

**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**

FACTUM OF THE URBANCORP CCAA ENTITIES

DLA PIPER (CANADA) LLP
333 Bay Street, Suite 5100
Bay Adelaide Centre West Tower
Toronto, ON M5H 2R2

Edmond Lamek (LSO #33338U)
Tel: (416) 365-3444
Email: edmond.lamek@dlapiper.com

Lawyers for the Urbancorp CCAA Entities

PART I – OVERVIEW

1. Pursuant to the Order of the Honourable Justice Newbould dated May 18, 2016 (the “**Initial Order**”), the Applicants, along with certain affiliated entities (together, the “**Urbancorp CCAA Entities**”), were granted creditor protection pursuant to the *Companies Creditors’ Arrangement Act* (“**CCAA**”) and KSV Kofman Inc.¹ was appointed as Monitor of the Urbancorp CCAA Entities (the “**Monitor**”).
2. The Initial Order granted a stay of proceedings in favour of the Urbancorp CCAA Entities until and including June 17, 2016 or such later date as the Court may order (the “**Stay Period**”). The Stay Period was most recently extended on January 27, 2025 pursuant to the Order of the Honourable Chief Justice Morawetz until and including August 29, 2025.
3. The Urbancorp CCAA Entities seek an extension of the Stay Period until and including February 27, 2026. The Urbancorp CCAA Entities submit that the requested extension of the Stay Period should be granted as they have been acting in good faith and with due diligence in the conduct of the within CCAA proceeding.
4. The requested stay extension is appropriate and consistent with the objectives of the CCAA and will assist the Monitor as it continues to address the sole substantive matter outstanding in these CCAA proceedings, being the resolution of all outstanding tax matters and distributions, before any final distributions can be made and the CCAA proceedings terminated. The requested extension of the Stay Period is necessary in the circumstances and is supported by the Monitor.

PART II - FACTS

5. Given that the facts relevant to the request for the extension of the Stay Period are those more recent facts arising since the date of the aforementioned Order of January 27, 2025, a more fulsome description of the background facts in respect of the Urbancorp CCAA Entities and these CCAA proceedings can be found in the Monitor’s reports to the Court, including the Sixtieth and Sixty-First Reports of the Monitor which are attached (without Appendices) as Appendices C and B, respectively, to the Sixty-Second Report of the Monitor dated August 19, 2025 (the “**Sixty-Second Report**”).
6. The wind-down of the Geothermal Asset Owners and the resultant tax issues, and the distribution of tax refunds and payment of any taxes owing, remain the last substantive and

¹ Effective August 31, 2020, KSV Kofman Inc. changed its name to KSV Restructuring Inc.

material matter to be addressed in these CCAA proceedings. The Monitor is also working to dispose of 10 parking spots and 125 bicycle storage units owned by the Cumberland CCAA Entities, which have received little to no market interest.

7. With the exception of one company, the Geothermal Asset Owners are solvent and all residual funds, net of professional fees, can be distributed to Urbancorp Inc. (“UCI”) primarily by way of intercorporate dividend. Prior to distributing those funds, the Monitor must receive clearance certificates from Canada Revenue Agency (“CRA”) confirming that the geothermal asset owners are not indebted to CRA on account of taxes or HST.²
8. As part of the process of obtaining clearance certificates, the Monitor continues to deal with CRA and the tax returns for all of the Geothermal Asset Owners. Following the Court ordered payment of rent by Vestaco Homes to UMI, the Monitor filed an amended 2020 T2 tax return for Vestco Homes which resulted in a tax refund of approximately \$668,000 inclusive of interest being collected in July, 2025. The amended return also reflected approximately \$1,145,000 of refundable dividend tax on hand which will be recovered upon Vestaco Homes distributing approximately \$3 million in dividends, of which \$2 million was paid in 2021 and the remaining \$1 million will happen upon the dissolution of Vestaco Homes.³
9. MNP LLP (“MNP”) filed the 2024 tax returns for the Geothermal Asset Owners and Urbancorp Cumberland 1 LP, all of which are essentially nil returns. The Monitor and MNP are working with MNP in respect of certain tax elections relating to the forgiveness of intercompany obligations owing between Vestaco Investments and 228, which will allow clearance certificates to be applied for those entities for the 2024 tax year.
10. However, the timeline for obtaining the clearance certificates is not within the control of the Monitor and, thus, while the Monitor is moving the matter forward as expeditiously as possible, there is no date certain by which the clearance certificates will be obtained.⁴
11. The length of the stay extension sought by the Urbancorp CCAA Entities reflects the uncertainty regarding the timing of the receipt of the clearance certificates but should the certificates be obtained prior to the expiry of the Stay Period, the Monitor will return to Court to seek orders to distribute the remaining funds, obtain its discharge and terminate the CCAA proceedings.

² Sixty- Second Report to Court of the Monitor, at p. 2.

³ *Ibid*, at p. 5.

⁴ *Ibid*, at pg. 6.

PART III - ISSUES

12. The issues before the Court are (i) whether the requested stay extension to February 27, 2026 should be granted; and (ii) whether the professional fee and Sixty-Second Report approvals should be granted.

PART IV - LAW AND ARGUMENT

A. Extension of the Stay Period

13. Section 11.02(2) of the CCAA provides that, on an application other than an initial application, the Court may make a stay order for any period that the Court considers necessary if the applicant satisfies the Court that (a) the circumstances exist that make the order appropriate, and (b) the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.⁵
14. As such, provided that the two aforementioned conditions are met, the Court has the discretion to grant an extension of the stay of proceedings in whatever duration the Court considers necessary and appropriate given the circumstances.
15. Other factors that the Court will consider in granting a stay extension include the debtor's progress during the previous stay period toward a restructuring, whether creditors will be prejudiced if the Court grants the extension and the comparative prejudice to the debtor, creditors and other stakeholders if the extension is not granted.⁶
16. The question of good faith relates to the conduct of the debtor during the CCAA proceeding.⁷ In the instant case, the Urbancorp CCAA Entities have acted in good faith throughout this CCAA proceeding and continue to do so and there has been no assertion by any party to the contrary.
17. The Urbancorp CCAA Entities have also acted with and continue to act with due diligence. During the course of the most recent Stay Period, the Monitor has continued to move forward on the sole substantive issue that remains to be addressed, obtaining clearance certificates for the Geothermal Asset Owners. As noted above, only once the clearance certificates are obtained can the net residual funds held by the Monitor be distributed. The Monitor has

⁵ CCAA, s. 11.02(3).

⁶ *Federal Gypsum Co. (Re)*, 2007 NSSC 347 at paras. 24-29.

⁷ *Muscletech Research & Development Inc. (Re)*, 2006 CanLII 3282 (Ont.S.C.J. [Comm. List]) at para. 4.

worked with its legal counsel and MNP on the various tax returns and amended tax returns that needed to be filed. Although the Monitor has no control over the timing to obtain the clearance certificates, it has acted and continues to act with due diligence to move the matter forward.

18. Lastly, in addition to the substantial progress that was made during the course of the last Stay Period, no creditor will be prejudiced if the requested extension of the Stay Period is granted and no party has voiced any opposition to the requested extension.

B. Fee and Report Approvals

19. As set out in *Nordstrom Canada Retail, Inc.*, the overarching test for assessing the fees and disbursements of the Monitor and its counsel is whether they are fair and reasonable in all of the circumstances and requires an overall assessment and consideration of the work done and the results achieved. In conducting that overall assessment and determining what is fair and reasonable, the predominant consideration for the Court should be the value provided.⁸
20. The Court shall consider the following factors in assessing the fees and disbursements: (i) the nature, extent and value of the assets being handled; (ii) the time spent and the complications and difficulties encountered; (iii) the Monitor’s knowledge, experience and skill; (iv) the diligence and thoroughness displayed by the Monitor; (v) the responsibilities the Monitor assumed; and (vi) the results of the Monitor’s efforts.⁹
21. The fees and disbursements of the Monitor and its counsel, Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg LLP (“**Davies**”), as well as those of counsel to the Urbancorp CCAA Entities, DLA Piper (Canada) LLP (“**DLA**”), for the period January 1, 2025 to July 31, 2025, are set out in the fee affidavits of Noah Goldstein, Robin Schwill and Edmond Lamek, respectively (together, the “**Fee Affidavits**”), attached as appendices to the Sixty Second Report.
22. The Sixty-Second Report details the efforts undertaken by the Monitor and Davies during the period of the most recent Stay Extension to advance the sole remaining substantive matter in the CCAA proceeding. In the instant case, the work done has been appropriately and conducted in a timely and diligent manner by all parties and the fees and disbursements of the Monitor, Davies and DLA are both fair and reasonable in all of the circumstances.

⁸ *Nordstrom Canada Retail, Inc.*, 2023 ONSC 4199 (Ont. S.C.J. [Comm. List]) at para. 24.

⁹ *Ibid.*

23. With respect to the Urbancorp CCAA Entities' request for approval of the Sixty-Second Report and the Monitor's activities described therein, the Court in *Target Canada Co. (Re)* noted that there are both policy and practical reasons for the approval of the Monitor's activities, including, among others, allowing the Monitor to move forward with the next steps in the CCAA proceeding, bringing the Monitor's activities before the Court, allowing an opportunity for the concerns of stakeholders to be addressed and any problems rectified, enabling the Court to satisfy itself that the Monitor's activities have been conducted in a prudent and diligent manner and providing the Monitor with protection not otherwise provided by the CCAA.¹⁰
24. The Court's approval of the Sixty-Second Report and the Monitor's activities fulfills the policy and practical purposes set out in the preceding paragraph and the other salutary effects noted by the Court in *Target*.
25. Finally, there has been no adverse comment about the fees and disbursements detailed in the Fee Affidavits nor the Sixty-Second Report and the Monitor's activities described therein.

PART V - CONCLUSION

26. For the reasons set forth herein, the Urbancorp CCAA Entities request that the Order extending the Stay Period until and including February 27, 2026 be granted, the fees and disbursements of the Monitor, Davies and DLA be approved and the Sixtieth Report and the Monitor's activities detailed therein be approved, substantially in the form of the draft Order attached as Tab 3 to the Urbancorp CCAA Entities' Motion Record.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 20th day of August, 2025.



DLA PIPER (CANADA) LLP

Lawyers for the Urbancorp CCAA Entities

¹⁰ *Target Canada Co. (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 7574 (Ont S.C.J. [Comm. List]) at para. 23.

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 DOWNS VIEW PARK DEVELOPMENT INC., URBANCORP (952 QUEEN WEST) INC., KING RESIDENTIAL INC., URBANCORP 60 ST. CLAIR INC., HIGH RES. INC., BRIDGE ON KING INC. (THE "APPLICANTS") AND THE AFFILIATED ENTITIES LISTED IN SCHEDULE "A" HERETO

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)
PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT TORONTO

FACTUM OF THE URBANCORP CCAA ENTITIES

DLA PIPER (CANADA) LLP
333 Bay Street, Suite 5100
Bay Adelaide Centre - West Tower
Toronto, ON M5H 2R2

Edmond F.B. Lamek (LSO #33338U)
Tel.: (416) 365-4444
Fax: (416) 369-7945
Email: edmond.lamек@dlapiper.com

Lawyers for the Urbancorp CCAA Entities