

**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 TORONTO  
MANAGEMENT INC., URBANCORP (ST. CLAIR VILLAGE)  
INC., URBANCORP (PATRICIA) INC., URBANCORP  
(MALLOW) INC., URBANCORP (LAWRENCE) INC.,  
URBANCORP DOWNSVIEW PARK DEVELOPMENT INC.,  
URBANCORP (952 QUEEN WEST) INC., KING RESIDENTIAL  
INC., URBANCORP 60 ST. CLAIR INC., HIGH RES. INC.,  
BRIDGE ON KING INC. (Collectively the "Applicants") AND  
THE AFFILIATED ENTITIES LISTED IN SCHEDULE "A"  
HERETO**

---

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE MONITOR  
(DOCUMENT REQUEST)**

---

August 26, 2021

**DAVIES WARD PHILLIPS & VINEBERG LLP**

155 Wellington Street West  
Toronto ON M5V 3J7

Robin B. Schwill (LSO #384521)  
rschwill@dwpv.com

Tel: 416.863.5502

Fax: 416.863.0871

Lawyers for the Monitor  
KSV Restructuring Inc.

**TO:** The E-Service List found at:  
[https://www.ksvadvisory.com/docs/default-source/insolvency-case-documents/urbancorp-group/ccaa-proceedings/service-list/service-list-as-at-december-9-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=46b856d5\\_2](https://www.ksvadvisory.com/docs/default-source/insolvency-case-documents/urbancorp-group/ccaa-proceedings/service-list/service-list-as-at-december-9-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=46b856d5_2)

**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 TORONTO  
MANAGEMENT INC., URBANCORP (ST. CLAIR VILLAGE)  
INC., URBANCORP (PATRICIA) INC., URBANCORP  
(MALLOW) INC., URBANCORP (LAWRENCE) INC.,  
URBANCORP DOWNSVIEW PARK DEVELOPMENT INC.,  
URBANCORP (952 QUEEN WEST) INC., KING RESIDENTIAL  
INC., URBANCORP 60 ST. CLAIR INC., HIGH RES. INC.,  
BRIDGE ON KING INC. (Collectively the "Applicants") AND  
THE AFFILIATED ENTITIES LISTED IN SCHEDULE "A"  
HERETO**

---

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE MONITOR  
(DOCUMENT REQUEST)**

---

**INDEX**

<b>TAB</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>
1.	<i>Urbancorp Inc. (Re)</i> , 2016 ONSC 3288

**CITATION:** Urbancorp Inc. (Re) 2016 ONSC 3288  
**COURT FILE NO.:** CV-16-11389-00CL  
CV-16-11392-00CL  
**DATE:** 20160525

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO  
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 TORONTO  
MANAGEMENT INC., URBANCORP (ST. CLAIR VILLAGE)  
INC., URBANCORP (PATRICIA) INC., URBANCORP  
(MALLOW) INC., URBANCORP (LAWRENCE) INC.,  
URBANCORP DOWNSVIEW PARK DEVELOPMENT INC.,  
URBANCORP RESIDENTIAL INC., URBANCORP (952 QUEEN  
WEST) INC., KING RESIDENTIAL INC., URBANCORP 60 ST.  
CLAIR INC., HIGH RES. INC., BRIDGE ON KING INC.  
(Collectively the “Applicants”) AND THE AFFILIATED  
ENTITIES LISTED IN SCHEDULE “A” HERETO**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF URBANCORP INC.**

**APPLICATION OF GUY GISSIN, THE FOREIGN  
REPRESENTATIVE OF URBANCORP INC., UNDER SECTION  
46 OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENTS ACT,  
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED**

**HEARD:** May 18, 2016

**COUNSEL:** *Edmund F.B. Lamek and Rachael Belanger*, for the Applicants

*L. Joseph Latham and Tamryn Jacobson*, for Guy Gissin, the Foreign  
Representative of Urbancorp Inc.

*Robin B. Schwill and Jay Swartz*, for KSV Kofman Inc.

*Jane Dietrich*, for Mattany (Downsview) Inc.

*Scott Bomhof*, for King Liberty North Corporation

*Adam Slavens*, for Tarion Warranty Corporation

*Heather Meredith*, for Bank of Nova Scotia

*Clifton P. Prophet and Frank Lamie*, for Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce

*John Paul Ventrella*, for Atrium Mortgage Investment Mortgage

*Aubrey E. Kauffman*, for Travelers Guarantee Company of Canada

*Brian Empey*, for Parc Downsview Park Inc.

## **NEWBOULD J.**

[1] A number of Urbancorp Inc. (“UC Inc.”) subsidiaries applied on May 18, 2016 for relief under the CCAA, including relief in respect of a number of non-applicant affiliated limited partnerships which may not be insolvent.<sup>1</sup> Some of the applicants earlier filed a notice of intent to make a proposal under section 50.4(1) of the BIA. These applicants apply to continue the NOI proceedings in this CCAA proceeding.

[2] UC Inc. is not an applicant in this CCAA proceeding. However, it issued debentures which traded on the Tel Aviv Stock Exchange. The trustee of those bonds alleged default by UC Inc. and, after the NOI proceedings were started in Canada, initiated a claim for relief in the District Court of Tel Aviv-Yafo, Israel (the “Israeli Court”). Orders were made granting relief to the trustee and Mr. Guy Gissin was appointed by the Israeli Court as the functionary officer and foreign representative of UC Inc. He has brought proceedings under Part IV of the CCAA for an initial recognition order and a supplemental order recognizing orders made by the Israeli Court.

---

<sup>1</sup> Urbancorp New Kings Inc. was inadvertently included as an applicant when this proceeding was first commenced. It has been removed as an applicant as it is not an insolvent corporation.

[3] It is evident that these two competing applications, if not resolved in some consensual way, would cause great difficulty in any restructuring of the Urbancorp Group. Fortunately, due to the efforts of Mr. Gissin and KSV, the proposal trustee and now the proposed Monitor, and their counsel, an agreement in principle to co-operate on a process to realize upon the assets of the Urbancorp Group has been reached and is contained in a Co-operation Protocol signed by Mr. Gissin and KSV.

[4] At the conclusion of the hearing, I granted the Initial Order and the recognition and supplemental orders sought by Mr. Gissin as the foreign representative, including the approval of the Co-Operation Protocol, for reasons to follow. These are my reasons.

#### **Factual background**

[5] The Urbancorp Group was founded in 1991 by Alan Saskin. As is typical in the real estate development industry, the Urbancorp Group generally uses single purpose project specific corporations to engage in the development, construction and sale of residential properties in the greater Toronto area. Since 2015, the Urbancorp Group has essentially been organized into two branches – the corporations which are owned directly or indirectly by Mr. Saskin or members of his family, which includes UTMI, and the entities that, as of December 2015, became UC Inc. subsidiaries. The majority of the Urbancorp corporations that are applicants in this proceeding have been formed as single purposes entities in connection with the construction and ownership of specific development projects.

[6] The Urbancorp Group has redeveloped over 100 acres of former industrial lands in the GTA, turning them into downtown neighbourhoods. The Urbancorp Group was the first developer in the King West village area of Toronto and created the neighbourhood named “King West Village”. In the West Queen West Triangle area of Toronto, across from the Drake hotel, the Urbancorp Group developed most of the homes, over 1,600 in that neighbourhood. In partnership with Artscape, a nonprofit provider of affordable artist housing, the Urbancorp

Group developed 72 units of affordable artist housing in West Queen West. The Urbancorp Group has donated land and paid for public parks in the City of Toronto, including four public parks in the King and Queen West areas.

[7] The Urbancorp Group has built over 5500 homes. It delivered 1,028 homes in the past two years, and currently has 1,058 additional homes under construction.

[8] However, as a result of the recent lack of liquidity described in detail in the affidavit of Mr. Siskin, the applicants are insolvent and cannot meet their liabilities generally as they become due, and as a result, the operations of all of the Urbancorp applicants and related entities has been put at risk.

[9] Mr. Saskin in his affidavit states that the primary financial challenge facing the Urbancorp applicants and related entities at this time, particularly the entities that filed NOI proceedings, is their inability to raise the necessary financing to advance their major projects beyond their current stages of development. This is due to a number of events, including the recent steps by Tarion Warranty Corporation to revoke certain Tarion registration certificates, and events relating to UC Inc. and its issuance of debentures in Israel. These events and the publicity and press surrounding them have materially threatened the ability of the non-applicant UC entities to carry on business in the ordinary course.

[10] UC Inc. is an Ontario company created for the purpose of issuing debentures to the Israeli public on the Tel Aviv Stock Exchange. Prior to listing the debentures Mr. Saskin and his family members agreed to transfer into UC Inc. their interests in five corporations within the Urbancorp Group that directly or indirectly held interests in several investment properties, rental properties and geothermal assets in Toronto

[11] UC Inc. issued NIS 180,583,000 (approx. \$64 million based on the exchange rate at that time) par value of debentures which traded on the Tel Aviv Stock Exchange. The terms of the

debentures contemplate UC Inc. repaying the debentures in five unequal installments on December 31, 2017, June 30, 2018, December 31, 2018, June 30, 2019 and December 31, 2019. The exclusive jurisdiction to determine all matters related to the debentures lies with a competent court in the State of Israel and pursuant to the governing laws of Israel.

[12] On March 31, 2015, Tarion Warranty Corporation, which provides warranties on new residential builds in Ontario for registered builders, issued a notice of proposal to revoke 17 of the Urbancorp Group's registrations as a result of concerns about the Urbancorp Group's financial position and the high number of warranty claims made against two non UC Inc. entities. The Urbancorp Group has since appealed Tarion's decision for 11 of the 17 registrations, and allowed the balance to expire. No decision has been rendered in connection with the appeal as of this date.

[13] The indenture trustee of the Israeli debentures alleged that UC Inc. had defaulted under the terms of the debenture trust. On April 24, 2016, the trustee initiated court proceedings against UC Inc. in the Israeli Court. Prior to those proceedings being initiated, the Urbancorp Group's Israeli auditors, Israeli legal counsel and UC Inc.'s board of directors resigned, leaving Mr. Saskin as the sole director of UC Inc. The trustee's application was initially heard on the morning of Sunday, April 24, 2016, at which time the Vice President of the Israeli Court issued an injunction to prevent UC Inc. or Mr. Saskin from taking any further steps to deal with UC Inc.'s assets.

[14] On Monday, April 25, 2016, the Israeli Court appointed Mr. Gissin as the functionary officer of UC Inc., with full management control and powers over its subsidiaries. The authority granted to Mr. Gissin under the order included the authority to seize all of UC Inc.'s assets, to exercise UC Inc.'s power of control over its subsidiaries and to approach the Canadian court as an authorized representative of UC Inc. The orders of the Israeli Court would clearly have prevented Mr. Siskin from taking steps to cause the subsidiaries of UC Inc. to file for protection

under the CCAA and would have permitted Mr. Gissin to take steps to prevent the applicants from doing so.

[15] On May 4, 2016, Mr. Gissin and his counsel met with KSV and its counsel, the result of which was an agreement in principle to co-operate on a process to realize upon the assets of the Urbancorp Group through a CCAA process, with KSV having augmented powers to control management and operations of the Urbancorp Group entities which would be filing, effectively removing Saskin as a decision-maker for those companies, all as set forth in a Co-operation Protocol finalized on May 13, 2016.

[16] On May 13, 2016, each of the Urbancorp CCAA applicants and related entities, as borrowers, and UC King South, as lender, entered into an intercompany interim credit facility term sheet whereby UC King South agreed to make available to the Urbancorp entities that had filed a NOI proceeding a revolving credit facility in the amount of \$1.9 million to finance their day-to-day operations and ongoing projects. UC King South is not an applicant in this proceeding. All proceeds of the interim loan continue to be held by KSV in its trust account. Based upon the anticipated cash flow needs of the Urbancorp CCAA applicants and related entities during these restructuring proceedings, including professional fees associated with these proceedings, it is likely that the \$1.9 million may not be sufficient to see the restructuring through to its completion. As a result, the applicants intend to commence a process to secure third party debtor-in-possession financing in the near term.

## **Issues and analysis**

### **(1) Recognition of Foreign Proceeding**

[17] Section 46(1) of the CCAA provides for the application by a foreign representative to recognize a foreign proceeding. Pursuant to section 47(1) of the CCAA, the court shall make an



order recognizing the foreign proceeding if (i) the proceeding is a foreign proceeding and (ii) the applicant is a foreign representative of that proceeding.

[18] A foreign proceeding is broadly defined in section 47(1) to mean a judicial or an administrative proceeding in a jurisdiction outside Canada dealing with creditor's collective interests generally under any law relating to bankruptcy or insolvency in which a debtor's property and affairs are subject to control or supervision by a foreign court for the purpose of reorganization or liquidation.

[19] It is clear in this case that the proceeding in the Israeli Court is a foreign proceeding within the meaning of the CCAA. It is a judicial proceeding brought under Israel's regulations relating to requests for compromise or arrangements, and the relief granted by the Israeli Court, including the appointment of a functionary officer, was for the purpose of enhancing creditors' collective interests.

[20] Section 45(1) of the CCAA defines a foreign representative as a person or body who is authorized in a foreign proceeding in respect of a debtor company to (a) administer the debtor's property or affairs for the purpose of reorganization or liquidation or (b) act as a representative in respect of the foreign proceeding.

[21] It is also the case that the Mr. Gissin is a foreign representative in respect of the foreign proceeding. He was appointed to monitor UCI's business and financial affairs and to act as a representative in respect of the foreign proceeding. He was provided with the express authority to seize all of UC Inc.'s assets, to exercise UC Inc.'s power of control of its subsidiaries and to approach the Canadian court as an authorized representative of UC Inc.

[22] Thus the foreign proceeding in the Israeli Court is to be recognized as a foreign proceeding under section 47(1) of the CCAA.

[23] Section 47(2) requires a finding as to whether the foreign proceeding is a foreign main proceeding or a foreign non-main proceeding. If the foreign proceeding is recognized as a main proceeding, there is an automatic stay provided in section 48(1) of the CCAA against law suits concerning the debtor's property, debts, liabilities or obligations and prohibitions against selling or disposing of property in Canada. If the foreign proceeding is recognized as a non-main proceeding, there is no such automatic stay and prohibition and it is necessary for an application to be made under section 49(1) to obtain such relief. For that reason, it is advantageous for a foreign representative to seek an order recognizing the foreign proceeding as a main proceeding. Mr. Gissin in this case has made such a request.

[24] A foreign main proceeding is defined in section 45(1) as a foreign proceeding in a jurisdiction where the debtor company has the centre of its main interests (COMI). Section 45(2) provides that in the absence of proof to the contrary, a debtor company's registered office is deemed to be the centre of its main interests.

[25] In this case, UC Inc.'s registered office is in Ontario. Pursuant to the Co-operation Protocol Mr. Gissin as the foreign representative has applied to have the Israeli Court proceeding recognized as a foreign main proceeding.

[26] The Co-operation Protocol sets out in some detail an agreement to work cooperatively to maximize recoveries through an orderly process for the stakeholders of UC Inc. and the applicants. Without such an agreement, there would no doubt have been contentious proceedings between the two spheres, being the Israeli sphere and the Canadian sphere. That has been avoided. The Co-operation Protocol provides that Mr. Gissin will apply under Part IV of the CCAA to be recognized as the foreign representative of a foreign main proceeding. The applicants in the CCAA proceedings will propose that the Monitor have augmented powers to control the ordinary course management and receipt and disbursements of funds for the applicants and acknowledge that Mr. Gissin shall have standing in these proceedings to represent UC Inc. The Monitor and Mr. Gissin shall attempt to agree on the restructuring or sale process

but if they cannot agree the decision will be made by this Court on the application of the Monitor. It is agreed that so long as the Monitor acts in good faith and has not engaged in wilful conduct or gross negligence, Mr. Gissin will not take any steps to remove KSV as the Monitor or to suggest that KSV must take instruction from Mr. Gissin or the Israeli Court.

[27] Thus the parties have agreed that while the Israeli proceeding will be considered to be a foreign main proceeding, Mr. Gissin as the foreign representative has agreed that his sole control of UC Inc. and its assets that was granted to him by the Israeli Court will to a large extent be exercised by the Monitor acting under the CCAA so long as the Monitor acts in good faith collaboratively with Mr. Gissin in accordance with the Co-operation Protocol. This is a very unusual situation in that as a practical matter it is not intended that orders will be made in the future in the foreign main proceeding directing the restructuring of UC Inc. and its subsidiaries with recognition orders being sought in Canada to have such orders carried out in Canada.

[28] It is not clear that the COMI of UC Inc. is in Israeli. The proceedings started in Israel because the Prospectus and the Deed of Trust made clear that Israeli courts were to have exclusive jurisdiction to deal with matters related to UC Inc., and that insolvency proceedings regarding UC Inc. could only be brought in the State of Israel.

[29] I am reluctant however to upset the balance that has been struck in this case by the Co-operation Protocol. Mr. Gissin in his affidavit has emphasized the importance of the proceedings to the stakeholders of UC Inc. in Israel and the importance of the different legal regimes working together. He has stated:

32. This matter is one of incredible significance to stakeholders in the State of Israel, including the real estate capital markets in general. To date, to the best of my knowledge, a total of 17 North American real estate companies have issued over NIS 11 billion of bonds in Israel. UCI [UC Inc.] was the first such North American company to have gone into insolvency proceedings, and that within four months from the issuance of the Debentures. Given the size of this industry in Israel, this case is being watched very carefully to see how the different legal

regimes can work together. I am hopeful that the co-operation evidenced to date in this matter, and in particular through the Co-Operation Protocol, can be continued for the benefit of all affected stakeholders.

[30] In this case, so long as the Co-operation Protocol exists, it may not be of much importance in Canada whether the foreign proceeding is a foreign main proceeding, as Mr. Gissin would be entitled as a matter of discretion under a foreign non-main proceeding to a granting of a stay of proceedings against UC Inc. and to an order prohibiting a sale of its property in Canada without leave of the Court. It probably is of more importance in Israel in insuring that if the co-operation between the foreign representative and the Monitor no longer exists and the Monitor acts in bad faith or engages in wilful conduct or gross negligence, the foreign representative will have the ability to go back to the Israeli Court as the court in a foreign main proceeding to seek appropriate relief that could then be sought to be recognized in Canada.

[31] The applicants, the Monitor and the foreign representative are all in agreement that an order be sought declaring the Israeli proceedings as the foreign main proceedings and no one appearing is opposing the order sought. In these unusual circumstances I am prepared to make an order that the proceeding in Israel is a foreign main proceeding. It follows that the initial recognition order is to provide a stay of any proceedings against UC Inc. and prohibit UC Inc. from selling or disposing of property in Canada without leave of the Court.

[32] It would be expected that if the Israeli Court in the future changed Mr. Gissin's mandate to increase or decrease his authorities or functions or provide any additional mandate in respect of UC Inc., such orders would be brought to the attention of this Court and any application made in connection with them would be made in these Part IV proceedings.

[33] It is also appropriate that a supplemental order be made (i) recognizing the decision made in the foreign proceeding by the Israeli Court, (ii) appointing KSV as the information officer, (iii) approving the Co-operation Protocol, (iv) staying any proceedings against or in respect of Mr. Gissin as foreign representative of UC Inc., (v) granting an administration charge of

\$400,000 for the costs of the foreign representative, its legal and financial advisors and of the information officer and its counsel and (vi) approval of the funding of the costs of the foreign representative, its legal and financial advisors and of the information officer and its counsel to be covered by the interim funding charge.

[34] With respect to the administration charge, there are no secured creditors of UC Inc. The principal creditors are the Israeli bondholders under the debentures. The foreign representative and the information officer are important to the process and the quantum of the charge is reasonable.

[35] With respect to the interim financing and the charge for it, KSV presently has the amount of CAD \$1,900,000 in a trust account, which funds KSV received from UC KING SOUTH, and which funds KSV proposes to utilize as a form of interim funding for certain costs in connection with the CCAA proceedings. It is appropriate for this charge to also cover the professional fees and other reasonable costs incurred by the foreign representative in the CCAA proceedings and of the Information Officer and its counsel.

**(2) Continuation under the CCAA**

[36] Section 11.6(a) provides:

11.6 Notwithstanding the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act,

(a) proceedings commenced under Part III of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act may be taken up and continued under this Act only if a proposal within the meaning of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act has not been filed under that Part;

[37] None of the Urbancorp entities that filed a notice of intention under Subsection 50.4(1) of the BIA has filed a proposal.

[38] In *Clothing for Modern Times (Re)*, 2011 ONSC 7522, Brown J. (as he then was) expressed the view that on a motion to continue under the CCAA an applicant company should place before the court evidence that the proposed continuation would be consistent with the purposes of the CCAA. Morawetz J. (as he then was) referred to and adopted the same point of view in *Comstock Canada Ltd. (Re)* (2013), 4 C.B.R. (6th) 47. I take this to be a reflection of the fact that an initial order should be made in a CCAA proceeding only if the purpose of the application is consistent with the purposes of the CCAA.

[39] In my view, the proposed continuation of the NOI proceedings as a CCAA proceeding is in accordance and consistent with the purposes of the CCAA. The purpose here is to attempt a restructuring of the Urbancorp business which is the subject of this application, including those entities which had filed NOI proceedings and other highly interconnected entities. It is under the CCAA and the jurisprudence that has developed that permits protection being provided both to the applicant companies and its related limited partnership entities that may not be insolvent. The continuation also assists in the co-operative proceeding with Mr. Gissin as the foreign representative of UC Inc. who is being recognized under Part IV of the CCAA.

[40] I am satisfied that the NOI proceedings commenced under the BIA should be taken up and continued under the CCAA.

### **(3) Protection under the CCAA**

[41] The applicants and their related entities have total claims against them in excess of \$5 million.

[42] I am satisfied that the applicants meet the *Stelco* test of insolvency enunciated by Justice Farley in *Re Stelco Inc.* (2004), 48 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. S.C.J.); leave to appeal to C.A. refused, [2004] O.J. No. 1903; leave to appeal to SCC refused, [2004] S.C.C.A. No. 336. The applicants are currently unable or will imminently be unable to meet such claims generally as

they become due. The primary financial challenge facing the Urbancorp applicants and their related entities is their inability to raise the necessary financing to advance their major projects beyond their current stages of development. This is due to a number of events, including the recent steps by Tarion to revoke certain Tarion registration certificates, and events relating to UC Inc. and the Israeli debentures. These events and the publicity and press surrounding them have materially threatened the ability of the non-applicant Urbancorp entities to carry on business in the ordinary course.

[43] A CCAA court may exercise its jurisdiction to extend protection by way of the stay of proceedings to a partnership related to an applicant where it is just and reasonable or just and convenient to do so. The courts have held that this relief is appropriate where the operations of a debtor company are so intertwined with those of a partner or limited partnership in question that not extending the stay would significantly impair the effectiveness of a stay in respect of the debtor company. See *Re Prizm Income Fund* (2011), 75 C.B.R. (5th) 213 per Morawetz J. The stay is not granted under section 11 of the CCAA but rather under the court's inherent jurisdiction. It has its genesis in *Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 and has been followed in several cases, including *Re Canwest Publishing Inc.* (2010) 63 C.B.R. (5th) 115, *Re Calpine Energy Canada Ltd.* (2006), 19 C.B.R. (5th) 187 and *4519922 Canada Inc. (Re)* (2015), 22 C.B.R. (6th) 44.

[44] I am satisfied that the stay of proceedings provided for in the Initial Order should extend to the related limited partnerships. Each is significantly interrelated to the business of the insolvent applicants as they and their stakeholders, assets (in many cases beneficial ownership of the assets of applicants), and intercompany payables and receivables in particular, form an integral part of the operations of the Urbancorp Group. Although they are not currently technically insolvent, the evidence is that it was reasonably expected at the time of filing that, without the benefit of a stay of proceedings, they will run out of liquidity before the time that would reasonably be required to implement a restructuring.

[45] The applicants seek an interim lender's charge to secure the interim funding from UC King South. It is to be secured against those Urbancorp entities that utilize any of the funds. The applicants also seek the authority for the Monitor to utilize an aggregate of up to \$1 million of cash which exists within the Urbancorp CCAA entities, to fund the cash flow requirements of other Urbancorp CCAA affiliates on an intercompany basis during these proceedings, secured by an intercompany lender's charge over the borrower entity's assets, properties and undertakings in favour of the lender entity, to rank *pari passu* with the interim lender's charge.

[46] I am satisfied after a consideration of the factors set out in section 11.2(4) of the CCAA that these charges should be granted. The charges will be subordinate to existing secured creditors and lienholders and will not secure any pre-filing obligations<sup>2</sup>. The money is clearly needed for the restructuring process and the charges are supported by the proposed Monitor who will have enhanced powers to operate the business during the restructuring with the authority to approve the advances.

[47] Other charges normal in CCAA cases are proposed. They are a director's and officer's charge in the amount of \$300,000 for the sole remaining director of the applicants after Mr. Siskin's retirement as a director and an administrative charge in the amount of \$750,000. These charges are reasonable and supported by the proposed Monitor. They are approved.

[48] At the conclusion of the hearing on May 18, 2016 I signed the Initial Order in the applicants' CCAA application and the Initial Order and supplemental orders on the application of Mr. Gissin under Part IV of the CCAA.

---

<sup>2</sup> An exception to the subordination to secured creditors is the Reznick Trust under the Israeli debenture which is to be subordinate to the Charges. Apparently there is still some issue because of the lack of time to deal with it as to what security if any there is to support the Reznick Trust. It may be that some future motion may be necessary to deal with this subordination exception.



---

Newbould J.

**Released:** May 25, 2016

**CITATION:** Urbancorp Inc. (Re) 2016 ONSC 3288  
**COURT FILE NO.:** CV-16-11389-00CL  
CV-16-11392-00CL  
**DATE:** 20160525

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE-ONTARIO  
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 TORONTO MANAGEMENT INC.,  
URBANCORP (ST. CLAIR VILLAGE) INC.,  
URBANCORP (PATRICIA) INC., URBANCORP  
(MALLOW) INC., URBANCORP (LAWRENCE)  
INC., URBANCORP DOWNSVIEW PARK  
DEVELOPMENT INC., URBANCORP  
RESIDENTIAL INC., URBANCORP (952 QUEEN  
WEST) INC., KING RESIDENTIAL INC.,  
URBANCORP 60 ST. CLAIR INC., HIGH RES.  
INC., BRIDGE ON KING INC. (Collectively the  
“Applicants”) AND THE AFFILIATED  
ENTITIES LISTED IN SCHEDULE “A” HERETO**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF URBANCORP INC.**

**APPLICATION OF GUY GISSIN, THE FOREIGN  
REPRESENTATIVE OF URBANCORP INC.,  
UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE *COMPANIES’  
CREDITORS ARRANGEMENTS ACT*, R.S.C. 1985,  
c. C-36, AS AMENDED**

---

**REASONS FOR JUDGMENT**

---

NEWBOULD J.

**Released:** May 25, 2016

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

Court File No: CV-16-11389-00CL

**AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT  
OF URBANCORP TORONTO MANAGEMENT INC., ET AL.**

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

PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT  
TORONTO

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE MONITOR  
(DOCUMENT REQUEST)**

**DAVIES WARD PHILLIPS & VINEBERG LLP**

155 Wellington Street West  
Toronto ON M5V 3J7

Robin B. Schwill (LSO #384521)  
rschwill@dwpv.com

Tel: 416.863.5502

Fax: 416.863.0871

Lawyers for the Monitor  
KSV Restructuring Inc.