

**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  
(Plan Sanction Order)  
Returnable December 14, 2016**

December 13, 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](mailto:lindsay.scott@paliareroland.com)

Lawyers for the Applicants

TO: THE SERVICE LIST

## INDEX

### TAB

1. *Re Canwest Global Communications Corp.*, 2010 ONSC 4209
2. *Re AbitibiBowater Inc.*, 2010 QCCS 4450
3. *Re Sammi Atlas Inc.* (1998), 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Sup. Ct.)
4. *Re Cline Mining Corp.*, 2015 ONSC 622

**TAB 1**

2010 ONSC 4209  
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Canwest Global Communications Corp., Re

Paras 14, 15, 17,  
19, 21

2010 CarswellOnt 5510, 2010 ONSC 4209, 191 A.C.W.S. (3d) 378, 70 C.B.R. (5th) 1

**IN THE MATTER OF SECTION 11 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 CANWEST GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS AND THE OTHER APPLICANTS**

Pepall J.

Judgment: July 28, 2010  
Docket: CV-09-8396-00CL

Counsel: Lyndon Barnes, Jeremy Dacks, Shawn Irving for CMI Entities  
David Byers, Marie Konyukhova for Monitor  
Robin B. Schwill, Vince Mercier for Shaw Communications Inc.  
Derek Bell for Canwest Shareholders Group (the "Existing Shareholders")  
Mario Forte for Special Committee of the Board of Directors  
Robert Chadwick, Logan Willis for Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders  
Amanda Darrach for Canwest Retirees  
Peter Osborne for Management Directors  
Steven Weisz for CIBC Asset-Based Lending Inc.

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial

APPLICATION by debtors for order sanctioning plan of compromise, arrangement, and reorganization and for related relief.

***Pepall J.:***

1 This is the culmination of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*<sup>1</sup> restructuring of the CMI Entities. The proceeding started in court on October 6, 2009, experienced numerous peaks and valleys, and now has resulted in a request for an order sanctioning a plan of compromise, arrangement and reorganization (the "Plan"). It has been a short road in relative terms but not without its challenges and idiosyncrasies. To complicate matters, this

restructuring was hot on the heels of the amendments to the CCAA that were introduced on September 18, 2009. Nonetheless, the CMI Entities have now successfully concluded a Plan for which they seek a sanction order. They also request an order approving the Plan Emergence Agreement, and other related relief. Lastly, they seek a post-filing claims procedure order.

2 The details of this restructuring have been outlined in numerous previous decisions rendered by me and I do not propose to repeat all of them.

### **The Plan and its Implementation**

3 The basis for the Plan is the amended Shaw transaction. It will see a wholly owned subsidiary of Shaw Communications Inc. ("Shaw") acquire all of the interests in the free-to-air television stations and subscription-based specialty television channels currently owned by Canwest Television Limited Partnership ("CTLTP") and its subsidiaries and all of the interests in the specialty television stations currently owned by CW Investments and its subsidiaries, as well as certain other assets of the CMI Entities. Shaw will pay to CMI US \$440 million in cash to be used by CMI to satisfy the claims of the 8% Senior Subordinated Noteholders (the "Noteholders") against the CMI Entities. In the event that the implementation of the Plan occurs after September 30, 2010, an additional cash amount of US \$2.9 million per month will be paid to CMI by Shaw and allocated by CMI to the Noteholders. An additional \$38 million will be paid by Shaw to the Monitor at the direction of CMI to be used to satisfy the claims of the Affected Creditors (as that term is defined in the Plan) other than the Noteholders, subject to a pro rata increase in that cash amount for certain restructuring period claims in certain circumstances.

4 In accordance with the Meeting Order, the Plan separates Affected Creditors into two classes for voting purposes:

(a) the Noteholders; and

(b) the Ordinary Creditors. Convenience Class Creditors are deemed to be in, and to vote as, members of the Ordinary Creditors' Class.

5 The Plan divides the Ordinary Creditors' pool into two sub-pools, namely the Ordinary CTLTP Creditors' Sub-pool and the Ordinary CMI Creditors' Sub-pool. The former comprises two-thirds of the value and is for claims against the CTLTP Plan Entities and the latter reflects one-third of the value and is used to satisfy claims against Plan Entities other than the CTLTP Plan Entities. In its 16<sup>th</sup> Report, the Monitor performed an analysis of the relative value of the assets of the CMI Plan Entities and the CTLTP Plan Entities and the possible recoveries on a going concern liquidation and based on that analysis, concluded that it was fair and reasonable that Affected Creditors of the CTLTP Plan Entities share pro rata in two-thirds

of the Ordinary Creditors' pool and Affected Creditors of the Plan Entities other than the CTLP Plan Entities share pro rata in one-third of the Ordinary Creditors' pool.

6 It is contemplated that the Plan will be implemented by no later than September 30, 2010.

7 The Existing Shareholders will not be entitled to any distributions under the Plan or other compensation from the CMI Entities on account of their equity interests in Canwest Global. All equity compensation plans of Canwest Global will be extinguished and any outstanding options, restricted share units and other equity-based awards outstanding thereunder will be terminated and cancelled and the participants therein shall not be entitled to any distributions under the Plan.

8 On a distribution date to be determined by the Monitor following the Plan implementation date, all Affected Creditors with proven distribution claims against the Plan Entities will receive distributions from cash received by CMI (or the Monitor at CMI's direction) from Shaw, the Plan Sponsor, in accordance with the Plan. The directors and officers of the remaining CMI Entities and other subsidiaries of Canwest Global will resign on or about the Plan implementation date.

9 Following the implementation of the Plan, CTLP and CW Investments will be indirect, wholly-owned subsidiaries of Shaw, and the multiple voting shares, subordinate voting shares and non-voting shares of Canwest Global will be delisted from the TSX Venture Exchange. It is anticipated that the remaining CMI Entities and certain other subsidiaries of Canwest Global will be liquidated, wound-up, dissolved, placed into bankruptcy or otherwise abandoned.

10 In furtherance of the Minutes of Settlement that were entered into with the Existing Shareholders, the articles of Canwest Global will be amended under section 191 of the CBCA to facilitate the settlement. In particular, Canwest Global will reorganize the authorized capital of Canwest Global into (a) an unlimited number of new multiple voting shares, new subordinated voting shares and new non-voting shares; and (b) an unlimited number of new non-voting preferred shares. The terms of the new non-voting preferred shares will provide for the mandatory transfer of the new preferred shares held by the Existing Shareholders to a designated entity affiliated with Shaw for an aggregate amount of \$11 million to be paid upon delivery by Canwest Global of the transfer notice to the transfer agent. Following delivery of the transfer notice, the Shaw designated entity will donate and surrender the new preferred shares acquired by it to Canwest Global for cancellation.

11 Canwest Global, CMI, CTLP, New Canwest, Shaw, 7316712 and the Monitor entered into the Plan Emergence Agreement dated June 25, 2010 detailing certain steps that will be taken before, upon and after the implementation of the plan. These steps primarily relate to the funding of various costs that are payable by the CMI Entities on emergence from the

CCAA proceeding. This includes payments that will be made or may be made by the Monitor to satisfy post-filing amounts owing by the CMI Entities. The schedule of costs has not yet been finalized.

### Creditor Meetings

12 Creditor meetings were held on July 19, 2010 in Toronto, Ontario. Support for the Plan was overwhelming. 100% in number representing 100% in value of the beneficial owners of the 8% senior subordinated notes who provided instructions for voting at the Noteholder meeting approved the resolution. Beneficial Noteholders holding approximately 95% of the principal amount of the outstanding notes validly voted at the Noteholder meeting.

13 The Ordinary Creditors with proven voting claims who submitted voting instructions in person or by proxy represented approximately 83% of their number and 92% of the value of such claims. In excess of 99% in number representing in excess of 99% in value of the Ordinary Creditors holding proven voting claims that were present in person or by proxy at the meeting voted or were deemed to vote in favour of the resolution.

### Sanction Test

14 Section 6(1) of the CCAA provides that the court has discretion to sanction a plan of compromise or arrangement if it has achieved the requisite double majority vote. The criteria that a debtor company must satisfy in seeking the court's approval are:

- (a) there must be strict compliance with all statutory requirements;
- (b) 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
- (c) the Plan must be fair and reasonable.

See *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*<sup>2</sup>

#### *(a) Statutory Requirements*

15 I am satisfied that all statutory requirements have been met. I already determined that the Applicants qualified as debtor companies under section 2 of the CCAA and that they had total claims against them exceeding \$5 million. The notice of meeting was sent in accordance with the Meeting Order. Similarly, the classification of Affected Creditors for voting purposes was addressed in the Meeting Order which was unopposed and not appealed. The meetings were both properly constituted and voting in each was properly carried out. Clearly the Plan was approved by the requisite majorities.

16 Section 6(3), 6(5) and 6(6) of the CCAA provide that the court may not sanction a plan unless the plan contains certain specified provisions concerning crown claims, employee claims and pension claims. Section 4.6 of Plan provides that the claims listed in paragraph (l) of the definition of "Unaffected Claims" shall be paid in full from a fund known as the Plan Implementation Fund within six months of the sanction order. The Fund consists of cash, certain other assets and further contributions from Shaw. Paragraph (l) of the definition of "Unaffected Claims" includes any Claims in respect of any payments referred to in section 6(3), 6(5) and 6(6) of the CCAA. I am satisfied that these provisions of section 6 of the CCAA have been satisfied.

***(b) Unauthorized Steps***

17 In considering whether any unauthorized steps have been taken by a debtor company, it has been held that in making such a determination, the court should rely on the parties and their stakeholders and the reports of the Monitor: *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*<sup>3</sup>.

18 The CMI Entities have regularly filed affidavits addressing key developments in this restructuring. In addition, the Monitor has provided regular reports (17 at last count) and has opined that the CMI Entities have acted and continue to act in good faith and with due diligence and have not breached any requirements under the CCAA or any order of this court. If it was not obvious from the hearing on June 23, 2010, it should be stressed that there is no payment of any equity claim pursuant to section 6(8) of the CCAA. As noted by the Monitor in its 16<sup>th</sup> Report, settlement with the Existing Shareholders did not and does not in any way impact the anticipated recovery to the Affected Creditors of the CMI Entities. Indeed I referenced the inapplicability of section 6(8) of the CCAA in my Reasons of June 23, 2010. The second criterion relating to unauthorized steps has been met.

***(c) Fair and Reasonable***

19 The third criterion to consider is the requirement to demonstrate that a plan is fair and reasonable. As Paperny J. (as she then was) stated in *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*:

The court's role on a sanction hearing is to consider whether the plan fairly balances the interests of all 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.<sup>4</sup>



20 My discretion should be informed by the objectives of the CCAA, namely 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.

21 In assessing whether a proposed plan is fair and reasonable, considerations include the following:

- (a) whether the claims were properly classified and whether the requisite majority of creditors approved the plan;
- (b) what creditors would have received on bankruptcy or liquidation as compared to the plan;
- (c) alternatives available to the plan and bankruptcy;
- (d) oppression of the rights of creditors;
- (e) unfairness to shareholders; and
- (f) the public interest.

22 I have already addressed the issue of classification and the vote. Obviously there is an unequal distribution amongst the creditors of the CMI Entities. Distribution to the Noteholders is expected to result in recovery of principal, pre-filing interest and a portion of post-filing accrued and default interest. The range of recoveries for Ordinary Creditors is much less. The recovery of the Noteholders is substantially more attractive than that of Ordinary Creditors. This is not unheard of. In *Armbro Enterprises Inc., Re*<sup>5</sup> Blair J. (as he then was) approved a plan which included an uneven allocation in favour of a single major creditor, the Royal Bank, over the objection of other creditors. Blair J. wrote:

"I am not persuaded that there is a sufficient tilt in the allocation of these new common shares in favour of RBC to justify the court in interfering with the business decision made by the creditor class in approving the proposed Plan, as they have done. RBC's cooperation is a sine qua non for the Plan, or any Plan, to work and it is the only creditor continuing to advance funds to the applicants to finance the proposed re-organization."<sup>6</sup>

23 Similarly, in *Uniforêt inc., Re*<sup>7</sup> a plan provided for payment in full to an unsecured creditor. This treatment was much more generous than that received by other creditors. There, the Québec Superior Court sanctioned the plan and noted that a plan can be more

generous to some creditors and still fair to all creditors. The creditor in question had stepped into the breach on several occasions to keep the company afloat in the four years preceding the filing of the plan and the court was of the view that the conduct merited special treatment. See also Romaine J.'s orders dated October 26, 2009 in *SemCanada Crude Company et al.*

24 I am prepared to accept that the recovery for the Noteholders is fair and reasonable in the circumstances. The size of the Noteholder debt was substantial. CMI's obligations under the notes were guaranteed by several of the CMI Entities. No issue has been taken with the guarantees. As stated before and as observed by the Monitor, the Noteholders held a blocking position in any restructuring. Furthermore, the liquidity and continued support provided by the Ad Hoc Committee both prior to and during these proceedings gave the CMI Entities the opportunity to pursue a going concern restructuring of their businesses. A description of the role of the Noteholders is found in Mr. Strike's affidavit sworn July 20, 2010, filed on this motion.

25 Turning to alternatives, the CMI Entities have been exploring strategic alternatives since February, 2009. Between November, 2009 and February, 2010, RBC Capital Markets conducted the equity investment solicitation process of which I have already commented. While there is always a theoretical possibility that a more advantageous plan could be developed than the Plan proposed, the Monitor has concluded that there is no reason to believe that restarting the equity investment solicitation process or marketing 100% of the CMI Entities assets would result in a better or equally desirable outcome. Furthermore, restarting the process could lead to operational difficulties including issues relating to the CMI Entities' large studio suppliers and advertisers. The Monitor has also confirmed that it is unlikely that the recovery for a going concern liquidation sale of the assets of the CMI Entities would result in greater recovery to the creditors of the CMI Entities. I am not satisfied that there is any other alternative transaction that would provide greater recovery than the recoveries contemplated in the Plan. Additionally, I am not persuaded that there is any oppression of creditor rights or unfairness to shareholders.

26 The last consideration I wish to address is the public interest. If the Plan is implemented, the CMI Entities will have achieved a going concern outcome for the business of the CTLP Plan Entities that fully and finally deals with the Goldman Sachs Parties, the Shareholders Agreement and the defaulted 8% senior subordinated notes. It will ensure the continuation of employment for substantially all of the employees of the Plan Entities and will provide stability for the CMI Entities, pensioners, suppliers, customers and other stakeholders. In addition, the Plan will maintain for the general public broad access to and choice of news, public and other information and entertainment programming. Broadcasting of news, public and entertainment programming is an important public service, and the bankruptcy and liquidation of the CMI Entities would have a negative impact on the Canadian public.

27 I should also mention section 36 of the CCAA which was added by the recent amendments to the Act which came into force on September 18, 2009. This section provides that a debtor company may not sell or otherwise dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business unless authorized to do so by a court. The section goes on to address factors a court is to consider. In my view, section 36 does not apply to transfers contemplated by a Plan. These transfers are merely steps that are required to implement the Plan and to facilitate the restructuring of the Plan Entities' businesses. Furthermore, as the CMI Entities are seeking approval of the Plan itself, there is no risk of any abuse. There is a further safeguard in that the Plan including the asset transfers contemplated therein has been voted on and approved by Affected Creditors.

28 The Plan does include broad releases including some third party releases. In *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*<sup>8</sup>, the Ontario Court of Appeal held that the CCAA court has jurisdiction to approve a plan of compromise or arrangement that includes third party releases. The *Metcalfe* case was extraordinary and exceptional in nature. It responded to dire circumstances and had a plan that included releases that were fundamental to the restructuring. The Court held that the releases in question had to be justified as part of the compromise or arrangement between the debtor and its creditors. There must be a reasonable connection between the third party claim being compromised in the plan and the restructuring achieved by the plan to warrant inclusion of the third party release in the plan.

29 In the *Metcalfe* decision, Blair J.A. discussed in detail the issue of releases of third parties. I do not propose to revisit this issue, save and except to stress that in my view, third party releases should be the exception and should not be requested or granted as a matter of course.

30 In this case, the releases are broad and extend to include the Noteholders, the Ad Hoc Committee and others. Fraud, wilful misconduct and gross negligence are excluded. I have already addressed, on numerous occasions, the role of the Noteholders and the Ad Hoc Committee. I am satisfied that the CMI Entities would not have been able to restructure without materially addressing the notes and developing a plan satisfactory to the Ad Hoc Committee and the Noteholders. The release of claims is rationally connected to the overall purpose of the Plan and full disclosure of the releases was made in the Plan, the information circular, the motion material served in connection with the Meeting Order and on this motion. No one has appeared to oppose the sanction of the Plan that contains these releases and they are considered by the Monitor to be fair and reasonable. Under the circumstances, I am prepared to sanction the Plan containing these releases.

31 Lastly, the Monitor is of the view that the Plan is advantageous to Affected Creditors, is fair and reasonable and recommends its sanction. The board, the senior management of the CMI Entities, the Ad Hoc Committee, and the CMI CRA all support sanction of the Plan as do all those appearing today.

32 In my view, the Plan is fair and reasonable and I am granting the sanction order requested.<sup>9</sup>

33 The Applicants also seek approval of the Plan Emergence Agreement. The Plan Emergence Agreement outlines steps that will be taken prior to, upon, or following implementation of the Plan and is a necessary corollary of the Plan. It does not confiscate the rights of any creditors and is necessarily incidental to the Plan. I have the jurisdiction to approve such an agreement: *Air Canada, Re*<sup>10</sup> and *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re*<sup>11</sup> I am satisfied that the agreement is fair and reasonable and should be approved.

34 It is proposed that on the Plan implementation date the articles of Canwest Global will be amended to facilitate the settlement reached with the Existing Shareholders. Section 191 of the CBCA permits the court to order necessary amendments to the articles of a corporation without shareholder approval or a dissent right. In particular, section 191(1)(c) provides that reorganization means a court order made under any other Act of Parliament that affects the rights among the corporation, its shareholders and creditors. The CCAA is such an Act: *Beatrice Foods Inc., Re*<sup>12</sup> and *Laidlaw, Re*<sup>13</sup>. Pursuant to section 191(2), if a corporation is subject to a subsection (1) order, its articles may be amended to effect any change that might lawfully be made by an amendment under section 173. Section 173(1)(e) and (h) of the CBCA provides that:

(1) Subject to sections 176 and 177, the articles of a corporation may by special resolution be amended to

(e) create new classes of shares;

(h) change the shares of any class or series, whether issued or unissued, into a different number of shares of the same class or series or into the same or a different number of shares of other classes or series.

35 Section 6(2) of the CCAA provides that if a court sanctions a compromise or arrangement, it may order that the debtor's constating instrument be amended in accordance with the compromise or arrangement to reflect any change that may lawfully be made under federal or provincial law.

36 In exercising its discretion to approve a reorganization under section 191 of the CBCA, the court must be satisfied that: (a) there has been compliance with all statutory requirements; (b) the debtor company is acting in good faith; and (c) the capital restructuring is fair and reasonable: *A&M Cookie Co. Canada, Re*<sup>14</sup> and *MEI Computer Technology Group Inc., Re*<sup>15</sup>

37 I am satisfied that the statutory requirements have been met as the contemplated reorganization falls within the conditions provided for in sections 191 and 173 of the CBCA. I am also satisfied that Canwest Global and the other CMI Entities were acting in good faith in attempting to resolve the Existing Shareholder dispute. Furthermore, the reorganization is a necessary step in the implementation of the Plan in that it facilitates agreement reached on June 23, 2010 with the Existing Shareholders. In my view, the reorganization is fair and reasonable and was a vital step in addressing a significant impediment to a satisfactory resolution of outstanding issues.

38 A post-filing claims procedure order is also sought. The procedure is designed to solicit, identify and quantify post-filing claims. The Monitor who participated in the negotiation of the proposed order is satisfied that its terms are fair and reasonable as am I.

39 In closing, I would like to say that generally speaking, the quality of oral argument and the materials filed in this CCAA proceeding has been very high throughout. I would like to express my appreciation to all counsel and the Monitor in that regard. The sanction order and the post-filing claims procedure order are granted.

*Application granted.*

## Footnotes

- 1 R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 as amended.
- 2 2000 ABQB 442 (Alta. Q.B.) at para. 60, leave to appeal denied 2000 ABCA 238 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]), aff'd 2001 ABCA 9 (Alta. C.A.), leave to appeal to S.C.C. refused July 12, 2001 [2001 CarswellAlta 888 (S.C.C.)].
- 3 *Ibid*, at para. 64 citing *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.*, [1993] O.J. No. 545 (Ont. Gen. Div.) and *Cadillac Fairview Inc., Re*, [1995] O.J. No. 274 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).
- 4 *Ibid*, at para. 3.
- 5 (1993), 22 C.B.R. (3d) 80 (Ont. Bkcty.).
- 6 *Ibid*, at para. 6.
- 7 (2003), 43 C.B.R. (4th) 254 (C.S. Que.).

8 (2008), 92 O.R. (3d) 513 (Ont. C.A.).

9 The Sanction Order is extraordinarily long and in large measure repeats the Plan provisions. In future, counsel should attempt to simplify and shorten these sorts of orders.

10 (2004), 47 C.B.R. (4th) 169 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

11 (2007), 35 C.B.R. (5th) 1 (Alta. Q.B.).

12 (1996), 43 C.B.R. (4th) 10 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

13 (2003), 39 C.B.R. (4th) 239 (Ont. S.C.J.).

14 [2009] O.J. No. 2427 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 8/

15 [2005] Q.J. No. 22993 (C.S. Que.) at para. 9.

---

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

# TAB 2

2010 QCCS 4450  
Quebec Superior Court

AbitibiBowater Inc., Re

2010 CarswellQue 10118, 2010 QCCS 4450, 193  
A.C.W.S. (3d) 360, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 80, EYB 2010-179705

## **In The Matter of the Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of**

AbitibiBowater Inc., Abitibi-Consolidated Inc., Bowater Canadian  
Holdings Inc. and The Other Petitioners Listed on Schedules  
"A", "B" and "C" (Debtors) and Ernst & Young Inc. (Monitor)

Clément Gascon, J.S.C.

Heard: September 20-21, 2010

Judgment: September 23, 2010

Docket: C.S. Montréal 500-11-036133-094

Counsel: Mr. Sean Dunphy, Me Guy P. Martel, Me Joseph Reynaud, for the Debtors  
Me Gilles Paquin, Me Avram Fishman, for the Monitor

Mr. Robert Thornton, for the Monitor

Me Bernard Boucher, for BI Citibank (London Branch), as Agent for Citibank, N.A.

Me Jocelyn Perreault, for Bank of Nova Scotia (as Administrative and Collateral Agent)

Me Marc Duchesne, Me François Gagnon, for the Ad hoc Committee of the Senior Secured  
Noteholders and U.S. Bank National Association, Indenture Trustee for the Senior Secured  
Noteholders

Mr. Frederick L. Myers, Mr. Robert J. Chadwick, for the Ad hoc Committee of Bondholders

Mr. Michael B. Rotsztein, for Fairfax Financial Holdings Ltd.

Me Louise Hélène Guimond, for Syndicat canadien des communications, de l'énergie et du  
papier (SCEP) et ses sections locales 59-N, 63, 84, 84-35, 88, 90, 92, 101, 109, 132, 138, 139,  
161, 209, 227, 238, 253, 306, 352, 375, 1256 et 1455 and for Syndicat des employés(es) et  
employés(es) professionnels(-les) et de bureau - Québec (SEPB) et les sections locales 110,  
151 et 526

Me Neil Peden, Mr. Raj Sahni, for The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of  
AbitibiBowater Inc. & al.

Me Sébastien Guy, for Caterpillar Financial Services and Desjardins Trust inc.

Mr. Richard Butler, for Her Majesty the Queen in Right of the Province of British Columbia  
and the Attorney General of British Columbia



Me Louis Dumont, Mr. Neil Rabinovitch, for Aurelius Capital Management LLC and Contrarian Capital Management LLC  
Mr. Christopher Besant, for NPower Cogen Limited  
Mr. Len Marsello, for the Attorney General for Ontario  
Mr. Carl Holm, for Bowater Canada Finance Company  
Mr. David Ward, for Wilmington Trust US Indenture Trustee of Unsecured Notes issued by BCFC

Subject: Insolvency

MOTION by debtor company seeking Court's approval of plan of arrangement.

*Clément Gascon, J.S.C.:*

### **Introduction**

1 This judgment deals with the sanction and approval of a plan of arrangement under the *CCAA*<sup>1</sup>. The sole issue to resolve is the fair and reasonable character of the plan. While the debtor company, the monitor and an overwhelming majority of stakeholders strongly support this sanction and approval, three dissenting voices raise limited objections. The Court provides these reasons in support of the Sanction Order it considers appropriate and justified to issue under the circumstances.

### **The Relevant Background**

2 On April 17, 2009 [2009 CarswellQue 14194 (C.S. Que.)], the Court issued an Initial Order pursuant to the *CCAA* with respect to the Abitibi Petitioners (listed in Schedule A), the Bowater Petitioners (listed in Schedule B) and the Partnerships (listed in Schedule C).

3 On the day before, April 16, 2009, AbitibiBowater Inc., Bowater Inc. and certain of their U.S. and Canadian Subsidiaries (the "*U.S. Debtors*") had, similarly, filed Voluntary Petitions for Relief under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code.

4 Since the Initial Order, the Abitibi Petitioners, the Bowater Petitioners and the Partnerships (collectively, "*Abitibi*") have, under the protection of the Court, undertaken a huge and complex restructuring of their insolvent business.

5 The restructuring of Abitibi's imposing debt of several billion dollars was a cross-border undertaking that affected tens of thousands of stakeholders, from employees, pensioners, suppliers, unions, creditors and lenders to government authorities.

6 The process has required huge efforts on the part of many, including important sacrifices from most of the stakeholders involved. To name just a few, these restructuring efforts

have included the closure of certain facilities, the sale of assets, contracts repudiations, the renegotiation of collective agreements and several costs saving initiatives<sup>2</sup>.

7 In a span of less than 18 months, more than 740 entries have been docketed in the Court record that now comprises in excess of 12 boxes of documents. The Court has, so far, rendered over 100 different judgments and orders. The Stay Period has been extended seven times. It presently expires on September 30, 2010.

8 Abitibi is now nearing emergence from this *CCAA* restructuring process.

9 In May 2010, after an extensive review of the available alternatives, and pursuant to lengthy negotiations and consultations with creditors' groups, regulators and stakeholders, Abitibi filed its Plan of Reorganization and Compromise in the *CCAA* restructuring process (the "*CCAA Plan*"<sup>3</sup>). A joint Plan of Reorganization was also filed at the same time in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court process (the "*U.S. Plan*").

10 In essence, the Plans provided for the payment in full, on the Implementation Date and consummation of the U.S. Plan, of all of Abitibi's and U.S. Debtors' secured debt obligations.

11 As for their unsecured debt obligations, save for few exceptions, the Plans contemplated their conversion to equity of the post emergence reorganized Abitibi. If the Plans are implemented, the net value would likely translate into a recovery under the *CCAA* Plan corresponding to the following approximate rates for the various Affected Unsecured Creditors Classes:

- (a) 3.4% for the ACI Affected Unsecured Creditor Class;
- (b) 17.1% for the ACCC Affected Unsecured Creditor Class;
- (c) 4.2% for the Saguenay Forest Products Affected Unsecured Creditor Class;
- (d) 36.5% for the BCFPI Affected Unsecured Creditor Class;
- (e) 20.8% for the Bowater Maritimes Affected Unsecured Creditor Class; and
- (f) 43% for the ACNSI Affected Unsecured Creditor Class.

12 With respect to the remaining Petitioners, the illustrative recoveries under the *CCAA* Plan would be nil, as these entities have nominal assets.

13 As an alternative to this debt to equity swap, the basic structure of the *CCAA* Plan included as well the possibility of smaller unsecured creditors receiving a cash distribution of

50% of the face amount of their Proven Claim if such was less than \$6,073, or if they opted to reduce their claim to that amount.

14 In short, the purpose of the *CCAA* Plan was to provide for a coordinated restructuring and compromise of Abitibi's debt obligations, while at the same time reorganizing and simplifying its corporate and capital structure.

15 On September 14, 2010, Abitibi's Creditors' Meeting to vote on the *CCAA* Plan was convened, held and conducted. The resolution approving the *CCAA* Plan was overwhelmingly approved by the Affected Unsecured Creditors of Abitibi, save for the Creditors of one the twenty Classes involved, namely, the BCFC Affected Unsecured Creditors Class.

16 Majorities well in excess of the statutorily required simple majority in number and two-third majority in value of the Affected Unsecured Claims held by the Affected Unsecured Creditors were attained. On a combined basis, the percentages were 97.07% in number and 93.47% in value.

17 Of the 5,793 votes cast by creditors holding claims totalling some 8,9 billion dollars, over 8,3 billion dollars worth of claims voted in favour of approving the *CCAA* Plan.

#### **The Motion<sup>4</sup> at Issue**

18 Today, as required by Section 6 of the *CCAA*, the Court is asked to sanction and approve the *CCAA* Plan. The effect of the Court's approval is to bind Abitibi and its Affected Unsecured Creditors to the terms of the *CCAA* Plan.

19 The exercise of the Court's authority to sanction a compromise or arrangement under the *CCAA* is a matter of judicial discretion. In that exercise, the general requirements to be met are well established. In summary, before doing so, the Court must be satisfied that<sup>5</sup>:

- a) There has been strict compliance with all statutory requirements;
- b) Nothing has been done or purported to be done that was not authorized by the *CCAA*; and
- c) The Plan is fair and reasonable.

20 Only the third condition is truly at stake here. Despite Abitibi's creditors' huge support of the fairness and the reasonableness of the *CCAA* Plan, some dissenting voices have raised objections.

21 They include:

- a) The BCFC Noteholders' Objection;
- b) The Contestations of the Provinces of Ontario and British Columbia; and
- c) The Contestation of NPower Cogen Limited.

22 For the reasons that follow, the Court is satisfied that the *CCAA* Plan is fair and reasonable. The Contestations of the Provinces of Ontario and British Columbia and of NPower Cogen Limited have now been satisfactorily resolved by adding to the Sanction Order sought limited "carve-out" provisions in that regard. As for the only other objection that remains, namely that of some of the BCFC Noteholders, the Court considers that it should be discarded.

23 It is thus appropriate to immediately approve the *CCAA* Plan and issue the Sanction Order sought, albeit with some minor modifications to the wording of specific conclusions that the Court deems necessary.

24 In the Court's view, it is important to allow Abitibi to move forthwith towards emergence from the *CCAA* restructuring process it undertook eighteen month ago.

25 No one seriously disputes that there is risk associated with delaying the sanction of the *CCAA* Plan. This risk includes the fact that part of the exit financing sought by Abitibi is dependent upon the capital markets being receptive to the high yield notes or term debt being offered, in a context where such markets are volatile. There is, undoubtedly, continuing uncertainty with respect to the strength of the economic recovery and the effect this could have on the financial markets.

26 Moreover, there are numerous arrangements that Abitibi and their key stakeholders have agreed to or are in the process of settling that are key to the successful implementation of the *CCAA* Plan, including collective bargaining agreements with employees and pension funding arrangements with regulators. Any undue delay with implementation of the *CCAA* Plan increases the risk that these arrangements may require alterations or amendments.

27 Finally, at hearing, Mr. Robertson, the Chief Restructuring Officer, testified that the monthly cost of any delay in Abitibi's emergence from this *CCAA* process is the neighbourhood of 30 million dollars. That includes the direct professional costs and financing costs of the restructuring itself, as well as the savings that the labour cost reductions and the exit financing negotiated by Abitibi will generate as of the Implementation Date.

28 The Court cannot ignore this reality in dealing rapidly with the objections raised to the sanction and approval of the *CCAA* Plan.

## Analysis

### 1. *The Court's approval of the CCAA Plan*

29 As already indicated, the first and second general requirements set out previously dealing with the statutory requirements and the absence of unauthorized conduct are not at issue.

30 On the one hand, the Monitor has reached the conclusion that Abitibi is and has been in strict compliance with all statutory requirements. Nobody suggests that this is not the case.

31 On the other hand, all materials filed and procedures taken by Abitibi were authorized by the *CCAA* and the orders of this Court. The numerous reports of the Monitor (well over sixty to date) make no reference to any act or conduct by Abitibi that was not authorized by the *CCAA*; rather, the Monitor is of the view that Abitibi has not done or purported to do anything that was not authorized by the *CCAA*<sup>6</sup>.

32 In fact, in connection with each request for an extension of the stay of proceedings, the Monitor has reported that Abitibi was acting in good faith and with due diligence. The Court has not made any contrary finding during the course of these proceedings.

33 Turning to the fairness and reasonableness of a *CCAA* Plan requirement, its assessment requires the Court to consider the relative degrees of prejudice that would flow from granting or refusing the relief sought. To that end, in reviewing the fairness and reasonableness of a given plan, the Court does not and should not require perfection<sup>7</sup>.

34 Considering that a plan is, first and foremost, a compromise and arrangement reached, between a debtor company and its creditors, there is, indeed, a heavy onus on parties seeking to upset a plan where the required majorities have overwhelmingly supported it. From that standpoint, a court should not lightly second-guess the business decisions reached by the creditors as a body<sup>8</sup>.

35 In that regard, courts in this country have held that the level of approval by the creditors is a significant factor in determining whether a *CCAA* Plan is fair and reasonable<sup>9</sup>. Here, the majorities in favour of the *CCAA* Plan, both in number and in value, are very high. This indicates a significant and very strong support of the *CCAA* Plan by the Affected Unsecured Creditors of Abitibi.

36 Likewise, in its Fifty-Seventh Report, the Monitor advised the creditors that their approval of the *CCAA* Plan would be a reasonable decision. He recommended that they approve the *CCAA* Plan then. In its Fifty-Eighth Report, the Monitor reaffirmed its view

that the *CCAA* Plan was fair and reasonable. The recommendation was for the Court to sanction and approve the *CCAA* Plan.

37 In a matter such as this one, where the Monitor has worked through out the restructuring with professionalism, objectivity and competence, such a recommendation carries a lot of weight.

38 The Court considers that the *CCAA* Plan represents a truly successful compromise and restructuring, fully in line with the objectives of the *CCAA*. Despite its weaknesses and imperfections, and notwithstanding the huge sacrifices and losses it imposes upon numerous stakeholders, the *CCAA* Plan remains a practical, reasonable and responsible solution to Abitibi's insolvency.

39 Its implementation will preserve significant social and economic benefits to the Canadian economy, including enabling about 11,900 employees (as of March 31, 2010) to retain their employment, and allowing hundreds of municipalities, suppliers and contractors in several regions of Ontario and Quebec to continue deriving benefits from a stronger and more competitive important player in the forest products industry.

40 In addition, the business of Abitibi will continue to operate, pension plans will not be terminated, and the Affected Unsecured Creditors will receive distributions (including payment in full to small creditors).

41 Moreover, simply no alternative to the *CCAA* Plan has been offered to the creditors of Abitibi. To the contrary, it appears obvious that in the event the Court does not sanction the *CCAA* Plan, the considerable advantages that it creates will be most likely lost, such that Abitibi may well be placed into bankruptcy.

42 If that were to be the case, no one seriously disputes that most of the creditors would end up being in a more disadvantageous position than with the approval of the *CCAA* Plan. As outlined in the Monitor's 57th Report, the alternative scenario, a liquidation of Abitibi's business, will not prove to be as advantageous for its creditors, let alone its stakeholders as a whole.

43 All in all, the economic and business interests of those directly concerned with the end result have spoken vigorously pursuant to a well-conducted democratic process. This is certainly not a case where the Court should override the express and strong wishes of the debtor company and its creditors and the Monitor's objective analysis that supports it.

44 Bearing these comments in mind, the Court notes as well that none of the objections raised support the conclusion that the *CCAA* Plan is unfair or unreasonable.

## 2. *The BCFC Noteholders' objections*

45 In the end, only Aurelius Capital Management LP and Contrarian Capital Management LLC (the "*Noteholders*") oppose the sanction of the *CCAA* Plan<sup>10</sup>.

46 These Noteholders, through their managed funds entities, hold about one-third of some six hundred million US dollars of Unsecured Notes issued by Bowater Canada Finance Company ("*BCFC*") and which are guaranteed by Bowater Incorporated. These notes are *BCFC*'s only material liabilities.

47 *BCFC* was a Petitioner under the *CCAA* proceedings and a Debtor in the parallel proceedings under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code. However, its creditors voted to reject the *CCAA* Plan: while 76.8% of the Class of Affected Unsecured Creditors of *BCFC* approved the *CCAA* Plan in number, only 48% thereof voted in favour in dollar value. The required majorities of the *CCAA* were therefore not met.

48 As a result of this no vote occurrence, the Affected Unsecured Creditors of *BCFC*, including the Noteholders, are Unaffected Creditors under the *CCAA* Plan: they will not receive the distribution contemplated by the plan. As for *BCFC* itself, this outcome entails that it is not an "Applicant" for the purpose of this Sanction Order.

49 Still, the terms of the *CCAA* Plan specifically provide for the compromise and release of any claims *BCFC* may have against the other Petitioners pursuant, for instance, to any inter company transactions. Similarly, the *CCAA* Plan specifies that *BCFC*'s equity interests in any other Petitioner can be exchanged, cancelled, redeemed or otherwise dealt with for nil consideration.

50 In their objections to the sanction of the *CCAA* Plan, the Noteholders raise, in essence, three arguments:

- (a) They maintain that *BCFC* did not have an opportunity to vote on the *CCAA* Plan and that no process has been established to provide for *BCFC* to receive distribution as a creditor of the other Petitioners;
- (b) They criticize the overly broad and inappropriate character of the release provisions of the *CCAA* Plan;
- (c) They contend that the NAFTA Settlement Funds have not been appropriately allocated.

51 With respect, the Court considers that these objections are ill founded.

52 First, given the vote by the creditors of BCFC that rejected the *CCAA* Plan and its specific terms in the event of such a situation, the initial ground of contestation is moot for all intents and purposes.

53 In addition, pursuant to a hearing held on September 16 and 17, 2010, on an Abitibi's *Motion for Advice and Directions*, Mayrand J. already concluded that BCFC had simply no claims against the other Petitioners, save with respect to the Contribution Claim referred to in that motion and that is not affected by the *CCAA* Plan in any event.

54 There is no need to now review or reconsider this issue that has been heard, argued and decided, mostly in a context where the Noteholders had ample opportunity to then present fully their arguments.

55 In her reasons for judgment filed earlier today in the Court record, Mayrand J. notably ruled that the alleged Inter Company Claims of BCFC had no merit pursuant to a detailed analysis of what took place.

56 For one, the Monitor, in its Amended 49<sup>th</sup> Report, had made a thorough review of the transactions at issue and concluded that they did not appear to give rise to any inter company debt owing to BCFC.

57 On top of that, Mayrand J. noted as well that the Independent Advisors, who were appointed in the Chapter 11 U.S. Proceedings to investigate the Inter Company Transactions that were the subject of the Inter Company Claims, had completed their report in this regard. As explained in its 58<sup>th</sup> Report, the Monitor understands that they were of the view that BCFC had no other claims to file against any other Petitioner. In her reasons, Mayrand J. concluded that this was the only reasonable inference to draw from the evidence she heard.

58 As highlighted by Mayrand J. in these reasons, despite having received this report of the Independent Advisors, the Noteholders have not agreed to release its content. Conversely, they have not invoked any of its findings in support of their position either.

59 That is not all. In her reasons for judgment, Mayrand J. indicated that a detailed presentation of the Independent Advisors report was made to BCFC's Board of Directors on September 7, 2010. This notwithstanding, BCFC elected not to do anything in that regard since then.

60 As a matter of fact, at no point in time did BCFC ever file, in the context of the current *CCAA* Proceedings, any claim against any other Petitioner. None of its creditors, including the Noteholders, have either purported to do so for and/or on behalf of BCFC. This is quite



telling. After all, the transactions at issue date back many years and this restructuring process has been going on for close to eighteen months.

61 To sum up, short of making allegations that no facts or analysis appear to support or claiming an insufficiency of process because the independent and objective ones followed so far did not lead to the result they wanted, the Noteholders simply have nothing of substance to put forward.

62 Contrary to what they contend, there is no need for yet again another additional process to deal with this question. To so conclude would be tantamount to allowing the Noteholders to take hostage the *CCAA* restructuring process and derail Abitibi's emergence for no valid reason.

63 The other argument of the Noteholders to the effect that BCFC would have had a claim as the holder of preferred shares of BCHI leads to similar comments. It is, again, hardly supported by anything. In any event, assuming the restructuring transactions contemplated under the *CCAA* Plan entail their cancellation for nil consideration, which is apparently not necessarily the case for the time being, there would be nothing unusual in having the equity holders of insolvent companies not receive anything in a compromise and plan of arrangement approved in a *CCAA* restructuring process.

64 In such a context, the Court disagrees with the Noteholders' assertion that BCFC did not have an opportunity to vote on the *CCAA* Plan or that no process was established to provide the latter to receive distribution as a potential creditor of the other Petitioners.

65 To argue that the *CCAA* Plan is not fair and reasonable on the basis of these alleged claims of BCFC against the other Petitioners has no support based on the relevant facts and Mayrand J.'s analysis of that specific point.

66 Second, given these findings, the issue of the breadth and appropriateness of the releases provided under the *CCAA* Plan simply does not concern the Noteholders.

67 As stated by Abitibi's Counsel at hearing, BCFC is neither an "Applicant" under the terms of the releases of the *CCAA* Plan nor pursuant to the Sanction Order. As such, BCFC does not give or get releases as a result of the Sanction Order. The *CCAA* Plan does not release BCFC nor its directors or officers acting as such.

68 As it is not included as an "Applicant", there is no need to provide any type of convoluted "carve-out" provision as the Noteholders requested. As properly suggested by Abitibi, it will rather suffice to include a mere clarification at paragraph 15 of the Sanction Order to reaffirm that in the context of the releases and the Sanction Order, "Applicant" does not include BCFC.

69 As for the Noteholders themselves, they are Unaffected Creditors under the *CCAA* Plan as a result of the no vote of their Class.

70 In essence, the main concern of the Noteholders as to the scope of the releases contemplated by the *CCAA* Plan and the Sanction Order is a mere issue of clarity. In the Court's opinion, this is sufficiently dealt with by the addition made to the wording of paragraph 15 of the Sanction Order.

71 Besides that, as explained earlier, any complaint by the Noteholders that the alleged inter company claims of BCFC are improperly compromised by the *CCAA* Plan has no merit. If their true objective is to indirectly protect their contentions to that end by challenging the wording of the releases, it is unjustified and without basis. The Court already said so.

72 Save for these arguments raised by the Noteholders that the Court rejects, it is worth noting that none of the stakeholders of Abitibi object to the scope of the releases of the *CCAA* Plan or their appropriateness given the global compromise reached through the debt to equity swap and the reorganization contemplated by the plan.

73 The *CCAA* permits the inclusion of releases (even ones involving third parties) in a plan of compromise or arrangement when there is a reasonable connection between the claims being released and compromised and the restructuring achieved by the plan. Amongst others, the broad nature of the terms "compromise or arrangement", the binding nature of a plan that has received creditors' approval, and the principles that parties should be able to put in a plan what could lawfully be incorporated into any other contract support the authority of the Court to approve these kind of releases<sup>11</sup>. In accordance with these principles, the Quebec Superior Court has, in the past, sanctioned plans that included releases of parties making significant contribution to a restructuring<sup>12</sup>.

74 The additional argument raised by the Noteholders with respect to the difference between the releases that could be approved by this Court as compared to those that the U.S. Bankruptcy Court may issue in respect of the Chapter 11 Plan is not convincing.

75 The fact that under the Chapter 11 Plan, creditors may elect not to provide releases to directors and officers of applicable entities does not render similar kind of releases granted under the *CCAA* Plan invalid or improper. That the result may be different in a jurisdiction as opposed to the other does not make the *CCAA* Plan unfair and unreasonable simply for that reason.

76 Third, the last objection of the Noteholders to the effect that the NAFTA Settlement Funds have not been properly allocated is simply a red herring. It is aimed at provoking a useless debate with respect to which the Noteholders have, in essence, no standing.

77 The Monitor testified that the NAFTA Settlement has no impact whatsoever upon BCFC. If it is at all relevant, all the assets involved in this settlement belonged to another of the Petitioners, ACCC, with respect to whom the Noteholders are not a creditor.

78 In addition, this apparent contestation of the allocation of the NAFTA Settlement Funds is a collateral attack on the Order granted by this Court on September 1, 2010, which approved the settlement of Abitibi's NAFTA claims against the Government of Canada, as well as the related payment to be made to the reorganised successor Canadian operating entity upon emergence. No one has appealed this NAFTA Settlement Order.

79 That said, in their oral argument, the Noteholders have finally argued that the Court should lift the Stay of Proceedings Order inasmuch as BCFC was concerned. The last extension of the Stay was granted on September 1, 2010, without objection; it expires on September 30, 2010. It is clear from the wording of this Sanction Order that any extension beyond September 30, 2010 will not apply to BCFC.

80 The Court considers this request made verbally by the Noteholders as unfounded.

81 No written motion was ever served in that regard to start with. In addition, the Stay remains in effect against BCFC up until September 30, 2010, that is, for about a week or so. The explanations offered by Abitibi's Counsel to leave it as such for the time being are reasonable under the circumstances. It appears proper to allow a few days to the interested parties to ascertain the impact, if any, of the Stay not being applicable anymore to BCFC, if alone to ascertain how this impacts upon the various charges created by the Initial Order and subsequent Orders issued by the Court during the course of these proceedings.

82 There is no support for the concern of the Noteholders as to an ulterior motive of Abitibi for maintaining in place this Stay of Proceedings against BCFC up until September 30, 2010.

83 All things considered, in the Court's opinion, it would be quite unfair and unreasonable to deny the sanction of the *CCAA* Plan for the benefit of all the stakeholders involved on the basis of the arguments raised by the Noteholders.

84 Their objections either reargue issues that have been heard, considered and decided, complain of a lack a clarity of the scope of releases that the addition of a few words to the Sanction Order properly addresses, or voice queries about the allocation of important funds to the Abitibi's emergence from the *CCAA* that simply do not concern the entities of which the Noteholders are allegedly creditors, be it in Canada or in the U.S.

85 When one remains mindful of the relative degrees of prejudice that would flow from granting or refusing the relief sought, it is obvious that the scales heavily tilt in favour of granting the Sanction Order sought.

### ***3. The Contestations of the Provinces of Ontario and British Columbia***

86 Following negotiations that the Provinces involved and Abitibi pursued, with the assistance of the Monitor, up to the very last minute, the interested parties have agreed upon a "carve-out" wording that is satisfactory to every one with respect to some potential environmental liabilities of Abitibi in the event future circumstances trigger a concrete dispute in that regard.

87 In the Court's view, this is, by far, the most preferred solution to adopt with respect to the disagreement that exists on their respective position as to potential proceedings that may arise in the future under environmental legislation. This approach facilitates the approval of the CCAA Plan and the successful restructuring of Abitibi, without affecting the right of any affected party in this respect.

88 The "carve-out" provisions agreed upon will be included in the Sanction Order.

### ***4. The Contestation of NPower Cogen Limited***

89 By its Contestation, NPower Cogen Limited sought to preserve its rights with respect to what it called the "Cogen Motion", namely a "*motion to be brought by Cogen before this Honourable Court to have various claims heard*" (para. 24(b) and 43 of NPower Cogen Limited Contestation).

90 Here again, Abitibi and NPower Cogen Limited have agreed on an acceptable "carve-out" wording to be included in the Sanction Order in that regard. As a result, there is no need to discuss the impact of this Contestation any further.

### ***5. Abitibi's Reorganization***

91 The Motion finally deals with the corporate reorganization of Abitibi and the Sanction Order includes declarations and orders dealing with it.

92 The test to be applied by the Court in determining whether to approve a reorganization under Section 191 of the CBCA is similar to the test applied in deciding whether to sanction a plan of arrangement under the CCAA, namely: (a) there must be compliance with all statutory requirements; (b) the debtor company must be acting in good faith; and (c) the capital restructuring must be fair and reasonable<sup>13</sup>.

93 It is not disputed by anyone that these requirements have been fulfilled here.

***6. The wording of the Sanction Order***

94 In closing, the Court made numerous comments to Abitibi's Counsel on the wording of the Sanction Order initially sought in the Motion. These comments have been taken into account in the subsequent in depth revisions of the Sanction Order that the Court is now issuing. The Court is satisfied with the corrections, adjustments and deletions made to what was originally requested.

**For these Reasons, The Court:**

1 *GRANTS* the Motion.

***Definitions***

2 *DECLARES* that any capitalized terms not otherwise defined in this Order shall have the meaning ascribed thereto in the *CCAA* Plan<sup>14</sup> and the Creditors' Meeting Order, as the case may be.

***Service and Meeting***

3 *DECLARES* that the notices given of the presentation of the Motion and related Sanction Hearing are proper and sufficient, and in accordance with the Creditors' Meeting Order.

4 *DECLARES* that there has been proper and sufficient service and notice of the Meeting Materials, including the *CCAA* Plan, the Circular and the Notice to Creditors in connection with the Creditors' Meeting, to all Affected Unsecured Creditors, and that the Creditors' Meeting was duly convened, held and conducted in conformity with the *CCAA*, the Creditors' Meeting Order and all other applicable orders of the Court.

5 *DECLARES* that no meetings or votes of (i) holders of Equity Securities and/or (ii) holders of equity securities of ABH are required in connection with the *CCAA* Plan and its implementation, including the implementation of the Restructuring Transactions as set out in the Restructuring Transactions Notice dated September 1, 2010, as amended on September 13, 2010.

***CCAA Plan Sanction***

6 *DECLARES* that:

a) the *CCAA* Plan and its implementation (including the implementation of the Restructuring Transactions) have been approved by the Required Majorities of Affected Unsecured Creditors in each of the following classes in conformity with the *CCAA*: ACI Affected Unsecured Creditor Class, the ACCC Affected Unsecured Creditor Class, the 15.5% Guarantor Applicant Affected Unsecured Creditor Classes, the Saguenay Forest Products Affected Unsecured Creditor Class, the BCFPI Affected Unsecured Creditor Class, the AbitibiBowater Canada Affected Unsecured Creditor Class, the Bowater Maritimes Affected Unsecured Creditor Class, the ACNSI Affected Unsecured Creditor Class, the Office Products Affected Unsecured Creditor Class and the Recycling Affected Unsecured Creditor Class;

b) the *CCAA* Plan was not approved by the Required Majority of Affected Unsecured Creditors in the BCFC Affected Unsecured Creditors Class and that the Holders of BCFC Affected Unsecured Claims are therefore deemed to be Unaffected Creditors holding Excluded Claims against BCFC for the purpose of the *CCAA* Plan and this Order, and that BCFC is therefore deemed not to be an Applicant for the purpose of this Order;

c) the Court is satisfied that the Petitioners and the Partnerships have complied with the provisions of the *CCAA* and all the orders made by this Court in the context of these *CCAA* Proceedings in all respects;

d) the Court is satisfied that no Petitioner or Partnership has either done or purported to do anything that is not authorized by the *CCAA*; and

e) the *CCAA* Plan (and its implementation, including the implementation of the Restructuring Transactions), is fair and reasonable, and in the best interests of the Applicants and the Partnerships, the Affected Unsecured Creditors, the other stakeholders of the Applicants and all other Persons stipulated in the *CCAA* Plan.

7 *ORDERS* that the *CCAA* Plan and its implementation, including the implementation of the Restructuring Transactions, are sanctioned and approved pursuant to Section 6 of the *CCAA* and Section 191 of the *CBCA*, and, as at the Implementation Date, will be effective and will enure to the benefit of and be binding upon the Applicants, the Partnerships, the Reorganized Debtors, the Affected Unsecured Creditors, the other stakeholders of the Applicants and all other Persons stipulated in the *CCAA* Plan.

### *CCAA Plan Implementation*

8 *DECLARES* that the Applicants, the Partnerships, the Reorganized Debtors and the Monitor, as the case may be, are authorized and directed to take all steps and

actions necessary or appropriate, as determined by the Applicants, the Partnerships and the Reorganized Debtors in accordance with and subject to the terms of the *CCAA* Plan, to implement and effect the *CCAA* Plan, including the Restructuring Transactions, in the manner and the sequence as set forth in the *CCAA* Plan, the Restructuring Transactions Notice and this Order, and such steps and actions are hereby approved.

9 *AUTHORIZES* the Applicants, the Partnerships and the Reorganized Debtors to request, if need be, one or more order(s) from this Court, including *CCAA* Vesting Order(s), for the transfer and assignment of assets to the Applicants, the Partnerships, the Reorganized Debtors or other entities referred to in the Restructuring Transactions Notice, free and clear of any financial charges, as necessary or desirable to implement and effect the Restructuring Transactions as set forth in the Restructuring Transactions Notice.

10 *DECLARES* that, pursuant to Section 191 of the *CBCA*, the articles of AbitibiBowater Canada will be amended by new articles of reorganization in the manner and at the time set forth in the Restructuring Transactions Notice.

11 *DECLARES* that all Applicants and Partnerships to be dissolved pursuant to the Restructuring Transactions shall be deemed dissolved for all purposes without the necessity for any other or further action by or on behalf of any Person, including the Applicants or the Partnerships or their respective securityholders, directors, officers, managers or partners or for any payments to be made in connection therewith, provided, however, that the Applicants, the Partnerships and the Reorganized Debtors shall cause to be filed with the appropriate Governmental Entities articles, agreements or other documents of dissolution for the dissolved Applicants or Partnerships to the extent required by applicable Law.

12 *DECLARES* that, subject to the performance by the Applicants and the Partnerships of their obligations under the *CCAA* Plan, and in accordance with Section 8.1 of the *CCAA* Plan, all contracts, leases, Timber Supply and Forest Management Agreements ("TSFMA") and outstanding and unused volumes of cutting rights (backlog) thereunder, joint venture agreements, agreements and other arrangements to which the Applicants or the Partnerships are a party and that have not been terminated including as part of the Restructuring Transactions or repudiated in accordance with the terms of the Initial Order will be and remain in full force and effect, unamended, as at the Implementation Date, and no Person who is a party to any such contract, lease, agreement or other arrangement may accelerate, terminate, rescind, refuse to perform or otherwise repudiate its obligations thereunder, or enforce or exercise any right (including any right of dilution or other remedy) or make any demand under or in respect of any such contract, lease, agreement or other arrangement and no automatic termination will have any validity or effect by reason of:

- a) any event that occurred on or prior to the Implementation Date and is not continuing that would have entitled such Person to enforce those rights or remedies (including defaults, events of default, or termination events arising as a result of the insolvency of the Applicants and the Partnerships);
- b) the insolvency of the Applicants, the Partnerships or any affiliate thereof or the fact that the Applicants, the Partnerships or any affiliate thereof sought or obtained relief under the *CCAA*, the *CBCA* or the Bankruptcy Code or any other applicable legislation;
- c) any of the terms of the *CCAA* Plan, the U.S. Plan or any action contemplated therein, including the Restructuring Transactions Notice;
- d) any settlements, compromises or arrangements effected pursuant to the *CCAA* Plan or the U.S. Plan or any action taken or transaction effected pursuant to the *CCAA* Plan or the U.S. Plan; or
- e) any change in the control, transfer of equity interest or transfer of assets of the Applicants, the Partnerships, the joint ventures, or any affiliate thereof, or of any entity in which any of the Applicants or the Partnerships held an equity interest arising from the implementation of the *CCAA* Plan (including the Restructuring Transactions Notice) or the U.S. Plan, or the transfer of any asset as part of or in connection with the Restructuring Transactions Notice.

13 *DECLARES* that any consent or authorization required from a third party, including any Governmental Entity, under any such contracts, leases, TSFMAs and outstanding and unused volumes of cutting rights (backlog) thereunder, joint venture agreements, agreements or other arrangements in respect of any change of control, transfer of equity interest, transfer of assets or transfer of any asset as part of or in connection with the Restructuring Transactions Notice be deemed satisfied or obtained, as applicable.

14 *DECLARES* that the determination of Proven Claims in accordance with the Claims Procedure Orders, the Cross-border Claims Protocol, the Cross-border Voting Protocol and the Creditors' Meeting Order shall be final and binding on the Applicants, the Partnerships, the Reorganized Debtors and all Affected Unsecured Creditors.

### ***Releases and Discharges***

15 *CONFIRMS* the releases contemplated by Section 6.10 of the *CCAA* Plan and *DECLARES* that the said releases constitute good faith compromises and settlements of the matters covered thereby, and that such compromises and settlements are in the best interests of the Applicants and its stakeholders, are fair, equitable, and are integral elements of the



restructuring and resolution of these proceedings in accordance with the *CCAA* Plan, it being understood that for the purpose of these releases and/or this Order, the terms "Applicants" or "Applicant" are not meant to include Bowater Canada Finance Corporation ("*BCFC*").

16 *ORDERS* that, upon payment in full in cash of all BI DIP Claims and ULC DIP Claim in accordance with the *CCAA* Plan, the BI DIP Lenders and the BI DIP Agent or ULC, as the case may be, shall at the request of the Applicants, the Partnerships or the Reorganized Debtors, without delay, execute and deliver to the Applicants, the Partnerships or the Reorganized Debtors such releases, discharges, authorizations and directions, instruments, notices and other documents as the Applicants, the Partnerships or the Reorganized Debtors may reasonably request for the purpose of evidencing and/or registering the release and discharge of any and all Financial Charges with respect to the BI DIP Claims or the ULC DIP Claim, as the case may be, the whole at the expense of the Applicants, the Partnerships or the Reorganized Debtors.

17 *ORDERS* that, upon payment in full in cash of their Secured Claims in accordance with the *CCAA* Plan, the ACCC Administrative Agent, the ACCC Term Lenders, the BCFPI Administrative Agent, the BCFPI Lenders, the Canadian Secured Notes Indenture Trustee and any Holders of a Secured Claim, as the case may be, shall at the request of the Applicants, the Partnerships or the Reorganized Debtors, without delay, execute and deliver to the Applicants, the Partnerships or the Reorganized Debtors such releases, discharges, authorizations and directions, instruments, notices and other documents as the Applicants, the Partnerships or the Reorganized Debtors may reasonably request for the purpose of evidencing and/or registering the release and discharge of any and all Financial Charges with respect to the ACCC Term Loan Claim, BCFPI Secured Bank Claim, Canadian Secured Notes Claim or any other Secured Claim, as the case may be, the whole at the expense of the Applicants, the Partnerships or the Reorganized Debtors.

For the purposes of the present paragraph [17], in the event of any dispute as to the amount of any Secured Claim, the Applicants, Partnerships or Reorganized Debtors, as the case may be, shall be permitted to pay to the Monitor the full amount in dispute (as specified by the affected Secured Creditor or by this Court upon summary application) and, upon payment of the amount not in dispute, receive the releases, discharges, authorizations, directions, instruments notices or other documents as provided for therein. Any amount paid to the Monitor in accordance with this paragraph shall be held in trust by the Monitor for the holder of the Secured Claim and the payer as their interests shall be determined by agreement between the parties or, failing agreement, as directed by this Court after summary application.

18 *PRECLUDES* the prosecution against the Applicants, the Partnerships or the Reorganized Debtors, whether directly, derivatively or otherwise, of any claim, obligation,

suit, judgment, damage, demand, debt, right, cause of action, liability or interest released, discharged or terminated pursuant to the *CCAA* Plan.

### ***Accounts with Financial Institutions***

19 *ORDERS* that any and all financial institutions (the "Financial Institutions") with which the Applicants, the Partnerships and the Reorganized Debtors have or will have accounts (the "Accounts") shall process and/or facilitate the transfer of, or changes to, such Accounts in order to implement the *CCAA* Plan and the transactions contemplated thereby, including the Restructuring Transactions.

20 *ORDERS* that Mr. Allen Dea, Vice-President and Treasurer of ABH, or any other officer or director of the Reorganized Debtors, is empowered to take all required acts with any of the Financial Institutions to affect the transfer of, or changes to, the Accounts in order to facilitate the implementation of the *CCAA* Plan and the transactions contemplated thereby, including the Restructuring Transactions.

### ***Effect of failure to implement CCAA Plan***

21 *ORDERS* that, in the event that the Implementation Date does not occur, Affected Unsecured Creditors shall not be bound to the valuation, settlement or compromise of their Affected Claims at the amount of their Proven Claims in accordance with the *CCAA* Plan, the Claims Procedure Orders or the Creditors' Meeting Order. For greater certainty, nothing in the *CCAA* Plan, the Claims Procedure Orders, the Creditors' Meeting Order or in any settlement, compromise, agreement, document or instrument made or entered into in connection therewith or in contemplation thereof shall, in any way, prejudice, quantify, adjudicate, modify, release, waive or otherwise affect the validity, enforceability or quantum of any Claim against the Applicants or the Partnerships, including in the *CCAA* Proceedings or any other proceeding or process, in the event that the Implementation Date does not occur.

### ***Charges created in the CCAA Proceedings***

22 *ORDERS* that, upon the Implementation Date, all *CCAA* Charges against the Applicants and the Partnerships or their property created by the *CCAA* Initial Order or any subsequent orders shall be determined, discharged and released, provided that the BI DIP Lenders Charge shall be cancelled on the condition that the BI DIP Claims are paid in full on the Implementation Date.

### ***Fees and Disbursements***

23 *ORDERS* and *DECLARES* that, on and after the Implementation Date, the obligation to pay the reasonable fees and disbursements of the Monitor, counsel to the Monitor and

counsel to the Applicants and the Partnerships, in each case at their standard rates and charges and including any amounts outstanding as of the Implementation Date, in respect of the *CCAA* Plan, including the implementation of the Restructuring Transactions, shall become obligations of Reorganized ABH.

### *Exit Financing*

24 *ORDERS* that the Applicants are authorized and empowered to execute, deliver and perform any credit agreements, instruments of indebtedness, guarantees, security documents, deeds, and other documents, as may be required in connection with the Exit Facilities.

### *Stay Extension*

25 *EXTENDS* the Stay Period in respect of the Applicants until the Implementation Date.

26 *DECLARES* that all orders made in the *CCAA* Proceedings shall continue in full force and effect in accordance with their respective terms, except to the extent that such Orders are varied by, or inconsistent with, this Order, the Creditors' Meeting Order, or any further Order of this Court.

### *Monitor and Chief Restructuring Officer*

27 *DECLARES* that the protections afforded to Ernst & Young Inc., as Monitor and as officer of this Court, and to the Chief Restructuring Officer pursuant to the terms of the Initial Order and the other Orders made in the *CCAA* Proceedings, shall not expire or terminate on the Implementation Date and, subject to the terms hereof, shall remain effective and in full force and effect.

28 *ORDERS* and *DECLARES* that any distributions under the *CCAA* Plan and this Order shall not constitute a "distribution" and the Monitor shall not constitute a "legal representative" or "representative" of the Applicants for the purposes of section 159 of the Income Tax Act (Canada), section 270 of the Excise Tax Act (Canada), section 14 of the Act Respecting the Ministère du Revenu (Québec), section 107 of the Corporations Tax Act (Ontario), section 22 of the Retail Sales Tax Act (Ontario), section 117 of the Taxation Act, 2007 (Ontario) or any other similar federal, provincial or territorial tax legislation (collectively the "Tax Statutes") given that the Monitor is only a Disbursing Agent under the *CCAA* Plan, and the Monitor in making such payments is not "distributing", nor shall be considered to "distribute" nor to have "distributed", such funds for the purpose of the Tax Statutes, and the Monitor shall not incur any liability under the Tax Statutes in respect of it making any payments ordered or permitted hereunder, and is hereby forever released, remised and discharged from any claims against it under or pursuant to the Tax Statutes or

otherwise at law, arising in respect of payments made under the *CCAA* Plan and this Order and any claims of this nature are hereby forever barred.

29 *ORDERS* and *DECLARES* that the Disbursing Agent, the Applicants and the Reorganized Debtors, as necessary, are authorized to take any and all actions as may be necessary or appropriate to comply with applicable Tax withholding and reporting requirements, including withholding a number of shares of New ABH Common Stock equal in value to the amount required to comply with such withholding requirements from the shares of New ABH Common Stock to be distributed to current or former employees and making the necessary arrangements for the sale of such shares on the TSX or the New York Stock Exchange on behalf of the current or former employees to satisfy such withholding requirements. All amounts withheld on account of Taxes shall be treated for all purposes as having been paid to the Affected Unsecured Creditor in respect of which such withholding was made, provided such withheld amounts are remitted to the appropriate Governmental Entity.

### *Claims Officers*

30 *DECLARES* that, in accordance with paragraph [25] hereof, any claims officer appointed in accordance with the Claims Procedure Orders shall continue to have the authority conferred upon, and to the benefit from all protections afforded to, claims officers pursuant to Orders in the *CCAA* Proceedings.

### *General*

31 *ORDERS* that, notwithstanding any other provision in this Order, the *CCAA* Plan or these *CCAA* Proceedings, the rights of the public authorities of British Columbia, Ontario or New Brunswick to take the position in or with respect to any future proceedings under environmental legislation that this or any other Order does not affect such proceedings by reason that such proceedings are not in relation to a claim within the meaning of the *CCAA* or are otherwise beyond the jurisdiction of Parliament or a court under the *CCAA* to affect in any way is fully reserved; as is reserved the right of any affected party to take any position to the contrary.

32 *DECLARES* that nothing in this Order or the *CCAA* Plan shall preclude NPower Cogen Limited ("Cogen") from bringing a motion for, or this Court from granting, the relief sought in respect of the facts and issues set out in the Claims Submission of Cogen dated August 10, 2010 (the "Claim Submission"), and the Reply Submission of Cogen dated August 24, 2010, provided that such relief shall be limited to the following:

- a) a declaration that Cogen's claim against Abitibi Consolidated Inc. ("Abitibi") and its officers and directors, arising from the supply of electricity and steam to Bridgewater

Paper Company Limited between November 1, 2009 and February 2, 2010 in the amount of £9,447,548 plus interest accruing at the rate of 3% *per annum* from February 2, 2010 onwards (the "Claim Amount") is (i) unaffected by the *CCAA* Plan or Sanction Order; (ii) is an Excluded Claim; or (iii) is a Secured Claim; (iv) is a D&O Claim; or (v) is a liability of Abitibi under its Guarantee;

b) an Order directing Abitibi and its Directors and Officers to pay the Claim Amount to Cogen forthwith; or

c) in the alternative to (b), an order granting leave, if leave be required, to commence proceedings for the payment of the Claim Amount under s. 241 of the *CBCA* and otherwise against Abitibi and its directors and officers in respect of same.

33 *DECLARES* that any of the Applicants, the Partnerships, the Reorganized Debtors or the Monitor may, from time to time, apply to this Court for directions concerning the exercise of their respective powers, duties and rights hereunder or in respect of the proper execution of the Order on notice to the Service List.

34 *DECLARES* that this Order shall have full force and effect in all provinces and territories in Canada.

35 *REQUESTS* the aid and recognition of any Court or administrative body in any Province of Canada and any Canadian federal court or administrative body and any federal or state court or administrative body in the United States of America and any court or administrative body elsewhere, to act in aid of and to be complementary to this Court in carrying out the terms of the Order, including the registration of this Order in any office of public record by any such court or administrative body or by any Person affected by the Order.

### *Provisional Execution*

36 *ORDERS* the provisional execution of this Order notwithstanding any appeal and without the necessity of furnishing any security;

37 *WITHOUT COSTS.*

### **Schedule "A" — Abitibi Petitioners**

1. *ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED INC.*
2. *ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED COMPANY OF CANADA*
3. *3224112 NOVA SCOTIA LIMITED*

4. *MARKETING DONOHUE INC.*
5. *ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED CANADIAN OFFICE PRODUCTS HOLDINGS INC.*
6. *3834328 CANADA INC.*
7. *6169678 CANADA INC.*
8. *4042140 CANADA INC.*
9. *DONOHUE RECYCLING INC.*
10. *1508756 ONTARIO INC.*
11. *3217925 NOVA SCOTIA COMPANY*
12. *LA TUQUE FOREST PRODUCTS INC.*
13. *ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED NOVA SCOTIA INCORPORATED*
14. *SAGUENAY FOREST PRODUCTS INC.*
15. *TERRA NOVA EXPLORATIONS LTD.*
16. *THE JONQUIERE PULP COMPANY*
17. *THE INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE AND TERMINAL COMPANY*
18. *SCRAMBLE MINING LTD.*
19. *9150-3383 QUÉBEC INC.*
20. *ABITIBI-CONSOLIDATED (U.K.) INC.*

**Schedule "B" — Bowater Petitioners**

1. *BOWATER CANADIAN HOLDINGS INC.*
2. *BOWATER CANADA FINANCE CORPORATION*
3. *BOWATER CANADIAN LIMITED*
4. *3231378 NOVA SCOTIA COMPANY*

5. *ABITIBIBOWATER CANADA INC.*
6. *BOWATER CANADA TREASURY CORPORATION*
7. *BOWATER CANADIAN FOREST PRODUCTS INC.*
8. *BOWATER SHELBURNE CORPORATION*
9. *BOWATER LAHAVE CORPORATION*
10. *ST-MAURICE RIVER DRIVE COMPANY LIMITED*
11. *BOWATER TREATED WOOD INC.*
12. *CANEXEL HARDBOARD INC.*
13. *9068-9050 QUÉBEC INC.*
14. *ALLIANCE FOREST PRODUCTS (2001) INC.*
15. *BOWATER BELLEDUNE SAWMILL INC.*
16. *BOWATER MARITIMES INC.*
17. *BOWATER MITIS INC.*
18. *BOWATER GUÉRETTE INC.*
19. *BOWATER COUTURIER INC.*

**Schedule "C" — 18.6 CCAA Petitioners**

1. *ABITIBIBOWATER INC.*
2. *ABITIBIBOWATER US HOLDING 1 CORP.*
3. *BOWATER VENTURES INC.*
4. *BOWATER INCORPORATED*
5. *BOWATER NUWAY INC.*
6. *BOWATER NUWAY MID-STATES INC.*

7. *CATAWBA PROPERTY HOLDINGS LLC*
8. *BOWATER FINANCE COMPANY INC.*
9. *BOWATER SOUTH AMERICAN HOLDINGS INCORPORATED*
10. *BOWATER AMERICA INC.*
11. *LAKE SUPERIOR FOREST PRODUCTS INC.*
12. *BOWATER NEWSPRINT SOUTH LLC*
13. *BOWATER NEWSPRINT SOUTH OPERATIONS LLC*
14. *BOWATER FINANCE II, LLC*
15. *BOWATER ALABAMA LLC*
16. *COOSA PINES GOLF CLUB HOLDINGS LLC*

*Motion granted.*

#### Footnotes

- 1 *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36.
- 2 See Monitor's Fifty-Seventh Report dated September 7, 2010, and Monitor's Fifty-Ninth Report dated September 17, 2010.
- 3 This Plan of Reorganisation and Compromise (as modified, amended or supplemented by CCAA Plan Supplements 3.2, 6.1(a) (i) (as amended on September 13, 2010) and 6.1(a)(ii) dated September 1, 2010, CCAA Plan Supplements 6.8(a), 6.8(b) (as amended on September 13, 2010), 6.8(d), 6.9(1) and 6.9(2) dated September 3, 2010, and the First Plan Amendment dated September 10, 2010, and as may be further modified, amended, or supplemented in accordance with the terms of such Plan of Reorganization and Compromise) (collectively, the "*CCAA Plan*") is included as Schedules E and F to the Supplemental 59th Report of the Monitor dated September 21, 2010.
- 4 Motion for an Order Sanctioning the Plan of Reorganization and Compromise and Other Relief (the "*Motion*"), pursuant to Sections 6, 9 and 10 of the CCAA and Section 191 of the Canada Business Corporations Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44 (the "*CBCA*").
- 5 *Boutiques San Francisco Inc. (Arrangement relatif aux)*, SOQUIJ AZ-50263185, B.E. 2004BE-775 (S.C.); *Cable Satisfaction International Inc. v. Richter & Associés inc.*, J.E. 2004-907 (C.S. Que.) [2004 CarswellQue 810 (C.S. Que.)].
- 6 See Monitor's Fifty-Eight Report dated September 16, 2010.
- 7 *T. Eaton Co., Re* (1999), 15 C.B.R. (4th) 311 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Sammi Atlas Inc. (Re)* (1998), 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]); *PSINET Ltd., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).



- 8 *Uniforêt inc., Re* (C.S. Que.) [2003 CarswellQue 3404 (C.S. Que.)], *TQS inc., Re*, 2008 QCCS 2448 (C.S. Que.), B.E. 2008BE-834; *PSINET Ltd., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Re)* (1993), 12 O.R. (3d) 500 (Ont. Gen. Div.).
- 9 *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. (Re)* (1993), 12 O.R. (3d) 500 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Boutiques San Francisco inc. (Arrangement relatif aux)*, SOQUII AZ-50263185, B.E. 2004BE-775; *PSINET Ltd., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Northland Properties Ltd., Re* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 175 (B.C. S.C.), affirmed 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 195 (B.C. C.A.).
- 10 The Indenture Trustee acting under the Unsecured Notes supports the Noteholders in their objections.
- 11 See, in this respect, *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*, 2008 ONCA 587 (Ont. C.A.); *Charles-Auguste Fortier inc., Re* (2008), J.E. 2009-9, 2008 QCCS 5388 (C.S. Que.); *Hy Bloom inc. c. Banque Nationale du Canada*, [2010] R.J.Q. 912 (C.S. Que.).
- 12 *Quebecor World Inc. (Arrangement relatif à)*, S.C. Montreal, N° 500-11-032338-085, 2009-06-30, Mongeon J.
- 13 *Raymor Industries inc. (Proposition de)*, [2010] R.J.Q. 608, 2010 QCCS 376 (C.S. Que.); *Quebecor World Inc. (Arrangement relatif à)*, S.C. Montreal, N° 500-11-032338-085, 2009-06-30, Mongeon J., at para. 7-8; *MEI Computer Technology Group Inc., Re* [2005 CarswellQue 13408 (C.S. Que.)], (S.C., 2005-11-14), SOQUII AZ-50380254, 2005 CanLII 54083; *Doman Industries Ltd., Re*, 2003 BCSC 375 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]); *Laidlaw, Re* (Ont. S.C.J.).
- 14 It is understood that for the purposes of this Sanction Order, the CCAA Plan is the Plan of Reorganisation and Compromise (as modified, amended or supplemented by CCAA Plan Supplements 3.2, 6.1(a)(i) (as amended on September 13, 2010) and 6.1(a)(ii) dated September 1, 2010, CCAA Plan Supplements 6.8(a), 6.8(b) (as amended on September 13, 2010), 6.8(d), 6.9(1) and 6.9(2) dated September 3, 2010, and the First Plan Amendment dated September 10, 2010, and as may be further modified, amended, or supplemented in accordance with the terms of such Plan of Reorganization and Compromise) included as Schedules E and F to the Supplemental 59<sup>th</sup> Report of the Monitor dated September 21, 2010.

**TAB 3**

1998 CarswellOnt 1145  
Ontario Court of Justice, General Division [Commercial List]

Sammi Atlas Inc., Re

Paras 4, 5

1998 CarswellOnt 1145, [1998] O.J. No. 1089, 3  
C.B.R. (4th) 171, 59 O.T.C. 153, 78 A.C.W.S. (3d) 10

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

In The Matter of the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.C.43

In The Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Sammi Atlas Inc.

Farley J.

Heard: February 27, 1998  
Judgment: February 27, 1998  
Docket: 97-BK-000219, B230/97

Counsel: *Norman J. Emblem*, for the applicant, Sammi Atlas Inc.  
*James Grout*, for Agro Partners, Inc.  
*Thomas Matz*, for the Bank of Nova Scotia.  
*Jay Carfagnini* and *Ben Zarnett*, for Investors' Committee.  
*Geoffrey Morawetz*, for the Trade Creditors' committee.  
*Clifton Prophet*, for Duk Lee.

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial

MOTION for approval and sanctioning of plan of compromise and arrangement under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*; MOTION by creditor for amendment of plan.

*Farley J.:*

1 This endorsement deals with two of the motions before me today:

1) Applicant's motion for an order approving and sanctioning the Applicant's Plan of Compromise and Arrangement, as amended and approved by the Applicant's unsecured creditors on February 25, 1998; and

2) A motion by Argo Partners, Inc. ("Argo"), a creditor by way of assignment, for an order directing that the Plan be amended to provide that a person who, on the record date, held unsecured claims shall be entitled to elect treatment with respect to each unsecured claim held by it on a claim by claim basis (and not on an aggregate basis as provided for in the Plan).

2 As to the Applicant's sanction motion, the general principles to be applied in the exercise of the court's discretion are:

1) there must be strict compliance with all statutory requirements and adherence to the previous orders of the court;

2) all materials 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 *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA"); and

3) the Plan must be fair and reasonable.

See *Northland Properties Ltd., Re* (1988), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 175 (B.C. S.C.); affirmed (1989), 73 C.B.R. (N.S.) 195 (B.C. C.A.) at p.201; *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 12 O.R. (3d) 500 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p.506.

3 I am satisfied on the material before me that the Applicant was held to be a corporation as to which the CCAA applies, that the Plan was filed with the court in accordance with the previous orders, that notices were appropriately given and published as to claims and meetings, that the meetings were held in accordance with the directions of the court and that the Plan was approved by the requisite majority (in fact it was approved 98.74% in number of the proven claims of creditors voting and by 96.79% dollar value, with Argo abstaining). Thus it would appear that items one and two are met.

4 What of item 3 - is the Plan fair and reasonable? 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. One must look at the creditors as a whole (i.e. generally) and to the objecting creditors (specifically) and see if rights are compromised in an attempt to balance interests (and have the pain of the compromise equitably shared) as opposed to a confiscation of rights: see *Campeau Corp., Re* (1992), 10 C.B.R. (3d) 104 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at p.109. It is recognized that the CCAA contemplates that a minority of creditors is bound by the Plan which a majority have approved - subject only to the court determining that the Plan is fair and reasonable: see *Northland Properties Ltd.* at p.201; *Olympia & York Developments Ltd.* at p.509. In the present case no one appeared today to oppose the Plan being sanctioned: Argo

merely wished that the Plan be amended to accommodate its particular concerns. Of course, to the extent that Argo would be benefited by such an amendment, the other creditors would in effect be disadvantaged since the pot in this case is based on a zero sum game.

5 Those voting on the Plan (and I note there was a very significant "quorum" present at the meeting) do so on a business basis. As Blair J. said at p.510 of *Olympia & York Developments Ltd.*:

As the other courts have done, I observe that it is not my function to second guess the business people with respect to the "business" aspects of the Plan, descending into the negotiating arena and 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.

The court should be appropriately reluctant to interfere with the business decisions of creditors reached as a body. There was no suggestion that these creditors were unsophisticated or unable to look out for their own best interests. The vote in the present case is even higher than in *Central Guaranty Trustco Ltd., Re* (1993), 21 C.B.R. (3d) 139 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) where I observed at p.141:

... This on either basis is well beyond the specific majority requirement of CCAA. Clearly there is a very heavy burden on parties seeking to upset a plan that the required majority have found that they could vote for; given the overwhelming majority this burden is no lighter. This vote by sophisticated lenders speaks volumes as to fairness and reasonableness.

The Courts should not second guess business people who have gone along with the Plan....

6 Argo's motion is to amend the Plan - after it has been voted on. However I do not see any exceptional circumstances which would support such a motion being brought now. In *Algoma Steel Corp. v. Royal Bank* (1992), 11 C.B.R. (3d) 11 (Ont. C.A.) the Court of Appeal observed at p.15 that the court's jurisdiction to amend a plan should "be exercised sparingly and in exceptional circumstances only" even if the amendment were merely technical and did not prejudice the interests of the corporation or its creditors and then only where there is jurisdiction under the CCAA to make the amendment requested, I was advised that Argo had considered bringing the motion on earlier but had not done so in the face of "veto" opposition from the major creditors. I am puzzled by this since the creditor or any other appropriate party can always move in court before the Plan is voted on to amend the Plan; voting does not have anything to do with the court granting or dismissing the motion. The court can always determine a matter which may impinge directly and materially upon the fairness and reasonableness of a plan. I note in passing that it would be inappropriate to attempt to obtain

a preview of the court's views as to sanctioning by brining on such a motion. See my views in *Central Guaranty Trustco Ltd., Re* at p.143:

... In *Algoma Steel Corp. v. Royal Bank* (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 *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*. (emphasis in original)

What Argo wants is a substantive change; I do not see the jurisdiction to grant same under the CCAA.

7 In the subject Plan creditors are to be dealt with on a sliding scale for distribution purposes only: with this scale being on an aggregate basis of all claims held by one claimant:

- i) \$7,500 or less to receive cash of 95% of the proven claim;
- ii) \$7,501 - \$100,000 to receive cash of 90% of the first \$7,500 and 55% of balance; and;
- iii) in excess of \$100,000 to receive shares on a formula basis (subject to creditor agreeing to limit claims to \$100,000 so as to obtain cash as per the previous formula).

Such a sliding scale arrangement has been present in many proposals over the years. Argo has not been singled out for special treatment; others who acquired claims by assignment have also been affected. Argo has acquired 40 claims; all under \$100,000 but in the aggregate well over \$100,000. Argo submitted that it could have achieved the result that it wished if it had kept the individual claims it acquired separate by having them held by a different "person"; this is true under the Plan as worded. Conceivably if this type of separation in the face of an aggregation provision were perceived to be inappropriate by a CCAA applicant, then I suppose the language of such a plan could be "tightened" to eliminate what the applicant perceived as a loophole. I appreciate Argo's position that by buying up the small claims it was providing the original creditors with liquidity but this should not be a determinative factor. I would note that the sliding scale provided here does recognize (albeit imperfectly) that small claims may be equated with small creditors who would more likely wish cash as opposed to non-board lots of shares which would not be as liquidate as cash; the high percentage cash for those proven claims of \$7,500 or under illustrates the desire not to have the "little person" hurt - at least any more than is necessary. The question will come down to balance - the plan must be efficient and attractive enough for it to be brought forward by an applicant with the realistic chance of its succeeding (and perhaps in that regard be "sponsored" by significant creditors) and while not being too generous so that the future of the applicant on an ongoing basis would be in jeopardy: at the same time it must gain enough support amongst the creditor

body for it to gain the requisite majority. New creditors by assignment may provide not only liquidity but also a benefit in providing a block of support for a plan which may not have been forthcoming as a small creditor may not think it important to do so. Argo of course has not claimed it is a "little person" in the context of this CCAA proceeding.

8 In my view Argo is being treated fairly and reasonably as a creditor as are all the unsecured creditors. An aggregation clause is not inherently unfair and the sliding scale provisions would appear to me to be aimed at "protecting (or helping out) the little guy" which would appear to be a reasonable policy.

9 The Plan is sanctioned and approved; Argo's aggregation motion is dismissed.

**Addendum:**

10 I reviewed with the insolvency practitioners (legal counsel and accountants) the aspect that industrial and commercial concerns in a CCAA setting should be distinguished from "bricks and mortgage" corporations. In their reorganization it is important to maintain the goodwill attributable to employee experience and customer (and supplier) loyalty; this may very quickly erode with uncertainty. Therefore it would, to my mind be desirable to get down to brass tacks as quickly as possible and perhaps a reasonable target (subject to adjustment up or down according to the circumstances including complexity) would be for a six month period from application to Plan sanction.

*Motion for approval granted; motion for amendment dismissed.*

**TAB 4**



Para 25

2015 ONSC 622  
Ontario Superior Court of Justice

Cline Mining Corp., Re

2015 CarswellOnt 3285, 2015 ONSC 622, 23 C.B.R. (6th) 194, 252 A.C.W.S. (3d) 8

**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 and Arrangement of Cline Mining  
Corporation, New ELK Coal Company LLC and North Central Energy Company

G.B. Morawetz R.S.J.

Heard: January 27, 2015  
Judgment: January 30, 2015  
Docket: CV-14-10781-00CL

Counsel: Robert J. Chadwick, Logan Willis for Applicants, Cline Mining Corporation et al.  
Michael DeLellis, David Rosenblatt for FTI Consulting Canada Inc., Monitor of the  
Applicants  
Jay Swartz for Secured Noteholders

Subject: Insolvency

MOTION by insolvent companies for approval or plan of arrangement and other relief.

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

1 Cline Mining Corporation, New Elk Coal Company LLC and North Central Energy  
Company (collectively, the "Applicants") seek an order (the "Sanction Order"), among other  
things:

- a. sanctioning the Applicants' Amended and Restated Plan of Compromise and  
Arrangement dated January 20, 2015 (the "Plan") pursuant to the *Companies'  
Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the "CCAA"); and
- b. extending the stay, as defined in the Initial Order granted December 3, 2014 (the  
"Initial Order"), to and including April 1, 2015.

2 Counsel to the Applicants submits that the Recapitalization is the result of significant efforts by the Applicants to achieve a resolution of their financial challenges and, if implemented, the Recapitalization will maintain the Applicants as a unified corporate enterprise and result in an improved capital structure that will enable the Applicants to better withstand prolonged weakness in the global market for metallurgical coal.

3 Counsel submits that the Applicants believe that the Recapitalization achieves the best available outcome for the Applicants and their stakeholders in the circumstances and achieves results that are not attainable under any other bankruptcy, sale or debt enforcement scenario.

4 The position of the Applicants is supported by the Monitor, and by Marret, on behalf of the Secured Noteholders.

5 The Plan has the unanimous support from the creditors of the Applicants. The Plan was approved by 100% in number and 100% in value of creditors voting in each of the Secured Noteholders Class, the Affected Unsecured Creditors Class and the WARN Act Plaintiffs Class.

6 The background giving rise to (i) the insolvency of the Applicants; (ii) the decision to file under the CCAA; (iii) the finding made that the court had the jurisdiction under the CCAA to accept the filing; (iv) the finding of insolvency; and (v) the basis for granting the Initial Order and the Claims Procedure Order was addressed in *Cline Mining Corp., Re*, 2014 ONSC 6998 (Ont. S.C.J.) and need not be repeated.

7 The Applicants report that counsel to the WARN Act Plaintiffs in the class action proceedings (the "Class Action Counsel") submitted a class proof of claim on behalf of the 307 WARN Act Plaintiffs in the aggregate amount of U.S. \$3.7 million. Class Action Counsel indicated that the WARN Act Plaintiffs were not prepared to vote in favour of the Plan dated December 3, 2014 (the "Original Plan") without an enhancement of the recovery. The Applicants report that after further discussions, agreement was reached with Class Action Counsel on the form of a resolution that provides for an enhanced recovery for the WARN Act Plaintiffs Class of \$210,000 (with \$90,000 paid on the Plan implementation date) as opposed to the recovery offered in the Original Plan of \$100,000 payable in eight years from the Plan implementation date.

8 As a result of reaching this resolution, the Original Plan was amended to reflect the terms of the WARN Act resolution.

9 The Applicants served the Amended Plan on the Service List on January 20, 2015.

10 The Plan provides for a full and final release and discharge of the Affected Claims and Released Claims, a settlement of, and consideration for, all Allowed Affected Claims and a recapitalization of the Applicants.

11 Equity claimants will not receive any consideration or distributions under the Plan.

12 The Plan provides for the release of certain parties (the "Released Parties"), including:

(i) the Applicants, the Directors and Officers and employees of contractors of the Applicants; and

(ii) the Monitor, the Indenture Trustee and Marret and their respective legal counsel, the financial and legal advisors to the Applicants and other parties employed by or associated with the parties listed in sub-paragraph (ii), in each case in respect of claims that constitute or relate to, *inter alia*, any Claims, any Directors/Officer Claims and any claims arising from or connected to the Plan, the Recapitalization, the CCAA Proceedings, the Chapter 15 Proceedings, the business or affairs of the Applicants or certain other related matter (collectively, the "Released Claims").

13 The Plan does not release:

(i) the right to enforce the Applicants' obligations under the Plan;

(ii) the Applicants from or in respect of any Unaffected Claim or any Claim that is not permitted to be released pursuant to section 19(2) of the CCAA; or

(iii) any Director or Officer from any Director/Officer Claim that is not permitted to be released pursuant to section 5.1(2) of the CCAA.

14 The Plan does not release Insured Claims, provided that any recourse in respect of such claims is limited to proceeds, if any, of the Applicants' applicable Insurance Policies.

15 The Meetings Order authorized the Applicants to convene a meeting of the Secured Noteholders, a meeting of Affected Unsecured Creditors and a meeting of WARN Act Plaintiffs to consider and vote on the Plan.

16 The Meetings were held on January 21, 2015. At the Meetings, the resolution to approve the Plan was passed unanimously in each of the three classes of creditors.

17 None of the persons with Disputed Claims voted at the Meetings, in person or by proxy. Consequently, the results of the votes taken would not change based on the inclusion or exclusion of the Disputed Claims in the voting results.

18 Pursuant to section 6(1) of the CCAA, the court has the discretion to sanction a plan of compromise or arrangement where the requisite double-majority of creditors has approved the plan. The effect of the court's approval is to bind the company and its creditors.

19 The general requirements for court approval of the CCAA Plan are well established:

- a. there must be strict compliance with all statutory requirements;
- b. all materials filed and procedures carried out must be examined to determine if anything has been done or purported to have been done, which is not authorized by the CCAA; and
- c. the plan must be fair and reasonable.

(see *SkyLink Aviation Inc., Re*, 2013 ONSC 2519 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]))

20 Having reviewed the record and hearing submissions, I am satisfied that the foregoing test for approval has been met in this case.

21 In arriving at my conclusion that the Plan is fair and reasonable in the circumstances, I have taken into account the following:

- a. the Plan represents a compromise among the Applicants and the Affected Creditors resulting from discussions among the Applicants and their creditors, with the support of the Monitor;
- b. the classification of the Applicants' creditors into three voting classes was previously approved by the court and the classification was not opposed at any time;
- c. the results of the Sale Process indicate that the Secured Noteholders would suffer a significant shortfall and there would be no residual value for subordinate interests;
- d. the Recapitalization provides a limited recovery for unsecured creditors and the WARN Act Plaintiffs;
- e. all Affected Creditors that voted on the Plan voted for its approval;

- f. the Plan treats Affected Creditors fairly and provides for the same distribution among the creditors within each of the Secured Noteholders Class, the Affected Unsecured Creditors Class and the WARN Act Plaintiffs Class;
- g. Unaffected Claims, which include, *inter alia*, government and employee priority claims, claims not permitted to be compromised pursuant to sections 19(2) and 5.1(2) of the CCAA and prior ranking secured claims, will not be affected by the Plan;
- h. the treatment of Equity Claims under the Plan is consistent with the provisions of the CCAA; and
- i. the Plan is supported by the Applicants (Marret, on behalf of the Secured Noteholders), the Monitor and the creditors who voted in favor of the Plan at the Meetings.

22 The CCAA permits the inclusion of third party releases in a plan of compromise or arrangement where those releases are reasonably connected to the proposed restructuring (see: *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*, 2008 ONCA 587 (Ont. C.A.) ("*ATB Financial*"); *SkyLink, supra*; and *Sino-Forest Corp., Re*, 2012 ONSC 7050 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), leave to appeal denied, 2013 ONCA 456 (Ont. C.A.)).

23 The court has the jurisdiction to sanction a plan containing third party releases where the factual circumstances indicate that the third party releases are appropriate. In this case, the record establishes that the releases were negotiated as part of the overall framework of the compromises in the Plan, and these releases facilitate a successful completion of the Plan and the Recapitalization. The releases cover parties that could have claims of indemnification or contribution against the Applicants in relation to the Recapitalization, the Plan and other related matters, whose rights against the Applicants have been discharged in the Plan.

24 I am satisfied that the releases are therefore rationally related to the purpose of the Plan and are necessary for the successful restructuring of the Applicants.

25 Further, the releases provided for in the Plan were contained in the Original Plan filed with the court on December 3, 2014 and attached to the Meetings Order. Counsel to the Applicants submits that the Applicants are not aware of any objections to the releases provided for in the Plan.

26 The Applicants also contend that the releases of the released Directors/Officers are appropriate in the circumstances, given that the released Directors and Officers, in the absence of the Plan releases, could have claims for indemnification or contribution

against the Applicants and the release avoids contingent claims for such indemnification or contribution against the Applicants. Further, the releases were negotiated as part of the overall framework of compromises in the Plan. I also note that no Director/Officer Claims were asserted in the Claims Procedure.

27 The Monitor supports the Applicants' request for the sanction of the Plan, including the releases contained therein.

28 I am satisfied that in these circumstances, it is appropriate to grant the releases.

29 The Plan provides for certain alterations to the Cline Articles in order to effectuate certain corporate steps required to implement the Plan, including the consolidation of shares and the cancellation of fractional interests of the Cline Common Shares. I am satisfied that these amendments are necessary in order to effect the provisions of the Plan and that it is appropriate to grant the amendments as part of the approval of the Plan.

30 The Applicants also request an extension of the stay until April 1, 2015. This request is made pursuant to section 11.02(2) of the CCAA. The court must be satisfied that:

(i) circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and

(ii) the applicant has acted, and is acting in good faith and with due diligence.

31 The record establishes that the Applicants have made substantial progress toward the completion of the Recapitalization, but further time is required to implement same. I am satisfied that the test pursuant to section 11.02(2) has been met and it is appropriate to extend the stay until April 1, 2015.

32 Finally, the Monitor requests approval of its activities and conduct to date and also approval of its Pre-Filing Report, the First Report dated December 16, 2014 and the Second Report together with the activities described therein. No objection was raised with respect to the Monitor's request, which is granted.

33 For the foregoing reasons, the motion is granted and an order shall issue in the form requested, approving the Plan and providing certain ancillary relief.

*Motion granted.*

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  
(Plan Sanction Order)  
Returnable December 14, 2016**

**PALIARE ROLAND ROSENBERG ROTHSTEIN LLP**

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

**Kenneth T. Rosenberg (LSUC #21102H)**  
Tel: 416.646.4304  
Email: [ken.rosenberg@paliareroland.com](mailto:ken.rosenberg@paliareroland.com)

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

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

Lawyers for the Applicants