

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

B E T W E E N:

MERIDIAN CREDIT UNION LIMITED

Applicant

- and -

STATEVIEW HOMES (ELM&CO) INC.

Respondent

**IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION PURSUANT TO SECTION 243(1) OF THE
*BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, AS AMENDED; AND
SECTION 101 OF THE COURTS OF JUSTICE ACT, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, AS AMENDED***

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE APPLICANT
(Re: Receivership Application Returnable May 18, 2023)**

May 8, 2023

FOGLER, RUBINOFF LLP

Lawyers
77 King Street West
Suite 3000, P.O. Box 95
TD Centre North Tower
Toronto, ON M5K 1G8

Scott Venton (LSO#: 43383R)

Tel: 416.941.8870

Fax: 416.941.8852

Email: sventon@foglers.com

Vern W. DaRe (LSO#: 32591E)

Tel: 416-941-8842

Fax: 416-941-8852

Lawyers for the Applicant,
Meridian Credit Union Limited

TO: **THE SERVICE LIST**

SERVICE LIST

TO:	<p>FOGLER, RUBINOFF LLP 77 King Street West Suite 3000, P. O. Box 95 Toronto, ON M5K 1G8</p> <p>Scott R. Venton Tel: (416) 941-8870 Fax: (416) 941-8852 Email: sventon@foglers.com</p> <p>Vern DaRe Tel: (416) 941-8842 Fax: (416) 941-8852 Email: vdare@foglers.com</p> <p>Lawyers for Meridian Credit Union Limited</p>
AND TO:	<p>NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT CANADA LLP 222 Bay Street, Suite 3000, P.O. Box 53, Toronto ON M5K 1E7</p> <p>Jennifer Stam Tel: (416) 202-6707 Email: jennifer.stam@nortonrosefulbright.com</p> <p>James Renihan Tel: 416) 216-1944 Email: james.renihan@nortonrosefulbright.com</p> <p>Lawyers for Stateview Homes (Elm&Co) Inc.</p>
AND TO:	<p>STATEVIEW HOMES (ELM&CO) INC. 410 Chrislea Road, Unit 16 Woodbridge, ON L4L 8B5</p> <p>Attention: carlo@stateviewhomes.com and dino@stateviewhomes.com</p>

AND TO:	<p>LENCZNER SLAGHT LLP 130 Adelaide Street W, Suite 2600 Toronto, ON M5H 3P5</p> <p>Andrew Parley Tel: (416) 416-865-3093 Email: aparley@litigate.com</p> <p>Lawyers for Carlo Taurasi and Dino Taurasi</p>
AND TO:	<p>MCCARTHY TETRAULT LLP 66 Wellington St W Suite 5300 Toronto ON M5K 1E6</p> <p>Geoff R. Hall Tel: (416) 601-7856 Email: ghall@mccarthy.ca</p> <p>Adam Ship Tel: (416) 601-7731 Email: aship@mccarthy.ca</p> <p>Adam Dobkin Tel: (416) 601-7563 Email: adobkin@mccarthy.ca</p> <p>Lawyers for The Toronto-Dominion Bank</p>
AND TO:	<p>FOGLER, RUBINOFF LLP 77 King Street West Suite 3000, P. O. Box 95 Toronto, ON M5K 1G8</p> <p>Martin R. Kaplan Tel: (416) 452-9444 Fax: (416) 941-8852 Email: mkaplan@foglers.com</p> <p>Lawyers for Bergo Investment Limited, MCO Management Inc. and Tony Karamitsos</p>

AND TO:	BLANEY MCMURTRY LLP Barristers & Solicitors 2 Queen Street East, Suite 1500 Toronto, ON M5C 3G5 Eric Golden Tel: (416) 593-3927 Email: egolden@blaney.com Chad Kopach Tel: (416) 593-2985 Email: ckopach@blaney.com Lawyers for Dorr Capital Corporation
AND TO:	KSV RESTRUCTURING INC. 220 Bay Street, 13 th Floor Toronto, ON M5J 2W4 Bobby Kofman Email: bkofman@ksvadvisory.com Noah Goldstein Email: ngoldstein@ksvadvisory.com Proposed Receiver
AND TO:	797377 ONTARIO INC. 5 Paisley Lane Uxbridge, ON L9P 0G5 Secured Creditor/Mortgagee
AND TO:	PALIARE ROLAND ROSENBERG ROTHSTEIN LLP 155 Wellington St. West, 35 th Floor Toronto, ON M5V 3H1 Jeffrey Larry Tel: (416) 646-4330 Email: jeff.larry@paliareroland.com Lawyers for Proposed Receiver

AND TO:	STATEVIEW CONSTRUCTION LTD. 410 Chrislea Road, Unit 16 Woodbridge, ON L4L 8B5 Attention: carlo@stateviewhomes.com and dino@stateviewhomes.com
AND TO:	DANIEL CICCONE 55 Cooperage Crescent Richmond Hill, ON L4C 9M2
AND TO:	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (CANADA) Ontario Regional Office, Tax Law Section 120 Adelaide Street West, Suite 400 Toronto, Ontario M5H 1T1 Diane Winters Email: diane.winters@justice.gc.ca Tel: (416) 973-3172 Fax: (416) 973-0810 Lawyers for Canada Revenue Agency
AND TO:	HIS MAJESTY THE KING IN RIGHT OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO AS REPRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE Insolvency Unit 6 th Floor, 33 King Street West Oshawa, Ontario L1H 8H5 Insolvency Unit Email: insolvency.unit@ontario.ca Tel: (905) 433-5657 Fax: (905) 436-4510

AND TO:	BDO CANADA LIMITED 20 Wellington E, Suite 500 Toronto, ON M5E 1C5 Clark Lonergan Email: Clonergan@bdo.ca Tel: (416) 865-0210 Fax: (416) 864-0904 Information Officer
----------------	---

INDEX

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

BETWEEN:

MERIDIAN CREDIT UNION LIMITED

Applicant

- and -

STATEVIEW HOMES (ELM&CO) INC.

Respondent

**IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION PURSUANT TO SECTION 243(1) OF THE
BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, AS AMENDED; AND
SECTION 101 OF THE COURTS OF JUSTICE ACT, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, AS AMENDED**

INDEX

TAB	DOCUMENT	PAGE NO.
1.	<i>Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village of Clair Creek</i> , 1996 CanLII 8258 (ON SC)	1
2.	<i>Elleway Acquisitions Limited v. The Cruise Professionals Limited</i> , 2013 ONSC 6866 (CanLII)	6
3.	<i>RMB Australia Holdings Limited v. Seafield Resources Ltd.</i> , 2014 ONSC 5205 (CanLII)	12
4.	<i>Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation v. Crown Jewel Resort Ranch, Inc.</i> , 2014 NSSC 128 (CanLII)	23

TAB 1

Ontario Supreme Court
Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village of Clair Creek
Date: 1996-05-31

Bank of Nova Scotia

and

Freure Village on Clair Creek et al

Ontario Court of Justice (General Division – Commercial List) Blair J.

Judgment – May 31, 1996.

John J. Chapman and John R. Varley, for Bank of Nova Scotia.

J. Gregory Murdoch, for Freure Group (all defendants).

John Lancaster, for Boehmers, a Division of St. Lawrence Cement.

Robb English, for Toronto-Dominion Bank.

William T. Houston, for Canada Trust.

May 31, 1996. Endorsement.

[1] BLAIR J.: – There are two companion motions here, namely:

(i) the within motion by the Bank for summary judgment on the covenants on mortgages granted by “Freure Management” and “Freure Village” to the Bank, which mortgages have been guaranteed by Freure Investments; and

(ii) the motion for appointment by the Court of a receiver-manager over five different properties which are the subject matter of the mortgages (four of which properties are apartment/townhouse complexes totalling 286 units and one of which is an as yet undeveloped property).

This endorsement pertains to both motions.

The Motion for Summary Judgment

[2] Three of the mortgages have matured and have not been repaid. The fourth has not yet matured but, along with the first three, is in default as a result of the failure to pay tax arrears.

The total tax arrears outstanding are in excess of \$850,000. The Bank is owed in excess of \$13,200,000. There is no question that the mortgages are in default. Nor is it contested that the monies are presently due and owing. The Defendants argue, however, that the Bank had agreed to forebear or to stand-still for six months to a year in May, 1995 and therefore submit the monies were not due and owing at the time demand was made and proceedings commenced.

[3] There is simply no merit to this defence on the evidence and there is no issue with respect to it which survives the “good hard look at the evidence” which the authorities require the Court to take and which requires a trial for its disposition: see Rule 20.01 and Rule 20.04, *Pizza Pizza Ltd v. Gillespie* (1990), 75 O.R. (2d) 225 (Gen. Div.); *Irving Ungerman Ltd. v. Galanis* (1993) 4 O.R. (3d) 545 (C.A.).

[4] On his cross-examination, Mr. Freure admitted:

(i) that he knew the Bank had not entered into any agreement whereby it had waived its rights under its security or to enforce its security; and

(ii) that he realized the Bank was entitled to make demand, that the individual debtors in the Freure Group owed the money, that

they did not have the money to pay and the \$13,200,000 indebtedness was “due and owing” (see cross-examination questions 46-54, 88-96, 233-243).

[5] As to the guarantees of Freure Investments, an argument was put forward that the Bank changed its position with regard to the accumulation of tax arrears without notice to the guarantor, and accordingly that a triable issue exists in that regard.

[6] No such triable issue exists. The guarantee provisions of the mortgage itself permit the Bank to negotiate changes in the security with the principal debtor. Moreover, the principal of the principal debtor and the principal of the guarantor – Mr. Freure – are the same. Finally, the evidence which is relied upon for the change in the Bank’s position – an internal Bank memo from the local branch to the credit committee of the Bank in Toronto – is not proof of any such agreement with the debtor or change; it is merely a recitation of various position proposals and a recommendation to the credit committee, which was not followed.

[7] Accordingly, summary judgment is granted as sought in accordance with the draft judgment filed today and on which I have placed my fiat. The cost portion of the judgment will bear interest at the *Courts of Justice Act* rate.

Receiver/Manager

[8] The more difficult issue for determination is whether or not the Court should appoint a receiver/manager.

[9] It is conceded, in effect, that if the loans are in default and not saved from immediate payment by the alleged forbearance agreement – which they are, and are not, respectively – the Bank is entitled to move under its security and appoint a receiver-manager privately. Indeed this is the route which the Defendants – supported by the subsequent creditor on one of the properties (Boehmers, on the Glencairn property) – urge must be taken. The other major creditors, TD Bank and Canada Trust, who are owed approximately \$20,000,000 between them, take no position on the motion.

[10] The Court has the power to appoint a receiver or receiver and manager where it is “just or convenient” to do so: the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. 43, s. 101. In deciding whether or not to do so, it must have regard to all of the circumstances but in particular the nature of the property and the rights and interests of all parties in relation thereto. The fact that the moving party has a right under its security to appoint a receiver is an important factor to be considered but so, in such circumstances, is the question of whether or not an appointment by the Court is necessary to enable the receiver-manager to carry out its work and duties more efficiently; see generally *Third Generation Realty Ltd. v. Twigg* (1991) 6 C.P.C. (3d) 366 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at pages 372-374; *Confederation Trust Co. v. Dentbram Developments Ltd.* (1992), 9 C.P.C. (3d) 399 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Royal Trust Corp. of Canada v. D.Q. Plaza Holdings Ltd.* (1984), 54 C.B.R. (N.S.) 18 (Sask. Q.B.) at page 21. It is not essential that the moving party, a secured creditor, establish that it will suffer irreparable harm if a receiver-manager is not appointed: *Swiss Bank Corp. (Canada) v. Odyssey Industries Inc.* (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 49 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

[11] The Defendants and the opposing creditor argue that the Bank can perfectly effectively exercise its private remedies and that the Court should not intervene by giving the extraordinary remedy of appointing a receiver when it has not yet done so and there is no

evidence its interest will not be well protected if it did. They also argue that a Court appointed receiver will be more costly than a privately appointed one, eroding their interests in the property.

[12] While I accept the general notion that the appointment of a receiver is an extraordinary remedy, it seems to me that where the security instrument permits the appointment of a private receiver – and even contemplates, as this one does, the secured creditor seeking a court appointed receiver – and where the circumstances of default justify the appointment of a private receiver, the “extraordinary” nature of the remedy sought is less essential to the inquiry. Rather, the “just or convenient” question becomes one of the Court determining, in the exercise of its discretion, whether it is more in the interests of all concerned to have the receiver appointed by the Court or not. This, of course, involves an examination of all the circumstances which I have outlined earlier in this endorsement, including the potential costs, the relationship between the debtor and the creditors, the likelihood of maximizing the return on and preserving the subject property and the best way of facilitating the work and duties of the receiver-manager.

[13] Here I am satisfied on balance it is just and convenient for the order sought to be made. The Defendants have been attempting to refinance the properties for 11/2 years without success, although a letter from Mutual Trust dated yesterday suggests (again) the possibility of a refinancing in the near future. The Bank and the debtors are deadlocked and I infer from the history and evidence that the Bank’s attempts to enforce its security privately will only lead to more litigation. Indeed, the debtor’s solicitors themselves refer to the prospect of “costly, protracted and unproductive” litigation in a letter dated March 21st of this year, should the Bank seek to pursue its remedies. More significantly, the parties cannot agree on the proper approach to be taken to marketing the properties which everyone agrees must be sold. Should it be on a unit by unit conversion condominium basis (as the debtor proposes) or on an en bloc basis as the Bank would prefer? A Court appointed receiver with a mandate to develop a marketing plan can resolve that impasse, subject to the Court’s approval, whereas a privately appointed receiver in all likelihood could not, at least without further litigious skirmishing. In the end, I am satisfied the interests of the debtors themselves, along with those of the creditors (and the tenants, who will be caught in the middle) and the orderly disposition of the property are all better served by the appointment of the receiver-manager as requested.

[14] I am prepared, in the circumstances, however, to render the debtors one last chance to rescue the situation, if they can bring the potential Mutual Trust refinancing to fruition. I postpone the effectiveness of the order appointing Doane Raymond as receiver-manager for a period of three weeks from this date. If a refinancing arrangement which is satisfactory to the Bank and which is firm and concrete can be arranged by that time, I may be spoken to at a 9:30 appointment on Monday, June 24, 1996 with regard to a further postponement. The order will relate back to today's date, if taken out.

[15] Should the Bank be advised to appoint Doane Raymond as a private receiver/manager under its mortgages in the interim, it may do so.

[16] Counsel may attend at an earlier 9:30 appointment if necessary to speak to the form of the order.

Motions granted.

TAB 2

CITATION: Elleway Acquisitions Limited v. The Cruise Professionals Limited, 2013 ONSC
6866

COURT FILE NO.: CV-13-10320-00CL

DATE: 20131127

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

**APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 243 OF THE *BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY*
ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c.B-3, AS AMENDED**

RE: ELLEWAY ACQUISITIONS LIMITED, Applicant

AND:

**THE CRUISE PROFESSIONALS LIMITED, 4358376 CANADA INC.
(OPERATING AS ITRAVEL2000.COM) AND 7500106 CANADA INC.,
Respondents**

BEFORE: MORAWETZ J.

COUNSEL: Jay Swartz and Natalie Renner, for the Applicant

John N. Birch, for the Respondents

David Bish and Lee Cassey, for Grant Thornton, Proposed Receiver

HEARD &

ENDORSED: NOVEMBER 4, 2013

REASONS: NOVEMBER 27, 2013

ENDORSEMENT

[1] At the conclusion of argument, the requested relief was granted with reasons to follow. These are the reasons.

[2] Elleway Acquisitions Limited (“Elleway” or the “Applicant”) seeks an order (the “Receivership Order”) appointing Grant Thornton Limited (“GTL”) as receiver (the “Receiver”),

without security, of all of the property, assets and undertaking of each of 4358376 Canada Inc., (operating as itravel2000.com (“itravel”)), 7500106 Canada Inc., (“Travelcash”), and The Cruise Professionals (“Cruise”) and together with itravel and Travelcash, “itravel Canada”), pursuant to section 243 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (Canada)* (the “BIA”) and section 101 of the *Courts of Justice Act (Ontario)* (the “CJA”).

[3] The application was not opposed.

[4] The itravel Group (as defined below) is indebted to Elleway in the aggregate principal amount of £17,171,690 pursuant to a secured credit facility that was purchased by Elleway and a working capital facility that was established by Elleway. The indebtedness is guaranteed by each of itravel, Cruise and Travelcash, among others. The itravel Group is in default of the credit facility and the working capital facility, and Elleway has demanded repayment of the amounts owing thereunder. Elleway has also served each of itravel, Cruise and Travelcash with a notice of intention to enforce its security under section 244(1) of the BIA. Each of itravel, Cruise and Travelcash has acknowledged its inability to pay the indebtedness and consented to early enforcement pursuant to section 244(2) of the BIA.

[5] Counsel to the Applicant submits that the itravel Group is insolvent and suffering from a liquidity crisis that is jeopardizing the itravel Group’s continued operations. Counsel to the Applicant submits that the appointment of a receiver is necessary to protect itravel Canada’s business and the interests of itravel Canada’s employees, customers and suppliers.

[6] Counsel further submits that itravel Canada’s core business is the sale of travel services, including vacation, flight, hotel, car rentals, and insurance packages offered by third parties, to its customers. itravel Canada’s business is largely seasonal and the majority of its revenues are generated in the months of October to March. itravel Canada would have to borrow approximately £3.1 million to fund its operations during this period and it is highly unlikely that another lender would be prepared to advance any funds to itravel Canada at this time given its financial circumstances.

[7] Further, counsel contends that the Canadian travel agent business is an intensely competitive industry with a high profile among consumers, making it very easy for consumers to comparison shop to determine which travel agent can provide services at the lowest possible cost. Given its visibility in the consumer market and the travel industry, counsel submits that it is imperative that itravel Canada maintain existing goodwill and the confidence of its customers. If itravel Canada’s business is to survive, potential customers must be assured that the business will continue uninterrupted and their advance payments for vacations will be protected notwithstanding itravel Canada’s financial circumstances.

[8] Therefore, counsel submits that, if a receiver is not appointed at this critical juncture, there is a substantial risk that itravel Canada will not be able to book trips and cruises during its most profitable period. This will result in a disruption to or, even worse, a complete cessation of itravel Canada’s business. Employees will resign, consumer confidence will be lost and existing goodwill will be irreparably harmed.

[9] It is contemplated that if GTL is appointed as the Receiver, GTL intends to seek the Court's approval of the sale of substantially all of ittravel Canada's assets to certain affiliates of Elleway, who will operate the business of ittravel Canada as a going concern following the consummation of the purchase transactions. Counsel submits that, it is in the best interests of all stakeholders that the Receivership Order be made because it will facilitate a going concern sale of ittravel Canada's business, preserving consumer confidence, existing goodwill and the jobs of over 250 employees.

[10] Elleway is a corporation incorporated under the laws of the British Virgin Islands. Elleway is an indirect wholly owned subsidiary of The Aldenham Grange Trust, a discretionary trust governed under Jersey law.

[11] ittravel, Cruise and Travelcash are indirect wholly owned subsidiaries of Travelzest plc ("Travelzest"), a publicly traded United Kingdom ("UK") company that operates a group of companies that includes ittravel Canada (the "ittravel Group"). The ittravel Group's UK operations were closed in March 2013. Since the cessation of the ittravel Group's UK operations, all of the ittravel Group's remaining operations are based in Canada. ittravel Canada currently employs approximately 255 employees. ittravel Canada's employees are not represented by a union and it does not sponsor a pension plan for any of its employees.

[12] The ittravel Group's primary credit facilities (the "Credit Facilities") were extended by Barclays Bank PLC ("Barclays") pursuant to a credit agreement (the "Credit Agreement") and corresponding fee letter (the "Fee Letter" and together with the Credit Agreement, the "Credit Facility Documents") under which Travelzest is the borrower.

[13] Pursuant to a series of guarantees and security documents (the "Security Documents"), each of Travelzest, Travelzest Canco, Travelzest Holdings, Itravel, Cruise and Travelcash guaranteed the obligations under the Credit Facility Documents and granted a security interest over all of its property to secure such obligations (the "Credit Facility Security"). Travelzest Canco and Travelzest Holdings are direct wholly owned UK subsidiaries of Travelzest. In addition, ittravel and Cruise granted a confirmation of security interest in certain intellectual property (the "IP Security Confirmation and together with the Credit Facility Security, the "Security").

[14] The Security Documents provide the following remedies, among others, to the secured party, upon the occurrence of an event of default under the Credit Facility Documents: (a) the appointment by instrument in writing of a receiver; and (b) the institution of proceedings in any court of competent jurisdiction for the appointment of a receiver. The Security Documents do not require Barclays to look to the property of Travelzest before enforcing its security against the property of ittravel Canada upon the occurrence of an event of default.

[15] Commencing on or about April 2012, the ittravel Group began to default on its obligations under the Credit Agreement.

[16] Pursuant to a series of letter agreements, Barclays agreed to, among other things, defer the applicable payment instalments due under the Credit Agreement until July 12, 2013 (the

“Repayment Date”). Travelzest failed to pay any amounts to Barclays on the Repayment Date. Travelzest’s failure to comply with financial covenants and its default on scheduled payments under the Repayment Plans constitute events of default under the Credit Facility Documents.

[17] Since 2010, Itravel Canada has attempted to refinance its debt through various methods, including the implementation of a global restructuring plan and the search for a potential purchaser through formal and informal sales processes. Two formal sales processes yielded some interest from prospective purchasers. Ultimately, however, neither sales process generated a viable offer for Itravel Canada's assets or the shares of Travelzest.

[18] Counsel submits that GTL has been working to familiarize itself with the business operations of Itravel Canada since August 2013 and that GTL is prepared to act as the Receiver of all of the property, assets and undertaking of ittravel Canada.

[19] Counsel further submits that, if appointed as the Receiver, GTL intends to bring a motion (the “Sales Approval Motion”) seeking Court approval of certain purchase transactions wherein Elleway, through certain of its affiliates, 8635919 Canada Inc. (the “ittravel Purchaser”), 8635854 Canada Inc. (the “Cruise Purchaser”) and 1775305 Alberta Ltd. (the “Travelcash Purchaser” and together with the ittravel Purchaser and the Cruise Purchaser, the “Purchasers”), will acquire substantially all of the assets of ittravel Canada (the “Purchase Transactions”).

[20] If the Purchase Transactions are approved, Elleway has agreed to fund the ongoing operations of ittravel Canada during the receivership. It is the intention of the parties that the Purchase Transactions will close shortly after approval by the Court and it is not expected that the Receiver will require significant funding.

[21] The purchase price for the Purchase Transactions will be comprised of cash, assumed liabilities and a cancellation of a portion of the Indebtedness. Elleway will supply the cash portion of the purchase price under each Purchase Transaction, which will be sufficient to pay any prior ranking secured claim or priority claim that is not being assumed.

[22] The Purchasers intend to offer substantially all of the employees of ittravel and Cruise the opportunity to continue their employment with the Purchasers.

[23] This motion raises the issue as to whether the Court should make an order pursuant to section 243 of the BIA and section 101 of the CJA appointing GTL as the Receiver.

1. The Court Should Make the Receivership Order

a. The Test for Appointing a Receiver under the BIA and the CJA

[24] Section 243(1) of the BIA authorizes a court to appoint a receiver where such appointment is “just or convenient”.

[25] Similarly, section 101(1) of the CJA provides for the appointment of a receiver by interlocutory order where the appointment is “just or convenient”.

[26] In determining whether it is just and convenient to appoint a receiver under both statutes, a court must have regard to all of the circumstances of the case, particularly the nature of the property and the rights and interests of all parties in relation to the property. See *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek*, [1996] O.J. 5088 at para. 10 (Gen. Div.)

[27] Counsel to the Applicant submits that where the security instrument governing the relationship between the debtor and the secured creditor provides for a right to appoint a receiver upon default, this has the effect of relaxing the burden on the applicant seeking to have the receiver appointed. Further, while the appointment of a receiver is generally regarded as an extraordinary equitable remedy, courts do not regard the nature of the remedy as extraordinary or equitable where the relevant security document permits the appointment of a receiver. This is because the applicant is merely seeking to enforce a term of an agreement that was assented to by both parties. See *Textron Financial Canada Ltd. v. Chetwynd Motels Ltd.*, 2010 BCSC 477, [2010] B.C.J. No. 635 at paras. 50 and 75 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]); *Freure Village, supra*, at para. 12; *Canadian Tire Corp. v. Healy*, 2011 ONSC 4616, [2011] O.J. No. 3498 at para. 18 (S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Bank of Montreal v. Carnival National Leasing Limited and Carnival Automobiles Limited*, 2011 ONSC 1007, [2011] O.J. No. 671 at para. 27 (S.C.J. [Commercial List]). I accept this submission.

[28] Counsel further submits that in such circumstances, the “just or convenient” inquiry requires the court to determine whether it is in the interests of all concerned to have the receiver appointed by the court. The court should consider the following factors, among others, in making such a determination:

- (a) the potential costs of the receiver;
- (a) the relationship between the debtor and the creditors;
- (b) the likelihood of preserving and maximizing the return on the subject property; and
- (c) the best way of facilitating the work and duties of the receiver.

See *Freure Village, supra*, at paras. 10-12; *Canada Tire, supra*, at para. 18; *Carnival National Leasing, supra*, at paras 26-29; *Anderson v. Hunking*, 2010 ONSC 4008, [2010] O.J. No. 3042 at para. 15 (S.C.J.).

[29] Counsel to the Applicant submits that it is just and convenient to appoint GTL as the Receiver in the circumstances of this case. As described above, the ittravel Group has defaulted on its obligations under the Credit Agreement and the Fee Letter. Such defaults are continuing and have not been remedied as of the date of this Application. This has given rise to Elleway’s rights under the Security Documents to appoint a receiver by instrument in writing and to institute court proceedings for the appointment of a receiver.

[30] It is submitted that it is just and convenient, or in the interests of all concerned, for the Court to appoint GTL as the Receiver for five main reasons:

- (a) the potential costs of the receivership will be borne by Elleway;
- (a) the relationships between ittravel Canada and its creditors, including Elleway, militate in favour of appointing GTL as the Receiver;
- (b) appointing GTL as the Receiver is the best way to preserve ittravel Canada's business and maximize value for all stakeholders;
- (c) appointing GTL as the Receiver is the best way to facilitate the work and duties of the Receiver; and
- (d) all other attempts to refinance ittravel Canada's debt or sell its assets have failed.

[31] It is noted that Elleway has also served a notice of intention to enforce security under section 244(1) of the BIA. ittravel Canada has acknowledged its inability to pay the Indebtedness and consented to early enforcement pursuant to section 244(2) of the BIA.

[32] Further, if GTL is appointed as the Receiver and the Purchase Transactions are approved, the Purchasers will assume some of ittravel Canada's liabilities and cancel a portion of the Indebtedness. Therefore, counsel submits that the appointment of GTL as the Receiver is beneficial to both ittravel Canada and Elleway.

[33] Counsel also points out that if GTL is appointed as the Receiver and the Purchase Transactions are approved by the Court, the business of ittravel Canada will continue as a going concern and the jobs of substantially all of ittravel Canada's employees will be saved.

[34] Having considered the foregoing, I am of the view that the Applicant has demonstrated that it is both just and convenient to appoint GTL as Receiver of ittravel Canada under both section 243 of the BIA and section 101 of the CJA. The Application is granted and the order has been signed in the form presented.

Morawetz J.

Date: November 27, 2013

TAB 3

CITATION: RMB Australia Holdings Limited v. Seafield Resources Ltd., 2014 ONSC 5205

COURT FILE NO.: CV-14-10686-00CL

DATE: 20140910

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST

BETWEEN:)	
)	
RMB AUSTRALIA HOLDINGS LIMITED)	<i>Maria Konyukhova and Yannick Katirai, for</i>
)	the applicant
Applicant)	
)	
– and –)	
)	
SEAFIELD RESOURCES LTD.)	<i>Wael Rostom, for KPMG</i>
)	
)	
Respondent)	
)	
)	
)	HEARD: September 9, 2014

NEWBOULD J.

[1] On September 9, 2014 I granted a receiving order for brief reasons to follow. These are my reasons.

[2] The applicant (“RMB”) is an Australian company with its head office in Sydney, New South Wales. RMB is the lender to the respondent (“Seafield”) under a Facility Agreement and is a first ranking secured creditor of Seafield.

[3] Seafield is an Ontario corporation with its head office in Toronto and is a reporting issuer listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange. It is an exploration and pre-development-stage mining company focused on acquiring, exploring and developing properties for gold mining. Seafield directly or indirectly owns mining properties or interests in Colombia, Mexico and Ontario.

[4] Although Seafield was served with the material on this application, neither it nor its counsel appeared to contest the application.

[5] Seafield wholly owns Minera Seafield S.A.S., a corporation existing under the laws of Colombia with its head office in Medellín, Colombia. Minera owns a number of mining titles and surface rights in Colombia, through which it controls three main mineral exploration and mining development properties. One of the properties is a 124 hectare parcel of land subject to a mineral exploitation contract granted by the Colombian Ministry of Mines (the Miraflores Property).

[6] Aside from a small underground mine operated by local artisanal miners, the Colombian properties are non-operational and do not generate revenue for Seafield. Minera relies solely on Seafield for funding to, among other things: (a) continue acquiring mineral property interests; (b) perform the work necessary to discover economically recoverable reserves; (c) conduct technical studies and potentially develop a mining operation; and (d) perform the technical, environmental and social work necessary under Colombian law to maintain the Properties in good standing.

[7] On February 21, 2013, Seafield as borrower, Minera as guarantor and RMB as lender and RMB’s agent entered into the Facility Agreement. Pursuant to the Facility Agreement, RMB made a \$16.5 million secured term credit facility available to Seafield. The Facility Agreement

provided that the proceeds of the Loan must be used for: (a) the funding of work programs in accordance with approved budgets to complete a bankable feasibility study for a project to exploit the Miraflores Property and for corporate expenditures; (b) to fund certain agreed corporate working capital expenditures; and (c) to pay certain expenses associated with the preparation, negotiation, completion and implementation of the Facility Agreement and related documents.

[8] All amounts under the Facility Agreement become due and payable upon the occurrence of an event of default under the Facility Agreement. Events of default include the inability of Seafield or Minera to pay its debts when they are due.

[9] RMB and Seafield entered into a general security agreement under which Seafield charged all of its assets. Minera, Seafield and RMB also entered into a share pledge agreement (the “Share Pledge Agreement”) pursuant to which Seafield pledged and granted to RMB a continuing security interest in and first priority lien on the issued and outstanding shares of Minera and any and all new shares in Minera that Seafield or any company related to it may acquire during the term of the Share Pledge Agreement.

[10] The Share Pledge Agreement specifies that upon the delivery of a notice of default under the Facility Agreement and during the continuance of the default, RMB has the right to, among other things, (a) exercise any and all voting and/or other consensual rights and powers accruing to any owner of ordinary shares in a Colombian company under Colombian law; (b) receive all dividends in respect of the share collateral; (c) commence legal proceedings to demand compliance with the Share Pledge Agreement; (d) take all measures available to guarantee compliance with the obligations secured by the Share Pledge Agreement under the Facility Agreement or applicable Colombian law; and (e) appoint a receiver.

[11] Minera gave a guarantee to RMB of amounts due under the Loan secured by a pledge agreement over the mining titles through which Minera controls its properties, a pledge agreement over its commercial establishment and the Share Pledge Agreement.

[12] Seafield has not generated any material revenues during its history, is not currently generating revenues, and requires third-party financing to enable it to pay its obligations as they come due. Notwithstanding its efforts since September 2013 to find sources of such third-party financing, Seafield has been unable to do so.

[13] Seafield's financial reporting is made on a consolidated basis and does not describe the financial status of Seafield and Minera separately. As stated in Seafield's unaudited condensed interim consolidated financial statements for the three and six-month periods ended June 30, 2014, as at June 30, 2014, Seafield's current liabilities exceeded its current assets by \$14,108,581. As of that date, Seafield had a deficit of \$44,722,780, incurred a net loss of \$699,179 for the six months ended June 30, 2014 and experienced net negative cash flow of \$689,583 for the six months ended June 30, 2014. As of June 30, 2014, Seafield had no non-current liabilities.

[14] Seafield's non-current assets are valued at approximately \$16,083,777 and include the Miraflores Property, which is booked at a value of \$15,244,828. Seafield also owns property and equipment whose carrying value is reported at \$808,948, including computer equipment, office equipment and land.

[15] In May and June 2014, Seafield informed RMB's agent that it expected to have insufficient funds to make the interest payment of \$344,477 due on June 30, 2014, triggering a default under the Facility Agreement. To date, Seafield has not made the interest payment due on June 30, 2014. The next interest payment under the Facility Agreement is due on September 30, 2014.

[16] Discussions took place between RMB's agent and Messrs. Pirie and Prins of Seafield, the then only two directors of Seafield, and several proposals were made on behalf of RMB for financing that were all turned down by Seafield.

[17] Seafield's financial position deteriorated through July and August, 2014. On August 15, 2014, Seafield indicated in an e-mail to RMB's agent that its cash position was dwindling and that it barely had enough to make it to the end of September.

[18] Budgets provided by Seafield to the RMB suggest that total budgeted expenses for Seafield and Minera for the month of September 2014 are estimated to be approximately \$231,500. Total budgeted expenses for the period from September 1, 2014 until December 31, 2014 are estimated to be approximately \$920,000.

[19] Following RMB's inability to negotiate a consensual resolution with Seafield's board and in light of Seafield's and Minera's dire financial situation, RMB demanded payment of all amounts outstanding under the Facility Agreement and gave notice of its intention to enforce its security by delivering a demand letter and a NITES notice on August 28, 2014.

[20] On or about August 29, 2014, in accordance with RMB's rights under the Share Pledge Agreement, an agreement governed by Colombian law, RMB took steps to enforce its pledge of the shares of Minera, which it held and continues to hold in Australia, and replaced the board with directors of RMB's choosing, all of whom are employees of RMB or its agent.

[21] The new Minera board was registered with the Medellin Chamber of Commerce in accordance with Colombian law. However, Minera's corporate minute book was not updated to reflect the appointment of either the new Minera board or the new CEO because Minera's general counsel and former corporate secretary refused to deliver up Minera's minute book.

[22] In addition, on September 2, 2014, Minera lodged a written opposition with the Chamber seeking to reverse the appointment of the new Minera board. The evidence on behalf of RMB is that as a result of that action, it is probable that the Chamber will not register the appointment of Minera's new chief executive officer.

[23] Late in the evening of September 4, 2014, Seafield issued a press release announcing that Minera had commenced creditor protection proceedings in Colombia. Such proceedings are started by making an application to the Superintendencia de Sociedades, a judicial body with oversight of insolvency proceedings in Colombia. The Superintendencia will review the application to determine whether sufficient grounds exist to justify the granting of creditor protection to Minerva. This review could take as little as three days to complete.

[24] Under Colombian law, an application for creditor protection can be lodged with the Superintendencia without the authorization of a corporation's board of directors. On September 5, 2014, the new Minera board passed a resolution withdrawing the application for creditor protection and filed it with the Superintendencia on that same day.

Analysis

[25] RMB is a secured creditor of Seafield and is thus entitled to bring an application for the appointment of a receiver under section 243 of the BIA which provides:

243. (1) Subject to subsection (1.1), on application by a secured creditor, a court may appoint a receiver to do any or all of the following if it considers it to be just or convenient to do so:

(a) take possession of all or substantially all of the inventory, accounts receivable or other property of an insolvent person or bankrupt that was acquired for or used in relation to a business carried on by the insolvent person or bankrupt;

(b) exercise any control that the court considers advisable over that property and over the insolvent person's or bankrupt's business; or

(c) take any other action that the court considers advisable.

[26] Seafield is in breach of its obligations and has defaulted under the Facility Agreement. In accordance with the Facility Agreement, the occurrence of an Event of Default grants RMB the right to seek the appointment of a receiver.

[27] As well, section 101 of the *Courts of Justice Act* permits the appointment of a receiver where it is just and convenient.

[28] In determining whether it is “just or convenient” to appoint a receiver under either the BIA or CJA, Blair J., as he then was, in *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek* (1996), 40 C.B.R. (3d) 274 (Ont. S.C.J.) stated that in deciding whether the appointment of a receiver was just or convenient, the court must have regard to all of the circumstances but in particular the nature of the property and the rights and interests of all parties in relation thereto, which includes the rights of the secured creditor under its security. He also referred to the relief being less extraordinary if a security instrument provided for the appointment of a receiver:

While I accept the general notion that the appointment of a receiver is an extraordinary remedy, it seems to me that where the security instrument permits the appointment of a private receiver -- and even contemplates, as this one does, the secured creditor seeking a court appointed receiver -- and where the circumstances of default justify the appointment of a private receiver, the "extraordinary" nature of the remedy sought is less essential to the inquiry. Rather, the "just or convenient" question becomes one of the Court determining, in the exercise of its discretion, whether it is more in the interests of all concerned to have the receiver appointed by the Court or not.

[29] See also *Elleway Acquisitions Ltd. v. Cruise Professionals Ltd.*, 2013 ONSC 6866, in which Morawetz J., as he then was, stated:

...while the appointment of a receiver is generally regarded as an extraordinary equitable remedy, courts do not regard the nature of the remedy as extraordinary

or equitable where the relevant security document permits the appointment of a receiver. This is because the applicant is merely seeking to enforce a term of an agreement that was assented to by both parties. See *Textron Financial Canada Ltd. v. Chetwynd Motels Ltd.*, 2010 BCSC 477, [2010] B.C.J. No. 635 at paras. 50 and 75 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]); *Freure Village, supra*, at para. 12; *Canadian Tire Corp. v. Healy*, 2011 ONSC 4616, [2011] O.J. No. 3498 at para. 18 (S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Bank of Montreal v. Carnival National Leasing Limited and Carnival Automobiles Limited*, 2011 ONSC 1007, [2011] O.J. No. 671 at para. 27 (S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

[30] The applicant submits, and I accept, that in the circumstances of this case, the appointment of a receiver is necessary to stabilize the corporate governance of Minera, as Seafield's wholly-owned subsidiary and its major asset.

[31] RMB does not believe that Minera will be able to obtain interim financing during the pendency of creditor protection proceedings, and RMB has concerns that those assets may deteriorate in value due to lack of care and maintenance.

[32] Failure to obtain additional financing for Seafield and Minera may result in significant deterioration in the value of Seafield and Minera to the detriment of all of their stakeholders. The evidence of the applicant is that among other things, it appears that the *Consulta Previa*, a mandatory, non-binding public consultation process mandated by Colombian law that involves indigenous communities located in or around natural resource projects, has not been completed. Failure to complete that process in a timely manner could lead to the potential revocation or loss of Minera's title and interests.

[33] Moreover, if further funding is not obtained by Minera, it is also likely that employees of Minera will eventually resign. These employees are necessary for, among other things, ongoing care, maintenance and safeguarding of the properties and assets of Minera, facilitating due diligence inquiries by prospective purchasers or financiers, and maintaining favourable relations with the surrounding community.

[34] RMB has lost confidence in the board of directors of Seafield. The details of the negotiations and the threats made by the Seafield directors, namely Messrs. Pirie and Prins, would appear to justify the loss of confidence by RMB in Seafield. RMB is not prepared to fund Seafield on the terms being demanded by Seafield's board and without changes to Seafield's governance structure.

[35] Notwithstanding that RMB has replaced Minera's board and CEO in accordance with its rights in connection with the Loan and Colombian law, Minera's CEO has refused to relinquish control of Minera or its books and records, including its corporate minute book, stalling RMB's efforts to take corporate control of Minera and creating a deadlock in its corporate governance. Moreover, Minera's CEO, without authorization from the new board of directors, has commenced creditor protection proceedings in Colombia which RMB believes may be detrimental to the value of Minera's assets and all of its and Seafield's stakeholders.

[36] RMB is prepared to advance funds to the receiver for purposes of funding the receivership and Minera's liability through inter-company loans. The receiver will be entitled to exercise all shareholder rights that Seafield has. The receiver will be able to flow funds that it has borrowed from RMB to Minera to enable Minera to meet its obligations as they come due, thereby preserving enterprise value.

[37] In these circumstances, I find that it is just and convenient for KPMG to be appointed the receiver of the assets of Seafield.

Newbould J.

Released: September 10, 2014

CITATION: RMB Australia Holdings Limited v. Seafield Resources Ltd., 2014 ONSC 5205

COURT FILE NO.: CV-14-10686-00CL

DATE: 20140910

ONTARIO

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

COMMERCIAL LIST

BETWEEN:

RMB AUSTRALIA HOLDINGS LIMITED

Applicant

– and –

SEAFIELD RESOURCES LTD.

Respondent

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT

Newbould J.

Released: September 10, 2014

TAB 4

SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA

Citation: *Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation v. Crown Jewel Resort Ranch, Inc.*, 2014 NSSC 128

Date: 20140410

Docket: Syd. No. 423486

Registry: Sydney

Between:

Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, a body corporate, incorporated pursuant to the *Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation Act*, enacted as Part II to the *Government Organization Act, Atlantic Canada, 1987*, R.S., 1985, c. 41 (4th Supp.) (“ECBC”)

Applicant

v.

Crown Jewel Resort Ranch, Inc., a body corporate incorporated under the laws of Nova Scotia (“Crown Jewel”)
And I.N.K. Real Estate Inc., a body corporate incorporated Under the laws of Nova Scotia (“I.N.K.”)

Together the Respondents

LIBRARY HEADING

Judge: The Honourable Justice Frank Edwards

Heard: March 5, 2014 in Sydney, Nova Scotia

Written Decision: April 10, 2014

Subject: **Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act**, s. 243. **Judicature Act**, s.

43 (9) – Application to Appoint Receiver/Manager

Summary:

Respondent Companies (RC's) set up to operate high end tourist resort. Husband and wife principals in RC's became embroiled in protracted divorce proceedings which effectively caused resort to cease operation. Loans (secured and unsecured) of almost three quarters of a million dollars seriously in arrears. Monthly payments were just under \$19,000.00 per month. Municipal taxes over \$70,000.00 in arrears – prospect of tax sale imminent. Remaining principal, Mr. Korem, had no realistic prospect of significantly reducing debt nor refinancing it.

Issue:

Whether just and convenient to appoint a receiver/manager.

Result:

Receiver/manager appointed. Just and convenient to do so:

1. Need for protection of the assets;
2. Apprehended or actual waste of assets;
3. Creditor had right to appoint a private receiver pursuant to a general security agreement;
4. Court appointed receiver required as cooperation of Mr. Korem with private receiver highly unlikely;
5. Appointment the most practical and prudent approach to maximizing the return to the parties.

Cases Noted:

Bank of Montreal v. Sherco Properties Inc., 2013 ONSC 7023 (S.C.J.); **Textron Financial Canada Limited v. Chetwynd Motels Limited**, 2010 BCSC 477, **Canadian Tire Corp., v. Healy**, 2011 ONSC 4616; **Bank of Montreal v. Carnivale National Leasing Ltd.**; **Carnivale Automobile Ltd.**, 2011 ONSC 1007; **Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village of Clair Creek** (1996), 40 C.B.R. (3d) 274 (Ont) S.C.J.; **Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village of Clair Creek** (1996), 1996 CarswellOnt 2328, 40 C.B.R. (3d) 274 (Ont. Gen. Div.) [Commercial List]; **Romspen Investment**

Corp. v. 1514904 Ontario Ltd., et al (2010), 2010
CarswellOnt 2951, 67 C.B.R. (5th) 231 (Ont. S.C.J.).

***THIS INFORMATION SHEET DOES NOT FORM PART OF THE COURT'S DECISION.
QUOTES MUST BE FROM THE DECISION, NOT THIS LIBRARY SHEET.***

SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA

Citation: *Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation v. Crown Jewel Resort Ranch, Inc.* 2014 NSSC 128

Date: 20140410

Docket: SYDJC No. 423486

Registry: Sydney

Between:

Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, a body corporate, incorporated pursuant to the *Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation Act*, enacted as Part II to the *Government Organization Act, Atlantic Canada, 1987*, R.S., 1985, c. 41 (4th Supp.) (“ECBC”)

Applicant

v.

Crown Jewel Resort Ranch, Inc., a body corporate incorporated under the laws of Nova Scotia (“Crown Jewel”)
And I.N.K. Real Estate Inc., a body corporate incorporated Under the laws of Nova Scotia (“I.N.K.”)

Together the Respondents

Judge: Justice Frank Edwards
Heard: March 5, 2014, in Sydney, Nova Scotia
Written Decision April 10, 2014

Counsel: Robert Risk, for the Applicant
Nahman Korem, for the Respondent Companies

By the Court:

The applicant is applying for an order appointing Greg MacKenzie of MacKenzie, Gillis, MacDougall Inc. (“MGM”) as receiver and manager of all of the undertakings, property and assets of Crown Jewel and I.N.K. pursuant to Section 243(1) of the **Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act**, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, and/or Section 43(9) of the **Judicature Act**, R.S.N.S. 1989, c. 240

Grounds for Order: The applicant is applying for the order on the following grounds:

1. A General Security Agreement made between Crown Jewel Resort Ranch, Inc. and the Cape Breton Growth Fund Corporation dated on or about February 3, 2005 and registered in the Nova Scotia Personal Property Registry as Registration No. 9213736 on February 8, 2005, as amended by Registration No. 21915103 on October 11, 2013.
2. A Mortgage made between I.N.K. Real Estate Inc. and the Cape Breton Growth Fund Corporation dated February 4, 2005 registered at the Victoria County Registry of Deeds on February 8, 2005 as Document No. 81337157 (PID Nos. 85017614, 85079127 and 85155281), said Mortgage having been assigned to Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation pursuant to a General Conveyance, Assignment and Assumption of Liabilities Agreement dated March 31, 2008 and registered at the Victoria County Registry of Deeds on May 30, 2008 as Document No. 90774226;
3. A General Security Agreement made between I.N.K. Real Estate Inc. and the Cape Breton Growth Fund Corporation dated on or about February 3, 2005 and registered in the Nova Scotia Personal Property Registry as Registration No. 9213692 on February 8,

2005, as amended by Registration No. 13924725 on May 23, 2008 (together with the above the “Security”)

4. The Respondent Companies (RC’s) have defaulted on their payments and failed to honour their obligations pursuant to a Letter of Offer made between Crown Jewel, I.N.K. and ECBC dated on or about October 2, 2003 with respect to Project No. 8600338-1 (the “Letter of Offer”).
5. The total amount of indebtedness secured by the Security is \$226,134.00 as at October 8, 2013 together with overdue interest on arrears in the amount of \$1,738.19 and interest thereafter at a per diem rate of \$37.17.
6. The RC’s were provided with respective Notices of Intention to Enforce Security pursuant to section 244 of the **Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act** on October 24, 2013.
7. Greg MacKenzie of MGM has agreed to act as the court-appointed receiver and manager of all of the undertakings, property and assets of both Crown Jewel and I.N.K. and the Applicant consents to his appointment.
8. The Applicant, ECBC relies on Section 243(1) of the **Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act**, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, which reads:

243. (1) Subject to subsection (1.1), on application by a secured creditor, a court may appoint a receiver to do any or all of the following if it considers it to be just or convenient to do so:

- (a) take possession of all or substantially all of the inventory, accounts receivable or other property of an insolvent person or bankrupt that was acquired for or used in relation to a business carried on by the insolvent person or bankrupt;
- (b) exercise any control that the court considers advisable over that property and over the insolvent person’s or bankrupt’s business;
or
- (c) take any other action that the court considers advisable.

9. The Applicant, ECBC relies on Section 43(9) of the **Judicature Act**, R.S.N.S. 1989, c. 240, which reads:

43. (9) A mandamus or an injunction may be granted or a receiver appointed by an interlocutory order of the Supreme Court, in all cases in which it appears to the Supreme Court to be just or convenient that such order should be made, and any such order may be made either unconditionally or upon such terms and conditions as the Supreme Court thinks just, and if an injunction is asked, either before or at or after the hearing of any cause or matter, to prevent any threatened or apprehended waste or trespass, such injunction may be granted if the Supreme Court thinks fit, whether the person against whom such injunction is sought is, or is not, in possession under any claim of title or otherwise or, if out of possession, does or does not claim a right to do the act sought to be restrained, under any colour of title, and whether the estates claimed by both or by either of the parties are legal or equitable.

Background: The RC's had obtained financing from the Cape Breton Growth Fund Corporation (CBGF), the Atlantic Canada Opportunity Agency (ACOA), and the Applicant, Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation (ECBC).

ECBC succeeded CBGF when the latter wound up in 2008. ECBC delivers and administers all programs offered by ACOA.

The RC's' intent was to establish an upscale, four-season, fly-in active vacation resort near Baddeck, Nova Scotia. Operations commenced in 2006 but struggled financially from the outset. The financial problems multiplied when the two principals in the RC's, Nahman Korem (Korem) and Iris Kedmi (Kedmi) became embroiled in protracted divorce proceedings. These continued between 2010 and December, 2012 when the Nova Scotia Court of Appeal dismissed Kedmi's appeal.

The resort essentially ceased to function as of the start of the domestic trouble between Korem and Kedmi in 2010.

By October 8, 2013, the RC's were in serious arrears on their loans. By that date, the total amount of indebtedness was as follows:

- 1. ECBC Secured Letter of Offer:** \$226,134.00 with overdue interest on arrears of \$1,738.19 plus interest of \$37.17 per day.
- 2. ECBC Unsecured Letter of Offer:** \$268,254.86 with overdue interest on arrears of \$1,738.19 plus interest of \$44.10 per day.
- 3. ACOA Unsecured Loan:** \$256,642.00 plus arrears of \$4,425.80.

Throughout the period of 2005-2009 the RC's were able to make their regular scheduled payments on the ACOA Unsecured Loan, having repaid approximately \$234,360.00 of the initial \$500,000.00 loan disbursement. (Lane affidavit para. 22)

The RC's have, however, paid only approximately \$6,000.00 toward the outstanding principal on the ACOA Unsecured Loan since 2009. Further, no repayments at all have been made on this loan within the 12 month period from December of 2012 to December of 2013. (Lane Affidavit para. 23)

With respect to both the ECBC Secured and Unsecured Letters of Offer, the RC's have to date made only a combined repayment in the approximate amount of \$9,235.00. As noted above, these loans are in significant arrears. Furthermore, overdue interest is due and owing and is accruing daily. (Lane affidavit para. 24)

The Applicant gave the RC's Notices of Intention to Enforce Security on October 24, 2013. Korem knew by November 2013 at the latest that ECBC intended to apply to have a receiver/manager appointed by the Court. A General Security Agreement given to CBGF/ECBC by the RC's provided for the appointment of a private receiver upon default.

Despite the fact that the loans were already overdue, ECBC took a hands-off approach during the divorce proceedings. Korem and Kedmi were making competing claims regarding the assets of the RC's. ECBC thus decided not to enforce its security until the divorce outcome was known. After dismissal of the Kedmi Appeal in December, 2012, Korem became the effective owner of all the assets and liabilities of the RC's.

Korem insists that ECBC is partially responsible for the present situation because it allowed Kedmi to liquidate some of the assets. I reject any such notion. During the 2010 – 2012 period, the resort was clearly in survival mode. The two

principals were locked in a particularly acrimonious marital dispute. The resort was generating no revenue. Kedmi was living on the resort property and was assuring ECBC that she was doing her best to maintain it.

It was in that context that ECBC allowed Kedmi to liquidate some assets that were not essential to the survival of the resort. ECBC also allowed her to liquidate assets which in fact had actually become liabilities. These included the horses which were very expensive to maintain but had no foreseeable prospect of generating revenue. Korem's grievance with ECBC is misplaced.

Korem now rests his hopes of financial recovery on the possibility of operating a timber cutting business. He presented ECBC with an appraisal of the timber resources on the resort property. The appraisal indicated that the value of the standing timber was 1.5 to 2 million dollars less harvesting costs.

ECBC gave Korem permission to do some limited wood harvesting but insisted upon the presentation of a business plan by July, 2013. The business plan Korem provided did not address how the RC's intended to service the ECBC and ACOA debts. Nor did it indicate how the RC's would finance the start-up of the timber business.

In October, 2013, ECBC again reviewed proposals put forward by Korem. Incidentally, ECBC learned that property taxes for the resort were \$80,000.00 in arrears (Korem says it's now \$75,000.00) and that a tax sale was imminent. ECBC decided it was time to apply to have a Receiver/Manager appointed.

RC's' Objections to Appointment of Receiver/Manager: Korem acted for the RC's without legal counsel. He put forward three objections to the appointment of a Receiver/Manager:

1. That the Mortgage dated February 4, 2005 is not valid;
2. That I.N.K. Real Estate Inc. is capable of making payments;
3. That it is not "just and convenient" to appoint a receiver.

I will deal with the objections in turn:

1. The Mortgage is Valid: It was properly executed by Korem and was duly recorded. Its repayment terms reflect those agreed to by Korem when he signed as president of I.N.K. Real Estate Inc. on October 2, 2003. Those repayment terms were subsequently modified (in I.N.K.'s favor) on March 23, 2005 and October 30, 2010. On both occasions, Korem signed. (See Lane Affidavit Tabs A & B).

The Mortgage was given as security for a Promissory Note dated January 21, 2005. Korem's objection seems to be based upon his view that ECBC's counsel at the time questioned the promissory note. On the contrary, the record shows that the lawyer was satisfied with the promissory note and authorized ECBC to disburse funds.

The RC's' obligations and ECBC's rights under the Mortgage remain in full force and effect.

2. The RC's are not Capable of Making Payments: As an aside, Korem seeks to claim that he cannot speak for Crown Jewel Resort Ranch Inc. (CJRR) because Kedmi still owns that company. At the same time Korem acknowledges that all CJRR's assets and liabilities have been transferred to him. Korem is the effective principal of both companies.

To service their debts to ECBC and ACOA, the RC's would have to make monthly payments of just under \$19,000.00 per month. (To say nothing of the arrears). As noted they are also in substantial arrears regarding property taxes (\$75,000.00) and owe contractor D.W. Matheson about \$35,000.00.

Korem has provided no details to show how he can finance the start-up of the timber business. By his own estimate, he would need one to two years just to pay off the ECBC Secured debt. He give no indication of how much longer it would take to pay off the Unsecured debts. Korem has been given ample opportunity to seek re-financing with another lender. He admits that commercial lenders will not go near him. There is no realistic prospect that the RC's will ever be able to address their debts.

It is Just and Convenient that a Receiver/Manager be Appointed: What follows, I adopt, in large measure from the Applicant's Brief.

In **The 2013-2014 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act**, Lloyd W. Houlden, Geoffrey B. Morawetz & Janis P. Sarra (Carswell:Toronto, Ontario 2013-2014) the authors set out at p. 1018 the factors I consider in determining whether it is appropriate to appoint a receiver. These are:

(a) whether irreparable harm might be caused if no order were made, although it is not essential for a creditor to establish irreparable harm if a receiver is not appointed;

(b) the risk to the security holder taking into consideration the size of the debtor's equity in the assets and the need for protection or safeguarding of the assets while litigation takes place;

(c) the nature of the property;

- (d) the apprehended or actual waste of the debtor's assets;
- (e) the preservation and protection of the property pending judicial resolution;
- (f) the balance of convenience to the parties;
- (g) the fact that the creditor has the right to appoint a receiver under the documentation provided for in the loan;
- (h) the enforcement of rights under a security instrument where the security holder encounters or expects to encounter difficulty with the debtor and others;
- (i) the principle that the appointment of a receiver is extraordinary relief that should be granted cautiously and sparingly;
- (j) the consideration of whether a court appointment is necessary to enable the receiver to carry out its duties more efficiently;
- (k) the effect of the order on the parties;
- (l) the conduct of the parties;
- (m) the length of time that a receiver may be in place;
- (n) the cost to the parties;
- (o) the likelihood of maximizing return to the parties; and
- (p) the goal of facilitating the duties of the receiver.

The authors further note that a court can, when it is appropriate to do so, place considerable weight on the fact that the creditor has the right to instrument –

appoint a receiver. In **Bank of Montreal v. Sherco Properties Inc.**, 2013 ONSC 7023 (S.C.J.) the court granted the application of the Bank of Montreal for the court-appointment of a receiver over the assets of Sherco Properties Inc. , finding at paragraph 42 that:

[42] Where the security instrument governing the relationship between the debtor and the secured creditor provides for a right to appoint a receiver upon default, this has the effect of relaxing the burden on the applicant seeking to have the receiver appointed. While the appointment of a receiver is generally regarded as an extraordinary equitable remedy, courts do not regard the nature of the remedy as extraordinary or equitable where the relevant security document permits the appointment of a receiver. This is because the applicant is merely seeking to enforce a term of an agreement that was assented to by both parties. See **Textron Financial Canada Limited v. Chetwynd Motels Limited**, 2010 BCSC 477; *Freure Village*, supra; **Canadian Tire Corp. v. Healy**, 2011 ONSC 4616 and **Bank of Montreal v. Carnivale National Leasing Ltd. and Carnivale Automobile Ltd.**, 2011 ONSC 1007.

The court in **Bank of Montreal v. Sherco Properties Inc.** offered the following reasons for its decision at paragraph 47 below:

[47] I have reached this conclusion for the following reasons:

(a) the terms of the security held by the Bank in respect of Sherco and Farm permit the appointment of a receiver;

(b) the terms of the mortgages permit the appointment of a receiver upon default;

(c) the value of the security continues to erode as interest and tax arrears continue to accrue;

(d) Mr. Sherk contends that, with his assistance and knowledge, the Bank will get the highest and most value from the sale of the lands. It has been demonstrated over the past two years that Mr. Sherk has not been able to accomplish a refinancing or a sale.

As noted at paragraph 33 of the Affidavit of Steve Lane, the General Security Agreement entered into by Crown Jewel provides ECBC with the specific authority to appoint by instrument a receiver or receiver and manager of the assets of the company upon default. The RC's are in default of the obligations owed to ECBC pursuant to the Secured Letter of Offer as referenced in paragraph 4 of the Affidavit of Steve Lane.

Certain other factors to be considered in determining whether it is just and convenient to appoint a receiver are particularly relevant to the case at Bar. These are:

(b) the risk to the security holder taking into consideration the size of the debtor's equity in the assets and the need for protection or safeguarding of the assets while litigation takes place;

Mr. Lane states at paragraphs 50 and 51 of his Affidavit that the RC's owe outstanding property taxes to Victoria County, Cape Breton in the approximate

amount of \$80,000.00 as of October, 2013 and that, failing payment, Victoria County intends to put the lands up for tax sale in March of 2014. Permitting this situation to continue will undoubtedly place ECBC's security interest at risk.

Paragraphs 58 and 59 of the Affidavit of Steve Lane sets out the concerns ECBC has with the alleged lease agreements entered into by Korem. Clearly Korem did not have, on behalf of the RC's, any authority to enter into these lease agreements without the consent of ECBC. Further, the lease agreements appear to have been made by the RC's under a different business name, notwithstanding the fact that this entity has no legal standing. Clearly the RC's can no longer be entrusted with protecting and safeguarding their assets and the actions they have taken with respect to these alleged lease agreements clearly places ECBC's security interest at risk.

(d) the apprehended or actual waste of the debtor's assets;

It is apparent that Korem intends to continue with timber harvesting on the lands of the RC's that are subject to the ECBC security interest. Although limited timber harvesting was permitted by ECBC while Korem attempted to resolve the outstanding matrimonial property dispute, ECBC is understandably not confident

that Korem will seek such consent in future. Given what appears to be an increasingly desperate financial situation of the RC's, ECBC holds a reasonable apprehension that the assets of the RC's, and in particular the timber resources, may be depleted or wasted.

(e) the preservation and protection of the property pending judicial resolution;

Crown Jewel Resort is no longer in operation and has been closed down for quite some time. ECBC remains concerned as to whether the assets of the resort are being adequately preserved and protected. For instance, ECBC has no way of ensuring that Korem will continue to properly maintain the resort property. Further, ECBC is concerned as to whether the assets of the resort will be properly insured on a continuing basis.

(g) the fact that the creditor has the right to appoint a receiver under the documentation provided for in the loan;

As noted above, ECBC has the right to appoint a receiver by instrument under the General Security Agreement entered into by the Respondent, Crown Jewel. ECBC advised the RC's of its intention to appoint a private receiver with respect to this matter during the November 20, 2013 negotiation referenced at paragraph 53 of Mr. Lane's Affidavit.

(j) the consideration of whether a court appointment is necessary to enable the receiver to carry out its duties more efficiently;

In **Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village of Clair Creek** (1996), 40 C.B.R. (3d)

274 (Ont) S.C.J. granted the motion for appointment by the court of a receiver-manager, holding at paragraph 13:

[13] Here I am satisfied on balance it is just and convenient for the order sought to be made. The Defendants have been attempting to refinance the properties for 1½ years without success, although a letter from Mutual Trust dated yesterday suggests (again) the possibility of a refinancing in the near future. The Bank and the debtors are deadlocked and I infer from the history and evidence that the Bank's attempts to enforce its security privately will only lead to more litigation. Indeed, the debtor's solicitors themselves refer to the prospect of "costly, protracted and unproductive" litigation in a letter dated March 21st of this year, should the Bank seek to pursue its remedies. More significantly, the parties cannot agree on the proper approach to be taken to marketing the properties which everyone agrees must be sold. Should it be on a unit by unit conversion condominium basis (as the debtor proposes) or on an en bloc basis as the Bank would prefer? A Court appointed receiver with a mandate to develop a marketing plan can resolve that impasse, subject to the Court's approval, whereas a privately appointed receiver in all likelihood could not, at least without further litigious skirmishing. In the end, I am satisfied the interests of the debtors themselves, along with those of the creditors (and the tenants, who will be caught in the middle) and the orderly disposition of the property are all better served by the appointment of the receiver-manager as requested.

Mr. Lane, at paragraph 60 of his Affidavit, notes the concerns ECBC has with the ability of MGM to carry out its duties. It is clear from the email stream of correspondences referenced at paragraph 59 of the Affidavit that Korem intends to set up as many road blocks as he can with respect to both the appointment of the receiver and the subsequent carrying out of its duties. As in **Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village of Clair Creek** above, it appears inevitable that Korem will continue to bring costly, protracted and unproductive litigation against both ECBC and its privately appointed receiver. Further, it appears clear that Korem will not agree on the proper approach to be taken to marketing and selling the assets of the RC's subject to the ECBC security interest. Certainly any such attempts to dispose of the property by the privately appointed receiver would be met with further litigious skirmishing.

(1) the conduct of the parties;

It is clear from a reading of Mr. Lane's Affidavit that ECBC has extended the RC's with every opportunity to turn the resort business around. Unfortunately, the business became insolvent and has not been in operation for some time. Ultimately, ECBC had no option other than to enforce its security in an attempt to recover some of the losses it incurred in relation to the loans granted to the RC's.

Despite the personal investment Korem has made in the resort, as well as the arduous and extremely adversarial divorce proceedings with Kedmi in regard to the assets of the RC's, Korem has not, despite being given ample opportunity to do so, made any reasonable progress in obtaining alternate financing with a view to paying out the ECBC indebtedness. Further, Korem has yet to provide ECBC with a meaningful business plan outlining the timely repayment of the ECBC debt.

(o) the likelihood of maximizing return to the parties;

The most practical and prudent approach to maximizing the return to the parties, including the unsecured debt, would be to proceed with a sale of the resort as soon as possible. In the interim, it remains open to Korem, while the receiver is in place, to obtain alternate financing with a view to paying out the ECBC debt.

The authors of **The 2013-2014 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act** comment at page 1018 that there is an important distinction between the duties and obligations of a receiver and manager privately appointed under the provisions of a security document and those of a receiver and manager appointed by court order. A privately appointed receiver and manager is not acting in a fiduciary capacity; it need only ensure that a fair sale is conducted of the assets covered by the security documents and that a proper accounting is made to the debtor. A court-appointed

receiver and manager, on the other hand, is an officer of the Court and acts in a fiduciary capacity with respect to all interested parties. Further, a court-appointed receiver derives its powers and authority wholly from the order of the court appointing it. It is not subject to the control and direction of the parties who had it appointed, or of anyone, except the Court. Given the significant unsecured debt owed to both ECBC and the Atlantic Canada Opportunity Agency, as set out at paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Affidavit of Steve Lane, a court-appointed receiver will more adequately and appropriately consider the interests of these, as well as potentially other, unsecured creditors and therefore the appointment by way of a court order is more appropriate in these particular circumstances.

The appointment of a receiver is, generally speaking, an extraordinary relief that should be granted cautiously and sparingly. However, in *Houlden, Morawetz and Sarra* at p. 1024 below:

The court has held that while generally, the appointment of a receiver is an extraordinary remedy, where the security instrument permits the appointment of a private receiver, and/or contemplates the secured creditor seeking a court-appointed receiver, and where the circumstances of default justify the appointment of a private receiver, the “extraordinary” nature of the remedy sought is less essential to the inquiry. Rather, the “just or convenient” question becomes one of the court determining whether or not it is more in the interests of all concerned to have the receiver appointed by the court: **Bank of Nova**

Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek (1996), 1996 CarswellOnt 2328, 40 C.B.R. (3d) 274 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

Finally, the authors note at p. 1024 of **The 2013-2014 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act** that the court's appointment of a receiver does not necessarily dictate the financial end of the debtor. In **Romspen Investment Corp. v. 1514904 Ontario Ltd.** et al. (2010), 2010 CarswellOnt 2951, 67 C.B.R. (5th) 231 (Ont. S.C.J.) the court commented at paragraph 32:

[32] The court's appointment of the Receiver does not dictate the end of this development nor the financial end necessarily of the Debtors. Some receiverships are terminated upon presentment of an acceptable plan of refinancing or after a sale of some but not all assets. Time will be necessary for the Receiver to determine value and appropriately market the subject properties. During this time, the Debtors are entitled to continue to seek out prospective lenders or identify potential purchasers, with the qualification that they cannot usurp the role of the Receiver. Other than the cost of the Receiver, there is no existing or imminent harm beyond the potential future risk of the Receiver obtaining court approval of an improvident sale. Market value versus a proposed sale price will form the very argument on the approval motion. It is premature to argue irreparable harm at this time.

Conclusion:

I therefore order the appointment of Greg MacKenzie of MacKenzie, Gillis, MacDougall Inc. as the receiver and/or manager of all of the undertakings, property and assets of the RC's, Crown Jewel Resort Ranch, Inc. and I.N.K. Real Estate Inc. The Applicant shall also have its costs in the amount of \$1500.00 payable forthwith.

Edwards, J.

Sydney, Nova Scotia

MERIDIAN CREDIT UNION LIMITED
Applicant

-and- STATEVIEW HOMES (ELM&CO) INC.
Respondent

Court File No. CV-23-00699067-00CL

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT
TORONTO

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES

FOGLER, RUBINOFF LLP

Lawyers
77 King Street West
Suite 3000, P.O. Box 95
TD Centre North Tower
Toronto, ON M5K 1G8

Scott Venton (LSO#: 43383R)

Tel: 416.941.8870
Fax: 416.941.8852
Email: sventon@foglers.com

Vern W. DaRe (LSO# 32591E)

Tel: 416.941.8842
Fax: 416.941.8852
Email: vdare@foglers.com

Lawyers for the Applicant,
Meridian Credit Union Limited