

**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 URBANCORP (WOODBINE) INC. AND
URBANCORP (BRIDLEPATH) INC., THE TOWNHOUSES OF HOGG'S
HOLLOW INC., KING TOWNS INC., NEWTOWNS AT KINGTOWNS
INC. AND DEAJA PARTNER (BAY) INC. (COLLECTIVELY, THE
"APPLICANTS")**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF TCC URBANCORP (BAY) LIMITED
PARTNERSHIP**

**JOINT BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE FUNCTIONARY
AND TERRA FIRMA CAPITAL CORPORATION
(Motion Returnable February 21, 2019)**

February 15, 2019

DENTONS CANADA LLP
77 King Street West, Suite 400
Toronto, Ontario M5K 0A1
Fax: 416-863-4592

Kenneth Kraft (LSO #31919P)
Tel: 416-863-4374
Email: kenneth.kraft@dentons.com

Neil Rabinovitch (LSO #33442F)
Tel: 416-863-4656
Email: neil.rabinovitch@dentons.com

*Lawyers for Guy Gissin the Israeli
Court-appointed functionary officer
and foreign representative of
Urbancorp Inc.*

**THORNTON GROUT
FINNIGAN LLP**
3200-100 Wellington Street West
TD Centre, Box 329
Toronto, ON M5K 1K7

John T. Porter (LSO #23844T)
Tel: (416) 304-0778
Fax: (416) 304-1313
Email: jporter@tgf.ca

*Counsel for Terra Firma Capital
Corporation*

TO: The Service List

**CCAA PROCEEDINGS OF URBANCORP (WOODBINE) INC.,
URBANCORP (BRIDLEPATH) INC. ET AL**

SERVICE LIST

(UPDATED OCTOBER 23, 2018)

TO: DLA PIPER (CANADA) LLP
Suite 6000, Box 367
1 First Canadian Place
Toronto, ON M5X 1E2

Edmond F.B. Lamek / Danny M. Nunes
Tel: 416.365.3444 / 416.365.3421
Email: edmond.lamek@dlapiper.com / danny.nunes@dlapiper.com

Lawyers for the Urbancorp CCAA Entities

AND TO: KSV ADVISORY INC.
150 King Street West, Suite 2308
Toronto, ON M5H 1J9

Bobby Kofman / Noah Goldstein / Robert Harlang
Tel: 416-932-6228 / 416-932-6027 / 416-932-6225
Email: bkofman@ksvadvisory.com / ngoldstein@ksvadvisory.com / rharlang@ksvadvisory.com

The Monitor

AND TO: DAVIES WARD PHILLIPS & VINEBERG LLP
155 Wellington Street West
Toronto, ON M5V 3J7

Robin B. Schwill / Jay Swartz
Tel: 416-863-5502 / 416-863-5520
Email: rschwill@dwpv.com / jswartz@dwpv.com

Lawyers for KSV Advisory Inc., in its capacity as the Monitor

AND TO: BENNETT JONES LLP
3400 One First Canadian Place
P.O. Box 130
Toronto, ON M5X 1A4

S. Richard Orzy / Raj S. Sahni
Tel: 416-777-5737 / 416-777-4804
Email: Orzyr@bennettjones.com / SahniR@bennettjones.com

Lawyers for Alan Saskin and Urbancorp Inc.

AND TO: BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP

199 Bay Street
Suite 4000, Commerce Court West
Toronto, ON M5L 1A9

Silvana M. D'Alimonte

Tel: 416-863-3860

Email: smda@blakes.com

Lawyers for Laurentian Bank of Canada

AND TO: ROBINS APPLEBY LLP

120 Adelaide Street West, Suite 2600
Toronto, ON M5H 1T1

Leor Margulies / Dominique Michaud

Tel: 416-360-3372 / 416-360-3795

Email: lmargulies@robapp.com / dmichaud@robapp.com

THORNTON GROUT FINNIGAN LLP

Toronto-Dominion Centre
100 Wellington Street West, Suite 3200,
P.O. Box 329
Toronto, ON M5K 1K

John T. Porter

Tel: 416-304-0778

Email: jporter@tgf.ca

Co-Counsel for Terra Firma Capital Corporation

AND TO: TEPLITSKY, COLSON LLP

70 Bond Street, Suite 200
Toronto, ON M5B 1X3

James M. Wortzman / Catherine Allen

Tel: 416-865-5315

Email: jwortzman@teplitskycolson.com / callen@teplitskycolson.com

Lawyers for Atrium Mortgage Investment Corporation

AND TO: FOGLER, RUBINOFF LLP

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

Vern W. DaRe

Tel: 416-941-8842

Email: vdare@foglers.com

Lawyers for Adrian Serpa and Stefano Serpa

AND TO: TRENT MORRIS BARRISTER

336-20 De Boers Drive
Toronto, ON M3J OH1

Trent Morris

Tel: 647-366-6837

Email: trent@trentmorris.ca

Lawyer for six purchasers of pre-construction homes

AND TO: TORYS LLP

79 Wellington Street West, 30th Floor
Box 270, TD South Tower
Toronto, ON M5K 1 N2

Adam M. Slavens

Tel: 416-865-7333

Email: aslavens@torys.com

Lawyers for Tarion Warranty Corporation

AND TO: DICKINSON WRIGHT LLP

199 Bay Street, Suite 2200, Commerce Court
Toronto, ON M5L 1G4

Lisa Corne / David Preger

Tel: 416-646-4608 / 416-646-4606

Email: lcorne@dickinsonwright.com / dpreger@dickinsonwright.com

Lawyers for certain purchaser of pre-construction units

AND TO: MINISTRY OF FINANCE

77 Bay Street, 11th Floor
Toronto, ON M5G 2C8

Kevin O'Hara

Tel: 416-327-8463

Email: Kevin.Ohara@ontario.ca

AND TO: GOLDMAN SLOAN NASH & HABER LLP

480 University Ave Suite 1600
Toronto, Ontario M5G 1V2

Mario Forte / Robert Drake

Tel: 416-597 6477 / 416-597-5014

Email: forte@gsnh.com / drake@gsnh.com

Lawyers for Fuller Landau LLP, Proposal Trustee to Alan Saskin

AND TO: DELZOTTO ZORZI, LLP

4810 Dufferin Street, Suite D
Toronto, ON M3H 5S8

Robert W. Calderwood / Sabrina Adamski

Tel.: 416-665-5555

E-mail: rcalderwood@dzlaw.com / sadamski@dzlaw.com

Lawyers for Furkin Construction Inc. and GMF Consulting Inc.

AND TO: FULLER LANDAU LLP

151 Bloor Street West
Toronto, ON M5S 1S4

Gary Abrahamson / Adam Erlich / Ken Pearl

Tel: 416-645-6500

Email: GAbrahamson@FullerLLP.com / AErlich@FullerLLP.com / KPearl@FullerLLP.com

Proposal Trustee to Alan Saskin

AND TO: DENTONS CANADA LLP

400-77 King Street West, TD Centre
Toronto, ON M5K 0A1

Neil Rabinovitch / Kenneth Kraft

Tel: 416-863-4656 / 416-863-4374

Email: neil.rabinovitch@dentons.com / kenneth.kraft@dentons.com

Lawyers for Adv. Gus Gissin, in his capacity as the Court-appointed Israeli Functionary of Urbancorp Inc.

AND TO: TORYS LLP

79 Wellington Street West, Suite 3000
Toronto, ON M5K 1N2

Scott Bomhof

Tel: 416-865-7370

Email: sbomhof@torys.com

Lawyers for First Capital Realty Inc.

AND TO: FARBER FINANCIAL GROUP 150

York Street, Suite 1600
Toronto, ON M5H 3S5

Hylton Levi

Tel: 416-496-3070

Email: hlevy@farberfinancial.com

AND TO: LAX O'SULLIVAN LISUS GOTTLIEB LLP

Suite 2750, 145 King Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 1J8

Andrew Winton

Tel: 416.644.5342

Email: awinton@counsel-toronto.com

**Lawyers for Doreen Saskin and DS (Bay)
Holdings Inc.**

AND TO: CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

c/o Department of Justice
The Exchange Tower
130 King Street West
Suite 3400, P.O. Box 36
Toronto, ON M5X 1K6

Fozia Chaudary

Tel:

Email: fozia.chaudary@justice.gc.ca

Lawyers for Canada Revenue Agency

**CCAA PROCEEDINGS OF URBANCORP (WOODBINE) INC., URBANCORP
(BRIDLEPATH) INC. ET AL**

**SERVICE LIST – email addresses
(Updated: October 23, 2018)**

edmond.lamek@dlapiper.com; danny.nunes@dlapiper.com; bkofman@ksvadvisory.com;
ngoldstein@ksvadvisory.com; rharlang@ksvadvisory.com; jswartz@dwpv.com;
rschwill@dwpv.com; Orzyr@bennettjones.com; SahniR@bennettjones.com; smda@blakes.com;
lmargulies@robapp.com; dmichaud@robapp.com; jporter@tgf.ca;
jwortzman@teplitskycolson.com; callen@teplitskycolson.com; vdare@foglers.com;
trent@trentmorris.ca; aslavens@torys.com; lcorne@dickinsonwright.com;
dpreger@dickinsonwright.com; Kevin.Ohara@ontario.ca; forte@gsnh.com; drake@gsnh.com;
rcalderwood@dzlaw.com; sadamski@dzlaw.com; GAbrahamson@FullerLLP.com;
AErlich@FullerLLP.com; KPearl@FullerLLP.com; neil.rabinovitch@dentons.com;
kenneth.kraft@dentons.com; sbomhof@torys.com; hlevy@farberfinancial.com;
awinton@counsel-toronto.com; fozia.chaudary@justice.gc.ca

3641812

INDEX

INDEX

Document	Tab
<i>Nortel Networks Corporation, (Re)</i> , 2010 ONSC 1708	1
<i>Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., (Re)</i> , 2007 ABCA 266	2
<i>Great Basin Gold Ltd., (Re)</i> , 2012 BCSC 1773	3
<i>Walter Energy Canada Holdings Inc., (Re)</i> , 2017 BCSC 1968 at para. 32	4
<i>Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada v. Sino-Forest Corp.</i> , 2013 ONSC 1078	5

TAB 1

2010 ONSC 1708
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Nortel Networks Corp., Re

2010 CarswellOnt 1754, 2010 ONSC 1708, 192 A.C.W.S. (3d) 368, 63 C.B.R. (5th) 44, 81 C.C.P.B. 56

**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
NORTEL NETWORKS CORPORATION, NORTEL NETWORKS LIMITED, NORTEL
NETWORKS GLOBAL CORPORATION, NORTEL NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL
CORPORATION AND NORTEL NETWORKS TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION (Applicants)

Morawetz J.

Heard: March 3-5, 2010

Judgment: March 26, 2010

Docket: 09-CL-7950

Counsel: Derrick Tay, Jennifer Stam, Suzanne Wood for Applicants

Lyndon Barnes, Adam Hirsh for Nortel Directors

Benjamin Zarnett, Gale Rubenstein, C. Armstrong, Melaney Wagner for Monitor, Ernst & Young Inc.

Arthur O. Jacques for Nortel Canada Current Employees

Deborah McPhail for Superintendent of Financial Services (non-PBGF)

Mark Zigler, Susan Philpott for Former and Long-Term Disability Employees

Ken Rosenberg, M. Starnino for Superintendent of Financial Services in its capacity as Administrator of the Pension
Benefit Guarantee Fund

S. Richard Orzy, Richard B. Swan for Informal Nortel Noteholder Group

Alex MacFarlane, Mark Dunsmuir for Unsecured Creditors' Committee of Nortel Networks Inc.

Leanne Williams for Flextronics Inc.

Barry Wadsworth for CAW-Canada

Pamela Huff for Northern Trust Company, Canada

Joel P. Rochon, Sakie Tambakos for Opposing Former and Long-Term Disability Employees

Robin B. Schwill for Nortel Networks UK Limited (In Administration)

Sorin Gabriel Radulescu for himself

Guy Martin for himself, Marie Josee Perrault

Peter Burns for himself

Stan and Barbara Arnelien for themselves

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial; Civil Practice and Procedure

MOTION by insolvent corporation for court approval of settlement agreement under Companies' Creditors
Arrangement Act.

Morawetz J.:

Introduction

1 On January 14, 2009, Nortel Networks Corporation ("NNC"), Nortel Networks Limited ("NNL"), Nortel Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Networks International Corporation and Nortel Networks Technology Corporation (collectively, the "Applicants") were granted a stay of proceedings pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") and Ernst & Young Inc. was appointed as Monitor.

2 The Applicants have historically operated a number of pension, benefit and other plans (both funded and unfunded) for their employees and pensioners, including:

(i) Pension benefits through two registered pension plans, the Nortel Networks Limited Managerial and Non-Negotiated Pension Plan and the Nortel Networks Negotiated Pension Plan (the "Pension Plans"); and

(ii) Medical, dental, life insurance, long-term disability and survivor income and transition benefits paid, except for survivor termination benefits, through Nortel's Health and Welfare Trust (the "HWT").

3 Since the CCAA filing, the Applicants have continued to provide medical, dental and other benefits, through the HWT, to pensioners and employees on long-term disability ("Former and LTD Employees") and active employees ("HWT Payments") and have continued all current service contributions and special payments to the Pension Plans ("Pension Payments").

4 Pension Payments and HWT Payments made by the Applicants to the Former and LTD Employees while under CCAA protection are largely discretionary. As a result of Nortel's insolvency and the significant reduction in the size of Nortel's operations, the unfortunate reality is that, at some point, cessation of such payments is inevitable. The Applicants have attempted to address this situation by entering into a settlement agreement (the "Settlement Agreement") dated as of February 8, 2010, among the Applicants, the Monitor, the Former Employees' Representatives (on their own behalf and on behalf of the parties they represent), the LTD Representative (on her own behalf and on behalf of the parties she represents), Representative Settlement Counsel and the CAW-Canada (the "Settlement Parties").

5 The Applicants have brought this motion for approval of the Settlement Agreement. From the standpoint of the Applicants, the purpose of the Settlement Agreement is to provide for a smooth transition for the termination of Pension Payments and HWT Payments. The Applicants take the position that the Settlement Agreement represents the best efforts of the Settlement Parties to negotiate an agreement and is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA.

6 The essential terms of the Settlement Agreement are as follows:

(a) until December 31, 2010, medical, dental and life insurance benefits will be funded on a pay-as-you-go basis to the Former and LTD Employees;

(b) until December 31, 2010, LTD Employees and those entitled to receive survivor income benefits will receive income benefits on a pay-as-you-go basis;

(c) the Applicants will continue to make current service payments and special payments to the Pension Plans in the same manner as they have been doing over the course of the proceedings under the CCAA, through to March 31, 2010, in the aggregate amount of \$2,216,254 per month and that thereafter and through to September 30, 2010, the Applicants shall make only current service payments to the Pension Plans, in the aggregate amount of \$379,837 per month;

(d) any allowable pension claims, in these or subsequent proceedings, concerning any Nortel Worldwide Entity, including the Applicants, shall rank *pari passu* with ordinary, unsecured creditors of Nortel, and no part of any such HWT claims shall rank as a preferential or priority claim or shall be the subject of a constructive trust or trust of any nature or kind;

(e) proofs of claim asserting priority already filed by any of the Settlement Parties, or the Superintendent on behalf of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund are disallowed in regard to the claim for priority;

(f) any allowable HWT claims made in these or subsequent proceedings shall rank *pari passu* with ordinary unsecured creditors of Nortel;

(g) the Settlement Agreement does not extinguish the claims of the Former and LTD Employees;

(h) Nortel and, *inter alia*, its successors, advisors, directors and officers, are released from all future claims regarding Pension Plans and the HWT, provided that nothing in the release shall release a director of the Applicants from any matter referred to in subsection 5.1(2) of the CCAA or with respect to fraud on the part of any Releasee, with respect to that Releasee only;

(i) upon the expiry of all appeals and rights of appeal in respect thereof, Representative Settlement Counsel will withdraw their application for leave to appeal the decision of the Court of Appeal, dated November 26, 2009, to the Supreme Court of Canada on a with prejudice basis;¹

(j) a CCAA plan of arrangement in the Nortel proceedings will not be proposed or approved if that plan does not treat the Pension and HWT claimants *pari passu* to the other ordinary, unsecured creditors ("Clause H.1"); and

(k) if there is a subsequent amendment to the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ("BIA") that "changes the current, relative priorities of the claims against Nortel, no party is precluded by this Settlement Agreement from arguing the applicability" of that amendment to the claims ceded in this Agreement ("Clause H.2").

7 The Settlement Agreement does *not* relate to a distribution of the HWT as the Settlement Parties have agreed to work towards developing a Court-approved distribution of the HWT corpus in 2010.

8 The Applicants' motion is supported by the Settlement Parties and by the Board of Directors of Nortel.

9 The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of Nortel Networks Inc. ("UCC"), the informal Nortel Noteholder Group (the "Noteholders"), and a group of 37 LTD Employees (the "Opposing LTD Employees") oppose the Settlement Agreement.

10 The UCC and Noteholders oppose the Settlement Agreement, principally as a result of the inclusion of Clause H.2.

11 The Opposing LTD Employees oppose the Settlement Agreement, principally as a result of the inclusion of the third party releases referenced in [6h] above.

The Facts

A. Status of Nortel's Restructuring

12 Although it was originally hoped that the Applicants would be able to restructure their business, in June 2009 the decision was made to change direction and pursue sales of Nortel's various businesses.

13 In response to Nortel's change in strategic direction and the impending sales, Nortel announced on August 14, 2009 a number of organizational updates and changes including the creation of groups to support transitional services and management during the sales process.

14 Since June 2009, Nortel has closed two major sales and announced a third. As a result of those transactions, approximately 13,000 Nortel employees have been or will be transferred to purchaser companies. That includes approximately 3,500 Canadian employees.

15 Due to the ongoing sales of Nortel's business units and the streamlining of Nortel's operations, it is expected that by the close of 2010, the Applicants' workforce will be reduced to only 475 employees. There is a need to wind-down and rationalize benefits and pension processes.

16 Given Nortel's insolvency, the significant reduction in Nortel's operations and the complexity and size of the Pension Plans, both Nortel and the Monitor believe that the continuation and funding of the Pension Plans and continued funding of medical, dental and other benefits is not a viable option.

B. The Settlement Agreement

17 On February 8, 2010 the Applicants announced that a settlement had been reached on issues related to the Pension Plans, and the HWT and certain employment related issues.

18 Recognizing the importance of providing notice to those who will be impacted by the Settlement Agreement, including the Former Employees, the LTD Employees, unionized employees, continuing employees and the provincial pension plan regulators ("Affected Parties"), Nortel brought a motion to this Court seeking the approval of an extensive notice and opposition process.

19 On February 9, 2010, this Court approved the notice program for the announcement and disclosure of the Settlement (the "Notice Order").

20 As more fully described in the Monitor's Thirty-Sixth, Thirty-Ninth and Thirty-Ninth Supplementary Reports, the Settlement Parties have taken a number of steps to notify the Affected Parties about the Settlement.

21 In addition to the Settlement Agreement, the Applicants, the Monitor and the Superintendent, in his capacity as administrator of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund, entered into a letter agreement on February 8, 2010, with respect to certain matters pertaining to the Pension Plans (the "Letter Agreement").

22 The Letter Agreement provides that the Superintendent will not oppose an order approving the Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Approval Order"). Additionally, the Monitor and the Applicants will take steps to complete an orderly transfer of the Pension Plans to a new administrator to be appointed by the Superintendent effective October 1, 2010. Finally, the Superintendent will not oppose any employee incentive program that the Monitor deems reasonable and necessary or the creation of a trust with respect to claims or potential claims against persons who accept directorships of a Nortel Worldwide Entity in order to facilitate the restructuring.

Positions of the Parties on the Settlement Agreement

The Applicants

23 The Applicants take the position that the Settlement is fair and reasonable and balances the interests of the parties and other affected constituencies equitably. In this regard, counsel submits that the Settlement:

- (a) eliminates uncertainty about the continuation and termination of benefits to pensioners, LTD Employees and survivors, thereby reducing hardship and disruption;
- (b) eliminates the risk of costly and protracted litigation regarding Pension Claims and HWT Claims, leading to reduced costs, uncertainty and potential disruption to the development of a Plan;
- (c) prevents disruption in the transition of benefits for current employees;
- (d) provides early payments to terminated employees in respect of their termination and severance claims where such employees would otherwise have had to wait for the completion of a claims process and distribution out of the estates;

(e) assists with the commitment and retention of remaining employees essential to complete the Applicants' restructuring; and

(f) does not eliminate Pension Claims or HWT Claims against the Applicants, but maintains their quantum and validity as ordinary and unsecured claims.

24 Alternatively, absent the approval of the Settlement Agreement, counsel to the Applicants submits that the Applicants are not required to honour such benefits or make such payments and such benefits could cease immediately. This would cause undue hardship to beneficiaries and increased uncertainty for the Applicants and other stakeholders.

25 The Applicants state that a central objective in the Settlement Agreement is to allow the Former and LTD Employees to transition to other sources of support.

26 In the absence of the approval of the Settlement Agreement or some other agreement, a cessation of benefits will occur on March 31, 2010 which would have an immediate negative impact on Former and LTD Employees. The Applicants submit that extending payments to the end of 2010 is the best available option to allow recipients to order their affairs.

27 Counsel to the Applicants submits that the Settlement Agreement brings Nortel closer to finalizing a plan of arrangement, which is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA. The Settlement Agreement resolves uncertainties associated with the outstanding Former and LTD Employee claims. The Settlement Agreement balances certainty with clarity, removing litigation risk over priority of claims, which properly balances the interests of the parties, including both creditors and debtors.

28 Regarding the priority of claims going forward, the Applicants submit that because a deemed trust, such as the HWT, is not enforceable in bankruptcy, the Former and LTD Employees are by default *pari passu* with other unsecured creditors.

29 In response to the Noteholders' concern that bankruptcy prior to October 2010 would create pension liabilities on the estate, the Applicants committed that they would not voluntarily enter into bankruptcy proceedings prior to October 2010. Further, counsel to the Applicants submits the court determines whether a bankruptcy order should be made if involuntary proceedings are commenced.

30 Further, counsel to the Applicants submits that the court has the jurisdiction to release third parties under a Settlement Agreement where the releases (1) are connected to a resolution of the debtor's claims, (2) will benefit creditors generally and (3) are not overly broad or offensive to public policy. See *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 92 O.R. (3d) 513 (Ont. C.A.), [*Metcalfe*] at para. 71, leave to appeal refused, (S.C.C.) and *Grace Canada Inc., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) [*Grace 2008*] at para. 40.

31 The Applicants submit that a settlement of the type put forward should be approved if it is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA and is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances. Elements of fairness and reasonableness include balancing the interests of parties, including any objecting creditor or creditors, equitably (although not necessarily equally); and ensuring that the agreement is beneficial to the debtor and its stakeholders generally, as per *Air Canada, Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) [*Air Canada*]. The Applicants assert that this test is met.

The Monitor

32 The Monitor supports the Settlement Agreement, submitting that it is necessary to allow the Applicants to wind down operations and to develop a plan of arrangement. The Monitor submits that the Settlement Agreement provides certainty, and does so with input from employee stakeholders. These stakeholders are represented by Employee Representatives as mandated by the court and these Employee Representatives were given the authority to approve such settlements on behalf of their constituents.

33 The Monitor submits that Clause H.2 was bargained for, and that the employees did give up rights in order to have that clause in the Settlement Agreement; particularly, it asserts that Clause H.1 is the counterpoint to Clause H.2. In this regard, the Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable.

34 The Monitor asserts that the court may either (1) approve the Settlement Agreement, (2) not approve the Settlement Agreement, or (3) not approve the Settlement Agreement but provide practical comments on the applicability of Clause H.2.

Former and LTD Employees

35 The Former Employees' Representatives' constituents number an estimated 19,458 people. The LTD Employees number an estimated 350 people between the LTD Employee's Representative and the CAW-Canada, less the 37 people in the Opposing LTD Employee group.

36 Representative Counsel to the Former and LTD Employees acknowledges that Nortel is insolvent, and that much uncertainty and risk comes from insolvency. They urge that the Settlement Agreement be considered within the scope of this reality. The alternative to the Settlement Agreement is costly litigation and significant uncertainty.

37 Representative Counsel submits that the Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable for all creditors, but especially the represented employees. Counsel notes that employees under Nortel are unique creditors under these proceedings, as they are not sophisticated creditors and their personal welfare depends on receiving distributions from Nortel. The Former and LTD Employees assert that this is the best agreement they could have negotiated.

38 Representative Counsel submits that bargaining away of the right to litigate against directors and officers of the corporation, as well as the trustee of the HWT, are examples of the concessions that have been made. They also point to the giving up of the right to make priority claims upon distribution of Nortel's estate and the HWT, although the claim itself is not extinguished. In exchange, the Former and LTD Employees will receive guaranteed coverage until the end of 2010. The Former and LTD Employees submit that having money in hand today is better than uncertainty going forward, and that, on balance, this Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable.

39 In response to allegations that third party releases unacceptably compromise employees' rights, Representative Counsel accepts that this was a concession, but submits that it was satisfactory because the claims given up are risky, costly and very uncertain. The releases do not go beyond s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA, which disallows releases relating to misrepresentations and wrongful or oppressive conduct by directors. Releases as to deemed trust claims are also very uncertain and were acceptably given up in exchange for other considerations.

40 The Former and LTD Employees submit that the inclusion of Clause H.2 was essential to their approval of the Settlement Agreement. They characterize Clause H.2 as a no prejudice clause to protect the employees by not releasing any future potential benefit. Removing Clause H.2 from the Settlement Agreement would be not the approval of an agreement, but rather the creation of an entirely new Settlement Agreement. Counsel submits that without Clause H.2, the Former and LTD Employees would not be signatories.

CAW

41 The CAW supports the Settlement Agreement. It characterizes the agreement as Nortel's recognition that it has a moral and legal obligation to its employees, whose rights are limited by the laws in this country. The Settlement Agreement temporarily alleviates the stress and uncertainty its constituents feel over the winding up of their benefits and is satisfied with this result.

42 The CAW notes that some members feel they were not properly apprised of the facts, but all available information has been disclosed, and the concessions made by the employee groups were not made lightly.

Board of Directors

43 The Board of Directors of Nortel supports the Settlement Agreement on the basis that it is a practical resolution with compromises on both sides.

Opposing LTD Employees

44 Mr. Rochon appeared as counsel for the Opposing LTD Employees, notwithstanding that these individuals did not opt out of having Representative Counsel or were represented by the CAW. The submissions of the Opposing LTD Employees were compelling and the court extends it appreciation to Mr. Rochon and his team in co-ordinating the representatives of this group.

45 The Opposing LTD Employees put forward the position that the cessation of their benefits will lead to extreme hardship. Counsel submits that the Settlement Agreement conflicts with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA because the LTD Employees are giving up legal rights in relation to a \$100 million shortfall of benefits. They urge the court to consider the unique circumstances of the LTD Employees as they are the people hardest hit by the cessation of benefits.

46 The Opposing LTD Employees assert that the HWT is a true trust, and submit that breaches of that trust create liabilities and that the claim should not be released. Specifically, they point to a \$37 million shortfall in the HWT that they should be able to pursue.

47 Regarding the third party releases, the Opposing LTD Employees assert that Nortel is attempting to avoid the distraction of third party litigation, rather than look out for the best interests of the Former and LTD Employees. The Opposing LTD Employees urge the court not to release the only individuals the Former and LTD Employees can hold accountable for any breaches of trust. Counsel submits that Nortel has a common law duty to fund the HWT, which the Former and LTD Employees should be allowed to pursue.

48 Counsel asserts that allowing these releases (a) is not necessary and essential to the restructuring of the debtor, (b) does not relate to the insolvency process, (c) is not required for the success of the Settlement Agreement, (d) does not meet the requirement that each party contribute to the plan in a material way and (e) is overly broad and therefore not fair and reasonable.

49 Finally, the Opposing LTD Employees oppose the *pari passu* treatment they will be subjected to under the Settlement Agreement, as they have a true trust which should grant them priority in the distribution process. Counsel was not able to provide legal authority for such a submission.

50 A number of Opposing LTD Employees made in person submissions. They do not share the view that Nortel will act in their best interests, nor do they feel that the Employee Representatives or Representative Counsel have acted in their best interests. They shared feelings of uncertainty, helplessness and despair. There is affidavit evidence that certain individuals will be unable to support themselves once their benefits run out, and they will not have time to order their affairs. They expressed frustration and disappointment in the CCAA process.

UCC

51 The UCC was appointed as the representative for creditors in the U.S. Chapter 11 proceedings. It represents creditors who have significant claims against the Applicants. The UCC opposes the motion, based on the inclusion of Clause H.2, but otherwise the UCC supports the Settlement Agreement.

52 Clause H.2, the UCC submits, removes the essential element of finality that a settlement agreement is supposed to include. The UCC characterizes Clause H.2 as a take back provision; if activated, the Former and LTD Employees have compromised nothing, to the detriment of other unsecured creditors. A reservation of rights removes the finality of the Settlement Agreement.

53 The UCC claims it, not Nortel, bears the risk of Clause H.2. As the largest unsecured creditor, counsel submits that a future change to the BIA could subsume the UCC's claim to the Former and LTD Employees and the UCC could end up with nothing at all, depending on Nortel's asset sales.

Noteholders

54 The Noteholders are significant creditors of the Applicants. The Noteholders oppose the settlement because of Clause H.2, for substantially the same reasons as the UCC.

55 Counsel to the Noteholders submits that the inclusion of H.2 is prejudicial to the non-employee unsecured creditors, including the Noteholders. Counsel submits that the effect of the Settlement Agreement is to elevate the Former and LTD Employees, providing them a payout of \$57 million over nine months while everyone else continues to wait, and preserves their rights in the event the laws are amended in future. Counsel to the Noteholders submits that the Noteholders forego millions of dollars while remaining exposed to future claims.

56 The Noteholders assert that a proper settlement agreement must have two elements: a real compromise, and resolution of the matters in contention. In this case, counsel submits that there is no resolution because there is no finality in that Clause H.2 creates ambiguity about the future. The very object of a Settlement Agreement, assert the Noteholders, is to avoid litigation by withdrawing claims, which this agreement does not do.

Superintendent

57 The Superintendent does not oppose the relief sought, but this position is based on the form of the Settlement Agreement that is before the Court.

Northern Trust

58 Northern Trust, the trustee of the pension plans and HWT, takes no position on the Settlement Agreement as it takes instructions from Nortel. Northern Trust indicates that an oversight left its name off the third party release and asks for an amendment to include it as a party released by the Settlement Agreement.

Law and Analysis

A. Representation and Notice Were Proper

59 It is well settled that the Former Employees' Representatives and the LTD Representative (collectively, the "Settlement Employee Representatives") and Representative Counsel have the authority to represent the Former Employees and the LTD Beneficiaries for purposes of entering into the Settlement Agreement on their behalf: *see Grace 2008, supra* at para 32.

60 The court appointed the Settlement Employee Representatives and the Representative Settlement Counsel. These appointment orders have not been varied or appealed. Unionized employees continue to be represented by the CAW. The Orders appointing the Settlement Employee Representatives expressly gave them authority to represent their constituencies "for the purpose of settling or compromising claims" in these Proceedings. Former Employees and LTD Employees were given the right to opt out of their representation by Representative Settlement Counsel. After provision of notice, only one former employee and one active employee exercised the opt-out right.

B. Effect of the Settlement Approval Order

61 In addition to the binding effect of the Settlement Agreement, many additional parties will be bound and affected by the Settlement Approval Order. Counsel to the Applicants submits that the binding nature of the Settlement Approval

Order on all affected parties is a crucial element to the Settlement itself. In order to ensure all Affected Parties had notice, the Applicants obtained court approval of their proposed notice program.

62 Even absent such extensive noticing, virtually all employees of the Applicants are represented in these proceedings. In addition to the representative authority of the Settlement Employee Representatives and Representative Counsel as noted above, Orders were made authorizing a Nortel Canada Continuing Employees' Representative and Nortel Canada Continuing Employees' Representative Counsel to represent the interests of continuing employees on this motion.

63 I previously indicated that "the overriding objective of appointing representative counsel for employees is to ensure that the employees have representation in the CCAA process": *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para 16. I am satisfied that this objective has been achieved.

64 The Record establishes that the Monitor has undertaken a comprehensive notice process which has included such notice to not only the Former Employees, the LTD Employees, the unionized employees and the continuing employees but also the provincial pension regulators and has given the opportunity for any affected person to file Notices of Appearance and appear before this court on this motion.

65 I am satisfied that the notice process was properly implemented by the Monitor.

66 I am satisfied that Representative Counsel has represented their constituents' interests in accordance with their mandate, specifically, in connection with the negotiation of the Settlement Agreement and the draft Settlement Approval Order and appearance on this Motion. There have been intense discussions, correspondence and negotiations among Representative Counsel, the Monitor, the Applicants, the Superintendent, counsel to the Board of the Applicants, the Noteholder Group and the Committee with a view to developing a comprehensive settlement. NCCE's Representative Counsel have been apprised of the settlement discussions and served with notice of this Motion. Representatives have held Webinar sessions and published press releases to inform their constituents about the Settlement Agreement and this Motion.

C. Jurisdiction to Approve the Settlement Agreement

67 The CCAA is a flexible statute that is skeletal in nature. It has been described as a "sketch, an outline, a supporting framework for the resolution of corporate insolvencies in the public interest". *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 28-29, citing *Metcalfe, supra*, at paras. 44 and 61.

68 Three sources for the court's authority to approve pre-plan agreements have been recognized:

- (a) the power of the court to impose terms and conditions on the granting of a stay under s. 11(4) of the CCAA;
- (b) the power of the court to make an order "on such terms as it may impose" pursuant to s. 11(4) of the CCAA; and
- (c) the inherent jurisdiction of the court to "fill in the gaps" of the CCAA in order to give effect to its objects: see *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 30, citing *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re* (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) [*Canadian Red Cross*] at para. 43; *Metcalfe, supra* at para. 44.

69 In *Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 78 O.R. (3d) 254 (Ont. C.A.), the Ontario Court of Appeal considered the court's jurisdiction under the CCAA to approve agreements, determining at para. 14 that it is not limited to preserving the *status quo*. Further, agreements made prior to the finalization of a plan or compromise are valid orders for the court to approve: *Grace 2008, supra* at para. 34.

70 In these proceedings, this court has confirmed its jurisdiction to approve major transactions, including settlement agreements, during the stay period defined in the Initial Order and prior to the proposal of any plan of compromise or

arrangement: see, for example, *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) and *Nortel Networks Corp., Re, 2010 ONSC 1096* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

71 I am satisfied that this court has jurisdiction to approve transactions, including settlements, in the course of overseeing proceedings during a CCAA stay period and prior to any plan of arrangement being proposed to creditors: see *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re* (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]) [*Calpine*] at para. 23, affirming (Alta. Q.B.); *Canadian Red Cross, supra*; *Air Canada, supra*; *Grace 2008, supra*, and *Grace Canada Inc., Re* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) [*Grace 2010*], leave to appeal to the C.A. refused February 19, 2010; *Nortel Networks Corp., Re, 2010 ONSC 1096* (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

D. Should the Settlement Agreement Be Approved?

72 Having been satisfied that this court has the jurisdiction to approve the Settlement Agreement, I must consider whether the Settlement Agreement *should* be approved.

73 A Settlement Agreement can be approved if it is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA and is fair and reasonable in all circumstances. What makes a settlement agreement fair and reasonable is its balancing of the interests of all parties; its equitable treatment of the parties, including creditors who are not signatories to a settlement agreement; and its benefit to the Applicant and its stakeholders generally.

i) Spirit and Purpose

74 The CCAA is a flexible instrument; part of its purpose is to allow debtors to balance the conflicting interests of stakeholders. The Former and LTD Employees are significant creditors and have a unique interest in the settlement of their claims. This Settlement Agreement brings these creditors closer to ultimate settlement while accommodating their special circumstances. It is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA.

ii) Balancing of Parties' Interests

75 There is no doubt that the Settlement Agreement is comprehensive and that it has support from a number of constituents when considered in its totality.

76 There is, however, opposition from certain constituents on two aspects of the proposed Settlement Agreement: (1) the Opposing LTD Employees take exception to the inclusion of the third party releases; (2) the UCC and Noteholder Groups take exception to the inclusion of Clause H.2.

Third Party Releases

77 Representative Counsel, after examining documentation pertaining to the Pension Plans and HWT, advised the Former Employees' Representatives and Disabled Employees' Representative that claims against directors of Nortel for failing to properly fund the Pension Plans were unlikely to succeed. Further, Representative Counsel advised that claims against directors or others named in the Third Party Releases to fund the Pension Plans were risky and could take years to resolve, perhaps unsuccessfully. This assisted the Former Employees' Representatives and the Disabled Employees' Representative in agreeing to the Third Party Releases.

78 The conclusions reached and the recommendations made by both the Monitor and Representative Counsel are consistent. They have been arrived at after considerable study of the issues and, in my view, it is appropriate to give significant weight to their positions.

79 In *Grace 2008, supra*, and *Grace 2010, supra*, I indicated that a Settlement Agreement entered into with Representative Counsel that contains third party releases is fair and reasonable where the releases are necessary and connected to a resolution of claims against the debtor, will benefit creditors generally and are not overly broad or offensive to public policy.

80 In this particular case, I am satisfied that the releases are necessary and connected to a resolution of claims against the Applicants.

81 The releases benefit creditors generally as they reduces the risk of litigation against the Applicants and their directors, protect the Applicants against potential contribution claims and indemnity claims by certain parties, including directors, officers and the HWT Trustee; and reduce the risk of delay caused by potentially complex litigation and associated depletion of assets to fund potentially significant litigation costs.

82 Further, in my view, the releases are not overly broad or offensive to public policy. The claims being released specifically relate to the subject matter of the Settlement Agreement. The parties granting the release receive consideration in the form of both immediate compensation and the maintenance of their rights in respect to the distribution of claims.

Clause H.2

83 The second aspect of the Settlement Agreement that is opposed is the provision known as Clause H.2. Clause H.2 provides that, in the event of a bankruptcy of the Applicants, and notwithstanding any provision of the Settlement Agreement, if there are any amendments to the BIA that change the current, relative priorities of the claims against the Applicants, no party is precluded from arguing the applicability or non-applicability of any such amendment in relation to any such claim.

84 The Noteholders and UCC assert that Clause H.2 causes the Settlement Agreement to not be a "settlement" in the true and proper sense of that term due to a lack of certainty and finality. They emphasize that Clause H.2 has the effect of undercutting the essential compromises of the Settlement Agreement in imposing an unfair risk on the non-employee creditors of NNL, including NNI, after substantial consideration has been paid to the employees.

85 This position is, in my view, well founded. The inclusion of the Clause H.2 creates, rather than eliminates, uncertainty. It creates the potential for a fundamental alteration of the Settlement Agreement.

86 The effect of the Settlement Agreement is to give the Former and LTD Employees preferred treatment for certain claims, notwithstanding that priority is not provided for in the statute nor has it been recognized in case law. In exchange for this enhanced treatment, the Former Employees and LTD Beneficiaries have made certain concessions.

87 The Former and LTD Employees recognize that substantially all of these concessions could be clawed back through Clause H.2. Specifically, they acknowledge that future Pension and HWT Claims will rank *pari passu* with the claims of other ordinary unsecured creditors, but then go on to say that should the BIA be amended, they may assert once again a priority claim.

88 Clause H.2 results in an agreement that does not provide certainty and does not provide finality of a fundamental priority issue.

89 The Settlement Parties, as well as the Noteholders and the UCC, recognize that there are benefits associated with resolving a number of employee-related issues, but the practical effect of Clause H.2 is that the issue is not fully resolved. In my view, Clause H.2 is somewhat inequitable from the standpoint of the other unsecured creditors of the Applicants. If the creditors are to be bound by the Settlement Agreement, they are entitled to know, with certainty and finality, the effect of the Settlement Agreement.

90 It is not, in my view, reasonable to require creditors to, in effect, make concessions in favour of the Former and LTD Employees today, and be subject to the uncertainty of unknown legislation in the future.

91 One of the fundamental purposes of the CCAA is to facilitate a process for a compromise of debt. A compromise needs certainty and finality. Clause H.2 does not accomplish this objective. The inclusion of Clause H.2 does not recognize that at some point settlement negotiations cease and parties bound by the settlement have to accept the

outcome. A comprehensive settlement of claims in the magnitude and complexity contemplated by the Settlement Agreement should not provide an opportunity to re-trade the deal after the fact.

92 The Settlement Agreement should be fair and reasonable in all the circumstances. It should balance the interests of the Settlement Parties and other affected constituencies equitably and should be beneficial to the Applicants and their stakeholders generally.

93 It seems to me that Clause H.2 fails to recognize the interests of the other creditors of the Applicants. These creditors have claims that rank equally with the claims of the Former Employees and LTD Employees. Each have unsecured claims against the Applicants. The Settlement Agreement provides for a transfer of funds to the benefit of the Former Employees and LTD Employees at the expense of the remaining creditors. The establishment of the Payments Charge crystallized this agreed upon preference, but Clause H.2 has the effect of not providing any certainty of outcome to the remaining creditors.

94 I do not consider Clause H.2 to be fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

95 In light of this conclusion, the Settlement Agreement cannot be approved in its current form.

96 Counsel to the Noteholder Group also made submissions that three other provisions of the Settlement Agreement were unreasonable and unfair, namely:

- (i) ongoing exposure to potential liability for pension claims if a bankruptcy order is made before October 1, 2010;
- (ii) provisions allowing payments made to employees to be credited against employees' claims made, rather than from future distributions or not to be credited at all; and
- (iii) lack of clarity as to whether the proposed order is binding on the Superintendent in all of his capacities under the *Pension Benefits Act* and other applicable law, and not merely in his capacity as Administrator on behalf of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund.

97 The third concern was resolved at the hearing with the acknowledgement by counsel to the Superintendent that the proposed order would be binding on the Superintendent in all of his capacities.

98 With respect to the concern regarding the potential liability for pension claims if a bankruptcy order is made prior to October 1, 2010, counsel for the Applicants undertook that the Applicants would not take any steps to file a voluntary assignment into bankruptcy prior to October 1, 2010. Although such acknowledgment does not bind creditors from commencing involuntary bankruptcy proceedings during this time period, the granting of any bankruptcy order is preceded by a court hearing. The Noteholders would be in a position to make submissions on this point, if so advised. This concern of the Noteholders is not one that would cause me to conclude that the Settlement Agreement was unreasonable and unfair.

99 Finally, the Noteholder Group raised concerns with respect to the provision which would allow payments made to employees to be credited against employees' claims made, rather than from future distributions, or not to be credited at all. I do not view this provision as being unreasonable and unfair. Rather, it is a term of the Settlement Agreement that has been negotiated by the Settlement Parties. I do note that the proposed treatment with respect to any payments does provide certainty and finality and, in my view, represents a reasonable compromise in the circumstances.

Disposition

100 I recognize that the proposed Settlement Agreement was arrived at after hard-fought and lengthy negotiations. There are many positive aspects of the Settlement Agreement. I have no doubt that the parties to the Settlement Agreement consider that it represents the best agreement achievable under the circumstances. However, it is my conclusion that the inclusion of Clause H.2 results in a flawed agreement that cannot be approved.

101 I am mindful of the submission of counsel to the Former and LTD Employees that if the Settlement Agreement were approved, with Clause H.2 excluded, this would substantively alter the Settlement Agreement and would, in effect, be a creation of a settlement and not the approval of one.

102 In addition, counsel to the Superintendent indicated that the approval of the Superintendent was limited to the proposed Settlement Agreement and would not constitute approval of any altered agreement.

103 In *Grace 2008, supra*, I commented that a line-by-line analysis was inappropriate and that approval of a settlement agreement was to be undertaken in its entirety or not at all, at para. 74. A similar position was taken by the New Brunswick Court of Queen's Bench in *Wandlyn Inns Limited (Re)* (1992), 15 C.B.R. (3d) 316 (N.B. Q.B.). I see no reason or basis to deviate from this position.

104 Accordingly, the motion is dismissed.

105 In view of the timing of the release of this decision and the functional funding deadline of March 31, 2010, the court will make every effort to accommodate the parties if further directions are required.

106 Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to all counsel and in person parties for the quality of written and oral submissions.

Motion dismissed.

Footnotes

- 1 On March 25, 2010, the Supreme Court of Canada released the following: *Donald Sproule et al. v. Nortel Networks Corporation et al.* (Ont.) (Civil) (By Leave) (33491) (The motions for directions and to expedite the application for leave to appeal are dismissed. The application for leave to appeal is dismissed with no order as to costs./La requête en vue d'obtenir des directives et la requête visant à accélérer la procédure de demande d'autorisation d'appel sont rejetées. La demande d'autorisation d'appel est rejetée; aucune ordonnance n'est rendue concernant les dépens.): <http://scc.lexum.umontreal.ca/en/news_release/2010/10-03-25.3a/10-03-25.3a.html>

TAB 2

2007 ABCA 266
Alberta Court of Appeal (In Chambers)

Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re

2007 CarswellAlta 1097, 2007 ABCA 266, [2007] A.W.L.D. 3481, [2007] A.J. No. 917, 161 A.C.W.S. (3d) 370, 33 B.L.R. (4th) 94, 35 C.B.R. (5th) 27, 410 W.A.C. 25, 417 A.R. 25, 80 Alta. L.R. (4th) 60

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

And In the Matter of Calpine Canada Energy Limited, Calpine Canada Power Ltd., Calpine Canada Energy Finance ULC, Calpine Energy Services Canada Ltd., Calpine Canada Resources Company, Calpine Canada Power Services Ltd., Calpine Canada Energy Finance II ULC, Calpine Natural Gas Services Limited and 3094479 Nova Scotia Company (the "CCAA Applicants")

Calpine Power L.P. (Appellant / Applicant (Creditor)) and The CCAA Applicants and Calpine Energy Services Canada Partnership, Calpine Canada Natural Gas Partnership and Calpine Canadian Saltend Limited Partnership (Respondents / Applicants)

Calpine Canada Natural Gas Partnership (Respondent / Applicant / CCAA Party) and Calpine Energy Services Canada Partnership and Lisa Winslow, Trustee of Calpine Greenfield Commercial Trust (Respondents / (CCAA Applicant and Interested Parties)) and Calpine Power L.P. (Appellant / Applicant / (Creditor in CCAA Proceedings))

C. O'Brien J.A.

Heard: August 15, 2007

Judgment: August 17, 2007

Docket: Calgary Appeal 0701-0222-AC, 0701-0223-AC

Proceedings: refusing leave to appeal *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re* (2007), 2007 CarswellAlta 1050, 2007 ABQB 504 (Alta. Q.B.)

Counsel: P.T. Linder, Q.C., R. Van Dorp for Applicant, CPL
L.B. Robinson, Q.C., S.F. Collins, J.A. Carfagnini for CCAA Applicants and the CCAA Parties (Respondents)
H.A. Gorman for Ad Hoc ULCI Noteholders Committee
P.H. Griffin, U. Sheikh for Calpine Corporation and other US Debtors
F.R. Dearlove for HSBC
P. McCarthy, Q.C., J. Kruger for Ernst & Young Inc., the Monitor
N.S. Rabinovitch for Lien Debtholders
R. De Waal for Unsecured Creditors Committee

Subject: Insolvency

APPLICATION by creditor for stay pending appeal and leave to appeal from judgment reported at *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re* (2007), 2007 CarswellAlta 1050, 2007 ABQB 504, 35 C.B.R. (5th) 1, 33 B.L.R. (4th) 68 (Alta. Q.B.), granting application for approval of settlement.

C. O'Brien J.A.:

Introduction

1 Calpine Power L.P. (CLP) applies for a stay pending appeal and leave to appeal three orders granted on July 24, 2007 in a proceeding under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (CCAA). At the request of counsel, the applications have been dealt with on an expedited basis. Oral submissions were heard on August 15, at the close of which I undertook to deliver judgment by the end of the week. I do so now.

Background facts

2 In December 2005, Calpine Canada Energy Limited, Calpine Canada Power Ltd., Calpine Canada Energy Finance ULC, Calpine Energy Services Canada Ltd., Calpine Canada Resources Company, Calpine Canada Power Services Ltd., Calpine Canada Energy Finance II ULC, Calpine Natural Gas Services Limited, and 3094479 Nova Scotia Company (CCAA Applicants) sought and obtain protection under the CCAA. At the same time, the parties referred to as the US Debtors sought and obtained similar protection under Chapter 11 of the U. S. Bankruptcy Code.

3 A monitor, Ernst & Young Inc., was appointed under the CCAA proceedings and a stay of proceedings was ordered against the CCAA Applicants and against Calpine Energy Services Canada Partnership, Calpine Canada Natural Gas Partnership and Calpine Canadian Saltend Limited Partnership. The latter three parties collectively are referred to as the CCAA Parties and those parties together with the CCAA Applicants as the CCAA Debtors.

4 This insolvency is extremely complex, involving many related corporations and partnerships, and highly intertwined legal and financial obligations. The goal of restructuring and realizing maximum value for assets has been made more difficult by a number of cross-border issues.

5 As described in the Monitor's 23rd Report, dated June 28, 2007, the CCAA Debtors and the US Debtors concluded that the most appropriate way to resolve the issues between them was to concentrate on reaching a consensual global agreement that resolved virtually all the material cross-border issues between them. The parties negotiated a global settlement agreement (GSA) subject to the approval of both Canadian and U. S. courts, execution of the GSA and the sale by Calpine Canada Resources Company of its holdings of Calpine Canada Energy Finance ULC (ULC1) Notes in the face amount of US\$359,770,000 (the CCRC ULC1 Notes). Counsel at the oral hearing informed me that the Notes were sold on August 14, 2007, yielding a net amount of approximately US \$403 million, an amount exceeding the face amount.

6 On July 24, 2007, the CCAA Applicants sought and obtained three orders. First, an order approving the terms of the GSA and directing the various parties to execute such documents and implement the transactions necessary to give effect to the GSA. Second, an order permitting CCRC and ULC1 to take the necessary steps to sell the CCRC ULC1 Notes. Third, an extension of the stay contemplated by the initial CCAA order to December 20, 2007. No objection was taken to the latter two orders and both were granted. The supervising judge also, in brief oral reasons, approved the GSA with written reasons to follow. Written Reasons for Judgment were subsequently filed on July 31, 2007: *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re*, 2007 ABQB 504 (Alta. Q.B.). The reasons are careful and detailed. They fully set out the relevant facts and canvas the applicable law and as I see no need to repeat the facts and authorities, the reasons should be read in conjunction with these relatively short reasons dealing with the applications arising therefrom.

7 The applications to the supervising judge were made concurrently with applications by the US Debtors to the US Bankruptcy Court in New York state, the applications proceeding simultaneously by video conference. The applications to the US Court, including an application for approval of the GSA, were also granted.

8 The applicant, CLP, the Calpine Canada Energy Finance II ULC (ULC2) Indenture Trustee and a group referring to itself as the "Ad Hoc Committee of Creditors of Calpine Canada Resources Company" opposed the approval of the GSA. CPL is the only party seeking leave to appeal.

9 CLP submits that the supervising judge erred in concluding that the GSA was not a compromise or plan of arrangement and therefore, sections 4 and 5 of the CCAA did not apply and no vote by creditors was necessary.

10 Sections 4 and 5 of the CCAA provide:

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

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

11 CLP further submits that the jurisdiction of the supervising judge to approve the GSA is governed by section 6 of the CCAA. Section 6 provides:

Where a majority in number representing two-thirds in value of the creditors, or class of creditors, as the case may be, present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or meetings thereof respectively held pursuant to sections 4 and 5, or either of those sections, agree to any compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at the meeting or meetings, the compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by the court, and if so sanctioned is binding

(a) on all the creditors or the class of creditors, as the case may be, and on any trustee for any such class of creditors, whether secured or unsecured, as the case may be, and on the company; and

(b) in the case of a company that has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act or is in the course of being wound up under the Winding-up and Restructuring Act, on the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator and contributories of the company.

12 The supervising judge found that the GSA is not linked to or subject to a plan of arrangement and does not compromise the rights of creditors that are not parties to it or have not consented to it, and it does not have the effect of unilaterally depriving creditors of contractual rights without their participation in the GSA. She concluded that the GSA was not a compromise or arrangement for the purposes of section 4 of the CCAA. In the course of her reasons she cites a number of cases for support that the court has jurisdiction to review and approve transactions and settlement agreements during the stay period of a CCAA proceedings if an agreement is fair and reasonable and will be beneficial to the debtor and its stakeholders generally.

Test for leave to appeal

13 This Court has repeatedly stated, for example in *Liberty Oil & Gas Ltd., Re*, 2003 ABCA 158, 44 C.B.R. (4th) 96 (Alta. C.A.), at paras. 15-16, that the test for leave under the CCAA involves a single criterion that there must be serious and arguable grounds that are of real and significant interest to the parties. The four factors used to assess whether this criterion is present are:

- (1) Whether the point on appeal is of significance to the practice;
- (2) Whether the point raised is of significance to the action itself;
- (3) Whether the appeal is *prima facie* meritorious or, on the other hand, whether it is frivolous; and

(4) Whether the appeal will unduly hinder the progress of the action.

14 In assessing these factors, consideration should also be given to the applicable standard of review: *Canadian Airlines Corp., Re*, 2000 ABCA 149, 261 A.R. 120 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]). Having regard to the commercial nature of the proceedings which often require quick decisions, and to the intimate knowledge acquired by a supervising judge in overseeing a CCAA proceedings, appellate courts have expressed a reluctance to interfere, except in clear cases: *Smoky River Coal Ltd., Re*, 1999 ABCA 179, 237 A.R. 326 (Alta. C.A.) at para. 61.

Analysis

15 The standard of review plays a significant, if not decisive, role in the outcome of this application for leave to appeal. The supervising judge, on the record of evidence before her, found that the GSA was "not a plan of compromise or arrangement with creditors" (Reasons, para. 51). This was a finding of fact, or at most, a finding of mixed law and fact. The applicant has identified no extricable error of law so the applicable standard is palpable or overriding error.

16 The statute itself contains no definition of a compromise or arrangement. Moreover, it does not appear that a compromise or an arrangement has been *proposed* between a debtor company and either its unsecured or secured creditors, or any class of them within the scope of sections 4 or 5 of the CCAA. Neither the company, a creditor, nor anyone made application to convene a meeting under those sections.

17 Rather, the GSA settles certain intercorporate claims between certain Canadian Calpine entities and certain US Calpine entities subject to certain conditions, including the approvals both of the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta and of the US Bankruptcy Court.

18 This is not to minimize the magnitude, significance and complexity of the issues dealt with in the intercorporate settlement which, by definition, was not between arm's length companies. The material cross-border issues are identified in the 23rd Report of the monitor and listed by the supervising judge (Reasons, para. 5).

19 It is implicit in her reasons, if not express, that the supervising judge accepted the analysis of the monitor, and found that the GSA would likely ultimately result in payment in full of all Canadian creditors, including CLP. CLP does not challenge this finding, but points out that payment is not assured, and rightly relies upon its status as a creditor to challenge the approval in the meantime until such time as it has been paid.

20 The supervising judge further found that the GSA "does not compromise the rights of creditors that are not parties to it or have not consented to it, and it certainly does not have the effect of unilaterally depriving creditors of contractual rights without their participation in the GSA" (Reasons, para. 51). CPL challenges this finding. In order to succeed in its proposed appeal, CPL must also demonstrate palpable and overriding error in these further findings of the supervising judge which once again, involve findings of fact or of mixed law and fact.

Application in this case

21 CPL submits that the "fundamental problem" with the approval granted by the supervising judge is that the GSA is in reality a plan of arrangement because it settles virtually all matters in dispute in the Canadian CCAA estate and therefore, entitles the applicant to a vote. CPL argues that the GSA must be an arrangement or compromise within the meaning of sections 4, 5 and 6 of the CCAA because, in its view, the GSA requires non party creditors to make concessions, re-orders the priorities of creditors and distributes assets of the estate.

22 The supervising judge acknowledged at the outset of her analysis that if the GSA were a plan of arrangement or compromise, a vote by creditors would be necessary (Reasons, para. 41). However, she was satisfied that the GSA did not constitute a plan of arrangement with creditors.

23 The applicant conceded that a CCAA supervising judge has jurisdiction to approve transactions, including settlements in the course of overseeing proceedings during a stay period and prior to any plan of arrangement being proposed to creditors. This concession was proper having regard to case authority recognizing such jurisdiction and cited in the reasons of the supervising judge, including *Air Canada, Re* (2004), 47 C.B.R. (4th) 169 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), *Playdium Entertainment Corp., Re* (2001), 31 C.B.R. (4th) 302 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), *T. Eaton Co., Re* (1999), 14 C.B.R. (4th) 288 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) and *Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 78 O.R. (3d) 254 (Ont. C.A.).

24 The power to approve such transactions during the stay is not spelled out in the CCAA. As has often been observed, the statute is skeletal. The approval power in such instances is usually said to be found either in the broad powers under section 11(4) to make orders other than on an initial application to effectuate the stay, or in the court's inherent jurisdiction to fill in gaps in legislation so as to give effect to the objects of the CCAA, including the survival program of the debtor until it can present a plan: *Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at para. 8.

25 Hunt, J.A. in delivering the judgment of this Court in *Smoky River Coal* considered the history of the legislation and its objectives in allowing the company to take steps to promote a successful eventual arrangement. She concluded at para. 53:

These statements about the goals and operation of the CCAA support the view that the discretion under s. 11(4) should be interpreted widely.

and further at para. 60:

To summarize, the language of s. 11(4) is very broad. The CCAA must be interpreted in a remedial fashion.

26 In my view, there is no serious issue as to the jurisdiction of a supervising judge to approve a settlement agreement between consenting parties prior to consideration of a plan of arrangement pursuant to section 6 of the CCAA. The fact that the GSA is not a simple agreement between two parties, but rather resolves a number of complex issues between a number of parties, does not affect the jurisdiction of the court to approve the agreement if it is for the general benefit of all parties and otherwise meets the tests identified in the reasons of the supervising judge.

27 CPL urges that the legal issue for determination by this Court is where the line is to be drawn to say when a settlement becomes a compromise or arrangement, thus requiring a vote under section 6 before the court can grant approval. It suggests that it would be useful to this practice area for the court to set out the criteria to be considered in this regard.

28 An element of compromise is inherent in a settlement as there is invariably some give and take by the parties in reaching their agreement. The parties to the GSA made concessions for the purpose of gaining benefits. It is obvious that something more than compromise between consenting parties within a settlement agreement is required to constitute an arrangement or compromise for purposes of the CCAA as if that were not so, no settlement agreement could be approved without a vote of the creditors. As noted, that is contrary to case authority accepted by all parties to these applications.

29 The CCAA deals with compromises or arrangements sought to be imposed upon creditors generally, or classes of creditors, and a vote is a necessary mechanism to determine whether the appropriate majority of the creditors proposed to be affected support the proposed compromise or arrangement.

30 As pointed out by the supervising judge, a settlement will almost always have an impact on the financial circumstances of a debtor. A settlement will invariably have an effect on the size of the estate available for other claimants (Reasons, para. 62).

31 Whether or not a settlement constitutes a plan of arrangement requiring a vote will be dependent upon the factual circumstances of each case. Here, the supervising judge carefully reviewed the circumstances and concluded, on the basis of a number of the fact findings, that there was no plan of arrangement within the meaning of the CCAA, and that the settlement merited approval. She recognized the peculiar circumstances which distinguishes this case, and observed at para. 76 of her Reasons:

The precedential implications of this approval must be viewed in the context of the unique circumstances that have presented a situation in which all valid claims of Canadian creditors likely will be paid in full. This outcome, particularly with respect to a cross-border insolvency of exceptional complexity, is unlikely to be matched in other insolvencies, and therefore, a decision to approve this settlement agreement will not open any floodgates.

32 At the time of granting her approval, the supervising judge had been overseeing the conduct of these CCAA proceedings since their inception — some 18 months earlier. She had the benefit of the many reports of the monitor and was familiar with the record of the proceedings. Her determination of this issue is entitled to deference in the absence of legal error or palpable and overriding error of fact.

33 CPL submits that the GSA compromises its rights and claims, and thus, challenges the express finding of the supervising judge that the settlement neither compromises the rights of creditors before it, nor deprives them of their existing contractual rights. The applicant relies upon the following effects of the GSA in making this submission:

(i) a priority payment of \$75 million out of the proceeds of the sale of bonds owned by Calpine Canada Resources Company;

(ii) the release of a potential claim against Calpine Canada Energy Limited, the parent of Calpine Canada Resources Company, which is a partner of Calpine Energy Services Canada Ltd., against which CPL has a claim;

(iii) the dismissal of a claim by Calpine Canada Energy Limited against Quintana Canada Holdings LLC, thereby depleting Calpine Canada Energy Limited of a potential asset which that company could use to satisfy any potential claim by CPL for any shortfall, were it not for the release of claims against Calpine Canada Energy Limited (see (ii) above); and

(iv) the dismissal of the Greenfield Action brought by another CCAA Debtor against Calpine Energy Services Canada Ltd. for an alleged fraudulent conversion of its interest in Greenfield LP which was developing a 1005 Megawatt generation plant.

34 For purposes of the CCAA proceedings, the applicant is a creditor of Calpine Energy Services Canada Ltd., Calpine Canada Power Ltd. and perhaps, also, Calpine Canada Resources Company. The GSA does not change its status as a creditor of those companies, nor does it bar the applicant from any existing claims against those companies.

35 In my view, the submission of the applicant does not show any palpable and overriding error in the findings of the supervising judge that the right of creditors not parties to the GSA have not been compromised or taken away. Firstly, there is no compromise of debt if such indebtedness, as ultimately found due to the applicant, is paid in full, which is the likely result as found by the supervising judge, albeit she acknowledged that this result was not guaranteed (Reasons, para. 81). Secondly, and in any event, the fact that the GSA impacts upon the assets of the debtor companies, against which the applicant may ultimately have a claim for any shortfall experienced by it, is a common feature of any settlement agreement and as earlier explained, does not automatically result in a vote by the creditors. The further fact that one of the affected assets of the debtor companies is a cause of action, or perhaps, more correctly, a possible cause of action, does not abrogate the rights of a creditor albeit there may be less monies to be realized at the end of the day.

36 The GSA does not usurp the right of the creditors to vote on a plan of arrangement if it becomes necessary to propose such a plan to the creditors. As explained by the supervising judge, the settlement between the CCAA Debtors and the US Debtors unlocked the Canadian proceedings to meaningful progress in asset realization and claims resolution, and provided the mechanisms for resolving the remaining issues and significant creditor claims, and the clarification of priorities.

37 It is correct, of course, that if the claims of CPL are paid in full in the course of the CCAA proceedings, it will never be necessary for it to vote on a plan of arrangement. The applicant should have no complaint with that result. On the other hand, if the claims are not satisfied, it seems likely a plan of arrangement will ultimately be proposed to the applicant, who will then have its right to vote on any such plan.

38 CPL argues that the supervising judge was not entitled to assess the merits of the GSA *vis-à-vis* the creditors as this was a matter for the exclusive business judgment of the creditors and to be exercised by their vote. As became apparent during the course of its submissions, if a vote were required, from the perspective of the CPL, this would give it veto power over the GSA. Unless clearly mandated by the statute, this is a result to be avoided. While it is understandable that an individual creditor seeks to obtain as much leverage as possible in order to enhance its negotiating position, the objectives and purposes of the CCAA could easily be frustrated in such circumstances by the self interest of a single creditor. Court approval requires, as a primary consideration, the determination that an agreement is fair and reasonable and will be beneficial to the debtor and its stakeholders generally. As the supervising judge noted, court approval of settlements and major transaction can and often is given over the objections of one or more parties because the court must act for the greater good consistent with the purpose and spirit and within the confines of the legislation.

39 I am not persuaded that the applicant has demonstrated any reasonably arguable error of law in the reasons of the supervising judge or any palpable and overriding errors in her findings of fact or findings of mixed fact and law. In the absence of any such error, it follows that she had discretion to approve the GSA, which she exercised based upon her assessment of the merits and reasonableness of the settlement, and other factors in accordance with the principles set out in the authorities, cited in her reasons, governing the approval of transactions, including settlements, during the stay period prior to a plan of arrangement being submitted to the creditors.

Conclusion

40 CPL has failed to establish serious and arguable grounds for granting leave. In particular, two of the factors used to assess whether this criterion is present have not been met. It has not been demonstrated that the point on appeal is of significance to the parties having regard to the fact dependent nature of whether a plan of arrangement has been proposed to creditors. More importantly, having regard to the standard of review and the findings of the supervising judge, the applicant has not demonstrated that the appeal for which leave is sought is *prima facie* meritorious.

41 The application for leave is dismissed. It follows that the application for a stay likewise fails and is dismissed.

42 Finally, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the excellent quality of the submissions, both written and oral, of counsel on these applications. The submissions were of great assistance in permitting the application to be dealt with in an abbreviated time frame.

Application dismissed.

TAB 3

2012 BCSC 1773
British Columbia Supreme Court [In Chambers]

Great Basin Gold Ltd., Re

2012 CarswellBC 3710, 2012 BCSC 1773, [2013] B.C.W.L.D. 1881, 224 A.C.W.S. (3d) 22, 99 C.B.R. (5th) 219

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

In the Matter of the Business Corporations Act, S.B.C. 2002, c. 57

In the Matter of Great Basin Gold Ltd. Petitioner

Fitzpatrick J.

Heard: November 20, 2012

Oral reasons: November 20, 2012

Docket: Vancouver S126583

Counsel: P.J. Reardon, J. Cockbill for Petitioner

J.R. Sandrelli, C. Cheuk for Certain Unaffiliated Holders of the Petitioner's Senior Unsecured Convertible Debentures (the "Noteholders")

P. Rubin for Credit Suisse, AG

J.I. McLean, Q.C. for Monitor, KPMG Inc.

Subject: Insolvency; Income Tax (Federal)

APPLICATION by debenture holders of insolvent corporation for order implementing settlement agreement with one of corporation's creditors.

Fitzpatrick J., In chambers:

1 Much of the history of this *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA") proceeding is outlined in my earlier reasons: *Great Basin Gold Ltd., Re*, 2012 BCSC 1459 (B.C. S.C.).

2 Broadly speaking, there were substantial issues joined between the principal combatants, Credit Suisse and the Ad Hoc Group, as defined in those reasons. Those issues principally related to the approval of the DIP loan facility that I had earlier granted in favour of Credit Suisse. The Ad Hoc Group disputed the granting of that DIP facility and launched an appeal of my October 1 order. I also understand that certain proceedings were commenced in the United States by the Ad Hoc Group towards a challenge of the granting of the guarantee and security by the U.S. companies of the group.

3 Following the issuance of those reasons on October 1, 2012, Credit Suisse and the Ad Hoc Group arrived at a tentative settlement of the issues arising between them. On October 16, 2012, I granted an order authorizing the petitioner to enter into this settlement agreement. The order also provided that the petitioner and the trustee under the trust indenture, Computershare Trust Company of Canada, were authorized to enter into such agreements as are required by the terms of the settlement. The members of the Ad Hoc Group are participants under the trust indenture.

4 An important aspect of the settlement negotiated by the Ad Hoc Group for the benefit of the entire debentureholders group is a guarantee from the U.S. holding company, Great Basin Gold Inc. ("GBGI"), and also certain subordinate security issued by GBGI in relation to that guarantee. From the debentureholder group's perspective, this settlement results in a substantial improvement of their current position. As with most settlement agreements, in return for these benefits, the debentureholder group must give up certain things. The agreements also provide that the debentureholder

group will not proceed with certain challenges asserted to date, that being principally relating to the Credit Suisse guarantee and security that was approved by my earlier orders. The debentureholder group must also abandon the appeal proceedings and the U.S. proceedings which are referred to above. Finally, the debentureholder group must also agree to abandon the criminal interest rate issue, and other challenges to such matters as the KERP and the appointment of CIBC World Markets as the financial advisor.

5 Understandably, Credit Suisse requires that any settlement be approved by the entire debentureholders group and they also require an opinion from a lawyer to the effect that the documentation to evidence the settlement, including an intercreditor agreement, is binding upon the entire debentureholder group.

6 The significance of the settlement is that it buys peace between Credit Suisse and the Ad Hoc Group. At the present time, the Credit Suisse DIP facility is in default and further funding under the DIP facility is in limbo pending a finalization of the settlement. Accordingly, the finalization of the settlement is of tremendous significance in this case such that it will allow a continuation of the DIP financing to be advanced to the GBG Group who is desperately in need of these funds.

7 The difficulty that arises in terms of finalizing the settlement relates to how the parties can ensure that the entire debentureholder group will be bound by the settlement. The trust indenture does provide for the calling of meetings to consider resolutions by the debentureholder group. However, counsel for the Ad Hoc Group candidly points out that the full extent of what is intended to be agreed to by the debentureholder group under the settlement may not be within the specific terms of resolutions contemplated by the trust debenture.

8 In any event, I note that with respect to some matters at least, the trust indenture does provide for a meeting process by which a meeting may be held and written resolutions would be voted upon. I am also advised that those matters would require a special resolution, or in other words, a two-thirds majority.

9 It is of some significance on this application that the Ad Hoc Group, together with another debentureholder who is also in support of this application, hold in excess of a two-thirds majority from among the overall debentureholder group.

10 I am advised that it is not possible in the circumstances to even call a meeting that the debentureholders under the trust indenture given the exigencies of the situation in relation to the need for funding. Nevertheless, there has been some effort to engage the trustee under the trust indenture, Computershare. There have been ongoing discussions between the Ad Hoc Group and Computershare in that the trustee has been kept apprised of the settlement negotiations and the terms of the tentative settlement. I am advised that Computershare is fully supportive of the settlement and has no difficulty, subject to these issues relating to process, in proceeding with these transactions.

11 There have also been efforts to engage other debentureholders who are not represented by the Ad Hoc Group and the other debentureholder who supports the application. Following my earlier order on October 16, Computershare forwarded to the debentureholders copies of certain pleadings relating to this transaction which reference the terms of the proposed settlement. I am also advised by counsel for the Ad Hoc Group that their offices have fielded a number of calls from these other debentureholders. So it cannot be said that the other debentureholders are entirely in the dark in terms of what has been tentatively agreed to by the Ad Hoc Group and what is intended to be accomplished through the settlement agreement.

12 The issue in the first instance is whether I have the jurisdiction to provide the relief granted. The relief sought is not only an approval of the settlement agreement, but also an order authorizing the trustee, Computershare, to execute the various documents related to the settlement agreement such that these documents will be legal, valid and binding obligations of the trustee and all debentureholders.

13 The applicable statutory authority is s. 11 of the *CCAA* which endows the court with a wide statutory discretion to grant such orders as are "appropriate in the circumstances":

General power of court

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

14 As discussed by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re*, 2010 SCC 60 (S.C.C.), the *CCAA* is a remedial statute and the court has "broad and flexible authority" to facilitate the reorganization of the debtor towards achieving the objectives of the *CCAA*, including avoiding the social and economic losses arising from restructuring proceedings: paras. 15-19. The exercise of the court's discretion was further discussed by the Court at paras. 59-72. In particular, the Court stated:

[70] The general language of the *CCAA* should not be read as being restricted by the availability of more specific orders. However, the requirements of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising *CCAA* authority. Appropriateness under the *CCAA* is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the *CCAA*. The question is whether the order will usefully further efforts to achieve the remedial purpose of the *CCAA* — avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company. I would add that appropriateness extends not only to the purpose of the order, but also to the means it employs. Courts should be mindful that chances for successful reorganizations are enhanced where participants achieve common ground and all stakeholders are treated as advantageously and fairly as the circumstances permit.

15 The last paragraph of the above quote makes the point that the chances of achieving a successful restructuring proceeding increase where the parties can agree on certain issues. Settlement agreements between the parties in these types of proceedings are very much encouraged where resolutions take place in the boardroom, as opposed to the courtroom. There is every reason to encourage such settlements, with approval and implementation subject to appropriate judicial oversight.

16 There is ample authority to the effect that s. 11 of the *CCAA* provides the court with jurisdiction to approve settlements even before the presentation of a plan of arrangement: *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re*, 2007 ABCA 266 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]) at para. 26, *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, 2010 ONSC 1708 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 71.

17 In *Nortel Networks*, Mr. Justice Morawetz sets out the test to be applied in approving a settlement agreement:

[73] A Settlement Agreement can be approved if it is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the *CCAA* and is fair and reasonable in all circumstances. What makes a settlement agreement fair and reasonable is its balancing of the interests of all parties; its equitable treatment of the parties, including creditors who are not signatories to a settlement agreement; and its benefit to the Applicant and its stakeholders generally.

18 I have no difficulty in concluding that the settlement agreement between Credit Suisse, the Ad Hoc Group and the petitioner group is fair and reasonable in the circumstances. The crux of the issue here is whether it is fair and reasonable to those debentureholders who have not yet participated in this process and have not perhaps fully appreciated the import of the agreement, particularly as it relates to the benefits to be achieved by the debentureholder group and the rights that the group will be giving up as a result of the transactions.

19 I would emphasize again this settlement has arisen by extensive negotiations as between Credit Suisse and the Ad Hoc Group. While those negotiations have taken place on the part of the Ad Hoc Group towards its own interests, inevitably the gains will accrue to the debentureholder group as a whole. Having considered the terms of the overall settlement agreement, I would be astounded if any debentureholders who were fully aware of those matters were to

take a contrary position towards opposing the settlement agreement. Again, it is of significance that as a result of this settlement, funding under the DIP facility will continue, which will be a benefit to all stakeholders.

20 Nevertheless, I agree that fairness and reasonableness dictate in these proceedings that those other debentureholders have some input. The process already undertaken by the Ad Hoc Group has addressed that matter to a certain extent. What is proposed is that a more fullsome notice of the settlement agreement be given to the debentureholder group as a whole.

21 Firstly, it is proposed that there be a press release which will include reference to not only the pleadings but the specific settlement documents which are posted on the Monitor's website. In addition, the press release will refer to counsel for the Ad Hoc Group, in Canada, the U.S. and South Africa, who are available to respond to any enquiries from debentureholders regarding the settlement agreement. Secondly, Computershare is to request that CDS send a notice to the debentureholders of the order sought today (called the "Settlement Implementation Order"). That notice will, as will the press release, highlight to the debentureholders that the deadline for any debentureholder to apply to vary, rescind or otherwise object to the Settlement Implementation Order will be within 21 days of the date of the Order. If there is no objection with that 21-day period, the settlement agreement will be fully effective and will constitute legal, valid and binding obligations of Computershare and all of the debentureholders and the consequences of not applying to challenge this Order will also be brought specifically to the attention of those persons reading the press release and the notice.

22 The Monitor had earlier indicated its support of the settlement agreement in accordance with the Third Report which was considered on the earlier application. Counsel for the Monitor has again confirmed its support of the settlement agreement and the process by which notice is to be given to the other debentureholders outlined above. Not surprisingly, the GBG Group is also in support.

23 I am satisfied that this process is appropriate and will give any other debentureholder sufficient time to challenge the Order if they wish. Again, I would emphasize that it is a critical aspect of this restructuring that this settlement be put in place as soon as possible so that the funding for the restructuring can proceed. It has already been stalled to some extent and no doubt to the detriment of the stakeholders as a whole. It is time to put an end to this prejudice delay and more the restructuring forward. Accordingly, the order sought is granted.

Application granted.

TAB 4

2017 BCSC 1968
British Columbia Supreme Court

Walter Energy Canada Holdings, Inc. (Re)

2017 CarswellBC 3037, 2017 BCSC 1968, [2017] B.C.W.L.D. 6712,
[2017] B.C.W.L.D. 6713, 284 A.C.W.S. (3d) 688, 54 C.B.R. (6th) 57

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

And In the Matter of the Business Corporations Act, S.B.C. 2002, c. 57, as Amended

And In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise and Arrangement of New Walter
Energy Canada Holdings, Inc., New Walter Canadian Coal Corp., New Brule
Coal Corp., New Willow Creek Coal Corp., New Energybuild Holdings ULC

Fitzpatrick J.

Heard: October 6, 2017

Judgment: November 1, 2017

Docket: Vancouver S1510120

Counsel: P. Riesterer, for Petitioners

T. Jeffries, for United Mine Workers of America 1974 Pension Plan and Trust

M. Nied, for Warrior Met Coal, LLC

J. Sanders, for United Steelworkers, Local 1-424

V. Tickle, P.J. Reardon, for Monitor, KPMG

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency

APPLICATION by respondent for approval of settlement of appeal.

Fitzpatrick J.:

Introduction

1 The petitioners, now called the New Walter Canada Group, apply for an order approving a settlement of certain claims. This is a significant development in these *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the "CCA") proceedings, in that the settlement will pave the way so as to allow all other claims to be settled expeditiously. Importantly, it will also allow the distribution of substantial funds to the creditors arising from the earlier monetization of the majority of the assets.

2 The petitioners also seek authorization to advance further funds to the U.K. arm of the Walter Energy group of companies, and specifically, Energybuild Group Limited or Energybuild Ltd. ("Energybuild"), on a secured basis and not exceeding an aggregate amount of 900,000. Finally, the petitioners seek an extension of the stay period to December 15, 2017.

3 For the reasons that follow, I grant the relief sought by the petitioners.

Background

4 The history of this matter has already been recounted in numerous decisions of this Court: *Walter Energy Canada Holdings, Inc., Re*, 2016 BCSC 1413 (B.C. S.C.); 2016 BCSC 2470 (B.C. S.C.); 2017 BCSC 53 (B.C. S.C.). Essentially, the coal mining assets of the petitioners were sold and the focus of the proceeding then moved to a consideration of the claims advanced by creditors, or alleged creditors.

5 The amounts available for distribution to the creditors is estimated to be in excess of \$63 million by the end of 2017.

6 The most significant claim advanced against the petitioners was that of a U.S. entity, the United Mine Workers of America 1974 Pension Plan and Trust (the "1974 Plan"). The 1974 Plan asserted its claim pursuant to certain "controlled group" provisions of U.S. legislation, being the *Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974*, 29 U.S.C. § 1001, as amended ("*ERISA*"). The significance of the 1974 Plan's claim cannot be understated as it was in excess of \$1.2 billion. If the claim was valid, it stood to consume the majority of the funds available for distribution to the other creditors, such that the substantial Canadian creditors' claims would have received only a nominal recovery.

7 The validity of the 1974 Plan's claim was addressed by this Court. On May 1, 2017, I held that the 1974 Plan's claim was governed by Canadian substantive law and not U.S. substantive law: *Walter Energy Canada Holdings, Inc., Re*, 2017 BCSC 709 (B.C. S.C.) at paras. 177-78, 182. Effectively, this resulted in the rejection of the 1974 Plan's claim against the petitioners.

8 The 1974 Plan filed an application for leave to appeal from my decision. Leave was granted by the British Columbia Court of Appeal on June 9, 2017. The appeal was scheduled to be heard on August 16, 2017. Eventually, the hearing date was adjourned in light of the ongoing negotiations between the parties which, if successful, would obviate the need to proceed.

9 In late September 2017, those negotiations were successful and resulted in the preparation of the Settlement Term Sheet Re Plan of Compromise and Arrangement (the "Settlement Term Sheet") which is presented for approval on this application.

10 There is no opposition to the approval of the Settlement Term Sheet. All stakeholders appearing are in support. The evidence on this application includes the affidavit #15 of William Aziz of BlueTree Advisors Inc., the Chief Restructuring Officer, and the Monitor who has filed its Thirteenth Report dated October 4, 2017.

The Settlement Term Sheet

11 As described above, the Settlement Term Sheet is the result of lengthy arm's length negotiation between the petitioners, the 1974 Plan and Warrior Met Coal, LLC ("Warrior"). Warrior is another U.S. entity who had advanced claims against some of the petitioners' assets. Warrior's claim was significant because, if the 1974 Plan's claim was not valid, the full amount of the claims against the operating subsidiaries within the New Walter Canada Group would be paid in full, resulting in monies flowing to the holding companies within the New Walter Canada Group against which Warrior's claim had been filed.

12 The essential terms of the Settlement Term Sheet are as follows.

a) Settlement of Warrior's Claims

13 The Settlement Term Sheet provides for a settlement and allowance of two claims asserted by Warrior: (i) a claim in respect of certain shared services provided by the U.S. Walter Energy entities to the Canadian Walter Energy entities (the "Shared Services Claim"); and (ii) a claim in relation to accrued but unpaid interest owing in respect of a promissory note between Walter Energy, Inc. and Walter Energy Canada Holdings, Inc. dated April 1, 2011 and related documents, which claim was compromised pursuant to an order of the Court pronounced December 21, 2016. That compromise was made pursuant to a proposal by the original Canadian Walter Energy entities pursuant to the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, which proposal was approved by the Court on December 21, 2016 (the "Hybrid Debt Claim").

14 Under the Settlement Term Sheet, Warrior's claims will be an Allowed Claim, as that phrase is defined in a Claims Process Order granted in these proceedings on August 16, 2016. Warrior's claims will be as follows: the Shared Services Claim will be an Allowed Claim in the amount of \$9,892,193.32; and, the Hybrid Debt Claim will be an Allowed Claim to be further compromised such that it is equal to the amount of the Available Net Proceeds (as described below). Further, in the Settlement Term Sheet, Warrior expressly consents to the use of the Available Net Proceeds in the manner described below.

b) Settlement of the 1974 Plan's Claim, Appeal and Related Cost Awards

15 The Settlement Term Sheet provides that, in consideration of the 1974 Plan abandoning its appeal, the petitioners will pay the first \$13 million of Available Net Proceeds to the 1974 Plan, and Warrior shall receive the remainder (if any) of Available Net Proceeds (after the payment of certain other amounts described below) in respect of the Hybrid Debt Claim.

16 Further, the petitioners have agreed that, in consideration of the abandonment of the 1974 Plan's appeal, they will (i) not pursue costs against the 1974 Plan in relation to proceedings arising from the assertion of its claim, both in this Court and in the Court of Appeal; and (ii) pay the costs of the United Steelworkers Local 1-424 ("USW"). The USW had been very much involved in opposing the efforts of the 1974 Plan to assert its claim. The USW's costs are fixed at \$75,000, which is to be paid from the funds available for distribution.

17 The 1974 Plan's agreement to abandon its appeal is contingent upon the petitioners' payment of \$13 million to the 1974 Plan from the Available Net Proceeds. The uncertainty as to whether this payment can be made arises because it is not yet known exactly what claims might be advanced against the petitioners.

18 The process under the Claims Process Order has been underway for some time now. Arising from that process, there are Allowed Claims of \$23.8 million and unresolved claims of \$7.5 million. However, more recently, the Monitor has been undertaking the process of flushing out any further restructuring claims pursuant to the Claims Process Amendment Order granted August 15, 2017. No claims have yet been received, however, the claims bar date is at the end of today. As of the hearing, no claims had been received that would potentially result in less than \$13 million being available to be paid to the 1974 Plan from the Available Net Proceeds.

19 Accordingly, the 1974 Plan will adjourn its appeal so as to conclude the unresolved restructuring claims process towards determining that \$13 million will, in any event, be available to be paid to the 1974 Plan, rather than Warrior, after deducting (i) all payments and taking all reserves required to administer and wind down the estate as contemplated; (ii) payment of the USW costs amount; and (iii) payment in full of all Allowed Claims, including the Shared Services Claim but excluding the Hybrid Debt Claim (the "Available Net Proceeds"). The 1974 Plan will then abandon its appeal following the petitioners' payment to the 1974 Plan of \$13 million.

20 In the event that additional claims are filed in the unresolved restructuring claims process and they become Allowed Claims, such that it is determined that the Available Net Proceeds will be insufficient to pay \$13 million to the 1974 Plan, the Settlement Term Sheet provides that (i) the 1974 Plan may bring its appeal at that time; and (ii) the petitioners, the Monitor and the USW may pursue costs against the 1974 Plan in relation to proceedings arising from the assertion of its claim, both in this Court and in the Court of Appeal.

21 Under the Settlement Term Sheet, the 1974 Plan's claim shall not become an Allowed Claim unless the 1974 Plan brings forward its appeal in the manner permitted by the Settlement Term Sheet and a final order is issued declaring that the 1974 Plan's claim is an Allowed Claim in respect of the petitioners.

22 The Settlement Term Sheet also provides that the director of the corporations composing the petitioners (who was also the director of the original Canadian Walter Energy petitioner companies) shall be paid an aggregate amount

of US\$250,000 from the Available Net Proceeds "in consideration for his commitment to [the petitioners] throughout the CCAA [p]roceedings".

c) Plan of Compromise or Arrangement

23 Upon the completion of the unresolved restructuring claim process or such earlier date as the petitioners and the Monitor may decide (after consultation with Warrior), the petitioners intend to bring forward a motion seeking the Court's approval of a plan of compromise or arrangement (the "Plan") that contains the principal terms set out in the Settlement Term Sheet. I am advised that the petitioners will bring this motion only if they and the Monitor are satisfied that sufficient funds will be available to address all remaining matters in the CCAA proceedings and the orderly wind-down or other process for the Walter U.K. Group, which includes Energybuild.

24 The terms that will be included in the proposed Plan are set out in the Settlement Term Sheet and include, among others terms, the following:

a) Warrior, as the sole claimant with a claim that is to be compromised under the Plan, shall be the sole claimant entitled to vote on the Plan;

b) the Plan will provide for the payment in full in cash of all claims that become Allowed Claims other than the Hybrid Debt Claim, provided that the petitioners and the Monitor determine that:

i. the petitioners have an amount sufficient to pay in full in cash all Allowed Claims and the full amount of all Claims that become Allowed Claims after the date of the Settlement Term Sheet;

ii. if there is an interim distribution, the petitioners have an amount sufficient to pay in full in cash any claim that is the subject of an unresolved Notice of Dispute if all such disputed claims were to become Allowed Claims; and

iii. the petitioners have retained an amount sufficient to address professional fees and other costs necessary for the effective administration of all remaining matters in connection with these CCAA proceedings, and to address whatever process occurs with respect to the Walter U.K. Group.

25 The 1974 Plan has agreed to support the petitioners in obtaining Court approval and implementation of the Plan.

d) Release of Claims against the Walter U.K. Group

26 Cambrian Energybuild Holdings ULC ("Cambrian") is one of the petitioners. It is the holding company for the coal mining operating companies in the United Kingdom. Its subsidiaries include Energybuild, the operating entity or entities that own and operate the Aberpergym underground coal mine located at the Neath Valley in Wales. The mine is currently in care and maintenance.

27 Efforts have been underway for some time on the part of the petitioners and the directors of the Walter U.K. Group in analyzing Energybuild's business and seeking opportunities to sell Energybuild and its affiliates or their assets. An interested party has come forward regarding a potential sale of Energybuild and certain of its affiliates. The interested party remains interested in acquiring these assets, but has requested that certain conditions be satisfied in respect of claims that may be made against Energybuild and any of its affiliates that may be acquired. One of those potential claims is that of the 1974 Plan, who similarly asserts that the Walter U.K. Group entities are liable for its claim under ERISA. In addition, there appears to be the potential for Warrior to assert claims directly against the Walter U.K. Group entities in relation to its intercompany claims by the U.S. Walter Energy entities.

28 Therefore, the petitioners and the Walter U.K. Group have sought, as part of the Settlement Term Sheet, to address any such claims. If not addressed, these lingering issues may result in the interested party disengaging entirely from the negotiations which the stakeholders hoped would lead to a sale of Energybuild and its assets.

29 The Settlement Term Sheet addresses the principal conditions precedent that relate to the sale of Energybuild and certain of its affiliates. In order to facilitate the sale of the Walter U.K. Group, any entity included within that Group or any of their respective assets, the Settlement Term Sheet provides for releases by both the 1974 Plan and Warrior on certain terms. These releases are effective immediately and are not dependent on whether there is at least Available Net Proceeds of \$13 million available for payment to the 1974 Plan or that the appeal is abandoned. Accordingly, these releases allow the petitioners and the directors of the Walter U.K. Group to proceed immediately to conclude a sale in the U.K., if possible.

30 The Term Sheet provides that the proceeds from any sale of the U.K. assets are to be applied as follows:

- a) first, to repay amounts advanced to or for the benefit of the Walter U.K. Group on a secured basis, as has already been authorized by orders granted in these *CCAA* proceedings. To date, 600,000 has been advanced and it is proposed that authorization be given for a further 300,000;
- b) second, to wind up any Walter U.K. Group entity that is not the subject of any sale in a cost effective and tax efficient manner that protects the Walter U.K. Group's directors and officers from liability to the fullest extent possible, at the discretion of the petitioners;
- c) third, if any amounts remain, such amounts shall be distributed to Warrior in respect of Warrior's claim asserted against the Walter U.K. Group, up to the maximum amount of 4,666,779; and
- d) fourth, if any amounts remain, such amounts shall be distributed to Cambrian on account of its equity interest in Energybuild.

Approval of Settlement Term Sheet

31 The petitioners seek approval of the Settlement Term Sheet pursuant to the *CCAA*, s. 11, which provides that I may exercise my discretion to make any order that I consider "appropriate in the circumstances".

32 In *Great Basin Gold Ltd., Re*, 2012 BCSC 1773 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) at para. 16, I concluded that s. 11 provides the necessary jurisdictional basis to consider and approve a settlement agreement even before the presentation of a plan of arrangement.

33 Regional Senior Justice Morawetz of the Superior Court of Justice has articulated, a number of times, the relevant considerations in approving a settlement in the *CCAA* context:

- a. is the settlement fair and reasonable?
- b. does the settlement provide substantial benefit to stakeholders? and
- c. is the settlement consistent with the purpose and spirit of the *CCAA*?

See: *Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada v. Sino-Forest Corp.*, 2013 ONSC 1078 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 49, leave to appeal refused 2013 ONCA 456 (Ont. C.A.); *1511419 Ontario Inc., Re*, 2015 ONSC 7538 (Ont. S.C.J.) at para. 14.

34 In my view, all three of the above considerations are satisfied here and support that the Settlement Term Sheet should be approved:

- a) the settlement removes a major stumbling block in providing a distribution to creditors, many of whom are former employees of the petitioners who have suffered financial distress as a result of not being paid their wages and other benefits;

b) if the 1974 Plan's claim were to proceed to a hearing of the appeal, there would be significant delay in resolving the issues. In addition, there would be significant cost to the petitioners, the CRO and the Monitor in participating in those proceedings;

c) the settlement avoids the risk of the 1974 Plan being successful, a result that would effectively deprive the claimants with Allowed Claims of any meaningful recovery;

d) the settlement allows the petitioners to proceed to a determination of the remaining claims on their merits which will also facilitate a final distribution to the creditors;

e) all of the Allowed Claims, many of whom are former employees, will receive their claim amounts in full. Only Warrior will face any compromise of its claim. Effectively, the payment of \$13 million to the 1974 Plan has no effect on the Allowed Claims since it is sourced from the Available Net Proceeds that would otherwise be paid to Warrior; and

f) the settlement will also facilitate the sale of the Walter U.K. Group assets in terms of the releases from the 1974 Plan and Warrior, which are effective immediately. A timely resolution of that aspect of the restructuring will be to the benefit of all parties in bringing these proceedings to a close.

35 There can be no doubt but that this settlement achieves what few *CCAA* proceedings achieve, namely a somewhat timely but full recovery for the vast majority of claimants. That the parties were able to resolve their differences to avoid the complex and costly legal battles to come is a testament to the ingenuity of the stakeholders and the flexibility that the *CCAA* affords in these difficult circumstances.

36 In *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re*, 2010 SCC 60 (S.C.C.), the Court confirmed the well-known description of the *CCAA* as being a remedial statute and that the court has "broad and flexible authority" to facilitate the reorganization of the debtor towards achieving the objectives of the *CCAA*, including avoiding the social and economic losses arising from restructuring proceedings: paras. 15-19.

37 These particular comments of the Court in *Century Services* bear repeating in respect of this application:

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

[Emphasis added.]

38 The Monitor supports the approval of the Settlement Term Sheet as being fair and reasonable, describing it as a "highly favourable outcome" for the petitioners' creditors who are to be paid in full. The Monitor expects that there will be sufficient funds to pay all of the Allowed Claims such that there is little likelihood of there being insufficient funds with which to pay \$13 million to the 1974 Plan. In the circumstances, this appears to be a reasonable expectation.

39 The only hesitation I had with respect to the approval of the Settlement Term Sheet arose from the proposal that the director be paid US\$250,000, in light of what was described as his commitment and the risks that he has undertaken in the fulfillment of his duties throughout these proceedings.

40 A somewhat similar circumstance arose in *Veris Gold Corp., Re*, 2015 BCSC 399 (B.C. S.C.), where approval of fees was sought in relation to amounts said to have accrued throughout a *CCAA* proceeding. In that case, the approval of the fees would have affected pre-existing claims after the fact:

[62] The matter of timing requires some discussion. The effect of the relief now sought by the Special Committee is such that their fees would be paid in priority to DB's security. WBox takes no position in respect of the relief sought, no doubt given the higher priority of its security as against DB's secured position.

[63] If such an application had been brought in a more timely manner, then the court would have been in a position to consider the matter based on the circumstances at the time. In addition, the stakeholders, such as DB, would have been able to assess the relief sought in respect of its position at that time. Court-ordered charges to protect persons providing services to the debtor can be sought under the *CCAA*: see for example, s. 11.4 (critical suppliers); s. 11.52 (fees and expenses of financial, legal and other experts).

[64] This is not unlike a situation where court-ordered charges are sought when services have already been provided and relief is only sought some time later. Inevitably, the argument is that it is only "fair" that the services delivered prior to the date of the charge be included. In addition, this is not unlike the situation where limits of spending have been imposed in respect of such charges, and the limits are exceeded and only later sought to be increased. In all of these circumstances, delay in seeking relief disadvantages the stakeholders in terms of considering the effect of the relief sought in the context of the current situation, and deprives them of a consideration of other options that might be available at the time. In addition, this delay puts the court in the very uncomfortable position of potentially depriving persons who have provided such services in good faith of the normal costs of doing so.

[Emphasis added.]

41 Having considered the matter, I do not see that any similar issues or disadvantages to the stakeholders arise in relation to the proposed payment to be made to the director. Unlike the situation in *Veris Gold*, this amount to be paid is only sourced from the Available Net Proceeds, which effectively means that Warrior will fund that amount from funds that would otherwise be paid to it. Warrior agrees to the payment of that amount. Accordingly, no Allowed Claims will be affected.

42 I conclude that the Settlement Term Sheet is fair and reasonable, that it provides a substantial benefit to the creditors of the petitioners and that it is consistent with the purpose and spirit of the *CCAA*.

Approval of Further Advances to the Walter U.K. Group

43 As set out above, the petitioners have already been funding the Walter U.K. Group in respect of its working capital requirements. The advances, which are secured, are currently outstanding in the amount of 600,000.

44 Mr. Aziz indicates that, with the releases set out in the Settlement Term Sheet now in hand, further time will be needed to hopefully conclude the negotiations with the party who has expressed an interest in purchasing the Walter U.K. Group's assets. The petitioners have been provided with cash flow forecasts for Energybuild that indicate a cash need of approximately 300,000 through to the end of the proposed extended stay period, namely December 15, 2017.

45 As such, the New Walter Canada Group is seeking this Court's authorization to advance up to an additional 300,000 (for an aggregate maximum of 900,000) on a secured basis to the Walter U.K. Group to fund Energybuild's working capital needs while negotiations regarding a potential sale continue. Mr. Aziz advises that no additional funds will be advanced unless the petitioners determine that such further advance will be in the best interests of Cambrian and the other members of the petitioners. By that statement, I take it to be the case that, if the negotiations do not result fairly quickly in a sale of the assets, other measures will be considered to deal with the Walter U.K. Assets as expeditiously and efficiently as possible.

46 All of the circumstances here support the conclusion that the further interim financing should be approved based on the factors set out in the *CCAA*, s. 11.2(4). That financing is approved on the terms sought.

Stay Extension

47 The current stay period expires today, October 6, 2017.

48 The petitioners seek an extension of the stay period to December 15, 2017. This extension is being requested to allow them to complete the unresolved restructuring claims process; possibly bring court proceedings to address any disputed claims; sell the Walter U.K. Group assets, if possible; develop the Plan and bring it before the Court for approval to implement the Settlement Term Sheet; and finally, address the distribution of the proceeds.

49 Both Mr. Aziz and the Monitor confirm what is manifestly apparent; namely, that the petitioners continue to act in good faith and with due diligence in these proceedings. The Monitor supports the extension of the stay period as being a reasonable estimate of the time required to address these final matters.

50 I have no hesitation in concluding that the requested stay extension is appropriate in the circumstances and that the petitioners are acting in good faith and with due diligence: *CCAA*, s. 11.02(2) and (3).

Conclusion

51 The proposed settlement, as contained in the Settlement Term Sheet, is fair and reasonable. The Settlement Term Sheet, between the petitioners, Warrior and the 1974 Plan is approved. I also order that the parties to the Settlement Term Sheet comply with their obligations under the Settlement Term Sheet and that the Monitor assist in that respect by taking all reasonable and necessary steps to do so.

52 Cambrian Energybuild Holdings ULC is authorized to advance up to a further 300,000 (for an aggregate maximum of 900,000) to Energybuild, on a secured basis.

53 Finally, the stay of proceedings in respect of the petitioners is extended to December 15, 2017.

Application granted.

TAB 5

2013 ONSC 1078

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada v. Sino-Forest Corp.

2013 CarswellOnt 3361, 2013 ONSC 1078, 100 C.B.R. (5th) 30, 227 A.C.W.S. (3d) 930, 37 C.P.C. (7th) 135

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

In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Sino-Forest Corporation, Applicant

The Trustees of the Labourers' Pension Fund of Central and Eastern Canada, The Trustees of the International Union of Operating Engineers Local 793 Pension Plan for Operating Engineers in Ontario, Sjunde Ap-Fonden, David Grant and Robert Wong, Plaintiffs and Sino-Forest Corporation, Ernst & Young LLP, BDO Limited (Formerly Known as BDO McCabe Lo Limited), Allen T.Y. Chan, W. Judson Martin, Kai Kit Poon, David J. Horsley, William E. Ardell, James P. Bowland, James M.E. Hyde, Edmund Mak, Simon Murray, Peter Wang, Garry J. West, Pöyry (Beijing) Consulting Company Limited, Credit Suisse Securities (Canada) In., TD Securities Inc., Dundee Securities Corporation, RBC Dominion Securities Inc., Scotia Capital Inc., CIBC World Markets Inc., Merrill Lynch Canada Inc., Canaccord Financial Ltd., Maison Placements Canada Inc., Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC and Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Incorporated (Successor by Merger to Banc of America Securities LLC), Defendants

Morawetz J.

Heard: February 4, 2013

Judgment: March 20, 2013

Docket: CV-12-9667-00CL, CV-11-431153-00CP

Counsel: Kenneth Rosenberg, Max Starnino, A. Dimitri Lascaris, Daniel Bach, Charles M. Wright, Jonathan Ptak, for Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers including the Class Action Plaintiffs
Peter Griffin, Peter Osborne, Shara Roy, for Ernst & Young LLP, John Pirie and David Gadsden, for Pöyry (Beijing) Consulting Company Ltd.

Robert W. Staley for Sino-Forest Corporation

Won J. Kim, Michael C. Spencer, Megan B. McPhee for Objectors, Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments LP and Comité Syndical National de Retraite Bâtirente Inc.

John Fabello Rebecca Wise, for Underwriters

Ken Dekker, Peter Greene for BDO Limited

Emily Cole, Joseph Marin for Allen Chan

James Doris for U.S. Class Action

Brandon Barnes for Kai Kit Poon

Robert Chadwick, Brendan O'Neill for Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders

Derrick Tay, Cliff Prophet for Monitor, FTI Consulting Canada Inc.

Simon Bieber for David Horsley

James Grout for Ontario Securities Commission

Miles D. O'Reilly, Q.C. for Junior Objectors, Daniel Lam and Senthilvel Kanagaratnam

Subject: Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure; Corporate and Commercial; Securities

MOTION by representative plaintiffs for approval of settlement in class proceeding.

Morawetz J.:

Introduction

1 The Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities (the "Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers' Committee" or the "Applicant"), including the representative plaintiffs in the Ontario class action (collectively, the "Ontario Plaintiffs"), bring this motion for approval of a settlement and release of claims against Ernst & Young LLP [the "Ernst & Young Settlement", the "Ernst & Young Release", the "Ernst & Young Claims" and "Ernst & Young", as further defined in the Plan of Compromise and Reorganization of Sino-Forest Corporation ("SFC") dated December 3, 2012 (the "Plan")].

2 Approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement is opposed by Invesco Canada Limited ("Invesco"), Northwest and Ethical Investments L.P. ("Northwest"), Comité Syndical National de Retraite Bâtirente Inc. ("Bâtirente"), Matrix Asset Management Inc. ("Matrix"), Gestion Férique and Montrusco Bolton Investments Inc. ("Montrusco") (collectively, the "Objectors"). The Objectors particularly oppose the no-opt-out and full third-party release features of the Ernst & Young Settlement. The Objectors also oppose the motion for a representation order sought by the Ontario Plaintiffs, and move instead for appointment of the Objectors to represent the interests of all objectors to the Ernst & Young Settlement.

3 For the following reasons, I have determined that the Ernst & Young Settlement, together with the Ernst & Young Release, should be approved.

Facts

Class Action Proceedings

4 SFC is an integrated forest plantation operator and forest productions company, with most of its assets and the majority of its business operations located in the southern and eastern regions of the People's Republic of China. SFC's registered office is in Toronto, and its principal business office is in Hong Kong.

5 SFC's shares were publicly traded over the Toronto Stock Exchange. During the period from March 19, 2007 through June 2, 2011, SFC made three prospectus offerings of common shares. SFC also issued and had various notes (debt instruments) outstanding, which were offered to investors, by way of offering memoranda, between March 19, 2007 and June 2, 2011.

6 All of SFC's debt or equity public offerings have been underwritten. A total of 11 firms (the "Underwriters") acted as SFC's underwriters, and are named as defendants in the Ontario class action.

7 Since 2000, SFC has had two auditors: Ernst & Young, who acted as auditor from 2000 to 2004 and 2007 to 2012, and BDO Limited ("BDO"), who acted as auditor from 2005 to 2006. Ernst & Young and BDO are named as defendants in the Ontario class action.

8 Following a June 2, 2011 report issued by short-seller Muddy Waters LLC ("Muddy Waters"), SFC, and others, became embroiled in investigations and regulatory proceedings (with the Ontario Securities Commission (the "OSC"), the Hong Kong Securities and Futures Commission and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police) for allegedly engaging in a "complex fraudulent scheme". SFC concurrently became embroiled in multiple class action proceedings across Canada, including Ontario, Quebec and Saskatchewan (collectively, the "Canadian Actions"), and in New York (collectively with the Canadian Actions, the "Class Action Proceedings"), facing allegations that SFC, and others, misstated its financial results, misrepresented its timber rights, overstated the value of its assets and concealed material information about its business operations from investors, causing the collapse of an artificially inflated share price.

9 The Canadian Actions are comprised of two components: first, there is a shareholder claim, brought on behalf of SFC's current and former shareholders, seeking damages in the amount of \$6.5 billion for general damages, \$174.8

million in connection with a prospectus issued in June 2007, \$330 million in relation to a prospectus issued in June 2009, and \$319.2 million in relation to a prospectus issued in December 2009; and second, there is a noteholder claim, brought on behalf of former holders of SFC's notes (the "Noteholders"), in the amount of approximately \$1.8 billion. The noteholder claim asserts, among other things, damages for loss of value in the notes.

10 Two other class proceedings relating to SFC were subsequently commenced in Ontario: *Smith et al. v. Sino-Forest Corporation et al.*, which commenced on June 8, 2011; and *Northwest and Ethical Investments L.P. et al. v. Sino-Forest Corporation et al.*, which commenced on September 26, 2011.

11 In December 2011, there was a motion to determine which of the three actions in Ontario should be permitted to proceed and which should be stayed (the "Carriage Motion"). On January 6, 2012, Perell J. granted carriage to the Ontario Plaintiffs, appointed Siskinds LLP and Koskie Minsky LLP to prosecute the Ontario class action, and stayed the other class proceedings.

CCAA Proceedings

12 SFC obtained an initial order under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA") on March 30, 2012 (the "Initial Order"), pursuant to which a stay of proceedings was granted in respect of SFC and certain of its subsidiaries. Pursuant to an order on May 8, 2012, the stay was extended to all defendants in the class actions, including Ernst & Young. Due to the stay, the certification and leave motions have yet to be heard.

13 Throughout the CCAA proceedings, SFC asserted that there could be no effective restructuring of SFC's business, and separation from the Canadian parent, if the claims asserted against SFC's subsidiaries arising out of, or connected to, claims against SFC remained outstanding.

14 In addition, SFC and FTI Consulting Canada Inc. (the "Monitor") continually advised that timing and delay were critical elements that would impact on maximization of the value of SFC's assets and stakeholder recovery.

15 On May 14, 2012, an order (the "Claims Procedure Order") was issued that approved a claims process developed by SFC, in consultation with the Monitor. In order to identify the nature and extent of the claims asserted against SFC's subsidiaries, the Claims Procedure Order required any claimant that had or intended to assert a right or claim against one or more of the subsidiaries, relating to a purported claim made against SFC, to so indicate on their proof of claim.

16 The Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers' Committee filed a proof of claim (encapsulating the approximately \$7.3 billion shareholder claim and \$1.8 billion noteholder claim) in the CCAA proceedings on behalf of all putative class members in the Ontario class action. The plaintiffs in the New York class action filed a proof of claim, but did not specify quantum of damages. Ernst & Young filed a proof of claim for damages and indemnification. The plaintiffs in the Saskatchewan class action did not file a proof of claim. A few shareholders filed proofs of claim separately. No proof of claim was filed by Kim Orr Barristers P.C. ("Kim Orr"), who represent the Objectors.

17 Prior to the commencement of the CCAA proceedings, the plaintiffs in the Canadian Actions settled with Pöyry (Beijing) Consulting Company Limited ("Pöyry") (the "Pöyry Settlement"), a forestry valuator that provided services to SFC. The class was defined as all persons and entities who acquired SFC's securities in Canada between March 19, 2007 to June 2, 2011, and all Canadian residents who acquired SFC securities outside of Canada during that same period (the "Pöyry Settlement Class").

18 The notice of hearing to approve the Pöyry Settlement advised the Pöyry Settlement Class that they may object to the proposed settlement. No objections were filed.

19 Perell J. and Émond J. approved the settlement and certified the Pöyry Settlement Class for settlement purposes. January 15, 2013 was fixed as the date by which members of the Pöyry Settlement Class, who wished to opt-out of either

of the Canadian Actions, would have to file an opt-out form for the claims administrator, and they approved the form by which the right to optout was required to be exercised.

20 Notice of the certification and settlement was given in accordance with the certification orders of Perell J. and Émond J. The notice of certification states, in part, that:

IF YOU CHOOSE TO OPT OUT OF THE CLASS, YOU WILL BE OPTING OUT OF THE ENTIRE PROCEEDING. THIS MEANS THAT YOU WILL BE UNABLE TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY FUTURE SETTLEMENT OR JUDGMENT REACHED WITH OR AGAINST THE REMAINING DEFENDANTS.

21 The opt-out made no provision for an opt-out on a conditional basis.

22 On June 26, 2012, SFC brought a motion for an order directing that claims against SFC that arose in connection with the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest in SFC, and related indemnity claims, were "equity claims" as defined in section 2 of the CCAA, including the claims by or on behalf of shareholders asserted in the Class Action Proceedings. The equity claims motion did not purport to deal with the component of the Class Action Proceedings relating to SFC's notes.

23 In reasons released July 27, 2012 [*Sino-Forest Corp., Re*, 2012 ONSC 4377 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])], I granted the relief sought by SFC (the "Equity Claims Decision"), finding that "the claims advanced in the shareholder claims are clearly equity claims". The Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers' Committee did not oppose the motion, and no issue was taken by any party with the court's determination that the shareholder claims against SFC were "equity claims". The Equity Claims Decision was subsequently affirmed by the Court of Appeal for Ontario on November 23, 2012 [*Sino-Forest Corp., Re*, 2012 ONCA 816 (Ont. C.A.)].

Ernst & Young Settlement

24 The Ernst & Young Settlement, and third party releases, was not mentioned in the early versions of the Plan. The initial creditors' meeting and vote on the Plan was scheduled to occur on November 29, 2012; when the Plan was amended on November 28, 2012, the creditors' meeting was adjourned to November 30, 2012.

25 On November 29, 2012, Ernst & Young's counsel and class counsel concluded the proposed Ernst & Young Settlement. The creditors' meeting was again adjourned, to December 3, 2012; on that date, a new Plan revision was released and the Ernst & Young Settlement was publicly announced. The Plan revision featured a new Article 11, reflecting the "framework" for the proposed Ernst & Young Settlement and for third-party releases for named third-party defendants as identified at that time as the Underwriters or in the future.

26 On December 3, 2012, a large majority of creditors approved the Plan. The Objectors note, however, that proxy materials were distributed weeks earlier and proxies were required to be submitted three days prior to the meeting and it is evident that creditors submitting proxies only had a pre-Article 11 version of the Plan. Further, no equity claimants, such as the Objectors, were entitled to vote on the Plan. On December 6, 2012, the Plan was further amended, adding Ernst & Young and BDO to Schedule A, thereby defining them as named third-party defendants.

27 Ultimately, the Ernst & Young Settlement provided for the payment by Ernst & Young of \$117 million as a settlement fund, being the full monetary contribution by Ernst & Young to settle the Ernst & Young Claims; however, it remains subject to court approval in Ontario, and recognition in Quebec and the United States, and conditional, pursuant to Article 11.1 of the Plan, upon the following steps:

(a) the granting of the sanction order sanctioning the Plan including the terms of the Ernst & Young Settlement and the Ernst & Young Release (which preclude any right to contribution or indemnity against Ernst & Young);

(b) the issuance of the Settlement Trust Order;

- (c) the issuance of any other orders necessary to give effect to the Ernst & Young Settlement and the Ernst & Young Release, including the Chapter 15 Recognition Order;
- (d) the fulfillment of all conditions precedent in the Ernst & Young Settlement; and
- (e) all orders being final orders not subject to further appeal or challenge.

28 On December 6, 2012, Kim Orr filed a notice of appearance in the CCAA proceedings on behalf of three Objectors: Invesco, Northwest and Bâtirente. These Objectors opposed the sanctioning of the Plan, insofar as it included Article 11, during the Plan sanction hearing on December 7, 2012.

29 At the Plan sanction hearing, SFC's counsel made it clear that the Plan itself did not embody the Ernst & Young Settlement, and that the parties' request that the Plan be sanctioned did not also cover approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement. Moreover, according to the Plan and minutes of settlement, the Ernst & Young Settlement would not be consummated (*i.e.* money paid and releases effective) unless and until several conditions had been satisfied in the future.

30 The Plan was sanctioned on December 10, 2012 with Article 11. The Objectors take the position that the Funds' opposition was dismissed as premature and on the basis that nothing in the sanction order affected their rights.

31 On December 13, 2012, the court directed that its hearing on the Ernst & Young Settlement would take place on January 4, 2013, under both the CCAA and the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*, S.O. 1992, c. 6 ("CPA"). Subsequently, the hearing was adjourned to February 4, 2013.

32 On January 15, 2013, the last day of the opt-out period established by orders of Perell J. and Émond J., six institutional investors represented by Kim Orr filed opt-out forms. These institutional investors are Northwest and Bâtirente, who were two of the three institutions represented by Kim Orr in the Carriage Motion, as well as Invesco, Matrix, Montrusco and Gestion Ferique (all of which are members of the Pöyry Settlement Class).

33 According to the opt-out forms, the Objectors held approximately 1.6% of SFC shares outstanding on June 30, 2011 (the day the Muddy Waters report was released). By way of contrast, Davis Selected Advisors and Paulson and Co., two of many institutional investors who support the Ernst & Young Settlement, controlled more than 25% of SFC's shares at this time. In addition, the total number of outstanding objectors constitutes approximately 0.24% of the 34,177 SFC beneficial shareholders as of April 29, 2011.

Law and Analysis

Court's Jurisdiction to Grant Requested Approval

34 The Claims Procedure Order of May 14, 2012, at paragraph 17, provides that any person that does not file a proof of claim in accordance with the order is barred from making or enforcing such claim as against any other person who could claim contribution or indemnity from the Applicant. This includes claims by the Objectors against Ernst & Young for which Ernst & Young could claim indemnity from SFC.

35 The Claims Procedure Order also provides that the Ontario Plaintiffs are authorized to file one proof of claim in respect of the substance of the matters set out in the Ontario class action, and that the Quebec Plaintiffs are similarly authorized to file one proof of claim in respect of the substance of the matters set out in the Quebec class action. The Objectors did not object to, or oppose, the Claims Procedure Order, either when it was sought or at any time thereafter. The Objectors did not file an independent proof of claim and, accordingly, the Canadian Claimants were authorized to and did file a proof of claim in the representative capacity in respect of the Objectors' claims.

36 The Ernst & Young Settlement is part of a CCAA plan process. Claims, including contingent claims, are regularly compromised and settled within CCAA proceedings. This includes outstanding litigation claims against the debtor and

third parties. Such compromises fully and finally dispose of such claims, and it follows that there are no continuing procedural or other rights in such proceedings. Simply put, there are no "opt-outs" in the CCAA.

37 It is well established that class proceedings can be settled in a CCAA proceeding. See *Robertson v. ProQuest Information & Learning Co.*, 2011 ONSC 1647 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) [*Robertson*].

38 As noted by Pepall J. (as she then was) in *Robertson*, para. 8:

When dealing with the consensual resolution of a CCAA claim filed in a claims process that arises out of ongoing litigation, typically no court approval is required. In contrast, class proceedings settlements must be approved by the court. The notice and process for dissemination of the settlement agreement must also be approved by the court.

39 In this case, the notice and process for dissemination have been approved.

40 The Objectors take the position that approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement would render their opt-out rights illusory; the inherent flaw with this argument is that it is not possible to ignore the CCAA proceedings.

41 In this case, claims arising out of the class proceedings are claims in the CCAA process. CCAA claims can be, by definition, subject to compromise. The Claims Procedure Order establishes that claims as against Ernst & Young fall within the CCAA proceedings. Thus, these claims can also be the subject of settlement and, if settled, the claims of all creditors in the class can also be settled.

42 In my view, these proceedings are the appropriate time and place to consider approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement. This court has the jurisdiction in respect of both the CCAA and the CPA.

Should the Court Exercise Its Discretion to Approve the Settlement

43 Having established the jurisdictional basis to consider the motion, the central inquiry is whether the court should exercise its discretion to approve the Ernst & Young Settlement.

CCAA Interpretation

44 The CCAA is a "flexible statute", and the court has "jurisdiction to approve major transactions, including settlement agreements, during the stay period defined in the Initial Order". The CCAA affords courts broad jurisdiction to make orders and "fill in the gaps in legislation so as to give effect to the objects of the CCAA." [*Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, 2010 ONSC 1708 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), paras. 66-70 ("*Re Nortel*")]; *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299, 72 O.T.C. 99 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), para. 43]

45 Further, as the Supreme Court of Canada explained in *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re*, 2010 SCC 60 (S.C.C.), para. 58:

CCAA decisions are often based on discretionary grants of jurisdiction. The incremental exercise of judicial discretion in commercial courts under conditions one practitioner aptly described as "the hothouse of real time litigation" has been the primary method by which the CCAA has been adapted and has evolved to meet contemporary business and social needs (internal citations omitted). ...When large companies encounter difficulty, reorganizations become increasingly complex. CCAA courts have been called upon to innovate accordingly in exercising their jurisdiction beyond merely staying proceedings against the Debtor to allow breathing room for reorganization. They have been asked to sanction measures for which there is no explicit authority in the CCAA.

46 It is also established that third-party releases are not an uncommon feature of complex restructurings under the CCAA [*ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*, 2008 ONCA 587 (Ont. C.A.) ("*ATB Financial*")]; *Nortel Networks Corp., Re, supra*; *Robertson, supra*; *Muscletech Research & Development Inc., Re* (2007), 30 C.B.R. (5th) 59, 156 A.C.W.S. (3d) 22 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) ("*Muscle Tech*"); *Grace Canada Inc., Re* (2008), 50

C.B.R. (5th) 25 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Allen-Vanguard Corp., Re*, 2011 ONSC 5017 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])).

47 The Court of Appeal for Ontario has specifically confirmed that a third-party release is justified where the release forms part of a comprehensive compromise. As Blair J. A. stated in *ATB Financial, supra*:

69. In keeping with this scheme and purpose, I do not suggest that any and all releases between creditors of the debtor company seeking to restructure and third parties may be made the subject of a compromise or arrangement between the debtor and its creditors. Nor do I think the fact that the releases may be "necessary" in the sense that the third parties or the debtor may refuse to proceed without them, of itself, advances the argument in favour of finding jurisdiction (although it may well be relevant in terms of the fairness and reasonableness analysis).

70. The release of the claim in question must be justified as part of the compromise or arrangement between the debtor and its creditors. In short, 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 ...

71. In the course of his reasons, the application judge made the following findings, all of which are amply supported on the record:

- a) The parties to be released are necessary and essential to the restructuring of the debtor;
- b) The claims to be released are rationally related to the purpose of the Plan and necessary for it;
- c) The Plan cannot succeed without the releases;
- d) The parties who are to have claims against them released are contributing in a tangible and realistic way to the Plan; and
- e) The Plan will benefit not only the debtor companies but creditor Noteholders generally.

72. Here, then — as was the case in T&N — there is a close connection between the claims being released and the restructuring proposal. The tort claims arise out of the sale and distribution of the ABCP Notes and their collapse in value, just as do the contractual claims of the creditors against the debtor companies. The purpose of the restructuring is to stabilize and shore up the value of those notes in the long run. The third parties being released are making separate contributions to enable those results to materialize. Those contributions are identified earlier, at para. 31 of these reasons. The application judge found that the claims being released are not independent of or unrelated to the claims that the Noteholders have against the debtor companies; they are closely connected to the value of the ABCP Notes and are required for the Plan to succeed ...

73. I am satisfied that the wording of the CCAA — construed in light of the purpose, objects and scheme of the Act and in accordance with the modern principles of statutory interpretation — supports the court's jurisdiction and authority to sanction the Plan proposed here, including the contested third-party releases contained in it.

...

78. ... I believe the open-ended CCAA permits third-party releases that are reasonably related to the restructuring at issue because they are encompassed in the comprehensive terms "compromise" and "arrangement" and because of the double-voting majority and court sanctioning statutory mechanism that makes them binding on unwilling creditors.

...

113. At para. 71 above I recited a number of factual findings the application judge made in concluding that approval of the Plan was within his jurisdiction under the CCAA and that it was fair and reasonable. For convenience, I reiterate them here — with two additional findings — because they provide an important foundation for his analysis concerning the fairness and reasonableness of the Plan. The application judge found that:

- a) The parties to be released are necessary and essential to the restructuring of the debtor;
- b) The claims to be released are rationally related to the purpose of the Plan and necessary for it;
- c) The Plan cannot succeed without the releases;
- d) The parties who are to have claims against them released are contributing in a tangible and realistic way to the Plan;
- e) The Plan will benefit not only the debtor companies but creditor Noteholders generally;
- f) The voting creditors who have approved the Plan did so with knowledge of the nature and effect of the releases; and that,
- g) The releases are fair and reasonable and not overly broad or offensive to public policy.

48 Furthermore, in *ATB Financial, supra*, para. 111, the Court of Appeal confirmed that parties are entitled to settle allegations of fraud and to include releases of such claims as part of the settlement. It was noted that "there is no legal impediment to granting the release of an antecedent claim in fraud, provided the claim is in the contemplation of the parties to the release at the time it is given".

Relevant CCAA Factors

49 In assessing a settlement within the CCAA context, the court looks at the following three factors, as articulated in *Robertson, supra*:

- (a) whether the settlement is fair and reasonable;
- (b) whether it provides substantial benefits to other stakeholders; and
- (c) whether it is consistent with the purpose and spirit of the CCAA.

50 Where a settlement also provides for a release, such as here, courts assess whether there is "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". Applying this "nexus test" requires consideration of the following factors: [*ATB Financial, supra*, para. 70]

- (a) Are the claims to be released rationally related to the purpose of the plan?
- (b) Are the claims to be released necessary for the plan of arrangement?
- (c) Are the parties who have claims released against them contributing in a tangible and realistic way? and
- (d) Will the plan benefit the debtor and the creditors generally?

Counsel Submissions

51 The Objectors argue that the proposed Ernst & Young Release is not integral or necessary to the success of Sino-Forest's restructuring plan, and, therefore, the standards for granting thirdparty releases in the CCAA are not satisfied.

No one has asserted that the parties require the Ernst & Young Settlement or Ernst & Young Release to allow the Plan to go forward; in fact, the Plan has been implemented prior to consideration of this issue. Further, the Objectors contend that the \$117 million settlement payment is not essential, or even related, to the restructuring, and that it is concerning, and telling, that varying the end of the Ernst & Young Settlement and Ernst & Young Release to accommodate opt-outs would extinguish the settlement.

52 The Objectors also argue that the Ernst & Young Settlement should not be approved because it would vitiate opt-out rights of class members, as conferred as follows in section 9 of the CPA: "Any member of a class involved in a class proceeding may opt-out of the proceeding in the manner and within the time specified in the certification order." This right is a fundamental element of procedural fairness in the Ontario class action regime [*Fischer v. IG Investment Management Ltd.*, 2012 ONCA 47 (Ont. C.A.), para. 69], and is not a mere technicality or illusory. It has been described as absolute [*Durling v. Sunrise Propane Energy Group Inc.*, 2011 ONSC 266 (Ont. S.C.J.)]. The opt-out period allows persons to pursue their self-interest and to preserve their rights to pursue individual actions [*Mangan v. Inco Ltd.* (1998), 16 C.P.C. (4th) 165, 38 O.R. (3d) 703 (Ont. Gen. Div.)].

53 Based on the foregoing, the Objectors submit that a proposed class action settlement with Ernst & Young should be approved solely under the CPA, as the Pöyry Settlement was, and not through misuse of a third-party release procedure under the CCAA. Further, since the minutes of settlement make it clear that Ernst & Young retains discretion not to accept or recognize normal opt-outs if the CPA procedures are invoked, the Ernst & Young Settlement should not be approved in this respect either.

54 Multiple parties made submissions favouring the Ernst & Young Settlement (with the accompanying Ernst & Young Release), arguing that it is fair and reasonable in the circumstances, benefits the CCAA stakeholders (as evidenced by the broad-based support for the Plan and this motion) and rationally connected to the Plan.

55 Ontario Plaintiffs' counsel submits that the form of the bar order is fair and properly balances the competing interests of class members, Ernst & Young and the non-settling defendants as:

- (a) class members are not releasing their claims to a greater extent than necessary;
- (b) Ernst & Young is ensured that its obligations in connection to the Settlement will conclude its liability in the class proceedings;
- (c) the non-settling defendants will not have to pay more following a judgment than they would be required to pay if Ernst & Young remained as a defendant in the action; and
- (d) the non-settling defendants are granted broad rights of discovery and an appropriate credit in the ongoing litigation, if it is ultimately determined by the court that there is a right of contribution and indemnity between the co-defendants.

56 SFC argues that Ernst & Young's support has simplified and accelerated the Plan process, including reducing the expense and management time otherwise to be incurred in litigating claims, and was a catalyst to encouraging many parties, including the Underwriters and BDO, to withdraw their objections to the Plan. Further, the result is precisely the type of compromise that the CCAA is designed to promote; namely, Ernst & Young has provided a tangible and significant contribution to the Plan (notwithstanding any pitfalls in the litigation claims against Ernst & Young) that has enabled SFC to emerge as Newco/NewcoII in a timely way and with potential viability.

57 Ernst & Young's counsel submits that the Ernst & Young Settlement, as a whole, including the Ernst & Young Release, must be approved or rejected; the court cannot modify the terms of a proposed settlement. Further, in deciding whether to reject a settlement, the court should consider whether doing so would put the settlement in "jeopardy of being unravelled". In this case, counsel submits there is no obligation on the parties to resume discussions and it could be that the parties have reached their limits in negotiations and will backtrack from their positions or abandon the effort.

Analysis and Conclusions

58 The Ernst & Young Release forms part of the Ernst & Young Settlement. In considering whether the Ernst & Young Settlement is fair and reasonable and ought to be approved, it is necessary to consider whether the Ernst & Young Release can be justified as part of the Ernst & Young Settlement. See *ATB Financial, supra*, para. 70, as quoted above.

59 In considering the appropriateness of including the Ernst & Young Release, I have taken into account the following.

60 Firstly, although the Plan has been sanctioned and implemented, a significant aspect of the Plan is a distribution to SFC's creditors. The significant and, in fact, only monetary contribution that can be directly identified, at this time, is the \$117 million from the Ernst & Young Settlement. Simply put, until such time as the Ernst & Young Settlement has been concluded and the settlement proceeds paid, there can be no distribution of the settlement proceeds to parties entitled to receive them. It seems to me that in order to effect any distribution, the Ernst & Young Release has to be approved as part of the Ernst & Young Settlement.

61 Secondly, it is apparent that the claims to be released against Ernst & Young are rationally related to the purpose of the Plan and necessary for it. SFC put forward the Plan. As I outlined in the Equity Claims Decision, the claims of Ernst & Young as against SFC are intertwined to the extent that they cannot be separated. Similarly, the claims of the Objectors as against Ernst & Young are, in my view, intertwined and related to the claims against SFC and to the purpose of the Plan.

62 Thirdly, although the Plan can, on its face, succeed, as evidenced by its implementation, the reality is that without the approval of the Ernst & Young Settlement, the objectives of the Plan remain unfulfilled due to the practical inability to distribute the settlement proceeds. Further, in the event that the Ernst & Young Release is not approved and the litigation continues, it becomes circular in nature as the position of Ernst & Young, as detailed in the Equity Claims Decision, involves Ernst & Young bringing an equity claim for contribution and indemnity as against SFC.

63 Fourthly, it is clear that Ernst & Young is contributing in a tangible way to the Plan, by its significant contribution of \$117 million.

64 Fifthly, the Plan benefits the claimants in the form of a tangible distribution. Blair J.A., at paragraph 113 of *ATB Financial, supra*, referenced two further facts as found by the application judge in that case; namely, the voting creditors who approved the Plan did so with the knowledge of the nature and effect of the releases. That situation is also present in this case.

65 Finally, the application judge in *ATB Financial, supra*, held that the releases were fair and reasonable and not overly broad or offensive to public policy. In this case, having considered the alternatives of lengthy and uncertain litigation, and the full knowledge of the Canadian plaintiffs, I conclude that the Ernst & Young Release is fair and reasonable and not overly broad or offensive to public policy.

66 In my view, the Ernst & Young Settlement is fair and reasonable, provides substantial benefits to relevant stakeholders, and is consistent with the purpose and spirit of the CCAA. In addition, in my view, the factors associated with the *ATB Financial* nexus test favour approving the Ernst & Young Release.

67 In *Nortel Networks Corp., Re, supra*, para. 81, I noted that the releases benefited creditors generally because they "reduced the risk of litigation, protected Nortel against potential contribution claims and indemnity claims and reduced the risk of delay caused by potentially complex litigation and associated depletion of assets to fund potentially significant litigation costs". In this case, there is a connection between the release of claims against Ernst & Young and a distribution to creditors. The plaintiffs in the litigation are shareholders and Noteholders of SFC. These plaintiffs have claims to assert against SFC that are being directly satisfied, in part, with the payment of \$117 million by Ernst & Young.

68 In my view, it is clear that the claims Ernst & Young asserted against SFC, and SFC's subsidiaries, had to be addressed as part of the restructuring. The interrelationship between the various entities is further demonstrated by Ernst & Young's submission that the release of claims by Ernst & Young has allowed SFC and the SFC subsidiaries to contribute their assets to the restructuring, unencumbered by claims totalling billions of dollars. As SFC is a holding company with no material assets of its own, the unencumbered participation of the SFC subsidiaries is crucial to the restructuring.

69 At the outset and during the CCAA proceedings, the Applicant and Monitor specifically and consistently identified timing and delay as critical elements that would impact on maximization of the value and preservation of SFC's assets.

70 Counsel submits that the claims against Ernst & Young and the indemnity claims asserted by Ernst & Young would, absent the Ernst & Young Settlement, have to be finally determined before the CCAA claims could be quantified. As such, these steps had the potential to significantly delay the CCAA proceedings. Where the claims being released may take years to resolve, are risky, expensive or otherwise uncertain of success, the benefit that accrues to creditors in having them settled must be considered. See *Nortel Networks Corp., Re, supra*, paras. 73 and 81; and *Muscletech, supra*, paras. 19-21.

71 Implicit in my findings is rejection of the Objectors' arguments questioning the validity of the Ernst & Young Settlement and Ernst & Young Release. The relevant consideration is whether a proposed settlement and third-party release sufficiently benefits all stakeholders to justify court approval. I reject the position that the \$117 million settlement payment is not essential, or even related, to the restructuring; it represents, at this point in time, the only real monetary consideration available to stakeholders. The potential to vary the Ernst & Young Settlement and Ernst & Young Release to accommodate opt-outs is futile, as the court is being asked to approve the Ernst & Young Settlement and Ernst & Young Release as proposed.

72 I do not accept that the class action settlement should be approved solely under the CPA. The reality facing the parties is that SFC is insolvent; it is under CCAA protection, and stakeholder claims are to be considered in the context of the CCAA regime. The Objectors' claim against Ernst & Young cannot be considered in isolation from the CCAA proceedings. The claims against Ernst & Young are interrelated with claims as against SFC, as is made clear in the Equity Claims Decision and Claims Procedure Order.

73 Even if one assumes that the opt-out argument of the Objectors can be sustained, and optout rights fully provided, to what does that lead? The Objectors are left with a claim against Ernst & Young, which it then has to put forward in the CCAA proceedings. Without taking into account any argument that the claim against Ernst & Young may be affected by the claims bar date, the claim is still capable of being addressed under the Claims Procedure Order. In this way, it is again subject to the CCAA fairness and reasonable test as set out in *ATB Financial, supra*.

74 Moreover, CCAA proceedings take into account a class of creditors or stakeholders who possess the same legal interests. In this respect, the Objectors have the same legal interests as the Ontario Plaintiffs. Ultimately, this requires consideration of the totality of the class. In this case, it is clear that the parties supporting the Ernst & Young Settlement are vastly superior to the Objectors, both in number and dollar value.

75 Although the right to opt-out of a class action is a fundamental element of procedural fairness in the Ontario class action regime, this argument cannot be taken in isolation. It must be considered in the context of the CCAA.

76 The Objectors are, in fact, part of the group that will benefit from the Ernst & Young Settlement as they specifically seek to reserve their rights to "opt-in" and share in the spoils.

77 It is also clear that the jurisprudence does not permit a dissenting stakeholder to opt-out of a restructuring. [*Sammi Atlas Inc., Re* (1998), 3 C.B.R. (4th) 171 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).] If that were possible, no creditor would take part in any CCAA compromise where they were to receive less than the debt owed to them. There is no right to

opt-out of any CCAA process, and the statute contemplates that a minority of creditors are bound by the plan which a majority have approved and the court has determined to be fair and reasonable.

78 SFC is insolvent and all stakeholders, including the Objectors, will receive less than what they are owed. By virtue of deciding, on their own volition, not to participate in the CCAA process, the Objectors relinquished their right to file a claim and take steps, in a timely way, to assert their rights to vote in the CCAA proceeding.

79 Further, even if the Objectors had filed a claim and voted, their minimal 1.6% stake in SFC's outstanding shares when the Muddy Waters report was released makes it highly unlikely that they could have altered the outcome.

80 Finally, although the Objectors demand a right to conditionally opt-out of a settlement, that right does not exist under the CPA or CCAA. By virtue of the certification order, class members had the ability to opt-out of the class action. The Objectors did not opt-out in the true sense; they purported to create a conditional opt-out. Under the CPA, the right to opt-out is "in the manner and within the time specified in the certification order". There is no provision for a conditional opt-out in the CPA, and Ontario's single opt-out regime causes "no prejudice...to putative class members". [CPA, section 9; *Osmun v. Cadbury Adams Canada Inc.* (2009), 85 C.P.C. (6th) 148 (Ont. S.C.J.), paras. 43-46; and *Eidoo v. Infineon Technologies AG*, 2012 ONSC 7299 (Ont. S.C.J.).]

Miscellaneous

81 For greater certainty, it is my understanding that the issues raised by Mr. O'Reilly have been clarified such that the effect of this endorsement is that the Junior Objectors will be included with the same status as the Ontario Plaintiffs.

Disposition

82 In the result, for the foregoing reasons, the motion is granted. A declaration shall issue to the effect that the Ernst & Young Settlement is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances. The Ernst & Young Settlement, together with the Ernst & Young Release, is approved and an order shall issue substantially in the form requested. The motion of the Objectors is dismissed.

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 URBANCORP (WOODBINE) INC. AND URBANCORP (BRIDLEPATH) INC., THE TOWNHOUSES OF HOGG'S HOLLOW INC., KING TOWNS INC., NEWTOWNS AT KINGTOWNS INC. AND DEAJA PARTNER (BAY) INC. (COLLECTIVELY, THE "APPLICANTS")

AND IN THE MATTER OF TCC URBANCORP (BAY) LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

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

Proceedings Commenced at Toronto

**JOINT BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE FUNCTIONARY AND
TERRA FIRMA CAPITAL CORPORATION
(Motion Returnable February 21, 2019)**

DENTONS CANADA LLP
77 King Street West, Suite 400
Toronto, Ontario M5K 0A1
Fax: 416-863-4592
Kenneth Kraft (LSO No. 31919P)
Tel: 416-863-4374
Email: kenneth.kraft@dentons.com
Neil Rabinovitch (LSO No. 33442F)
Tel: 416-863-4656
Email: neil.rabinovitch@dentons.com

*Lawyers for Guy Gissin, the Israeli
Court-appointed functionary officer
and foreign representative of
Urbancorp Inc.*

**THORNTON GROUT FINNIGAN
LLP**
3200-100 Wellington Street West
TD Centre, Box 329
Toronto, ON M5K 1K7
John T. Porter (LSO No. 23844T)
Tel: (416) 304-0778
Fax: (416) 304-1313
Email: jporter@tgf.ca

*Counsel for Terra Firma Capital
Corporation*