantial injustice" (*Re Keddy Motor Inns Ltd.* (1992), 13 C.B.R. (3d) 245 (N.S. C.A.), "confiscation" of rights (*Re Campeau Corp.* (1992), 10 C.B.R. (3d) 104 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Re SkyDome Corp.* (March 21, 1999), Doc. 98-CL-3179 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List])) and majorities "feasting upon" the rights of the minority (*Re Quintette Coal Ltd.* (1992), 13 C.B.R. (3d) 146 (B.C. S.C.). Although it cannot be disputed that the group of Unsecured Noteholders represented by Resurgence are being asked to accept a significant reduction of their claims, as are all of the affected unsecured creditors, I do not see a "substantial injustice", nor view their rights as having been "confiscated" or "feasted upon" by being required to succumb to the wishes of the majority in their class. No bad faith has been demonstrated in this case. Rather, the treatment of Resurgence, along with all other affected unsecured creditors, represents a reasonable balancing of interests. While the court is directed to consider whether there is an injustice being worked within a class, it must also determine whether there is an injustice with respect the stakeholders as a whole. Even if a plan might at first blush appear to have that effect, when viewed in relation to all other parties, it may nonetheless be considered

appropriate and be approved: *Algoma Steel Corp. v. Royal Bank* (1992), 11 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. Gen. Div.) and *Re Northland Properties Ltd.*, *supra* at 9.

107 Further, to the extent that greater or discrete motivation to support a Plan may be seen as a conflict, the Court should take this same approach and look at the creditors as a whole and to the objecting creditors specifically and determine if their rights are compromised in an attempt to balance interests and have the pain of compromise borne equally.

108 Resurgence represents 58.2% of the Unsecured Noteholders or $96 million in claims. The total claim of the Unsecured Noteholders ranges from $146 million to $161 million. The affected unsecured class, excluding aircraft financing, tax claims, the noteholders and claims under $50,000, ranges from $116.3 million to $449.7 million depending on the resolutions of certain claims by the Claims Officer. Resurgence represents between 15.7% - 35% of that portion of the class.

109 The total affected unsecured claims, excluding tax claims, but including aircraft financing and noteholder claims including the unsecured portion of the Senior Secured Notes, ranges from $673 million to $1,007 million. Resurgence represents between 9.5% - 14.3% of the total affected unsecured creditor pool. These percentages indicate that at its very highest in a class excluding Air Canada's assigned claims and Senior Secured's deficiency, Resurgence would only represent a maximum of 35% of the class. In the larger class of affected unsecured it is significantly less. Viewed in relation to the class as a whole, there is no injustice being worked against Resurgence.

110 The thrust of the Resurgence submissions suggests a mistaken belief that they will get more than 14 cents on liquidation. This is not borne out by the evidence and is not reasonable in the context of the overall Plan.

b. Receipts on liquidation or bankruptcy

111 As noted above, the Monitor prepared and circulated a report on the Plan which contained a summary of a liquidation analysis outlining the Monitor's projected realizations upon a liquidation of CAIL ("Liquidation Analysis").

112 The Liquidation Analysis was based on: (1) the draft unaudited financial statements of Canadian at March 31, 2000; (2) the distress values reported in independent appraisals of aircraft and aircraft related assets obtained by CAIL in January, 2000; (3) a review of CAIL's aircraft leasing and financing documents; and (4) discussions with CAIL Management.

113 Prior to and during the application for sanction, the Monitor responded to various requests for information by parties involved. In particular, the Monitor provided a copy of the Liquidation Analysis to those who requested it. Certain of the parties involved requested

the opportunity to question the Monitor further, particularly in respect to the Liquidation Analysis and this court directed a process for the posing of those questions.

114 While there were numerous questions to which the Monitor was asked to respond, there were several areas in which Resurgence and the Minority Shareholders took particular issue: pension plan surplus, CRAL, international routes and tax pools. The dissenting groups asserted that these assets represented overlooked value to the company on a liquidation basis or on a going concern basis.

Pension Plan Surplus

115 The Monitor did not attribute any value to pension plan surplus when it prepared the Liquidation Analysis, for the following reasons:

> 1) The summaries of the solvency surplus/deficit positions indicated a cumulative net deficit position for the seven registered plans, after consideration of contingent liabilities;
>
> 2) The possibility, based on the previous splitting out of the seven plans from a single plan in 1988, that the plans could be held to be consolidated for financial purposes, which would remove any potential solvency surplus since the total estimated contingent liabilities exceeded the total estimated solvency surplus;
>
> 3) The actual calculations were prepared by CAIL's actuaries and actuaries representing the unions could conclude liabilities were greater; and
>
> 4) CAIL did not have a legal opinion confirming that surpluses belonged to CAIL.

116 The Monitor concluded that the entitlement question would most probably have to be settled by negotiation and/or litigation by the parties. For those reasons, the Monitor took a conservative view and did not attribute an asset value to pension plans in the Liquidation Analysis. The Monitor also did not include in the Liquidation Analysis any amount in respect of the claim that could be made by members of the plan where there is an apparent deficit after deducting contingent liabilities.

117 The issues in connection with possible pension surplus are: (1) the true amount of any of the available surplus; and (2) the entitlement of Canadian to any such amount.

118 It is acknowledged that surplus prior to termination can be accessed through employer contribution holidays, which Canadian has taken to the full extent permitted. However, there is no basis that has been established for any surplus being available to be withdrawn from an ongoing pension plan. On a pension plan termination, the amount available as a solvency surplus would first have to be further reduced by various amounts to determine

whether there was in fact any true surplus available for distribution. Such reductions include contingent benefits payable in accordance with the provisions of each respective pension plan, any extraordinary plan wind up cost, the amounts of any contribution holidays taken which have not been reflected, and any litigation costs.

119 Counsel for all of Canadian's unionized employees confirmed on the record that the respective union representatives can be expected to dispute all of these calculations as well as to dispute entitlement.

120 There is a suggestion that there might be a total of $40 million of surplus remaining from all pension plans after such reductions are taken into account. Apart from the issue of entitlement, this assumes that the plans can be treated separately, that a surplus could in fact be realized on liquidation and that the Towers Perrin calculations are not challenged. With total pension plan assets of over $2 billion, a surplus of $40 million could quickly disappear with relatively minor changes in the market value of the securities held or calculation of liabilities. In the circumstances, given all the variables, I find that the existence of any surplus is doubtful at best and I am satisfied that the Monitor's Liquidation Analysis ascribing it zero value is reasonable in this circumstances.

CRAL

121 The Monitor's liquidation analysis as at March 31, 2000 of CRAL determined that in a distress situation, after payments were made to its creditors, there would be a deficiency of approximately $30 million to pay Canadian Regional's unsecured creditors, which include a claim of approximately $56.5 million due to Canadian. In arriving at this conclusion, the Monitor reviewed internally prepared unaudited financial statements of CRAL as of March 31, 2000, the Houlihan Lokey Howard and Zukin, distress valuation dated January 21, 2000 and the Simat Helliesen and Eichner valuation of selected CAIL assets dated January 31, 2000 for certain aircraft related materials and engines, rotables and spares. The Avitas Inc., and Avmark Inc. reports were used for the distress values on CRAL's aircraft and the CRAL aircraft lease documentation. The Monitor also performed its own analysis of CRAL's liquidation value, which involved analysis of the reports provided and details of its analysis were outlined in the Liquidation Analysis.

122 For the purpose of the Liquidation Analysis, the Monitor did not consider other airlines as comparable for evaluation purposes, as the Monitor's valuation was performed on a distressed sale basis. The Monitor further assumed that without CAIL's national and international network to feed traffic into and a source of standby financing, and considering the inevitable negative publicity which a failure of CAIL would produce, CRAL would immediately stop operations as well.

123 Mr. Peterson testified that CRAL was worth $260 million to Air Canada, based on Air Canada being a special buyer who could integrate CRAL, on a going concern basis, into its network. The Liquidation Analysis assumed the windup of each of CRAL and CAIL, a completely different scenario.

124 There is no evidence that there was a potential purchaser for CRAL who would be prepared to acquire CRAL or the operations of CRAL 98 for any significant sum or at all. CRAL has value to CAIL, and in turn, could provide value to Air Canada, but this value is attributable to its ability to feed traffic to and take traffic from the national and international service operated by CAIL. In my view, the Monitor was aware of these features and properly considered these factors in assessing the value of CRAL on a liquidation of CAIL.

125 If CAIL were to cease operations, the evidence is clear that CRAL would be obliged to do so as well immediately. The travelling public, shippers, trade suppliers, and others would make no distinction between CAIL and CRAL and there would be no going concern for Air Canada to acquire.

International Routes

126 The Monitor ascribed no value to Canadian's international routes in the Liquidation Analysis. In discussions with CAIL management and experts available in its aviation group, the Monitor was advised that international routes are unassignable licenses and not property rights. They do not appear as assets in CAIL's financials. Mr. Carty and Mr. Peterson explained that routes and slots are *not* treated as assets by airlines, but rather as rights in the control of the Government of Canada. In the event of bankruptcy/receivership of CAIL, CAIL's trustee/receiver could not sell them and accordingly they are of no value to CAIL.

127 Evidence was led that on June 23, 1999 Air Canada made an offer to purchase CAIL's international routes for $400 million cash plus $125 million for aircraft spares and inventory, along with the assumption of certain debt and lease obligations for the aircraft required for the international routes. CAIL evaluated the Air Canada offer and concluded that the proposed purchase price was insufficient to permit it to continue carrying on business in the absence of its international routes. Mr. Carty testified that something in the range of $2 billion would be required.

128 CAIL was in desperate need of cash in mid December, 1999. CAIL agreed to sell its Toronto — Tokyo route for $25 million. The evidence, however, indicated that the price for the Toronto — Tokyo route was not derived from a valuation, but rather was what CAIL asked for, based on its then-current cash flow requirements. Air Canada and CAIL obtained Government approval for the transfer on December 21, 2000.

129 Resurgence complained that despite this evidence of offers for purchase and actual sales of international routes and other evidence of sales of slots, the Monitor did not include Canadian's international routes in the Liquidation Analysis and only attributed a total of $66 million for all intangibles of Canadian. There is some evidence that slots at some foreign airports may be bought or sold in some fashion. However, there is insufficient evidence to attribute any value to other slots which CAIL has at foreign airports. It would appear given the regulation of the airline industry, in particular, the *Aeronautics Act* and the *Canada Transportation Act*, that international routes for a Canadian air carrier only have full value to the extent of federal government support for the transfer or sale, and its preparedness to allow the then-current license holder to sell rather than act unilaterally to change the designation. The federal government was prepared to allow CAIL to sell its Toronto — Tokyo route to Air Canada in light of CAIL's severe financial difficulty and the certainty of cessation of operations during the Christmas holiday season in the absence of such a sale.

130 Further, statements made by CAIL in mid-1999 as to the value of its international routes and operations in response to an offer by Air Canada, reflected the amount CAIL needed to sustain liquidity without its international routes and was not a representation of market value of what could realistically be obtained from an arms length purchaser. The Monitor concluded on its investigation that CAIL's Narida and Heathrow slots had a realizable value of $66 million, which it included in the Liquidation Analysis. I find that this conclusion is supportable and that the Monitor properly concluded that there were no other rights which ought to have been assigned value.

Tax Pools

131 There are four tax pools identified by Resurgence and the Minority Shareholders that are material: capital losses at the CAC level, undepreciated capital cost pools, operating losses incurred by Canadian and potential for losses to be reinstated upon repayment of fuel tax rebates by CAIL.

Capital Loss Pools

132 The capital loss pools at CAC will not be available to Air Canada since CAC is to be left out of the corporate reorganization and will be severed from CAIL. Those capital losses can essentially only be used to absorb a portion of the debt forgiveness liability associated with the restructuring. CAC, who has virtually all of its senior debt compromised in the plan, receives compensation for this small advantage, which cost them nothing.

Undepreciated capital cost ("UCC")

133 There is no benefit to Air Canada in the pools of UCC unless it were established that the UCC pools are in excess of the fair market value of the relevant assets, since Air Canada could create the same pools by simply buying the assets on a liquidation at fair market value. Mr. Peterson understood this pool of UCC to be approximately $700 million. There is no evidence that the UCC pool, however, could be considered to be a source of benefit. There is no evidence that this amount is any greater than fair market value.

Operating Losses

134 The third tax pool complained of is the operating losses. The debt forgiven as a result of the Plan will erase any operating losses from prior years to the extent of such forgiven debt.

Fuel tax rebates

135 The fourth tax pool relates to the fuel tax rebates system taken advantage of by CAIL in past years. The evidence is that on a consolidated basis the total potential amount of this pool is $297 million. According to Mr. Carty's testimony, CAIL has not been taxable in his ten years as Chief Financial Officer. The losses which it has generated for tax purposes have been sold on a 10 - 1 basis to the government in order to receive rebates of excise tax paid for fuel. The losses can be restored retroactively if the rebates are repaid, but the losses can only be carried forward for a maximum of seven years. The evidence of Mr. Peterson indicates that Air Canada has no plan to use those alleged losses and in order for them to be useful to Air Canada, Air Canada would have to complete a legal merger with CAIL, which is not provided for in the plan and is not contemplated by Air Canada until some uncertain future date. In my view, the Monitor's conclusion that there was no value to any tax pools in the Liquidation Analysis is sound.

136 Those opposed to the Plan have raised the spectre that there may be value unaccounted for in this liquidation analysis or otherwise. Given the findings above, this is merely speculation and is unsupported by any concrete evidence.

c. Alternatives to the Plan

137 When presented with a plan, affected stakeholders must weigh their options in the light of commercial reality. Those options are typically liquidation measured against the plan proposed. If not put forward, a hope for a different or more favourable plan is not an option and no basis upon which to assess fairness. On a purposive approach to the CCAA, what is fair and reasonable must be assessed against the effect of the Plan on the creditors and their various claims, in the context of their response to the plan. Stakeholders are expected to decide their fate based on realistic, commercially viable alternatives (generally seen as the prime motivating factor in any business decision) and not on speculative desires or hope

for the future. As Farley J. stated in *T. Eaton Co.* (1999), 15 C.B.R. (4th) 311 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paragraph 6:

> One has to be cognizant of the function of a balancing of their prejudices. Positions must be realistically assessed and weighed, all in the light of what an alternative to a successful plan would be. Wishes are not a firm foundation on which to build a plan; nor are ransom demands.

138 The evidence is overwhelming that all other options have been exhausted and have resulted in failure. The concern of those opposed suggests that there is a better plan that Air Canada can put forward. I note that significant enhancements were made to the plan during the process. In any case, this is the Plan that has been voted on. The evidence makes it clear that there is not another plan forthcoming. As noted by Farley J. in *T. Eaton Co.*, *supra*, "no one presented an alternative plan for the interested parties to vote on" (para. 8).

d. Oppression

Oppression and the CCAA

139 Resurgence and the Minority Shareholders originally claimed that the Plan proponents, CAC and CAIL and the Plan supporters 853350 and Air Canada had oppressed, unfairly disregarded or unfairly prejudiced their interests, under Section 234 of the ABCA. The Minority Shareholders (for reasons that will appear obvious) have abandoned that position.

140 Section 234 gives the court wide discretion to remedy corporate conduct that is unfair. As remedial legislation, it attempts to balance the interests of shareholders, creditors and management to ensure adequate investor protection and maximum management flexibility. The Act requires the court to judge the conduct of the company and the majority in the context of equity and fairness: *First Edmonton Place Ltd. v. 315888 Alberta Ltd.* (1988), 40 B.L.R. 28 (Alta. Q.B.). Equity and fairness are measured against or considered in the context of the rights, interests or reasonable expectations of the complainants: *Diligenti v. RWMD Operations Kelowna Ltd.* (1976), 1 B.C.L.R. 36 (B.C. S.C.).

141 The starting point in any determination of oppression requires an understanding as to what the rights, interests, and reasonable expectations are and what the damaging or detrimental effect is on them. MacDonald J. stated in *First Edmonton Place*, *supra* at 57:

> In deciding what is unfair, the history and nature of the corporation, the essential nature of the relationship between the corporation and the creditor, the type of rights affected in general commercial practice should all be material. More concretely, the test of unfair prejudice or unfair disregard should encompass the following considerations:

> The protection of the underlying expectation of a creditor in the arrangement with the corporation, the extent to which the acts complained of were unforeseeable where the creditor could not reasonably have protected itself from such acts and the detriment to the interests of the creditor.

142 While expectations vary considerably with the size, structure, and value of the corporation, all expectations must be reasonably and objectively assessed: *Pente Investment Management Ltd. v. Schneider Corp.* (1998), 42 O.R. (3d) 177 (Ont. C.A.).

143 Where a company is insolvent, only the creditors maintain a meaningful stake in its assets. Through the mechanism of liquidation or insolvency legislation, the interests of shareholders are pushed to the bottom rung of the priority ladder. The expectations of creditors and shareholders must be viewed and measured against an altered financial and legal landscape. Shareholders cannot reasonably expect to maintain a financial interest in an insolvent company where creditors' claims are not being paid in full. It is through the lens of insolvency that the court must consider whether the acts of the company are in fact oppressive, unfairly prejudicial or unfairly disregarded. CCAA proceedings have recognized that shareholders may not have "a true interest to be protected" because there is no reasonable prospect of economic value to be realized by the shareholders given the existing financial misfortunes of the company: *Royal Oak Mines Ltd.*, *supra*, para. 4., *Re Cadillac Fairview Inc.* (March 7, 1995), Doc. B28/95 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), and *T. Eaton Company*, *supra*.

144 To avail itself of the protection of the CCAA, a company must be insolvent. The CCAA considers the hierarchy of interests and assesses fairness and reasonableness in that context. The court's mandate not to sanction a plan in the absence of fairness necessitates the determination as to whether the complaints of dissenting creditors and shareholders are legitimate, bearing in mind the company's financial state. The articulated purpose of the Act and the jurisprudence interpreting it, "widens the lens" to balance a broader range of interests that includes creditors and shareholders and beyond to the company, the employees and the public, and tests the fairness of the plan with reference to its impact on all of the constituents.

145 It is through the lens of insolvency legislation that the rights and interests of both shareholders and creditors must be considered. The reduction or elimination of rights of both groups is a function of the insolvency and not of oppressive conduct in the operation of the CCAA. The antithesis of oppression is fairness, the guiding test for judicial sanction. If a plan unfairly disregards or is unfairly prejudicial it will not be approved. However, the court retains the power to compromise or prejudice rights to effect a broader purpose, the restructuring of an insolvent company, provided that the plan does so in a fair manner.

Oppression allegations by Resurgence

146 Resurgence alleges that it has been oppressed or had its rights disregarded because the Petitioners and Air Canada disregarded the specific provisions of their trust indenture, that Air Canada and 853350 dealt with other creditors outside of the CCAA, refusing to negotiate with Resurgence and that they are generally being treated inequitably under the Plan.

147 The trust indenture under which the Unsecured Notes were issued required that upon a "change of control", 101% of the principal owing thereunder, plus interest would be immediately due and payable. Resurgence alleges that Air Canada, through 853350, caused CAC and CAIL to purposely fail to honour this term. Canadian acknowledges that the trust indenture was breached. On February 1, 2000, Canadian announced a moratorium on payments to lessors and lenders, including the Unsecured Noteholders. As a result of this moratorium, Canadian defaulted on the payments due under its various credit facilities and aircraft leases.

148 The moratorium was not directed solely at the Unsecured Noteholders. It had the same impact on other creditors, secured and unsecured. Canadian, as a result of the moratorium, breached other contractual relationships with various creditors. The breach of contract is not sufficient to found a claim for oppression in this case. Given Canadian's insolvency, which Resurgence recognized, it cannot be said that there was a reasonable expectation that it would be paid in full under the terms of the trust indenture, particularly when Canadian had ceased making payments to other creditors as well.

149 It is asserted that because the Plan proponents engaged in a restructuring of Canadian's debt before the filing under the CCAA, that its use of the Act for only a small group of creditors, which includes Resurgence is somehow oppressive.

150 At the outset, it cannot be overlooked that the CCAA does not require that a compromise be proposed to *all* creditors of an insolvent company. The CCAA is a flexible, remedial statute which recognizes the unique circumstances that lead to and away from insolvency.

151 Next, Air Canada made it clear beginning in the fall of 1999 that Canadian would have to complete a financial restructuring so as to permit Air Canada to acquire CAIL on a financially sound basis and as a wholly owned subsidiary. Following the implementation of the moratorium, absent which Canadian could not have continued to operate, Canadian and Air Canada commenced efforts to restructure significant obligations by consent. They perceived that further damage to public confidence that a CCAA filing could produce, required Canadian to secure a substantial measure of creditor support in advance of any public filing for court protection. Before the Petitioners started the CCAA proceedings on March 24, 2000, Air Canada, CAIL and lessors of 59 aircraft in its fleet had reached agreement in principle on the restructuring plan.

152 The purpose of the CCAA is to create an environment for negotiations and compromise. Often it is the stay of proceedings that creates the necessary stability for that process to unfold. Negotiations with certain key creditors in advance of the CCAA filing, rather than being oppressive or conspiratorial, are to be encouraged as a matter of principle if their impact is to provide a firm foundation for a restructuring. Certainly in this case, they were of critical importance, staving off liquidation, preserving cash flow and allowing the Plan to proceed. Rather than being detrimental or prejudicial to the interests of the other stakeholders, including Resurgence, it was beneficial to Canadian and all of its stakeholders.

153 Resurgence complained that certain transfers of assets to Air Canada and its actions in consolidating the operations of the two entities prior to the initiation of the CCAA proceedings were unfairly prejudicial to it.

154 The evidence demonstrates that the sales of the Toronto — Tokyo route, the Dash 8s and the simulators were at the suggestion of Canadian, who was in desperate need of operating cash. Air Canada paid what Canadian asked, based on its cash flow requirements. The evidence established that absent the injection of cash at that critical juncture, Canadian would have ceased operations. It is for that reason that the Government of Canada willingly provided the approval for the transfer on December 21, 2000.

155 Similarly, the renegotiation of CAIL's aircraft leases to reflect market rates supported by Air Canada covenant or guarantee has been previously dealt with by this court and found to have been in the best interest of Canadian, not to its detriment. The evidence establishes that the financial support and corporate integration that has been provided by Air Canada was not only in Canadian's best interest, but its only option for survival. The suggestion that the renegotiations of these leases, various sales and the operational realignment represents an assumption of a benefit by Air Canada to the detriment of Canadian is not supported by the evidence.

156 I find the transactions predating the CCAA proceedings, were in fact Canadian's life blood in ensuring some degree of liquidity and stability within which to conduct an orderly restructuring of its debt. There was no detriment to Canadian or to its creditors, including its unsecured creditors. That Air Canada and Canadian were so successful in negotiating agreements with their major creditors, including aircraft financiers, without resorting to a stay under the CCAA underscores the serious distress Canadian was in and its lenders recognition of the viability of the proposed Plan.

157 Resurgence complained that other significant groups held negotiations with Canadian. The evidence indicates that a meeting was held with Mr. Symington, Managing Director of Resurgence, in Toronto in March 2000. It was made clear to Resurgence that the pool of unsecured creditors would be somewhere between $500 and $700 million and that Resurgence

would be included within that class. To the extent that the versions of this meeting differ, I prefer and accept the evidence of Mr. Carty. Resurgence wished to play a significant role in the debt restructuring and indicated it was prepared to utilize the litigation process to achieve a satisfactory result for itself. It is therefore understandable that no further negotiations took place. Nevertheless, the original offer to affected unsecured creditors has been enhanced since the filing of the plan on April 25, 2000. The enhancements to unsecured claims involved the removal of the cap on the unsecured pool and an increase from 12 to 14 cents on the dollar.

158 The findings of the Commissioner of Competition establishes beyond doubt that absent the financial support provided by Air Canada, Canadian would have failed in December 1999. I am unable to find on the evidence that Resurgence has been oppressed. The complaint that Air Canada has plundered Canadian and robbed it of its assets is not supported but contradicted by the evidence. As described above, the alternative is liquidation and in that event the Unsecured Noteholders would receive between one and three cents on the dollar. The Monitor's conclusions in this regard are supportable and I accept them.

e. Unfairness to Shareholders

159 The Minority Shareholders essentially complained that they were being unfairly stripped of their only asset in CAC — the shares of CAIL. They suggested they were being squeezed out by the new CAC majority shareholder 853350, without any compensation or any vote. When the reorganization is completed as contemplated by the Plan, their shares will remain in CAC but CAC will be a bare shell.

160 They further submitted that Air Canada's cash infusion, the covenants and guarantees it has offered to aircraft financiers, and the operational changes (including integration of schedules, "quick win" strategies, and code sharing) have all added significant value to CAIL to the benefit of its stakeholders, including the Minority Shareholders. They argued that they should be entitled to continue to participate into the future and that such an expectation is legitimate and consistent with the statements and actions of Air Canada in regard to integration. By acting to realign the airlines before a corporate reorganization, the Minority Shareholders asserted that Air Canada has created the expectation that it is prepared to consolidate the airlines with the participation of a minority. The Minority Shareholders take no position with respect to the debt restructuring under the CCAA, but ask the court to sever the corporate reorganization provisions contained in the Plan.

161 Finally, they asserted that CAIL has increased in value due to Air Canada's financial contributions and operational changes and that accordingly, before authorizing the transfer of the CAIL shares to 853350, the current holders of the CAIL Preferred Shares, the court must have evidence before it to justify a transfer of 100% of the equity of CAIL to the Preferred Shares.

162 That CAC will have its shareholding in CAIL extinguished and emerge a bare shell is acknowledged. However, the evidence makes it abundantly clear that those shares, CAC's "only asset", have no value. That the Minority Shareholders are content to have the debt restructuring proceed suggests by implication that they do not dispute the insolvency of both Petitioners, CAC and CAIL.

163 The Minority Shareholders base their expectation to remain as shareholders on the actions of Air Canada in acquiring only 82% of the CAC shares before integrating certain of the airlines' operations. Mr. Baker (who purchased *after* the Plan was filed with the Court and almost six months after the take over bid by Air Canada) suggested that the contents of the bid circular misrepresented Air Canada's future intentions to its shareholders. The two dollar price offered and paid per share in the bid must be viewed somewhat skeptically and in the context in which the bid arose. It does not support the speculative view that some shareholders hold, that somehow, despite insolvency, their shares have some value on a going concern basis. In any event, any claim for misrepresentation that Minority Shareholders might have arising from the take over bid circular against Air Canada or 853350, if any, is unaffected by the Plan and may be pursued after the stay is lifted.

164 In considering Resurgence's claim of oppression I have already found that the financial support of Air Canada during this restructuring period has benefited Canadian and its stakeholders. Air Canada's financial support and the integration of the two airlines has been critical to keeping Canadian afloat. The evidence makes it abundantly clear that without this support Canadian would have ceased operations. However it has not transformed CAIL or CAC into solvent companies.

165 The Minority Shareholders raise concerns about assets that are ascribed limited or no value in the Monitor's report as does Resurgence (although to support an opposite proposition). Considerable argument was directed to the future operational savings and profitability forecasted for Air Canada, its subsidiaries and CAIL and its subsidiaries. Mr. Peterson estimated it to be in the order of $650 to $800 million on an annual basis, commencing in 2001. The Minority Shareholders point to the tax pools of a restructured company that they submit will be of great value once CAIL becomes profitable as anticipated. They point to a pension surplus that at the very least has value by virtue of the contribution holidays that it affords. They also look to the value of the compromised claims of the restructuring itself which they submit are in the order of $449 million. They submit these cumulative benefits add value, currently or at least realizable in the future. In sharp contrast to the Resurgence position that these acts constitute oppressive behaviour, the Minority Shareholders view them as enhancing the value of their shares. They go so far as to suggest that there may well be a current going concern value of the CAC shares that has been

conveniently ignored or unquantified and that the Petitioners must put evidence before the court as to what that value is.

166 These arguments overlook several important facts, the most significant being that CAC and CAIL are insolvent and will remain insolvent until the debt restructuring is fully implemented. These companies are not just technically or temporarily insolvent, they are massively insolvent. Air Canada will have invested upward of $3 billion to complete the restructuring, while the Minority Shareholders have contributed nothing. Further, it was a fundamental condition of Air Canada's support of this Plan that it become the sole owner of CAIL. It has been suggested by some that Air Canada's share purchase at two dollars per share in December 1999 was unfairly prejudicial to CAC and CAIL's creditors. Objectively, any expectation by Minority Shareholders that they should be able to participate in a restructured CAIL is not reasonable.

167 The Minority Shareholders asserted the plan is unfair because the effect of the reorganization is to extinguish the common shares of CAIL held by CAC and to convert the voting and non-voting Preferred Shares of CAIL into common shares of CAIL. They submit there is no expert valuation or other evidence to justify the transfer of CAIL's equity to the Preferred Shares. There is no equity in the CAIL shares to transfer. The year end financials show CAIL's shareholder equity at a deficit of $790 million. The Preferred Shares have a liquidation preference of $347 million. There is no evidence to suggest that Air Canada's interim support has rendered either of these companies solvent, it has simply permitted operations to continue. In fact, the unaudited consolidated financial statements of CAC for the quarter ended March 31, 2000 show total shareholders equity went from a deficit of $790 million to a deficit of $1.214 million, an erosion of $424 million.

168 The Minority Shareholders' submission attempts to compare and contrast the rights and expectations of the CAIL preferred shares as against the CAC common shares. This is not a meaningful exercise; the Petitioners are not submitting that the Preferred Shares have value and the evidence demonstrates unequivocally that they do not. The Preferred Shares are merely being utilized as a corporate vehicle to allow CAIL to become a wholly owned subsidiary of Air Canada. For example, the same result could have been achieved by issuing new shares rather than changing the designation of 853350's Preferred Shares in CAIL.

169 The Minority Shareholders have asked the court to sever the reorganization from the debt restructuring, to permit them to participate in whatever future benefit might be derived from the restructured CAIL. However, a fundamental condition of this Plan and the expressed intention of Air Canada on numerous occasions is that CAIL become a wholly owned subsidiary. To suggest the court ought to sever this reorganization from the debt restructuring fails to account for the fact that it is not two plans but an integral part of a single plan. To accede to this request would create an injustice to creditors whose claims are

being seriously compromised, and doom the entire Plan to failure. Quite simply, the Plan's funder will not support a severed plan.

170 Finally, the future profits to be derived by Air Canada are not a relevant consideration. While the object of any plan under the CCAA is to create a viable emerging entity, the germane issue is what a prospective purchaser is prepared to pay in the circumstances. Here, we have the one and only offer on the table, Canadian's last and only chance. The evidence demonstrates this offer is preferable to those who have a remaining interest to a liquidation. Where secured creditors have compromised their claims and unsecured creditors are accepting 14 cents on the dollar in a potential pool of unsecured claims totalling possibly in excess of $1 billion, it is not unfair that shareholders receive nothing.

e. The Public Interest

171 In this case, the court cannot limit its assessment of fairness to how the Plan affects the direct participants. The business of the Petitioners as a national and international airline employing over 16,000 people must be taken into account.

172 In his often cited article, *Reorganizations Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (1947), 25 Can.Bar R.ev. 587 at 593 Stanley Edwards stated:

> Another reason which is usually operative in favour of reorganization is the interest of the public in the continuation of the enterprise, particularly if the company supplies commodities or services that are necessary or desirable to large numbers of consumers, or if it employs large numbers of workers who would be thrown out of employment by its liquidation. This public interest may be reflected in the decisions of the creditors and shareholders of the company and is undoubtedly a factor which a court would wish to consider in deciding whether to sanction an arrangement under the C.C.A.A.

173 In *Re Repap British Columbia Inc.* (1998), 1 C.B.R. (4th) 49 (B.C. S.C.) the court noted that the fairness of the plan must be measured against the overall economic and business environment and against the interests of the citizens of British Columbia who are affected as "shareholders" of the company, and creditors, of suppliers, employees and competitors of the company. The court approved the plan even though it was unable to conclude that it was necessarily fair and reasonable. In *Re Quintette Coal Ltd.*, *supra*, Thackray J. acknowledged the significance of the coal mine to the British Columbia economy, its importance to the people who lived and worked in the region and to the employees of the company and their families. Other cases in which the court considered the public interest in determining whether to sanction a plan under the CCAA include *Re Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) and *Algoma Steel Corp. v. Royal Bank* (April 16, 1992), Doc. Toronto B62/91-A (Ont. Gen. Div.)

174 The economic and social impacts of a plan are important and legitimate considerations. Even in insolvency, companies are more than just assets and liabilities. The fate of a company is inextricably tied to those who depend on it in various ways. It is difficult to imagine a case where the economic and social impacts of a liquidation could be more catastrophic. It would undoubtedly be felt by Canadian air travellers across the country. The effect would not be a mere ripple, but more akin to a tidal wave from coast to coast that would result in chaos to the Canadian transportation system.

175 More than sixteen thousand unionized employees of CAIL and CRAL appeared through counsel. The unions and their membership strongly support the Plan. The unions represented included the Airline Pilots Association International, the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Transportation District 104, Canadian Union of Public Employees, and the Canadian Auto Workers Union. They represent pilots, ground workers and cabin personnel. The unions submit that it is essential that the employee protections arising from the current restructuring of Canadian not be jeopardized by a bankruptcy, receivership or other liquidation. Liquidation would be devastating to the employees and also to the local and national economies. The unions emphasize that the Plan safeguards the employment and job dignity protection negotiated by the unions for their members. Further, the court was reminded that the unions and their members have played a key role over the last fifteen years or more in working with Canadian and responsible governments to ensure that Canadian survived and jobs were maintained.

176 The Calgary and Edmonton Airport authorities, which are not for profit corporations, also supported the Plan. CAIL's obligations to the airport authorities are not being compromised under the Plan. However, in a liquidation scenario, the airport authorities submitted that a liquidation would have severe financial consequences to them and have potential for severe disruption in the operation of the airports.

177 The representations of the Government of Canada are also compelling. Approximately one year ago, CAIL approached the Transport Department to inquire as to what solution could be found to salvage their ailing company. The Government saw fit to issue an order in council, pursuant to section 47 of the *Transportation Act*, which allowed an opportunity for CAIL to approach other entities to see if a permanent solution could be found. A standing committee in the House of Commons reviewed a framework for the restructuring of the airline industry, recommendations were made and undertakings were given by Air Canada. The Government was driven by a mandate to protect consumers and promote competition. It submitted that the Plan is a major component of the industry restructuring. Bill C-26, which addresses the restructuring of the industry, has passed through the House of Commons and is presently before the Senate. The Competition Bureau has accepted that Air Canada has

the only offer on the table and has worked very closely with the parties to ensure that the interests of consumers, employees, small carriers, and smaller communities will be protected.

178 In summary, in assessing whether a plan is fair and reasonable, courts have emphasized that perfection is not required: see for example *Re Wandlyn Inns Ltd.* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 316 (N.B. Q.B.), *Quintette Coal, supra* and *Repap, supra*. Rather, various rights and remedies must be sacrificed to varying degrees to result in a reasonable, viable compromise for all concerned. The court is required to view the "big picture" of the plan and assess its impact as a whole. I return to *Algoma Steel v. Royal Bank, supra* at 9 in which Farley J. endorsed this approach:

> What might appear on the surface to be unfair to one party when viewed in relation to all other parties may be considered to be quite appropriate.

179 Fairness and reasonableness are not abstract notions, but must be measured against the available commercial alternatives. The triggering of the statute, namely insolvency, recognizes a fundamental flaw within the company. In these imperfect circumstances there can never be a perfect plan, but rather only one that is supportable. As stated in *Re Sammi Atlas Inc.* (1998), 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at 173:

> A plan under the CCAA is a compromise; it cannot be expected to be perfect. It should be approved if it is fair, reasonable and equitable. Equitable treatment is not necessarily equal treatment. Equal treatment may be contrary to equitable treatment.

180 I find that in all the circumstances, the Plan is fair and reasonable.

IV. Conclusion

181 The Plan has obtained the support of many affected creditors, including virtually all aircraft financiers, holders of executory contracts, AMR, Loyalty Group and the Senior Secured Noteholders.

182 Use of these proceedings has avoided triggering more than $1.2 billion of incremental claims. These include claims of passengers with pre-paid tickets, employees, landlords and other parties with ongoing executory contracts, trade creditors and suppliers.

183 This Plan represents a solid chance for the continued existence of Canadian. It preserves CAIL as a business entity. It maintains over 16,000 jobs. Suppliers and trade creditors are kept whole. It protects consumers and preserves the integrity of our national transportation system while we move towards a new regulatory framework. The extensive efforts by Canadian and Air Canada, the compromises made by stakeholders both within

and without the proceedings and the commitment of the Government of Canada inspire confidence in a positive result.

184 I agree with the opposing parties that the Plan is not perfect, but it is neither illegal nor oppressive. Beyond its fair and reasonable balancing of interests, the Plan is a result of bona fide efforts by all concerned and indeed is the only alternative to bankruptcy as ten years of struggle and creative attempts at restructuring by Canadian clearly demonstrate. This Plan is one step toward a new era of airline profitability that hopefully will protect consumers by promoting affordable and accessible air travel to all Canadians.

185 The Plan deserves the sanction of this court and it is hereby granted. The application pursuant to section 185 of the ABCA is granted. The application for declarations sought by Resurgence are dismissed. The application of the Minority Shareholders is dismissed.

Application granted; counter-applications dismissed.

Footnotes

* Leave to appeal refused 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 52, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 86, [2000] 10 W.W.R. 314, 2000 ABCA 238, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 46 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]).

End of Document

2000 ABCA 238
Alberta Court of Appeal [In Chambers]

Canadian Airlines Corp., Re

2000 CarswellAlta 919, 2000 ABCA 238, [2000] 10 W.W.R. 314, [2000] A.W.L.D. 655, [2000] A.J. No. 1028, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 46, 228 W.A.C. 131, 266 A.R. 131, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 52, 99 A.C.W.S. (3d) 533, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 86

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended;

And In the Matter of the Business Corporations Act (Alberta) S.A. 1981, c. B-15, as amended, Section 185;

And In the Matter of Canadian Airlines Corporation and Canadian Airlines International Ltd.; Resurgence Asset Management LLC (Applicant) and Canadian Airlines Corporation and Canadian Airlines International Ltd. (Respondents)

Wittmann J.A.

Heard: August 3, 2000
Judgment: August 29, 2000
Docket: Calgary Appeal 00-08901

Proceedings: refused leave to appeal *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re* (2000), 2000 CarswellAlta 662, 2000 ABQB 442, [2000] 10 W.W.R. 269, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 1, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 41, 265 A.R. 201 (Alta. Q.B.); affirmed (2000), 2000 CarswellAlta 1556, 2001 ABCA 9, [2001] 3 W.W.R. 1 (Alta. C.A.)

Counsel: *D.R. Haigh, Q.C.*, *D.S. Nishimura*, and *A.Z.A. Campbell*, for Applicant.
H.M. Kay, Q.C., *A.L. Friend, Q.C.*, and *L.A. Goldbach*, for Respondents.
S.F. Dunphy, for Air Canada.
F.R. Foran, Q.C., for Monitor, Pricewaterhouse Coopers.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency

APPLICATION by investment corporation for leave to appeal from judgment reported at 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 41, [2000] 10 W.W.R. 269, 2000 ABQB 442, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 1 (Alta. Q.B.), approving airline's plan of arrangement under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act.*

Wittmann J.A. **[In Chambers]:**

INTRODUCTION

1 This is an application by Resurgence Asset Management LLC ("Resurgence") for leave to appeal the order of Paperny, J., dated June 27, 2000, [reported 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, [2000] 10 W.W.R. 269 (Alta. Q.B.)] pursuant to proceedings under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended, ("*CCAA*"). The order sanctioned a plan of compromise and arrangement ("the Plan") proposed by Canadian Airlines Corporation ("CAC") and Canadian Airlines International Ltd. ("CAIL") (together, "Canadian") and dismissed an application by Resurgence for a declaration that Resurgence was an unaffected creditor under the Plan.

BACKGROUND

2 Resurgence was the holder of 58.2 per cent of $100,000,000.00 (U.S.) of the unsecured notes issued by CAC.

3 CAC was a publicly traded Alberta corporation which, prior to the June 27 order of Paperny, J., owned 100 per cent of the common shares of CAIL, the operating company of Canadian Airlines.

4 Air Canada is a publicly traded Canadian corporation. Air Canada owned 10 per cent of the shares of 853350 Alberta Ltd. ("853350"), which prior to the June 27 order of Paperny, J., owned all the preferred shares of CAIL.

5 As described in detail by the learned chambers judge in her reasons, Canadian had been searching for a decade for a solution to its ongoing, significant financial difficulties. By December 1999, it was on the brink of bankruptcy. In a series of transactions including 853350's acquisition of the preferred shares of CAIL, Air Canada infused capital into Canadian and assisted in debt restructuring.

6 Canadian came to the conclusion that it must conclude its debt restructuring to permit the completion of a full merger between Canadian and Air Canada. On February 1, 2000, to secure liquidity to continue operating until debt restructuring was achieved, Canadian announced a moratorium on payments to lessors and lenders. CAIL, Air Canada and lessors of 59 aircraft reached an agreement in principle on a restructuring plan. They also reached agreement with other secured creditors and several major unsecured creditors with respect to restructuring.

7 Canadian still faced threats of proceedings by secured creditors. It commenced proceedings under the *CCAA* on March 24, 2000. Pricewaterhouse Coopers Inc. was appointed as Monitor by court order.

8 Arrangements with various aircraft lessors, lenders and conditional vendors which would benefit Canadian by reducing rates and other terms were approved by court orders dated April 14, 2000 and May 10, 2000.

9 On April 25, 2000, in accordance with the March 24 court order, Canadian filed the Plan which was described as having three principal objectives:

(a) To provide near term liquidity so that Canadian can sustain operations;

(b) To allow for the return of aircraft not required by Canadian; and

(c) To permanently adjust Canadian's debt structure and lease facilities to reflect the current market for asset value and carrying costs in return for Air Canada providing a guarantee of the restructured obligations.

10 The Plan generally provided for stakeholders by category as follows:

(a) Affected unsecured creditors, which included unsecured noteholders, aircraft claimants, executory contract claimants, tax claimants and various litigation claimants, would receive 12 cents per dollar (later changed to 14 cents per dollar) of approved claims;

(b) Affected secured creditors, the senior secured noteholders, would receive 97 per cent of the principal amount of their claim plus interest and costs in respect of their secured claim, and a deficiency claim as unsecured creditors for the remainder;

(c) Unaffected unsecured creditors, which included Canadian's employees, customers and suppliers of goods and services, would be unaffected by the Plan;

(d) Unaffected secured creditor, the Royal Bank, CAIL's operating lender, would not be affected by the Plan.

11 The Plan also proposed share capital reorganization by having all CAIL common shares held by CAC converted into a single retractable share, which would then be retracted by CAIL for $1.00, and all CAIL preferred shares held by 853350 converted into CAIL common shares. The Plan provided for amendments to CAIL's articles of incorporation to effect the proposed reorganization.

12 On May 26, 2000, in accordance with the orders and directions of the court, two classes of creditors, the senior secured noteholders and the affected unsecured creditors voted on the Plan as amended. Both classes approved the Plan by the majorities required by ss. 4 and 5 of the *CCAA*.

13 On May 29, 2000, by notice of motion, Canadian sought court sanction of the Plan under s. 6 of the *CCAA* and an order for reorganization pursuant to s. 185 of the *Business Corporations Act* (Alberta), S.A. 1981, c. B-15 as amended ("*ABCA*"). Resurgence was among those who opposed the Plan. Its application, along with that of four shareholders of CAC, was ordered to be tried during a hearing to consider the fairness and reasonableness of the Plan ("the fairness hearing").

14 Resurgence sought declarations that the actions of Canadian, Air Canada and 853350 constitute an amalgamation, consolidation or merger with or into Air Canada or a conveyance or transfer of all or substantially all of Canadian's assets to Air Canada; that any plan of arrangement involving Canadian will not affect Resurgence and directing the repurchase of their notes pursuant to provisions of their trust indenture and that the actions of Canadian, Air Canada and 853350 were oppressive and unfairly prejudicial to it pursuant to s. 234 of the *ABCA*.

15 The fairness hearing lasted two weeks during which *viva voce* evidence of six witnesses was heard, including testimony of the chief financial officers of Canadian and Air Canada. Submissions by counsel were made on behalf of the federal government, the Calgary and Edmonton airport authorities, unions representing employees of Canadian and various creditors of Canadian. The court also received two special reports from the Monitor.

16 As part of assessing the fairness of the Plan, the learned chambers judge received a liquidation analysis of CAIL, prepared by the Monitor, in order to estimate the amounts that might be recovered by CAIL's creditors and shareholders in the event that CAIL's assets were disposed of by a receiver or trustee. The Monitor concluded that liquidation would result in a shortfall to certain secured creditors, that recovery by unsecured creditors would be between one and three cents on the dollar, and that there would be no recovery by shareholders.

17 The learned chambers judge stated that she agreed with the parties opposing the Plan that it was not perfect, but it was neither illegal, nor oppressive, and therefore, dismissed the requested declarations and relief sought by Resurgence. Further, she held that the Plan was the only alternative to bankruptcy as ten years of struggle and failed creative attempts at restructuring clearly demonstrated. She ruled that the Plan was fair and reasonable and deserving of the sanction of the court. She granted the order sanctioning the Plan, and the application pursuant to s. 185 of the *ABCA* to reorganize the corporation.

LEAVE TO APPEAL UNDER THE *CCAA*

18 The *CCAA* provides for appeals to this Court as follows:

> 13. Except in the Yukon Territory, any person dissatisfied with an order or a decision made under this Act may appeal therefrom on obtaining leave of the judge appealed from or of the court or a judge or the court to which the appeal lies and on such terms as to security and in other respects as the judge or court directs.

19 As set out in *Re Canadian Airlines Corp.*, 2000 ABCA 149 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]) ("*Resurgence No. 1*"), a decision on a leave application sought earlier in this action, and as conceded by all the parties to this application, the criterion to be applied in an application for leave to appeal is that there must be serious and arguable grounds that are of real and significant interest to the parties. This criterion subsumes four factors to be considered by the court:

(1) whether the point on appeal is of significance to the practice;

(2) whether the point raised is of significance to the action itself;

(3) whether the appeal is *prima facie* meritorious or, on the other hand, whether it is frivolous; and

(4) whether the appeal will unduly hinder the progress of the action.

20 The respondents argue that apart from the test for leave, mootness is an additional overriding factor in the present case which is dispositive against the granting of leave to appeal.

MOOTNESS

21 In *Galcor Hotel Managers Ltd. v. Imperial Financial Services Ltd.* (1993), 81 B.C.L.R. (2d) 142 (B.C. C.A.), an order authorizing the distribution of substantially all the assets of a limited partnership had been fully performed. The appellants appealed, seeking to have the order vacated. The appellants had unsuccessfully applied for a stay of the order. In deciding whether to allow the appeal to be presented, Gibbs, J.A., for the court, said there was no merit, substance or prospective benefit that could accrue to the appellants, and that the appeal was therefore moot.

22 In *Borowski v. Canada (Attorney General)*, [1989] 1 S.C.R. 342 (S.C.C.), Sopinka, J. for the court, held that where there is no longer a live controversy or concrete dispute, an appeal is moot.

23 No stay of the June 27 order was obtained or even sought. In reliance on that order, most of the transactions contemplated by the Plan have been completed. According to the Affidavit of Paul Brotto, sworn July 6, 2000, filed July 7, 2000, the following occurred:

> 5. The transactions contemplated by the Plan have been completed in reliance upon the Sanction Order. The completion of the transactions has involved, among other things, the following steps:
>
> (a) Effective July 4, 2000, all of the depreciable property of CAIL was transferred to a wholly-owned subsidiary of CAIL and leased back from such subsidiary by CAIL;
>
> (b) Articles of Reorganization of CAIL, being Schedule "D" to the Plan (which is Exhibit "A" to the Sanction Order), were filed and a Certificate of Amendment and Registration of Restated Articles was issued by the Registrar of Corporations pursuant to the Sanction Order, and in accordance with sections 185 and 255 of the Business Corporations Act (Alberta) (the "Certificate") on July 5, 2000. Pursuant to the Articles of Reorganization, the common shares of CAIL formerly held by CAC were converted to retractable preferred shares and the same were retracted. All preferred shares of CAIL held by 853350 Alberta Ltd. ("853350") were converted into CAIL common shares;
>
> (c) The "Section 80.04 Agreement" referred to in the Plan between CAIL and CAC, pursuant to which certain forgiveness of debt obligations under s.80 of the Income Tax Act were transferred from CAIL to CAC, has been entered into as of July 5, 2000;
>
> (d) Payment of $185,973,411 (US funds) has been made to the Trustee on behalf of all holders of Senior Secured Notes as provided for in the Plan and 853350 has acquired the Amended Secured Intercompany Note; and
>
> (e) Payments have been made to Affected Unsecured Creditors holding Unsecured Proven Claims and further payments will be made upon the resolution of disputed claims by the Claims officer; and
>
> (f) It is expected that payment will be made within several days of the date of this Affidavit to the Trustee, on behalf of the Unsecured Notes, in the amount 14 percent of approximately $160,000,000.

24 In *Norcan Oils Ltd. v. Fogler* (1964), [1965] S.C.R. 36 (S.C.C.), it was held that the Alberta Supreme Court Appellate Division could not set aside or revoke a certificate of

amalgamation after the registrar of companies had issued the certificate in accordance with a valid court order and the corporations legislation. A notice appealing the order had been served but no stay had been obtained. Absent express legislative authority to reverse the process once the certificate had been issued, the majority of the Supreme Court of Canada held the amalgamation could not be unwound and therefore, an appellate court ought not to make an order which could have no effect.

25 Courts following *Norcan Oils Ltd.* have recognized that any right to appeal will be lost if a party does not obtain a stay of the filing of an amalgamation approval order: *Harris v. Universal Explorations Ltd.* (1982), 35 A.R. 71 (Alta. T.D.) and *Gibbex Mines Ltd. v. International Video Cassettes Ltd.*, [1975] 2 W.W.R. 10 (B.C. S.C.).

26 *Norcan* applies to bind this Court in the present action where CAIL's articles of reorganization were filed with the Registrar of Corporations on July 5, 2000 and pursuant to the provisions of the *ABCA*, a certificate amending the articles was issued. The certificate cannot now be rescinded. There is no provision in the ***ABCA*** for reversing a reorganization.

27 The respondents point out that there are other irreversible changes which have occurred since the date of the June 27, 2000 order. They include changes in share structure, changes in management personnel, implementation of a restructuring plan that included a repayment agreement with its principal lender and other creditors and payments to third parties. [Affidavit of Paul Brotto, paras. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.]

28 The applicant relies on *Re Blue Range Resource Corp.* (1999), 244 A.R. 103 (Alta. C.A.), to argue that leave to appeal can be granted after a *CCAA* plan has been implemented. In that case, as noted by Fruman, J.A. at 106, a plan was in place and an appeal of the issues which were before her would not unduly hinder the progress of restructuring.

29 In this case, however, the proposed appeal by Resurgence would interfere with the restructuring since the remedies it seeks requires that the Plan be set aside. One proposed ground of appeal attacks the fairness and reasonableness of the Plan itself when the Plan has been almost fully implemented. It cannot be said that the proposed appeal would not unduly hinder the progress of restructuring.

30 If the proposed appeal were allowed, this Court cannot rewrite the Plan; nor could it remit the matter back to the *CCAA* supervising judge for such purpose. It must either uphold or set aside the approval of the Plan granted by the court below. In effect, if Resurgence succeeded on appeal, the Plan would be vacated. However, that remedy is no longer possible, at minimum, because the certificate issued by the Registrar cannot be revoked. As stated in *Norcan Oils Ltd.*, an appellate court cannot order a remedy which could have no effect. This Court cannot order that the Plan be undone in its entirety.

31 Similarly, the other ground of Resurgence's proposed appeal, oppression under s. 234 of the *ABCA*, cannot be allowed since that remedy must be granted within the context of the *CCAA* proceedings. As recognized by the learned chambers judge, allegations of oppression were considered in the test for fairness when seeking judicial sanction of the Plan. As she discussed at paragraphs 140-145 of her reasons, the starting point in any determination of oppression under the *ABCA* requires an understanding of the rights, interests and reasonable expectations which must be objectively assessed. In this action, the rights, interests and reasonable expectations of both shareholders and creditors must be considered through the lens of *CCAA* insolvency legislation. The complaints of Resurgence, that its rights under its trust indenture have been ignored or eliminated, are to be seen as the function of the insolvency, and not of oppressive conduct. As a consequence, even if Resurgence were to successfully appeal on the ground of oppression, the remedy would not be to give effect to the terms of the trust indenture. This Court could only hold that the fairness test for the court's sanction was not met and therefore, the approval of the Plan should be set aside. Again, as explained above, reversing the Plan is no longer possible.

32 The applicant was unable to point to any issue where this Court could grant a remedy and yet leave the Plan unaffected. It proposed on appeal to seek a declaration that it be declared an unaffected unsecured creditor. That is not a ground of appeal but is rather a remedy. As the respondents argued, the designation of Resurgence as an affected unsecured creditor was part of the Plan. To declare it an unaffected unsecured creditor requires vacating the Plan. On every ground proposed by the applicant, it appears that the response of this Court can only be to either uphold or set aside the approval of the court below. Setting aside the approval is no longer possible since essential elements of the Plan have been implemented and are now irreversible. Thus, the applicant cannot be granted the remedy it seeks. No prospective benefit can accrue to the applicant even if it succeeded on appeal. The appeal, therefore, is moot.

DISCRETION TO HEAR MOOT APPEALS

33 Even if an appeal could provide no benefit to the applicants, should leave be granted?

34 In *Borowski*, *supra*, Sopinka, J. described the doctrine of mootness at 353. He said that, as an aspect of a general policy or practice, a court may decline to decide a case which raises merely a hypothetical or abstract questions and will apply the doctrine when the decision of the court will have no practical effect of resolving some controversy affecting the rights of parties.

35 After discussing the principles involved in deciding whether an issue was moot, Sopinka, J. continued at 358 to describe the second stage of the analysis by examining the basis upon which a court should exercise its discretion either to hear or decline to hear a moot appeal. He

examined three underlying factors in the rationale for the exercise of discretion in departing from the usual practice. The first is the requirement of an adversarial context which helps guarantee that issues are well and fully argued when resolving legal disputes. He suggested the presence of collateral consequences may provide the necessary adversarial context. Second is the concern for judicial economy which requires that special circumstances exist in a case to make it worthwhile to apply scare judicial resources to resolve it. Third is the need for the court to demonstrate a measure of awareness of its proper law-making function as the adjudicative branch in the political framework. Judgments in the absence of a dispute may be viewed as intruding into the role of the legislative branch. He concluded at 363:

> In exercising its discretion in an appeal which is moot, the court should consider the extent to which each of the three basic rationalia for enforcement of the mootness doctrine is present. This is not to suggest that it is a mechanical process. The principles identified above may not all support the same conclusion. The presence of one or two of the factors may be overborne by the absence of the third and vice versa.

36 The third factor underlying the rationale does not apply in this case. As for the first criterion, the circumstances of this case do not reveal any collateral consequences, although, it may be assumed that the necessary adversarial context could be present. However, there are no special circumstances making it worthwhile for this Court to ration scarce judicial resources to the resolution of this dispute. This outweighs the other two factors in concluding that the mootness doctrine should be enforced.

37 On the ground of mootness, leave to appeal should not be granted.

38 I am supported in this conclusion by similar cases before the British Columbia Court of Appeal, *Sparling v. Northwest Digital Ltd.* (1991), 47 C.P.C. (2d) 124 (B.C. C.A.) and *Galcor*, *supra*.

39 In *Sparling*, a company sought to restructure its financial basis and called a special meeting of shareholders. A court order permitted the voting of certain shares at the shareholders' meeting. A director sought to appeal that order. On the basis of the initial order, the meeting was held, the shares were voted and some significant changes to the company occurred as a result. Hollinrake, J.A. for the court described these as substantial changes which are irreversible. He found that the appeal was moot because there was no longer a live controversy. After considering *Borowski*, he also concluded that the court should not exercise its discretion to depart from the usual practice of declining to hear moot appeals.

40 In *Galcor*, as stated earlier, an order authorizing the distribution of certain monies to limited partners was appealed. A stay was sought but the application was dismissed. An injunction to restrain the distribution of monies was also sought and refused. The monies were distributed. The B.C. Court of Appeal held there was no merit, no substance and no

prospective benefit to the appellants nor could they find any merit in the argument that there would be a collateral advantage if the appeal were heard and allowed. None of the criteria in *Borowski* were of assistance as there was no issue of public importance and no precedent value to other cases. Gibbs, J.A. was of the opinion it would not be prudent to use judicial time to hear a moot case as the rationing of scarce judicial resources was of importance and concern to the court.

APPLICATION OF THE CRITERIA FOR LEAVE

41 In any event, consideration of the usual factors in granting leave to appeal does not result in the granting of leave.

42 In particular, the applicant has not established *prima facie* meritorious grounds. The issue in the proposed appeal must be whether the learned chambers judge erred in determining that the Plan was fair and reasonable. As discussed in *Resurgence No. 1*, regard must be given to the standard of review this Court would apply on appeal when considering a leave application. The applicant has been unable to point to an error on a question of law, or an overriding and palpable error in the findings of fact, or an error in the learned chambers judge's exercise of discretion.

43 Resurgence submits that serious and arguable grounds surround the following issues: (a) Should Resurgence be treated as an unaffected creditor under the Plan? and (b) Should the Plan have been sanctioned under s. 6 of the *CCAA*? The applicant cannot show that either issue is based on an appealable error.

44 On the second issue, the main argument of the applicant is that the learned chambers judge failed to appreciate that the vote in favour of the Plan was not fair. At bottom, most of the submissions Resurgence made on this issue are directed at the learned chambers judge's conclusion that shareholders and creditors of Canadian would not be better off in bankruptcy than under the Plan. To appeal this conclusion, based on the findings of fact and exercise of discretion, Resurgence must establish that it has a *prima facie* meritorious argument that the learned chambers judge's error was overriding and palpable, or created an unreasonable result. This, it has not done.

45 Resurgence also argues that the acceptance of the valuations given by the Monitor to certain assets, in particular, Canadian Regional Airlines Limited ("CRAL"), the pension surplus and the international routes was in error. The Monitor did not attribute value to these assets when it prepared the liquidation analysis. Resurgence argued that the learned chambers judge erred when she held that the Monitor was justified in making these omissions.

46 Resurgence argued that CRAL was worth as much as $260 million to Air Canada. The Monitor valued CRAL on a distressed sale basis. It assumed that without CAIL's national

and international network to feed traffic and considering the negative publicity which the failure of CAIL would cause, CRAL would immediately stop operations.

47 The learned chambers judge found that there was no evidence of a potential purchaser for CRAL. She held that CRAL had a value to CAIL and could provide value of Air Canada, but this was attributable to CRAL's ability to feed traffic to and take traffic from the national and international service of CAIL. She held that the Monitor properly considered these factors. The $260 million dollar value was based on CRAL as a going concern which was a completely different scenario than a liquidation analysis. She accepted the liquidation analysis on the basis that if CAIL were to cease operations, CRAL would be obliged to do so as well and that would leave no going concern for Air Canada to acquire.

48 CRAL may have some value, but even assuming that, Resurgence has not shown that it has a *prima facie* meritorious argument that the learned chambers judge committed an overriding and palpable error in finding that the Monitor was justified in concluding CRAL would not have any value assuming a windup of CAIL. She found that there was no evidence of a market for CRAL as a going concern. Her preference for the liquidation analysis was a proper exercise of her discretion and cannot be said to have been unreasonable.

49 Resurgence also argued that the pension plan surplus must be given value and included in the liquidation analysis because the surplus may revert to the company depending upon the terms of the plan. There was some evidence that in the two pension plans, with assets over $2 billion, there may be a surplus of $40 million. The Monitor attributed no value because of concerns about contingent liabilities which made the true amount of any available surplus indefinite and also because of the uncertainty of the entitlement of Canadian to any such amount.

50 The learned chambers judge found that no basis had been established for any surplus being available to be withdrawn from an ongoing pension plan. She also found that the evidence showed the potential for significant contingencies. Upon termination of the plan, further reductions for contingent benefits payable in accordance with the plans, any wind up costs, contribution holidays and litigation costs would affect a determination of whether there was a true surplus. The evidence before the learned chambers judge included that of the unionized employees who expected to dispute all the calculations of the pension plan surplus and the entitlement to the surplus. The learned chambers judge observed also that the surplus could quickly disappear with relatively minor changes in the market value of the securities held or in the calculation of liabilities. She concluded that given all variables, the existence of any surplus was doubtful at best and held that ascribing a zero value was reasonable in the circumstances.

51 In addition to the evidence upon which the learned chambers judge based her conclusion, she is also supported by the case law which demonstrates that even if a pension surplus existed and was accessible, entitlement is a complex question: *Schmidt v. Air Products of Canada Ltd.*, [1994] 2 S.C.R. 611 (S.C.C.).

52 Resurgence argued that the international routes of Canadian should have been treated as valuable assets. The Monitor took the position that the international routes were unassignable licences in control of the Government of Canada and not property rights to be treated as assets by the airlines. Resurgence argues that the Monitor's conclusion was wrong because there was evidence that the international routes had value. In December 1999, CAIL sold its Toronto - Tokyo route to Air Canada for $25 million. Resurgence also pointed to statements made by Canadian's former president and CEO in mid-1999 that the value of its international routes was $2 billion. It further noted that in the United States, where the government similarly grants licences to airlines for international routes, many are bought and sold.

53 The learned chambers judge found the evidence indicated that the $25 million paid for the Toronto-Tokyo route was not an amount derived from a valuation but was the amount CAIL needed for its cash flow requirements at the time of the transaction in order to survive. She found that the statements that CAIL's international routes were worth $2 billion reflected the amount CAIL needed to sustain liquidity without its international routes and was not the market value of what could realistically be obtained from an arm's length purchaser. She found there was no evidence of the existence of an arm's length purchaser. As the respondents pointed out, the Canadian market cannot be compared to the United States. Here in Canada, there is no other airline which would purchase international routes, except Air Canada. Air Canada argued that it is pure speculation to suggest it would have paid for the routes when it could have obtained the routes in any event if Canadian went into liquidation.

54 Even accepting Resurgence's argument that those assets should have been given some value, the applicant has not established a *prima facie* meritorious argument that the learned chambers judge was unreasonable to have accepted the valuations based on a liquidation analysis rather than a market value or going concern analysis nor that she lacked any evidence upon which to base her conclusions. She found that the evidence was overwhelming that all other options had been exhausted and have resulted in failure. As described above, she had evidence upon which to accept the Monitor's valuations of the disputed assets. It is not the role of this Court to review the evidence and substitute its opinion for that of the learned chambers judge. She properly exercised her discretion and she had evidence upon which to support her conclusions. The applicant, therefore, has not established that its appeal is *prima facie* meritorious.

55 On the first issue, Resurgence argues that it should be an unaffected creditor to pursue its oppression remedy. As discussed above, the oppression remedy cannot be considered outside the context of the *CCAA* proceedings. The learned chambers judge concluded that the complaints of Resurgence were the result of the insolvency of Canadian and not from any oppressive conduct. The applicant has not established any *prima facie* error committed by the learned chambers judge in reaching that conclusion.

56 Thus, were this appeal not moot, leave would not be granted as the applicant has not met the threshold for leave to appeal.

CONCLUSION

57 The application for leave to appeal is dismissed because it is moot, and in any event, no serious and arguable grounds have been established upon which to found the basis for granting leave.

Application dismissed.

End of Document

2001 ABCA 9
Alberta Court of Appeal

Canadian Airlines Corp., Re

2000 CarswellAlta 1556, 2001 ABCA 9, [2001] 4 W.W.R. 1, [2001] A.W.L.D. 132, 242 W.A.C. 179, 277 A.R. 179, 88 Alta. L.R. (3d) 8

Resurgence Asset Management LLC (Appellant)and Canadian Airlines Corporation and Canadian Airlines International Ltd. (Respondents)

Conrad, McFadyen, O'Leary JJ.A.

Judgment: December 15, 2000
Docket: Calgary Appeal 18901

Proceedings: affirming [2000] 10 W.W.R. 269 (Alta. Q.B.); refused leave to appeal [2000] 10 W.W.R. 314 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers])

Counsel: *D.R. haigh, Q.C.*, *D.S. Nishimura* and *A. Campbell*, for Appellant.
A.L. Friend, Q.C., *S. Dunphy (Air Canada)* and *L.A. Goldbach*, for Respondents.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

APPEAL by investment corporation from order reported at [2000] 10 W.W.R. 314, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 52, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 46, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 86, 266 A.R. 131, 228 W.A.C. 131, 2000 ABCA 238 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]), dismissing application for leave to appeal judgment reported at [2000] 10 W.W.R. 269, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 41, 265 A.R. 201, 2000 ABQB 442 (Alta. Q.B.), approving plan of arrangement of airline.

***Conrad J.A.* (orally):**

1 We have reached a decision in this matter. The decision is unanimous and will be delivered by Madam Justice McFadyen.

***McFadyen J.A.* (orally):**

2 In our view, the *Weststar* decision of the Supreme Court of Canada adopted the reasoning of Chief Justice McEachern. In turn, his decision was based on the provisions of the British Columbia *Court of Appeal Act* as they existed at the time. Section 9(7) permitted the Court to vary or discharge any order made by a single judge of the Court. In other words, the British

Columbia legislation gave jurisdiction to the British Columbia Court of Appeal to review *all* decisions of the single judge, including leave orders.

3 In Alberta, Rule 516 provides that the Court may vary orders made by single judges on matters which are incidental to an appeal. Without commenting on the meaning of that phrase, we are of the view that matters incidental to an appeal do not include leave and our Court has consistently held that to be the case.

4 In our view, there is no jurisdiction in Alberta to review the decision of a single judge refusing leave to appeal.

***Conrad J.A.* (orally):**

5 In keeping with the practice that has developed with these parties, the Court orders that there will be no costs of this appeal.

Appeal dismissed.

End of Document

2001 CarswellAlta 888
Supreme Court of Canada

Canadian Airlines Corp., Re

2001 CarswellAlta 888, 2001 CarswellAlta 889, [2001] S.C.C.A. No. 60, 257 W.A.C. 351 (note), 275 N.R. 386 (note), 293 A.R. 351 (note)

Resurgence Asset Management LLC v. Canadian Airlines Corporation and Canadian Airlines International Ltd.

Bastarache J., Iacobucci J., McLachlin C.J.C.

Judgment: July 13, 2001
Docket: 28388

Proceedings: Leave to appeal refused (2000), 2001 ABCA 9, 2000 CarswellAlta 1556, [2001] 3 W.W.R. 1, 277 A.R. 179, 242 W.A.C. 179 (Alta. C.A.); Affirmed 2000 ABCA 238, 2000 CarswellAlta 919, [2000] 10 W.W.R. 314, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 46, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 52, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 86, 266 A.R. 131, 228 W.A.C. 131 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]); Leave to appeal refused 2000 ABQB 442, 2000 CarswellAlta 662, [2000] 10 W.W.R. 269, 20 C.B.R. (4th) 1, 84 Alta. L.R. (3d) 9, 9 B.L.R. (3d) 41, 265 A.R. 201 (Alta. Q.B.)

Counsel: None given.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

Bastarache J., Iacobucci J., McLachlin C.J.C.:

1 The application for leave to appeal is dismissed with costs.

End of Document

TAB 9

Paras 14, 17-18, 20, 31

2000 CarswellAlta 623
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Canadian Airlines Corp., Re

2000 CarswellAlta 623, [2000] A.W.L.D. 642, [2000] A.J. No. 1693, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 12

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

In the Matter of the Business Corporations Act (Alberta) S.A. 1981, c. B-15, As Amended, Section 185

In the Matter of Canadian Airlines Corporation and Canadian Airlines International Ltd.

Paperny J.

Judgment: May 12, 2000 *
Docket: Calgary 0001-05071

Proceedings: refused leave to appeal *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 2000 ABCA 149, 80 Alta. L.R. (3d) 213 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers])

Counsel: *A.L. Friend, Q.C.*, *H.M. Kay, Q.C.*, and *R.B. Low, Q.C.*, for Canadian Airlines.
V.P. Lalonde and *Ms M. Lalonde*, for AMR Corporation.
S. Dunphy, for Air Canada.
P.T. McCarthy, Q.C., for PricewaterhouseCoopers.
D. Nishimura, for Resurgence Asset Management LLC.
E. Halt, for Claims Officer.
A.J. McConnell, for Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company of New York and Montreal Trust Co. of Canada.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

APPLICATION by unsecured creditors of corporation for order that unsecured claims held by Air Canada should be placed in separate class from other unsecured creditors, and for order striking portion of reorganization plan.

***Paperny J.* (orally):**

1 Resurgence Asset Management LLC "Resurgence" appeared on behalf of holders of approximately 60 percent of the unsecured notes issued by Canadian Airlines Corporation in the total amount of $100 million U.S. These unsecured note holders are proposed to be classified as unsecured creditors in the plan that is the subject of these proceedings.

2 Resurgence applied for the following relief:

1. An order lifting the stay of proceedings against Canadian Airlines Corporation and Canadian Airlines International Ltd. (respectively "CAC" and "CAIL" and collectively called "Canadian") to permit Resurgence to commence and proceed with an oppression action against Canadian, Air Canada and others.

2. Further, and in the alternative, Resurgence sought the same relief described in item one above in the context of the C.C.A.A. proceedings.

3. An order that any and all unsecured claims held or controlled, directly or indirectly by Air Canada shall be placed in a separate class and either not allowed to be voted at all, or, alternatively, allowed to be voted in separate class from all other affected unsecured claims.

4. An order that there be a separation in class between creditors of CAC and CAIL

5. An order striking Section 6.2(2)(ii) of the plan on the basis that it is contrary to the C.C.A.A.

3 Resurgence abandoned the application described in item 1 above, and the application in item 2 was addressed in my ruling given May 8, 2000, in these proceedings.

Standing

4 Prior to dealing with the remaining issues of classification, voting and Section 6.2(2)(ii) of the plan, the issue of standing needs to be addressed. This was a matter of some debate, largely in the context of the first two applications. Canadian argued that Resurgence was only a fund manager and did not hold the unsecured notes, beneficially or otherwise, and, accordingly, did not have standing to make any of the applications. The evidence establishes that Resurgence is not the legal owner and the evidence of beneficial ownership is equivocal.

5 Canadian has not raised this issue on any of the previous occasions on which Resurgence has been before the court in these proceedings. There has been a consent order involving Resurgence and Canadian.

6 In my view, it is not appropriate now for Canadian to suggest that Resurgence does not represent the interests of the holders of 60 percent of the unsecured notes and essentially seek a declaration that Resurgence is a stranger to these proceedings.

7 I am not prepared to dismiss the applications of Resurgence on classification, voting and amending the plan out of hand on the basis of standing.

8 Resurgence was also supported in these applications by the senior secured note holders. For the purposes of these applications, I accept that Resurgence is representing the interests of 60 percent of the unsecured note holders.

Classification of Air Canada's Unsecured Claim

9 By my April 14, 2000 order in these proceedings, I approved transactions involving CAIL, a large number of aircraft lessors and Air Canada, which achieved approximately $200 million worth of concessions for CAIL. In exchange for granting the concession, each creditor received a guarantee from Air Canada and the assurance that the creditor would immediately cease to be affected by the C.C.A.A. proceedings.

10 These concessions or deficiency claims were quantified and reflected in promissory notes which were assigned to Air Canada in exchange for its guarantee of the aircraft leases. The monitor approved the method of quantifying these claims and recognized the value of the concessions to Canadian. In that order I reserved the issue of classification and voting to be determined at some later date. The plan provides for two classes of creditors, secured and unsecured.

11 The unsecured class is composed of a number of types of unsecured claims, including aircraft financings, executory contracts, unsecured notes, litigation claims, real estate leases and the deficiencies, if any, of the senior secured note holders.

12 In one portion of the application, Resurgence seeks to have Air Canada vote the promissory notes in separate class and relied on several factors to distinguish the claims of other Affected, Unsecured Creditors from Air Canada's unsecured claim, including the following:

1. The Air Canada appointed board caused Canadian to enter into these C.C.A.A. proceedings under which Air Canada stands to gain substantial benefits in its own operations and in the merged operations and ownership contemplated after the compromise of debts under the plan.

2. Air Canada is providing the fund of money to be distributed to the Affected Unsecured Creditors and will, therefore, end up paying itself a portion of that money if it is included in the Affected Unsecured Creditors' class and permitted to vote.

3. Air Canada gave no real consideration in acquiring the deficiency claims and manufactured them only to secure a 'yes' vote.

13 Air Canada and Canadian argue that the legal right associated with Air Canada's unsecured promissory notes and with the other Affected, Unsecured Claims, are the same and that the matters raised by Resurgence, as relating to classification, are really matters of fairness, more appropriately dealt with at the fairness hearing. Air Canada and Canadian emphasized that classification must be determined according to the rights of the creditors, not their personalities.

14 The starting point in determining classification is the statute under which the parties are operating and from which the court obtains its jurisdiction. The primary purpose of the C.C.A.A. is to facilitate the re-organization of insolvent companies, and this goal must be given proper consideration at every stage of the C.C.A.A. process, including classification of claims; see, for example, *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 20 (Alta. Q.B.)

15 Beyond identifying secured and unsecured classes, the C.C.A.A. does not offer any guidance to the classification of claims. The process, instead, has developed in the case law.

16 A frequently cited description of the method of classification of creditors for the purposes of voting on a plan, under the C.C.A.A., is *Sovereign Life Assurance Co. v Dodd* (1891), [1892] 2 Q.B. 573 (Eng. C.A.).

17 At page 583 (Q.B.), Bowen, L.J. stated:

> The word 'class' is vague and to find out what is meant by it, we must look at the scope of the section which is a section enabling the court to order a meeting of a class of creditors to be called. It seems plain that we must give such a meaning to the term 'class' as will prevent the section being so worked as to result in confiscation and injustice, and that it must be confined to those persons whose rights are not so dissimilar as to make it impossible for them to consult together with the view to their common interest.

This test has been described as the "commonality of interest" test. All counsel agree that this is the test to apply in classification of claims under the C.C.A.A. However, there is a dispute on the types of interests that are to be considered in determining commonality.

18 Generally, the cases hold that classification is a fact-driven determination unique to the circumstances of every case, upon which the court should be loathe to impose rules for universal application, particularly in light of the flexible and remedial jurisdiction involved; see, for example, *Re Fairview Industries Ltd.* (1991), 11 C.B.R. (3d) 71 (N.S. T.D.)

19 The majority of the cases presented to me, held that commonality of the interest is to be determined by the rights the creditor has vis-a-vis the debtor. Courts have also found it helpful to consider the context of the proposed plan and treatment of creditors under a liquidation scenario. In the absence of bad faith, motivation for supporting or rejecting a plan is not a classification issue in the authorities.

20 In considering what interests are included in the commonality of interest test, Forsyth J., in *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd.* (Supra) had to determine whether all the secured creditors of the company ought to be included in one class. The creditors all had first-charge security and the same method of valuation was applied to each secured claim in order to determine security value under the plan. The distinguishing features were submitted to be based on the difference in the security held, including ease of marketability and realization potential. In holding that a separate class was not necessary, Forsyth J., said at page 29:

> Different security positioning and changing security values are a fact of life in the world of secured financing. To accept this argument would again result in a different class of creditor for each secured lender.

In doing so, Forsyth J. rejected the "identity of the interest" approach in which creditors in a class must have identical interests.

21 It was also submitted in *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd.* that since the purchaser under the plan had made financing arrangements with the Royal Bank, the bank had an interest not shared by the other secured creditors. Forsyth J., held that in the absence of any allegation that the Royal Bank was not acting bona fide in considering the benefit of the plan, the secured creditors could not be heard to criticize the presence of the Royal Bank in their class.

22 Forsyth J., also emphasized in *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd.* that the commonality test cannot be considered without also considering the underlying purpose of the C.C.A.A., which is to facilitate reorganizations of insolvent companies. To that end, the court should not approve a classification scheme which would make a reorganization difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. At the same time, while the C.C.A.A. grants the court the authority to alter the legal rights of parties other than the debtor company without their consent, the court will not permit a confiscation of rights or an injustice to occur.

23 The *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd.* approach was specifically adopted in British Columbia in *Northland Properties Ltd. v. Excelsior Life Insurance Co. of Canada* (1989), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 195 (B.C. C.A.), where it was held that various mortgagees with different mortgages against different properties were included in the same class.

24 In *Savage v. Amoco Acquisition Co.* (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 154 (Alta. C.A.) the Alberta Court of Appeal rejected the argument that shareholders who have private arrangements with the applicant or who are brokers or officers or otherwise in a special position vis-a-vis the debtor company, should be put in a special category.

25 At page 158 the court stated in regard to the test applied to classification:

> We do not think that this rule justifies the division of shareholders into separate classes on the basis of their presumed prior commitment to a point of view. The state of facts, common to all, is that they are all offered this proposal, face as an alternative the break-up of this apparently insolvent company and hold shares that appear to be worthless on break-up. In any event, any attempt to divide them on the basis suggested, would be futile. One would have as many groups as there are shareholders.

The commonality of interest test was addressed by the British Columbia Supreme Court in *Re Woodward's Ltd.* (1993), 84 B.C.L.R. (2d) 206 (B.C. S.C.). Tysoe J. rejected the identity of interest approach and held that it was permissible to include creditors with different legal rights in the same class, so long as their legal rights were not so dissimilar that it was still possible for them to vote with a common interest.

26 Tysoe J. went on to find that legal interests should be considered in the context of the proposed plan and that it was also necessary to examine the legal rights of creditors in the context of the possible failure of the plan.

27 In other words, "interest" for the purpose of classification does not include the personality or identity of the creditor, and the interests it may have in the broader commercial sphere that might influence its decision or predispose it to vote in a particular way; rather, "interest" involves the entitlement of the debt holder viewed within the context of the provisions of the proposed plan. In that regard, see *Woodward's Ltd.* at page 212.

28 In *Fairview Industries Ltd.* , the court held that in classification there need not be a commonality of interest of debts involved, so long as the legal interests were the same. Justice Glube (as she then was) stated that it did not automatically follow that those with different commercial interests, for example, those with security on "quick" assets, are necessarily in conflict with those with security on "fixed" assets. She stated that just saying there is a conflict is insufficient to warrant separation.

29 In *Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1991), 86 D.L.R. (4th) 621 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at 626 like *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd.*, the "identity of interests" approach was rejected. The court preserved a class of creditors which included debenture holders, terminated employees, realty lessors and equipment lessors.

30 Borins J. held that not every difference in the nature of the debt warrants a separate class and that in placing a broad and purposive interpretation on the C.C.A.A., the court should "take care to resist approaches which would potentially jeopardize a potentially viable plan." He observed that "excessive fragmentation is counterproductive to the legislative intent to facilitate corporate reorganization" and that it would be "improper to create a special class simply for the benefit of an opposing creditor which would give that creditor the potential to exercise an unwarranted degree of power." (p. 627).

31 In summary, the cases establish the following principles applicable to assessing commonality of interest:

1. Commonality of interest should be viewed on the basis of the non-fragmentation test, not on an identity of interest test;

2. The interests to be considered are the legal interests the creditor holds qua creditor in relationship to the debtor company, prior to and under the plan as well as on liquidation;

3. The commonality of these interests are to be viewed purposively, bearing in mind the object of the C.C.A.A., namely to facilitate reorganizations if at all possible;

4. In placing a broad and purposive interpretation on the C.C.A.A., the court should be careful to resist classification approaches which would potentially jeopardize potentially viable plans.

5. Absent bad faith, the motivations of the creditors to approve or disapprove are irrelevant.

6. The requirement of creditors being able to consult together means being able to assess their legal entitlement *as creditors* before or after the plan in a similar manner.

32 With this background, I will make several observations relating to the reasons asserted by Resurgence that distinguish Air Canada from the rest of the Affected Unsecured Creditors.

33 The first two reasons given relate to interests of Air Canada extraneous to its legal rights as a unsecured creditor. The third reason relates largely to the further assertion that

Air Canada should not be allowed to vote at all. The matter of voting is addressed more specifically later in these reasons.

34 The factors described by Resurgence distinguish between Air Canada and other unsecured creditors relate largely to the fact that Air Canada is the assignee of the unsecured debt. In my view, that approach is to be discouraged at the classification stage. To require the court to consider who holds the claim, as distinct from what they hold, at that point would be untenable. I note that Mr. Edwards recognizes in 1947 in his article, "*Reorganizations under the Companies Creditors Arrangement Act*", (1947), 25 Cdn. Bar Rev. 587, and observe this concern is heightened in the current commercial reality of debt trading.

35 Resurgence also asserted that a court should avoid placing creditors with a potential conflict of interest in the same class and relies on *Re NsC Diesel Power Inc.* (1990), 79 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1 (N.S. T.D.), a case in which the court considered a potential conflict of interest between subcontractors and direct contractors. To the extent this case can be seen as decided on the basis of the distinct legal rights of the creditors, I agree with the result. To the extent that the case determined that a class could be separated based on a conflict of interest not based on legal right, I disagree. In my view, this would be the sort of issue the court should consider at the fairness hearing.

36 Resurgence also relied on the decisions of the British Columbia Supreme Court in *Re Northland Properties Ltd.* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 166 (B.C. S.C.), a case decided prior to *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd.*. In that case the court held that a subsidiary wholly owned by Northland Bank was incorporated to purchase certain bonds from Northland in exchange for preferred shares and was not entitled to vote. The court found that would be tantamount to Northland Bank voting in its own reorganization and relied on *Re Wellington Building Corp.*, [1934] O.R. 653, 16 C.B.R. 48 (Ont. S.C.) In this regard. I would note that the passage relied upon at page 5 in that case, in *Wellington Building Corp* (Supra) dealt with whether the scheme, as proposed, was unfair.

37 All creditors proposed to be included in the class of Affected, Unsecured Creditors, are all unsecured and are treated the same under the plan. All would be treat similarly under the BIA. The plan provides that they will receive 12 cents on the dollar. The Monitor opined that in liquidation unsecured creditors would realize a maximum of 3 cents on the dollar. Their legal interests are essentially the same. Issue is taken with the presence of Air Canada, supporter and funder of the plan, also having taken an assignment of a substantial, unsecured claim. However, absent bad faith, who creditors are is not relevant. Air Canada's mere presence in the class does not in and of itself constitute bad faith.

38 Further, all of these methods of distinguishing Air Canada's unsecured claim at their core are fundamentally issues of fairness which will be addressed by the Court at the fairness

hearing on June 5, 2000. I am prepared to give serious consideration to these matters at that time and direct that there be a separate tabulation of the votes cast by Air Canada arising from any assignments of promissory notes they have taken, so that there is an evidentiary record to assist me in assessing the fairness of the vote when and if I am called upon to sanction the plan. This approach was taken by Justice Forsyth in *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd.*, and in my view is consistent with the underlying purpose of the C.C.A.A. I wish to emphasize that the concerns raised by Resurgence will form part of the assessment of the overall fairness of the plan.

39 Permitting the classification to remain intact for voting purposes will not result in a confiscation of rights of or injustice to the unsecured note holders. Their treatment does not at this point depart from any other Affected Unsecured Creditors and recognizes the similarity of legal rights. Although based on different legal instruments, the legal rights of the unsecured note holders and Air Canada are essentially the same. Neither has security, nor specific entitlement to assets. Further, the ability of all of the Affected Unsecured Creditors to realize their claims against the debtor companies, depend in significant part, on the company's ability to continue as a going concern.

40 The separate tabulation of votes will allow the "voice" of unsecured creditors to be heard, while at the same time, permit rather than rule out the possibility that a plan might proceed.

41 It is important to preserve this possibility in the interests of facilitating the aim of the C.C.A.A. and protecting interests of all constituents. To fracture the class prior to the vote, may have the effect of denying the court jurisdiction to consider sanctioning a plan which may pass the fairness test but which has been rejected by one creditor. This would be contrary to the purpose of the C.C.A.A.

Separating the Claims Against CAC and CAIL

42 Resurgence briefly argued that since Air Canada's debt is owed by CAIL only, it could only look to CAIL's assets in a bankruptcy and would not be able to look to any CAC assets. In contrast, Resurgence suggested that the unsecured note holders are creditors of both CAIL under a guarantee, and CAC under the notes. Resurgence submitted that the resulting difference in legal rights destroys the commonality of interests.

43 There is insufficient evidence to suggest that the unsecured note holders are also creditors of CAIL. Counsel referred only to a statement made by Mr. Carty on cross-examination that there was an "unsecured guarantee". However, no documents have been brought to my attention that would support this statement and, in of itself, the statement is not determinative. In any case, I do not have sufficient evidence before me to conclude that there would be a meaningful difference in recoveries for unsecured creditors of CAC and

CAIL in the event of bankruptcy. I, therefore, cannot conclude on this basis that rights are being confiscated, unlike Tysoe J.'s ability to do so in *Re Woodward's Ltd.* Simply looking to different assets or pools of assets will not alone fracture a class; some unique additional legal right of value in liquidation going unrecognized in a plan and not balanced by others losing rights as well is needed on the analysis of Tysoe J.

44 I recognize the struggle between the unsecured note holders, represented by Resurgence on one side, and Air Canada and Canadian on the other. Resurgence fears the inclusion of Air Canada and the Affected Unsecured Creditors' class will swamp the vote. Air Canada and Canadian fear that exclusion of Air Canada will result in the voting down of a plan which, in their view, otherwise stands a realistic chance of approval. As unsecured creditors, they do share similar legal rights. As supporters or opponents of the plan, they may well have distinctly different financial or strategic interests. I believe that in the circumstances of this case, these other interests and their impact on the plan, are best addressed as matters of fairness at the June 5, 2000 hearing, and in this way, the concerns will be heard by the court without necessarily putting an end to the entire process.

Voting

45 Although my decision on classification makes it clear that I will permit Air Canada to vote on the plan, I wish to comment further on this issue. Air Canada submitted that it should be entitled to vote the face value of the promissory notes which represent deficiency claims assigned to it from aircraft lessors in the same fashion as any other creditor who has acquired the claims by assignment. All parties accept that deficiency claims such as these would normally be included and voted upon in an unsecured claims class. The request by Resurgence to deny them a vote would have the effect of varying rights associated with those notes.

46 The concessions achieved in the re-negotiation of the aircraft leases, represent value to CAIL. The methodology of calculation of the claims and their valuation was reviewed by the Monitor and this is not being challenged. Rather, it is because it is Air Canada that now holds them, that it is objectionable to Resurgence. Resurgence asserts that Air Canada manufactured the assignment so it could preserve a 'yes' vote. This, in my view, is a matter going to fairness. Is it fair for Air Canada to vote to share in the pool of cash funded by it for the benefit of unsecured creditors? That matter is best resolved at the fairness hearing.

47 Resurgence relied on *Northland Properties Ltd.* in which a wholly owned subsidiary of the debtor company was not allowed to vote because to do so would amount to the debtor company voting in its own reorganization. The corporate relationship between Air Canada and CAIL can be distinguished from the parent and wholly owned subsidiary in *Northland Properties Ltd.*. Air Canada is not CAIL's parent and owns 10 percent of a

numbered company which owns 82 percent of CAIL. Further, as noted above, the court in *Northland Properties Ltd.* apparently relied on the passage from *Wellington Building Corp* which indicated in that case the court was being asked to approve a plan as fair. Again, the basis on which Resurgence seeks to deprive Air Canada of its vote is really an issue of fairness.

Section 6(2)(2) of the Plan

48 Resurgence wishes me to strike out Section 6(2)(2) of the plan, which essentially purports to provide a release by affected creditors of all claims based in whole or in part on any act, omission transaction, event or occurrence that took place prior to the effective date in any way relating to the debtor companies and subsidiaries, the C.C.A.A. proceeding or the plan against:

1. The debtor companies and its subsidiaries;

2. The directors, officers and employees;

3. The former directors, officers and employees of the debtor companies and its subsidiaries; or

4. The respective current and former professionals of the entities, including the Monitor, its counsel and its current officers and directors, et cetera. Resurgence submits that this provision constitutes a wholesale release of directors and others which is beyond that permitted by Section 5.1 of the C.C.A.A. CAIL and CAC submit that the proposed release was not intended to preclude rights expressly preserved by the statute and are prepared to amend the plan to state this.

49 Section 5.1(3) of the C.C.A.A. provides that the court may declare that a claim against directors shall not be compromised if it is satisfied that the compromise would not be fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

50 In this application of Resurgence, the court must deal with two issues: One, what releases are permitted under the statute; and, two, what releases ought to be permitted, if any, under the plan.

51 In my view, I will be in a better position to assess the fairness of the proposed compromise of claims which is drafted in extremely broad terms, when I consider the other issues of fairness raised by Resurgence. Accordingly, I leave that matter to the fairness hearing as well.

52 In summary, the application contained in paragraph (d) of the Resurgence Notice of Motion is dismissed. The application in paragraph (e) is adjourned to June 5, 2000.

Application dismissed.

Footnotes

* Leave to appeal refused 2000 ABCA 149, 80 Alta L.R. (3d) 213, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 33 (Alta C.A. [In Chambers]).

End of Document

2000 ABCA 149
Alberta Court of Appeal [In Chambers]

Canadian Airlines Corp., Re

2000 CarswellAlta 503, 2000 ABCA 149, [2000] A.W.L.D. 563, [2000] A.J. No. 610, 19 C.B.R. (4th) 33, 225 W.A.C. 120, 261 A.R. 120, 80 Alta. L.R. (3d) 213, 97 A.C.W.S. (3d) 844

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended

In the Matter of the Business Corporations Act (Alberta) S.A. 1981, c.B-15., as amended, Section 185

In the Matter of Canadian Airlines Corporation and Canadian Airlines International Ltd.

Resurgence Asset Management LLC, Applicant and Canadian Airlines Corporation and Canadian Airlines International Ltd., Respondents

Wittmann J.A.

Heard: May 18, 2000
Judgment: May 29, 2000
Docket: Calgary Appeal 00-18816

Proceedings: (May 12, 2000), Doc. Calgary 0001-05071 [Alta. Q.B.]

Counsel: *D. Haigh, Q.C.*, and *D. Nishimura*, for Applicant.
A.L. Friend, Q.C., and *H.M. Kay, Q.C.*, for Respondents.
S. Dunphy, for Air Canada.
A.J. McConnell, for Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company of New York and Montreal Trust Co. of Canada.
P.T. McCarthy, Q.C., for Price Waterhouse Coopers.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

APPLICATION for leave to appeal from judgment reported at (2000), 19 C.B.R. (4th) 12 (Alta. Q.B.).

Memorandum of decision. *Wittmann J.A.*:

Introduction

1 This is an application for leave to appeal the decision of Paperny, J. made on May 12, 2000, pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (*CCAA*). The applicant, Resurgence Asset Management LLC (Resurgence), is an unsecured creditor by virtue of its holding 58.2 per cent of U.S. $100,000,000.00 unsecured notes issued by Canadian Airlines Corporation (CAC)

2 CAC and Canadian Airlines International Ltd. (CAIL) (collectively Canadian) commenced proceedings under the *CCAA* on March 24, 2000.

3 A proposed Plan of Compromise and Arrangement (the Plan) has been filed in this matter regarding CAC and CAIL, pursuant to the CCAA.

4 The decision of Paperny, J. May 12, 2000 (the Decision) ordered, among other things, that the classification of creditors not be fragmented to exclude Air Canada as a separate class from Resurgence in terms of the unsecured creditors; that Air Canada should be entitled to vote on the Plan pursuant to s. 6 of the *CCAA* at the creditors' meeting to be held May 26, 2000; that there be no separation of unsecured creditors of CAC from unsecured creditors of CAIL for voting purposes; and that votes in respect of claims assigned to Air Canada, be recorded and tabulated separately, for the purpose of consideration in the application for court approval of the Plan (the Fairness Hearing).

Leave to Appeal Under the CCAA

5 The section of the *CCAA* governing appeals to this Court is as follows:

> 13. Except in the Yukon Territory, any person dissatisfied with an order or a decision made under this Act may appeal therefrom on obtaining leave of the judge appealed from or of the court or a judge of the court to which the appeal lies and on such terms as to security and in other respects as the judge or court directs.

6 The criterion to be applied in an application for leave to appeal pursuant to the *CCAA* is not in dispute. The general criterion is embodied in the concept that there must be serious and arguable grounds that are of real and significant interest to the parties: *Re Multitech Warehouse Direct Inc.* (1995), 32 Alta. L.R. (3d) 62 (Alta. C.A.) at 63; *Re Smoky River Coal Ltd.* (1999), 237 A.R. 83 (Alta. C.A.); *Re Blue Range Resource Corp.* (1999), 244 A.R. 103 (Alta. C.A.); *Re Blue Range Resource Corp.* (2000), 15 C.B.R. (4th) 160 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]); *Re Blue Range Resource Corp.* (2000), 15 C.B.R. (4th) 192 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]).

7 Subsumed in the general criterion are four applicable elements which originated in *Power Consolidated (China) Pulp Inc. v. British Columbia Resources Investment Corp.* (1988), 19 C.P.C. (3d) 396 (B.C. C.A.), and were adopted in *Med Finance Co. S.A. v. Bank of Montreal* (1993), 22 C.B.R. (3d) 279 (B.C. C.A.). McLachlin, J.A. (as she then was) set forth the elements in *Power Consolidated* as follows at p.397:

> (1) whether the point on appeal is of significance to the practice;
>
> (2) whether the point raised is of significance to the action itself;
>
> (3) whether the appeal is *prima facie* meritorious or, on the other hand, whether it is frivolous; and
>
> (4) whether the appeal will unduly hinder the progress of the action.

These elements have been considered and applied by this Court, and were not in dispute before me as proper elements of the applicable criterion.

Facts

8 On or about October 19, 1999, Air Canada announced its intention to make a bid for CAC and to proceed to complete a merger subject to a restructuring of Canadian's debt. On or about November 5, 1999, following a ruling by the Quebec Superior Court, a competing offer by Airline Industry Revitalization Co. Inc. was withdrawn and Air Canada indicated that it would proceed with its offer for CAC.

9 On or about November 11, 1999, Air Canada caused the incorporation of 853350 Alberta Ltd. (853350), for the sole purpose of acquiring the majority of the shares of CAC. At the time of incorporation, Air Canada held 10 per cent of the shares of 853350. Paul Farrar, among others, holds the remaining 90 per cent of the shares of 853350.

10 On or about November 11, 1999, Air Canada, through 853350, offered to purchase the outstanding shares of CAC at a price of $2.00 per share for a total of $92,000,000.00 for all of the issued and outstanding voting and non-voting shares of CAC.

11 On or about January 4, 2000, Air Canada and 853350 acquired 82 per cent of CAC's outstanding common shares for approximately $75,000,000.00 plus the preferred shares of CAIL for a purchase price of $59,000,000.00. Air Canada then replaced the Board of Directors of CAC with its own nominees.

12 Substantially all of the aircraft making up the fleet of Canadian are held by Air Canada through lease arrangements with various lessors or other aircraft financial agencies. These

arrangements were the result of negotiations with lessors, jointly conducted by Air Canada and Canadian.

13 In general, these arrangements include the following:

(i) the leases have been renegotiated to reflect contemporary fair market value (or below) based on two independent desk top valuations; and

(ii) the present value of the difference between the financial terms under the previous lease arrangements and the renegotiated fair market value terms was characterized as "unsecured deficiency," reflected in a Promissory Note payable to the lessor from Canadian and assigned by the lessor to Air Canada.

14 In the result, Air Canada has acquired or is in the process of acquiring all but eight of the deficiency claims of aircraft lessors or financiers listed in Schedule "B" to the Plan in the total amount of $253,506.944.00. Air Canada intends to vote those claims as an unsecured creditor under the Plan.

15 The executory contracts claims listed in Schedule "B" to the Plan total $110,677,000.00, of which $108,907,000.00 is the claim of Loyalty Management Group Canada Inc. (Loyalty), an entity with a long term contract with Canadian to purchase air miles. The claim is subject to an agreement of settlement between Loyalty, Canadian and Air Canada. Air Canada was assigned the Loyalty unsecured claim.

16 In the Plan, all unsecured creditors of both CAC and CAI are grouped in the same class for voting purposes.

17 Pursuant to the Plan, unsecured creditors will receive a payment of $0.12 on the dollar for each $1.00 of their claim unless the total amount of unsecured claims exceeds $800 million, in which case, they will receive less. Air Canada will fund this Pro Rata Cash Amount. As a result of the assignments of the deficiency amounts in favour of Air Canada, if the Plan is approved, Air Canada will notionally be paying a substantial proportion of the Pro Rata Cash Amount to itself.

18 The Plan further contemplates Air Canada becoming the 100 per cent owner of Canadian through 853350.

19 On April 7, 2000, an Order was granted by Paperny, J., directing that the Plan be filed by the Petitioners; establishing a claims dispute process; authorizing the calling of meetings for affected creditors to vote on the Plan to be held on May 26, 2000; authorizing the Petitioners to make application for an Order sanctioning the Plan on June 5, 2000; and providing other directions.

20 The April 7, 2000 Order established three classes of creditors: (a) the holders of Canadian Airlines Corporation 10 per cent Senior Secured Notes due 2005 (the Secured Noteholders); (b) the secured creditors of the Petitioners affected by the Plan (the Affected Secured Creditors); and (c) the unsecured creditors affected by the Plan (the Affected Unsecured Creditors).

21 On April 25, 2000, the Petitioners filed and served the Plan, in accordance with the Order of April 7, 2000. By Notice of Motion dated April 27, 2000, Resurgence brought an application, among other things, seeking "directions as to the classification and voting rights of the creditors ... (and) the quantum of the 'deficiency claims' assigned to Air Canada." Resurgence sought to have Air Canada excluded from voting as an unsecured creditor unless segregated into a separate class. Resurgence also sought to have the holders of the unsecured notes vote as a separate class.

22 The result of the April 27, 2000 motion by Resurgence is the Decision.

The Decision

23 In the Decision, the supervising chambers judge referred to her order of April 14, 2000, wherein she approved transactions involving the re-negotiation of the aircraft leases. She referred to "about $200,000,000.00 worth of concessions for CAIL" as "concessions or deficiency claims" which were quantified and reflected in promissory notes which were assigned to Air Canada in exchange for its guarantee of the aircraft leases. The monitor approved of the method of quantifying the claims and Paperny, J. approved the transactions, reserving the issue of classification and voting to her May 12 Decision.

24 The Plan provides for one class of unsecured creditor. The unsecured class is composed of a number of types of unsecured claims including executory contracts (e.g. Air Canada from Loyalty) unsecured notes (e.g. Resurgence), aircraft leases (e.g. Air Canada from lessors), litigation claims, real estate leases and the deficiencies, if any, of the senior secured noteholders.

25 In seeking to have Air Canada vote the promissory notes in a separate class Resurgence argued several factors before Paperny, J., as set out at pp. 4-5 of the Decision as follows:

> 1. The Air Canada appointed board caused Canadian to enter into these ***CCAA*** proceedings under which Air Canada stands to gain substantial benefits in its own operations and in the merged operations and ownership contemplated after the compromise of debts under the plan.

2. Air Canada is providing the fund of money to be distributed to the Affected Unsecured Creditors and will, therefore, end up paying itself a portion of that money if it is included in the Affected Unsecured Creditors' class and permitted to vote.

3. Air Canada gave no real consideration in acquiring the deficiency claims and manufactured them only to secure a 'yes' vote.

26 She then recited the argument made by Air Canada and Canadian to the effect that the legal rights associated with Air Canada's unsecured claims are the same as those associated with the other affected unsecured claimants, and that the matters raised by Resurgence relating to classification are really matters of fairness more appropriately dealt with in a Fairness Hearing scheduled to be held June 5, 2000.

27 After observing that the *CCAA* offers no guidance with respect to the classification of claims, beyond identifying secured and unsecured categories and the possibility of classes within each category, and that the process has developed in case law, Paperny, J. embarked on a detailed analysis and consideration of the case law in this area including *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.* (1988), 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 20 (Alta. Q.B.); *Sovereign Life Assurance Co. v. Dodd* (1891), [1892] 2 Q.B. 573 (Eng. C.A.); *Re Fairview Industries Ltd.* (1991), 11 C.B.R. (3d) 71 (N.S. T.D.); *Northland Properties Ltd. v. Excelsior Life Insurance Co. of Canada* (1989), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 195 (B.C. C.A.); *Savage v. Amoco Acquisition Co.* (1988), 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 154 (Alta. C.A.); *Re Woodward's Ltd.* (1993), 84 B.C.L.R. (2d) 206 (B.C. S.C.); *Sklar-Peppler Furniture Corp. v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1991), 86 D.L.R. (4th) 621 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at 626; *Re NsC Diesel Power Inc.* (1990), 79 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1 (N.S. T.D.); *Re Wellington Building Corp.*, [1934] O.R. 653, 16 C.B.R. 48 (Ont. S.C.). Paperny, J. also referred to an oft-cited article "Reorganization under the Companies Creditors Arrangement Act" by S. E. Edwards (1947), 25 Can. Bar Rev. 587. She concluded her legal analysis at pp.12-13 by setting forth the principles she found to be applicable in assessing commonality of interest as an appropriate test for the classification of creditors:

1. Commonality of interest should be viewed on the basis of the non-fragmentation test, not on an identity of interest test;

2. The interests to be considered are the legal interests the creditor holds qua creditor in relationship to the debtor company, prior to and under the plan as well as on liquidation;

3. The commonality of these interests are to be viewed purposively, bearing in mind the object of the *CCAA*, namely to facilitate reorganizations if at all possible;

> 4. In placing a broad and purposive interpretation on the *CCAA*, the court should be careful to resist classification approaches which would potentially jeopardize potentially viable plans.
>
> 5. Absent bad faith, the motivations of the creditors to approve or disapprove are irrelevant.
>
> 6. The requirement of creditors being able to consult together means being able to assess their legal entitlement as creditors before or after the plan in a similar manner.

The Standard of Review and Leave Applications

28 The elements of the general criterion cannot be properly considered in a leave application without regard to the standard of review that this Court applies to appeals under the *CCAA*. If leave to appeal were to be granted, the applicable standard of review is succinctly set forth by Fruman, J.A. in *Royal Bank v. Fracmaster Ltd.* (1999), 244 A.R. 93 (Alta. C.A.) where she stated for the Court at p.95:

> .... this is a court of review. It is not our task to reconsider the merits of the various offers and decide which proposal might be best. The decisions made by the Chambers judge involve a good measure of discretion, and are owed considerable deference. Whether or not we agree, we will only interfere if we conclude that she acted unreasonably, erred in principle or made a manifest error.

In another recent *CCAA* case from this Court, *Re Smoky River Coal Ltd.* (1999), 237 A.R. 326 (Alta. C.A.), Hunt, J.A., speaking for the unanimous Court, extensively reviewed the history and purpose of the *CCAA*, and observed at p.341:

> The fact that an appeal lies only with leave of an appellate court (s. 13 *CCAA*) suggests that Parliament, mindful that *CCAA* cases often require quick decision-making, intended that most decisions be made by the supervising judge. This supports the view that those decisions should be interfered with only in clear cases.

29 The standard of review of this Court, in reviewing the *CCAA* decision of the supervising judge, is therefore one of correctness if there is an error of law. Otherwise, for an appellate court to interfere with the decision of the supervising judge, there must be a palpable and overriding error in the exercise of discretion or in findings of fact.

Statutory Provisions

30 The *CCAA* includes provisions defining secured creditor, unsecured creditor, refers to classes of them, and provides for court approval of a plan of compromise or arrangement in the following sections:

2. Interpretation

. . . . .

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

. . . . .

"Unsecured creditor" means any creditor of a company who is not a secured creditor, whether resident or domiciled within or outside Canada, and a trustee for the holders of any unsecured bonds issue under a trust deed or other instrument running in favour of the trustee shall be deemed to be an unsecured creditor for all purposes of this Act except for the purpose of voting at a creditors' meeting in respect of any of those bonds.

Compromises and Arrangements

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

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

. . . . .

6. Where a majority in number representing two-thirds in value of the creditors, or class of creditors, as the case may be, present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or meetings thereof respectively held pursuant to sections 4 and 5, or either of those sections, agree to any compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at the meeting or meetings, the compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by the court, and if so sanctioned is binding

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

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

Classes of Creditors

31 It is apparent from a review of the foregoing sections that division into classes of creditors within the unsecured and secured categories may, in any given case, materially affect the outcome of the vote referenced in section 6. Compliance with section 6 triggers the ability of the court to approve or sanction the Plan and to bind the parties referenced in s. 6(a) and 6(b) of the *CCAA*. In argument before me, it was conceded by the applicant that Resurgence would not have the ability to ensure approval of the Plan by casting its vote if Air Canada were to be excised from the unsecured creditor category into a separate class. Conversely, counsel for Resurgence candidly admitted that Resurgence would effectively have a veto of the Plan if Air Canada were segregated into a separate class of unsecured creditor.

Application of the Criteria for Leave to Appeal

32 The four elements of the general criterion are set out in paragraph [7]. The first and second elements are satisfied in this case. The points raised on appeal are of significance to the action. If Resurgence succeeds, it obtains a veto. If it does not succeed, and it votes as a member of the unsecured creditors class with Air Canada, Air Canada can control the vote of the unsecured creditors.

33 In terms of the points on appeal being of significance to the practice, it may be that an appellate court's views in this province on the classification of unsecured creditors issue is desirable, there being no appellate authority from this Court on this issue. Although I have doubt as to the significance of this element of the general criterion in the context of the facts

of this case, I am prepared for the purposes of this application to treat this element as having being satisfied.

34 The third element is whether the appeal is *prima facie* meritorious or, on the other hand, whether it is frivolous. In my view, the proper interpretation of this element is not a mutually exclusive application of an appeal being either meritorious or frivolous. Rather, the appeal must be *prima facie* meritorious; if it is not *prima facie* meritorious, this element is not satisfied.

35 I find that the appeal on the points raised from the Decision is not *prima facie* meritorious. In the plain ordinary meaning of the words of this element, on first impression, there must appear to be an error in principle of law or a palpable and overriding error of fact. Exercise of discretion by a supervising judge, so long as it is exercised judicially, is not a matter for interference by an appellate court, even if the appellate court were inclined to decide the matter another way. It is precisely this kind of a factor which breathes life into the modifier "*prima facie*" meritorious.

36 I have carefully reviewed all of the cases referred to by the supervising chambers judge and the principles she derived from them. In my view, she made no error in law.

37 In the exercise of her discretion, she decided neither to allow the applicant's motion to excise Air Canada from the unsecured creditors class nor to prohibit Air Canada from voting. She also declined, on the facts established before her, to separate creditors of CAC from creditors of CAIL for voting purposes. She did, however, order that Air Canada's vote be recorded and tabulated and indicated that this will be considered at the Fairness Hearing.

38 It was strenuously argued before me by the applicant, that deferring classification and voting issues to the Fairness Hearing was an error of law or principle in and of itself.

39 The argument was put in terms that if, on a proper classification of unsecured creditors, Air Canada was removed from the unsecured class, and Resurgence vetoed the Plan, the matter of a Fairness Hearing would never arise. While that may be true, it does not follow that there is any error in law in what the supervising judge did. She concluded that the separate tabulation of the votes will allow the voice of the unsecured creditors to be heard, while, at the same time, permit, rather than rule out the possibility, that the Plan might proceed. This approach is consistent with the purpose of the *CCAA* as articulated in many of the authorities in this country.

40 The supervising chambers judge also refused to exclude Air Canada from voting on the basis that the legal rights attached to the notes held by Air Canada were valid. Resurgence argued that because Air Canada had other interests in the outcome of the Plan, it should be excluded from voting as an unsegregated secured creditor. Paperny, J. held that this was an

issue of fairness, as was the fact that Air Canada was really voting on its own reorganization. She did not err in principle. She expressly acknowledged the authorities that, on different facts, either allowed different classes or excluded a vote. See, for example, *Re Woodward's Ltd.* (1993), 84 B.C.L.R. (2d) 206 (B.C. S.C.); *Re Northland Properties Ltd.* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 166 (B.C. S.C.); *Re NsC Diesel Power Inc.* (1990), 79 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1 (N.S. T.D.).

41 The fourth element of the general criterion is whether the appeal will unduly hinder the progress of the action. In other words, will the delay involved in prosecuting, hearing and deciding the appeal be of such length so as to unduly impede the ultimate resolution of the matter by a vote or court sanction? The approach of the supervising judge to the issues raised by the applicant is that its concerns will be seriously addressed at the Fairness Hearing scheduled for June 5, 2000, pursuant to s.6 of the *CCAA*, provided the creditors vote to adopt the Plan.

42 This element has at its root the purpose of the *CCAA*; the role of the supervising judge; the need for a timely and orderly resolution of the matter; and the effect on the interests of all parties pending a decision on appeal. The comments of McFarlane, J.A. in *Re Pacific National Lease Holding Corp.* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 265 (B.C. C.A. [In Chambers]) are particularly apt where he stated as follows at p.272:

> Despite what I have said, there may be an arguable case for the petitioners to present to a panel of this Court on discreet questions of law. But I am of the view that this Court should exercise its powers sparingly when it is asked to intervene with respect to questions which arise under the C.C.A.A. The process of management which the Act has assigned to the trial Court is an ongoing one. In this case a number of orders have been made. Some, including the one under appeal, have not been settled or entered. Other applications are pending. The process contemplated by the Act is continuing.
>
> A colleague has suggested that a judge exercising a supervisory function under the C.C.A.A. is more like a judge hearing a trial, who makes orders in the course of that trial, than a chambers judge who makes interlocutory or proceedings for which he has no further responsibility.
>
> Also, we know that in a case where a judgment has not been entered, it may be open to a judge to reconsider his or her judgment, and alter its terms. In supervising a proceeding under the C.C.A.A. orders are made, and orders are varied as changing circumstances require. Orders depend upon a careful and delicate balancing of a variety of interests and of problems. In that context appellate proceedings may well upset the balance, and delay or frustrate the process under the C.C.A.A. I do not say that leave will never be granted in a C.C.A.A. proceeding. But the effect upon all parties concerned will be an important consideration in deciding whether leave ought to be granted.

43 In that case, it appears that McFarlane, J.A. was satisfied that the first three elements of the criteria had been met, i.e. that there "may be an arguable case for the petitioners to present to a panel of this court on discrete [sic] questions of law".

44 It was argued before me that an appeal would give rise to an uncertainly of process and a lack of confidence in it; that the creditors, or some of them, may be inclined to withdraw support for the Plan that would otherwise be forthcoming, but for the delay. None of the parties tendered affidavit evidence on this issue.

45 Nowhere in any of the authorities has the issue of onus in meeting the elements the general criterion been prominent. I am of the view that the onus is on the applicant. That onus would include the applicant producing at least some evidence on the fourth element to shift the onus to the respondents, even though it involves proving a negative, i.e. that there will not be any material adverse impact as the result of the delay occasioned by an appeal. That evidence is lacking in this case. It is lacking on both sides but the respondents do not have an initial onus in this regard. Therefore, I find that the fourth element has not been established by the applicant.

46 The last step in a proper analysis in the context of a leave application is to ascribe appropriate weight to each of the elements of the general criterion and decide over all whether the test has been met. In most cases, the last two elements will be more important, and ought to be ascribed more weight than the first two elements. The last two elements here have not been met while the first two arguably have. In the result, I am satisfied that the applicant has not met the threshold for leave to appeal on the basis of the authorities, and I am therefore denying the application.

Conclusion

47 The application for leave to appeal the Decision is dismissed on the basis that there is no *prima facie* meritorious case and that the granting of leave would likely unduly hinder the progress of the action.

Application dismissed.

End of Document

TAB 10

Para 49

1988 CarswellAlta 319
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.

1988 CarswellAlta 319, [1989] 2 W.W.R. 566, [1989] A.W.L.D. 231, [1989] C.L.D. 336, 64 Alta. L.R. (2d) 139, 72 C.B.R. (N.S.) 20

NORCEN ENERGY RESOURCES LIMITED and PRAIRIE OIL ROYALTIES COMPANY LTD. v. OAKWOOD PETROLEUMS LTD.

Forsyth J.

Judgment: December 22, 1988
Docket: No. 8801-14453

Counsel: *J.J. Marshall, Q.C.*, and *J.A. Legge*, for Norcen Energy Resources Limited and Prairie Oil Royalties Company, Ltd.
E.D. Tavender, Q.C., D. Lloyd, R. Wigham and *R.C. Dixon*, for Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.
B. Tait and *B.D. Newton*, for Bank of Montreal.
B. O'Leary, M.R. Russo, A. Pettie and *A.Z. Breitman*, for Sceptre Resources Limited.
L. Robinson, for Royal Bank of Canada.
P.T. McCarthy and *T. Warner*, for HongKong Bank of Canada.
R. Gregory and *P. Jull*, for Bank America, Canada.
R.C. Pittman and *B.J. Roth*, for Esso Resources.
W. Corbett, for Canadian Co-operative Society and Saskatchewan Co-operative Society.
T.L. Czechowskyj, for National Bank.
J.G. Hanley and *H.J.R. Clarke*, for A.B.C. noteholders.
V.P. Lalonde and *L.R. Duncan*, for Innovex Equities Corporation.
I. Kerr, for Alberta Securities.
G.K. Randall, Q.C., for Director C.B.C.A.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency; Criminal

Application to approve classification of creditors for purpose of voting on plan of arrangement.

Forsyth J.:

1 On 12th December 1988 Oakwood Petroleums Limited ("Oakwood") filed with the court a plan of arrangement ("the plan") made pursuant to the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Canada), R.S.C. 1970, c. C-25 [now R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36] ("C.C.A.A."), as amended, ss. 185 and 185.1 [now ss. 191 and 192] of the Canada Business Corporations Act, S.C. 1974-75-76 [now R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44] as amended, and s. 186 of the Business Corporations Act (Alberta), S.A. 1981, c. B-15, as amended.

2 On 16th December 1988 Oakwood brought an application before me for an order which would, inter alia, approve the classification of creditors and shareholders proposed in the plan. I would note that the classifications requested are made pursuant to ss. 4, 5 and 6 of the C.C.A.A. for the purpose of holding a vote within each class to approve the plan.

3 Since my concern primarily is with the secured creditors of Oakwood, I shall set out, in part, the sections of the C.C.A.A. relevant to the court's authority with respect to compromises with secured creditors:

> 4 5. Where a compromise or arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its secured creditors or any class of them, the court may ... order a meeting of such creditors or class of creditors ...
>
> 5 6. Where a majority in numbers representing three-fourths in value of the creditors, or class of creditors, as the case may be, present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or meetings ... held pursuant to sections 4 and 5 ... agree to any compromise or arrangement ... [it] may be sanctioned by the court, and if so sanctioned is binding on all the creditors ...

6 The plan filed with the court envisions five separate classes of creditors and shareholders. They are as follows:

7 (i) The secured creditors;

8 (ii) The unsecured creditors;

9 (iii) The preferred shareholders of Oakwood;

10 (iv) The common shareholders and holders of class A non-voting shares of Oakwood;

11 (v) The shareholders of New York Oils Ltd.

12 With the exception of the proposed class comprising the secured creditors of Oakwood, there has been for the moment no objection to the proposed groupings. I add here that shareholders of course have not yet had notice of the proposal with respect to voting

percentages and classes with respect to their particular interests. With that caveat, and leaving aside the proposed single class of secured creditors, I am satisfied that the other classes suggested are appropriate and they are approved.

13 I turn now to the proposed one class of secured creditors. The membership of and proposed scheme of voting within the secured creditors class is dependent upon the value of each creditor's security as determined by Sceptre Resources Ltd. ("Sceptre"), the purchaser under the plan.

14 As a result of those valuations, the membership of that class was determined to include: the Bank of Montreal, the A.B.C. noteholders, the Royal Bank of Canada, the National Bank of Canada and the HongKong Bank of Canada and the Bank of America Canada. Within the class, each secured creditor will receive one vote for each dollar of "security value". The valuations made by Sceptre represent what it considers to be a fair value for the securities.

15 Any dispute over the amount of money each creditor is to receive for its security will be determined at a subsequent fairness hearing where approval of the plan will be sought. Further, it should be noted that all counsel have agreed that, on the facts of this case, any errors made in the valuations would not result in any significant shift of voting power within the proposed class so as to alter the outcome of any vote. Therefore, the valuations made by Sceptre do not appear to be a major issue before me at this time insofar as voting is concerned.

16 The issue with which I am concerned arises from the objection raised by two of Oakwood's secured creditors, namely, HongKong Bank and Bank of America Canada, that they are grouped together with the other secured creditors. They have brought applications before me seeking leave to realize upon their security or, in the alternative, to be constituted a separate and exclusive class of creditors and to be entitled to vote as such at any meeting convened pursuant to the plan.

17 The very narrow issue which I must address concerns the propriety of classifying all the secured creditors of the company into one group. Counsel for Oakwood and Sceptre have attempted to justify their classifications by reference to the "commonality of interests test" described in *Sovereign Life Assur. Co. v. Dodd*, [1892] 2 Q.B. 573 (C.A.). That test received the approval of the Alberta Court of Appeal in *Savage v. Amoco Acquisition Co.* (1988), 59 Alta. L.R. (2d) 260, 68 C.B.R. (N.S.) 154, 87 A.R. 321, where Kerans J.A., on behalf of the court, stated [pp. 264-65]:

> 18 We agree that the basic rule for the creation of groups for the consideration of fundamental corporate changes was expressed by Lord Esher in *Sovereign Life Assur. Co. v. Dodd*, [supra] when he said, speaking about creditors:

> 19 ... if we find a different state of facts existing among different creditors which may differently affect their minds and their judgments, they must be divided into different classes.

20 In the case of *Sovereign Life Assur. Co.*, Bowen L.J. went on to state at p. 583 that the class:

> 21 ... must be confined to those persons whose rights are not so dissimilar as to make it impossible for them to consult together with a view to their common interest.

22 Counsel also made reference to two other "tests" which they argued must be complied with — the "minority veto test" and the "bona fide lack of oppression test". The former, it is argued, holds that the classes must not be so numerous as to give a veto power to an otherwise insignificant minority. In support of this test, they cite my judgment in *Amoco Can. Petroleum Co. v. Dome Petroleum Ltd.*, Calgary No. 8701-20108, 28th January 1988 (not yet reported).

23 I would restrict my comments on the applicability of this test to the fact that, in the *Amoco* case, I was dealing with "a very small minority group of [shareholders] near the bottom of the chain of priorities". Such is not the case here.

24 In support of the "bona fide lack of oppression test", counsel cite *Re Alabama, New Orleans, Texas & Pac. Junction Ry. Co.*, [1891] 1 Ch. 213 (C.A.), where Lindley L.J. stated at p. 239:

> 25 The Court must look at the scheme, and see whether the Act has been complied with, whether the majority are acting *bona fide*, and whether they are coercing the minority in order to promote interests adverse to those of the class whom they purport to represent ...

26 Whether this test is properly considered at this stage, that is, whether the issue is the constitution of a membership of a class, is not necessary for me to decide as there have been no allegations by the HongKong Bank or Bank of America as to a lack of bona fides.

27 What I am left with, then, is the application to the facts of this case of the "commonality of interests test" while keeping in mind that the proposed plan of arrangement arises under the C.C.A.A.

28 Sceptre and Oakwood have argued that the secured creditors' interests are sufficiently common that they can be grouped together as one class. That class is comprised of six institutional lenders (I would note that the A.B.C. noteholders are actually a group of ten lenders) who have each taken first charges as security on assets upon which they have the

right to realize in order to recover their claims. The same method of valuation was applied to each secured claim in order to determine the security value under the plan.

29 On the other hand, HongKong Bank and Bank of America have argued that their interests are distinguishable from the secured creditors class as a whole and from other secured creditors on an individual basis. While they have identified a number of individually distinguishing features of their interests vis-à-vis those of other secured parties (which I will address later), they have put forth the proposition that since each creditor has taken separate security on different assets, the necessary commonality of interests is not present. The rationale offered is that the different assets may give rise to a different state of facts which could alter the creditors' view as to the propriety of participating in the plan. For example, it was suggested that the relative ease of marketability of a distinct asset as opposed to the other assets granted as security could lead that secured creditor to choose to disapprove of the proposed plan. Similarly, the realization potential of assets may also lead to distinctions in the interests of the secured creditors and consequently bear upon their desire to participate in the plan.

30 In support of this proposition, the HongKong Bank and Bank of America draw from comments made by Ronald N. Robertson, Q.C., in a publication entitled "Legal Problems on Reorganization of Major Financial and Commercial Debtors", Canadian Bar Association — Ontario Continuing Legal Education, 5th April 1983, at p. 15, and by Stanley E. Edwards in an earlier article, "Reorganizations under the Companies'; Creditors Arrangement Act" (1947), 25 Can. Bar Rev. 587, at p. 603. Both authors gave credence to this "identity of interest" proposition that secured creditors should not be members of the same class "unless their security is on the same or substantially the same property and in equal priority". They also made reference to a case decided under c. 11 of the Bankruptcy Code of the United States of America which, while not applying that proposition in that given set of facts, accepted it as a "general rule". That authority is *Re Palisades-on-the-Desplaines; Seidel v. Palisades-on-the-Desplaines*, 89 F. 2d. 214 at 217-18 (1937, Ill.).

31 Basically, in putting forth that proposition, the HongKong Bank and Bank of America are asserting that they have made advances to Oakwood on the strength of certain security which they identified as sufficient and desirable security and which they alone have the right to realize upon. Of course, the logical extension of that argument is that in the facts of this case each secured creditor must itself comprise a class of creditors. While counsel for the HongKong Bank and Bank of America suggested it was not necessary to do so in this case, as they are the only secured creditors opposed to the classification put forth, in principle such would have to be the case if I were to accept their proposition.

32 To put the issue in another light, what I must decide is whether the holding of distinct security by each creditor necessitates a separate class of creditor for each, or whether

notwithstanding this factor that they each share, nevertheless this factor does not override the grouping into one class of creditors. In my opinion, this decision cannot be made without considering the underlying purpose of the C.C.A.A.

33 In *Norcen Energy Resources Ltd. v. Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.*, Calgary No. 8801-14453, 17th November 1988 [now reported ante, p. 1, 63 Alta. L.R. (2d) 361], after canvassing the few authorities on point, I concluded that the purpose of the C.C.A.A. is to allow debtor companies to continue to carry on their business and that necessarily incidental to that purpose is the power to interfere with contractual relations. In referring to the case authority *Re Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act; A.G. Can. v. A.G. Que.*, [1934] S.C.R. 659, 16 C.B.R. 1, [1934] 4 D.L.R. 75, I stated at pp. 24 and 25 [p. 15]:

> 34 It was held in that case that the Act was valid as relating to bankruptcy and insolvency rather than property and civil rights. At p. 664, Cannon J. held:
>
> > 35 Therefore, if the proceedings under this new Act of 1933 are not, strictly speaking, 'bankruptcy' proceedings, because they had not for object the sale and division of the assets of the debtor, they may, however, be considered as 'insolvency proceedings' *with the object of preventing a declaration of bankruptcy and the sale of these assets*. If the creditors directly interested for the time being reach the conclusion that an opportune arrangement to avoid such sale would better protect their interest, as a whole or in part, provisions for the settlement of the liabilities of the insolvent are an essential element of any insolvency legislation ...

36 I went on to note:

> 37 *The C.C.A.A. is an Act designed to continue, rather than liquidate companies ...* The critical part of the decision is that federal legislation pertaining to assisting in the continuing operation of companies is constitutionally valid. In effect the Supreme Court of Canada has given the term "insolvency" a broad meaning in the constitutional sense by bringing within that term *an Act designed to promote the continuation of an insolvent company*. [emphasis added]

38 In this regard, I would make extensive reference to the article by Mr. Robertson, Q.C., where, in discussing the classification of creditors under the C.C.A.A. and after stating the proposition referred to by counsel for the HongKong Bank and Bank of America, he states at p. 16 in his article:

> 39 An initial, almost instinctive, response that differences in claims and property subject to security automatically means segregation into different classes does not necessarily make economic or legal sense in the context of an act such as the C.C.A.A.

40 And later at pp. 19 and 20, in commenting on the article by Mr. Edwards, he states:

> 41 However, if the trend of Edwards' suggestions that secured creditors can only be classed together when they held security of the same priority, that perhaps classes should be sub-divided into further groups according to whether or not a member of the class also holds some other security or form of interest in the debtor company, *the multiplicity of discrete classes or subclasses classes might be so compounded as to defeat the object of the act*. As Edwards himself says, the subdivision of voting groups and the counting of angels on the heads of pins must top somewhere and some forms of differences must surely be disregarded.

42 In summarizing his discussion, he states on pp. 20-21:

> 43 From the foregoing one can perceive at least two potentially conflicting approaches to the issue of classification. On the one hand there is the concept that members of a class ought to have the same "interest" in the company, ought to be only creditors entitled to look to the same "source" or "fund" for payment, and ought to encompass all of the creditors who do have such an identity of legal rights. *On the other hand, there is recognition that the legislative intent is to facilitate reorganization, that excessive fragmentation of classes may be counter-productive and that some degree of difference between claims should not preclude creditors being put in the same class.*
>
> 44 *It is fundamental to any imposed plan or reorganization that strict legal rights are going to be altered and that such alteration may be imposed against the will of at least some creditors.* When one considers the complexity and magnitude of contemporary large business organizations, and the potential consequences of their failure it may be that the courts will be compelled to focus less on whether there is any identity of legal rights and rather focus on whether or not those constituting the class are persons, to use Lord Esher's phrase, "whose rights are not so dissimilar as to make it impossible for them to consult together with a view to their common interest" ...
>
> 45 If the plan of reorganization is such that the creditors' particular priorities and securities are preserved, especially in the event of ultimate failure, *it may be that the courts will, for example in an apt case decide that creditors who have basically made the same kinds of loans against the same kind of security, even though on different terms and against different particular secured assets, do have a sufficient similarity of interest to warrant being put into one class and being made subject to the will of the required majority of that class*. [emphasis added]

46 These comments may be reduced to two cogent points. First, it is clear that the C.C.A.A. grants a court the authority to alter the legal rights of parties other than the

debtor company without their consent. Second, the primary purpose of the Act is to facilitate reorganizations and this factor must be given due consideration at every stage of the process, including the classification of creditors made under a proposed plan. To accept the "identity of interest" proposition as a starting point in the classification of creditors necessarily results in a "multiplicity of discrete classes" which would make any reorganization difficult, if not impossible, to achieve.

47 In the result, given that this planned reorganization arises under the C.C.A.A., I must reject the arguments put forth by the HongKong Bank and the Bank of America, that since they hold separate security over different assets, they must therefore be classified as a separate class of creditors.

48 I turn now to the other factors which the HongKong Bank and Bank of America submit distinguishes them on individual bases from other creditors of Oakwood. The HongKong Bank and Bank of America argue that the values used by Sceptre are significantly understated. With respect to the Bank of Montreal, it is alleged that that bank actually holds security valued close to, if not in excess of, the outstanding amount of its loans when compared to the HongKong Bank and Bank of America whose security, those banks allege, is approximately equal to the amount of its loans. It is submitted that a plan which understates the value of assets results in the oversecured party being more inclined to support a plan under which they will receive, without the difficulties of realization, close to full payments of their loans.

49 The problem with this argument is that it is a throwback to the "identity of interest" proposition. Differing security positions and changing security values are a fact of life in the world of secured financing. To accept this argument would again result in a different class of creditor for each secured lender, with the possible exception of the A.B.C. noteholders who could be lumped with the HongKong Bank or Bank of America, as their percentage realization under the proposed plan is approximately equal to that of the HongKong Bank and Bank of America.

50 Further, the HongKong Bank and Bank of America also submit that since the Royal Bank and National Bank of Canada are so much more undersecured on their loans, they too have a distinct interest in participating in the plan which is not shared by themselves. The sum total of their submissions would seem to be that, since oversecured and undersecured lenders have a greater incentive to participate, it is only those lenders, such as themselves with just the right amount of security, that do not share that common interest. Frankly, it appears to me that these arguments are drawn from the fact that they are the only secured creditors of Oakwood who would prefer to retain their right to realize upon their security, as opposed to participating in the plan. I do not wish to suggest that they should be chided for taking such a position, but surely expressed approval or disapproval of the plan is not a

valid reason to create different classes of creditors. Further, as I have already clearly stated, the C.C.A.A. can validly be used to alter or remove the rights of creditors.

51 Finally, I wish to address the argument that, since Sceptre has made arrangements with the Royal Bank of Canada relating to the purchase of Oakwood, it has an interest not shared by the other secured creditors. The Royal Bank's position as a principal lender in the reorganization is separate from its status as a secured creditor of Oakwood and arises from a separate business decision. In the absence of any allegation that the Royal Bank will not act bona fide in considering the benefit of the plan of the secured creditors as a class, the HongKong Bank and Bank of America cannot be heard to criticize the Royal Bank's presence in the same class.

52 In light of my conclusions, the result is that I approve the proposed classification of secured creditors into one class.

53 There is one further comment I wish to make with respect to the valuations made by Sceptre for the purposes of the vote calculations. I assume that Sceptre will be relying on those valuations at any fairness hearing, assuming this matter proceeds. I would simply observe that the onus is of course on Sceptre to establish that the valuations relied on and set forth in their plan in fact represent fair value under all the circumstances.

54 It has been obvious during the course of the hearing of this phase of the application that at least two of the secured creditors, to whom reference has been made, are not satisfied that that is the case, and in the event evidence is led by them in an effort to establish that the values proposed do not represent the fair value, the onus will be on Sceptre and Oakwood to establish the contrary. Underlying my comments above are of course the court's concern of ensuring that approval of any plan proposed does not result in unfair confiscation of the property of any secured creditors. In that regard, the underlying value of the assets of each individual secured creditor on the facts of this case would appear to be of prime importance.

Application granted.

End of Document

TAB 11

ICLR

Page 583

***573 Sovereign Life Assurance Company v. Dodd.**

Image 1 within document in PDF format.

Court of Appeal
6 July 1892

[1892] 2 Q.B. 573

Lord Esher M.R., Bowen L.J. and Kay L.J.
1892 July 6

Analysis

Company—Winding—up—Set—off—Mutual Credits or Dealings—Life Insurance Company—Action by Company for Money Lent—Policy not matured at Commencement of Winding—up, but matured at Date of Action—Release—Bankruptcy Act, 1883 (46 & 47 Vict. c. 52), s. 38—Joint Stock Companies Arrangement Act, 1870(33 & 34 Vict. c. 104), s. 2.

The defendant in 1879 effected with the plaintiffs two policies of life insurance for 1000*l*., each upon his own life, from the date thereof to May 7, 1888, by which policies the plaintiffs contracted that in the event of the defendant being alive on that day they would then pay the moneys assured to the defendant. In April and June, 1887, the defendant obtained two loans of 570l. and 600l. respectively from the plaintiffs upon mortgage of the policies. In August, 1887, a petition was presented for the winding-up of the plaintiff company, and a provisional liquidator was appointed. The defendant continued to pay to the plaintiffs the premiums upon the policies down to May 7, 1888; but the moneys assured by the policies were never paid to him. In July, 1889, a winding-up order was made. In April, 1890, an arrangement under the Joint Stock Companies Act, 1870, was entered into between the plaintiff company and the Sun Life Assurance Company, whereby it was provided that the policies of the plaintiff company should be transferred to the Sun Company, and that the holders of policies in the plaintiff company should, in full satisfaction of all claims upon the plaintiffs, accept certain reduced payments from the Sun Company. A meeting of policy-holders was summoned under s. 2 of the Act, at which a statutory majority agreed to the arrangement, but the defendant did not himself assent to it; it was in June, 1890, duly sanctioned by the Court, In December, 1890, the plaintiffs brought an action against the defendant to recover the amount of the loans, and the defendant sought to set off against the plaintiffs' claim the sums which, but for the winding-up, would have been payable to him upon the policies:—

Held, that the defendant was entitled to the set-off.
By s. 2 of the Joint Stock Companies Arrangement Act, 1870, where an arrangement is proposed between a company in the course of being wound up and "the creditors of such company, or any class of such creditors," the Court may order that a meeting of "such creditors or class of creditors" shall be summoned, and if a majority in number, representing three-fourths in value of "such creditors or class of creditors," agree to the arrangement, it shall, if sanctioned by an order of the Court, be binding on "all such creditors or class of creditors, as the case may be," and also on the liquidator and contributories of the company.
The persons summoned to the meeting under the above section were the policy-holders of the company, and no separate meeting was summoned of those whose policies had, as distinct from those whose policies had not, matured:—

Held, that the insured persons whose policies had matured formed a distinct ***574** class of creditors from those whose policies had not matured; that a separate meeting of such class ought to have been held under the Act in order to make the arrangement binding upon the members of that class; and that the arrangement did not, therefore, operate as a release by the defendant of his claim against the plaintiffs.

APPEAL from a judgment of Charles, J. [1]

The action was brought to recover the amount of two loans of 570*l*. and 600l., with interest. The facts, which were not in dispute, were as follows:—

On February 5, 1879, the defendant effected with the plaintiffs two policies of 1000*l*., each upon his own life, from the date thereof to May 7, 1888, whereby the amount assured was to be payable to him if he was living on May 7, 1888, or to his executors if he died within the term of the insurance. On September 10, 1880, he obtained from the plaintiffs a loan of 320l., and in April, 1887, an additional sum of 250l. was advanced to him by the plaintiffs, making altogether 570l., which sum was secured by a mortgage to the secretary of the plaintiff company of the first of the two policies above mentioned. In June, 1887, 600l. was advanced by the company on a similar mortgage of the second policy.

On August 5, 1887, a petition to wind up the plaintiff company was presented; and on September 2, 1887, a provisional liquidator was appointed. On September 5, the secretary forwarded receipts to the defendant for his premiums. "The petition," he wrote, "is to be heard on Wednesday next; the object, I am informed, being to obtain a scheme for reduction of contracts." No arrangement, however, was made at that time for any scheme, and after the lapse of nearly two years, namely, on July 30, 1889, a winding-up order was made, and on September 17, 1889, a liquidator was appointed. Meanwhile, on May 7, 1888, the money insured by the defendant's policies became due to him. He had regularly paid all the premiums, which were payable quarterly, both before and after the date of the petition to wind-up.

On April 11, 1890, a deed of arrangement was entered into between the plaintiff company and the Sun Life Assurance Company ***575** under the Joint Stock Companies Arrangement Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 104), which was sanctioned by the Court on June 14, 1890. A meeting of policy-holders was summoned, under s. 2 of the Act, to agree to the arrangement; but no separate meeting was summoned of those whose policies had, as distinct from those whose policies had not, matured.[2] The defendant did not assent to the arrangement; but at the meeting a majority, representing three-fourths in value, did assent. The deed recited, among other things, that it would be advantageous, in the opinion of the liquidator, to the persons claiming in the liquidation, to effect an arrangement under which the policies held by them on August 4, 1887, should be transferred on agreed terms to some other office, and that the liquidator considered that the terms of the agreement thereinafter expressed would, if sanctioned by the Court, be for the benefit of the persons interested; and then provided, in clause 1, for the issue of new policies by the Sun Life Assurance Company to policy-holders whose policies, if subsisting, would not have matured by August 4, 1890, guaranteeing, first, "the payment on death, or other time specified in the said policy, of the reduced sum set against the policy-holder's name in the thirteenth column of the second schedule thereto;" and, secondly, the payment at such times as aforesaid of a certain dividend, payable out of the assets of the Sovereign Life Assurance Company.

By clause 2 it was provided that, "As to policies of the Sovereign Company, which, but for the said winding-up order, ***576** would have matured between August 4, 1887, and August 4, 1890 ... the Sun Company will, within one month after proof of death and title, make the same reduced payments to the representatives of such policy-holders or their assigns, and on the same terms and conditions, as if such policy had been a subsisting policy, and had matured after August 4, 1890."

By clause 7 it was provided that, as the consideration for the obligations imposed on the Sun Company, the liquidator would from time to time pay over or transfer to the Sun Company all such parts of the assets of the Sovereign Company as would be properly applicable to meet the claims of the policy-holders of the Sovereign Company who were such on August 4, 1887.

Clause 11 provided as follows: "If this agreement is sanctioned by the Court, all policy-holders of the Sovereign Company who were such on August 4, 1887, shall accept the provisions hereof in full satisfaction of all claims on the Sovereign Company and the assets thereof." The deed further provided that the winding-up should be continued so far as might be necessary to settle the rights of all parties.

The reduced sums which, under clause 2 of the deed of arrangement, were set against the defendant's name in the thirteenth column of the second schedule thereto, were 26*l.* in respect of each of his two policies; and the estimated dividends, payment of which was guaranteed to him out of the assets of the plaintiffs by the Sun Company, amounted to 241l. on each policy.

In December, 1890, the plaintiffs by their liquidator brought this action against the defendant to recover the sum of 1345*l.* 19s. 5d., being the amount of the above-mentioned two loans and interest thereon. The defendant pleaded a set-off of the 2000l. which was payable to him by the plaintiffs in respect of his two policies on May 7, 1888. He also counter-claimed for the difference between the money so due on the policies and the amount of the loans; but the counter-claim was not insisted upon at the trial.

The learned judge held that the defendant was entitled to the set-off[3], and the plaintiffs appealed.

*577

Buckley, Q.C., and *Hull, (H. Tindal Atkinson*, with them), for the plaintiffs, argued as in the Court below, and contended, in addition, that it was unnecessary under the Act of 1870 to call a separate meeting of the class of policy-holders whose policies had matured, as the whole body of policy-holders formed only one class of creditors, whether their policies had matured or not.

Crump, Q.C., and *Morton Smith*, for the defendant, were not called upon.

LORD ESHER, M.R.

I am of opinion that this appeal must be dismissed. The plaintiff company, which is in liquidation, has brought an action by its liquidator to recover money lent by the company to the defendant before the liquidation, and the defendant sets up as a defence a right of set-off against the company or the liquidator, or both of them. In that state of facts it is argued, first, that the defendant has no right of set-off at all; and, secondly, that the claim upon which he relies has been released.

The first point which we have to consider is, what will destroy the right of set-off; when an action of debt is brought, will the fact of the plaintiff being in liquidation or bankrupt (the action being brought by the liquidator or trustee) of itself destroy the right, and drive the defendant into bankruptcy to prove his claim? Let us try what the rights of the parties would have been under the old law in such a case. A trustee brings an action to recover a debt due; a set-off is pleaded, and it is suggested that it would have been a good replication that the bankrupt could only pay 1s. in the pound, thus wiping out the set-off or reducing it to 1s. in the pound. It is enough to say that such a thing was never heard of. A set-off can only be set up where an action is brought; what is the right of the defendant after an action is commenced against him? Clearly it is to set off a debt due to him from the plaintiff; if the debt due to him is of the same kind as that in respect of which he is being sued, he can set it off. The right of set-off depends on the existence of a debt due to the defendant, and the fact of his debtor being a bankrupt does not prevent the set-off arising, though it prevents his obtaining in the bankruptcy more than his share of the assets; ***578** the whole debt is still in existence. Therefore, where an action is brought by a trustee in bankruptcy, he is in within the terms of the statute of set-off, and the defendant can set off a debt due to him from the bankrupt. What is the result of a plea of set-off? It is not a counter-claim or a cross-action, but a plea in bar; and therefore, in cases where the plea is made out, although it may be true that when the action was brought the defendant was a debtor of the plaintiff, yet, the plaintiff being the defendant's debtor to the same amount, the plaintiff's claim is barred. Bankruptcy, therefore, makes no difference to the right of set-off.

Now, the cases in which a debt could be set off in bankruptcy were limited, and many difficulties arose; but the subject was dealt with by s. 39 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, and s. 38 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, which enlarged the subject-matter of the plea of set-off; they made, however, no alteration in the result of a set-off, and a debt can, therefore, now be treated as a set-off which could not have been so treated under the old law, and when pleaded and proved it is still a bar to the action. We have, therefore, to see whether, when this action was brought, the defendant had a right to set off this debt. Now, when an action is brought by a company, through its liquidator, to recover a sum of money lent, the defendant may answer that the claim is true, but that the company is indebted to him in an equal or larger sum, which he has a right to set off against the claim. Was the company so indebted to the defendant in the present case? At the time when the action was brought the date for payment of the policies had arrived; the company was, therefore, then indebted to the defendant, who had a claim against them for a liquidated and ascertained amount, the sums insured by the policies. The company was indebted to him, and he to the company; but the winding-up prevented him from getting payment of the 2000*l*., though he could prove in the winding-up in respect of it. The winding-up had no effect upon his right to plead a set-off; he had, therefore, a right to plead that the plaintiffs were indebted to him in a sum of 2000l., and claim to set that sum off against the plaintiffs' claim, though he could not, of course, actually recover the 2000l. from the plaintiffs. ***579** It seems to me clear that in this case the defendant had a right to plead a set-off, which, if proved, was a bar to the action; and it is immaterial whether it would have been a set-off before the statute (though I incline to think that it was), for I have no doubt that it comes within the terms of the section.

It is said that the decision in Ex parte Price, In re Lankester [4], is to a contrary effect; but the distinguishing feature of that case is, as was pointed out in In re Asphaltic Wood Pavement Co., Lee and Chapman's Case [5], that there was no action at all, and that the Court was only considering the rights of proof in bankruptcy. Had there been no action in the present case, and had the proceedings been in bankruptcy, it is unnecessary to consider what would then have been the rights of the defendant; we have to consider his rights in the action only, and in that point of view his set-off is so great as to bar the plaintiffs' claim. That is in accordance with the judgment in the Asphaltic Wood Pavement Company's Case [6]; and it is not in conflict with the decision in Ex parte Price, In re Lankester. [7] The defendant, therefore, is entitled to the benefit of his set-off, unless the plaintiffs can say that the debt had been released as against them, and that the defendant had assented to take, and had taken, somebody else as his debtor. This question depends on what was done at the meeting of creditors, and whether what was there done bound the defendant, and bound him to the extent of releasing the plaintiffs from their liability; the time at which the action was brought is the date to which we must look for the purpose of determining this question.

Now, as to the meeting, we have to consider the persons who must be summoned to it, and who are to be dealt with as different classes; that is, we must consider the state of affairs at the date of the meeting, for the persons to attend it are those who have a right to attend it at that time, and it is that state of affairs, and not the position of things at the date of the original contract, that we must look at. The Act says that the persons to be summoned to the meeting (all of whom, be it said in passing, are creditors) are persons who can be divided into different classes - classes which the Act of Parliament recognises, though ***580** it does not define them. This, therefore, must be done: they must be divided into different classes. What is the reason for such a course? It is because the creditors composing the different classes have different interests; and, therefore, if we find a different state of facts existing among different creditors which may differently affect their minds and their judgment, they must be divided into different classes.

In the present case, the persons who had notice of the meeting were policy-holders - that is to say, policy-holders whose policies had to be dealt with. But the defendant was not a policy-holder at all; his policies had been fulfilled, and he was a creditor for the amount of the policies, and could have sued the company for money due; he had a vested cause of action, the policy-holders had none; and it is obvious that he could not consider the matter with the same mind and from the same point of view as the policy-holders who were summoned to the meeting. I do not say that, when there is nothing left to be done but the payment of the money, a person in the defendant's position may not be said properly to be in the same class as others who are creditors of the society; but, at any rate, he cannot fall within the same class as those whose policies have not matured. The defendant, therefore, belongs to a different class from those persons who were summoned as policy-holders, for his policies had not to be dealt with in any way; they had already matured; he has, therefore, not been summoned to the meeting, and what was done there does not bind him. The judgment of the learned judge in the Court below must be affirmed; he was right in holding that the section applied so as to enlarge the subject-matter of a plea of set-off. As I have already intimated, I think that apart from the statute there would have been a set-off; but, if the right depends upon the statute, I entirely agree with the judgment of Charles, J., that the defence is available to the defendant, and is a bar to the action.

BOWEN, L.J.

I am of the same opinion. The action is for money lent, and the defendant seeks to rely upon the defence that he is entitled as against the company to treat as a set-off money due on policies granted by the company to him, which ***581** policies accrued due on May 7, 1888. At that date a petition to wind up the company had already been presented; the defendant had paid all the premiums on the policies both before and after the date of the presentation of the winding-up petition, and on the day when the policies matured there was a large sum of money owing to him by the company. What was the defendant's position on that day? The company was being wound up, for the winding-up order, though not then made, dated back when made to the presentation of the petition, and the defendant was in the position of a person who had effected a policy and assigned it to the company as security for a loan, and also of a person who was entitled to say that 2000*l.* was owed to him by the company. It is true that he could not successfully prosecute an action for the 2000l. against the company because of the winding-up; but he was entitled to prove against the company for the value of his claim. His case is, therefore, distinguished from that of other policy-holders whose policies had not matured; he had gone on paying his premiums after the winding-up until the date when his policies became due, and his claim on his policies had therefore a fixed and ascertained value; this operated to his benefit, and the case has considerable resemblance to Macfarlane's Claim, In re Northern Counties of England Fire Insurance Co. [8], and In re Bridges, Hill v. Bridges. [9] Further, the defendant had the company's money in his pocket, and was entitled to make use of a counter-claim, or, more correctly, a set-off, against any action which the company might bring against him to recover the money; he could not sue the company or counter-claim against them in the strictest sense of the term because of the liquidation; but he could say that the transactions had resulted in mutual debts, and that he had a right to set off the debt of the company to him against his own debt to the company. That was his position when his policies matured, and he could be in no worse position when the company brought their action; he was entitled to set up his defence of set-off, which is so large in amount as to be a bar to the company's claim. That being so, I agree with the Master of the Rolls that it is unnecessary to consider what would have been the position ***582** of the parties had there been only bankruptcy proceedings and no action had been brought. What is there to prevent the defendant's right of set-off in this action? Certainly not the winding-up, which has not altered the position and rights of the parties in this respect. As far as I can see, this is a good set-off at law; but if it were not a good legal set-off by reason of the existence of an assignment of the policies to the secretary of the company, it would, at all events, be a good set-off in equity.

The operation of s. 39 of the Act of 1869 and s. 38 of the Act of 1883 has been to enlarge, not the effect of a set-off, but the meaning of the term. This is clear from the decision in In re Asphaltic Wood Pavement Co. [10], and is especially clear in the judgment of Cotton, L.J., which is cited at some length by Charles, J., in his judgment now appealed against. It is said, however, that the decision in Ex parte Price, In, re Lankester [11], is inconsistent with that case, and covers the present one; but I am unable to agree with that contention. The case of Ex parte Price, In re Lankester [12], dealt only with the doctrine of mutual rights in relation to the proof of a set-off in a winding-up, not in a case where an action had been brought; and the Court was dealing with the valuation of current policies subsisting at the time of the accrual of the right of set-off which was under consideration. In the present case, however, the policy had ceased or matured, and we are dealing with the rights of a person who is entitled to the full value of the policy. There is, therefore, in the present case, either a mutual debt or a mutual dealing; and unless there has been a release of the defendant's claim against the plaintiffs, the latter are out of court.

This question of a release depends, first, upon the construction of the document; secondly, upon the effect of the statute on that document. I feel grave doubt whether the term "policy-holder" includes those persons who have been policy-holders, but whose policies have matured not by death but by the happening of the stipulated event; but it is unnecessary to decide that question if we think that under the Act of 1870 the deed of arrangement did not bind dissentient creditors. What is the proper construction of that statute? It makes the majority of the creditors ***583** or of a class of creditors bind the minority; it exercises a most formidable compulsion upon dissentient, or would-be dissentient, creditors; and it therefore requires to be construed with care, so as not to place in the hands of some of the creditors the means and opportunity of forcing dissentients to do that which it is unreasonable to require them to do, or of making a mere jest of the interests of the minority. If we are to construe the section as it is suggested on behalf of the plaintiffs it ought to be construed, we should be holding that a class of policy-holders whose interests are uncertain may by a mere majority in value override the interests of those who have nothing to do with futurity, and whose rights have been already ascertained. It is obvious that these two sets of interests are inconsistent, and that those whose policies are still current are deeply interested in sacrificing the interests of those whose policies have matured. They are bound by no community of interest, and their claims are not capable of being ascertained by any common system of valuation. Are we, then, justified in so construing the Act of Parliament as to include these persons in one class? The word "class" is vague, and to find out what is meant by it we must look at the scope of the section, which is a section enabling the Court to order a meeting of a class of creditors to be called. It seems plain that we must give such a meaning to the term "class" as will prevent the section being so worked as to result in confiscation and injustice, and that it must be confined to those persons whose rights are not so dissimilar as to make it impossible for them to consult together with a view to their common interest. If that be so, in considering the deed of arrangement made with the company which took over the business of the Sovereign, we must so construe it as not to include in one class those whose policies had already ripened into debts, and those whose policies might not ripen into debts for years to come; for the position of a person like the defendant, who had an ascertained sum of 2000*l*. due to him from the company, was entirely different from that of those policy-holders whose future was entirely uncertain. It was, therefore, not right to summon as members of one and the same class those who had an absolute bar against any claim of the company and those who had not. I think, therefore, that ***584** there was no release of the defendant's claim against the plaintiffs, and that the appeal must be dismissed. I am not sorry to have had the opportunity of calling attention to s. 2 of the Act of 1870, which is constantly utilized, and often, I think, very carelessly and unjustly.

KAY, L.J.

I am of the same opinion. My judgment depends upon the facts of the case, which are very peculiar and may possibly never recur. The defendant took out two policies on the same day in a form which gave his representatives a right to recover the amount if he died before May 7, 1888, and made it payable on that day to him if he were then alive. There were two events in which he or his representatives became entitled to the money, subject to the premiums being kept up. The defendant afterwards mortgaged the policies to the company to secure moneys lent to him, and the company have brought this action to recover the moneys so lent. The form of the policy shews that the capital funds of the company alone were liable for the amount insured, and the effect of this, as appears from In re State Fire Insurance Co. [13], is not to create a charge on the funds; it amounts to a condition that the company will only be liable in case they have sufficient funds to pay the amount of the policy. Then on August 5, 1887, there was a winding-up petition; and on September 2 a provisional liquidator was appointed. The time for the maturing of the defendant's policies was drawing near, and the premiums were paid by him to the provisional liquidator. On May 7, 1888, the policies matured. No winding-up order had then been made, and the defendant was entitled to the debt of 2000*l*. owing by the company to him. It is said that the debt was not owing to the defendant because he had executed an assignment of his policies to a trustee for the company, and so mortgaged them to secure advances from the company, and therefore there was no liability on the part of the latter to the defendant, who was not entitled to a re-assignment of the policies until he had paid off the amount of the advances. On July 30, 1889, the winding-up order was made, and this related back to August 5, 1887, the date of the winding-up petition. Then a ***585** long time elapsed; and on April 11, 1890, a deed of arrangement was entered into, which is relied upon as a release. The company has now brought this action to recover the moneys lent, and the defendant claims to be entitled to a set-off for the moneys due on the policies, basing his claim chiefly upon the fact of the transaction amounting to a mutual credit or dealing within s. 38 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883. It is not denied that when the policies matured the company had sufficient funds to pay them. They were, therefore, then indebted to the defendant in the full amount of these policies.

The case of Ex parte Price, In re Lankester [14], is the only decision which has been cited to us as throwing any difficulty in the way of the defendant's set-off; but there is a very broad distinction between the two cases; in that case a proof was tendered by the company in the bankruptcy of the assured, and an attempt was made on behalf of the trustee in bankruptcy to avail himself of the mutual credit clause, because at the date of the bankruptcy the bankrupt was entitled to a current policy which had not matured; in other words, the bankrupt was indebted to the company, and tried to set off what was not due, but the value of what might become due upon the policy. In the present case, however, the claim which the defendant seeks to set off had already accrued due; it was a sum ascertained and liquidated; this makes all the difference. I do not in any way desire to dissent from the decision in Ex parte Price, In re Lankester [15], but it is distinguishable on the ground I have indicated from the present case, which more nearly approaches the case of In re Asphaltic Wood Pavement Co. [16] There was a clear debt due upon these policies when the present action was brought; and I think we may discard the argument founded upon the fact that there had been an assignment of the policies to the company, for there will be a set-off in equity in cases where, but for some such circumstance as this assignment, there would have been a legal set-off. The company were liable to the defendant for the amount of the policies, subject of course to their charge upon the policies for the advances, and I think that in this action the defendant probably had a set-off against ***586** the company wholly independent of the section. If, however, he had not, there was clearly a mutual dealing between the company and the assured which entitled the latter to have the accounts between them taken, and to bring in his claim against the company under the mutual credit clause.

Then comes the question under the deed of arrangement, which makes provision for the liquidation of current policies, and clause 2 of which provides for policies "which but for the said winding-up order would have matured between August 4, 1887, and August 4, 1890." The expression "would have matured" is a loose one, and does not apply to a case where the policy has matured on a fixed date which the assured has outlived. Then, by clause 11, all policy-holders who were policy-holders on August 4, 1887, are to accept the provisions of the deed in full satisfaction of their claims on the plaintiff company. Without deciding whether this clause is binding on any particular policy-holder, I am not satisfied that it amounts to a release of the defendant's claim against the company. He claims to set off his claim against that of the company; can it be contended that clause 11 operates to deprive a man of an existing right of set-off? I think not; and, as the defendant had such an existing right, I do not think that this clause applies.

I also agree that it is exceedingly doubtful whether this deed relates at all to a policy-holder in the position of the defendant. There never was a separate meeting of the class of policy-holders to which he belonged, and he ought not to have been mixed up with those whose policies had not matured. It is not contested that his policies had matured; the sum secured by them was due, and he had a claim to set off that sum in order to liquidate the sum due from him to the company. I think, therefore, that this deed of arrangement cannot be treated as a release by him of the debt due from the company.

Representation

- Solicitor for plaintiffs: J. Robinson.
- Solicitor for defendant: N. Jourdain.

Appeal dismissed. (W. J. B.)

Footnotes

1 [1892] 1 Q.B. 405.

2 By s. 2 of the Joint Stock Companies Arrangement Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 104): "Where any compromise or arrangement shall be proposed between a company which is … in the course of being wound up … and the creditors of such company, or any class of such creditors, it shall be lawful for the Court, in addition to any other of its powers, on the application in a summary way of any creditor or the liquidator, to order that a meeting of such creditors or class of creditors shall be summoned in such manner as the Court shall direct; and if a majority in number representing three-fourths in value of such creditors or class of creditors present either in person or by proxy at such meeting shall agree to any arrangement or compromise, such arrangement or compromise shall, if sanctioned by an order of the Court, be binding on all such creditors or class of creditors, as the case may be, and also on the liquidator and contributories of the said company."

3 [1892] 1 Q.B. 405.

4 Law Rep. 10 Ch. 648.

5 30 Ch. D. 216.

6 30 Ch. D. 216.

7 Law Rep. 10 Ch. 648.

8 17 Ch. D. 337.

9 17 Ch. D. 342.

10 30 Ch. D. 216.

11 Law Rep. 10 Ch. 648.

12 Law Rep. 10 Ch. 648.

13 1 D. J. & S. 634.

14 Law Rep. 10 Ch. 648.

15 Law Rep. 10 Ch. 648.

16 30 Ch. D. 216.

[1892] 2 Q.B. 573

End of Document

Court File No. CV-15-10926-00CL

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

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE APPLICANTS
(Meeting Order)
Returnable November 10, 2016

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

Kenneth T. Rosenberg (LSUC #21102H)
Tel: 416.646.4304
Email: ken.rosenberg@paliareroland.com

Massimo Starnino (LSUC #41048G)
Tel: 416.646.7431
Email: max.starnino@paliareroland.com

Lindsay Scott (LSUC #60275G)
Tel: 416.646.7442
Email: lindsay.scott@paliareroland.com

Lawyers for the Applicants