

This is the 3rd Affidavit of Suzanne Volkow in this case and was made on May 30, 2025

No. S-243389 Vancouver Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

IN BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY

IN THE MATTER OF THE RECEIVERSHIP OF ECOASIS DEVELOPMENTS LLP AND OTHERS

BETWEEN:

SANOVEST HOLDINGS LTD.

PETITIONER

AND:

ECOASIS DEVELOPMENTS LLP, ECOASIS BEAR MOUNTAIN DEVELOPMENTS LTD., ECOASIS RESORT AND GOLF LLP, 0884185 B.C. LTD., 0884188 B.C. LTD., 0884190 B.C. LTD., 0884194 B.C. LTD., BM 81/82 LANDS LTD., BM 83 LANDS LTD., BM 84 LANDS LTD., BM CAPELLA LANDS LTD., BM HIGHLANDS GOLF COURSE LTD., BM HIGHLANDS LANDS LTD., BM MOUNTAIN GOLF COURSE LTD., and BEAR MOUNTAIN ADVENTURES LTD.

RESPONDENTS

AFFIDAVIT

I, Suzanne Volkow, of 2900 – 550 Burrard Street, Vancouver, British Columbia, SWEAR THAT:

- 1. I am a paralegal in the law firm Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP, solicitors for the Petitioner, Sanovest Holdings Ltd. ("Sanovest"), and as such have personal knowledge of the facts hereinafter deposed to except where stated to be on information and belief, in which case I verily believe them to be true.
- 2. Attached hereto as **Exhibit "A"** is a copy of the transcript taken of the proceedings in the Supreme Court of British Columbia in Bankruptcy and Insolvency on September 10 to 12, 2024,

in respect of the hearing of the initial application brought by Sanovest seeking the appointment of a receiver and manager over certain of the assets, undertakings, and property of the Respondents.

3. Attached hereto as **Exhibit "B"** is a copy of email correspondence between counsel to 599315 B.C. Ltd. and Daniel Matthews and counsel to Sanovest, dated May 21, 2025 to May 27, 2025.

SWORN, BEFORE ME at Vancouver, British Columbia, on May 30, 2025

A Commissioner for taking Affidavits for

British Golymbia

SUŽANNE VOLKOV

KIBBEN JACKSON
Barrister & Solicitor
Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP
2900 - 550 Burrard Street
Vancouver, BC V6C 0A3

604 631 4786

This is Exhibit "A"

Referred to in the Affidavit of

SUZANNE VOLKOW

Sworn before me this 30 day of

May, 2025

A Commissioner for taking Affidavits in British Columbia

No. S234048 Vancouver Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA (BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE WALKER)

Vancouver, BC September 10, 2024

BETWEEN:

599315 B.C. Ltd. and Daniel Matthews

Petitioners

AND:

Ecoasis Bear Mountain Developments Ltd., Ecoasis Developments LLP, and Ecoasis Resort and Golf LLP, Tian Kusumoto, and Sanovest Holdings Ltd.

Respondents

* * * * *

No. S243389 Vancouver Registry

IN BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY

IN THE MATTER OF THE RECEIVERSHIP OF ECOASIS
DEVELOPMENTS LLP AND OTHERS

BETWEEN:

Sanovest Holdings Ltd.

Petitioners

AND:

Ecoasis Developments LLP,
Ecoasis Bear Mountain Developments Ltd.,
Ecoasis Resort and golf LLP, 0884185 B.C. Ltd.,
0884188 B.C. Ltd., 0884190 B.C. Ltd., 0884194 B.C. Ltd.,
BM 81/82 Lands Ltd., BM 83 Lands Ltd., BM 84 Lands Ltd.,
BM Capella Lands Ltd., BM Highlands Golf Course Ltd.,
BM Highlands Lands Ltd., BM Mountain Golf Course Ltd.,
and Bear Mountain Adventures Ltd.

Respondents

EXCERPT FROM PROCEEDINGS IN CHAMBERS (Proceedings from 10:11 AM to 2:06 PM)

COPY

APPEARANCES

Counsel for Sanovest Holdings: A.I. Nathanson, KC

A.I. Nathanson, KC D. Byma K. Jackson L. Hiebert

Counsel for 599315 B.C. Ltd.: C.A.B. Ferris, KC

C.A.B. Ferris, KC G. Brandt W.L. Roberts C. Ohama-Darcus

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXCERPT FROM PROCEEDINGS IN CHAMBERS SEPTEMBER 10, 2024 (Proceedings from 10:11 AM to 10:11 AM)

PROCEEDINGS

Witness	Proceedings	Page
	Discussion re housekeeping matters	1
	Discussion re preliminary matters	2
	Summation by the court	4
	Submissions re sealing order by Cnsl L. Hiebert	8
	Order re affidavits	11
	Discussion re housekeeping matters	12
	Submissions re sealing order by Cnsl G. Brandt	14
	Order re sealing of affidavits	19
	Submissions re receivership order by Cnsl K. Jackson	20
	Discussion re housekeeping matters	40
	Submissions re receivership order by Cnsl K. Jackson (continued)	40
	Reporter certification	68

EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description	Page
	Description	

No exhibits marked.

RULINGS, REASONS, ORDERS

Description	Page
Order re affidavits	11
Order re sealing of affidavits	19

1 Discussion re housekeeping matters

```
September 10, 2024
 1
 2
                                         Vancouver, BC
 3
 4
                  (EXCERPT FROM PROCEEDINGS)
 5
                  (PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED) ([10:11:10 AM])
 7
 8
       DISCUSSION RE HOUSEKEEPING MATTERS:
 9
10
       THE CLERK: In the matter of 599215 and BC Limited
11
            versus Ecoasis Bear Mountain Developments in
12
            action 234048 and Sanovest Holdings Limited versus
13
            Ecoasis Developments LLP in action 243389,
            Justice.
14
15
       THE COURT: All right.
                              Mr. Nathanson.
16
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Good morning.
17
                 Introductions. So together with me is
18
            Mr. Jackson --
19
       THE COURT: Mr. Jackson.
20
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          -- Ms. Hiebert --
21
       THE COURT:
                   All right.
22
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- and Mr. Byma.
23
       THE COURT: Mr. Byma.
24
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: And in action 048, we act for Tian
25
            Kusumoto and Sanovest Holdings. And in the second
26
            proceeding, the insolvency proceedings, 389, we
27
            act for the petitioner, Sanovest Holdings.
       THE COURT: Thank you. CNSL A. NATHANSON: Thank you.
28
29
30
       THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ferris?
31
       CNSL C. FERRIS: Thank you, Justice. With me is -- is
32
            Mr. Brandt, initial G --
33
       THE COURT: Mr. Brandt.
       CNSL C. FERRIS: -- Ohama-Darcus in the
34
35
            [indiscernible], and, at the back --
36
       THE COURT:
                  Mr. Roberts.
37
       CNSL C. FERRIS: -- Mr. Roberts.
                                          We act for
38
            Mr. Matthews and his numbered company --
       THE COURT: All right.
39
40
       CNSL C. FERRIS: -- 591 [sic] and in both proceedings.
41
       THE COURT: I see a number of people in the courtroom.
42
            Is everyone -- are there enough tables for
            everyone, or do I need to get another table put in
43
44
            here somewhere?
45
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: We're fine on the side of Ecoasis.
46
       CNSL C. FERRIS: So are we.
47
       THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
```

2 Discussion re preliminary matters

```
2
       DISCUSSION RE PRELIMINARY MATTERS:
 3
 4
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            Justice Walker, just a few
 5
            preliminary matters -- I've spoken to my friend
            Mr. Ferris about this -- just to enumerate them
 7
            and then go through them very quickly so we can
 8
            get on to the main event.
 9
                 So there are orders by consent for the use of
10
            evidence in one proceeding and the other --
11
                 Sorry, yes. Mr. Ferris asks and I would like
12
            to know as well who would be attending remotely.
13
                   Okay. I think there may be someone from
       THE COURT:
14
            the media attending, but let's just -- and, clerk,
15
            do you know who's online?
                   I do, Justice.
16
       THE CLERK:
17
       THE COURT:
                   How many people are -- are attending
18
            remotely?
19
       THE CLERK:
                   They are attending remotely.
20
       THE COURT:
                   How many people? How many -- how many
21
            people?
22
       THE CLERK:
                   Three.
23
       THE COURT:
                   Three?
24
       THE CLERK:
                   Yeah.
25
       THE COURT:
                   Do you need --
26
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            Sorry, may I have just a moment?
27
       THE COURT:
                   Yes, of course.
28
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Just [indiscernible]. Is it -- is
29
            it -- I don't know if we could find out whether
30
            it's just other counsel who are interested or
31
            whether it's members of the public.
32
       THE COURT:
                  I can ask.
33
                 Those who are attending remotely, is anyone
34
            counsel?
35
                 You are -- no? I knew -- I was told that one
36
            member of the media may be -- may be signing in.
37
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           That's fine, Justice.
38
            I appreciate that.
39
                 So -- so that -- that -- preliminary matters
40
            are use of evidence orders, which are by consent
41
            at the moment.
42
       THE COURT: All right.
43
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: There are applications by both
44
            sides for sealing orders, which I don't expect
45
            will be contentious as amongst counsel.
46
            Ms. Hiebert and Mr. Brandt will deal with that.
47
       THE COURT: Okay.
```

3
Discussion re preliminary matters

```
There is a case plan conference
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
 2
            that has been --
 3
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
                           -- sat --
 4
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
 5
       THE COURT:
                   I saw that.
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- before you this afternoon --
 7
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
 8
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- at 3:00 PM.
                                           I think our counsel
 9
            here would prefer to do it at 3:30. We think that
10
            there won't be a lot of substance to it.
11
                 And our plan is to let Mr. Peterson, who is
12
            counsel for Tom Kusumoto in one of the
13
            proceedings, know that.
14
       THE COURT:
                  Mr. Peterson's in Victoria?
15
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Yes, and I don't know what his
16
            arrangements were, whether he's coming in person
17
            or whether he --
18
                   Will you reach out to him?
       THE COURT:
19
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: We will.
20
       THE COURT: But if he wants to attend it by Teams, he
21
            certainly can.
                           Thank you. And we'll -- we'll let
22
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
23
            him know. Mr. Byma will deal with that.
24
                 And then the last point, which I'll tell you
25
            now, is -- I'll just tell you we've agreed on how
26
            to deal with the two applications. And so
27
            counsel's plan, subject to your direction, is as
28
            follows.
29
                 After these preliminary matters, Mr. Jackson
30
            will make the application for the appointment of
31
            the receiver in the insolvency proceeding.
32
            friends will then combine their response to that
33
            motion with their application for interim relief
34
            under the oppression remedy.
35
       THE COURT: And respond to the receivership.
36
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          And -- and respond to the
37
            receivership.
                           That's right.
38
                 And then Mr. Jackson will reply.
39
                 I will respond to the oppression interim
40
            relief motion.
41
                 And then my friends will have a last right of
42
            reply in respect of their oppression motion.
43
                 I think we're reasonably comfortable that we
44
            can get this done in the time that we have
45
            available.
46
       THE COURT:
                  All right.
47
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: It's already been adjourned.
```

THE COURT: I can't -- I know. I appreciate everyone's 2 understanding. I couldn't -- I simply couldn't 3 appear. 4 CNSL A. NATHANSON: We -- we had adjournments before 5 your unfortunate accident, Justice. 6 THE COURT: Yeah. 7 CNSL A. NATHANSON: But there is commercial urgency, as 8 you see. 9 THE COURT: I see that. 10 CNSL A. NATHANSON: So we're going to work hard to get 11 this -- get this done. 12 THE COURT: Yeah, I can't sit on Friday. Right? 13 but if it has to -- I'll get some other date ASAP 14 if it has to -- doesn't finish by Thursday. CNSL A. NATHANSON: Thank you. On -- on our side, 15 16 we're going to work hard to make sure it can be 17 And I think it can. And we know that 18 you've had some advanced review of the material. 19 THE COURT: I -- I have. And I want to put something 20 out to counsel. I don't know if you want me to 21 put it out now or you want to deal with the 22 consent orders first. 23 CNSL A. NATHANSON: No time like to present, Justice. 24 25

SUMMATION BY THE COURT:

26 27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

THE COURT: Okay. Well, look, I haven't read every I -- I was -- and Mr. Matthews' single page. submissions came in -- were uploaded late yesterday. I just only had a chance to skim it. This is what I gleaned from what I read so The parties are deadlocked. It's a deadlock. And whether that has a meaning -whether the BC Business Corporations Act applies or not to bring a deadlock -- I know there's an issue about oppression and standing.

Practically speaking, the deadlock -- it appears that the business can't meet its payroll, can't pay its debts, and they have the primary secure lender -- the debts owed to the lender's in default. The lender happens to be a partner of the -- of the business.

And I appreciate that there's an allegation that Sanovest is trying to leverage its position as a credit -- secured pretty to somehow take advantage of -- of the business, but -- and there are also competing allegations of breach of

fiduciary duty, oppressive conduct.

And I see now by getting the CPC file that this action and others are set for trial in January 2025.

And so I just wonder how much of the -- the allegations concerning oppressive conduct, breach of fiduciary duty, mall -- I'll call it malafide conduct, tortuous conduct. I can decide on a summary application. And, really, aren't they the type of allegations that require the determination at trial?

I also see that the parties appear to agree that some form of officer needs to be appointed to deal with the business and selling assets.

And -- and I wasn't clear if Mr. Matthews was saying it needs to be a marketing agent or a receiver with limited powers. From the NOA response, I thought it was a receiver but with limited powers. And so I -- my sense was that the parties agree that something needs to be done, and the question is, is it a receiver with broad powers or some -- a receiver with more limited powers?

And I see that Mr. Matthews also wants to make -- enshrine his -- his ability to redeem in the context.

So I thought, well, a receiver is the court's officer. And if -- if I appoint a receiver in -- in the -- with the usual powers, the receiver has to come back. The receiver has to engage an analysis of the business and the assets and come back with a recommendation to court.

And I don't know if the receiver is going to say, look, Mr. Matthews is right. There's greater value to sell these properties off piecemeal so that you -- rather than on-block, because they'll be greater -- there will be greater proceeds realized as opposed to an unblocked sale where someone might be buying something at an unfair discount. Or on-block is the way to go.

And so if -- if I appoint a receiver with the usual powers, it doesn't prejudice -- I -- I was wondering how would it prejudice Mr. Matthews' rights. Because he always has the ability to come and contest what the receiver is saying and recommending.

At the same time, if Mr. Matthews wants the

ability to redeem, think about [indiscernible] and how long that's going to take to get finally worked up, approved, and the sales process to take. That's month -- usually a number of months.

Well if there's a right to redeem enshriped

Well, if there's a right to redeem enshrined, he's going to have that ability in the interim, come back, arrange financing, redeem, and pay out Sanovest.

And all of the issues that are -- that are in -- in dispute between the parties still go to trial.

If he can't redeem and the receiver comes and recommends sales however -- on-block or limited -- and there's sale proceeds, they get paid and get held in trust in an interest-bearing trust account depending the determination of the trial so that no one's prejudiced.

But if there's something truly unique about these properties where someone says, look, it's -it's unfair and prejudiced if this unique piece of property is sold, monetizing it isn't appropriate.

And if -- then somebody needs to arrange financing so the business can be run properly in the interim, so the status quo's maintained somehow.

And if there's financing to do that, the question is should the court appoint someone to run the business if this was a CCAA proceeding, some kind of super monitor, somebody to run the business so that no one's prejudiced, the issues get on at trial -- which is not that far away -- and then the judge hearing the trial makes the determination and everything at that point falls into place based upon the finding. It just struck me from what I was reading.

Now, I may have missed a lot, maybe a lot of nuances and things. But it seems to me there was a -- there may be a way to preserve the business, protect everyone's assets, or have the receiver come back and make appropriate recommendations that still enshrines Mr. Matthews's right of redemption.

And in the meantime, I hear from an independent court's officer what the right thing to do is.

That -- that's what struck me. And -- and -- and what I was thinking, that's sort of --

```
everyone knows what I -- what I gleaned.
 2
            maybe I'm way off base, but that s what I was
            seeing when I read -- read the materials.
 3
 4
                 I appreciate, Mr. Ferris, I haven't had a
 5
            chance to read your client's written submissions
            and need to.
 7
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Thank you, Justice.
       THE COURT: I don't know if that helps.
 8
 9
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: I'm not -- that's helpful.
                                                        I'm --
10
            I'm not going to make any comment. I'll let
11
            Mr. Ferris address that. But it is helpful to
12
            know what you're thinking.
                 So I'll just deal with these things very
13
14
            quickly. So the first thing is, because we have
15
            two proceedings, counsel agree that any materials
            filed in one will be evidence in the other and
16
17
            vice versa.
18
       THE COURT: Okay.
19
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           We have two consent orders.
                                                         They
20
            have been vetted. I can hand them up.
21
       THE COURT:
                   Okav.
22
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Counsel have signed them.
23
            thought Ms. Hiebert -- sorry?
24
       CNSL L. HIEBERT: I've given you both.
25
       THE COURT: And -- and the oppression action, that's --
26
            that's --
27
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            The oppression --
28
       THE COURT: -- 389?
29
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           No.
30
                       380 -- 048?
       THE COURT:
                   No.
31
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Yeah.
32
       THE COURT:
                   And that's going to trial in January?
33
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Yes.
       CNSL C. FERRIS: No. No, that's not correct.
34
35
       THE COURT:
                   It's not?
36
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        It's going to trial in January of
37
            2026.
38
       THE COURT:
                   Oh, I thought it was 2025.
39
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        It was moved.
40
       THE COURT:
                   Oh, all right.
41
       CNSL C. FERRIS: It was originally 2025, and -- and
42
            that's what the case planning order is to address
43
            is --
44
       THE COURT:
                   Oh, I see.
45
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       -- to set the schedule to lead us to
46
            2026.
47
       THE COURT:
                  Oh, all right. Well, that may make a
```

8 Submissions re sealing order by Cnsl L. Hiebert

```
difference from what I just said.
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Well, you'll -- you'll hear from Mr. Jackson. I mean, either way, it's -- it's
 2
 3
 4
             just over a year, so it's --
 5
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- still not a long period of time,
 7
             given everything you described. But I -- I won't
 8
            pre-argue here.
 9
       THE COURT: All right. Okay.
                                        That's fine. Everyone
10
             agrees to these, so that's ...
11
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                         Thank you.
12
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Yes, Justice.
13
       THE COURT: Okay. Madam Clerk, you can hand these
14
            back, then.
15
                            Thank you, Justice.
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
16
       THE COURT:
                   Madam Clerk?
17
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            Sorry.
18
       THE COURT:
                    Thank you.
19
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: And you've got copies?
20
       THE COURT:
                   Yes.
21
                            Thank you. We'll arrange to have
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
22
             these entered.
23
       THE COURT:
                   Thank you.
24
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: I've said what I need to say on the
25
            CPC.
                   If there's any difficulties with
26
            Mr. Peterson, we'll advise you.
27
       THE COURT:
                   All right.
28
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            Otherwise, 3:30.
29
                  And then Ms. Hiebert will bring submissions
30
             on the sealing order.
31
       THE COURT: Okay.
32
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            Thank you.
33
       THE COURT: That's something I have -- hang on,
34
            Mr. Nathanson. I haven't -- I didn't read
35
             anything about the sealing, so you're going to
36
            have to --
37
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                          I -- yeah, I -- I wouldn't expect
38
             that you have.
39
40
       SUBMISSIONS RE SEALING ORDER BY CNSL L. HIEBERT:
41
42
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
43
                  So I'm going to hand up the notice of
44
             application and the authorities -- Sanovest's
45
             authorities for the sealing order.
46
                  But I'm -- and there are two applications
47
            because there are two affidavits sworn at
```

9 Submissions re sealing order by Cnsl L. Hiebert

different times, and the applications got filed at different times. But I'm going to speak to them 3 both concurrently because they are, effectively, 4 the same issue. 5 Both affidavits attach appraisal evidence. And, as the court has already noted, the parties 7 don't agree on a lot, but they certainly agree 8 that there -- that there's going to be a sale 9 process here. It's -- they agree that it should 10 be conducted by a court officer. 11 THE COURT: Right. 12 CNSL L. HIEBERT: And -- and so, in our submission, we 13 want to protect the market for those assets. 14 so the -- the sealing order that we are seeking 15 seals the appraisals -- or seals those two 16 affidavits attaching those appraisals. 17 affidavit number 1 of Jennifer Bantog made 18 June 14th and the affidavit number 4 of Tian 19 Kusumoto made August 8th. You don't have copies 20 of those. 21 THE COURT: I don't. Okav. 22 CNSL L. HIEBERT: So I will hand up those. So this is 23 the June 14th affidavit. 24 THE COURT: This is the one filed in 048? 25 CNSL L. HIEBERT: These are both in the oppression 26 action, yeah, ending 048. 27 THE COURT: Okay. 28 CNSL L. HIEBERT: And so --29 The first one is Ms. Bantog? THE COURT: 30 CNSL L. HIEBERT: Yes. That's the June 14th affidavit. 31 THE COURT: She works -- she's a legal assistant at 32 your firm. All right. 33 CNSL L. HIEBERT: She is, yes. And it attaches 34 correspondence from our firm to an appraiser and 35 then Exhibit B, the response. And, particularly, 36 if the court turns to page 10 of the exhibits. 37 THE COURT: Okay. 38 CNSL L. HIEBERT: At the bottom, the very -- basically 39 the last sentence at the bottom of that page has 40 comments regarding value. And -- and so the 41 appraisals -- we wanted -- we just want those 42 sealed so that there's no information in the 43 market that might impact the ultimate sale 44 process. 45 THE COURT: Right. And will you be dealing with this 46 evidence and the other evidence during the course 47 of submissions?

10 Submissions re sealing order by Cnsl L. Hiebert

```
CNSL L. HIEBERT: These affidavits are not being dealt
 2
            with in the course of -- of Mr. Jackson's
 3
            submissions on the receivership. I believe they
 4
            may be spoken to in the context of the oppression.
 5
       THE COURT: So then my question is how do we deal with
            that in terms of submissions and -- and -- and the
 7
            open courtroom?
 8
       CNSL L. HIEBERT: Well, I think that we will -- we will
 9
            deal with it the way we've often done it in
10
            insolvency proceedings where we refer to -- refer
11
            to the pages but don't say --
12
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
13
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         -- in open court the information that
14
            we're looking to have sealed.
15
       THE COURT:
                   All right.
16
       CNSL L. HIEBERT: Because everyone will just refer the
17
            court to the pages, and then everyone can read
18
            the -- the relevant information. And those
19
            parties who are able to have access to the
20
            information will be able to -- to read the same
21
            information. But we'll all be careful not to put
22
            the figures and --
23
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
24
       CNSL L. HIEBERT: -- the information into the record.
25
       THE COURT: All right. And so then the other one is
            from Tian Kusumoto?
26
27
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                          Yes.
28
       THE COURT:
                   He's the CFO?
29
       CNSL L. HIEBERT: He is the -- he is the -- he is the CFO of -- of one of the entities. He's -- he's
30
31
            the directing mind of -- of Sanovest --
32
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
33
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         -- and one of the -- one of the
34
            litigants here.
35
       THE COURT: Okay.
36
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         And the affidavit just attaches some
37
            further appraisal evidence.
38
       THE COURT:
                   It's a different appraiser?
39
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         Yes.
40
       THE COURT:
                  All right. Okay. And what does the order
41
            say in terms of who has access and -- and whether
42
            there's a Suntek [phonetic] clause in it?
43
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         Yes, so the -- so the order -- do you
44
            have a copy, Justice?
45
       THE COURT: Of the ...?
46
       CNSL L. HIEBERT: It will be attached to the notice of
47
            application. The one filed August 15th will be
```

11 Submissions re sealing order by Cnsl L. Hiebert Order

```
the one we'll look at.
 2
       THE COURT: Okay.
                          Just give me one second. Okay.
 3
            I've got it.
 4
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                        Or I can hand up the vetted copy --
 5
                   No, that's all right.
       THE COURT:
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                        -- if that's easier.
 7
       THE COURT:
                  I'll take a look at this.
 8
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                        But -- so we're -- we're proposing
 9
            that the -- the access to the sealed items in the
10
            court file be accessed subject to court order. My
11
            friends already have copies of these affidavits,
12
            so they don't need access to copies of the court
13
            file.
                   So it's only these two -- only these two
14
       THE COURT:
15
            documents, then?
16
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         Only these two affidavits.
17
       THE COURT:
                   Everything else is -- is open to the
18
            public?
19
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         Yes.
20
                 And the proposed duration for these
21
            affidavits, because they're appraisals tied to the
22
            sale process, it will end on the earlier of a
23
            certificate confirming that the sale -- the sale
24
            of the property.
25
       THE COURT:
                   All right.
26
       CNSL L. HIEBERT: This is similar language that has
27
            been used in receivership proceedings. It's -- it
            refers to just a certificate, not specifically
28
29
            whether it's a receiver certificate because we
30
            don't yet know what kind of -- what kind of
31
            officer might be appointed.
32
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
33
                        And it's -- but I think this -- this
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
34
            gives the party the flexibility that, when the
35
            property's been sold, a certificate be filed, and
36
            then these materials can be unsealed.
37
       THE COURT:
                   Okay. All right.
                                      Everyone agree to this?
38
                 Oh, sorry, and access to -- to seal the
39
            orders [indiscernible] upon access.
40
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                        It's -- access is subject to further
41
            order of the court. But counsel for 599 and
42
            Mr. Matthews already have copies, so they don't
            need access to the court filed copies.
43
44
       THE COURT: Okay.
                         Does everyone agree to this?
45
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Yeah.
46
       CNSL C. FERRIS: Yes, Justice.
47
       THE COURT: Okay. Do you have the vetted orders, then?
```

12 Discussion re housekeeping matters Order re affidavits

Yes.

CNSL L. HIEBERT:

```
2
       THE COURT: This is one ...
 3
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                        It's one -- one order referring to
 4
            both affidavits.
 5
       THE COURT: Okay.
                          So --
       CNSL L. HIEBERT: We're going to file them in one
 7
            envelope.
                  I'll give you all these materials back, but
 8
       THE COURT:
 9
            I'll keep the two affidavits.
10
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                        Certainly.
11
       THE COURT: All right. Okay.
                                      Thank you.
12
       THE CLERK: Justice, [indiscernible] two affidavits are
13
            the agreements sealed, or is there another copy of
14
            it? Those are the judge's copies?
15
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         Those are the judge's copies.
16
       THE CLERK:
                   Oh.
17
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         I have the -- I have the originals
18
            for the registry.
19
20
       DISCUSSION RE HOUSEKEEPING MATTERS:
21
22
       THE COURT: Okay. Now, just other housekeeping
23
            matters, I have two -- here. These are -- yeah, I
24
            have written submissions of Sanovest on the
25
            hearing of the petition and the defendants Tian
26
            Kusumoto and -- regarding an interim relief.
27
            They're bound up.
28
                 I have something I printed off, the written
29
            argument of Mr. Matthews in 599, but is that a
30
            fulsome document?
31
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        Yes.
       THE COURT: Okay.
32
33
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       I have a written copy for you with a
34
            book of authorities.
35
       THE COURT: Oh, good. All right. I'll take that.
36
                 And let me just see. There's a joint --
37
            there's a condensed record and joint book of
38
            authorities. I take it --
39
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         Those are --
40
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        Sorry.
41
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                        Those are for the -- for use on the
42
            receivership application. We just -- because the
43
            record is quite --
44
       THE COURT: Yes.
45
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         -- large, we thought that the
46
            receivership has some focused documents that
47
            are -- are relevant and cited in --
```

13 Discussion re housekeeping matters

```
Okay.
       THE COURT:
 2
                         -- our written argument.
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
 3
                   Okay.
       THE COURT:
 4
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         There is an electronic version of the
 5
            condensed record in the FTS.
                   Oh, is there? Okay.
       THE COURT:
 7
       CNSL L. HIEBERT: And -- and we've provided the index
 8
            to our friends.
 9
                 And then the book of authorities is a joint
10
            book of authorities with the authorities cited in
11
            our -- our petition and the response to petition.
12
            They're --
13
       THE COURT: Okay.
                         The authorities, they don't include
14
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
15
            the oppression --
16
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
17
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                        -- law but just the receivership.
                         And the written submissions of
18
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
19
            Sanovest, is that --
20
       CNSL L. HIEBERT: Yes.
21
                   -- different than what was filed on
       THE COURT:
22
            August 19th?
23
                        Written submissions? Oh, there --
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
24
            there will be two arguments.
25
                   Oh.
       THE COURT:
26
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         There will be one -- there's --
27
       THE COURT:
                   I -- I have two. I have two. One --
28
            one -- they're both filed August 19th. One is in
29
            respect of the oppression proceeding, the other
30
            one is in respect of the petition to the
31
            receivership proceeding. I'm just wondering if
32
            what you've handed up loose is the --
33
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                        Oh, then you -- then you already
            had -- then you have -- yes, a loose copy,
34
35
            that's -- you can ignore that one, because the --
36
            the bound copy is -- will be the exact same.
37
       THE COURT:
                   All right. So it wasn't updated by -- for
38
            any reason?
39
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         It has not been updated, no.
                   Okay.
40
       THE COURT:
41
       CNSL L. HIEBERT: No, it's the same.
42
                   So I'll just use this. Okay.
       THE COURT:
43
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         I can take that back.
44
       THE COURT:
                   I'll just keep it here. Thank you.
                                                         I may
45
            have marked -- yes.
46
                        So, Justice, just a final housekeeping
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
47
            item. Mr. Brandt is going to speak to a couple of
```

```
sealing orders that are.
 2
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
 3
 4
       SUBMISSIONS RE SEALING ORDER BY CNSL G. BRANDT:
 5
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                         Thank you, Justice. And our materials
 7
            are in a -- our collective binder that includes
 8
            copies of the affidavits to be sealed along with
 9
            our notice of application, if I could hand that
10
            up.
11
       THE COURT:
                   Yes, thank you.
12
       CNSL G. BRANDT: Thank you, Justice. And just as my
13
            friends had, there are two applications before the
            court because there are affidavits to be sealed in
14
15
            the two separate proceedings. The binder starts
16
            with the proceeding 243389, which is the --
17
       THE COURT:
                   Insolvency.
18
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        -- receivership proceeding. Correct,
19
            Justice. And we have the notice of application.
20
                  What we're seeking sealed here is a copy of
21
            the affidavit number 2 of Mr. Matthews filed in
22
            the receivership proceeding.
23
       THE COURT: Okay.
24
       CNSL G. BRANDT: And if I may, I'll -- I can just take the court into paragraph 13 of the notice of
25
26
            application, as given advice from the court that
27
            you've read some of the background materials.
                 And --
28
29
       THE COURT: Right.
30
       CNSL G. BRANDT: -- there are essentially three areas
31
            in this affidavit over which we're seeking the
32
            sealing order.
33
                  The first relates to an arbitration involving
34
            the hotel. As is set out in the notice of
35
            application, the arbitration -- the arbitration
36
            includes, among other things, a lease, and the
37
            lease is subject to a confidentiality clause, and
38
            Matthews' affidavit number 2 describes
39
            communications regarding the hotel lease.
40
       THE COURT: So is the arbitration underway now?
41
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                         There's an arbitration underway now,
42
            not involving -- so involving the partnership --
43
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
44
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                         -- or, more precisely, the Resort
45
            partnership.
46
       THE COURT:
                   Yes.
47
       CNSL G. BRANDT: And parties who -- the Resort
```

partnership was in a commercial lease, an operations agreement with. And that -- that -- those two agreements arose from the sale of a hotel that was originally owned by the referred partnership, subsequently sold out from the partnership to -- we'll call it the hotel operators. That is an arbitration that's going on with the Resort partnership, essentially, as the claimant. And there's claims and cross claims there.

As I -- I've set out in the next section, there are aspects of the hotel arbitration proceeding that have become public because there -- there was an initial decision and an appeal and a challenge to that decision. And it's an absurd -- materials have been filed. And to the extent those materials are part of the public record, they are not -- we don't seek a sealing order over them.

But to the extent there are ongoing matters in the arbitration that are not coming to the public record in that manner, we are seeking a sealing order, and that's what's set out here in -- in Matthews' affidavit -- affidavit number 2 are aspects of the arbitration that are -- that are subject to the arbitration --

THE COURT: So which paragraph?

CNSL G. BRANDT: -- confidentiality -- those paragraphs are paragraphs 13 through 17 of Mr. Matthews' affidavit number 2.

THE COURT: Okay. So you want the whole of this affidavit --

CNSL G. BRANDT: We're seeking the whole of the affidavit sealed. There's -- there's the third area regarding negotiations of investors that's set out at paragraph 19 of our application, and those cover the whole affidavit. This affidavit -- this affidavit was prepared with the intention that a sealing order would be sought.

THE COURT: Well, there's a -- a reference to another affidavit of Mr. Matthews. Are you seeking to have that sealed? That's number 1. Or am I looking at --

CNSL G. BRANDT: So affidavit number 1 is not -- we're not seeking to have a sealing order for affidavit number 1. That's filed.

So I -- I do have a vetted order here with

```
respect to the affidavit number 2 of Mr. Matthews.
 2
       THE COURT: So in terms of access, you want -- you want
 3
            just this affidavit sealed?
 4
       CNSL G. BRANDT: The affidavit's sealed pending further
 5
            order of the court. That's what we're seeking
            here.
 7
                 I need to sign the copy I just handed up.
 8
            apologies.
 9
       THE COURT: Wouldn't it be appropriate to put some sort
10
            of termination clause in there? I mean, it's --
11
            the purpose of this is to -- is to protect it
12
            during the course of the hearing of -- of the
13
            insolvency proceeding or the oppression action.
14
       CNSL G. BRANDT: Well, the difficulty -- and I -- I'll
15
            come to further sealing orders where we are
16
            seeking, you know, the order may be terminated
17
            earlier. But because the issue here relates to
            the confidentiality of arbitration, that doesn't
18
19
            end, per se, even with the end of the arbitration
20
            proceeding.
21
       THE COURT:
                  I see.
                           Okav.
22
       CNSL G. BRANDT: And similarly with the confidentiality
23
            of the commercial hotel lease, that ...
24
       THE COURT: Right. Okay. All right. Let me think
25
            about that for a minute. Let's look at the next
26
            one.
27
       CNSL G. BRANDT: So if I can, then, just move into the
            next tab here, which is the receivership -- sorry,
28
29
            the oppression proceeding.
30
       THE COURT: And that's tab 4?
31
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        That is ...
32
       THE COURT: Tab --
33
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       It's tab 4 under the next big tab.
34
            Correct.
35
                 And so here there are three affidavits for
36
            which -- over which we're seeking a sealing order.
37
            The first is the affidavit number 1 of Ms. Celiz,
38
            who is a legal assistant. And that affidavit
39
            attaches a response to the material that's in the
40
            Bantog affidavit, which has just been sealed.
41
       THE COURT: Okay. Just a moment. So I've got four.
            And where is that affidavit?
42
       CNSL G. BRANDT: At tab 5.
43
44
       THE COURT: Oh, here. Oh, that's Jennifer Bantog's
45
            affidavit.
46
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       That's right. Ms. Celiz's affidavit
47
            is at tab 6.
```

```
THE COURT: Okay. So what's at tab 5 has just been
 2
            sealed?
 3
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       Has just been sealed.
 4
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
 5
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       And at tab 6 is -- is enclosing a
            letter. And as you'll see, it's -- just over the
 7
            page at tab A, it's a response to the letter
 8
            that's attached to the Bantog affidavit.
 9
       THE COURT: All right.
10
                        So that's -- that's the basis there,
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
11
            and we'll come in a moment to the conditions.
12
       THE COURT: Yeah.
13
       CNSL G. BRANDT: The affidavit -- the next is the
14
            affidavit number 4 of Ms. Celiz, and that is
15
            enclosing the full copy of appraisal report.
16
            Mr. Matthews in an unfiled affidavit has referred
17
            to certain excerpts of the appraisal, but the full
            appraisal, so the court has it, is attached here.
18
            And obviously Mr. Matthews was selective in this
19
20
            first affidavit around that issue.
21
                 And then, finally, affidavit number 5 of
22
            Mr. Matthews contains confidential communications
23
            exchanged between Mr. Matthews and others, and
24
            that --
25
       THE COURT: Just a -- just a minute.
                                              That's at tab --
26
            where is that at? I'm at tab 7.
                                               That's
27
            Ms. Celiz's number 4.
                                   Tab 5 -- or tab 8 is the
28
            sealing order.
29
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        Sorry, Justice. I may hand that up
30
            separately.
31
       THE COURT: All right.
                               That's the original?
32
       CNSL G. BRANDT: This is the original.
33
       THE COURT: Okay. Do you have a copy?
       CNSL G. BRANDT: I -- I do have a copy here, which I'll
34
35
            pull that up, yes. Oh, it's actually blank.
36
            Perhaps I can hand it up for now, and we'll bring
37
            a copy.
38
       THE COURT: Sure.
39
       CNSL G. BRANDT: We'll need to ...
40
       THE COURT:
                  So if you're handing me the original -- so
41
            I won't mark it up.
42
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       Well ...
43
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
                          This is --
                       So --
44
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
45
       THE COURT:
                  Yeah, this is Matthews number 5?
46
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       This is Matthews number 5.
47
       THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
```

```
CNSL G. BRANDT: And this -- this affidavit responds to
 2
            a primary affidavit of Mr. Kusumoto. And in
 3
            Mr. Kusumoto's version of the affidavit, he's
 4
            redacted the values to -- again, to preserve
 5
            confidentiality of negotiations with third
            parties.
                      This is a response to that.
                                                   And our
 7
            approach has been to -- to not make public any of
 8
            that correspondence and taking a similar approach.
 9
       THE COURT: And so you want -- you say it should be
10
            sealed because it contains information regarding
11
            values?
12
       CNSL G. BRANDT: Values and -- and negotiations with
13
            third parties -- nature of negotiations with third
14
            parties for sale of the assets that are subject
15
            [indiscernible].
                  Anything in here that's without privilege,
16
       THE COURT:
17
            can you -- without prejudice communication or
18
            privileged that I shouldn't see?
19
       CNSL G. BRANDT: No. No, there isn't, Justice.
       THE COURT: Okay.
20
21
       CNSL G. BRANDT: All right.
22
       THE COURT: Okay. So let's look at the sealing order
23
            for -- what -- what do you say, then, the
24
            duration?
25
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        So the duration for -- let's go
26
            through each of these.
27
       THE COURT: All right.
28
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        So for Ms. Celiz's affidavit, the
29
            duration here is until the filing of the
30
            certificate.
31
       THE COURT: All right.
32
       CNSL G. BRANDT: Confirming sale for Ms. Celiz's
33
            affidavit number 4, certificate of sale. And for
34
            Mr. Matthews number 5, until further order of the
35
            court because, again, the nature of the
36
            confidential negotiations.
37
       THE COURT:
                  And that's confidential negotiations
38
            between the parties?
39
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        Between --
                   Third --
40
       THE COURT:
41
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        -- third parties. With third parties
42
            regarding the sale of partnership assets,
43
            expressions of interest. And all this goes to
44
            the -- the fact that these negotiations themselves
45
            generally occurred under an expectation of
46
            confidentiality or express confidentiality
47
            agreements with third parties --
```

19 Submissions re sealing order by Cnsl G. Brandt Order re sealing of affidavits

```
THE COURT: Oh, I see.
 2
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       -- who -- who don't want to have and
 3
            wouldn't want to have the nature of their
 4
            negotiations with the partnership made public.
 5
       THE COURT:
                   So that -- that's why it's different than
            the other -- the other affidavits --
       CNSL G. BRANDT: Than an appraisal.
 7
       THE COURT: -- with a filing of a certificate.
 8
 9
       CNSL G. BRANDT: Exactly. I do have a -- a better
10
            copy.
11
       THE COURT:
                   Sure.
12
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       And I do have a second copy for Madam
13
            Clerk.
14
                   Okay.
       THE COURT:
                          Thank you. Let me hear from
15
            Ms. Hiebert again.
16
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                        We've no submissions on their sealing
17
            orders.
18
       THE COURT: Okay. I'm satisfied in the circumstances
19
            that the order should be granted.
20
       CNSL G. BRANDT: Thank you, Justice.
21
       THE COURT: And I -- although you didn't take me to
22
            your case authorities, Ms. Hiebert, I didn't look
23
            at what was in there, I'm aware of those cases.
24
                        Yeah. And I didn't think we needed
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
25
            to -- to go --
26
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
27
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
                         -- through the -- the authorities in
28
            detail, the court being familiar with them and
29
            [indiscernible].
       THE COURT: Okay. So I've signed the -- signed the two
30
31
            vetted orders.
32
                 Let me give you back this original affidavit
33
            of Matthews number 5.
34
       CNSL C. FERRIS: Thank you.
                                    And we'll -- we'll replace
35
            that for you, Justice.
36
       THE COURT:
                  Right.
37
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       And with respect --
38
       THE COURT:
                   Can I give you the binder back, and then
39
            you can just give me a set of affidavits that are
40
            sealed so I don't --
41
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        We'll do that.
                                        We'll do that all at
42
            once, Justice.
43
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah, all right. So I'll give the binder
44
            back.
45
       CNSL C. FERRIS: And you'll note there are blanks in
46
            the record, the paper record that the court has --
47
       THE COURT: Okay.
```

CNSL C. FERRIS: -- that they can simply insert it
 into.

THE COURT: Oh, all right. So if we get them punched, just tell me where to put that.
CNSL C. FERRIS: We'll do that. Thank you, Justice.

THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. Jackson?

SUBMISSIONS RE RECEIVERSHIP ORDER BY CNSL K. JACKSON:

CNSL K. JACKSON: Yes. Me, Justice. As my colleague mentioned, I'll be speaking to the application by Sanovest for receivership order.

Before I begin, maybe I could just quickly just tack on some comments to your observations at the outset of the hearing, Justice.

Unsurprisingly, very commercial and practical observations, ones which, frankly, I share.

I'll just, perhaps, supplement a few of the comments there if you're taking notes on your initial impressions, which I think are, for the most part, correct.

You mentioned that there's an awful lot of allegations and an awful lot of evidence around malafides, you know, breaches of fiduciary obligations, misappropriation of funds, all -- oppression, all of that. There is.

I have studiously stayed away from it because, as far as I'm concerned in the context of the applications before the court, it's irrelevant. It need not be decided. The parties are ad idem on one point, that there has to be some sort of resolution to this process in the form of a -- an order appointing a receiver for a sale. I don't -- this court -- I think it would be a very difficult task to ask of this court to wade so far into that material to -- to determine that there is some sort of prima facie determination of oppression, which would justify relief, which, otherwise, we agree is available under section 39 of the [indiscernible] Act.

It doesn't mean that you're not going to hear it. There's an application with the -- with the evidence that's being relied upon brought by Mr. Matthews and 599. And we'll probably use those two interchangeably, which is responded to, and, frankly, has to be responded to by Mr. Kusumoto and Sanovest. It has to be.

But I don't think the court needs to determine anything with respect to that evidence. 3 The only thing that really matters that, I 4 think, arises from that is it's very good evidence 5 of one thing: These parties do not get along, they cannot agree on anything, and, quite frankly, 7 an adult needs to be put in charge of this. That -- that's what it comes down to. 8 That's -- as far as I'm concerned, you can boil 9 10 all that evidence down to that because it's the --11 it's evident in support of the very -- very relief 12 sought. That's --13 THE COURT: So in terms of the oppression, the interim relief application --14 15 CNSL K. JACKSON: Yeah. 16 THE COURT: -- in the oppression proceeding, I take it, 17 then, that there are -- the affidavits there 18 contain significant conflicts -- significant 19 conflicts --20 CNSL K. JACKSON: Indeed. 21 THE COURT: -- in the evidence. 22 CNSL K. JACKSON: Right. 23 THE COURT: So whoever has -- is dealing with that, the 24 one question I had -- one of the questions I had 25 is, is it appropriate for me to even determine 26 them on a summary basis? And, if it is, how can I 27 do that given the nature of the conflict? CNSL K. JACKSON: I would -- it's a question I would 28 29 ask myself, Justice. I don't have an answer for 30 that. I don't think the court can determine 31 what -- it could. It could be asked to wade into 32 It may be asked to wade into that. I don't 33 think it needs to wade into that and make a 34 determination because it is an awful lot of 35 conflicting evidence. 36 I mean, fundamentally, each party thinks the 37 other is -- is guilty of various misdeeds and 38 misconduct. 39 It would take -- I don't know. I'm not a --40 I'm not a true litigator, Justice. My impression 41 is it would take -- I'm surrounded by them, but I 42 am not one for good reason. It would take, I think, an awful lot of 43 44 additional evidence, perhaps viva voce evidence, 45 everything else to be able to explore all of those 46 issues properly to make a determination. And you 47 don't need to, Justice, because it doesn't affect

the availability of relief. Period.

Both parties rely on -- on -- on jurisdiction for the appointment of a receiver, which doesn't require findings of fact in relation to those allegations.

I say it -- it all amounts to, what I said, one thing: They don't get along, they can't get along, they have fundamental, intractable disagreements, and that is supportive of a receivership order being made. That's it.

And -- and -- and I think the reality is there's an application before you which deals with it. You're going to probably hear it. I think you can. It's -- it won't impede your ability to make an order to resolve this today -- or not today but upon conclusion of the -- of the hearing.

That's the first point.

On the oppression proceeding, which has a trial -- we're now here in January 2026 -- that may play out to trial, depending on how things proceed. If a receivership order is issued -- complete receivership order, I should say, the order sought by Sanovest -- if a complete receivership order is issued, that proceeding largely boils down to a question of damages. There's some party liable for damages to another.

It doesn't -- it doesn't have the related relief, which often arises in oppression proceedings relating to replacements of directors and -- and all the like because that will have been addressed by a receivership order. It will be damages.

Now, it's sometime in January 2026. Any order for sale is going to take a long time. There is, baked into Sanovest's receivership application order, the concept that the court-appointed receiver will return to court -- THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.

CNSL K. JACKSON: -- within a period of time not specified to seek approval for a sale or an investment solicitation process. There's an automatic delay of some time, and I can't imagine it's going to be days or weeks. It's probably months before that receiver comes back and seeks [indiscernible].

Then it has to carry out that assessment, and

then it has to come back, seek approval of any sales, and it has to complete those sales.

If we're done that in 2025, that will be a good accomplishment. But, irrespective, as justice said earlier, those funds will be in a trust account.

First of all, there's no dispute as to Sanovest's indebtedness for the most part. Matthews and 599 agree that Sanovest is owed at least \$50 million -- \$50 million at least in principal and some interest. They disagree as to the total amount of interest. But the point is there will not be a dispute about paying out from sales the large -- the majority of the amount owing to Sanovest, which is beneficial. It will stop the burn at that point.

And if there is some dispute about distribution of the additional funds to Sanovest either as creditor or as its entitlement under the partnership agreement for its partnership interest, then those funds can be held up and tied up in court pursuant to an order until all the claims between the parties are resolved, if that's necessary.

So it doesn't -- it's not a problem, in my mind, that we have ongoing litigation. In fact, I think we'll resolve a lot of that litigation if there's a receivership order issued because it takes away some of the -- some of the disputes.

And I'll say the other thing about that. In my experience, once you have monetized assets, focusing the parties' attention on settlement becomes easier because they know what they're fighting for.

That's the oppression proceeding, which you commented on, Justice.

Third thing I'll mention in respect of your initial comments deals with the allegation which you identified. It comes from 599 and Matthews that somehow -- and that's the important point -- somehow Sanovest is seeking to advantage itself through this receivership. Yes, I think that is, boiled down, the -- the basis for the opposition to the receivership application.

There are multiple allegations of various forms of mischief by -- by Sanovest, which are denied, of course.

```
But -- and I'll come to this a bit more
 2
            shortly, but they really don't -- there's no real
 3
            tie from allegations of mischief to why that would
 4
            deny the -- the entitlement of Sanovest to the
 5
            relief, it seems.
                 The -- the reality is I can't -- I have a
 7
            difficult time -- when you said "somehow," I had
8
            the exact same impression. How is this
 9
            advantaging Sanovest? It's a creditor, yes.
10
            wants to get repaid, yes. It's also a
11
            partnership, and it has, actually, a greater
12
            partnership stake and priority partnership stakes
13
            in comparison to 599.
14
                 Putting the partnership into receivership,
15
            selling the lands and the business affects
16
            Sanovest as much as it does 599 or Matthews -- in
17
            fact, disproportionally so. How is that
18
            advantaging itself?
19
                 And so if they say, well, Sanovest wants to
20
            buy the assets --
21
       THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
22
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        -- now, we have no indication that
23
            that is true. I've not heard that. 599 wants to
            buy the assets. Well, if it's going to do that,
24
25
            it will be doing it in open court in a transparent
26
            fashion with the market being thoroughly tested by
27
            the court's officer. How is that advantaging
28
            itself?
29
       THE COURT: And, likewise, it would hurt Sanovest as
            well; right?
30
31
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Or 5 --
32
       THE COURT:
                   Sanovest --
33
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         -- 599.
34
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
35
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Right.
36
       THE COURT:
                  Yeah, 599. Or if there's some -- some
37
            effort by Sanovest to -- in the sales process to
38
            use -- is credit -- credited somehow.
39
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Right.
40
       THE COURT:
                   And there's an allegation of impropriety or
41
            fraud with the party Sanovest that would have to
42
            be considered in the sales process, and I'd have
43
            to consider the advice of the court's officer.
44
            Right?
45
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Absolutely. And this is part of my
46
                    I mean, I don't -- I think if there was
            point.
47
            some sort of nefarious scheme by -- by Sanovest
```

doing it in full light of the court in front of the court's officer is not the way to carry that 3 out. 4 And that's my point. I have a difficult 5 time -- and I've had a difficult time -- trying to -- to wade through the allegations of mischief to try and figure out how any of them could 7 constitute mischief of a sort that would advantage 8 9 Sanovest by seeking a receivership order to put 10 someone in charge of these assets, to operate the 11 business, to run a transparent court-ordered 12 approved sale process at all. 13 And so -- so -- so that somehow advantages 14 itself is exactly my point. I have yet to figure 15 out that theory, and I cannot understand it. 16 I'll come to it a bit more because I address 17 a couple of the specific allegations. 18 And the last thing is your comment on 19 redemption. 20 THE COURT: M'mm-hmm. 21 CNSL K. JACKSON: I will address this again first 22 but -- because there is this point. 23 First point is Mr. Matthews and 599, they 24 have no right of redemption. They don't have --25 the equity of redemption lies with the -- the 26 borrower, the owner of the lands. Right? 27 THE COURT: Okay. 28 CNSL K. JACKSON: It's not just the borrower. 29 borrower, the nominees, the owners of the lands. 30 THE COURT: Who are -- I haven't drilled through the --31 CNSL K. JACKSON: Right. 32 THE COURT: -- entire ownership. So who owns the 33 lands, then? 34 CNSL K. JACKSON: Well, there are legal owners and 35 beneficial owners. 36 THE COURT: Right. 37 CNSL K. JACKSON: Importantly, the beneficial owners 38 are, for some of the lands, the respondent, which 39 is the top-level partnership, Ecoasis Developments 40 LLP, that limited partner. 41 THE COURT: Right. 42 CNSL K. JACKSON: That is the one which has Sanovest and 599 as limited partners. 43 So -- so we called

that "Developments." It beneficially owns some of

partner of the other partnership, which is Ecoasis

The other -- and then it also is the limited

44

45

46

47

the lands.

```
Resort and Golf LLP, which is one of the
            respondents, and we call that "Resort." So Resort
 3
            owns some of the lands beneficially.
 4
                 And then lands are legally owned by a number
 5
            of nominees, which are numbered companies
            enumerated in -- as respondents here. We don't
 7
            need to go through them precisely, but it's
 8
            relevant except -- with one exception: Bear
 9
            Mountain Adventures Ltd., the last named
10
            respondent.
11
       THE COURT:
                  Oh, yeah.
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Bear Mountain Adventures, BMA, it had
12
            one parcel of land transferred to it for a dollar.
13
14
            And Sanovest's mortgage still attaches to it, and
15
            so it's the legal and beneficial owner of one
16
            parcel of land.
                            And so the beneficial owners are
17
            the two partnerships and BMA, and the legal owners
18
            are the nominee numbered companies and BMA.
19
       THE COURT:
                  Who's the borrower, then? You say the
20
            borrower has the --
21
       CNSL K. JACKSON: The borrower is --
22
       THE COURT: -- right of redemption.
                                            Who's the
23
            borrower?
24
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Right. And so the borrower's -- I
            think it's actually -- the borrower is
25
26
            Developments. And then its obligations --
27
                  And that's a -- that's a -- that's a
       THE COURT:
28
            partnership?
29
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Yes.
30
       THE COURT:
                  Okay.
31
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Yes, yes, exactly.
32
                 Ms. Hiebert points out in the condensed
33
            record --
34
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
35
                         -- tab 6 --
36
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
37
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         -- would be helpful to ...
38
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah. Because if the partnership has the
39
            right of redemption, then it's --
                        So --
40
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
41
       THE COURT:
                  -- it consists of Mr. Matthews' group and
42
            Sanovest's group; right? Or if I --
43
       CNSL K. JACKSON: I'm sorry, Justice.
                                              I missed the
44
            question.
45
       THE COURT: I just want to drill down on your point
46
            that it's the borrower that has the right of
47
            redemption? Is that what this --
```

```
CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        It's the --
 2
       THE COURT: If it's the partnership, the partners are
 3
            Mr. Matthews and his group and Sanovest and its
 4
            group?
 5
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Right.
                                 Right.
                                          Sanovest and 599.
            But behind them, Mr. Kusumoto and -- and
 7
            Mr. Matthews. That's right.
 8
       THE COURT: So then the ability to redeem --
 9
       CNSL K. JACKSON: It comes from -- it's actually the
10
            persons who have granted the security. And --
11
            and -- and so it's the -- the partnership --
       THE COURT: Yeah.
12
13
                         -- the partnerships who have granted
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
14
            their beneficial interests, and it's the nominee
15
            companies --
16
       THE COURT:
                   Oh.
17
       CNSL K. JACKSON: -- the nominee companies --
18
       THE COURT:
                   All right.
19
       CNSL K. JACKSON: -- who have the ability to redeem.
20
            So -- and so ...
21
       THE COURT: Are they deadlocked as well? In other
22
            words, if Mr. Matthews was able to raise the funds
23
            to redeem, would -- would that be blocked by --
       CNSL K. JACKSON: It's -- it's -- one of the problems
24
25
            is -- is that redemption becomes more difficult
26
            because, of course, it has to be those parties who
27
            are deadlocked.
28
       THE COURT:
                   Right. Right.
29
                        Right. That -- that was exactly
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
30
            my --
31
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
32
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         -- point, Justice.
33
                 And -- and, I mean, the -- the court will
34
            have, you know, a fairly broad discretion in the
            context of a receivership proceeding if
35
36
            Mr. Matthews shows up with a cheque and says --
37
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
38
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        -- look, help me get through this
39
            blockade.
40
                 And I'm not saying there's no pathway to do
41
            that, but I want to be clear that there is no
42
            right of redemption for that -- for Mr. Matthews
43
            or 599.
44
       THE COURT: Okay.
45
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         It exists with the very parties who
46
            are deadlocked.
47
                 And your point is -- the second one, I would
```

say, in any event -- and this may be a complete 2 answer to redemption -- is there's going to be 3 months and months and months before there's an 4 approval of the sale here --5 THE COURT: Yeah. CNSL K. JACKSON: -- by any measure. And redemption --7 the right of redemption exists up to the approval 8 of sale. Sometimes beyond, but let's not worry 9 about that. Up to the point of approval of the 10 sale. 11 And so this idea that there needs time, there 12 will be time. 13 THE COURT: So the practical matter, then, is the sale 14 process unfolds, the -- the receiver comes forward 15 with offers, Mr. Matthews and his group can say, 16 well, we have a competing bid. We have a bid 17 that -- we have -- we re going -- we can either -- we want to redeem, judge. Or the other route would be let's say they 18 19 20 can -- they can buy the properties less than the 21 cost of redemption, they can --22 CNSL K. JACKSON: Certainly. And depending on --23 THE COURT: -- tender a bid, then, that beats the 24 others and buys the assets. 25 CNSL K. JACKSON: Right. If -- if Mr. Matthews is able 26 to source funding --27 THE COURT: Right. 28 CNSL K. JACKSON: -- now -- this is now, you know, some 29 time later --30 THE COURT: Correct. 31 CNSL K. JACKSON: -- and some time down the road, it 32 could be -- then -- then that funding could be 33 used, yes, certainly as -- as a means by which to fund an acquisition of -- of -- of the property or 34 35 some of the properties, yeah. 36 THE COURT: Right. 37 CNSL K. JACKSON: Or the business. 38 I suppose there's a world in which 39 Mr. Matthews and counsel shows up and says, well, 40 I don't have enough to buy the property, but I 41 have enough to redeem secured creditors -- redeem 42 the security and what's owed to the -- pay out the 43 secured creditors and what's owed to them. 44 Because of the deadlock, we have an inability to 45 do that, but you can cause your receiver to do it, 46 perhaps. It's the receiver. And I -- I expect

that there's a way in which that could happen.

47

```
Quite frankly, what's -- what's my client
 2
            going to say if it's tendered a cheque for the
 3
            full amount?
 4
       THE COURT:
                  Right.
 5
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        But -- but my point is they don't
            have a right automatically, and there's time to do
 7
            that.
                   Not just --
8
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
 9
       CNSL K. JACKSON: -- you know, there will be time after
10
            a receivership, which -- which the court's already
11
            picked up on, so ...
12
       THE COURT: Yeah.
13
                        Now, Justice, those -- those were
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
14
            the -- sort of the -- the points I wanted to make
15
            in response to your initial observations with
16
            which I -- as I said earlier, I completely agree.
17
                 What I might do is just ...
       THE COURT: All right. And just a couple more
18
19
            questions.
20
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Yes. Yes, of course.
21
       THE COURT: So then receiver would step in and run the
22
            business --
23
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Indeed.
24
       THE COURT: -- under your -- under your
25
            [indiscernible]?
26
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Right. And so there are one --
27
                   And so one of the -- one of the things
            right.
28
            you've seen, having skimmed at least the response
29
            or seen the response from 599 and Matthews, is you
30
            don't need a receiver of the Resorts business and
31
            assets.
32
                 And with that, we disagree. First of all,
33
            it's subject to the security in favour of
34
            Sanovest. It's captured by that security.
35
            part of the security package. And, in fact,
            that -- if -- if it needs to be bundled and sold
36
37
            with the other assets or doesn't need to be,
38
            that's something which shouldn't be predetermined.
39
            That's up to the court's officer to recommend.
40
                 That's the first point.
41
                 The second point is that our client has
42
            concerns with the way in which that business is
43
            being operated. It's been expressed -- again, you
44
            don't have to find it, but the parties disagree.
45
            But there are allegations of -- of
46
            misappropriation of funds from that business and
47
            just general concerns with the way it's run in
```

terms of the -- the dispute about the lease of the hotel space, for the -- for the pro shop, and things like that. Again, the issue is it -- it has to be taken out of the hands of the parties who have fundamental disagreements.

That's the second point.

The third point is this business is in jeopardy. And this one may be the more important of all things. This business has \$1.9 or so million of aged AR, trade creditors. It has --now, they -- they describe it differently because they call some of it aged AR and some of it cheques which we have issued but not released. I suspect under your -- under an accounting program, when you cut a cheque, it puts it into a different column, even if the cheque hasn't been delivered and cashed.

THE COURT: Right.

CNSL K. JACKSON: But, either way, the two add up to about \$1.9 million.

This -- Mr. Matthews's own evidence, which I'll take you through, is -- this is back in -- in -- is it May or June? First affidavit.

CNSL L. HIEBERT: May.

CNSL K. JACKSON: May. Mr. Matthews' initial evidence was this partnership -- the -- the business, the -- the partnerships are teetering on the brink, effectively. There is a concern they won't make payroll. There is all this AR. We need to do something.

And, of course, for Sanovest, that's a concern. That is obvious evidence of -- of indebtedness and a need for controls and -- and ensuring a stay to prevent creditors from taking action.

That evidence changed once, I think, Mr. Matthews realized that perhaps that wasn't the most advantageous evidence to -- to put in in relation to a receivership application.

Mr. -- in -- in -- in June, Mr. Matthews said, well, it's not as bad as that. We're going to be fine. Over the course of the next four months, we're going to be able to pay down -- or two months, we're going to be able to pay down -- four months, we're going to be able to pay down our AR by \$780,000. We're heading into the golf season. It's -- it's going to be good.

And what was -- we found out very recently is that hasn't happened. There has been, effectively, no paydown whatsoever of the indebtedness, the AR. It's almost identical to what it was in May.

And, worst of all, we're heading out of the golf season into the lean year -- lean months of -- of a golf operation.

And so from the perspective of Sanovest as a secured creditor and, frankly -- this is not to be lost -- with respect to the other stakeholders, having a receiver put in place, having a receivership order with a stay of proceedings to prevent creditors from taking action, these -- all these creditors with AR -- with AP, I should say, is essential. And it will ensure that there is funding to the extent necessary to make payroll, to keep the lights on, and to keep the business operating while the sale is carried out. And that -- there is likely going to be need -- a need for some borrowings.

The -- the bank accounts -- it's in evidence that, currently, the bank accounts are either overdrawn or have several thousand dollars. That -- that's how close it is with issued cheques in the hundreds of thousands that aren't delivered and AR of another \$1.2 or 3 million on top of that.

That business needs a receiver to operate it; a receivership order to enable -- I mean to borrow funds, to -- to -- to fund it; and it needs a stay of proceeding.

THE COURT: And where would the money come from?

CNSL K. JACKSON: So -- so -- so, seriously, one -one -- one of the allegations by 599 is -- well,
it's -- it's -- it's part of the difficulty with
the -- with the response. On one hand, they say
Sanovest would not fund. They have been refusing
to fund and advance additional funds under their
loan.

Well, at times, that has been true. There have been requests, and there has been no funding. But, of course, the loan is in default. There's no obligation to fund. Quite frankly, if you're Sanovest and you're concerned with the way that the business is being operated, the way your funds are being used, you're entitled to say no to that.

Now, the other thing 599 says is that Sanovest is seeking to advantage itself -- or entrench itself is the word they use -- as a secured lender by advancing funds in a receivership. It's seeking to enhance it's status as secured lender by advancing funds.

First of all, which is it?

But, second of all, somebody needs to advance funds to the receiver. Sanovest has indicated it will -- it is prepared to do so in the context of a receivership. It will advance funds.

Does it have to be Sanovest? No. The receiver would be expected to find the best priced money available on the market. There's no doubt people will be happy to loan against these lands and maybe at a better rate than Sanovest. I'd be surprised, but that's for the receiver to determine.

But the point is there is funding available. Sanovest is prepared to make the funding available because, of course, it's not so foolish as to think that it could initiate a receivership without funding.

But it doesn't have to be Sanovest, and it's not contrary to 599's suspicions seeking to advantage itself or somehow entrench itself as a secured creditor by adding to its debt, despite the fact that 599 earlier asked it to do so.

So there is funding available if -- and -- and from Sanovest if no one else.

THE COURT: And so another question, then, is are there secured creditors behind Sanovest?

CNSL K. JACKSON: There are -- there are not secured creditors behind. There's HSBC ahead of Sanovest --

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL K. JACKSON: -- on some of the lands. Right? Not all of the lands. And so when -- when -- when the -- when the -- when the partnership acquired these lands -- it was in 2013 -- they were acquired -- you may recall that Bear Mountain CCAA, one of the earlier accredited driven CCAAs where HSBC was a secured creditor -- had a -- by you -- HSBC standards, worldwide, had significant exposure to -- to this development.

And when it sold, it took some cash -- not as much as it wanted in cash, and so it has a

```
participation agreement where, on the sale of
            lands in the future, it gets a certain percentage
 3
            of the -- of the proceeds of sale.
 4
                 That -- that obligation is secured by
 5
            mortgages of certain of the lands. And so there
            are certain lands with --
 7
       THE COURT: What -- what I was worried -- well,
            thinking about and also concerned about is in the
8
            middle of this protract -- this very fractious
 9
10
            dispute between the parties, is there or are there
11
            other creditors who would initiate bankruptcy
            proceedings under the BIA and -- and, you know, in
12
            addition to bankrupt -- some -- some proceeding
13
14
            that would effectively take it out of the hands of
15
            the parties in any event?
16
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Right. Well, I don't see HSBC doing
17
            that.
                   I think their -- their obligations arise on
            sales, and so I think they're -- they're not the
18
19
            bigger concern.
20
                 I think the bigger concern, Justice, is the
21
            City of Langford has a $1.8 million claim, which
22
            it's advancing --
23
       THE COURT: Okay.
24
       CNSL K. JACKSON: -- against the -- the partnership.
25
            And -- and there are, as I said, you know,
26
            $2 million of -- of unsecured creditors out
27
28
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
29
       CNSL K. JACKSON: -- who are unpaid. And all it really
30
            takes is one of those with a more significant
31
            claim to start taking action. Even
32
            [indiscernible], there are -- there are actions in
33
            terms of seizing assets --
34
       THE COURT:
                  Right.
                        -- if they get to judgment.
35
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
36
            haven't seen it happen yet, but, of course,
37
            that's -- you know, we're holding our breath at
38
            least on the -- on the Sanovest end.
39
                 Excuse me.
40
                 That's true.
                               There are -- there are also --
            there are secured creditors: more -- equipment
41
42
            lessors, vehicles, and the like. Sorry, there's
43
            also the golf course -- the golf cart -- I'm
44
            missing one. There's another significant claim
45
            that was advanced by ...
46
       THE COURT: In any event --
47
       CNSL K. JACKSON: In any event, Justice --
```

```
THE COURT: -- your point is that --
 2
       CNSL K. JACKSON: -- there -- that's what --
 3
       THE COURT: -- my concern is not unfounded in the sense
 4
            that what you're saying is -- in your submission
 5
            is that a receivership brings about a stay that
            would otherwise let some third party creditor, who
            is owed money, take a course of action that would -- would take this out of the hands of the
 7
 8
 9
            parties in any event.
10
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Right. Right.
                                         And we've already
11
            seen -- as I said, we've already seen litigation
12
            initiated, you know, for a significant amount of
13
            money. And -- and, you know, in the context of
            the debt compared to Sanovest, it's not
14
15
            significant, but it wouldn't be the first time
16
            that a smaller, unsecured creditor has tipped a
17
            company into -- into a receivership as a result.
18
       THE COURT: So I know you're going to get into this in
19
            a significant way, but --
20
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Yeah.
21
       THE COURT: -- tell me, what is the issue, then, with
22
            the more limited receivership order? I take it,
23
            as a receivership order, the question is, is it a
24
            broad one, or is it --
25
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Right.
26
       THE COURT:
                   -- limited with the power to sell specific
27
            assets? And I wasn't certain because I didn't
28
            have opportunity read all the submissions how that
29
            would be formulated.
30
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Right. Well -- well, there are a
31
            number of problems with it. And so maybe just to
32
            do that, then, what I could do is --
33
       THE COURT: Just the --
34
                         -- quickly --
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
35
       THE COURT: Just the -- the big overview so I can
36
            then --
37
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Right.
38
       THE COURT:
                   Or -- or you can deal with it later.
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Well, no. No. I mean, look, one of
39
40
            the fundamental dis -- disagreements between the
            parties is the -- the means by which and the
41
42
            manner in which the lands or the assets should be
43
            monetized. Right?
44
       THE COURT: Right.
45
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Sanovest is of the view that there
46
            should be an unblock sale. Sell it all, get the
47
            best price for all because it's better to have it
```

```
sold as a whole than in pieces.
 2
       THE COURT: Right.
 3
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Mr. Matthews and 599 disagree.
 4
            view is, we think we can come up with this way of
 5
            slicing and dicing and rearranging and subdividing
            and packaging the parcels to be able to sell
 7
            land -- only some of them, though -- and get just
 8
            enough money to pay out Sanovest and have a bit of
 9
            working capital. That's what they think is the
10
            right way to go.
11
                 The parties disagree. Period.
12
                 Here's the thing. We're not here to tell you
13
            that Sanovest is absolutely right.
14
                  It would -- that would -- that was -- I was
       THE COURT:
15
            going to go to that next.
16
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Right.
17
       THE COURT:
                   Ultimately, the receiver could come down on
            the side of San -- Mr. Matthews initially and say,
18
19
            look, rather than trying to sell it all unblock, I
20
            think the more appropriate -- given the market
21
            conditions and the nature of these assets --
22
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Right.
23
       THE COURT: -- it's preferable to try and sell them at
24
            certain stages or in certain smaller blocks.
25
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Right. Right. And -- and -- and if
26
            that's the receiver's conclusion --
27
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
28
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        -- Sanovest -- the reason -- seeking
29
            a receiver, it knows the consequences of seeking a
30
            receiver. It's giving the -- it's not seeking to
31
            tie the receiver's hands in any regard is -- apart
32
            from the fact that, at the behest of 599, it is --
33
            it is mandated to come back to court to seek a
34
            sale -- an investment solicitation process order,
            which it would do anyways.
35
36
                 But, sure, we're not -- Sanovest is not
37
            seeking to -- to bind the receiver to proceed in
38
            one particular way or another.
                                             That's the
39
            difference.
40
                 599 and Matthews are asking this court to
41
            make a determination that this -- this -- is the
42
            best way to monetize the assets for the
43
            partnership.
44
                 Well, there's a disagreement on that.
45
            is insufficient evidence for this court to
46
            conclude that. And the court shouldn't conclude
47
            that but leave it to its officers to report.
```

And it may well be the conclusion of the court's officer, but it may not be.

And they're asking this court on what we say is insufficient evidence of the value of these lands.

And -- and -- and here's the other part of this. What does it do to the remaining lands? That will leave behind a remaining parcels of land where there's no comment at what -- what happens if you sell these chunks of land to developers who begin to develop and -- and take away some of the density and the zoning and leaving these lands behind? And -- and there's no evidence at all about what the impact is apart from Mr. Kusumoto says, I have a concern about that.

And it needs to be investigated in a much more thorough manner by a court's officer. That's our point. That -- those the primary concerns.

Now, we can get into other issues with it because the order they're seeking actually compels subdivision. It compels subdivision despite the fact that Sanovest's mortgage precludes that without its consent.

HSBC has a mortgage. It's not named or on notice of this order. And they don't even name in their proceeding the legal owners of the lands. The actual numbered companies that are the legal owners whose lands are to be subdivided aren't even named. How do they show up at a land title office with that in hand and say, this is how it's going to be done?

So there are -- there's any number of reasons it's unworkable.

But the most reason -- the -- the most -- the primary reason it's unworkable is it presupposes that their way of -- of having the lands sold is the correct way, and that's not something that this court should be determining on this application is what we say with this evidence.

THE COURT: And -- and it would -- and they have -- Mr. Matthews, just like Sanovest, would have the opportunity at a later date to come and contest the receiver's recommendations.

CNSL K. JACKSON: So there's two things that -- that, you know, I would take as a given in any receivership.

One, every stakeholder will have the ear of

the receiver. Now, in this case, the two fundamentally, you know, most important stakeholders are Mr. Matthews and Mr. Kusumoto. Each one --

THE COURT: And --

CNSL K. JACKSON: There's no receiver in the land that's going to -- to decide how to monetize the assets of this partnership without speaking with the two of them.

THE COURT: Well, there's also obligations owed by them.

CNSL K. JACKSON: Precisely. To both of them. And -- and -- and so they're going to have as much input as they want into the formulation of the plan for the sale process by the receiver.

Of course, they will -- they have the benefit of counsel. They can get their own financial advisors, if they want. Whatever -- there's going to be that process.

And as I said earlier, it's not going to be days or weeks. It's going to be months to get that process hammered out with the evidence this court needs to be satisfied that this is the right way to proceed, first point.

And -- and the second thing is exactly what you said, Justice. Even if they say, well, we gave them all these ideas and evidence that we said this is the way to proceed and the receiver shows up and comes up with a plan that we don't agree with it, there's still someone they have to get on there, the receiver, and that's -- that's this court, Justice. They still have the opportunity to say, somehow, this court's officer has made a mistake in its conclusion.

And so there's -- there's any number of safeguards in that regard.

The concern is -- is prejudging the way in which it's to be done and tying the hands of the court's officer to proceed in one manner. That's the concern.

And -- and so one of the -- one of the benefits of the comprehensive, complete receivership order sought by Sanovest is it does no such thing. It does no such thing.

I'll -- I'll -- while we're on it, I'm -- and I recognize the time, and maybe I'll make one or two --

THE COURT: Sure.

CNSL K. JACKSON: -- points before the break, if the court is so inclined -- is my friends call it a marketing agent, which is an unknown concept to me. I mean, I know what it is just by the words, but -- but it's not something which there's jurisdiction under any of the authorities in which they rely to do this.

Now, it's a receiver. I think if you put it to them, they will say, yes, it's a receiver. We're just cloaking it with a different name. Fine.

There is no funding mechanism in the context of that process that they envisage. There's going to be subdivision, which I don't think is necessarily an inexpensive process. You're going to need consultants. You're going to need to bring — to go to the City. You're — you're going to have to get approvals to get all of that done. You're going to have to pay the court's officer. There's no funding mechanism built into this at all. At all.

And so, you know, it's going to take months. There's no indication -- there's no evidence -- this is one of the problems. Again, they're asking the court to say, this is the right way to go. There's no evidence of how long it will take to do the subdivision. Our client says it's got to be six months anyways. So it's going to be months and months and months without funding.

THE COURT: Yeah.

CNSL K. JACKSON: We don't know how that works.

There's -- in -- in their written submission in response, there's an indication that, well, the -- that's -- the marketing agent will come back and seek interim financing. We're going to have a fight all over again if that's what they seek to do because it's going to be without notice of HSBC so far on -- on notice to, presumably, our client, where we can say, how does this benefit us? You can't get it over our objection. We consent to the funding ahead of us on a receivership -- a full-blown receivership -- but not in this.

But even -- in any event, as we sit here today, this -- it's -- it's half-baked. It doesn't actually have a funding process baked into the order that they're seeking, this receivership

```
order -- the limited receivership order.
 2
                 And it's going to take months and months and
 3
            months, and there are carrying costs that are not
 4
            going to be insignificant to get the subdivision.
 5
            No indication of what those might be.
            indication of funding for them.
                 All solved by a complete receivership.
 7
 8
       THE COURT: And I take it, under the -- the modified
            receivership proposal that -- that Mr. Matthews
 9
10
            wants ordered, the receiver runs the business in
11
            any event? In other words, he's out? Or no?
12
       CNSL K. JACKSON: No, I don't think so.
13
       THE COURT: Okay.
14
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        I think Mr. Matthews wants to hold
15
            onto his -- his -- his golf course operation
16
            and -- and has. And the -- and one of the -- one
17
            of the difficulties with carving out the resort is
18
            if there's going to be borrowing, it's going to be
19
            against lands. No one's borrowing against golf
20
            carts and -- and a golf business. No one's
21
            lending against that.
22
                 The lands -- some of those lands are
23
            beneficially owned by the resort. Someone needs
24
            to be actually able to manage/operate the resort
25
            and actually sign off, technically, on -- on -- on
26
            lending to the -- the development -- the
27
            partnership writ large based on security against
28
            the lands.
29
       THE COURT: All right. Well, we'll take the morning
30
            break. One of the things I don't have a handle on
31
            is the nature of the various businesses that --
32
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Right.
33
       THE COURT:
                  -- are --
       CNSL K. JACKSON: I -- I jumped way ahead, Justice.
34
35
       THE COURT: No, but I --
36
       CNSL K. JACKSON: I'll back up a bit.
37
       THE COURT:
                   No, I appreciate it. I -- thank you for
38
            the overview.
39
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Very good.
40
       THE COURT:
                   Okay. We'll take the morning break, then.
41
            Thank you.
42
       THE CLERK: Order in chambers. Chambers are adjourned
43
            for morning recess.
44
45
                 (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED FOR MORNING RECESS)
46
                 ([11:21:26 AM])
47
                 (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED) ([11:44:18 AM])
```

40

Submissions re receivership order by Cnsl K. Jackson Discussion re housekeeping matters

```
2
       DISCUSSION RE HOUSEKEEPING MATTERS:
 3
 4
                   Yes.
       THE COURT:
 5
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       By way of house --
 6
       THE CLERK:
                   We are on the record, Justice.
 7
                   Thanks.
       THE COURT:
 8
                 Yeah, go ahead.
                                   Start over.
 9
       CNSL G. BRANDT: Justice, just by way of housekeeping,
10
            I'd like to hand up the --
11
       THE COURT: Okay.
12
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        -- copies of the affidavits that have
13
            been the subject of the sealing order.
14
                  Okay.
       THE COURT:
15
       CNSL G. BRANDT: And I'm going to hand up two --
16
            there's two affidavits here that have their tab
17
            numbers written on them in stickies.
18
       THE COURT: Okay.
19
       CNSL G. BRANDT: And there are blanks in the volumes of
20
            the record.
21
                 And then, secondly, I have volume 9 of the
22
            application record, which includes the two
23
            affidavits -- number 1 and 4 -- of Ms. Celiz,
24
            which were sealed, as -- as -- well as an
25
            unsealed -- non-sealed affidavit of Ms. Celiz.
26
       THE COURT:
                  From Ms. who?
27
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        And that's volume 9.
28
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
29
                        Those are the legal assistant
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
30
            affidavits.
31
       THE COURT: Oh, I see. Okay. All right. Very good.
32
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       Thank you, Justice.
33
       THE COURT: Thank you.
34
                 Mr. Jackson.
35
36
       SUBMISSIONS RE RECEIVERSHIP ORDER BY CNSL K. JACKSON
37
       continuing:
38
39
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Yes.
                                Thank you, Justice.
40
                 What I might do, just to finish off the point
41
            around the application and order sought by 599, if
42
            I could just ask you on the -- on the joint app --
43
            the condensed application --
44
       THE COURT: Yeah.
45
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         -- record tab 3. If I could ask you
46
            just to turn to that. It's -- it's the notice of
47
            application by 599 and Mr. Matthews.
```

THE COURT: All right. 2 CNSL K. JACKSON: That gives you a high level at the 3 beginning, of course, of the orders sought by 4 them. 5 And I just wanted to finish this off --6 THE COURT: I'm going to -- oh, I see -- I see what you 7 They're asking me to order them subdivided. 8 All right. 9 CNSL K. JACKSON: Sorry, Justice? I missed that. 10 THE COURT: They're asking me to order them be 11 subdivided. K. JACKSON: Well, yes. And so, I mean -- and if you look -- if you look at page 12 at the top --12 CNSL K. JACKSON: 13 14 you won't see it on the first page, but the second 15 page, you'll see the page numbers at the top. 16 THE COURT: Yes. 17 CNSL K. JACKSON: Page 12 is the actual form of order 18 that was appended. 19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 CNSL K. JACKSON: And just -- it's -- it's -- it's -part of the difficulty, I'm not sure how this is 21 22 carried out, but it -- it reflects exactly what it 23 says there, that the lands and premises as follows 24 be, you know, sub 1 subdivided and bundled; sub 2 25 subdivided and bundled; sub 3, these ones be 26 bundled. 27 It doesn't really say how, just that they are to be -- I -- I'm not -- I don't think that order 28 29 itself would be sufficient to accomplish that. It 30 doesn't say that anybody is supposed to do that. 31 And so it's a bit -- and -- and if you look at the written submissions from 599 and Matthews, 32 33 they say, well, we're not actually seeking an 34 order that they be subdivided and bundled, but 35 I -- I don't know how else to read that. 36 And it doesn't -- it says -- well, this -- I 37 think what they say is, well, the -- the marketing 38 agent/receiver can do that. I suppose if that was 39 what they were directed to do, they could seek 40 necessary orders or consent from various parties and carry that out. 41 42 But that's not what the order they're seeking 43 Seems to me they're asking the court to 44 simply order that, whatever, and then I -- I -- I 45 guess somehow it would be carried out. 46 What I pointed out last was there's no 47 funding mechanism for any of this built into their

order at present. That includes the draft order that's attached as a schedule, but I think that would be a problematic order for them to obtain in the circumstances.

But paired up with that, there's this idea that a marketing agent -- I'm going to keep saying "receiver" because it's just -- I've, through that, just called it a receiver. They haven't identified who this is to be. It's an unnamed person or institution or firm is to be appointed as a marketing agent. They haven't named anyone.

I don't know how you can make an order without a person actually being appointed. We --we -- we -- you know, we've put forward Alvarez & Marsal. We have had sent them active materials, and they're -- you know, they -- they -- they've -- they've included all that. We don't have that from 599 and Matthews. So I don't know how you can order that.

It may be -- it's occurred to me -- or us, I suppose, when we've spoken about it on our side here -- that I'm not sure you'd find someone enthralled with the idea of taking on that role, having no funding and -- and having to try and carry out, perhaps, if that's the intention -- to carry out the subdivision, incur whatever costs there are for that, go through a sale process.

It's just it's not there. It -- it -- when I said earlier that it's a half-baked order, it doesn't seem to have been thought through in that regard, and I think it puts the -- puts the court in an impossible position to suggest that the order could possibly be made.

And then, since I have it, Justice, at page 3 of the order -- sorry, the application -- my apologies, the application. So what they're seeking, in fact, are two different orders: one is the -- the subdivision order with a marketing agent appointment, two is an order authorizing the distribution of any proceeds from the sale of one or more of the parcels as follows.

Now, this -- this is -- I mean, we've asked. Our friends have not provided a draft of what that order is, so we don't know exactly what it looks like. But we have pretty good information from what the proposed process high -- high level is.

In their materials, 599 and -- and Matthews

refer to their application as being a funding application or an application for a funding order. I think what they intend to say is that this order, if granted, will enable us to monetize some of the assets and create value and sufficient funds to pay out Sanovest and carry on the business because it's going to provide funding for the -- for the business.

Well, you have my concerns with the order that carries -- it gets you to any realizations.

But here -- here -- and, again, one of the problems, of course, is we don't know what -- the actual amount to be generated from the sale. They'll say it could be \$90 million. Maybe. But that's not -- there's no -- not sufficient evidence to drive that

The order distributing the proceeds is -- is even more problematic because the second thing it wants -- the first:

2(a), a reserve to satisfy any taught -- tax obligation of Ecoasis Bear Mountain Developments --

That's the top partnership, which is defined at "the company,"

-- the partnership --

Which is later defined as "Developments," so same one, I think,

-- Ecoasis Resort and Golf --

Which is the resort partnership,

-- and their respective partners, which includes Sanovest and 599 arising from the sales.

What taxes? There's no evidence whatsoever as to what that might be. It could be a dollar, it could be every single dollar because we don't know what the tax obligations are.

One thing I do know is that there's going to be a significant cap gains hit at six -- at two-thirds of whatever the -- the capital gains is

any -- any relation proceeds or -- or relations

from the -- from the -- from the cost of those lands. But we don't know what it is. 3 So it's kind -- and there's no process baked 4 in anywhere or indicated or in the evidence as to 5 how that's to be determined or what it might even It's just any tax obligation arising from the be. 7 sale. 8 And then, next: 9 10 Of the balance --11 12 I suppose it should say "if any," 13 14 -- of the net sale proceeds, 85% goes to 15 repay the amount owing to Sanovest and 15% is 16 retained by the company --17 18 Which is defined as "Developments," 19 20 -- for ongoing operating expenses, the 21 partnership --22 23 Which is also Developments, 24 25 -- and the Resort partnership. 26 27 Well, here -- here -- here's the problem with 28 that. Under the agreement -- under the loan 29 agreement, every dollar has to go to Sanovest for 30 the sale. There's no contemplation of -- of an 85 31 percent/15 percent split. There's no obligation 32 on the part of Sanovest to give a discharge in 33 those circumstances. If the loan is in default, 34 it can say, every single penny comes to me. 35 So it's seeking to rewrite the very agreement 36 that the partnership, as borrower, has with 37 Sanovest on a distribution. And Sanovest says, 38 no, thank you. That's not acceptable. 39 And then there's an optimistic: 40 41 Following repayment of the Sanovest loan in 42 full, the residue 50/50 --43 44 Which sounds nice to a point, but that's not 45 exactly how the waterfall works -- I'll come to it 46 later -- in terms of how the partners share any --

47

from the monetization of the asset of the partnership.

Right. Sorry. That's a good point too.
Ms. Hiebert reminds me, 85 percent of the amount owing to Sanovest is a disputed amount. There's no mechanism anywhere for that resolution of that in the distribution order here or in the limited receivership order that's being sought.

So 85 percent of what? They're paying 85 percent to what? Towards what until they're paid in full? It's not -- there's no process to have that determined whatsoever in -- in -- in the contemplation of 599 and Matthews.

I'll point out also the distribution order conflicts with the limited receivership order in draft because the limited receivership order does provide for a charge in favour of the marketing agent/receiver ahead of all other distributions of prior claims. And so it's missing — it seems to be missing a whole other category of — of — of payments that have to be made in this waterfall.

So it's contrary the contractual entitlement of Sanovest. It's -- it's internally inconsistent as between the two orders. It doesn't have any indication about how tax obligations or amounts owing to Sanovest are to be determined.

I said before it's half-baked, Justice. I -- I want to lean into that. This isn't thought through in terms of how properly this can work.

Justice, that's all I intend to say for now about the -- the orders that are being sought by 599 and Matthews.

What I might do is come back a little bit [indiscernible] my submissions a little bit more strictly according to the way they're laid out in our written submissions. In doing so, I now happily jumped through a lot of the overview. It may be -- come to some of the facts that may still be a little elusive in terms of how things have gone so far, which -- if you have those written submissions.

THE COURT: I do.

CNSL K. JACKSON: I want to make sure you have the right ones, Justice. I think --

THE COURT: August 19th, 2024.

CNSL K. JACKSON: Right. Yeah, the oppression ones are much bigger.

```
Yeah, it's the --
       THE COURT:
 2
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Ours are smaller.
 3
       THE COURT:
                   Regarding the hearing on the petition.
 4
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Right. Very good. Thank you. So --
 5
       THE COURT: And you are going to walk me through or
            explain at some point how this structure -- how --
 7
            how the ...
8
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Right.
 9
       THE COURT:
                  ... all the assets are set up.
10
       CNSL K. JACKSON: That's what I was going to do.
11
       THE COURT: Because I -- I -- I haven't drilled down
12
            into that.
13
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        I'm going to be doing that, yes, at
14
            this part here, at -- at page 4.
15
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
16
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         And so -- so, again, I don't know if
17
            an org chart is necessary. It's -- actually, at
18
            the top level, the partnership is -- we call it
            "Developments." "Developments partnership."
19
20
                 And Developments is the top-level partner,
21
            the partnership units of which are owned equally
22
            by Sanovest and 599.
23
       THE COURT: If I do ask you for an org chart, you can
24
            get one?
25
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        We can do that over lunch .
26
       THE COURT: All right.
                               Tomorrow.
27
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Certainly. It won't be able -- it
28
            will not be difficult.
29
       THE COURT: All right.
30
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Now, Development.
31
       THE COURT:
                   By Sanovest and 599.
32
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         599.
33
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
34
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Developments, as the top partnership,
            is the sole limited partner of -- I guess we call
35
36
            it a subsidiary partnership, which is Resorts.
37
            Resorts.
38
       THE COURT:
                   Sure.
39
       CNSL K. JACKSON: My friends think I'm wrong about
                   Ms. Hiebert's going to make sure I'm right.
40
            this.
41
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
42
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Right.
                                Sorry. My friends -- so
            limited liability partner.
43
44
                 The -- the -- there's one unit issued to the
45
            manager of the partnership, which is -- which is
46
            Ecoasis -- EMDB -- Ecoasis Mountain ...
       UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Bear Mountain.
47
```

```
CNSL K. JACKSON: Bear Mountain Developments.
 2
            Ecoasis -- EBMD. It is -- there's one unit.
 3
            it's 49.5 percent Sanovest, 49.5 percent --
                  That's off Developments?
 4
       THE COURT:
 5
                        599 with Developments and -- and then
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
            1 percent for EM -- Ecoasis -- BMD -- EBMD.
 7
                 And at the Resorts level, it's Developments
            for 99 percent for -- or 99.5 -- and then one unit
 8
 9
            issued to EBMD.
10
                 Now, I didn't bother mentioning it, because
11
            the one is the notional unit, which is issued for
12
            these lease circumstances, but it's -- it exists.
13
       THE COURT: All right.
14
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        They don't get a return on it.
            they do, it's $100 or something.
15
16
       THE COURT:
                   That's -- EBMD is the managing partner?
17
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Yes.
18
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
19
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Yes. It's a manager.
20
       CNSL C. FERRIS: I'll just add that it's the
21
            corporation in the chain. So EMD -- BD is a
22
            corporation, not a partnership.
23
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Okay.
                               All right.
                                            I see.
                                                    Apparently
24
            this is important for oppression.
25
       THE COURT: All right. So I think an org chart would
26
            be in order.
27
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Sure. Certainly. Not a problem.
28
                 I think there's a reason that my friend
29
            was -- was quick to point out there is a
30
            corporation somewhere in here.
31
       THE COURT: Okay. All right.
32
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Right? It will be something that my
            friend and -- and Mr. Nathanson will be -- will be
33
34
            speaking to more. From -- for my purposes and, I
            think, for the purposes of the receivership, it's
35
36
            entirely irrelevant.
37
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
38
       CNSL K. JACKSON: So Developments owns what we call
39
            the -- the project lands. And so at its core,
            this entire enterprise is about developing the
40
41
            lands that were acquired. So Developments is the
42
            owner of the project. And there's a number of
43
            parcels of the project lands.
44
                 Resorts is the -- is the beneficial owner --
45
            I should say beneficial owner in both cases -- of
46
            the golf course and tennis facilities. So it --
47
            sorry. And -- and, as a result of the way things
```

```
have turned out and the way it's been structured,
            it also owns some -- a smaller number -- of
 3
            parcels that are for development. So we say the
 4
            project lands, the development lands, are owned
 5
            largely by Developments and somewhat by -- in --
            in a smaller portion by Resorts. A little bit.
 7
                  Ms. Hiebert found that 24 of the parcels are
 8
            owned by Developments and two by Resorts.
 9
            Beneficial.
                         Beneficially. I keep saying owned,
10
            but beneficially.
11
                 And then there's that one parcel of land that
12
            was transferred to Bear Mountain -- BMA, Bear
13
            Mountain Adventures, that one parcel of land that
14
            was transferred to it for a dollar.
15
                 So those are the -- and then all of the lands
            except for the ones that were transferred to
16
17
            BMA -- all of the lands are owned through nominee
18
            numbered companies.
19
       THE COURT: Okay.
20
       CNSL K. JACKSON: We will get you an org chart to
21
            show --
22
       THE COURT: Yeah.
23
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         -- a little bit of that detail.
24
                 But the point is the -- the two partners, 599
25
            and Sanovest, the top partners, have their
26
            partnership interest in Developments, which, in
27
            turn, has a partnership interest in Resorts.
28
            own the lands, the two partnerships, through
29
            nominees.
30
                  And it's all situated in Langford?
       THE COURT:
31
       CNSL K. JACKSON: It's all in Langford. That's right.
32
            The district of Langford. And it's --
33
       UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's not all in Langford.
34
       CNSL K. JACKSON: It's not?
35
       THE COURT: What's that?
36
       UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's not all --
37
       CNSL K. JACKSON: So it's not all in Langford.
38
            much is in Langford?
                                 Ms. Hiebert is an absolute
            fact monster here, so I'll ask her.
39
40
                 We'll find -- there's another --
41
       UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's a neighbouring district
42
            of Highlands.
43
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Oh, there you go. Some portion of
44
            Highlands.
45
       THE COURT:
                  And there -- there was a hotel somewhere,
46
            but that's not in the mix?
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Well, the hotel was sold --
47
```

```
THE COURT: Right. That's --
       CNSL K. JACKSON: -- years ago. And so the hotel is now owned by another party. It had the -- the --
 2
 3
 4
            the arrangement originally was that -- that
 5
            Resorts, the operator of the golf course, would
            lease some facilities from the hotel, which were
 7
            traditionally owned collectively -- some of the
 8
            facilities for the pro shop, for cart storage and
 9
            charging, and things like that.
10
                  That lease expired in July. It wasn't
11
                      There's disagreement -- surprise --
            renewed.
12
            between the two partners as to whether it should
13
            have been renewed, and the hotel says, doesn't
14
            matter what you wanted; I wouldn't have renewed it
15
            if Mr. Matthews was running this, but I would if
16
            the receiver was.
17
                 You know, that's one of the exact problems
18
            that's now -- Mr. Matthews will say, it's okay.
19
            We've taken care of it. We've got a pro shop
20
            facility that seems to be working just fine.
21
                 And Mr. Kusumoto will say, no, it's a hallway
22
            with a bunch of, you know, clothes on clothing
23
            racks in a hallway and no access to showers or
24
            what -- I think it's another dispute. And someone
25
            has to sort out if it should be a new lease or it
26
            could just stay where it is.
27
                           It's not -- how many acres are --
       THE COURT:
                  Right.
28
            are -- are ...
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Total acres, I think, are 740 is what
29
30
            I recall.
31
       THE COURT: And it's all bare land except for the golf
32
            course and -- and this shop, this --
33
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Leaving out the hotel. Anything that
34
            is -- certain -- it's been sold over time.
35
                 And, in fact, one of the things -- if you
36
            want to just jump ahead a little bit to -- in --
37
            in -- in the submissions --
38
                 Right. And so if you look at paragraph 25 on
39
            page 8.
       THE COURT: All right.
40
41
       CNSL K. JACKSON: So this -- this -- this goes back to
42
            when the lands were acquired. So the partnerships
43
            acquired the project lands and the golf course
44
            lands and tennis facilities and 156-room hotel --
45
            that's the one that was since sold -- in 2013.
46
                 Turning to paragraph 27, that talks about the
47
            transfer from one of the nominees -- not a
```

```
numbered co but BM Mountain Golf Course Ltd. of
            the BMA lands to BMA for $1. Those are sought to
 3
            be included in the receivership order.
 4
            still under the Sanovest mortgage, and they rely
 5
            on Sanovest funding to pay property taxes -- or at
            least the enterprise funding to pay property
 7
            taxes.
8
       THE COURT: So 28, when it says Bear Mountain, which
 9
            Bear Mountain?
10
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        So Bear Mountain --
11
       THE COURT: What's that?
12
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        -- is what we call the overall
13
            development.
14
       THE COURT:
                   Oh, I see.
15
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         The whole development area.
16
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
17
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Yeah. And so that's big -- it's the
18
            big development that was the dream of Len Barry
19
            back originally when it was first owned by -- by
20
            him to develop a great big golf course and
21
            residential and commercial development called Bear
22
            Mountain over on the island largely in Langford.
23
            It now has about 1,400 residential units.
24
       THE COURT: Okay.
25
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         3,000 residents.
                                            It's expected to
26
            grow to 3,000 residential units -- 8,000
27
            residents -- in the next 10 years.
28
                 Over the page .
29
       THE COURT: So some of that's -- not all of that's
30
            owned by the -- by the partnership?
31
       CNSL K. JACKSON: No. In fact, all of the things --
32
            all of those residential units -- housing units
33
            have now sold.
34
       THE COURT: Right.
35
       CNSL K. JACKSON: They monetized some of the lands by
36
            developing and selling over time.
37
                  So what we're dealing with is the 29 --
38
            that 740 acres?
39
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Right. Right. And 200 of that is
40
            the development lands, the project lands.
41
            rest is the golf courses and the tennis
42
            facilities.
43
       THE COURT: Okay. All right.
                                       I see.
                                               That answers my
       question. Thank you. CNSL C. FERRIS: Justice, as opposed to me standing up
44
45
46
            on multiple occasions just to let you know that a
47
            lot of these facts are -- are -- we think are --
```

```
are not totally -- in total -- that's -- we --
 2
            like, the last fact, we don't agree with that.
 3
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
                          All right.
 4
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Just so you know.
 5
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
                           Thank you.
 6
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         We'll figure out maybe where the --
 7
            where the divide is here at some point.
 8
       THE COURT: All right.
 9
       CNSL K. JACKSON: We can deal with it in reply if we
10
            need to.
11
       THE COURT:
                   Okay. All right. That helps -- gives me
12
            an overview.
13
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Right. Right.
14
                 Okay. So -- so -- so backing up ...
15
       THE COURT:
                   Where do you want to go to now?
16
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Right. So back to page 4, paragraph
17
            15 -- or paragraph 14. So the first thing I want
            to point out -- now, on this application, there's
18
19
            a -- some facts which are -- cannot be disputed.
20
                 Sanovest's loan is in default.
                                                   There's --
21
            it's been in default for a while. Payments
22
            haven't been made. It's the end of paragraph 14.
23
            No payments since July of 2023. Over a year.
24
            it came due in May of 2024.
25
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
26
       CNSL K. JACKSON: But there's no doubt it's in default.
27
            That's -- it -- how much might be owing under it,
            well, our client will say 64 million plus. 599 will say, well, at least $50 million in principal
28
29
30
            plus some interest. But we also know that 599
31
            will say, okay, let's not forget that interest is
32
            accruing at $5 million a year on this.
33
            million bucks a year.
34
                 The partnerships are managed by EBMD.
35
            paragraph 15. That's one that owns limited units
36
            in the -- in the partnerships, and Matthews is the
37
            CEO of that company. And he will admit that the
38
            companies -- the borrower and the -- and the --
39
            and the nominee -- were all quarantors, are unable
            to pay the amounts owing to Sanovest unless the
40
41
            property is sold.
42
                 Now, back in May, here's what Mr. Matthews
43
            said about the partnerships. They were managing
44
            cash -- this is over the page -- on a daily basis,
45
            prioritizing only the most urgent of payments.
46
                 By the way, the -- the evidence cites are all
47
            footnoted.
```

THE COURT: Yes. CNSL K. JACKSON: 3 team has been in possession of a stack of signed 4 and unsigned vendor cheques that cannot go out 5 given operating shortfall. And he's concerned that: 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28 29 30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47

We will not be able to pay our staff, keep the lights on, and maintain our golf courses and member services while also meeting our obligations to vendors and others.

Since September 2023, the accounting

And so in May, again, Mr. Matthews' evidence was that the partnership's financial position would deteriorate further when property taxes came due in July 2024. And the existing financial strain has:

> -- already impacted our operations, our reputation, goodwill, our trust and credibility, and our staff morale.

Just a footnote on that, the property taxes did not get paid. They didn't get paid, and penalties were incurred at two points already, totalling 10 percent of the total taxes in July and September.

THE COURT: Sorry, how much? CNSL K. JACKSON: The total amount of taxes was 1 -what's the total taxes? It's later on in here. point ... \$1.6 million in taxes and two 5 percent penalties were incurred on that amount. were incurred.

THE COURT: So that's on top of what you say is --CNSL K. JACKSON: Indeed. THE COURT: -- the penalties?

CNSL K. JACKSON: Yes.

> So in June -- I mentioned this earlier --Mr. Matthews revisited his evidence from May, saying that it wasn't as dire as all that; the financial position would improve, including paying down accounts by approximately \$780,000.

But that didn't come to bear. evidence -- this is paragraph 18 -- from August 2024 shows that any reductions were minimal, and, in most cases, it increased.

So partnerships -- this is actually -- maybe

```
I'll take you very quickly to this. So this is --
 2
            just going to hand this up rather than having to
 3
            flip back and forth, Justice.
 4
       THE COURT: All right.
 5
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Oh, sorry.
                                     Here we are.
            are.
 7
                 So this is -- it's Exhibit R to
 8
            Mr. Kusumoto's affidavit -- his third affidavit.
 9
            This just shows you what it is at August 6th,
10
            2024. So -- so you see unreleased cheques, aged
11
            accounts payable. This is the state of the --
12
            of -- of the partnerships in August 2024.
13
                 So Resort and Golf, which is the Resorts
14
            partnership, has unreleased cheques of $575,000
15
            and aged accounts payable of just about 900. So
16
            we're talking about, what, just under 1.5. $1.45
17
            million of unpaid -- unpaid AR.
18
                 Now, Developments had $78,000 of unreleased
19
            cheques and $400,000 of -- of aged accounts, so
20
            about 500,000. So we're talking about 1.9 to
21
            $2 million of -- of trade payables that were --
22
            that are outstanding in August of 2024.
23
                 Compare that to May, and the number was
24
            $2 million of total aged and unreleased cheques
25
            according to Mr. Matthews.
26
                 In other words, it has improved -- maybe -- a
27
            few tens of thousands of dollars. Not $780,000,
28
            as Mr. Matthews deposed would be the case.
29
                 If -- if you want to compare that just to
30
            what Mr. Matthews said, it's at tab 13 of the
31
            condensed record where -- where he says, at the
            time, the two combined had about 2.5 -- 2.05 --
32
33
            $2.05 million in unreleased cheques and aged
34
            payables. In other words, improvement is minimal,
35
            if -- if anything. Not $780,000.
36
                 But we also go on to note here staff
37
            retention bonuses -- these were unpaid in May --
            were still unpaid. The for both, unpaid in May,
38
39
                           Interest continues to incur.
            still unpaid.
                   Sorry, what's the?
40
       THE COURT:
41
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Employee -- employer health tax.
42
       THE COURT: Right. Right you are. Employer health
43
            taxes.
44
       CNSL K. JACKSON: PST, unpaid in May, still unpaid.
45
            GST is unknown. WCB, due May 20th, still unpaid.
46
            Property taxes I mentioned already; late penalty.
47
            This is in August; second one was in early
```

```
September. And the City of Langford, 1.9.
 2
             still unpaid.
 3
                  That is the current state. And so while
 4
            Mr. Matthews got very optimistic in June about
 5
            what would happen hasn't come to bear.
            this partnership -- the Resorts partnership is in
 7
            dire financial straits.
 8
                  Justice, page 6, what I'm going to do is I'm
            going to skip over -- actually, sorry, I'm not. Paragraph 19. I mentioned before and I'll say
 9
10
11
             again, the partnership's financial difficulties
12
             and the dispute really arise because they failed
            to develop the project lands in a timely manner.
13
14
            You'll have different rationales or reasons or
15
             explanations as to why, each pointing a finger at
16
             the other, but that's the heart of the problem.
17
                  Here's an important point. Mr. Matthews has
18
             said that he's open to various alternatives in
19
             relation to the sale of the partnership assets
            that would include an unblock sale if carried out
20
21
             in an orderly and prudent manner. And that -- the
22
             reference is -- is -- is --
23
                   That's in his affidavit?
       THE COURT:
24
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         It's at the affidavit -- that's at
25
             footnote 16 here, affidavit number 3 of
26
            Mr. Matthews' -- it's in a letter from
27
            Mr. Matthews.
28
       THE COURT:
                    Do you mind just showing me that?
29
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Yes.
                                 Tab 14.
30
                   Of the condensed record?
       THE COURT:
31
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Yes, sorry.
32
       THE COURT: Okay.
33
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                          Exhibit 00.
34
       THE COURT: Okay.
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
35
                          So it's a letter from -- from counsel
             for 599 and Mr. Matthews to counsel for --
36
37
       THE COURT:
                    Tab 16?
38
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                          Tab, sorry, 14.
39
       THE COURT:
                    14.
                         Thanks.
40
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                          You should have 00.
41
       THE COURT:
                    Yeah.
                           Just ...
42
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                          Page 314.
43
       THE COURT:
                    Oh, here it is.
                                      Page 3 -- sorry, starts at
44
             312?
45
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                          It does, yes.
46
       THE COURT:
                    Okay.
47
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                          And 314 --
```

```
THE COURT: All right.
 2
       CNSL K. JACKSON: -- is page 3 of the letter from
 3
            Lawsons --
 4
       THE COURT:
                  Right.
 5
                         -- to Fasken.
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                                         At (c), halfway down
            the page --
 7
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
 8
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        -- financing alternatives.
 9
       THE COURT:
                   So (b) is supporting an unblock listing and
10
            sales processes?
11
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Right:
12
13
                 Any of the following options, if carried out
14
                 in an orderly and prudent matter:
15
16
                 (b), an unblock listing of sales process for
17
                 substantially all the partnerships and land
18
                 assets.
19
20
            That was April 2024.
                                   Something's changed.
21
            whole point of a receivership is, of course,
22
            orderly and prudent, rational process for the
23
            sale, unblock, if necessary. But that's the
24
                    They're open to it, as they should be.
            point.
25
            the court's officer thinks that that's the -- and
26
            the court agrees that's the right way to proceed,
27
            so be it.
28
                 So -- so -- so something's changed, but that
29
            was certainly something Mr. Matthews was open to
            in April of 2024.
30
31
                 Right.
                        I should say that too.
                                                  So
32
            Ms. Hiebert points out too that this is at tab 17
33
            of the same condensed book. This is Mr. Matthews'
34
            own affidavit now sworn June of this year.
35
            if you have tab 17 of the condensed book, page 9.
36
       THE COURT:
                   All right.
37
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         So what Mr. Matthews says there is --
38
       THE COURT:
                   Which paragraph?
39
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Paragraph 14.
                   Okay.
40
       THE COURT:
                         Yeah. All right.
41
       CNSL K. JACKSON: So he says -- Mr. -- Mr. Kusumoto
42
            states:
43
44
                 It is unclear what basis Mr. Matthews used to
45
                 choose and select lands instead of other
```

options like an unblock sale, the individual

sale of different parcels, or other solutions

46

47

to the partnerships' liquidity problems.

And then Mr. Matthews says:

I am not opposed to an unblock sale and have supported the potential for an unblock sale for many years now. An unblock land sale was also one of several options I presented to Sanovest and Tian --

That's Mr. Kusumoto,

-- in April 2024.

That's the letter I just took you to.

And so apparently he's not that offended by the concept. That's the only point I take from that part of the submissions.

We talked about relative prejudice and the interest of the parties. It appears that that's not something which Mr. Matthews hasn't contemplated as a potentially reasonable alternative to the outcome.

Justice, I'm just flipping through to try and high-grade this so I don't take up more time than allotted to me. I am going to have to go a bit into the afternoon, but I'll try and make sure I don't take up too much time.

I'm going to -- I'm going to skip ahead, Justice, about the project lands and a bit -- we're touching again a little bit on the -- the order that's being sought with respect to the subdivision and sale at page 9 of the submissions, paragraph -- beginning at paragraph 30 where -- this is from Mr. Clarke's affidavit. He's the -- he's the CFO of -- of the partnerships. So he -- he says -- or at least that's the evidence that's reflected at paragraph 30:

Development of the project lands will require, among other things, the subdivision of existing parcels, municipality approvals for density and zoning, and the significant financial investment.

Paragraph 31:

Matthews asserts that, as of 2024, the total appraised value of the partnership's assets exceeds --

And you'll see the number there. I think that's in -- I think that's actually in evidence that's open, but I don't want to -- I'll be slightly careful about that:

-- excluding certain properties and the value of the resort partnership's golf and tennis assets.

The appraisal was not -- when this was filed, by the way -- these submissions were filed hadn't been disclosed. It is now in evidence. I think it's in the recent affidavit that --

CNSL L. HIEBERT: Affidavit 4.

CNSL K. JACKSON: Affidavit 4 of Mr. Matthews. Oh, sorry, the assistant affidavit.

The whole point of this is we don't know what the value is. It's an appraisal. The appraisal -- it's -- there are concerns with the appraisal in terms of what -- what it relies upon. It -- it at one point talks about absorption of the process over 27 years and then says it can be accomplished in 12. It doesn't talk about, you know, a number of different issues that we have concerns with .

But the point is, it's an appraisal, and we don't know what the actual value is. If it's significant, that's good. But it doesn't help in terms of the relief sought by -- I guess specific limited relief sought by 599.

It also doesn't talk about the impact of value on selling only the select lands versus the other lands. What about the other lands? It doesn't -- doesn't have any commentary about that concern. It doesn't have any evidence about the time or the cost associated with the proposed subdivision and sale process, which is one of my points. The court is being asked to make a decision that that is the right way to proceed without sufficient evidence.

30 -- 32, Developments partnership has an interest in a number of pieces of litigation against third parties, against present and former

```
directors, and against the partners themselves,
            including alleged diversion of funds and
 3
            properties, which includes those lands transferred
 4
            to Bear Mountain Adventures and funds used by
 5
            Mr. Matthews and Tom Kusumoto. And to be clear,
            Tom Kusumoto is Tian Kusumoto's late father.
 7
       UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's not deceased.
 8
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Is he deceased?
                                           No. I have that
 9
            wrong. How did I get that --
10
       UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's sitting in the courtroom.
11
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Numerous of his ties are greatly
12
            exaggerated.
13
       UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                              Praise the lord.
                         I thought -- miracle.
14
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
15
       UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                               That's right.
16
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                          There's a fact I agree I got wrong.
17
       THE COURT:
                    I take it he is in the courtroom.
       CNSL K. JACKSON: He is. He left, but he is -- no, I
18
19
            thought there was something else, actually. I'm
20
            sorry. I have to apologize.
21
                   I'm being shown that he's just walked back
       THE COURT:
22
            in the courtroom.
23
       UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                              Exactly.
24
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Hale. In any -- apologies.
                 Anyways, there is -- there is -- there is
25
26
            a -- the -- the -- Tian Kusumoto took over from
27
            Tom Kusumoto as -- as the principal and management
            of -- of Sanovest, and -- and the partnership has claims against Mr. Matthews and Mr. Kusumoto with
28
29
            respect to diversion of funds -- Tom Kusumoto.
30
31
                  One of the points we make is this.
                                                       Those --
32
            those chosen -- actually, that litigation, that's
33
            not being funded. There are significant amounts
34
            owing to counsel on at least one of the
            proceedings in arbitration.
35
36
       THE COURT: Sorry.
                           There's that -- which action is
37
            not -- that's the [indiscernible] -- which number
38
            that?
39
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                          The --
40
       THE COURT:
                    Is that part of the CPC this afternoon?
41
            Mr. Nathanson --
42
       CNSL K. JACKSON: That one is part of the CPC this
43
            afternoon.
44
       THE COURT:
                   All right.
45
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Yes.
46
       UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
                               That -- that action?
47
       CNSL K. JACKSON: That one is not, sorry.
```

```
oppression one is this afternoon. That's out of
 2
                           I'll have to defer to the
            my bailiwick.
 3
            counsel -- the real litigators -- on that one.
 4
                   So that -- that's a -- that's an action by
       THE COURT:
 5
            the Development against the third parties?
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        M'mm-hmm.
 7
                  And one against former -- oh, against
       THE COURT:
8
            present and former directors.
 9
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Right.
                                 There -- there are
10
            other -- those are some of the claims that exist,
11
            ves --
       THE COURT:
12
                   Okay.
13
                         -- by Developments.
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
14
                   Okay.
       THE COURT:
15
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         The point is someone's going to have
16
            to fund those.
                            Someone's going to have to
17
            consider whether to pursue.
                        I'm -- I'm not --
18
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
19
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
20
       CNSL C. FERRIS: -- [indiscernible].
21
       CNSL K. JACKSON: And so this is all part and parcel
22
            of -- without funding, there's no ability to
23
            defend proceedings, which -- of which there are
24
                  There's no ability to pursue proceedings.
25
            That's the point. There are any number of
26
            proceedings.
27
       THE COURT:
                  I understand. All right.
       CNSL C. FERRIS: The -- the -- there's no funding of
28
29
            the proceedings between the parties. Right?
30
            The -- there's been no response filed by the
31
            partnership. Those are -- the proceedings that
32
            are going to be the subject of the case planning
33
            conference this afternoon are between the various
34
            principals and -- and the companies. That's not
35
            anything that -- that is being funded or requires
36
            funding by the company.
37
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
38
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Right.
                                 There -- but -- right.
39
            is about third-party proceedings -- against third
            parties.
40
41
       THE COURT:
                          Just give me -- there -- there are
                  Okay.
42
            lawsuits that involve the principals of -- of the
43
            partnership that are facing -- that are joined
            issue. They're parties? K. JACKSON: Yes. Yes.
44
45
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
46
       THE COURT: Further -- further display of the deadlock;
            right? If they're -- is that the point?
47
```

```
CNSL K. JACKSON: Right. Right. This is -- this is --
 2
            that's -- there's -- there were three proceedings
 3
            that were joined that were all related to
 4
            allegations of wrongdoing among the -- among the
 5
            principals or the partners.
 6
       THE COURT:
                   I see.
 7
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Right.
 8
       THE COURT: All right. Okay.
 9
       CNSL K. JACKSON: The partnerships -- and I could have
10
            done this sooner because I was trying to find
11
            where I had it in reference -- in the evidence.
12
            But this is at paragraph 34. This is what I said
13
            earlier about who owns which units in the
14
            partnerships.
15
       THE COURT:
                   Oh, yeah. All right.
       CNSL K. JACKSON: There's nothing here to take you
16
17
            through. You've already been told that.
                  All right.
18
       THE COURT:
19
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Paragraph 36, from 2013 to 2021, Tom
20
            Kusumoto -- the healthy and present Tom
21
            Kusumoto -- was a director of EBMD, and June 2021,
22
            he resigned as a director of EBMD and Tian
23
            Kusumoto became a director and CFO of EBMD.
24
                 One point, Matthews has said that
25
            Mr. Kusumoto -- Tian Kusumoto -- holds the chief
26
            financial officer position in name only, saying
27
            this title was not intended to reflect the role of
28
            an organization's working CFO.
29
       THE COURT: Why does that matter?
30
       CNSL K. JACKSON: I think it has more to do with the
31
            oppression proceeding --
       THE COURT: Oh, okay.
32
33
       CNSL K. JACKSON: -- saying he had full access and
34
            control, and I think there will be a dispute about
35
            that. Irrelevant in the receivership application,
36
            in my view. But -- but in his role as president
37
            and CEO of EBMD, Mr. Matthews has exercised the
38
            overall management and control.
39
                 Allocation of net -- this is paragraph 38 --
            net income and distributable cash. So after you
40
41
            pay out your debts, the partnership distributes
42
            the net income and distributable cash pari passu
43
            to the two partners up to $15 million and then
44
            partners holding class C units up to 30 million.
45
            So after 15, the next goes $30 million to the
46
            class C units.
47
                 The only holder of class C units is Sanovest.
```

So when I said earlier that it had a disproportionate equity, if you will, interest in the partnership, that's where that comes from. After the first \$15 million, it takes the next 30. So it's impacted first before 599 on anything that occurs.

And then, after that, a notional amount goes to EBMD up to \$100, and then the rest gets split pro rata between 599 and Sanovest -- Sanovest.

So paragraph 40, the partnership generates some revenues in the golf course and tennis operations, but, historically, primary source of funding has been loans from Sanovest.

The loan agreement was first entered in 2013, amended in 2016 and 2022, including to increase the amount available under the agreement [indiscernible] facility and to extend the repayment date.

And the loans used -- the loans made under the agreement were used to fund obligations related to the development of the project lands, to pay property taxes on the project lands and the BMA lands, and to fund a shortfall from operations.

The borrower is Developments, the top-level partnership. Resorts partnership is -- Resorts is a guarantor, as are the nominees that own the land. They all guaranteed it, provided security by way of GSAs and mortgages and beneficial charges.

So all -- well, paragraph 44, putting it altogether, all of the partnership's assets, including all real and personal property and undertakings as well as the BMA lands, are secured in favour of Sanovest. So everything that we're seeking to have a receiver appointed over are secured in favour of Sanovest.

45, the loan agreement provides that, during the term of the loan -- so -- so they could -- as is normal in a development project, the lender agrees that if you pay me the amount -- the net proceeds of sale, that you can get -- you're entitled to a discharge of our mortgage.

That doesn't exist when the loan's in default or after the term of the loan. That loan is expired. It's become due. There's no entitlement to discharge. At this point, Sanovest

is entitled to rely on full payment -- or require a full payment.

46, it also provides that the project lands can only be subdivided or stratified with Sanovest's prior written consent, which can be withheld at Sanovest's sole discretion.

And there's my point at paragraph 47 that —the fact that the 599 parties don't dispute that at least \$50 million is owing. Sanovest claims it's closer now to 64.5 million, but they made demand in May for approximately \$62.3 million.

The partnership disputes -- I'm going to -- I'm going to go quickly over this part, Justice, because you -- you -- you nailed it, I think, on this one. There's a raft of allegations going back and forth. You -- you've named several of them, and it goes on. And there's going to be a lot of discussion, I suspect, about that when we come to the hearing about the oppression application or the application within the oppression proceedings. So I'm going to skip over, for the most part, about that.

But let's just say that they aren't resolved. There's no expectation that they can be resolved in any time quickly, and it's going to take an awful lot of time and money to do that.

Meanwhile, you have, effectively, a floundering enterprise with no ability to revive it, no ability to sell, no ability to fund while those things play out, which doesn't seem to be a particularly practical resolution in the circumstances.

There's allegations that self -self-interested transactions that Mr. Kusumoto's
advanced regarding payments to Mr. Matthews and
transfers of assets to Mr. Matthews personally or
to Tom Kusumoto -- that is, Mr. Kusumoto's
father -- where no shareholder approval was sought
or obtained. Again, there's an awful lot of
evidence around that, which I think is also
relevant other than the fact that it's an existing
issue that the parties have as between themselves.

It's -- I will say with that that those allegations were at least verified by the former CFO, Mr. Clarke. And -- and he says that he'd learned of the transactions after the fact and tried to record them as best he could in the

```
company's ledgers.
                                So at least there's some
 2
            back-up for that.
 3
                 But, again, I'm not asking you to make a
 4
            determination in relation to that.
 5
       THE COURT:
                   So then you turn to the current state of
            the business.
 7
                                 So I've already touched on a
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Right.
 8
            lot of this --
 9
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
10
       CNSL K. JACKSON: -- as I'm trying -- as I say, I'm
11
            trying to high-grade this a little bit, Justice.
12
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
13
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        And so --
14
       THE COURT:
                   When you say they've breached other
15
            negative reporting covenants under the
16
            agreement -- okay.
17
                         Sorry, Justice?
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                   I'm just looking at -- there's a breach of
18
       THE COURT:
19
            other negative reporting covenants, you said,
20
            under the agreements.
21
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        There's breach -- well, I mean,
22
            there's breaches of reporting covenants, which
23
            have been going on for some time. There is
24
            statutory obligations:
                                    financial statements not
25
            having been provided since December 31st of 2018,
26
            so we're talking, you know, five years of
27
            financial statements; class draft financial
28
            statements back to 2020; the books are not kept up
            to date; the accountants don't know how much \bar{\text{GST}}
29
30
            or PST or employment taxes are due.
31
                 Again, there will be an allegation that this
32
            is all Mr. Kusumoto's and not Mr. Matthews's
33
                          That's all I'll say, Justice.
            fault.
                   Sure.
34
                 I don't -- I don't -- I don't think we
35
            need -- no, unless something comes up that makes
36
            me feel compelled to respond, you know, to it in
37
            reply, I'm not going to go into too much detail.
38
       THE COURT: But your point at 59 is that it's
39
            insolvent.
40
                         59 is that they are insolvent.
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
            mean, they are. There's no doubt about it.
41
42
            They -- they -- they can't pay Sanovest.
43
            have $2 million of aged payables.
                                               They owe --
44
            that obviously includes approximately $540,000 for
45
            accounting and legal services provided --
46
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
47
       CNSL K. JACKSON: -- since 2022. And some of those
```

```
professionals have said they'll discontinue
            services unless paid.
 3
                 There's no dispute about the -- the fact
 4
            that that's -- and that's not disputed.
 5
                 Paragraph 60, they defaulted on a $300,000
            payment to Langford, which resulted in an action
 7
            being commenced against Developments seeking
8
            judgment of about $1.8 million. It affected two
 9
            other actions involving claims of 1.5 and
10
            $2.1 million. It goes on and on and on and on.
11
                 And so, I mean, I -- it can't seriously be
12
            disputed that they're insolvent. That's --
13
            that's -- that's practically a given at this
            point.
14
15
                   I think when you start at 66 -- we'll have
       THE COURT:
16
            to come back at 2:00. But just before we break,
17
            can you tell -- what -- what's the interest rate
18
            charge that Sanovest wants to charge under the --
19
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         8 percent. 8 percent.
20
       THE COURT:
                   8 percent, yes.
21
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Compounded quarterly.
22
       THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Ferris, I have one question
23
            for you. I don't know if it's properly put to you
24
            or other counsel.
25
                 Is your client's position that I -- I should
26
            and I can determine the allegations in the
27
            oppression action on -- on the summary
28
            application?
29
       CNSL C. FERRIS: Our -- our -- our position is that
30
            it's essentially an injection test, and so you
31
            would look at it in the same manner as that.
32
       THE COURT:
                  Okay.
                         But at the end of the day, the
33
            relief your client's seeking in the -- on the
34
            oppression is for the interim relief, the -- an
35
            order concerning subdivision, the appointing of
36
            some sort of receiver with limited powers?
37
       CNSL C. FERRIS: Essentially you have a company that
38
            has -- at least by appraised value -- an excess of
39
            200 -- very large --
40
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
41
       CNSL C. FERRIS: And -- and -- and it -- and a debt
42
            which is a very small percentage of that overall
43
            value and a client who has been trying to sell
44
            assets to pay the debt for over two years and had
45
            been stymied by Mr. Kusumoto.
46
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
47
       CNSL C. FERRIS: And so our position is, essentially,
```

```
that you should do what's required, not take
 2
            control away and essentially give the victory in
 3
            the oppression -- of the oppressive actions as
 4
            part of an interim application.
 5
       THE COURT: Okay.
                         Then something I'd like everyone to
            think about, and that is I -- I don't know that
 7
            it's so much as a victory, but if the company --
            if the parties are deadlocked and these are --
 8
 9
            these allegations that engaged the oppression
10
            action and these other actions I'm learning about
11
            are something that's going to trial and the
12
            parties recognize that assets need to be sold to
13
            fund the business and the obligations of -- of a
14
            receiver are owed to all of the stakeholders and
15
            having been taken to Mr. Matthews' evidence that
16
            he's not opposed to an unblock sale, I am -- I'm
17
            going to obviously have to hear from
            Mr. Matthews -- why not appoint a court's officer
18
            to look at the whole of the matter? Particularly
19
20
            in view of these allegations where each side's
21
            alleging the other one is engaged in self-dealing,
22
            self-interest, abuse of -- abuse -- breach of
23
            fiduciary duty, all sorts of things?
24
       CNSL C. FERRIS: So -- so the simple answer is it's the
25
            scope of what the person can do.
26
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
27
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       We don't oppose.
                                          We've been trying to
28
            sell --
29
       THE COURT: Yeah.
30
       CNSL C. FERRIS: -- for two years.
                                           Been stymied.
31
            point is that there is a continuing dilution of
32
            my -- of my client's interest every day that that
33
            loan is outstanding.
34
       THE COURT: Right.
35
       CNSL C. FERRIS: It's about $13,000 a day. And so
36
            we're looking for the quickest, most efficient
37
            process to get that loan paid off.
38
                 And then if there needs to be a different
            relief brought in where the parties are -- are --
39
40
            are on more equal footing so -- so they -- this
            process can't be -- my -- my friend can't suggest
41
42
            that, receiver, you know what you should do?
43
            should build out this project for the next 10
44
            years and while the clock ticks against my client.
45
                 The -- that's what we're trying to prevent.
46
       THE COURT: Okay. So if -- but if I -- if there's an
            independent court's officer that looks at this and
47
```

```
is mindful of the -- of the burn rate and the need
            to get funds in to pay off Sanovest, I would --
 3
            I -- I'm -- I'm going to have to hear from you on
 4
            what the impediment of that is while, on the other
 5
            hand, I'll being asked to issue an order that
            reflects subdivision where -- I mean, it requires
 7
            an outlay of expenditure, municipal approvals, and
 8
            the like that would take a long period of time.
 9
       CNSL C. FERRIS: So we don't agree with that. And
10
            so --
11
       THE COURT:
                   Oh, I see.
                               Okay. All right.
                 And I just wondered if everyone -- seems to
12
13
            me all parties recognize there's financial
14
            distress. The operation is deadlocked.
15
            wonder what -- and -- and parties reserve their
16
            rights to -- to oppose any relief or course of
17
            action recommended by the receiver.
                                                  But the
18
            receiver, at the end of the day, is the
19
            independent court's officer, who owes duty do all
20
            of the parties. I -- I wonder if there's not
21
            some --
22
       CNSL C. FERRIS: So in the first line in our argument,
23
            if you read it, is a question is the scope of that
24
            receiver's powers.
25
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
26
       CNSL C. FERRIS: Not that -- whether or not there
27
            should be a receiver.
28
       THE COURT: Yeah, in a -- I -- I read it.
29
       CNSL C. FERRIS: And -- and so that's -- that's what
            the -- the submission is -- is about.
30
31
       THE COURT: Yeah.
32
       CNSL C. FERRIS: And the problem -- you know, my -- we
33
            can't get funding because Mr. Kusumoto won't agree
34
            to sell the assets, so no third-party funder will
            provide it.
35
36
       THE COURT:
                  Right.
37
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       And so we're -- we're in this circle.
38
                 But the question is -- is -- is really let's
39
            get this paid off efficiently and guickly and --
40
            and -- and -- and pay them off to the extent
41
            that's required.
42
       THE COURT: Right.
                       And not sort of take over the
43
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
44
            operations and go to a big expensive process,
45
            which Sanovest then funds again for years on, and
46
            it keeps clicking against my client.
47
                 You know, a receiver to manage is way more
```

67
Submissions re receivership order by Cnsl K. Jackson

expensive than a receiver to sell. THE COURT: I see. CNSL C. FERRIS: And so that's what we've tried to do. We've tried to be efficient, we've tried to be --to do what's required, not what's putting Mr. Kusumoto in a preferred position. THE COURT: I see. Well, although the receiver, if --if -- a receiver with full powers is appointed may not recommend that. It may. CNSL C. FERRIS: If you -- a receiver with full powers is recommended today to take over the operations, that clock starts ticking immediately. THE COURT: I see. And -- okay. Very good. helps. Thank you very much. THE CLERK: Order in chambers. Chambers are adjourned for the noon recess. (EXCERPT ENDS) ([12:37:42 PM]) (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED) ([3:19:04 PM])

REPORTER CERTIFICATION

I certify that proceedings from timestamp 10:11:10 AM to timestamp 12:37:42 PM, inclusive, are a true and accurate transcript of these proceedings, recorded on a sound recording apparatus, transcribed to the best of my skill and ability in accordance with applicable standards.

Eveliene Symonds
Authorized Reporter

\$1 [1] - 50:3 \$1.45 [1] - 53:17 \$100 [2] - 47:16, 61:9 \$13,000 [1] - 65:36 \$15 [2] - 60:44, 61:5 \$2.05 [1] - 53:34 \$30 [1] - 60:46 \$300,000 [1] - 64:6 \$400,000 [1] - 53:20 \$50 [4] - 23:11, 51:30, 62:10	15%[1] - 44:16 156-room [1] - 49:45 15th [1] - 11:1 16 [2] - 54:26, 54:38 160K [1] - 52:33 17 [3] - 15:30, 55:33, 55:36 18 [1] - 52:45 19 [4] - 1:16, 2:5, 15:37, 54:11 19th [3] - 13:23, 13:29, 45:46	50:27 30 [5] - 56:35, 56:39, 57:46, 60:45, 61:5 31 [1] - 56:47 312 [1] - 54:45 314 [2] - 54:43, 55:1 31st [1] - 63:26 32 [1] - 57:46 34 [1] - 60:13 36 [1] - 60:20 38 [1] - 60:40 380 [1] - 7:31	6 6 [4] - 17:1, 17:6, 26:36, 54:9 60 [1] - 64:6 62.3 [1] - 62:12 64 [1] - 51:29 64.5 [1] - 62:11 66 [1] - 64:16 68 [1] - 1:21 6th [1] - 53:10	11:39, 11:40, 11:41, 11:44, 16:3, 49:24, 60:34 accessed [1] - 11:11 accident [1] - 4:6 accomplish [1] - 41:30 accomplished [1] - 57:28 accomplishment [1] - 23:5 accordance [1] - 68:8 according [2] - 45:36,
\$540,000 [1] - 63:45 \$575,000 [1] - 53:15 \$78,000 [1] - 53:19 \$780,000 [4] - 30:47, 52:43, 53:28, 53:36	2 2 [11] - 1:9, 14:22, 14:39, 15:25, 15:31, 16:2, 33:27, 41:25,	389 [2] - 1:27, 7:29 39 [1] - 20:41 3:00 [1] - 3:9 3:30 [2] - 3:10, 8:29	7 [1] - 17:27 740 [2] - 49:30, 50:39	53:26 account [2] - 6:16, 23:7 accountants [1] - 63:30
\$90 [1] - 43:15 0 048 [4] - 1:25, 7:31, 9:25, 9:27 0884185 [1] - 1:19 0884188 [1] - 1:20 0884190 [1] - 1:20 0884194 [1] - 1:20	53:22, 53:25, 63:44 2(a [1] - 43:22 2.05 [1] - 53:33 2.1 [1] - 64:11 2.5 [1] - 53:33 20 [1] - 1:18 200 [2] - 50:40, 64:40 2013 [4] - 32:41, 49:46, 60:20, 61:15 2016 [1] - 61:16	4 [12] - 1:10, 9:19, 16:31, 16:34, 17:15, 17:28, 18:34, 40:24, 46:15, 51:17, 57:19, 57:20 40 [3] - 1:19, 1:20, 61:11 44 [1] - 61:32 45 [1] - 61:39	8 [6] - 1:12, 17:28, 49:40, 64:20, 64:21 8,000 [1] - 50:27 81/82 [1] - 1:20 83 [1] - 1:20 84 [1] - 1:20 85 [4] - 44:31, 45:5, 45:10 85% [1] - 44:15 8th [1] - 9:20	accounting [3] - 30:15, 52:3, 63:46 accounts [6] - 31:23, 31:24, 52:43, 53:12, 53:16, 53:20 accredited [1] - 32:43 accruing [1] - 51:33 accurate [1] - 68:5 acquired [5] - 32:40, 32:42, 47:42, 49:43,
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2018 [1] - 63:26 2020 [1] - 63:29 2021 [2] - 60:20, 60:22 2022 [2] - 61:16, 64:1 2023 [2] - 51:24, 52:3	46 [1] - 62:4 47 [1] - 62:8 49.5 [2] - 47:4	9 9 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	49:44 acquisition [1] - 28:35 acres [3] - 49:28, 49:30, 50:39 act [3] - 1:25, 1:28,
47:7, 52:30, 52:31 1,400 [1] - 50:24 1.2 [1] - 31:28 1.5 [2] - 53:17, 64:10	2024 [14] - 1:4, 1:3, 1:1, 45:46, 51:25, 52:17, 52:46, 53:11, 53:13, 53:23, 55:21, 55:31, 56:14, 57:2	5 [12] - 16:44, 17:2, 17:22, 17:28, 17:46, 17:47, 18:35, 19:34, 24:32, 51:33, 52:32	900 [1] - 53:16 99 [1] - 47:9 99.5 [1] - 47:9	1:38 Act [2] - 4:35, 20:41 action [18] - 1:13, 1:14, 1:25, 5:4, 7:26, 9:27, 16:14, 30:36,
1.6 [1] - 52:32 1.8 [2] - 33:22, 64:9 1.9 [4] - 30:10, 30:21, 53:21, 54:2 10 [7] - 1:4, 1:3, 1:1,	2025 [4] - 5:5, 7:39, 7:42, 23:4 2026 [4] - 7:38, 7:47, 22:21, 22:35	50/50 [1] - 44:43 500,000 [1] - 53:21 59 [2] - 63:39, 63:41 591 [1] - 1:41	A.I [1] - 2:2 ability [13] - 5:26,	31:15, 33:32, 34:8, 58:37, 58:47, 59:5, 64:7, 64:28, 65:11,

ADJOURNED)([3:19: 04 [1] - 67:20 adjournments [1] -4.5 admit [1] - 51:38 adult [1] - 21:8 advance [3] - 31:40, 32:9, 32:12 advanced [3] - 4:19, 33:46, 62:36 advancing [3] - 32:5, 32:7, 33:23 advantage [5] - 4:47, 23:42. 25:9. 32:3. 32:27 advantageous [1] -30:39 advantages [1] -25:14 advantaging [3] -24:10, 24:19, 24:28 Adventures [5] - 1:22, 26:10, 26:13, 48:14, 58:5 advice [2] - 14:27, 24:44 advise [1] - 8:27 advisors [1] - 37:19 affect [1] - 22:1 affected [1] - 64:9 affects [1] - 24:16 affidavit [52] - 9:18, 9:19, 9:24, 9:31, 10:37, 14:22, 14:32, 14:39, 15:25, 15:31, 15:33, 15:35, 15:38, 15:39, 15:42, 15:45, 15:46, 16:2, 16:4, 16:38, 16:39, 16:41, 16:43, 16:46, 16:47, 17:9, 17:14, 17:15, 17:17, 17:21, 17:22, 18:2, 18:3, 18:4, 18:29, 18:34, 19:33, 30:24, 40:26, 53:9, 54:24, 54:25, 54:26, 55:35, 56:36, 57:18, 57:19, 57:20, 57:21 affidavit's [1] - 16:5 affidavits [24] - 1:13, 1:16. 2:4. 2:5. 9:1. 9:6, 9:17, 10:2, 11:12, 11:17, 11:22, 12:5, 12:10, 12:13, 14:9, 14:15, 16:36, 19:7, 19:40, 21:18, 40:13, 40:17, 40:24, 40:31 afternoon [6] - 3:7, 56:28, 58:41, 58:44,

59:2, 59:34 aged [8] - 30:11, 30:13, 53:11, 53:16, 53:20, 53:25, 53:34, agent [6] - 5:17, 38:5, 38:36, 42:7, 42:12, 42:40 agent/receiver [2] -41:39, 45:19 ago [1] - 49:3 agree [17] - 5:13, 5:21, 7:16, 9:8, 9:10, 11:38, 11:45, 20:40, 21:7, 23:10, 29:17, 37:31, 51:3, 58:17, 66:10, 66:34 agreed [1] - 3:26 agreement [11] - 15:3, 23:21, 33:2, 44:29, 44:30, 44:36, 61:15, 61:17, 61:21, 61:39, 63:17 agreements [4] -12:14, 15:4, 19:1, 63:21 agrees [3] - 8:11, 55:27, 61:42 ahead [7] - 32:35, 38:43, 39:35, 40:9, 45:19, 49:37, 56:30 allegation [4] - 4:44, 23:39, 24:41, 63:32 allegations [18] - 5:1, 5:7, 5:11, 20:24, 22:6, 23:46, 24:4, 25:7, 25:18, 29:46, 31:36, 60:5, 62:16, 62:34, 62:45, 64:27, 65:10, 65:21 alleged [1] - 58:3 alleging [1] - 65:22 **allocation** [1] - 60:40 allotted [1] - 56:27 almost [1] - 31:5 alternative [1] - 56:24 alternatives [2] -54:19, 55:9 **altogether** [1] - 61:33 Alvarez [1] - 42:15 AM [8] - 1:25, 1:4, 1:6. 1:7, 39:47, 40:1, 68:4 amended [1] - 61:16 amount [13] - 23:13, 23:15, 29:4, 34:13, 43:14, 44:16, 45:5, 45:6, 52:30, 52:33, 61:8, 61:17, 61:42

amounts [4] - 22:7,

45:26, 51:41, 58:34 analysis [1] - 5:32 **AND**[4] - 1:7, 1:13, 1:15, 1:18 answer [3] - 21:30, 28:3, 65:25 answers [1] - 50:44 anyways [3] - 35:36, 38:30, 58:26 **AP**[1] - 31:16 apart [2] - 35:32, 36:15 apologies [3] - 16:9, 42:37, 58:25 apologize [1] - 58:21 app [1] - 40:43 **apparatus** [1] - 68:7 appeal [1] - 15:16 **appear** [2] - 4:4, 5:13 APPEARANCES[1] appended [1] - 41:19 applicable [1] - 68:8 application [34] -3:31, 3:34, 5:10, 8:45, 11:1, 12:43, 14:10, 14:20, 14:27, 14:36, 15:37, 20:12, 20:43, 21:15, 22:13, 22:38, 23:45, 30:40, 36:40, 40:23, 40:42, 40:44, 41:1, 42:36, 42:37, 43:2, 43:3, 51:19, 60:36, 62:21, 64:29, 65:5 applications [6] -2:44, 3:27, 8:47, 9:2, 14:14, 20:30 **applies** [1] - 4:35 appoint [4] - 5:29, 5:42, 6:28, 65:19 appointed [7] - 5:14, 11:32, 22:39, 42:11, 42:14, 61:37, 67:9 appointing [2] - 20:34, 64:36 appointment [3] -3:31, 22:4, 42:40 appraisal [11] - 9:6, 10:38, 17:16, 17:18, 17:19, 19:8, 57:15, 57:23, 57:24, 57:25, 57:31 appraisals [4] - 9:16, 9:17, 9:42, 11:22 appraised [2] - 57:3, 64:39 appraiser [2] - 9:35, 10:39

appreciate [5] - 2:39,

appropriate [5] - 6:22, 6:41, 16:10, 21:26, 35:21 approval [6] - 22:42, 23:2, 28:5, 28:8, 28:10, 62:39 approvals [3] - 38:20, 56:43, 66:8 approved [2] - 6:4, 25:13 April [3] - 55:21, 55:31, 56:14 AR [8] - 30:11, 30:13, 30:30, 30:47, 31:5, 31:16, 31:28, 53:18 arbitration [13] -14:34, 14:36, 14:41, 14:42, 15:8, 15:13, 15:22, 15:26, 15:27, 16:19, 16:20, 58:36 area [2] - 15:36, 50:16 areas [1] - 14:31 **argue** [1] - 8:9 argument [3] - 12:30, 13:3, 66:23 arguments [1] - 13:25 arise [2] - 33:18, 54:13 arises [2] - 21:5, 22:30 arising [2] - 43:39, 44:7 arose [1] - 15:4 arrange [3] - 6:8, 6:23, 8:22 arrangement [1] -49:5 arrangements [1] -3:17 ASAP[1] - 4:14 aspects [2] - 15:13, 15:26 asserts [1] - 57:2 assessment[1] - 23:1 asset [1] - 45:2 assets [30] - 5:15, 5:32, 6:40, 9:14, 18:15, 18:43, 23:32, 24:21, 24:25, 25:11, 28:25, 29:32, 29:38, 33:34, 34:28, 34:43, 35:22, 35:43, 37:9, 43:6, 46:10, 54:20, 55:19, 57:3, 57:13, 61:33, 62:37, 64:45, 65:13, 66:35 assistant [4] - 9:32, 16:39, 40:30, 57:21

associated [1] - 57:41

4:2, 4:44, 7:5, 39:38

approach [2] - 18:8,

attach [1] - 9:6 attached [4] - 10:47, 17:9, 17:19, 42:3 attaches [4] - 9:34, 10:37, 16:40, 26:15 attaching [1] - 9:17 attend [1] - 3:21 attending [5] - 2:13, 2:15, 2:18, 2:20, 2:34 attention [1] - 23:33 August [10] - 9:20, 11:1, 13:23, 13:29, 45:46, 52:45, 53:10, 53:13, 53:23, 54:1 authorities [11] - 8:45, 8:46, 12:35, 12:39, 13:10, 13:11, 13:15, 19:23, 19:28, 38:8 Authorized [1] - 68:15 authorizing [1] - 42:40 automatic [1] - 22:44 automatically [1] -29:7 availability [1] - 22:2 available [7] - 3:46, 20:40, 32:15, 32:20, 32:21, 32:30, 61:17 aware [1] - 19:24 awful [6] - 20:23, 20:24, 21:35, 21:44, 62:27, 62:40

В

B.C [6] - 1:5, 1:19, 1:20, 2:4 back-up [1] - 63:3 background [1] -14:28 backing [1] - 51:15 bad [1] - 30:42 bailiwick [1] - 59:3 baked [6] - 22:37, 38:46, 38:47, 42:30, 44:4, 45:28 balance [1] - 44:11 bank [2] - 31:23, 31:24 bankrupt [1] - 33:14 BANKRUPTCY[1] -1:13 bankruptcy [1] - 33:12 Bantog [4] - 9:18, 9:30, 16:41, 17:9 Bantog's [1] - 16:45 **bare** [1] - 49:32 Barry [1] - 50:19 base [1] - 7:3 based [2] - 6:35, 39:28 basis [5] - 17:11,

21:27, 23:44, 51:45,
55:45 BC [4] - 1:4, 1:2, 1:11,
4:35
BD [1] - 47:22
Bear [17] - 1:7, 1:19,
1:22, 1:12, 26:9, 26:13, 32:42, 43:23,
47:1, 47:2, 48:13,
50:9, 50:10, 50:11,
50:22, 58:5
bear [2] - 52:44, 54:6
bearing [1] - 6:16
beats [1] - 28:24
became [1] - 60:24
become [2] - 15:14,
61:47
becomes [2] - 23:34, 27:26
BEFORE [1] - 1:3
begin [2] - 20:14,
36:12
beginning [2] - 41:4,
56:35 BEGINS)([10:11:10 _[1]
- 1:7
behest [1] - 35:33
behind [5] - 27:7,
32:33, 32:35, 36:9,
36:14
beneficial [10] - 23:16,
25:36, 25:38, 26:16,
26:17, 27:15, 47:45,
47:46, 48:10, 61:30
beneficially [5] - 25:45, 26:4, 39:24,
48:10, 48:11
benefit [2] - 37:17,
38:41
benefits [1] - 37:43
best [5] - 32:14, 35:1,
35:43, 63:1, 68:7
better [3] - 19:10,
32:17, 35:1
BETWEEN [2] - 1:5, 1:16
between [13] - 6:11,
17:24, 18:39, 18:40,
23:24, 33:11, 34:41,
45:25, 49:13, 59:30,
59:34, 61:10, 62:43
beyond [1] - 28:9
BIA [1] - 33:13
bid [3] - 28:17, 28:24
big [6] - 16:34, 34:36,
50:18, 50:19, 50:21, 66:45
bigger [3] - 33:20,
33:21, 46:1
bind [1] - 35:38

45:34, 45:35, 48:7, 48:24, 49:37, 56:27, 56:31, 56:32, 63:12 blank [1] - 17:36 blanks [2] - 19:46, 40:20 **block** [3] - 5:37, 5:41, 6:14 blockade [1] - 27:40 blocked [1] - 27:24 blocks [1] - 35:25 blown [1] - 38:44 BM [8] - 1:20, 1:21, 1:21, 50:2 BMA [9] - 26:13, 26:18, 26:19, 48:13, 48:18, 50:3, 61:24, 61:35 **BMD** [1] - 47:7 boil [1] - 21:10 boiled [1] - 23:44 boils [1] - 22:27 bonuses [1] - 53:38 book [6] - 12:35, 12:38, 13:10, 13:11, 55:34, 55:36 books [1] - 63:29 borrow [1] - 31:31 borrower [12] - 25:27, 25:29, 25:30, 26:20, 26:21, 26:22, 26:24, 26:26, 26:47, 44:37, 51:39, 61:26 borrower's [1] - 26:25 borrowing [2] - 39:19, 39:20 borrowings [1] -31:22 bother [1] - 47:11 bottom [2] - 9:39, 9:40 bound [2] - 12:28, 13:37 Brandt [6] - 2:5, 1:15, 1:33, 1:34, 2:47, 14:1 BRANDT [53] - 14:5, 14:7, 14:13, 14:19, 14:25, 14:31, 14:42, 14:45, 15:1, 15:29, 15:34, 15:45, 16:5, 16:15, 16:23, 16:28, 16:32, 16:34, 16:44, 16:47, 17:4, 17:6, 17:11, 17:14, 17:30, 17:33, 17:35, 17:40, 17:43, 17:45, 17:47,

binder [4] - 14:8, 14:16, 19:39, 19:44

bit [14] - 24:2, 25:17,

35:9, 39:37, 41:32,

18:2, 18:13, 18:20, 18:22, 18:26, 18:29, 18:33, 18:40, 18:42, 19:3, 19:8, 19:10, 19:13, 19:21, 40:6, 40:10, 40:13, 40:16, 40:20, 40:28, 40:30, 40:33 breach [5] - 5:1, 5:7, 63:19, 63:22, 65:23 breached [1] - 63:15 breaches [2] - 20:25, 63:23 break [4] - 38:3, 39:31, 39:41, 64:17 breath [1] - 33:38 bring [4] - 4:36, 8:30, 17:37, 38:19 brings [1] - 34:6 brink [1] - 30:29 BRITISH [1] - 1:2 broad [3] - 5:22, 27:35, 34:25 brought [2] - 20:44, 65:40 bucks [1] - 51:34 **build** [1] - 65:44 built [2] - 38:22, 42:1 bunch [1] - 49:23 bundled [5] - 29:37, 41:25, 41:26, 41:27, 41:35 burn [2] - 23:17, 66:2 **Business** [1] - 4:35 business [28] - 4:39, 4:43, 4:47, 5:15, 5:32, 6:24, 6:29, 6:31, 6:39, 24:16, 25:12, 28:38, 29:23, 29:31, 29:43, 29:47, 30:8, 30:10, 30:27, 31:19, 31:30, 31:47, 39:11, 39:21, 43:8, 43:9, 63:7, 65:14 businesses [1] -39:32 buy [4] - 24:21, 24:25, 28:21, 28:41 buying [1] - 5:40 **buys** [1] - 28:25 BY [5] - 4:26, 8:41, 14:5, 20:9, 40:37 **Byma** [4] - 2:2, 1:23, 1:24, 3:24 C

C.A.B [1] - 2:4

cannot [4] - 21:7,

25:16, 51:20, 52:5

capital [2] - 35:10, 44.1 captured [1] - 29:35 care [1] - 49:20 careful [2] - 10:22, 57:9 carried [5] - 31:20, 41:23, 41:46, 54:21, 55:14 carries [1] - 43:11 carry [6] - 23:1, 25:3, 41:42, 42:26, 42:27, 43:7 carrying [1] - 39:4 cart [2] - 33:44, 49:9 carts [1] - 39:21 carving [1] - 39:18 case [6] - 3:2, 7:43, 19:23, 37:2, 53:29, 59:33 cases [3] - 19:24, 47:46, 52:47 cash [5] - 32:47, 33:1, 51:45, 60:41, 60:43 cashed [1] - 30:18 category [1] - 45:21 CCAA[2] - 6:29, 32:43 CCAAs[1] - 32:43 Celiz [4] - 16:38, 17:15, 40:24, 40:26 Celiz's [4] - 16:47, 17:28, 18:29, 18:33 **CEO** [2] - 51:38, 60:38 certain [9] - 17:18, 33:3. 33:6. 33:7. 34:28, 35:25, 49:35, 57:11 certainly [8] - 3:22, 9:8, 12:11, 28:23. 28:34, 46:28, 47:28, 55:30 certificate [7] - 11:24, 11:29, 11:30, 11:36, 18:31, 18:34, 19:9 certification [1] - 1:21 CERTIFICATION[1] -68:1 certify [1] - 68:3 CFO [6] - 10:29, 10:31, 56:37, 60:24, 60:29, 62:46 chain [1] - 47:22 challenge [1] - 15:16 CHAMBERS [2] -1:24, 1:3 chambers [4] - 39:43, 67:16 chance [2] - 4:31, 7:6

cap [1] - 43:47

Capella [1] - 1:21

changed [3] - 30:37, 55:21, 55:29 charge [5] - 21:8, 25:11, 45:18, 64:19 charges [1] - 61:31 **charging** [1] - 49:10 **chart** [4] - 46:18, 46:24, 47:26, 48:21 cheque [4] - 27:37, 29:3, 30:16, 30:17 cheques [8] - 30:14, 31:26, 52:5, 53:11, 53:15, 53:20, 53:25, 53:34 chief [1] - 60:26 choose [1] - 55:46 chosen [1] - 58:33 chunks [1] - 36:11 circle [1] - 66:38 circumstances [5] -19:19, 42:5, 44:34, 47:13, 62:33 cited [2] - 13:1, 13:11 cites [1] - 51:47 City [3] - 33:22, 38:19, 54:2 claim [3] - 33:22, 33:32, 33:45 claimant [1] - 15:10 claims [8] - 15:10, 23:24, 45:20, 58:30, 59:11, 62:10, 64:10 Clarke [1] - 62:46 Clarke's [1] - 56:36 class [4] - 60:45, 60:47, 61:1, 63:28 clause [3] - 10:43, 14:38, 16:11 clear [3] - 5:16, 27:42, 58:6 CLERK [10] - 1:11, 2:17, 2:20, 2:23. 2:25, 12:13, 12:17, 39:43, 40:7, 67:16 **Clerk** [3] - 8:14, 8:17, 19:14 clerk [1] - 2:15 clicking [1] - 66:47 client [8] - 29:2, 29:42, 38:29, 38:40, 51:29, 64:44, 65:45, 66:47 client's [4] - 7:6, 64:26, 64:34, 65:33 cloaking [1] - 38:12 clock [2] - 65:45, 67:13 **close** [1] - 31:26 closer [1] - 62:11 clothes [1] - 49:23 clothing [1] - 49:23

CNSL [399] - 1:17,
1:21, 1:23, 1:25,
1:30, 1:32, 1:35, 1:38, 1:41, 1:46,
1:47, 2:5, 2:27, 2:29,
2:38, 2:44, 3:2, 3:5,
3:7, 3:9, 3:16, 3:20,
3:23, 3:37, 4:1, 4:5,
4:8, 4:11, 4:16, 4:24,
7:8, 7:10, 7:20, 7:23,
7:25, 7:28, 7:30,
7:32, 7:34, 7:35, 7:37, 7:40, 7:42,
7.37, 7.40, 7.42,
7:46, 8:3, 8:7, 8:12,
8:13, 8:16, 8:18,
8:20, 8:22, 8:25,
8:29, 8:33, 8:38,
8:41, 8:43, 9:13,
9:23, 9:26, 9:29,
9:31, 9:34, 9:39,
10:2, 10:9, 10:14,
10:17, 10:25, 10:28,
10:30, 10:34, 10:37,
10:40, 10:44, 10:47,
11:5, 11:7, 11:9,
11:17, 11:20, 11:27,
11:34, 11:41, 11:46,
11:47, 12:2, 12:4,
12:7, 12:11, 12:16,
12:18, 12:32, 12:34,
12:40, 12:41, 12:42,
12:46, 13:3, 13:5,
13:8, 13:15, 13:18,
13:21, 13:24, 13:27,
13:34, 13:40, 13:42, 13:44, 13:47, 14:5,
14:7, 14:13, 14:19,
14:25, 14:31, 14:42, 14:45, 15:1, 15:29,
15:34, 15:45, 16:5,
16:15, 16:23, 16:28,
16:32, 16:34, 16:44,
16:47, 17:4, 17:6,
17:11, 17:14, 17:30,
17:33, 17:35, 17:40,
17:43, 17:45, 17:47,
18:2, 18:13, 18:20,
18:22, 18:26, 18:29,
18:33, 18:40, 18:42,
19:3, 19:8, 19:10,
19:13, 19:17, 19:21,
19:25, 19:28, 19:35,
19:38, 19:42, 19:46,
20:2, 20:6, 20:9,
20:11, 21:16, 21:21,
21:23, 21:29, 22:41,
24:23, 24:32, 24:34,
24:36, 24:40, 24:46,
25:22, 25:29, 25:32,
25:35, 25:38, 25:43,
26:13, 26:22, 26:25,
, , ,

26:30, 26:32, 26:36, 26:38, 26:41, 26:44, 27:2, 27:6, 27:10, 27:14, 27:18, 27:20, 27:25, 27:30, 27:33, 27:39, 27:46, 28:7, 28:23, 28:26, 28:29, 28:32, 28:38, 29:6, 29:10, 29:14, 29:21, 29:24, 29:27, 30:20, 30:25, 30:26, 31:35, 32:34, 32:38, 33:17, 33:25, 33:30, 33:36, 34:1, 34:3, 34:11, 34:21, 34:26, 34:31, 34:35, 34:38, 34:40, 34:46, 35:4, 35:17, 35:23, 35:26, 35:29, 36:45. 37:7. 37:13. 38:3, 38:33, 39:13, 39:15, 39:33, 39:35, 39:37, 39:40, 40:6, 40:10, 40:13, 40:16, 40:20, 40:28, 40:30, 40:33, 40:37, 40:40, 40:46, 41:3, 41:10, 41:13, 41:18, 41:21, 45:44, 45:47, 46:3, 46:5, 46:9, 46:11, 46:14, 46:17, 46:26, 46:28, 46:31, 46:33, 46:35, 46:40, 46:43, 47:2, 47:6, 47:15, 47:18, 47:20, 47:21, 47:24, 47:28, 47:33, 47:39, 48:21, 48:24, 48:32, 48:35, 48:38, 48:44, 49:1, 49:3, 49:30, 49:34, 49:42, 50:11, 50:13, 50:16, 50:18, 50:26, 50:32, 50:36, 50:40, 50:46, 51:5, 51:7, 51:10, 51:14, 51:17, 51:27, 52:3, 52:30, 52:36, 52:38, 53:6, 53:42, 53:45, 54:25, 54:30, 54:32, 54:34, 54:36, 54:39, 54:41, 54:43, 54:46, 55:1, 55:3, 55:6, 55:9, 55:12, 55:38, 55:40, 55:42, 57:19, 57:20, 58:9, 58:12, 58:15, 58:17, 58:19, 58:25, 58:40, 58:43, 58:46, 59:1, 59:7, 59:10, 59:14, 59:16, 59:19, 59:21, 59:22, 59:29, 59:39, 59:46, 60:2, 60:8, 60:10, 60:17, 60:20,

60:31, 60:34, 63:8, 63:11, 63:14, 63:18, 63:22, 63:41, 64:1, 64:20, 64:22, 64:30, 64:38, 64:42, 65:1, 65:25, 65:28, 65:31, 65:36, 66:10, 66:23, 66:27, 66:30, 66:33, 66:38, 66:44, 67:4, 67:11 Cnsl [4] - 1:12, 1:15, 1:18, 1:20 **co**[1] - 50:2 colleague [1] - 20:11 **collective** [1] - 14:8 collectively [1] - 49:8 **COLUMBIA**[1] - 1:2 column [1] - 30:17 combine [1] - 3:33 combined [1] - 53:33 comfortable [1] - 3:44 coming [2] - 3:17, 15:22 **commenced** [1] - 64:8 COMMENCED)([10: 11:10[1] - 1:6 comment [3] - 7:11, 25:19, 36:10 commentary [1] -57:39 commented [1] -23:37 comments [4] - 9:41, 20:15, 20:20, 23:39 commercial [5] - 4:8, 15:2, 16:24, 20:17, 50:22 communication [1] -18:18 communications [2] -14:40, 17:23 companies [8] - 26:6, 26:19, 27:16, 27:18, 36:28, 48:19, 51:39, 59:35 company [8] - 1:39, 34:18, 43:27, 44:17, 51:38, 59:37, 64:38, 65.8 company's [1] - 63:2 compare [2] - 53:24, 53:30 compared [1] - 34:15 comparison [1] -24:14 compelled [1] - 63:37 compels [2] - 36:21, 36:22 competing [2] - 5:1, 28:17

complete [6] - 22:24, 22:25, 23:3, 28:2, 37:43, 39:8 completely [1] - 29:17 compounded [1] -64.22 comprehensive[1] -37.43 concept [3] - 22:38, 38:5, 56:18 concern [9] - 30:29, 30:33, 33:20, 33:21, 34:4, 36:16, 37:38, 37:41, 57:40 concerned [5] - 20:29, 21:10, 31:46, 33:9, 52:6 concerning [2] - 5:7, 64:36 concerns [6] - 29:43, 30:1, 36:19, 43:10, 57:24, 57:30 conclude [2] - 35:47 conclusion [4] -22:17, 35:27, 36:2, 37:35 concurrently [1] - 9:4 condensed [8] -12:38, 13:6, 26:33, 40:44, 53:32, 54:31, 55:34, 55:36 conditions [2] - 17:12, 35:22 conduct [4] - 5:2, 5:7, 5:9 conducted [1] - 9:11 conference [2] - 3:2, 59:34 confidential [3] -17:23, 18:37, 18:38 confidentiality [7] -14:38, 15:29, 16:19, 16:23, 18:6, 18:47 confirming [2] -11:24, 18:33 conflict [1] - 21:28 conflicting [1] - 21:36 conflicts [3] - 21:19, 21:20, 45:16 consent [8] - 2:10, 2:41, 4:23, 7:20, 36:24, 38:42, 41:41, 62:6 consequences [1] -35:30 consider [2] - 24:44, 59:18

considered [1] - 24:43

consists [1] - 26:42

constitute [1] - 25:9

consultants [1] -38.18 contain [1] - 21:19 contains [2] - 17:23, 18:11 contemplated [1] -56:23 contemplation [2] -44:31, 45:14 contentious [1] - 2:46 **CONTENTS**[1] - 1:2 contest [2] - 5:46, 36:43 context [7] - 5:27, 10:5. 20:29. 27:36. 32:11, 34:14, 38:14 continued [1] - 1:20 **continues** [1] - 53:40 continuing [2] - 40:38, 65:32 contractual [1] - 45:23 contrary [2] - 32:26, 45:23 control [3] - 60:35, 60:39, 65:3 controls [1] - 30:34 copies [10] - 8:20, 9:20, 11:12, 11:13, 11:43, 11:44, 12:15, 12:16, 14:9, 40:13 copy [14] - 10:45, 11:5, 12:14, 12:34, 13:35, 13:37, 14:21, 16:8, 17:16, 17:34, 17:35, 17:38, 19:11, 19:13 COPY [1] - 1:27 core [1] - 47:40 corporation [3] -47:22, 47:23, 47:31 Corporations [1] -4:35 correct [6] - 7:35, 14:19, 16:35, 20:22, 28:31, 36:38 correspondence [2] -9:35, 18:9 cost [3] - 28:22, 44:2, 57:41 costs [2] - 39:4, 42:27 Counsel [2] - 2:2, 2:4 counsel [16] - 2:31, 2:35, 2:46, 3:9, 3:13, 4:21, 7:16, 7:23, 11:42, 28:40, 37:18, 54:36, 54:37, 58:35, 59:4, 64:25 counsel's [1] - 3:28 couple [3] - 14:1,

25:18, 29:19

Course [3] - 1:21, 1:21, 50:2 course [26] - 2:28, 9:47, 10:3, 16:13, 24:1, 27:27, 29:21, 30:32, 30:43, 31:44. 32:22, 33:37, 33:44, 34:8, 37:17, 39:16, 41:4, 43:13, 47:47, 49:6, 49:33, 49:44, 50:21, 55:22, 61:12, 66:17 courses [2] - 50:42, 52:10 COURT [378] - 1:2, 1:16, 1:20, 1:22, 1:24, 1:29, 1:31, 1:34, 1:37, 1:40, 1:42, 2:1, 2:14, 2:18, 2:21, 2:24, 2:26, 2:28, 2:33, 2:43, 3:1, 3:4, 3:6, 3:8, 3:15, 3:19, 3:21, 3:36, 3:47, 4:2, 4:7, 4:10, 4:13, 4:20, 4:26, 4:28, 7:9, 7:19, 7:22, 7:26, 7:29, 7:31, 7:33, 7:36, 7:39, 7:41, 7:45, 8:1, 8:6, 8:10, 8:14, 8:17, 8:19, 8:21, 8:24, 8:28, 8:32, 8:34, 9:12, 9:22, 9:25, 9:28, 9:30, 9:32, 9:38, 9:46, 10:6, 10:13, 10:16, 10:24, 10:26, 10:29, 10:33, 10:36, 10:39, 10:41, 10:46, 11:3, 11:6, 11:8, 11:15, 11:18, 11:26, 11:33, 11:38, 11:45, 12:1, 12:3, 12:6, 12:9, 12:12, 12:23, 12:33, 12:36, 12:45, 13:2, 13:4, 13:7, 13:14, 13:17, 13:19, 13:22, 13:26, 13:28, 13:38, 13:41, 13:43, 13:45, 14:3, 14:12, 14:18, 14:24, 14:30, 14:41, 14:44, 14:47, 15:28, 15:32. 15:41, 16:3, 16:10, 16:22, 16:25, 16:31, 16:33, 16:42, 16:45, 17:2, 17:5, 17:10, 17:13, 17:26, 17:32, 17:34, 17:39, 17:41, 17:44, 17:46, 18:1, 18:10, 18:17, 18:21, 18:23, 18:28, 18:32,

18:38, 18:41, 19:2, 19:6, 19:9, 19:12, 19:15, 19:19, 19:22, 19:27, 19:31, 19:37, 19:39, 19:44, 20:1, 20:4, 20:7, 21:14, 21:17, 21:22, 21:24, 22:40, 24:22, 24:30, 24:33, 24:35, 24:37, 24:41, 25:21, 25:28, 25:31, 25:33, 25:37, 25:42, 26:12, 26:20, 26:23, 26:28, 26:31, 26:35, 26:37, 26:39, 26:42, 26:46, 27:3, 27:9, 27:13, 27:17, 27:19, 27:22, 27:29, 27:32, 27:38, 27:45, 28:6, 28:14, 28:24, 28:28, 28:31, 28:37, 29:5, 29:9, 29:13, 29:19, 29:22, 29:25, 30:19, 31:34, 32:32, 32:37, 33:8, 33:24, 33:29, 33:35, 33:47, 34:2, 34:4, 34:19, 34:22, 34:27, 34:34, 34:36, 34:39, 34:45, 35:3, 35:15, 35:18, 35:24, 35:28, 36:41, 37:6, 37:11, 38:2, 38:32, 39:9, 39:14, 39:30, 39:34, 39:36, 39:38, 39:41, 40:5, 40:8, 40:12, 40:15, 40:19, 40:27, 40:29, 40:32, 40:34, 40:45, 41:2, 41:7, 41:11, 41:17, 41:20, 45:43, 45:46, 46:2, 46:4, 46:6, 46:10, 46:12, 46:16, 46:24, 46:27, 46:30, 46:32, 46:34, 46:39, 46:42, 47:5, 47:14, 47:17, 47:19, 47:26, 47:32, 47:38, 48:20, 48:23, 48:31, 48:36, 48:46, 49:2, 49:28, 49:32, 49:41, 50:9, 50:12, 50:15, 50:17, 50:25, 50:30, 50:35, 50:38, 50:44, 51:4, 51:6, 51:9, 51:12, 51:16, 51:26, 52:2, 52:29, 52:35, 52:37, 53:5, 53:41, 53:43, 54:24, 54:29, 54:31, 54:33, 54:35, 54:38, 54:40, 54:42, 54:44, 54:47, 55:2, 55:5, 55:8, 55:10,

55:37, 55:39, 55:41, 58:18, 58:22, 58:37, 58:41, 58:45, 59:5, 59:8, 59:13, 59:15, 59:20, 59:28, 59:38, 59:42, 59:47, 60:7, 60:9, 60:16, 60:19, 60:30, 60:33, 63:6, 63:10, 63:13, 63:15, 63:19, 63:39, 63:47, 64:16, 64:21, 64:23, 64:33, 64:41, 64:47, 65:6, 65:27, 65:30, 65:35, 65:47, 66:12, 66:26, 66:29, 66:32, 66:37, 66:43, 67:3, 67:8, 67:14 court [47] - 1:10, 5:33, 6:28, 9:7, 9:11, 9:37, 10:14, 10:18, 11:11, 11:13, 11:42, 11:44, 14:15, 14:26, 14:27, 16:6, 17:19, 18:36, 19:29, 19:47, 20:30, 20:35, 20:36, 21:2, 21:31, 22:39, 23:23, 24:26, 25:2, 25:12, 27:34, 35:34, 35:41, 35:46, 35:47, 36:4, 36:39, 37:24, 37:33, 38:4, 38:27, 41:44, 42:32, 55:27, 57:43 court's [16] - 5:28, 6:45, 24:28, 24:44, 25:3, 29:11, 29:40, 36:3, 36:18, 37:34, 37:40, 38:21, 55:26, 65:19, 66:1, 66:20 court-appointed [1] -22:39 court-ordered [1] -25:12 courtroom [5] - 1:42, 10:8, 58:11, 58:18, 58:23 covenants [3] - 63:16, 63:20, 63:23 cover [1] - 15:38 **CPC** [4] - 5:3, 8:26, 58:41, 58:43 create [1] - 43:6 credibility [1] - 52:22 credit [2] - 4:46, 24:39 credited [1] - 24:39 creditor [7] - 23:20, 24:10, 31:11, 32:28, 32:44, 34:7, 34:17 creditors [11] - 28:42,

28:44, 30:11, 30:35,

31:15, 31:16, 32:33,

32:35, 33:12, 33:27, 33:42 cross [1] - 15:10 current [2] - 54:4, 63:6 cut [1] - 30:16 D daily [1] - 51:45 damages [3] - 22:27, 22:28, 22:34 Daniel [1] - 1:5 Darcus [2] - 2:6, 1:35 date [4] - 4:14, 36:43, 61:19, 63:30 days [2] - 22:45, 37:22 deadlock [5] - 4:34, 4:36, 4:38, 28:45, 59:47 deadlocked [6] - 4:33, 27:22, 27:28, 27:47, 65:9, 66:15 deal [10] - 2:47, 3:24, 3:27, 4:22, 5:15, 7:14, 10:6, 10:10, 34:39, 51:10 dealing [4] - 9:46, 21:24, 50:38, 65:22 deals [2] - 22:13, 23:39 dealt [1] - 10:2 debt [4] - 32:28, 34:15, 64:42, 64:45 debts [3] - 4:40, 4:41, 60:42 deceased [2] - 58:8, 58:9 December [1] - 63:26 decide [2] - 5:9, 37:8 decided [1] - 20:31 decision [3] - 15:15, 15:16, 57:44 default [7] - 4:42, 31:44, 44:34, 51:21, 51:22, 51:27, 61:46 defaulted [1] - 64:6 defend [1] - 59:24 defendants [1] - 12:26 defer [1] - 59:3

defined [3] - 43:26,

delivered [2] - 30:17,

demand [1] - 62:12

density [2] - 36:13,

deposed [1] - 53:29

denied [1] - 24:1

deny [1] - 24:5

43:31. 44:19

delay [1] - 22:44

31:27

56:44

describe [1] - 30:12 described [1] - 8:8 describes [1] - 14:39 Description [1] - 1:25 description [1] - 2:3 despite [2] - 32:28, 36:22 detail [3] - 19:29, 48:24, 63:38 deteriorate [1] - 52:16 determination [8] -5:11, 6:17, 6:34, 20:39, 21:35, 21:47, 35:42. 63:5 determine [6] - 20:37, 21:3, 21:26, 21:31, 32:19, 64:27 determined [3] - 44:6, 45:13, 45:27 determining [1] -36:39 develop [3] - 36:12, 50:21, 54:14 developers [1] - 36:11 developing [2] -47:41, 50:37 development [12] -32:46, 39:27, 48:4, 48:5, 50:14, 50:16, 50:19, 50:22, 50:41, 56:41, 61:22, 61:41 Development [2] -46:31, 59:6 Developments [30] -1:7, 1:8, 1:18, 1:19, 1:12, 1:14, 25:40, 25:45, 26:27, 43:24, 43:31, 44:19, 44:24, 46:20, 46:21, 47:2, 47:5, 47:6, 47:8, 47:39, 47:42, 48:6, 48:9, 48:27, 53:19, 57:46, 59:14, 61:26, 64:8 developments [1] -46:35 **DEVELOPMENTS**[1] - 1:15 dicing [1] - 35:6 difference [2] - 8:2, 35:40 different [12] - 9:2, 9:3, 10:39, 13:22, 19:6, 30:16, 38:12, 42:38, 54:15, 56:1, 57:29, 65:39 differently [1] - 30:12 difficult [6] - 20:36, 24:8, 25:5, 25:6, 27:26, 46:29

difficulties [3] - 8:26, 39:18, 54:12 difficulty [3] - 16:15, 31:37, 41:22 dilution [1] - 65:32 dire [2] - 52:41, 54:8 directed [1] - 41:40 directing [1] - 10:32 direction [1] - 3:28 director [3] - 60:22, 60:23, 60:24 directors [3] - 22:31, 58:2, 59:9 dis [1] - 34:41 disagree [5] - 23:12, 29:33, 29:45, 35:4, 35:12 disagreement [2] -35:45, 49:12 disagreements [3] -22:10, 30:6, 34:41 discharge [3] - 44:33, 61:44, 62:1 disclosed [1] - 57:17 discontinue [1] - 64:2 discount [1] - 5:41 discretion [2] - 27:35, 62.7 discussion [1] - 62:19 **DISCUSSION** [4] - 1:9, 2:3, 12:21, 40:3 **Discussion** [4] - 1:8, 1:9, 1:14, 1:19 display [1] - 59:47 disproportionally [1] -24:18 disproportionate [1] -61:3 dispute [11] - 6:11, 23:8, 23:14, 23:18, 30:2, 33:11, 49:25, 54:13, 60:35, 62:9, 64:4 disputed [4] - 45:6, 51:20, 64:5, 64:13 disputes [2] - 23:30, 62:13 distress [1] - 66:15 distributable [2] -60:41, 60:43 distributes [1] - 60:42 distributing [1] -43:18 distribution [5] -23:19, 42:41, 44:38, 45:8, 45:15 distributions [1] -45:19 district [2] - 48:33, 48:42

diversion [2] - 58:3, 58:31 divide [1] - 51:8 document [1] - 12:31 documents [2] -11:16, 12:47 dollar [5] - 26:14, 43:43, 43:44, 44:30, 48:15 dollars [2] - 31:25, 53:28 done [10] - 3:45, 4:12, 4:18, 5:21, 10:10, 23:4, 36:32, 37:39, 38:21, 60:11 doubt [3] - 32:15, 51:27, 63:42 down [13] - 21:9, 21:11, 22:27, 23:44, 26:46, 28:32, 30:44, 30:45, 30:46, 35:18, 46:12, 52:43, 55:6 draft [4] - 42:2, 42:44, 45:17, 63:28 dream [1] - 50:19 drill [1] - 26:46 drilled [2] - 25:31, 46:12 drive [1] - 43:17 driven [1] - 32:43 due [5] - 51:25, 52:16. 53:46, 61:47, 63:31 duration [4] - 11:21, 18:25, 18:26, 18:30 **during** [3] - 9:47, 16:13, 61:39 duty [4] - 5:2, 5:8, 65:24, 66:20 Ε

ear [1] - 37:1 early [1] - 54:1 easier [2] - 11:7, 23:34 **EBMD** [10] - 47:3, 47:7, 47:10, 47:17, 51:35, 60:22, 60:23, 60:24, 60:38, 61:9 Ecoasis [17] - 1:7, 1:8, 1:8, 1:18, 1:19, 1:19, 1:12, 1:14, 1:46, 25:40, 26:1, 43:23, 43:34, 46:47, 47:3, ECOASIS [1] - 1:14 effectively [5] - 9:4, 30:29, 31:4, 33:15, 62:28 efficient [2] - 65:37, 67:5

EM [1] - 47:7 **EMD**[1] - 47:22 EMDB [1] - 46:47 **employee** [1] - 53:42 **employer** [2] - 53:42, 53:43 employment[1] -63:31 enable [2] - 31:31, 43:5 enclosing [2] - 17:6, 17:16 end [7] - 11:23, 16:20, 33:39, 51:23, 64:33, 66:19 ending [1] - 9:27 ENDS)([12:37:42 [1] -67:19 engage [1] - 5:31 engaged [2] - 65:10, 65:22 enhance [1] - 32:6 enshrine [1] - 5:26 enshrined [1] - 6:6 enshrines [1] - 6:42 ensure [1] - 31:17 ensuring [1] - 30:35 entered [2] - 8:23, 61:15 enterprise [3] - 47:41, 50:7, 62:29 enthralled [1] - 42:24 entire [2] - 25:33, 47:41 entirely [1] - 47:37 entities [1] - 10:31 entitled [3] - 32:1, 61:44, 62:2 entitlement [4] -23:20, 24:5, 45:23, 62:1 entrench [2] - 32:4, 32.27 enumerate [1] - 2:7 enumerated [1] - 26:7 **envelope** [1] - 12:8 envisage [1] - 38:15 equal [1] - 65:41 equally [1] - 46:22 equipment [1] - 33:42 equity [2] - 25:26, 61:3 essential [1] - 31:17 essentially [6] - 14:31,

efficiently [1] - 66:40

either [5] - 8:4, 23:20,

electronic [1] - 13:5

elusive [1] - 45:40

28:19, 30:20, 31:24

effort [1] - 24:38

65:1, 65:3 Eveliene [1] - 68:14 event [8] - 2:9, 28:2, 33:16. 33:47. 34:1. 34:10, 38:45, 39:12 evidence [45] - 2:11, 2:41, 7:17, 9:6, 9:47, 10:38, 20:24, 20:44, 21:3, 21:5, 21:11, 21:22, 21:36, 21:45, 30:22, 30:26, 30:33, 30:37, 30:39, 31:23, 35:46, 36:5, 36:14, 36:40, 37:23, 37:28, 38:25, 38:28, 43:17, 43:42, 44:5, 51:47, 52:14, 52:40, 52:45, 56:38, 57:7, 57:17, 57:40, 57:45, 60:12, 62:41, 65:16 evident [1] - 21:12 exact [3] - 13:37, 24:9, 49:18 exactly [9] - 19:10, 25:15, 26:32, 27:30, 37:26, 41:23, 42:45, 44:46, 58:24 exaggerated [1] -58:13 exceeds [1] - 57:4 except [3] - 26:9, 48:17, 49:32 exception [1] - 26:9 **EXCERPT** [5] - 1:24, 1:3, 1:4, 1:7, 67:19 excerpts [1] - 17:18 **excess**[1] - 64:39 **exchanged** [1] - 17:24 excluding [1] - 57:11 excuse [1] - 33:40 exercised [1] - 60:38 Exhibit [4] - 1:25, 9:36, 53:8, 54:34 **EXHIBITS** [1] - 1:23 exhibits [2] - 1:27, exist [2] - 59:11, 61:45 existing [3] - 52:17, 56:43, 62:42 exists [3] - 27:46, 28:8, 47:13 expect [3] - 2:45, 8:38, 28:47 expectation [2] -18:46, 62:25 expected [2] - 32:14, 50:26 expenditure [1] - 66:8

expenses [1] - 44:21

15:9, 64:31, 64:38, expensive [2] - 66:45, 67:2 **experience** [1] - 23:32 expired [2] - 49:11, 61:47 explain [1] - 46:7 explanations [1] -54:16 explore [1] - 21:46 **exposure** [1] - 32:46 **express** [1] - 18:47 expressed [1] - 29:44 expressions [1] -18:44 extend [1] - 61:18 extent [4] - 15:18, 15:21, 31:18, 66:41

F

facie [1] - 20:38 facilities [5] - 47:47, 49:7, 49:9, 49:45, 50:43 facility [2] - 49:21, 61:18 facing [1] - 59:44 fact [18] - 18:45, 22:5, 23:27, 24:18, 29:36, 32:29, 35:33, 36:23, 42:38, 48:40, 49:36, 50:32, 51:3, 58:17, 62:9, 62:42, 62:47, 64:4 facts [3] - 45:39, 51:1, 51:20 failed [1] - 54:13 fairly [1] - 27:35 falls [1] - 6:34 familiar [1] - 19:29 far [7] - 4:33, 6:32, 20:29, 20:37, 21:10, 38:40, 45:41 fashion [1] - 24:27 Fasken [1] - 55:6 father [2] - 58:7, 62:39 fault [1] - 63:34 favour [4] - 29:34, 45:18, 61:36, 61:38 Ferris [7] - 2:4, 1:31, 2:7, 2:12, 7:5, 7:12, 64:23 FERRIS [45] - 1:32, 1:35, 1:38, 1:41, 1:47, 7:35, 7:37, 7:40, 7:42, 7:46, 8:12, 11:47, 12:32, 12:34, 12:41, 13:47, 19:35, 19:38, 19:42, 19:46, 20:2, 20:6,

47:21, 50:46, 51:5, 59:19, 59:21, 59:29, 64:30, 64:38, 64:42, 65:1, 65:25, 65:28, 65:31, 65:36, 66:10, 66:23, 66:27, 66:30, 66:33, 66:38, 66:44, 67:4, 67:11 few [3] - 2:5, 20:19, 53:28 fiduciary [4] - 5:2, 5:8, 20:25, 65:24 fight [1] - 38:38 **fighting** [1] - 23:35 figure [3] - 25:8, 25:15, 51:7 figures [1] - 10:23 file [4] - 5:3, 11:11, 11:14, 12:7 filed [14] - 7:17, 9:2, 9:25, 11:1, 11:36, 11:44, 13:22, 13:29, 14:22, 15:17, 15:47, 57:15, 57:16, 59:31 filing [2] - 18:30, 19:9 final [1] - 13:47 finally [2] - 6:3, 17:22 financial [12] - 37:18, 52:15, 52:17, 52:42, 54:8, 54:12, 56:45, 60:27, 63:25, 63:28, 66:14 financing [5] - 6:8, 6:24, 6:27, 38:37, 55:9 findings [1] - 22:5 fine [6] - 1:46, 2:38, 8:10, 30:43, 38:13, 49:21 finger [1] - 54:16 finish [3] - 4:15, 40:41, 41:6 firm [3] - 9:33, 9:35, 42:11 first [24] - 4:23, 7:15, 9:30, 14:34, 16:38, 17:21, 22:19, 23:8, 25:22, 25:24, 29:33, 29:41, 30:24, 32:8, 34:16, 37:25, 41:15, 43:20, 50:20, 51:18, 61:5, 61:6, 61:15, 66:23 five [1] - 63:27 flexibility [1] - 11:35 flip [1] - 53:4 flipping [1] - 56:25 floundering [1] -62:29 focused [1] - 12:47

focusing [1] - 23:33 following [2] - 44:42, 55:14 follows [3] - 3:29, 41:24, 42:42 foolish [1] - 32:22 footing [1] - 65:41 footnote [2] - 52:24, 54:26 footnoted [1] - 52:1 FOR [1] - 39:46 forget [1] - 51:32 form [3] - 5:14, 20:34, 41:18 former [4] - 58:1, 59:8, 59:9, 62:45 forms [1] - 23:47 **formulated** [1] - 34:30 formulation [1] -37:15 forth [2] - 53:4, 62:17 forward [2] - 28:15, 42:15 four [3] - 16:42, 30:43, 30:46 fractious [1] - 33:10 frankly [6] - 20:18, 20:47, 21:7, 29:2, 31:11, 31:45 fraud [1] - 24:42 Friday [1] - 4:13 friend [4] - 2:6, 47:29, 47:34, 65:42 friends [9] - 3:33, 3:42, 11:12, 13:9, 14:14, 38:4, 42:44, 46:40, 46:43 FROM [3] - 1:24, 1:3, 1:4 front [1] - 25:2 **FTS**[1] - 13:6 full [12] - 17:16, 17:18, 25:2, 29:4, 38:44, 44:43, 45:12, 60:34, 62:2, 62:3, 67:9, 67:11 full-blown [1] - 38:44 fulsome [1] - 12:31 fund [10] - 28:35, 31:32, 31:39, 31:40, 31:45, 59:17, 61:21, 61:24, 62:30, 65:14 fundamental [3] -22:9, 30:6, 34:41 fundamentally [2] -21:37, 37:3 funded [2] - 58:34, 59:36 **funder** [1] - 66:35

funding [26] - 28:27,

28:33, 31:18, 31:43, 32:20, 32:21, 32:24, 32:30, 38:14, 38:22, 38:31, 38:43, 38:47, 39:7, 42:1, 42:25, 43:2, 43:3, 43:8, 50:6, 50:7, 59:23, 59:29, 59:37, 61:14, 66:34 funds [19] - 20:26, 23:6, 23:19, 23:22, 27:23, 29:47, 31:32, 31:40, 31:47, 32:5, 32:7, 32:10, 32:12, 43:7, 58:3, 58:5, 58:31, 66:3, 66:46 future [1] - 33:3

G

gains [2] - 43:47, 44:1 general [1] - 30:1 generally [1] - 18:46 generated [1] - 43:14 generates [1] - 61:11 given [8] - 7:25, 8:8, 14:27, 21:28, 35:21, 36:46, 52:6, 64:14 gleaned [2] - 4:32, 7:2 Golf [7] - 1:8, 1:21, 1:21, 26:2, 43:34, 50:2, 53:14 golf [18] - 1:19, 30:47, 31:8, 31:9, 33:44, 39:16, 39:20, 39:21, 47:47, 49:6, 49:32, 49:44, 50:21, 50:42, 52:10, 57:12, 61:12 goodwill [1] - 52:21 grade [2] - 56:26, 63:12 granted [4] - 19:20, 27:11, 27:14, 43:5 great [1] - 50:21 greater [4] - 5:35, 5:38, 24:12 greatly [1] - 58:12 group [5] - 26:42, 26:43, 27:4, 27:5, 28:16 grow [1] - 50:27 **GSAs**[1] - 61:30 GST [2] - 53:46, 63:30 guaranteed [1] - 61:29 guarantor [1] - 61:28 guarantors [1] - 51:40 guess [3] - 41:46, 46:36, 57:34 guilty [1] - 21:38

Н

hale [1] - 58:25 half [3] - 38:46, 42:30, 45:28 half-baked [3] - 38:46, 42:30, 45:28 halfway [1] - 55:6 hallway [2] - 49:22, 49:24 hammered [1] - 37:23 hand [14] - 7:21, 8:14, 8:44, 9:23, 11:5, 14:10, 17:30, 17:37, 31:38, 36:31, 40:11, 40:16, 53:3, 66:6 handed [2] - 13:33, 16:8 handing [1] - 17:41 handle [1] - 39:31 hands [5] - 30:5, 33:15, 34:9, 35:32, 37:39 hang [1] - 8:34 happily [1] - 45:38 happy [1] - 32:16 hard [2] - 4:11, 4:17 heading [2] - 30:47, 31:7 health [2] - 53:42, 53:43 healthy [1] - 60:21 hear [7] - 6:44, 8:3, 19:15, 20:42, 22:14, 65:18, 66:4 heard [1] - 24:24 hearing [7] - 6:33, 12:26, 16:13, 20:16, 22:18, 46:4, 62:20 heart [1] - 54:17 held [2] - 6:16, 23:22 help [2] - 27:39, 57:33 helpful [3] - 7:10, 7:12, 26:38 helps [3] - 7:9, 51:12, 67:15 Hiebert [13] - 2:3, 1:12, 1:21, 2:47, 7:24, 8:30, 19:16, 19:23, 26:33, 45:5, 48:8, 48:39, 55:33 HIEBERT [57] - 7:25, 8:38, 8:41, 8:43, 9:13, 9:23, 9:26, 9:29, 9:31, 9:34, 9:39, 10:2, 10:9, 10:14, 10:17, 10:25,

10:28, 10:30, 10:34,

10:37, 10:40, 10:44,

10:47, 11:5, 11:7,

11:9, 11:17, 11:20, 11:27, 11:34, 11:41, 12:2, 12:4, 12:7, 12:11, 12:16, 12:18, 12:40, 12:42, 12:46, 13:3, 13:5, 13:8, 13:15, 13:18, 13:21, 13:24, 13:27, 13:34, 13:40, 13:42, 13:44, 19:17, 19:25, 19:28, 30:25, 57:19 Hiebert's [1] - 46:41 high [5] - 41:3, 42:47, 56:26, 63:12 high-grade [2] -56:26, 63:12 Highlands [4] - 1:21, 1:21, 48:43, 48:45 historically [1] - 61:13 hit [1] - 43:47 hmm [4] - 22:40, 24:22, 25:21, 59:7 hold [1] - 39:15 holder [1] - 61:1 holding [2] - 33:38, 60:45 Holdings [6] - 1:9, 1:16, 2:2, 1:13, 1:26, 1:28 **holds** [1] - 60:26 HONOURABLE [1] -1:3 hotel [14] - 14:35, 14:40, 15:5, 15:7, 15:13, 16:24, 30:3, 48:46, 49:1, 49:3, 49:7, 49:14, 49:34, 49:45 house [1] - 40:6 housekeeping [6] -1:8, 1:14, 1:19, 12:23, 13:47, 40:10 HOUSEKEEPING [3] -1:9, 12:21, 40:3 housing [1] - 50:33 HSBC [6] - 32:35, 32:44, 32:45, 33:17, 36:25, 38:39 hundreds [1] - 31:27 hurt [1] - 24:30

idea [3] - 28:12, 42:6, 42:24 ideas [1] - 37:28 idem [1] - 20:32 identical [1] - 31:5 identified [2] - 23:40, 42:10

ignore [1] - 13:36 imagine [1] - 22:44 immediately [1] -67:13 impact [3] - 9:44, 36:15, 57:36 impacted [2] - 52:20, 61:6 impede [1] - 22:15 **impediment** [1] - 66:5 important [5] - 23:41, 30:9, 37:3, 47:25, importantly [1] - 25:38 **impossible** [1] - 42:33 impression [2] -21:41. 24:9 impressions [1] -20:21 impropriety [1] -24:41 improve [1] - 52:42 improved [1] - 53:27 improvement [1] -53:35 **IN** [5] - 1:2, 1:13, 1:14, 1:24, 1:3 inability [1] - 28:45 inclined [1] - 38:4 include [2] - 13:15, 54:21 included [2] - 42:18, 50.4 includes [7] - 14:8, 14:37, 40:23, 42:2, 43:39, 58:4, 63:45 including [4] - 52:42, 58:3, 61:16, 61:34 inclusive [1] - 68:4 income [2] - 60:41, 60:43 inconsistent [1] -45:24 increase [1] - 61:16 increased [1] - 52:47 incur [2] - 42:27, 53:40 incurred [3] - 52:26, 52:33, 52:34 indebtedness [3] -23:9, 30:34, 31:5 indeed [3] - 21:21, 29:24, 52:36 independent [3] -6:45, 66:1, 66:20 index [1] - 13:8 indicated [2] - 32:10, 44.5 indication [6] - 24:23, 38:25, 38:35, 39:6,

39:7, 45:26 indiscernible [10] -1:36, 6:2, 11:40, 12:13, 20:41, 29:26, 33:33, 45:35, 58:38, 61:18 indiscernible] [5] -2:29, 18:16, 19:30, 22:47, 59:21 individual [1] - 55:47 inexpensive [1] -38:17 information [8] - 9:43, 10:14, 10:19, 10:21, 10:22, 10:25, 18:11, 42:46 initial [6] - 1:33, 15:15, 20:21, 23:39, 29:16, 30:26 initiate [2] - 32:23, 33:12 initiated [1] - 34:13 injection [1] - 64:31 input [1] - 37:14 insert [1] - 20:2 insignificant [1] - 39:5 insolvency [5] - 1:27, 3:32, 10:11, 14:18, 16:14 INSOLVENCY [1] -1:13 insolvent [3] - 63:40, 63:41. 64:13 instead [1] - 55:46 institution [1] - 42:11 insufficient [2] -35:46, 36:5 intend [2] - 43:4, 45:31 intended [1] - 60:28 intention [2] - 15:40, 42:26 interchangeably [1] -20:46 interest [16] - 6:16, 18:44, 23:12, 23:13, 23:22, 48:27, 48:28, 51:31, 51:32, 53:40, 56:21, 57:47, 61:3, 64:18, 65:23, 65:33 interest-bearing [1] -6:16 interested [2] - 2:31, 62:35 interests [1] - 27:15 interim [9] - 3:34, 3:40, 6:7, 6:25, 12:27, 21:14, 38:37,

64:35, 65:5

internally [1] - 45:24

intractable [1] - 22:9 introductions [1] -1:18 investigated [1] -36:17 investment [3] -22:43, 35:35, 56:45 investors [1] - 15:36 involve [1] - 59:43 involving [4] - 14:34, 14:43, 64:10 irrelevant [3] - 20:31, 47:37, 60:36 irrespective [1] - 23:5 island [1] - 50:23 issue [9] - 4:37, 9:5, 16:18, 17:21, 30:4, 34:22, 59:45, 62:43, 66:6 issued [8] - 22:23, 22:26, 23:29, 30:14, 31:26, 46:45, 47:10, 47:12 issues [5] - 6:10, 6:31, 21:47, 36:20, 57:29 item [1] - 14:1 items [1] - 11:10 itself [9] - 23:42, 24:19, 24:29, 25:15, 32:3, 32:4, 32:27, 41:30

J

JACKSON [200] - 20:9, 20:11, 21:16, 21:21, 21:23, 21:29, 22:41, 24:23, 24:32, 24:34, 24:36, 24:40, 24:46, 25:22, 25:29, 25:32, 25:35, 25:38, 25:43, 26:13, 26:22, 26:25, 26:30, 26:32, 26:36, 26:38, 26:41, 26:44, 27:2, 27:6, 27:10, 27:14, 27:18, 27:20, 27:25, 27:30, 27:33, 27:39, 27:46, 28:7, 28:23, 28:26, 28:29, 28:32, 28:38, 29:6, 29:10, 29:14, 29:21, 29:24, 29:27, 30:20, 30:26, 31:35, 32:34, 32:38, 33:17, 33:25, 33:30, 33:36, 34:1, 34:3, 34:11, 34:21, 34:26, 34:31, 34:35, 34:38, 34:40, 34:46, 35:4, 35:17, 35:23, 35:26, 35:29, 36:45,

39:40, 40:37, 40:40, 40:46, 41:3, 41:10, 41:13, 41:18, 41:21, 45:44, 45:47, 46:3, 46:5, 46:9, 46:11, 46:14, 46:17, 46:26, 46:28, 46:31, 46:33, 46:35, 46:40, 46:43, 47:2, 47:6, 47:15, 47:18, 47:20, 47:24, 47:28, 47:33, 47:39, 48:21, 48:24, 48:32, 48:35, 48:38, 48:44, 49:1, 49:3, 49:30, 49:34. 49:42. 50:11. 50:13. 50:16. 50:18. 50:26. 50:32. 50:36. 50:40. 51:7. 51:10. 51:14, 51:17, 51:27, 52:3, 52:30, 52:36, 52:38, 53:6, 53:42, 53:45, 54:25, 54:30, 54:32, 54:34, 54:36, 54:39, 54:41, 54:43, 54:46, 55:1, 55:3, 55:6, 55:9, 55:12, 55:38, 55:40, 55:42, 57:20, 58:9, 58:12, 58:15, 58:17, 58:19, 58:25, 58:40, 58:43, 58:46, 59:1, 59:7, 59:10, 59:14, 59:16, 59:22, 59:39, 59:46, 60:2, 60:8, 60:10, 60:17, 60:20, 60:31, 60:34, 63:8, 63:11, 63:14, 63:18, 63:22, 63:41, 64:1, 64:20, 64:22 Jackson [10] - 2:3, 1:18, 1:20, 1:19, 1:20, 3:30, 3:39, 8:4, 20:7, 40:35 Jackson's [1] - 10:3 January [5] - 5:5, 7:33, 7:37, 22:21, 22:35 Jennifer [2] - 9:18, 16:45 jeopardy [1] - 30:9 joined [2] - 59:44, 60:4

joint [4] - 12:37,

12:38, 13:10, 40:43

judge [2] - 6:33, 28:19

judge's [2] - 12:15,

12:16

37:7, 37:13, 38:3,

38:33, 39:13, 39:15,

39:33, 39:35, 39:37,

July [4] - 49:11, 51:24, 52:17, 52:27 jump [1] - 49:37 jumped [2] - 39:35, 45:38 June [9] - 9:19, 9:24, 9:31, 30:24, 30:41, 52:39, 54:5, 55:35, 60:22 jurisdiction [2] - 22:3, 38:8 Justice [49] - 1:15, 1:32, 2:5, 2:17, 2:38, 4:6, 4:24, 7:8, 8:13, 8:16, 10:45, 11:47, 13:47, 14:7, 14:13, 14:20, 17:30, 18:20, 19:21, 19:36, 19:43, 20:6, 20:11, 20:16, 21:30, 21:41, 22:1, 23:37, 26:44, 27:33, 29:14, 33:21, 34:1, 37:27, 37:33, 39:35, 40:7, 40:33, 40:40, 41:10. 42:35. 45:28. 45:45, 53:4, 56:31, 62:14, 63:12, 63:18, 63:34 justice [7] - 12:13, 23:6, 40:10, 45:31, 50:46, 54:9, 56:25 **JUSTICE** [1] - 1:3 justify [1] - 20:39

judgment [2] - 33:36,

Κ

KC [2] - 2:2, 2:4 keep [7] - 12:10, 13:45, 31:19, 42:7, 48:10, 52:9 keeps [1] - 66:47 kept [1] - 63:29 **kind** [4] - 6:30, 11:31, 44:4 knows [2] - 7:2, 35:30 Kusumoto [29] - 1:8, 1:26, 3:13, 9:20, 10:27, 12:27, 18:3, 21:1, 27:7, 36:15, 37:4, 49:22, 55:42, 56:12, 58:6, 58:7, 58:27, 58:28, 58:30, 58:31, 60:21, 60:22, 60:24, 60:26, 62:38, 64:46, 66:34, 67:7 Kusumoto's [6] -18:4, 53:9, 58:7, 62:35, 62:38, 63:33

L laid [1] - 45:36 land [13] - 26:14, 26:17, 35:8, 36:9, 36:11, 36:30, 37:7, 48:12, 48:14, 49:32, 55:18, 56:8, 61:29 lands [56] - 24:16, 25:27, 25:30, 25:34, 25:39, 25:46, 26:4, 26:5, 32:16, 32:38, 32:39, 32:41, 33:3, 33:6, 33:7, 34:43, 36:6, 36:8, 36:13, 36:27, 36:29, 36:37, 39:20, 39:23, 39:29, 41:24, 44:3, 47:40, 47:42, 47:44, 48:5, 48:16, 48:18, 48:29, 49:43, 49:44, 49:45, 50:3, 50:36, 50:41, 54:14, 55:46, 56:31, 56:41, 57:37, 57:38, 58:4, 61:22, 61:23, 61:24, 61:35, 62:4 Lands [5] - 1:20, 1:21, 1:21 Langford [10] - 33:22, 48:31, 48:32, 48:33, 48:34, 48:38, 48:39, 50:23, 54:2, 64:7 language [1] - 11:27 large [4] - 12:46, 23:15, 39:28, 64:40 largely [3] - 22:27, 48:6, 50:23 last [7] - 3:25, 3:42, 9:40, 25:19, 26:10, 41:47, 51:3 late [3] - 4:30, 53:47, 58:7 law [1] - 13:18 Lawsons [1] - 55:4 lawsuits [1] - 59:43 lead [1] - 7:46 lean [3] - 31:8, 45:29 learned [1] - 62:47 learning [1] - 65:11 lease [10] - 14:37, 14:38, 14:40, 15:2, 16:24, 30:2, 47:13, 49:7, 49:11, 49:26 least [12] - 23:11, 29:29, 33:39, 50:7, 51:30, 56:38, 58:35, 62:10, 62:45, 63:2, leave [2] - 36:1, 36:9

leaving [2] - 36:13,

49:34 ledgers [1] - 63:2 left [1] - 58:19 legal [9] - 9:32, 16:39, 25:35, 26:16, 26:18, 36:27, 36:28, 40:30, 63:46 legally [1] - 26:5 Len [1] - 50:19 lender [5] - 4:41, 4:42, 32:5, 32:7, 61:41 lender's [1] - 4:41 lending [2] - 39:22, 39:27 less [1] - 28:21 lessors [1] - 33:43 letter [6] - 17:7, 17:8, 54:27, 54:36, 55:3, 56:16 level [7] - 25:40, 41:3, 42:47, 46:19, 46:21, 47:8, 61:26 leverage [1] - 4:45 liability [1] - 46:44 liable [1] - 22:28 lies [1] - 25:26 light [1] - 25:2 lights [2] - 31:19, 52:10 likely [1] - 31:21 likewise [1] - 24:30 Limited [2] - 1:11, 1:13 limited [18] - 5:18, 5:20, 5:23, 6:14, 25:41, 25:44, 25:47, 34:23, 34:27, 39:2, 45:8, 45:16, 45:17, 46:36, 46:44, 51:36, 57:35, 64:37 line [1] - 66:23 liquidity [1] - 56:2 listing [2] - 55:10, 55:17 litigants [1] - 10:35 litigation [5] - 23:27, 23:28, 34:12, 57:47, 58:33 litigator [1] - 21:41 litigators [1] - 59:4 **LLP**[8] - 1:8, 1:8, 1:15, 1:18, 1:19, 1:14, 25:41, 26:2 loan [14] - 31:41, 31:44, 32:16, 44:29, 44:34, 44:42, 51:21, 61:15, 61:39, 61:40, 61:46, 65:34, 65:38

loan's [1] - 61:45

loans [3] - 61:14,

61:20 look [17] - 4:28, 5:35, 6:20, 11:2, 11:8, 16:26, 18:23, 19:23, 27:39, 34:40, 35:20, 41:14, 41:32, 49:39, 64:32, 65:20 looking [4] - 10:15, 15:44, 63:19, 65:37 looks [2] - 42:45, 66:1 loose [2] - 13:33, 13:35 lord [1] - 58:14 lost [1] - 31:12 Ltd [20] - 1:5, 1:7, 1:9, 1:16, 1:19, 1:19, 1:20, 1:20, 1:21, 1:21, 1:22, 2:4, 26:10, 50:2 lunch [1] - 46:26

M

m'mm [4] - 22:40, 24:22, 25:21, 59:7 m'mm-hmm [4] -22:40, 24:22, 25:21, 59:7 Madam [3] - 8:14, 8:17, 19:13 main [1] - 2:9 maintain [1] - 52:10 maintained [1] - 6:25 majority [1] - 23:15 **malafide** [1] - 5:8 malafides [1] - 20:25 mall [1] - 5:8 manage [1] - 67:1 manage/operate [1] -39:25 managed [1] - 51:35 management [2] -58:28, 60:39 manager [2] - 46:46, 47:20 managing [2] - 47:17, 51:44 mandated [1] - 35:34 manner [7] - 15:23, 34:43, 36:18, 37:40, 54:14, 54:22, 64:32 mark [1] - 17:42 marked [2] - 1:27, 13:46 market [5] - 9:14, 9:44, 24:27, 32:15, 35:21 marketing [8] - 5:17, 38:5, 38:36, 41:38,

42:7, 42:12, 42:39,

45:18 Marsal [1] - 42:16 material [3] - 4:19, 16:40, 20:37 materials [10] - 7:4, 7:16, 11:37, 12:9, 14:7, 14:28, 15:17, 15:18, 42:16, 43:1 matter [6] - 1:11, 28:14, 49:15, 55:15, 60:30, 65:20 MATTER [1] - 1:14 MATTERS[4] - 1:9, 2:3, 12:21, 40:3 matters [10] - 1:8, 1:9, 1:14, 1:19, 2:6, 2:40, 3:30, 12:24, 15:21, 21:4 Matthews [74] - 1:5, 1:39, 5:16, 5:25, 5:35, 6:1, 11:43, 12:30, 14:22, 15:42, 16:2, 17:17, 17:20, 17:23, 17:24, 17:46, 17:47, 18:35, 19:34, 20:45, 23:10, 23:40, 24:17, 25:24, 27:4, 27:8, 27:23, 27:37, 27:43, 28:16, 28:26, 28:40, 29:30, 30:38, 30:41, 35:4, 35:19, 35:41, 36:42, 37:4, 39:10, 39:15, 41:1, 41:33, 42:19, 43:1, 45:14, 45:33, 49:16, 49:19, 51:37, 51:43, 52:40, 53:26, 53:29, 53:31, 54:5, 54:18, 54:28, 54:37, 55:30, 55:38, 55:45, 56:4, 56:22, 57:2, 57:20, 58:6, 58:30, 60:25, 60:38, 62:36, 62:37, 65:19 Matthews' [11] - 4:29, 5:44, 14:39, 15:25, 15:30, 26:42, 30:26, 52:14, 54:27, 55:34, 65:16 Matthews's [3] - 6:42, 30:22, 63:33 mean [15] - 8:4, 16:11, 20:42, 21:37, 24:47, 27:34, 31:31, 34:40, 38:6, 41:13, 42:43, 63:22, 63:42, 64:12, 66:7 meaning [1] - 4:34 means [2] - 28:34, 34:42

meantime [1] - 6:44 meanwhile [1] - 62:28 measure [1] - 28:7 mechanism [4] -38:14, 38:22, 42:1, 45.7 media [2] - 2:15, 2:37 meet [1] - 4:39 meeting [1] - 52:11 member [2] - 2:37, 52:11 members [1] - 2:32 mention [1] - 23:38 mentioned [5] - 20:12, 20:23, 52:39, 53:47, 54:11 mentioning [1] - 47:11 **middle** [1] - 33:10 might [10] - 5:40, 9:44, 11:32, 29:18, 39:6, 40:41, 43:43, 44:6, 45:34, 51:28 million [27] - 23:11, 30:11, 30:21, 31:28, 33:22, 33:27, 43:15, 51:29, 51:30, 51:33, 51:34, 52:32, 53:18, 53:22, 53:25, 53:34, 60:44, 60:45, 60:46, 61:5, 62:10, 62:11, 62:12, 63:44, 64:9, 64:11 mind [3] - 10:32, 23:27, 54:29 mindful [1] - 66:2 minimal [2] - 52:46, 53:35 minute [2] - 16:26, 17:26 miracle [1] - 58:15 misappropriation [2] -20:26, 29:47 mischief [4] - 23:47, 24:4, 25:7, 25:9 misconduct [1] -21:39 misdeeds [1] - 21:38 missed [3] - 6:37, 26:44, 41:10 missing [3] - 33:45, 45:20, 45:21 mistake [1] - 37:35 mix [1] - 48:47 modified [1] - 39:9 moment [4] - 2:27, 2:42. 16:42. 17:12 monetization [1] -45:2 monetize [3] - 35:43, 37:8, 43:5

monetized [3] - 23:32, 34:44, 50:36 monetizing [1] - 6:22 money [6] - 31:34, 32:15, 34:8, 34:14, 35:9. 62:27 monitor [1] - 6:30 monster [1] - 48:40 month [1] - 6:5 months [18] - 6:5, 22:46, 28:4, 30:44, 30:45, 30:46, 31:8, 37:22, 38:24, 38:30, 38:31, 39:3, 39:4 morale [1] - 52:22 **MORNING** [1] - 39:46 morning [4] - 1:17, 39:30, 39:41, 39:44 mortgage [5] - 26:15, 36:23, 36:25, 50:5, 61:44 mortgages [2] - 33:6, 61:30 most [10] - 20:22, 23:9, 30:39, 36:35, 37:3, 51:46, 52:47, 62:23, 65:37 motion [3] - 3:34, 3:41, 3:43 Mountain [20] - 1:7, 1:19, 1:21, 1:22, 1:12, 26:10, 26:13, 32:42. 43:23. 46:47. 47:1, 47:2, 48:13, 48:14, 50:2, 50:9, 50:10, 50:11, 50:23, 58:5 move [1] - 16:28 moved [1] - 7:40 multiple [2] - 23:46, 50:47 municipal [1] - 66:8 municipality [1] -56:43

N

nailed [1] - 62:15

name [3] - 36:26, 38:12, 60:27 named [5] - 26:10, 36:25, 36:30, 42:12, 62:17 NATHANSON [44] -1:17, 1:21, 1:23, 1:25, 1:30, 1:46, 2:5, 2:27, 2:29, 2:38, 2:44, 3:2, 3:5, 3:7, 3:9, 3:16, 3:20, 3:23, 3:37, 4:1, 4:5, 4:8, 4:11, 4:16, 4:24, 7:8, 7:10, 7:20, 7:23, 7:28, 7:30, 7:32, 7:34, 8:3, 8:7, 8:13, 8:16, 8:18, 8:20, 8:22, 8:25, 8:29, 8:33, 11:46

Nathanson [5] - 2:2,

1:16, 8:35, 47:34, 58:42 **nature** [6] - 18:14,

35:22, 39:32 necessarily [1] - 38:17 necessary [5] - 23:25, 31:18, 41:41, 46:18, 55:24

18:36, 19:4, 21:28,

need [23] - 1:44, 2:26, 7:7, 8:25, 11:13, 11:44, 16:8, 17:40, 20:31, 22:1, 26:8, 29:31, 29:38, 30:30, 30:34, 31:21, 38:18, 51:11, 63:36, 65:13, 66:2

needed [1] - 19:25 needs [16] - 5:14, 5:17, 5:21, 6:23, 21:2, 21:8, 21:34, 28:12, 29:37, 31:30, 31:32, 32:9, 36:17, 37:24, 39:24, 65:39 nefarious [1] - 25:1 negative [2] - 63:16,

63:20 **negotiations** [8] -15:36, 18:6, 18:13, 18:14, 18:37, 18:38,

18:14, 18:37, 18:3 18:45, 19:5 neighbouring [1] -

48:42 **net** [5] - 44:15, 60:40, 60:41, 60:43, 61:42 **new** [1] - 49:26 **next** [12] - 15:12.

next [12] - 15:12, 16:26, 16:29, 16:34, 17:14, 30:43, 35:16, 44:9, 50:28, 60:46, 61:5, 65:44 nice [1] - 44:45

NOA [1] - 5:18 nominee [5] - 26:19, 27:15, 27:18, 48:18, 51:40

nominees [5] - 25:30, 26:6, 48:30, 50:1, 61:28

non [1] - 40:26 non-sealed [1] - 40:26 noon [1] - 67:17 normal [1] - 61:41 note [2] - 19:46, 53:37 noted [1] - 9:7 notes [1] - 20:20 nothing [1] - 60:17 notice [10] - 8:44, 10:47, 14:10, 14:20, 14:26, 14:35, 36:26, 38:39, 38:40, 40:47 notional [2] - 47:12,

61:8
nuances [1] - 6:38
number [35] - 1:42,
6:5, 9:18, 9:19,
14:22, 14:39, 15:25,
15:31, 15:43, 15:45,
15:47, 16:2, 16:38,
17:15, 17:22, 17:28,
17:46, 17:47, 18:34,
18:35, 19:34, 26:5,
34:32, 36:33, 37:36,
40:24, 47:43, 48:3,

59:26 **numbered** [6] - 1:39, 26:6, 26:19, 36:28,

53:24, 54:26, 57:6,

57:29, 57:47, 58:38,

numbers [2] - 40:18, 41:16

48:19, 50:2

numerous [1] - 58:12

0

objection [1] - 38:42 obligation [5] - 31:45, 33:5, 43:23, 44:7, 44:32 obligations [10] -20:26, 26:27, 33:18, 37:11, 43:45, 45:26, 52:12, 61:21, 63:25, 65:14 observations [3] -20:15, 20:18, 29:16 **obtain** [1] - 42:4 obtained [1] - 62:40 **obvious** [1] - 30:33 obviously [3] - 17:20, 63:45, 65:18 occasions [1] - 50:47 occurred [2] - 18:46, 42:21 occurs [1] - 61:7 **OF** [4] - 1:2, 1:14, 1:2 offended [1] - 56:17 offers [1] - 28:16 office [1] - 36:31 officer [19] - 5:14, 5:29, 6:45, 9:11,

25:3, 29:40, 36:3, 36:18, 37:34, 37:40, 38:22, 55:26, 60:27, 65:19, 66:1, 66:20 officers [1] - 36:1 often [2] - 10:10, 22:30 Ohama [2] - 2:6, 1:35 Ohama-Darcus [2] -2:6, 1:35 on-block [3] - 5:37, 5:41, 6:14 once [3] - 19:43, 23:32, 30:37 one [94] - 2:11, 2:36, 3:13, 7:17, 9:25, 9:30, 10:26, 10:31, 10:34, 11:1, 11:2, 11:3, 12:3, 12:4, 12:7, 13:27, 13:28, 13:29, 13:31, 13:36, 16:27, 20:32, 21:6, 21:25, 21:43, 22:8, 25:43, 26:2, 26:9, 26:14, 26:16, 27:25, 28:1. 29:27. 29:28. 30:9, 31:35, 31:36, 31:38, 32:31, 32:43, 33:31, 33:45, 34:25, 34:40, 35:39, 37:1, 37:5, 37:40, 37:42, 37:47, 38:26, 39:17, 39:31, 42:38, 42:41, 43:12, 43:32, 43:46, 46:25, 46:45, 47:3, 47:9, 47:12, 48:12, 48:14, 49:18, 49:36, 49:46, 50:1, 51:36, 54:1, 56:9, 57:26, 57:42, 58:32, 58:35, 58:43, 59:1, 59:2, 59:4, 59:8, 60:25, 62:16, 64:23, 65:22 one's [4] - 6:18, 6:31, 39:20, 39:21 ones [5] - 20:18, 41:26, 45:45, 45:47, 48:17

48:17
ongoing [3] - 15:21,
23:27, 44:21
online [1] - 2:16
OO [2] - 54:34, 54:41
open [8] - 10:8, 10:14,
11:18, 24:26, 54:19,
55:25, 55:30, 57:8
operate [2] - 25:11,
31:30

operated [2] - 29:44, 31:47

66:17

opposed [4] - 5:39,
50:46, 56:6, 65:17

opposition [1] - 23:44

oppression [29] 3:35, 3:40, 3:43,
4:37, 7:26, 7:28,
9:26, 10:5, 13:16,
13:30, 16:14, 16:30,
20:27, 20:39, 21:14,
21:17, 22:20, 22:30,
23:36, 45:47, 47:25,
59:2, 60:32, 62:20,
62:22, 64:28, 64:35,
65:4, 65:10

65:4, 65:10 oppressive [3] - 5:2, 5:7, 65:4 optimistic [2] - 44:40, 54:5 options [3] - 55:14, 55:47, 56:9

order [87] - 1:11, 1:15, 1:17, 1:20, 7:43, 8:31, 8:46, 9:15, 10:41, 10:44, 11:11, 11:42, 12:4, 14:33, 15:20, 15:24, 15:40, 15:46, 16:1, 16:6, 16:17, 16:37, 17:29, 18:23, 18:35, 19:20, 20:13, 20:34, 22:11, 22:16. 22:23. 22:24. 22:25. 22:26. 22:33. 22:36, 22:38, 23:23, 23:29, 25:10, 31:14, 31:31, 34:23, 34:24, 35:35, 36:21, 36:26, 37:44, 39:1, 39:2, 39:43, 40:14, 40:42, 41:8, 41:11, 41:18,

41:29, 41:35, 41:43, 41:45, 42:2, 42:4, 42:13, 42:20, 42:30, 42:34, 42:36, 42:39, 42:40, 42:45, 43:3, 43:5, 43:10, 43:18, 45:8, 45:9, 45:15,

45:16, 45:17, 47:27,

50:4, 56:33, 64:36, 66:6, 67:16 ORDER [4] - 8:41, 14:5, 20:9, 40:37 Order [4] - 1:13, 1:16, 2:4. 2:5 ordered [2] - 25:12, 39:11 orderly [3] - 54:22, 55:15, 55:23 orders [16] - 2:10, 2:41, 2:45, 4:23, 7:20, 11:40, 12:1, 14:2, 16:16, 19:18, 19:32, 41:4, 41:41, 42:38, 45:25, 45:32 ORDERS [1] - 2:1 org [4] - 46:18, 46:24, 47:26, 48:21 organization's [1] -60:29 original [4] - 17:32, 17:33, 17:41, 19:33 originally [4] - 7:42, 15:5, 49:5, 50:20 originals [1] - 12:18 **OTHERS** [1] - 1:15 otherwise [3] - 8:29, 20:40, 34:7 outcome [1] - 56:24 outlay [1] - 66:8 outset [1] - 20:16 outstanding [2] -53:23, 65:34 overall [3] - 50:13, 60:39, 64:43 overdrawn [1] - 31:25 overview [4] - 34:36. 39:39, 45:38, 51:13 owe [1] - 63:44 owed [7] - 4:41, 23:10, 28:43, 28:44, 34:8, 37:11, 65:15 owes [1] - 66:20 owing [8] - 23:16, 44:16, 45:6, 45:27, 51:28, 51:41, 58:35, 62:10 own [5] - 30:22, 37:18, 48:29, 55:35, 61:28 owned [12] - 15:5, 26:5, 39:24, 46:22, 48:5, 48:9, 48:10, 48:18, 49:4, 49:8, 50:20, 50:31 owner [5] - 25:27, 26:16, 47:43, 47:45, 47:46 owners [8] - 25:30, 25:35, 25:36, 25:38,

26:17, 26:18, 36:27, 36:29 ownership [1] - 25:33 owns [7] - 25:33, 25:45. 26:4. 47:39. 48:3, 51:36, 60:14

Ρ

package [1] - 29:36

packaging [1] - 35:7

Page [3] - 1:7, 1:25,

page [22] - 4:29, 9:37, 9:40, 17:8, 41:14, 41:15, 41:16, 41:18, 42:35, 46:15, 49:40, 50:29. 51:17. 51:45. 54:9. 54:43. 54:44. 55:3, 55:7, 55:36, 56:34 pages [2] - 10:12, 10:18 paid [7] - 6:15, 45:11, 52:25, 64:3, 65:38, 66:40 paired [1] - 42:6 paper [1] - 19:47 paragraph [24] -14:26, 15:28, 15:37, 49:39, 49:47, 51:17, 51:18, 51:23, 51:36, 52:45, 54:11, 55:39, 55:40, 56:35, 56:39, 56:47, 60:13, 60:20, 60:40, 61:11, 61:32, 62:8, 64:6 paragraphs [2] -15:29. 15:30 parcel [5] - 26:14, 26:17, 48:12, 48:14, 59:22 parcels [8] - 35:7, 36:9, 42:42, 47:44, 48:4, 48:8, 56:1, 56:43 **pari** [1] - 60:43 part [17] - 15:18, 20:22, 23:9, 24:46, 29:36, 31:37, 36:7, 41:22, 44:33, 46:15, 56:19, 58:41, 58:43, 59:22, 62:14, 62:23, 65:5 participation [1] -33:2 particular [1] - 35:39 particularly [3] - 9:36, 62:32, 65:20

parties [42] - 4:33,

5:13, 5:21, 6:11, 9:7, 10:20, 15:1, 18:7, 18:14, 18:15, 18:39, 18:42, 19:1, 20:31, 21:6, 22:3, 23:24, 27:27, 27:46, 29:45, 30:5, 33:11, 33:16, 34:10, 34:42, 35:12, 41:41, 56:21, 58:1, 59:6, 59:30, 59:41, 59:45, 62:9, 62:43, 65:9, 65:13, 65:40, 66:14, 66:16, 66:21 parties' [1] - 23:33 partner [7] - 4:42, 25:41, 26:1, 46:21, 46:36, 46:44, 47:17 partners [11] - 25:44, 27:3, 43:38, 44:47, 48:25, 48:26, 49:13, 58:2, 60:6, 60:44, 60:45 partnership [57] -14:43, 14:46, 15:2, 15:6, 15:7, 15:9, 18:43, 19:5, 23:21, 24:12, 24:13, 24:15, 25:40, 26:1, 26:29, 26:39, 27:3, 27:12, 30:27, 32:40, 33:25, 35:44, 37:9, 39:28, 43:26, 43:29, 43:36, 44:22, 44:26, 44:37, 45:3, 46:19, 46:20, 46:22, 46:35, 46:37, 46:46, 47:23, 48:27, 48:28, 50:31, 53:15, 54:7, 54:20, 57:46, 58:29, 59:32, 59:44, 60:42, 61:4, 61:11, 61:27, 62:13 partnership's [5] -52:15, 54:12, 57:3, 57:12. 61:33 partnerships [14] -26:18, 27:14, 30:28, 48:29, 49:43, 51:35, 51:37, 51:44, 53:1, 53:13, 55:18, 56:37, 60:10, 60:15 partnerships' [1] -56:2 party [8] - 11:35, 21:37, 22:28, 24:42, 34:7, 49:4, 59:40, 66:35 passu [1] - 60:43 pathway [1] - 27:41 pay [20] - 4:40, 6:8, 28:43, 30:44, 30:45,

30:46, 35:9, 38:21, 43:7, 50:6, 50:7, 51:41, 52:9, 60:42, 61:23, 61:42, 63:43, 64:45, 66:3, 66:41 payable [2] - 53:12, 53:16 payables [3] - 53:22, 53:35, 63:44 paydown [1] - 31:4 paying [3] - 23:14, 45:10, 52:42 payment [3] - 62:2, 62:3, 64:7 payments [5] - 45:22, 51:22, 51:24, 51:46, 62:36 payroll [3] - 4:39, 30:30, 31:18 penalties [3] - 52:25, 52:33, 52:37 penalty [1] - 53:47 pending [1] - 16:5 **penny** [1] - 44:35 people [5] - 1:42, 2:18, 2:21, 2:22, 32:16 per [1] - 16:20 percent [13] - 44:32, 45:5, 45:10, 45:11, 47:4, 47:7, 47:9, 52:27, 52:32, 64:20, 64:21 percent/15 [1] - 44:32 percentage [2] - 33:3, 64:43 perhaps [6] - 17:37, 20:19, 21:45, 28:47, 30:38, 42:26 period [5] - 8:7, 22:2, 22:41, 35:12, 66:9 person [4] - 3:17, 42:11, 42:14, 65:26 personal [1] - 61:34 personally [1] - 62:37 persons [1] - 27:11 perspective[1] -31.10 Peterson [2] - 3:12, 8:27 **Peterson's** [1] - 3:15 petition [5] - 12:26, 13:12, 13:31, 46:4 petitioner [1] - 1:28 Petitioners [2] - 1:6, 1:17 **phonetic** [1] - 10:43

pieces [2] - 35:2, 57:47 place [2] - 6:35, 31:13 plan [5] - 3:2, 3:12, 3:28, 37:15, 37:30 **planning** [2] - 7:43, 59:33 play [2] - 22:22, 62:31 plus [2] - 51:29, 51:31 PM [5] - 1:25, 3:9, 67:19, 67:20, 68:4 point [51] - 3:25, 6:34, 20:32, 22:19, 23:13, 23:17, 23:41, 24:47, 25:5, 25:15, 25:23, 25:24, 26:46, 27:33, 28:1, 28:10, 29:6, 29:41, 29:42, 30:7, 30:8, 32:20, 34:2, 36:19, 37:25, 40:41, 44:45, 45:4, 45:15, 46:7, 47:30, 48:25, 51:8, 51:19, 52:32, 54:18, 55:22, 55:25, 56:18, 57:22, 57:26, 57:31, 59:16, 59:26, 60:1, 60:25, 62:1, 62:8, 63:39, 64:15, 65:32 pointed [1] - 41:47 **pointing** [1] - 54:16 points [7] - 26:33, 29:15, 38:3, 52:26, 55:33, 57:43, 58:32 portion [2] - 48:7, 48:44 position [9] - 4:45, 42:33, 52:15, 52:42, 60:27, 64:26, 64:30, 65:1, 67:7 possession [1] - 52:4 possibly [1] - 42:34 potential [1] - 56:7 potentially [1] - 56:23 power [1] - 34:27 powers [10] - 5:18, 5:20, 5:23, 5:24, 5:30, 5:43, 64:37, 66:25, 67:9, 67:11 practical [3] - 20:17, 28:14, 62:32 practically [2] - 4:38, 64:14 praise [1] - 58:14 **pre** [1] - 8:9 **pre-argue** [1] - 8:9 precisely [3] - 14:45, picked [1] - 29:12 26:8, 37:13 precludes [1] - 36:23 piece [1] - 6:21 predetermined [1] piecemeal [1] - 5:36

29:39 prefer [1] - 3:10 preferable [1] - 35:24 preferred [1] - 67:7 prejudging [1] - 37:38 prejudice [4] - 5:43, 5:44, 18:18, 56:20 prejudiced [3] - 6:18, 6:21, 6:31 PRELIMINARY [1] preliminary [4] - 1:9, 2:6, 2:40, 3:30 premises [1] - 41:24 prepared [3] - 15:39, 32:11, 32:21 present [5] - 4:24, 42:2, 58:1, 59:9, 60:21 **presented** [1] - 56:9 preserve [2] - 6:39, 18:5 president [1] - 60:37 presumably [1] -38:40 presupposes [1] -36:36 pretty [2] - 4:46, 42:46 prevent [3] - 30:35, 31:15, 65:46 price [1] - 35:1 priced [1] - 32:14 prima [1] - 20:38 primary [5] - 4:40, 18:3, 36:19, 36:36, 61.13principal [3] - 23:12, 51:30, 58:28 principals [3] - 59:35, 59:43, 60:6 printed [1] - 12:29 **prioritizing** [1] - 51:46 **priority** [1] - 24:13 privilege [1] - 18:17 privileged [1] - 18:19 pro [4] - 30:3, 49:9, 49:20, 61:10 problem [5] - 23:26, 44:28, 47:28, 54:17, 66:33 problematic [2] - 42:4, 43.19 problems [6] - 27:25, 34:32, 38:26, 43:13, 49:18, 56:2 proceed [7] - 22:23, 35:38, 37:25, 37:29, 37:40, 55:27, 57:44 proceeding [22] -1:27, 2:11, 3:32,

6:29, 13:30, 13:32, 14:17, 14:19, 14:23, 15:14, 16:14, 16:21, 16:30, 21:17, 22:20, 22:26, 23:36, 27:36, 31:33, 33:14, 36:27, 60:32 PROCEEDINGS [8] -1:24, 1:3, 1:6, 1:4, 1:6, 39:46, 40:1, 67:20 Proceedings [3] -1:25, 1:4, 1:7 proceedings [21] -1:27, 1:41, 3:14, 7:16, 10:11, 11:28, 14:16, 22:31, 31:14, 33:13, 58:36, 59:24, 59:25, 59:27, 59:30, 59:32, 59:40, 60:3, 62:22, 68:3, 68:6 proceeds [8] - 5:38, 6:15, 33:4, 42:41, 43:18, 44:15, 45:1,

61:43
process [28] - 6:4,
9:10, 9:45, 11:23,
20:33, 22:43, 24:38,
24:43, 25:13, 28:15,
35:35, 37:16, 37:20,
37:23, 38:15, 38:17,
38:47, 42:28, 42:47,
44:4, 45:12, 55:17,
55:23, 57:27, 57:42,
65:38, 65:42, 66:45
processes [1] - 55:11
professionals [1] 64:2

program [1] - 30:15 project [14] - 47:40, 47:43, 47:44, 48:5, 49:44, 50:41, 54:14, 56:31, 56:41, 61:22, 61:23, 61:41, 62:4, 65:44

properly [4] - 6:24, 21:47, 45:30, 64:24 properties [6] - 5:36, 6:20, 28:21, 28:36, 57:11, 58:4 property [12] - 6:22,

oroperty [12] - 6:22, 11:25, 28:35, 28:41, 50:6, 50:7, 51:42, 52:16, 52:24, 53:47, 61:23, 61:34

property's [1] - 11:36 proposal [1] - 39:10 proposed [3] - 11:21, 42:47, 57:41

proposing [1] - 11:9

protect [3] - 6:40, 9:14, 16:12 protract [1] - 33:10 provide [3] - 43:8, 45:18, 66:36 provided [5] - 13:8, 42:44, 61:29, 63:26, 63:46 provides [2] - 61:39, 62:4 prudent [3] - 54:22, 55:15, 55:23 **PST** [2] - 53:45, 63:31 public [7] - 2:32, 11:19, 15:14, 15:18, 15:23, 18:8, 19:5 pull [1] - 17:36 punched [1] - 20:4 purpose [1] - 16:12 purposes [2] - 47:35, 47:36 pursuant [1] - 23:23 pursue [2] - 59:18, 59:25 put [13] - 1:44, 4:20, 4:22, 10:22, 16:10, 20:5, 21:8, 25:10, 30:39, 31:13, 38:10, 42:15, 64:24

Q

puts [3] - 30:16, 42:32

putting [3] - 24:15,

61:32, 67:6

quarterly [1] - 64:22 questions [2] - 21:25, 29:20 quick [1] - 47:30 quickest [1] - 65:37 quickly [8] - 2:8, 7:15, 20:14, 34:35, 53:2, 62:14, 62:26, 66:40 quite [4] - 12:44, 21:7, 29:2, 31:45 quo's [1] - 6:25

R

racks [1] - 49:24

raft [1] - 62:16 raise [1] - 27:23 rata [1] - 61:10 rate [3] - 32:17, 64:18, 66:2 rather [3] - 5:37, 35:20, 53:3 rational [1] - 55:23 rationales [1] - 54:15 re [12] - 1:8, 1:9, 1:11,

1:13, 1:14, 1:15, 1:16, 1:17, 1:19, 1:20, 2:4, 2:5 **RE** [8] - 1:9, 2:3, 8:41, 12:21, 14:5, 20:9, 40:3, 40:37 reach [1] - 3:19 read [13] - 4:28, 4:32, 7:4, 7:6, 8:35, 10:18, 10:21, 14:28, 34:29, 41:36, 66:24, 66:29 reading [1] - 6:36 real [3] - 24:3, 59:4, 61:34 reality [2] - 22:12, 24:7 realizations [1] -43:11 realized [2] - 5:39, 30:38 really [7] - 5:10, 21:4, 24:3, 33:30, 41:28, 54:13, 66:39 rearranging [1] - 35:6 reason [6] - 13:39, 21:43, 35:29, 36:35, 36:36, 47:29 reasonable [1] - 56:23 reasonably [1] - 3:44 **REASONS**[1] - 2:1 reasons [2] - 36:33, 54:15 receiver [56] - 3:32, 5:18. 5:19. 5:22. 5:23, 5:28, 5:29, 5:30, 5:31, 5:34, 5:42, 5:46, 6:13, 6:40, 11:30, 20:34, 22:4, 22:39, 22:46, 28:15, 28:46, 28:47, 29:22, 29:31, 31:13, 31:30, 32:10, 32:14, 32:18, 35:18, 35:30, 35:31, 35:38, 37:2, 37:7, 37:16, 37:29, 37:32, 38:10, 38:11, 39:11, 42:8, 42:9, 49:17, 61:37, 64:37, 65:15, 65:43, 66:18, 66:19, 66:28, 67:1, 67:2, 67:8, 67:9, 67:11 receiver's [4] - 35:27, 35:32, 36:44, 66:25 RECEIVERSHIP [3] -

1:14, 20:9, 40:37

receivership [52] -

1:17, 1:20, 3:36,

3:38, 10:4, 11:28,

12:43, 12:47, 13:18,

13:32, 14:19, 14:23,

16:29, 20:13, 22:11, 22:23, 22:24, 22:26, 22:33, 22:37, 23:29, 23:43, 23:45, 24:15, 25:10, 27:36, 29:11, 30:40, 31:14, 31:31, 32:6, 32:12, 32:23, 34:6, 34:18, 34:23, 34:24, 36:47, 37:44, 38:43, 38:44, 39:1, 39:2, 39:8, 39:10, 45:9, 45:16, 45:17, 47:36, 50:4, 55:22, 60:36 recent [1] - 57:18 recently [1] - 31:2 recess [2] - 39:44, 67:17 **RECESS** [1] - 39:46 recognize [3] - 37:47, 65:13, 66:14 recommend [2] -29:40, 67:10 recommendation [1] -5:33 recommendations [2] - 6:41. 36:44 recommended [2] -66:18. 67:12 recommending [1] -5:47 recommends [1] -6:14 RECONVENED)([11: 44:18 [1] - 40:1 record [16] - 10:25, 12:38, 12:44, 13:6, 15:19, 15:23, 19:47, 26:34, 40:7, 40:21, 40:23, 40:46, 53:32, 54:31, 63:1 recorded [1] - 68:6 recording [1] - 68:6 redacted [1] - 18:5 redeem [11] - 5:26, 6:2, 6:6, 6:8, 6:13, 27:9, 27:20, 27:24, 28:19, 28:42 redemption [13] -6:43, 25:20, 25:25, 25:26, 26:23, 26:40, 27:1, 27:26, 27:43, 28:3, 28:7, 28:8,

28:22

reductions [1] - 52:46

reference [3] - 15:41,

refer [4] - 10:11,

10:17, 43:2

54:23, 60:12

referred [2] - 15:5,

17:17 referring [1] - 12:4 refers [1] - 11:29 reflect [1] - 60:28 reflected [1] - 56:39 reflects [2] - 41:23, 66:7 refusing [1] - 31:39 regard [3] - 35:32, 37:37, 42:32 regarding [8] - 9:41, 12:27, 14:40, 15:36, 18:11, 18:43, 46:4, 62:36 registry [1] - 12:19 Registry [2] - 1:1, 1:12 related [3] - 22:29, 60:4, 61:22 relates [2] - 14:34, 16:18 relating [1] - 22:31 relation [5] - 22:5, 30:40, 45:1, 54:20, 63:5 relations [1] - 45:1 relative [1] - 56:20 released [1] - 30:14 relevant [4] - 10:19, 13:1, 26:9, 62:42 relied [1] - 20:44 relief [15] - 3:34, 3:41, 12:27, 20:40, 21:12, 21:15, 22:2, 22:30, 24:6, 57:34, 57:35, 64:34, 64:35, 65:40, 66:17 relies [1] - 57:25 rely [4] - 22:3, 38:9, 50:5, 62:2 remaining [2] - 36:8, 36:9 remedy [1] - 3:35 reminds [1] - 45:5 remotely [4] - 2:13, 2:19, 2:20, 2:34 renewed [3] - 49:12, 49:14, 49:15 repaid [1] - 24:11 repay [1] - 44:16 repayment [2] - 44:42, 61:19 replace [1] - 19:35 replacements [1] -22:31 reply [4] - 3:39, 3:43, 51:10, 63:38 report [2] - 17:16, 36:1 **REPORTER** [1] - 68:1 Reporter [2] - 1:21, 68:15

reporting [3] - 63:16, 63:20, 63:23 reputation [1] - 52:21 requests [1] - 31:43 require [4] - 5:11, 22:5, 56:42, 62:2 required [3] - 65:2, 66:42, 67:6 requires [2] - 59:36, 66:7 reserve [2] - 43:22, 66:16 residential [4] - 50:22, 50:24, 50:27, 50:33 residents [2] - 50:26, 50:28 residue [1] - 44:43 resigned [1] - 60:23 resolution [3] - 20:33, 45:7, 62:32 resolve [2] - 22:16, 23:28 resolved [3] - 23:24, 62:24, 62:25 Resort [11] - 1:8, 1:19, 14:45, 15:1, 15:9, 26:2, 26:3, 43:34, 44:26, 53:14 resort [5] - 39:18, 39:24, 39:25, 43:36, 57:12 resorts [2] - 46:38, 47:45 Resorts [11] - 29:31, 46:37, 47:8, 48:7, 48:9, 48:28, 49:6, 53:14, 54:7, 61:27 respect [10] - 3:43, 13:30, 13:31, 16:2, 19:38, 21:3, 23:38, 31:12, 56:33, 58:31 respective [1] - 43:38 respond [4] - 3:36, 3:37, 3:40, 63:37 responded [2] - 20:46, 20:47 respondent [2] -25:39, 26:11 Respondents [2] -1:10, 1:23 respondents [2] -26:3, 26:7 responds [1] - 18:2 response [13] - 3:33, 5:19, 9:36, 13:12, 16:40, 17:8, 18:7, 29:16, 29:29, 29:30, 31:38, 38:35, 59:31 rest [2] - 50:42, 61:9

result [2] - 34:18, 48:1

resulted [1] - 64:7 retained [1] - 44:17 retention [1] - 53:38 return [2] - 22:39, 47:15 revenues [1] - 61:12 review [1] - 4:19 revisited [1] - 52:40 revive[1] - 62:29 rewrite [1] - 44:36 rights [2] - 5:45, 66:17 **road** [1] - 28:32 Roberts [3] - 2:5, 1:37, 1:38 role [3] - 42:24, 60:28, 60:37 route [1] - 28:20 **RULINGS** [1] - 2:1 run [6] - 6:24, 6:29, 6:30, 25:12, 29:22, 30:1 running [1] - 49:16 runs [1] - 39:11

S

S234048 [1] - 1:1 S243389 [1] - 1:12 safeguards [1] - 37:37 sale [44] - 5:39, 6:15, 9:9. 9:44. 11:23. 11:24. 15:4. 18:15. 18:33, 18:34, 18:43, 20:35, 22:36, 22:42, 25:13, 28:5, 28:9, 28:11, 28:14, 31:20, 33:2, 33:4, 34:47, 35:35, 37:16, 42:28, 42:41, 43:14, 44:8, 44:15, 44:31, 54:20, 54:21, 55:24, 55:47, 56:1, 56:6, 56:7, 56:8, 56:34, 57:42, 61:43, 65:17 sales [11] - 6:4, 6:14, 23:3, 23:15, 24:38, 24:43, 33:19, 43:40, 55:11, 55:17 San [1] - 35:19 Sanovest [87] - 1:9, 1:16, 2:2, 1:13, 1:26, 1:28, 4:45, 6:9, 10:32, 12:25, 13:20, 20:13, 21:1, 22:25, 23:10, 23:16, 23:19, 23:42, 23:47, 24:5, 24:10, 24:17, 24:20, 24:30, 24:33, 24:38, 24:42, 25:1, 25:10, 25:43, 27:4, 27:6,

31:39, 31:46, 32:3, 32:10, 32:13, 32:17, 32:21, 32:25, 32:31, 32:33, 32:36, 33:39, 34:15, 34:46, 35:9, 35:14, 35:29, 35:37, 36:42, 37:44, 43:7, 43:39, 44:16, 44:30, 44:33, 44:38, 44:42, 45:6, 45:24, 45:27, 46:23, 46:32, 47:4, 48:26, 50:5, 50:6, 51:41, 56:10, 58:29, 61:1, 61:10, 61:14, 61:36, 61:38, 62:1, 62:10, 63:43, 64:19, 66:3. 66:46 Sanovest's [9] - 8:45, 22:37, 23:9, 26:15, 26:43, 36:23, 51:21, 62:6, 62:7 sat [1] - 3:5 satisfied [2] - 19:19, 37:24 satisfy [1] - 43:22 saw [1] - 3:6 schedule [2] - 7:46, 42:3 scheme [1] - 25:1 scope [2] - 65:26, 66:24 **se** [1] - 16:20 seal [1] - 11:39 sealed [18] - 9:43, 10:15, 11:10, 12:14, 14:9, 14:15, 14:21, 15:35, 15:43, 16:4, 16:5, 16:41, 17:3, 17:4, 18:11, 19:41, 40:25, 40:26 **SEALING** [2] - 8:41, 14:5 sealing [21] - 1:11, 1:15, 1:16, 2:5, 2:45, 8:31, 8:36, 8:46, 9:15, 14:2, 14:33, 15:19, 15:24, 15:40, 15:46, 16:16, 16:37, 17:29, 18:23, 19:17, 40:14 seals [2] - 9:16 season [2] - 31:1, 31:8 second [11] - 1:26, 11:3, 19:13, 28:1, 29:42, 30:7, 32:9, 37:26, 41:15, 43:19, 54:1 secondly [1] - 40:22 section [2] - 15:12,

29:35, 30:32, 31:10,

20:41 secure [1] - 4:41 secured [14] - 4:46, 28:42, 28:44, 31:11, 32:5, 32:7, 32:28, 32:33, 32:34, 32:44, 33:5, 33:42, 61:35, 61:38 security [7] - 27:11, 28:43, 29:34, 29:35, 29:36, 39:28, 61:29 see [28] - 1:42, 4:9, 4:10, 5:3, 5:13, 5:25, 7:45, 12:37, 16:22, 17:7, 18:19, 19:2, 33:17, 40:32, 41:7, 41:15, 41:16, 47:24, 50:15, 50:44, 53:11, 57:6, 60:7, 66:12, 67:3, 67:8, 67:14 seeing [1] - 7:4 seek [7] - 15:19, 22:42, 23:2, 35:34, 38:37, 38:38, 41:40 seeking [28] - 9:15, 14:21, 14:32, 15:23, 15:34. 15:42. 15:46. 16:6, 16:17, 16:37, 23:42, 25:10, 32:3, 32:6, 32:26, 35:29, 35:30, 35:31, 35:38, 36:21, 39:1, 41:34, 41:43, 42:38, 44:36, 61:37, 64:8, 64:34 seeks [1] - 22:46 seem [2] - 42:31, 62:31 seizing [1] - 33:34 select [2] - 55:46, 57:37 **selective** [1] - 17:20 **self** [4] - 62:34, 62:35, 65:22, 65:23 self-dealing [1] -65:22 self-interest [1] -65:23 self-interested [1] -62:35 sell [12] - 5:36, 34:27, 34:47, 35:7, 35:20, 35:24, 36:11, 62:30, 64:44, 65:29, 66:35, 67:2 selling [4] - 5:15, 24:16, 50:37, 57:37 sense [2] - 5:20, 34:4 sent [1] - 42:16 sentence [1] - 9:40

separate [1] - 14:16

separately [1] - 17:31 **SEPTEMBER** [1] - 1:3 september [1] - 1:4 **September** [4] - 1:1, 52:3, 52:28, 54:2 seriously [2] - 31:35, 64:12 services [3] - 52:11, 63:46, 64:3 set [8] - 5:4, 7:46, 14:35, 15:12, 15:24, 15:37, 19:40, 46:10 **settlement** [1] - 23:33 several [3] - 31:25, 56:9, 62:17 share [2] - 20:18, 44:47 shareholder [1] -62:39 **shop** [4] - 30:3, 49:9, 49:20, 49:33 shortfall [2] - 52:6, 61:24 shortly [1] - 24:3 show [2] - 36:30, 48.22 showers [1] - 49:24 showing [1] - 54:29 shown [1] - 58:22 **shows** [5] - 27:37, 28:40, 37:30, 52:46, 53:10 sic [1] - 1:41 side [4] - 1:46, 4:16, 35:19, 42:22 side's [1] - 65:21 sides [1] - 2:45 sign [2] - 16:8, 39:26 signed [4] - 7:23, 19:31, 52:4 significant [12] -21:19, 32:45, 33:31, 33:45, 34:13, 34:16, 34:20, 43:47, 56:44, 57:33, 58:34 signing [1] - 2:37 similar [2] - 11:27, 18:9 similarly [1] - 16:23 simple [1] - 65:25 simply [3] - 4:3, 20:2, 41:45 single [3] - 4:29, 43:44, 44:35 sit [2] - 4:13, 38:45 sitting [1] - 58:11 situated [1] - 48:31 six [2] - 38:30, 43:47 skill [1] - 68:7 **skim** [1] - 4:31

skimmed [1] - 29:29 **skip** [3] - 54:10, 56:30, 62:22 slicing [1] - 35:6 slightly [1] - 57:8 **small** [1] - 64:43 smaller [5] - 34:17, 35:25, 46:3, 48:3, 48.7 sold [13] - 6:22, 11:36, 15:6, 29:37, 32:47, 35:2, 36:37, 49:1, 49:35, 49:46, 50:34, 51:42, 65:13 sole [2] - 46:36, 62:7 solicitation [2] -22:43, 35:35 solutions [1] - 56:1 solved [1] - 39:8 someone [9] - 2:14, 5:40, 6:20, 6:28, 25:11, 37:31, 39:24, 42:23, 49:25 something's [2] -55:21, 55:29 sometime [1] - 22:35 **sometimes** [1] - 28:9 somewhat [1] - 48:6 somewhere [3] - 1:45, 47:31. 48:46 sooner [1] - 60:11 sorry [27] - 2:12, 2:27, 7:24, 8:18, 11:39, 12:41, 16:29, 17:30, 26:44, 33:43, 41:10, 42:36, 45:4, 46:43, 48:1, 52:29, 53:6, 53:41, 54:10, 54:32, 54:39, 54:44, 57:21, 58:21, 58:37, 59:1, 63:18 sort [10] - 7:1, 16:10, 20:33, 20:38, 25:1, 25:9, 29:15, 49:26, 64:37, 66:44 sorts [1] - 65:24 sought [13] - 15:40, 21:13, 22:25, 37:44, 40:42, 41:4, 45:9, 45:32. 50:3. 56:33. 57:34, 57:35, 62:39 sound [1] - 68:6 sounds [1] - 44:45 source [2] - 28:27, 61:13 **space** [1] - 30:3 SPEAKER [10] - 47:1, 48:34, 48:37, 48:42, 58:8, 58:11, 58:14, 58:16, 58:24, 58:47

speaking [4] - 4:38, 20:12, 37:9, 47:35 **specific** [3] - 25:18, 34:27, 57:34 specifically [1] - 11:29 specified [1] - 22:42 **split** [2] - 44:32, 61:9 **spoken** [3] - 2:6, 10:5, 42.22 stack [1] - 52:4 staff [3] - 52:9, 52:22, 53:37 stages [1] - 35:25 stake [1] - 24:13 stakeholder [1] - 37:1 stakeholders [3] -31:12, 37:4, 65:15 stakes [1] - 24:13 standards [2] - 32:45, 68:8 standing [2] - 4:37, 50:46 start [3] - 33:32, 40:9, 64:16 starts [3] - 14:16, 54:44, 67:13 state [3] - 53:12, 54:4, 63.6 statements [3] -63:25, 63:28, 63:29 states [1] - 55:43 status [2] - 6:25, 32:6 statutory [1] - 63:25 stay [5] - 30:35, 31:14, 31:32, 34:6, 49:27 stayed [1] - 20:28 step [1] - 29:22 stickies [1] - 40:18 still [13] - 6:11, 6:42, 8:7, 26:15, 37:31, 37:33, 45:39, 50:5, 53:39, 53:40, 53:45, 53:46, 54:3 stop [1] - 23:17 storage [1] - 49:9 strain [1] - 52:17 straits [1] - 54:8 **stratified** [1] - 62:5 strictly [1] - 45:36 struck [2] - 6:35, 6:47 **structure** [1] - 46:7 structured [1] - 48:2 studiously [1] - 20:28 stymied [2] - 64:46, 65:31 sub [3] - 41:25, 41:26 subdivided [7] -36:29, 41:8, 41:12, 41:25, 41:26, 41:35, 62:5

subdividing [1] - 35:6 subdivision [12] -36:22, 38:16, 38:29, 39:5, 42:27, 42:39, 56:34, 56:42, 57:42, 64:36.66:7 subject [9] - 3:28, 11:11, 11:41, 14:38, 15:27, 18:15, 29:34, 40:14, 59:33 **submission** [4] - 9:13, 34:5, 38:34, 66:31 SUBMISSIONS [4] -8:41, 14:5, 20:9, 40:37 Submissions [4] -1:11, 1:15, 1:17, 1:20 submissions [19] -4:30, 7:6, 8:30, 10:1, 10:4, 10:7, 12:25, 13:19, 13:24, 19:17, 34:29, 41:33, 45:35, 45:37, 45:42, 49:38, 56:19, 56:34, 57:16 subsequently [1] -15:6 **subsidiary** [1] - 46:37 **substance** [1] - 3:11 substantially [1] -55:18 sufficient [4] - 41:30, 43:6, 43:16, 57:45 suggest [2] - 42:33, 65:42 summary [3] - 5:10, 21:27, 64:28 SUMMATION[1] -4:26 **Summation** [1] - 1:10 Suntek [1] - 10:43 **super** [1] - 6:30 supplement [1] -20:19 support [1] - 21:12 supported [1] - 56:7 supporting [1] - 55:10 supportive [1] - 22:10 suppose [4] - 28:39, 41:39, 42:22, 44:13 **supposed** [1] - 41:31 **SUPREME** [1] - 1:2 **surprise** [1] - 49:12 surprised [1] - 32:18 surrounded [1] -21:42 suspect [2] - 30:15, 62:19 **suspicions** [1] - 32:26

sworn [2] - 9:1, 55:35

Symonds [1] - 68:14

Т tab [23] - 16:29, 16:31, 16:33, 16:34, 16:44, 17:1, 17:2, 17:6, 17:8, 17:26, 17:27, 17:28, 26:36, 40:17, 40:46, 53:31, 54:30, 54:38, 54:39, 55:33, 55:36 **TABLE** [1] - 1:2 table [1] - 1:44 tables [1] - 1:43 tack [1] - 20:15 talks [2] - 49:47, 57:26 task [1] - 20:36 taught [1] - 43:22 tax [5] - 43:22, 43:45, 44:7, 45:26, 53:42 taxes [13] - 43:42, 50:6, 50:8, 52:16, 52:24, 52:27, 52:30, 52:31, 52:32, 53:44, 53:47, 61:23, 63:31 team [1] - 52:4 Teams [1] - 3:21 technically [1] - 39:26 teetering [1] - 30:28 tender [1] - 28:24 tendered [1] - 29:3 tennis [5] - 47:47, 49:45, 50:42, 57:12, 61:12 tens [1] - 53:28 term [2] - 61:40, 61:46 terminated [1] - 16:17 termination [1] -16:11 terms [11] - 10:7, 10:42, 16:3, 21:14, 30:2, 33:34, 44:47, 45:30, 45:40, 57:25, 57:34 test [1] - 64:31 tested [1] - 24:27 THE [391] - 1:2, 1:3, 1:14, 1:11, 1:16, 1:20, 1:22, 1:24, 1:29, 1:31, 1:34, 1:37, 1:40, 1:42, 2:1, 2:14, 2:17, 2:18, 2:20, 2:21, 2:23, 2:24, 2:25, 2:26, 2:28, 2:33, 2:43, 3:1, 3:4, 3:6, 3:8, 3:15, 3:19, 3:21, 3:36, 3:47, 4:2, 4:7, 4:10, 4:13, 4:20, 4:26,

1·20 7·0 7·10 7·20
4:28, 7:9, 7:19, 7:22,
7:26, 7:29, 7:31,
7:33, 7:36, 7:39,
7:41, 7:45, 8:1, 8:6,
8:10, 8:14, 8:17,
8:19, 8:21, 8:24,
8:28, 8:32, 8:34,
9:12, 9:22, 9:25,
9:28, 9:30, 9:32,
9:38, 9:46, 10:6,
10:13, 10:16, 10:24,
10:26, 10:29, 10:33,
10:36, 10:39, 10:41,
10:46, 11:3, 11:6,
11:8, 11:15, 11:18,
11:26, 11:33, 11:38,
11:45, 12:1, 12:3,
12:6, 12:9, 12:12,
12:13, 12:17, 12:23,
12:33, 12:36, 12:45,
13:2, 13:4, 13:7,
13:14, 13:17, 13:19,
13:22, 13:26, 13:28,
13:22, 13:26, 13:28, 13:38, 13:41, 13:43,
13:45, 14:3, 14:12,
14:18, 14:24, 14:30,
14:41, 14:44, 14:47,
15:28, 15:32, 15:41,
16:3, 16:10, 16:22,
16:25, 16:31, 16:33,
16:42, 16:45, 17:2,
17:5, 17:10, 17:13,
17:26, 17:32, 17:34,
17:39, 17:41, 17:44,
17:46, 18:1, 18:10,
18:17, 18:21, 18:23, 18:28, 18:32, 18:38,
18:28, 18:32, 18:38,
18:41, 19:2, 19:6,
19:9, 19:12, 19:15,
19:19, 19:22, 19:27,
19:31, 19:37, 19:39,
19:44, 20:1, 20:4,
20:7, 21:14, 21:17,
21:22, 21:24, 22:40,
24:22, 24:30, 24:33,
24:35, 24:37, 24:41,
25:21, 25:28, 25:31,
25:33, 25:37, 25:42,
26:12, 26:20, 26:23,
26:28, 26:31, 26:35,
26:37, 26:39, 26:42,
26:46, 27:3, 27:9,
27:13, 27:17, 27:19,
27:22, 27:29, 27:32,
27:38, 27:45, 28:6,
28:14, 28:24, 28:28,
28:31, 28:37, 29:5,
29:9, 29:13, 29:19,
29:22, 29:25, 30:19,
31:34, 32:32, 32:37,
33:8, 33:24, 33:29,

33:35, 33:47, 34:2, 34:4, 34:19, 34:22, 34:27, 34:34, 34:36, 34:39, 34:45, 35:3, 35:15, 35:18, 35:24, 35:28, 36:41, 37:6, 37:11, 38:2, 38:32, 39:9, 39:14, 39:30, 39:34, 39:36, 39:38, 39:41, 39:43, 40:5, 40:7, 40:8, 40:12, 40:15, 40:19, 40:27, 40:29, 40:32, 40:34, 40:45, 41:2, 41:7, 41:11, 41:17, 41:20, 45:43, 45:46, 46:2, 46:4, 46:6, 46:10, 46:12. 46:16. 46:24. 46:27, 46:30, 46:32, 46:34, 46:39, 46:42, 47:5, 47:14, 47:17, 47:19, 47:26, 47:32, 47:38, 48:20, 48:23, 48:31, 48:36, 48:46, 49:2, 49:28, 49:32, 49:41, 50:9, 50:12, 50:15, 50:17, 50:25, 50:30, 50:35, 50:38, 50:44, 51:4, 51:6, 51:9, 51:12, 51:16, 51:26, 52:2, 52:29, 52:35, 52:37, 53:5, 53:41, 53:43, 54:24, 54:29, 54:31, 54:33, 54:35, 54:38, 54:40, 54:42, 54:44, 54:47, 55:2, 55:5, 55:8, 55:10, 55:37, 55:39, 55:41, 58:18, 58:22, 58:37, 58:41, 58:45, 59:5, 59:8, 59:13, 59:15, 59:20, 59:28, 59:38, 59:42, 59:47, 60:7, 60:9, 60:16, 60:19, 60:30, 60:33, 63:6, 63:10, 63:13, 63:15, 63:19, 63:39, 63:47, 64:16, 64:21, 64:23, 64:33, 64:41, 64:47, 65:6, 65:27, 65:30, 65:35, 65:47, 66:12, 66:26, 66:29, 66:32, 66:37, 66:43, 67:3, 67:8, 67:14, 67:16 themselves [3] -18:45, 58:2, 62:43 theory [1] - 25:16 they've [3] - 42:18,

63:15

thinking [3] - 7:1,

7:13, 33:9 thinks [2] - 21:37, 55:26 third [17] - 15:35, 18:6, 18:14. 18:41. 18:42. 19:1, 23:38, 30:8, 34:7, 53:9, 58:1, 59:6, 59:40, 66:35 third-party [2] - 59:40, 66:35 thirds [1] - 44:1 thorough [1] - 36:18 thoroughly [1] - 24:27 thousand [1] - 31:25 thousands [2] - 31:27, 53:28 three [5] - 2:23, 2:24, 14:31, 16:36, 60:3 Thursday [1] - 4:15 Tian [10] - 1:8, 1:25, 9:19, 10:27, 12:26, 56:10, 58:7, 58:27, 60:23, 60:26 ticking [1] - 67:13 ticks [1] - 65:45 tie [2] - 24:4, 35:32 tied [2] - 11:22, 23:22 ties [1] - 58:12 timely [1] - 54:14 timestamp [2] - 68:3, 68.4 tipped [1] - 34:17 title [2] - 36:30, 60:28 today [4] - 22:16, 22:17, 38:46, 67:12 together [1] - 1:18 Tom [8] - 3:13, 58:6, 58:7, 58:28, 58:31, 60:20. 60:21. 62:38 tomorrow [1] - 46:27 took [3] - 32:47, 56:16, 58:27 top [11] - 25:40, 31:28, 41:14, 41:16, 43:26, 46:19, 46:21, 46:35, 48:26, 52:35, 61:26 top-level [3] - 25:40, 46:21, 61:26 tortuous [1] - 5:9 total [8] - 23:13, 49:30, 51:2, 52:27, 52:30, 52:31, 53:25, 57.2 totalling [1] - 52:26 totally [1] - 51:2 touched [1] - 63:8 touching [1] - 56:32 towards [1] - 45:11

trade [2] - 30:11,

53:22

traditionally [1] - 49:8 transactions [2] -62:35, 62:47 transcribed [1] - 68:7 transcript [1] - 68:5 transfer [1] - 50:1 transferred [5] -26:14, 48:13, 48:15, 48:17, 58:4 transfers [1] - 62:37 transparent [2] -24:26, 25:12 trial [11] - 5:4, 5:12, 6:12. 6:17. 6:32. 6:33, 7:33, 7:37, 22:21, 22:22, 65:12 tried [4] - 63:1, 67:4, 67:5 true [5] - 21:41, 24:24, 31:42, 33:41, 68:5 truly [1] - 6:19 trust [4] - 6:16, 23:7, 52:21 try [5] - 25:8, 35:24, 42:25, 56:25, 56:28 trying [9] - 4:45, 25:6, 35:20, 60:11, 63:11, 63:12, 64:44, 65:28, 65:46 turn [3] - 40:47, 48:28, 63:6 turned [1] - 48:2 turning [1] - 49:47 turns [1] - 9:37 two [45] - 3:27, 7:16, 7:20, 8:47, 9:1, 9:16, 11:15, 11:17, 12:10, 12:13, 12:24, 13:25, 13:28, 14:14, 14:16, 15:4, 19:31, 20:46, 26:18, 30:20, 30:45, 36:45, 37:2, 37:10, 38:1, 40:16, 40:17, 40:23, 42:38, 42:40, 44:1, 45:25, 48:9, 48:25, 48:29, 49:13, 52:26, 52:32, 53:33, 60:44, 64:9, 64:45, 65:31 two-thirds [1] - 44:1 tying [1] - 37:39

U

type [1] - 5:11

ultimate [1] - 9:44 ultimately [1] - 35:18 unable [1] - 51:40 unblock [11] - 34:47, 35:20, 54:21, 55:10,

55:17, 55:24, 55:47, 56:6, 56:7, 56:8, 65:17 unblocked [1] - 5:39 unclear [1] - 55:45 under [23] - 3:35, 16:34, 18:46, 20:41, 23:20, 29:25, 30:15, 31:40, 33:13, 38:8, 39:9, 44:29, 50:5, 51:28, 53:17, 61:17, 61:20, 63:16, 63:21, 64:19 undertakings [1] -61:35 underway [2] - 14:41, 14:42 unfair [2] - 5:40, 6:21 unfiled [1] - 17:17 unfolds [1] - 28:15 unfortunate [1] - 4:6 unfounded [1] - 34:4 UNIDENTIFIED [10] -47:1, 48:34, 48:37, 48:42, 58:8, 58:11, 58:14, 58:16, 58:24, 58:47 unique [2] - 6:19, 6:21 unit [4] - 46:45, 47:3, 47:9, 47:12 units [10] - 46:22, 50:24, 50:27, 50:33, 51:36, 60:14, 60:45, 60:47, 61:1 unknown [2] - 38:5, 53:46 unless [3] - 51:41, 63:36, 64:3 unnamed [1] - 42:10 unpaid [11] - 33:30, 53:18, 53:38, 53:39, 53:40, 53:45, 53:46, 54:3 unreleased [5] -53:11, 53:15, 53:19, 53:25, 53:34 unsealed [2] - 11:37, 40.26 unsecured [2] - 33:27, 34:17 unsigned [1] - 52:5 unsurprisingly [1] -20:17 unworkable [2] -36:34, 36:36 **up** [42] - 6:4, 7:21, 8:44, 9:23, 11:5,

12:28, 13:33, 14:11,

16:8, 17:30, 17:36,

17:37, 17:42, 23:22,

23:23, 27:37, 28:8, 28:10, 28:40, 29:12, 29:40, 30:20, 35:5, 36:30, 37:30, 39:37, 40:11, 40:16, 42:6, 46:10, 50:46, 51:15, 53:3, 56:26, 56:29, 60:44, 60:45, 61:9, 63:3, 63:29, 63:36 updated [2] - 13:38, 13:40 uploaded [1] - 4:30 urgency [1] - 4:8 urgent [1] - 51:46 usual [2] - 5:30, 5:43

V

value [11] - 5:36, 9:41, 36:5, 43:6, 57:3, 57:11, 57:23, 57:32, 57:37, 64:39, 64:44 values [3] - 18:5, 18:12, 18:13 Vancouver [4] - 1:1, 1:4, 1:12, 1:2 various [6] - 21:38, 23:46, 39:32, 41:41, 54:19, 59:34 vehicles [1] - 33:43 vendor [1] - 52:5 vendors [1] - 52:12 verified [1] - 62:45 versa [1] - 7:18 version [2] - 13:5, 18:4 versus [3] - 1:12, 1:13, 57:37 vetted [5] - 7:21, 11:5, 12:1, 16:1, 19:32 vice [1] - 7:18 Victoria [1] - 3:15 victory [2] - 65:3, 65:8 view [4] - 34:46, 35:5, 60:37, 65:21 viva [1] - 21:45 **voce** [1] - 21:45 volume [2] - 40:22, 40:28

W

volumes [1] - 40:20

W.L [1] - 2:5 wade [5] - 20:37, 21:32, 21:33, 21:34, 25:7 walk [1] - 46:6 walked [1] - 58:22

WALKER [1] - 1:3

Walker [1] - 2:5 wants [10] - 3:21, 5:25, 6:1, 24:11, 24:20, 24:24, 39:11, 39:15, 43:20, 64:19 waterfall [2] - 44:46, 45:22 **WCB** [1] - 53:46 weeks [2] - 22:45, 37:22 whatsoever [3] - 31:4, 43:42, 45:13 whole [9] - 15:32, 15:34, 15:38, 35:2, 45:21, 50:16, 55:22, 57:22, 65:20 withheld [1] - 62:7 Witness [1] - 1:7 wonder [3] - 5:6, 66:16, 66:21 wondered [1] - 66:13 wondering [2] - 5:44, 13:32 word [1] - 32:4 words [5] - 27:23, 38:6, 39:12, 53:27, 53:35 works [3] - 9:32, 38:33, 44:46 world [1] - 28:39 **worldwide** [1] - 32:45 worried [1] - 33:8 worry [1] - 28:9 worst [1] - 31:7 writ [1] - 39:28 written [13] - 7:6, 12:25, 12:29, 12:34, 13:3, 13:19, 13:24, 38:34, 40:18, 41:33, 45:37, 45:41, 62:6

wrongdoing [1] - 60:5

year [6] - 8:5, 31:8, 51:24, 51:33, 51:34, 55:35 years [9] - 49:3, 50:28, 56:8, 57:27, 63:27, 64:45, 65:31, 65:45, 66:46 yesterday [1] - 4:31

Z

zoning [2] - 36:13, 56:44

No. S234048 Vancouver Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA (BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE WALKER)

Vancouver, BC September 10, 2024

BETWEEN:

599315 B.C. LTD. and DANIEL MATTHEWS

Petitioners

AND:

ECOASIS BEAR MOUNTAIN DEVELOPMENTS LTD., ECOASIS DEVELOPMENTS LLP, and ECOASIS RESORT AND GOLF LLP, TIAN KUSUMOTO, and SANOVEST HOLDINGS LTD.

Respondents

* * * * *

No. S243389 Vancouver Registry

IN BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY

IN THE MATTER OF THE RECEIVERSHIP OF ECOASIS DEVELOPMENTS LLP AND OTHERS

BETWEEN:

SANOVEST HOLDINGS LTD.

Petitioners

AND:

ECOASIS DEVELOPMENTS LLP,
ECOASIS BEAR MOUNTAIN DEVELOPMENTS LTD.,
ECOASIS RESORT AND GOLF LLP, 0884185 B.C. LTD.,
0884188 B.C. LTD., 0884190 B.C. LTD., 0884194 B.C. LTD.,
BM 81/82 LANDS LTD., BM 83 LANDS LTD., BM 84 LANDS LTD.,
BM CAPELLA LANDS LTD., BM HIGHLANDS GOLF COURSE LTD.,
BM HIGHLANDS LANDS LTD., BM MOUNTAIN GOLF COURSE LTD.
and BEAR MOUNTAIN ADVENTURES LTD.

Respondents

EXCERPT FROM PROCEEDINGS IN CHAMBERS (Proceedings from 2:06 PM to 3:19 PM)

COPY

Charest Legal Solutions Inc.
CharestLS.com

APPEARANCES

A.I. Nathanson, KC D. Byma K. Jackson L. Hiebert Counsel for Sanovest Holdings:

C.A.B. Ferris, KC G. Brandt W.L. Roberts Counsel for 599315 B.C. Ltd.:

C. Ohama-Darcus

Charest Legal Solutions Inc. CharestLS.com

EXCERPT FROM PROCEEDINGS IN CHAMBERS SEPTEMBER 10, 2024 (Proceedings from 2:06 PM to 3:19 PM)

PROCEEDINGS

Witness	Proceedings	Page	
	Submissions by Cnsl K. Jackson	1	
	Submissions by Cnsl W. Roberts	31	
	Reporter certification	39	

EXHIBITS

	ige
--	-----

No exhibits marked.

```
1
                                       September 10, 2024
 2
                                       Vancouver, BC
 3
 4
                 (EXCERPT FROM PROCEEDINGS)
5
 6
                 (PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 10:11 AM)
7
                 (EXCERPT BEGINS AT 2:06 PM)
8
9
      THE COURT: Mr. Jackson.
10
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Thank you.
                                     Justice, two of our --
11
           three of our colleagues, I think, are out in the
12
           hall trying to negotiate the order that you might
13
           issue this afternoon, so they may -- I'm sure
14
           they'll make their way back in.
15
      THE COURT: All right.
16
      CNSL K. JACKSON: But that's why you see a couple
17
           fewer bodies.
18
                I have two things for you, Justice. One is,
19
           as we've described it, a nonintuitive org chart
20
           that Ms. Hiebert managed to find and get.
21
      THE COURT:
                  Oh, good.
22
      CNSL K. JACKSON: And also a list of the nominee
23
           entities.
                      Those are the ones that own -- legal
           owners of the real property --
24
25
      THE COURT:
                  Perfect.
26
      CNSL K. JACKSON: -- and guarantors of the
27
           indebtedness of the partnership to Sanovest.
28
           second one, the nominee entities, is just a handy
29
           list, because it's in the materials, but that
30
           just enumerates it in one place for your ease of
31
           reference.
32
                On the org chart, yeah, it's -- you'll see
33
           Sanovest and 599 on the far left and right.
34
           own 50 percent of the actual shares of EBMD,
35
           Ecoasis Bear Mountain Developments. That's the
36
           manager company. And then you'll see there their
37
           partnership unit interests in Ecoasis
38
           Developments LLP.
39
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
40
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Along with the 0.5 percent interest
41
           of EBMD, and then below all of that is the resort
42
           partnership and the relative interests being held
           by the development's partnership and EBMD.
43
44
      THE COURT: And the managing partner is?
45
      CNSL K. JACKSON: EBMD. That's the one that's the --
           that's the one that manages the company that
46
47
           manages the partnerships, the business.
```

```
CNSL C. FERRIS: Just to be completely accurate, it's
      the general partner in a limited partnership. CNSL K. JACKSON: Sorry, I missed your question.
 3
 4
            that's not the managing partner; the general
 5
            partner.
       THE COURT:
                   It's the general partner.
 7
       CNSL K. JACKSON: It also manages the operations, but
 8
            it is the general partner too.
 9
       THE COURT:
                   General partner in what partnership,
10
            Mr. Ferris?
11
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        I've said it correctly.
12
       CNSL K. JACKSON: It's an LLP, which I was corrected
13
                          So when he says GP --
            on earlier.
       THE COURT:
14
                   It's an LLP?
15
                         It's an LLP, right, and so it's --
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
16
      THE COURT:
                  But it's also the managing partner.
17
      CNSL K. JACKSON: It's the managing partner.
18
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        It's the managing partner.
19
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Within, yes.
20
      THE COURT:
                   Of?
21
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Of the operations end of the LLP.
22
      THE COURT:
                   All right.
                                Okay.
       CNSL K. JACKSON: So Justice, I left off -- I think
23
24
            we've sort of -- I'm going to -- I'll try to
25
            be -- I'm trying to be less than an hour here.
26
            We started at 66. That's sort of where I left
27
            off about the equivocal evidence as to the
28
            partnership's financial state.
29
                 This goes to something I'll come back to
30
            again. Mr. Ferris gave us a little bit of a
31
            preview of the response, which will help me to be
32
            able to focus submissions a little bit in my
33
            submissions, and this is relevant to, you know,
34
            why a receiver needs to be appointed over the
35
            whole enterprise, including resort's partnership
36
            and its business.
37
                 And it goes back to something we've harked
38
            on a little bit here, but there's some pinpoint
39
            sites around the evidence at paragraph 66 about
40
            the partnerships' financial distress. And his
41
            evidence back in May, I recall, was that resort partnership's revenues -- this is at 66 -- were
42
43
            insufficient to support expenses, with operating
44
            expenses, including property taxes, of more than
45
            $200,000 per month. Payments at that time were
46
            being deferred in the amount of $2 million.
47
            think I was saying they had accrued accounts
```

```
receivable. They had accrued accounts payable,
            of course -- I'm sure you understood what I
 3
           meant --
4
      THE COURT:
                   I did.
5
      CNSL K. JACKSON: -- of $2 million.
      THE COURT:
                  I figured it out.
                                      When I first --
7
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Very good. Why am I harping on all
8
            this money coming to them.
9
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah, that's right. I thought it was --
10
      CNSL K. JACKSON: It's --
11
      THE COURT:
                  -- aged AR that was going to be written
12
            off.
13
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Yeah, no.
14
      THE COURT:
                   It's the converse.
15
                        Yes, and thank you.
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                                               I'm glad that
           was clear to you, but I apologize for that
16
17
            confusion.
                        That's a mistake I make occasionally.
18
                 And then last, in September 2023, the
19
           partnership's been holding signed cheques due to
20
            the shortfall, in the status quo is not
21
            sustainable.
22
      THE COURT:
                   Right.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: At the time he also swore that the
23
24
            partnership's reputation and goodwill have
25
            already been affected and its viability was at
26
            risk.
27
      THE COURT:
                  All right.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Now, one of the things that 599 says now is, you know, receivership over everything is
28
29
30
           bad for the value and for the assets of the
31
           business. Well, first of all, let's not forget
32
            that they're seeking a receivership too, just not
33
            a complete receivership.
34
                 Second of all, there's plenty of evidence
35
            about the partnership dispute and the financially
36
            strained circumstances of the partnership in the
37
           media already. There's an affidavit of Irene Lee
            in the materials which has a whole bunch of --
38
39
            some of the press around this already.
40
      THE COURT:
                   So where do I find that?
41
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         That is at --
42
      THE COURT:
                  Condensed book?
      CNSL K. JACKSON: I'm just going to find that for you.
43
44
            Tab 10 of the condensed book.
45
      THE COURT:
                  All right.
46
      CNSL K. JACKSON: And not all the -- so of course, in
47
            the larger volumes you'll find the full amount,
```

 but there are articles here from various publications: Business in Vancouver, Vancouver Island Free Daily, Victoria Times Columnist, Chek News, Victoria News, all through, and some of them have been reproduced and attached as some of the exhibits. And they're from as far back — the first one, at tab B — from 2022 about lawsuits being filed against Bear Mountain, and it already mentions Sanovest and 599.

And 2023, at Exhibit C, Business in Vancouver, talking about the developer claiming the partner blocking sales. In other words, this dispute has been aired. At D, City of Langford suing Bear Mountain.

This dispute -- the partnership's financial circumstances, it has been aired in public extensively, so the idea that a receivership is somehow going to change things, while in some cases that might be true, in this case that would be very hard to hold up as being a concern.

And just to put a fine point on that, I'm going to take you, Justice, to tab 17 of the joint record -- sorry, the condensed record, and it's page 10, paragraph 16. So one of the things in response to concerns about values and reliability of appraisal raised by Sanovest, Matthews and 599, at paragraph 16, say, well, here's a true copy of -- this is five lines down -- four lines down -- of a Bear Mountain valuation and marketing proposal prepared by Colliers dated 2023, talking about how it's going to maximize value by proceeding with sales at this time and such.

Well, if you look at that, it's tab E, which is one of the -- the first tab you'll see -- the only tab, I think, in it. If you turn to page 118.

THE COURT: One-eight-zero?

CNSL K. JACKSON: One-one-eight.

THE COURT: Oh, one-one-right.

CNSL K. JACKSON: Yes. And so it's a very small --

THE COURT: Yeah, I see it.

CNSL K. JACKSON: Right at the top. It says "Possible Marketing Approaches."

THE COURT: Yeah, okay. Let me just get to 118.

CNSL K. JACKSON: 118. Close to the end, but you'll see small -- yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. I've got it. CNSL K. JACKSON: Right. "Possible Marketing 3 Approaches." 4 5 En bloc sale of all sites. 6 7 This is the second line down. Now, this is the valuation that had been put forward by $\ensuremath{\mathsf{--}}$ 8 9 marketing approach put forward by Mr. Matthews. 10 THE COURT: And just -- Colliers was retained by 11 Mr. Matthews --12 CNSL K. JACKSON: Yes. 13 THE COURT: -- or by the partnership? 14 CNSL K. JACKSON: Well, let's see what he says. 15 want to be sure before I say that unequivocally. 16 16 he says: 17 18 ... prepared by Colliers, delivered to the 19 partnership. 20 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 CNSL K. JACKSON: So I assume it would have been 23 obtained by the partnership. Prepared for 24 Ecoasis Developments LLP. 25 THE COURT: Okay. There are different options 26 being -- different approaches, three. 27 CNSL K. JACKSON: There are. There are. But one of 28 the things it does say, en bloc sale of all 29 sites. 30 THE COURT: Right. CNSL K. JACKSON: The second part down on 118: 31 32 33 There is meaningful skittishness within the 34 development community of acquiring and 35 owning a single component or components of 36 Bear Mountain, given its perception of 37 conflict within the Ecoasis ownership group 38 and how a single development might be 39 affected. Rational logic would suggest that 40 outright ownership of a development site 41 within the Bear Mountain community should 42 not be concerning to a developer, as it 43 would have nothing to do with Ecoasis. 44 Reality, though, suggests that successful 45 development requires cooperation, and most

purchasers would stay away from potentially

being affected by Ecoasis ownership

46

47

conflicts.
In other words,

In other words, you know, going to have a tough time selling pieces of this and not the whole, says Colliers, the person engaging that partnership, and this is the evidence put forward by Mr. Matthews.

THE COURT: And when was this prepared? November? CNSL K. JACKSON: 2023. It was from -- I think -- I'll just give you the exact date. November 2023.

THE COURT: All right.

CNSL K. JACKSON: Sorry, just to complete this, I've been asked by my colleagues to continuing reading that page at 118:

This could be alleviated if the sites at Bear Mountain are offered before sale in their entirety, as this would eliminate the market's concerns with respect to Ecoasis being able to execute on a sale.

Ms. Hiebert thinks I need to finish my point earlier, being that a receivership -- this goes back to my point. A receivership -- you know, there's already market skittishness. That's a concern, so let's be fair that a receivership is not going to be the problem here for attaining value for the lands.

THE COURT: Yeah.

CNSL K. JACKSON: And en bloc seems to be better, according to Colliers too.

THE COURT: They're saying getting the internal disputes out of the picture is important.

CNSL K. JACKSON: Right. Who would want to buy into this, is kind of the point I think they're making as politely as they can.

I'm going to go over -- skip over some of the further parts of my written submissions, Justice. You have them, of course, and you've read them, I believe.

But one thing I did want to go back to, because this concerns the current status of the finances. I didn't take you to the evidence exact, but you heard in the paragraph immediately preceding 66 that there was \$2 million owing as of May, that it was going to get paid down --

this is paragraph 69 -- it was going to get paid down by \$780,000. That's at paragraph 69. 3 immediate payroll crisis, says Matthews, has been 4 avoided: 5 6 ... and I expect operations will be 7 sustained at least through the summer and 8 into the early fall. 9 10 But that's as far as it goes. And in that time, 11 he says it's going to pay down creditors from 12 2 million by \$780,000. 13 I handed up a piece of paper to you that 14 showed what the current outstanding cheques and 15 AP are, but now that I have you with the 16 condensed record, at tab 18, Exhibit O. 17 THE COURT: All right. 18 CNSL K. JACKSON: This is the bank balances of 19 Developments and Resorts at August 1st, 2024. 20 So --21 THE COURT: Right. 22 CNSL K. JACKSON: So we know from the earlier document 23 that shows the amount of outstanding cheques and 24 the amount of accounts payable, well -- and that 25 was all on August 6th. Five days before that, if 26 you look at the top line of this, it's a bit 27 small print, but Ecoasis Developments has just over \$3,000 in its bank account -- in that bank account, and at the very bottom, it seems to 28 29 30 have -- no, it doesn't, sorry. Just over \$3,000. 31 It also has a MasterCard, at the very 32 bottom, with just under \$7,000 owing on it. 33 THE COURT: Where do I see that? 34 CNSL K. JACKSON: Very bottom. Look at the left line, 35 "business MC." 36 THE COURT: Oh, business MC, right. Right, okay. 37 CNSL K. JACKSON: So a Canadian balance owing on a 38 MasterCard of just under 7,000 against cash of 39 3,000. 40 And then if you look -- okay. And that 41 doesn't even account for -- just numbered 51, which is Exhibit R, which you can flip to it if 42 43 you want to go back and forth between them. 44 THE COURT: Right. 45 CNSL K. JACKSON: So Development has unreleased 46 cheques still of 78,000 and payables of 575,000 47 against an account which is negative when you net

them between the MasterCard and the bank account as of August 2024. That's Developments.

Now, for the resort, Resorts, if you go back to tab 0 -- or Exhibit 0 -- you'll see a business account with 22,000 -- just over \$22,000 of cash in one account for Resorts, a small amount in another account below that.

THE COURT: Right.

CNSL K. JACKSON: A US account about halfway down of just over \$2,000.

THE COURT: Oh, yeah. Okay.

CNSL K. JACKSON: So about \$25,000 in total. There's a MasterCard which has a balance of over \$20,000 for Resorts. That's the second from the bottom.

THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.

CNSL K. JACKSON: Business MC. So putting those together, there's maybe 5,000, \$4,000 free cash.

Flipping back to Exhibit R, there's unreleased cheques of \$575,000 for Resorts, and there's accounts payable of \$900,000 for Resorts with this much money in the bank account, when Mr. Matthews' evidence was that things were going to be fine through the summer and we'd pay things down by 780,000.

That goes to my point. One of the things I'll say -- I'll come to a little bit more -- I'll say right now this -- I understand when 599 says, if you put a receiver in that's going to manage the business, there's going to be incremental cost, I accept that as true. But sometimes you need to put a receiver-manager in to manage a business.

When does that occur? Well, in a couple of obvious situations. One, where the business is not being run well or there's concerns about the business not being run well. That's been expressed by Mr. Kusumoto. It's been contested by Mr. Matthews, but there's a concern, and perhaps, the evidence shows, that it's running pretty lean, and that's a concern.

But the second reason is if this is going to continue to operate without harming stakeholders -- and I mean stakeholders including Sanovest -- that business is part of its collateral. If it ends up in trouble because another creditor takes steps or because it, in fact, starts bouncing cheques or someone sues,

that's bad for Sanovest, for its collateral, which it bargained to get. It's also bad for third parties who continue to do business with them -- with the partnership.

And so you put a receiver-manager in to look after the business, to safeguard it and to ensure, in part, that the collateral isn't prejudiced, isn't devalued, and to ensure that third parties aren't prejudiced. In other words, we can take comfort that, where the receiver is appointed over a business, that accounts will get paid, post filing accounts will get paid. There will be a stay, and all ongoing supply, which is mandated, will ensure that those suppliers get paid and payroll gets paid.

We can't say that now. We can't say that with confidence now, given the evidence that's before the court as recently as August. And so there is an incremental cost, but it's necessary.

And I will say this. This isn't a pulp mill. This is a golf course with a pro shop. Generally speaking, these are light touches by receivers in terms of management. They have existing personnel who know how to run the golf course. They can retain them. In fact, if Mr. Matthews is the right person to run the golf course, and this seems very important to him, well, he can be retained, if the receiver is satisfied that he's the right person for it.

In other words, you can minimize costs by just keeping the existing infrastructure and management in place. They basically look after accounts payable. They look after cheques going out. They ensure that everyone's getting paid, and if there's a need for funding, they can get funding.

So Justice, what I'd like to do, if I may, is just turn to the legal basis portion of the submissions, which start at page 21, and some of this I'm also going to go through fairly quickly, because --

THE COURT: So even if -- so just to go back to your last point.

CNSL K. JACKSON: Yes.

THE COURT: So if even Sanovest objected, if the receiver came along and said, look, the most business-effective thing to do is to retain

```
Mr. Matthews in his capacity.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Yes.
 3
      THE COURT:
                 Because he has the greatest knowledge of
 4
           the day-to-day operations, that's the receiver's
5
           recommendation.
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         That may be the best thing to do,
7
           and -- like, even if Mr. Kusumoto doesn't agree
8
           with it, and given his evidence, he probably
9
           doesn't, that's not determinative, of course, and
10
           this goes to another point that I think I was
11
           going to come to later, but I think there's a bit
12
           of a misapprehension as to the receiver's --
13
           having heard from my friend earlier and getting a
14
           little preview of the response, there's a bit of
15
           a misapprehension there.
16
                If our client says, hey, receiver, we want
17
           you to develop 20 vertical stories, the receiver
18
           is not bound to do that. It's not -- it's not
19
           Sanovest's agent. It's not Sanovest's guy.
           receiver does what it thinks is best.
20
21
                I will say this. I'd be absolutely
22
           flabbergasted and floored if the receiver decided
           to take, you know, land that had basically been
23
           bare land or some servicing and somehow come up
24
25
           with a plan to develop it over 20 years. I have
26
           never seen that.
27
      THE COURT:
                  I suppose a concern for Mr. Matthews might
28
           be, since Sanovest is prepared to fund this
29
           aspect of the receivership and not the other one,
30
           is that Sanovest, if it got unhappy with the
31
           receiver's recommendations, could pull the plug
32
           on financing. So I'd have to make sure that
33
           there's a sufficient fund charged for the
34
           receiver.
35
                I mean, I'm trying to --
36
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                       Yeah. No, I mean --
37
                 -- read into what Mr. Ferris's client's
      THE COURT:
38
           concern is. Is that -- I'm kind thinking how can
39
           the receiver be the agent of Sanovest and be told
40
           what to do.
41
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                       Right.
                                 It can't.
42
      THE COURT: He's the court's officer.
43
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Right.
44
      THE COURT:
                  But the receiver owes obligations to all
45
           stakeholders.
                          The law is very clear on that.
46
           how could Sanovest have some sway over the
47
           receiver? Well, it would be through funding.
```

```
I thought, well, is that what the concern is?
           Sanovest would say, well, we're really unhappy
 3
           and we want to cut off the fund something.
 4
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Yeah, it's a fair question. I don't
5
           think that was exactly my friend's point.
      THE COURT:
                 No, it wasn't.
7
      CNSL K. JACKSON: But it's one that he might have
8
           raised.
9
      THE COURT: But that's what I --
10
      CNSL K. JACKSON: -- and which -- and so we should
11
           address it.
12
                I mean, I think we see that more in a CCAA
13
           where the, you know, existing secured will put
14
           cash flows and restrictions on the financing,
15
           because they're the only source of the financing.
16
                 Right.
      THE COURT:
17
      CNSL K. JACKSON: You know, financing, they could do
18
           it under a borrowing certificate here. Here's
19
           my -- the safeguard in all of this is I don't see
20
           this receiver -- any receiver -- being bound to
21
           any party, and the reason is this. These lands
22
           have value sufficient to pay for the receiver's
23
           costs.
24
      THE COURT:
                  I see.
25
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Many times over. And so if they
26
           think that Sanovest or some other party that's
27
           prepared to lend, including, perhaps, 599, is
28
           trying to tie in restrictions on use of funds and
29
           what the receiver is going to do, I suspect that
30
           receiver would be going straight to the market
31
           and saying, thanks, but no thanks; I'm happy to
32
           go get it from -- and name your ten parties that
33
           are happy to cut a cheque against lands that have
34
           significant value.
35
      THE COURT:
                  Right. Okay.
36
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Right.
37
                  So there's sufficient -- there's
      THE COURT:
38
           sufficient value there to cover the receiver's
           costs so that it doesn't have to be worried about
39
40
           Sanovest cut off financing.
41
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        No, and in fact, Mr. Matthews would
42
           say the same thing. He says in his evidence, I
43
           don't doubt there's any problem getting financing
44
           against these lands in the event of a
45
           receivership.
                          That's paraphrasing, but that's
46
           what he says.
47
      THE COURT: Okay. All right.
```

```
CNSL K. JACKSON: And so I don't think -- I mean, it's
           a fair question. I think, if the circumstances
 3
           were different and this thing had only one source
           of financing --
5
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
 6
      CNSL K. JACKSON: -- you might say, ah-ha, I've seen
7
           this before; you're going to tie them up in knots
8
           and make them do what you want. But that can't
9
           happen here.
10
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah, okay.
11
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Which also includes how the
12
           partnership is run by the receiver, and if the
13
           receiver decides, this is the most efficient and
14
           best way to do it, is to maintain, effectively,
           the status quo, so be it. So be it. And, you
15
16
           know, certainly our client -- you know, it's
17
           bought into the concept of a receivership and
18
           handing everything over to the receiver.
19
      THE COURT:
                 Right.
20
      CNSL K. JACKSON: You'll see the order -- you know, if
21
           we get to it -- is very much around standard
22
           model order, in fact adding in a provision to
23
           ensure that SISP is approved by the court to
24
           allay concerns in that regard too.
25
      THE COURT: Okay. All right. So you were --
26
      CNSL K. JACKSON: I was going to go to the legal
27
           basis, and I think --
28
      THE COURT:
                  What page is that?
29
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        That's at page 21.
30
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
31
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Although I'm going to probably skip
32
           through some of this, because I know that in
33
           their response 599 says that a receiver --
34
           appointment of receiver is not justified, which
35
           I'd say I don't know how you can say that, given
36
           what they're seeking. I think they've come past
           that, and I think now, having heard this in the
37
           beginning, it's a question of what receivership
38
39
           order you should issue.
40
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
41
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        I'm going to skip through the
           authority of the court to grant a receivership
42
                   Whether one should be made, it should.
43
44
                I'm going to skip through the Maple Trade
45
           factors for now.
46
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
47
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Because I will touch upon them in a
```

I want to touch on a couple of cases, though, before I dive in a little bit to the facts of this one, which is start at paragraph 86. 5 THE COURT: Okay. CNSL K. JACKSON: Which is the decision in CMI 7 Roadbuilding at -- it's in the joint book of 8 receivership authorities, the smaller one. 9 THE COURT: Oh, yeah, okay. 10 CNSL K. JACKSON: I think we handed it up. 11 THE COURT: Just give me a minute to get it. 12 CNSL K. JACKSON: It would be tab 8, and it's the very 13 last page of tab 8, so almost easier to flip to 14 tab 9 and go backwards. Or second-to-last page, 15 I quess. THE COURT: Justice Macintosh. 16 17 CNSL K. JACKSON: Right. Right. So in this one --18 this case -- I mean, I know it because I was 19 involved -- the secured creditor who supplied 20 equipment to the debtors said, hey, you know, you 21 haven't paid for it. You've got a security 22 interest, and we want a receiver appointed. they said, this thing's -- this thing you gave 23 us, it's an asphalt machine. You sold us a bill 24 25 of goods. It's a lemon. It doesn't work. 26 never got -- it never got commissioned. We don't 27 owe you what you say you owe us. All of that was 28 accepted. 29 But what they -- what Justice Macintosh said 30 is, well, okay. There's a lot of disputes around 31 that, but -- a bit like what the court said this 32 morning -- was that can all come out in the wash, can't it? And so what he says, if you look at 33 34 the last line at the bottom of page 11 -- or 35 second-to-last: 36 37 I accept CMI's submissions that the facts at 38 bar bear many similarities to those in Ward 39 Western where a receiver was appointed. Of 40 further note from Ward Western, the Court of 41 Appeal at paras. 68-87 --42 43 And that case is in here if Justice wants to turn 44 to it, but I don't need to myself. 45 46 -- addressed the point that a receiver can

be appointed even where the facts of the

47

case are actively disputed in conflicting evidence, provided the evidence establishes the basis for the appointment consistent with the tests found in cases such as *Maple Trade Finance*. That is the situation before me.

And so it's a bit what I said early on. There's going to be a lot of conflicting evidence, and you can sift through all of that and decide whether, under *Maple Trade*, the receivership appointment on the terms sought is appropriate, ignoring the conflicts in evidence on immaterial issues.

The other case I'm going to go through in a little bit more detail is *Pandion*, which is tab 15. And so this is an application. This was a mess of a mining enterprise where the secured creditor, Pandion, sought to approve a receiver. The mining debtor -- mining company debtor is Otso, O-t-s-o, and there were lawsuits among Otso, its majority shareholder, Pandion and another party, Lionsbridge. It was quagmire.

At paragraph 4 of the decision, the court notes that:

The petitioners ("Pandion") collectively constitute Otso's only secured creditor. There is a dispute as to how much Pandion is owed.

Like this case.

It may be in the vicinity of US\$26 million or exceed US\$95 million. Whatever the amount owing, there is no dispute that Otso is in default and is not in a position to pay.

Then it goes on to describe some of the litigation:

Otso's majority shareholder ... maintains that it was induced by fraudulent misrepresentations and other wrongful conduct on the part of Pandion and Lionsbridge into investing US\$27 million ...

 It's advanced claims and actions recently
commenced in Connecticut and in this Court.
 Paragraph 6:

Otso is insolvent because it is at present unable to pay its debts as they come due. Otso's financial predicament is compounded by the following:

The value of the mine is uncertain.

Well, probably have more certainty in lands in BC than a mine, but you never know what value is.

The amount owing to Pandion is uncertain.

We have a dispute on that. And (c):

Brunswick is suing Pandion and Lionsbridge, and there may be claims by or against Otso arising from or in connection with this litigation.

Lots of potential and existing litigation.

Paragraph 12 the court notes that Otso, the debtor, doesn't oppose the application, but says the appointment of a receiver should include certain terms. Brunswick itself completely opposes the application.

Background, paragraph 15. 2,500 pages of evidence. Counsel, in their submissions, went into considerable detail with a view to explaining why their respective clients actions were reasonable and those of their adversaries were careless and wrongful. Each side accuses the other of bad faith.

There are material conflicts in the evidence. Faced with extensive affidavit evidence untested by cross-examination, and having heard just three days of argument in chambers ... I am not in a position to resolve the conflicts. However, to provide context for this decision, it is important that I outline three important disputes.

And he goes on. I don't need to go into these.

They're not relevant for this. But issues concerning the mine's prospects, number one. Over the page, dispute as to the amount owing to Pandion. Page 10, Brunswick's claims against Pandion and Lionsbridge, which have already been commenced, he notes at paragraph 31.

So some initial discussion around interim receivership or receivership.

Page 15 I'll pick up next, Justice.

Is it just or convenient that a receiver of Otso be appointed?

And so the court goes through *Textron*, of course another one of the seminal cases in *Maple Trade*.

Paragraph 55:

The following considerations favour the appointment of a receiver in this case.

56:

A continuing expenditure of funds is necessary to preserve the value of the mine. Otherwise, it is a wasting asset. Otso does not have the funds required even to keep the mine in "care and maintenance" mode. It has been unable to find a lender in the context of the CCAA proceeding. Brunswick is unwilling to inject further equity. Pandion is willing to fund the necessary expenditure in the context of a receivership, but not otherwise.

Not dissimilar at all from this case.

Appointment of a receiver will facilitate preservation and the orderly marketing of the mine for the benefit of all of Otso's creditors, and perhaps even its shareholders. Pandion is the party --

And again, every hope here that there is return for equity and it's not insignificant.

-- with the greatest economic stake. It has first call on the assets, it is not clear

that there is sufficient value that it will be paid in full, and the value of its security is deteriorating. It is the fulcrum creditor. Moreover, Pandion has contracted for the right to appoint a receiver.

58:

There are only two ways out of the present predicament. If the amount owing to Pandion is resolved in Otso's favour so that Pandion can be paid out, it is conceivable that Brunswick may come up with the necessary funds or another equity investor may be found. Otherwise, the mine must be sold. Either way, the appointment of a receiver will facilitate matters by stabilizing the situation. It will prevent the assertion of lawsuits against Otso without leave of the court. The likely alternative is a free for all of litigation and a wasting asset.

A court-appointed receiver is objective and neutral, characteristics of particular importance in a case involving competing claims and factual disputes. The receiver may seek assistance from the court. In the context of a receivership, the court may give directions for the resolution of contentious issues.

 That will arise in this case. There are going to be occasions when that arises in this case, and this is a good forum in which to have those disputes resolved quickly.

So some of the things the court -- the court ultimately makes the whole receivership order, but it comments on some of the very specific issues. And so page 18, the first thing they talk about is what do we do about the choses in action. And so there are claims, I said, by the partnership against various third parties, and the model order includes choses in action, the court notes.

Paragraph 68:

Choses in action belonging to Otso should be

Submissions by Cnsl K. Jackson

realized for the benefit of Otso and its creditors. The receiver should be afforded an opportunity to investigate and report on any choses in action it might discern. If the receiver chooses to pursue a claim on Otso's behalf, the model order permits it to do so. As an independent officer of the court, the receiver can be trusted to take such steps. However, it is easy to imagine that Pandion might choose not to fund pursuit of a chose in action that other interested parties might wish to pursue, and that the receiver might be impaired in its ability to pursue such claims.

It will be a term of the order that, if the receiver chooses not to pursue a chose in action that an interested party believes should be pursued, that party will be afforded a reasonable opportunity to seek the court's direction. The court might allow the interested party to pursue the claim in Otso's name, on appropriate terms such as ... in the context of a --

Section 38 order in a bankruptcy. No concerns with something like that in this case, if there's a concern that the receiver might not pursue choses in action.

But the first -- the prima facie, the starting point, is the receiver pursues or considers and determines whether to pursue choses in action, and if not, then there's every opportunity to come back to the court and have that resolved.

Sub (c), which is -- it's the -- (c) is one of the issues that they wanted to talk about, resolution of the amounts owing to Pandion. Oh, I'm sorry, I've skipped over (b), claims against Otso, which is claims against the debtor company.

This order that we're proposing is just like the model order. It stays claims against the debtor without the receiver's consent or leave of the court. And so one of the creditors says, we may wish to apply to lift the stay of actions against Otso, perhaps in the context of one of its actions against Pandion and Lionsbridge.

And 72:

3 4

The stay afforded under clause 8 of the model order is one of the advantages of the receivership. It contemplates further applications to court, as may be necessary. No further provision is necessary.

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

And so, again, in this case there are multiple proceedings involving the debtors. Those will proceed with leave -- with consent or with leave.

Resolution of the amount owing, of course, that's something that will have to be determined. This is a ready forum for that determination.

And so this -- that case has an uncanny similarity to the facts of this case, and the court effectively landed where we suggest this court should land. The full receivership is appropriate, and if issues arise in relation to it because some party is aggrieved or thinks that the receiver should be doing something it's not doing or there's litigation that needs to proceed, that can easily be resolved, and happily, given the way that the insolvency courts operate, it can be done quickly.

So back to the written submissions, Justice. So we say, as I've said before, and I'll say it again, the complete receivership order is, we say, the appropriate way to proceed, for all the reasons we've been saying.

The partial receivership order, the distribution order --

THE COURT: Which page are you at?

CNSL K. JACKSON: Oh, sorry. Paragraph 88 on page 24 Justice.

THE COURT: Okay. Right.

CNSL K. JACKSON: And so, just to take paragraph 88 and expand it, it's a partial order. It doesn't go far enough. It doesn't resolve -- even if it was appropriate -- even if there was evidence this court could be satisfied that this was the right way to proceed on these lands, what about the rest of the problems? What about the rest of the collateral? What about the rest of the disputes? What about the deadlock? What about the other third parties, employees, suppliers, everyone else that's left dealing with the fallout with respect to the remainder of the

```
partnership enterprise?
                One thing I'll point out, at paragraph 94 --
           this is a point which I'd sort of made before,
           but I didn't complete the thought -- the
5
           partnerships are in a dire financial position.
           It calls into question the partnerships' ability
7
           to maintain, secure and insure the property.
8
           They have no money to do any of that. One of
9
           Mr. -- when it was pointed out that the golf
10
           course didn't do as well this summer, as was
11
           expected, one of the rationale -- one of the
12
           reasons for it was, well, we had a failure of a
13
           pump, I believe, which caused flooding. I think
14
           it was a pump. I can't remember what it was, but
15
           some piece of equipment, significant piece of
16
           equipment which caused damage to two of the
17
           holes.
18
                This is a classic example of what happens
19
           when companies run thin, businesses run thin, and
20
           we can't be satisfied they have the funds to
21
           ensure they don't?
22
                 Where does that appear? Just so I have --
      THE COURT:
23
      CNSL K. JACKSON: That is right, and so -- again, I'll
24
           move -- I'll get Ms. Hiebert to --
25
      THE COURT:
                  Just give me a note of where it is.
26
      CNSL K. JACKSON: No, I will. Ms. Hiebert will have
27
           that, I'm sure, in two seconds, but I'll carry on
28
           and come back to it when she does, because the
           encyclopedia here is at work.
29
30
                And so one of the other things, property
31
           taxes, they weren't paid. 10 percent penalty
32
           incurred, the second one by September 2nd, which
33
           has now passed, and property taxes, remember, get
34
           adjusted daily, so that every day of the sale
35
           continues to actually increase property tax
36
           exposure for any sale on an adjustment basis.
                So for the evidence of Mr. Matthews -- oh,
37
38
           this is, sorry, Mr. Larocque, which is the
39
           general manager of Resorts. So Mr. Larocque's
40
           affidavit at tab 24, complete record --
                         Sorry, that affidavit was delivered
41
      CNSL L. HIEBERT:
42
           after the condensed record was finalized.
43
           in volume 8.
44
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Volume 8, tab 24.
45
      THE COURT: Okay. Right.
46
      CNSL K. JACKSON: And so it's at -- Mr. Larocque goes
47
           through about why he says -- it's -- he doesn't
```

disagree that revenues were down and the operations weren't as successful as hope. And so 3 if you look at --4 CNSL C. FERRIS: That's not the evidence. That is not 5 the evidence. 6 CNSL G. BRANDT: That's an unfair reading of the 7 affidavit. 8 CNSL K. JACKSON: Okay. At paragraph 5: 9 10 Each month I do a mid month check on green 11 fee/cart revenues. This is done so I can 12 ensure our team has sufficient time in a 13 given month to respond should we see an 14 anomaly in revenues. With my mid-month 15 check in July 2024, I noticed that revenues 16 were not tracking relative to last year. 17 18 CNSL C. FERRIS: Yeah, so you have to read 19 paragraph 10 where he goes to the end of July. 20 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. 21 Should I start there, Justice? CNSL K. JACKSON: 22 THE COURT: Just do 5 --23 CNSL K. JACKSON: Keep going at paragraph 4? 24 paragraph 5? 25 THE COURT: Yeah, read paragraph 5, and then you can 26 take me to 10. 27 CNSL K. JACKSON: Thank you. 28 29 With my mid-month check in July 2024 I 30 noticed that revenues were not tracking 31 relative to last year. I'm in regular 32 contact with general managers from other 33 regional facilities who also reported drops 34 in golf bookings for July 2024. 35 consensus among general managers was that 36 June 2024 was a strong month for the golf 37 business, but a combination of intense heat, 38 economic concerns and summer vacations 39 contributing to an unexpected downturn for 40 July 2024. 41 42 Paragraph 6: 43 44 Another factor unique to our operations at 45 Bear Mountain was a critical water pump

breakage on our valley course. The valley

pump and invariable frequency drive were

46

installed at Bear Mountain in 2008. The VFD regulates the water pressures when the pumps turn on to slowly increase water pressure safely within the system. It failed on July 25th this year resulting in a loss of water to holes number 6 through 15 on our valley course.

At the very end, we can go through, but the last sentence:

Unfortunately, this pump breakage and the need to divert water resources meant the turf on both courses was not in optimal shape.

And so that -- that, of course, is a concern about ability to maintain the operations -- the equipment on the operations.

Paragraph 10, I'll read that for my friend:

As well, our year-to-date revenues to July of 2024 -- July 31st, 2024 remain above our revenues for the same period between January 1 and July 31, 2023. Further revenues for green fees/carts, our most important daily revenue stream, are currently at their highest for the period January 1 to July 31, 2024, as compared to all years back to 2016.

Sure. But not anywhere near what Mr. Matthews said they were going to be, because, of course, the accounts payable didn't change in any material fashion. So better than previous years, not great, and I say a concern with maintenance of equipment.

But more to the point in all of that, great, the best year since 2016, sustainable, on Mr. Matthews' evidence, into the early fall. We are still in summer, but not for long, and at that point any financial improvements have to be done. That would be the implication of Mr. Matthews' evidence.

So what are we going to do about keeping the lights on?

THE COURT: You just said a moment ago that, eastbound

with those better revenues, they still -- they can't meet payroll. They can't 3 CNSL K. JACKSON: Well, you saw --4 THE COURT: They can't pay -- they're still 5 withholding cheques. They're still withholding cheques. CNSL K. JACKSON: 7 They still have \$200 million in payables, and 8 they have collectively, between the two 9 partnerships, \$20,000 in the bank, give or take. 10 I haven't got my math exactly right, but nothing. Nothing. That's the most current evidence on the 11 12 status of that, and Mr. Matthews himself says, we 13 can do this until the early fall. I don't think 14 we should wait any longer. 15 So then we can go through -- so Maple Trade 16 factors. I decided what I would do is I would 17 just go in sort of a comparison of the two 18 options with some of the trade factors. 19 THE COURT: Let me just put this away. 20 CNSL K. JACKSON: Yes, sorry. I don't think I'll 21 refer to the -- thank you. And I'm at page 26, 22 Justice. So what I thought I'd do is, as I say, 23 go through the Maple Trade factors with a bit of 24 a comparison of what's being suggested by the 25 parties. 26 So starting at paragraph 99(a), irreparable 27 He described the approach proposed under 28 the partial receivership order as uncertain, 29 piecemeal, incomplete, requires time. 30 doesn't take into account all of the 31 partnership's liabilities, including prior 32 ranking mortgages on some of the select lands. 33 No evidence for how a sale of the select lands 34 will impact on the other lands, the other assets 35 at all. 36 And second point under this, number 2, there's no stay of proceedings for the Resorts, 37 38 no funding for operations. There's irreparable 39 harm as a risk, which I think has to be taken as 40 a given, given that -- the aged AP. There's no 41 There's risk of irreparable harm when stay. 42 other creditors take enforcement proceedings. 43 Whereas, number 3, the complete receivership

order, deals with all this. I has funding. It

monetization of sales in any way that makes the

has a stay, and it leaves open the possibility of

most sense according to the court's officer, with

44

45

46

input from stakeholders and on application to the court.

(B), the risk to the securityholder and need to protect or safeguard assets. It's agreed the assets have significant value, but there's no liquidity. There's no funds to safeguard the property during the process, including from enforcement steps.

With \$20,000 in the bank, what about insurance? Complete receivership order deals with that. There's funding to ensure that the assets are safeguarded. There's insurance that everything is involved in a controlled process so there's no risk to the securityholder.

The nature of the property. Parties agree that the property has significant development potential. Complete receivership order allows for a comprehensive approach and solution to monetize the lands. And this is the point I made at the outset. The partial receivership order precludes that. It presupposes that Mr. Matthews' views reflect the best way to monetize the lands. It doesn't allow for a comprehensive solution. It allows for no input. It allows for no discretion on the part of the court's officer.

Also the partial receivership order only focusses on the select lands, so that means the remaining collateral, including the business, languishes, risks duplicative proceedings, which can distract, which will tie up resources, unnecessarily exposes Sanovest and other stakeholders to the risk that the select lands aren't of sufficient value to pay out the Sanovest debt, or it can't be realized in a timely manner.

Waste of the debtors' assets, (d). We come back to a theme. There's no funds available to the partnerships, including for maintenance and insurance. Partial receivership order does nothing to deal with that; complete receivership order does. Of course, value of the other lands.

Preservation and protection pending judicial resolution. So a complete receivership order ensures preservation and protection of assets, facilitating funding for expenses and operating costs and the receivership process itself. We

 know the partnerships don't generate sufficient revenue to meet obligations as they come due, so assets are jeopardized. A partial receivership order would seek to protect portions of the property, but leaving the balance vulnerable. 599 has offered no evidence as to how long -- and this is important -- has offered no evidence as to how long the proposed subdivision and sale of the select lands may take.

There's no mechanism to meet the obligations, not only to carry out that, but prior to the time that that is completed and the sale actually ensues.

Moreover, they have a distribution, which is contrary to contractual entitlements, but contemplate as reserve for tax obligations with no idea what those actually are or how they'd be calculated.

Balance of convenience. I don't have to go too much more into this. I've said it a few times. Complete receivership order leaves open all the options. There is — there is no prejudice to 599 from a complete receivership order, because everything that they want to do is available within the context of a complete receivership.

Mr. Matthews want to retain control over his golf course. The receiver, if that's the right thing to do, will ensure that he's retained to manage. Mr. Matthews thinks that certain lands should be subdivided, parcelled, bundled and sold. If that's the right thing to do, that's what will happen. And everything will be funded without concern in that regard during that process without fear of third parties, without concerns about wastage.

(G), the right to a receiver under the documentation. It is undisputed that Sanovest has the right to appoint a receiver and manager under the GSAs and the mortgages. It secures all -- all of the partnerships' lands are secured in favour of Sanovest and so -- and the business of the resort.

Enforcement rights of the securityholder; that's (h). I mean, that's what would happen if Sanovest appointed a receiver by instrument. I don't think we have to worry about that being the

case. I'm not sure that we could take it as a given that wouldn't be successful.

Extraordinary relief. Extraordinary relief that should be granted cautiously, accepted, other than those caveats which are in the materials about the fact that when it's contemplated under negotiated agreements, the relief is less extraordinary.

And the need for a court-appointed for the receiver to carry out its duties, we need that in this case. This is going to be contentious. There's going to be disputes. There's going to be the immediate for the receiver to have an order to protect it, to rely upon it, to come back to court under.

(M), I'm just going to skip down, Justice.
Length of time the receiver may be in place.
THE COURT: Right.

CNSL K. JACKSON: We don't know. 599, in its materials, for reasons I can't comprehend, seems to think that its process is going to be a fast one. I have difficulty with that, and here's why. They cannot sell the lands. They cannot begin to sell the lands until they're subdivided. There is no evidence about how long it takes to subdivide -- assuming they have funding, assuming they could even get subdivision, which is, by no means, a certainty -- which is by no means a certainty -- they have to go through the subdivision process. Mr. Kusumoto says he thinks that's six months, at least, before you can even begin to sell the lands.

So we're six months in. Then you have to go back to the court with a sale process that gets approved, and then you initiate your sale process.

Under the complete receivership order, there is a world in which the receiver comes to court in a period of time, whatever it is -- several weeks or a couple months -- and comes back and says, here's the sale process I wish to initiate starting in a week. We don't have to go through subdivision.

If that happens it's going to be a much faster sale in a complete receivership process. It's possible the receiver comes back and says, we agree with Mr. Matthews it should be

 subdivided. Well, then we have the exact same length of time. So it's either faster or the same in a complete receivership. It's going to take time to sell. No one has any idea, but I can't see how a complete receivership has any risk of being longer than a partial receivership reliant upon subdivision.

I should say also we don't have -- we don't have a person named to be appointed under the partial receivership order. I don't -- how can that -- when is that going to happen? And is anybody prepared to take that on? It's a complete gap. Apart from the funding gap, there's a complete gap in how this partial receivership order is to be carried out. So I guess there's some inherent delay baked into that too.

Costs to the parties. This is at sub (n) on page 30. I'm not going to go into that too much. There's always a cost to a receivership. There's two forms of receivership: One has some more lands and one has less. One has managing a golf course. For all the reasons I've said, there are incremental costs, but there are occasions when that is absolutely necessary to safeguard the collateral, to safeguard third parties and to ensure operations and funding during the receivership. That's where it comes.

So I do accept there will be some incrementally greater cost. Well, actually, sorry, I don't know that, because I don't know what subdivision costs. None of us do. But that involves usually consultants, engineers, applications. I don't know what it adds. None of us do. So it's entirely feasible that the full receivership, without a subdivision, turns out to be cheaper, rather than foisting that upon a court's officer.

And likelihood of maximizing return, that's for the receiver to comment upon down the road, because we don't have sufficient evidence to know which one is going to bear -- which process will be better, but we do know that optionality exists under a complete receivership order, that the court can be informed upon by its receiver.

So I'll let the rest sit there, Justice. I think I made most of my points, and some of them

 several times. You have my point on the delay and the time, because I want to think a little bit about what my friend said. There was, what about the cost? I've addressed that. What about the ongoing delay? I get that. There is delay, but it can't be worse.

And the other thing is this. There's still this concept of redemption, that if Mr. Matthews can come up with a way of addressing this, the financing, then there's a way to deal with that within this proceeding, irrespective of what order issues, especially if it's a complete receivership order, it can deal with it entirely, rather than only part. In fact, it would be harder for him, I think, to redeem in the context of a partial receivership or to seek to get an order that allows him to redeem.

And if there are sales -- if the sales don't proceed en bloc and there are piecemeal sales, and it looks -- and Sanovest gets paid out at some point, receivership orders can be terminated. That's a point which seems to be lost on my friends, is that this seem -- they take it as if it's sort of a final order. It's a fluid proceeding. It's realtime, just to prey upon a phrase which is used altogether too often, but it's true. There is the opportunity for parties to come back and seek to vary, seek to have disputes resolved, seek to figure out how litigation will proceed, if it's to proceed, and if appropriate, terminate a receivership, which happens from time to time.

I will be surprised if we see a situation here, but it's open to the court to order that and direct that, if there are circumstances that merit that. And so it's not as if Mr. Matthews is having his opportunity to deal with this problem taken away.

THE COURT: Under the full receivership order, is it contemplated that counsel would be appointed for the receiver?

CNSL K. JACKSON: I should have mentioned that,
Justice, and actually, that is one of the things,
I think -- so Alvarez and Marsal has engaged
Blakes, Peter Rubin, in the event that they are
appointed. The court will be familiar with
Mr. Rubin. I think that's not a bad thing,

```
particularly where there is going to be a need,
            in fairly, you know, short order, to consider
           some of the litigation that the partnerships are
            involved in and what should be happening with
5
           those, and I can't think of many counsel in the
            city better suited for that.
7
      THE COURT: Do you know if under the partial
            receivership order, appointment of counsel for
8
9
            this court officer is contemplated? And if you
10
            don't know, I'll leave it to your friends.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Well, I can tell you what the order -- the order -- the full order that's
11
12
13
            attached to the notice of application doesn't
14
            actually authorize -- what it provides --
15
                   The one you took me to before?
      THE COURT:
16
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Right.
17
      THE COURT: It deals with subdivision and
18
            distribution.
19
      CNSL K. JACKSON: It has a whole bunch of -- well, it
           has a number of powers. So it's the model order
20
21
            cribbed way down. And so if you look at --
22
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah. This is their order?
23
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Yes, this is at tab 3 --
                   Where is that?
24
      THE COURT:
25
      CNSL K. JACKSON: -- of the condensed book.
26
      THE COURT:
                   Okay, just a minute.
27
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Yes.
28
                   It fell apart.
      THE COURT:
29
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Oh, sorry.
30
                   All right.
      THE COURT:
31
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         So it does -- it does contemplate,
32
            at 2(b), that the receiver can engage any number
33
            of people, including counsel. So sorry, I jumped
34
            ahead.
35
      THE COURT:
                   Okay. All right.
36
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        2(b), you'll see second line down,
37
            the reference to counsel.
38
      THE COURT:
                  All right.
39
      CNSL K. JACKSON: So whoever the receiver is under
40
           that order could engage counsel, and there is,
41
            at --
42
                  But they call it a marketing agent under
      THE COURT:
43
            that order.
44
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Pardon me?
                                      Well --
45
      THE COURT: It's called -- I thought --
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Well, they call it a marketing --
46
47
            I'm struggling with the term. I think my friends
```

```
concede it's a receiver cloaked with a different
           name. Am I right about that?
 3
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Yes, and we've discussed it, and it's
           just simply to maintain -- for the market to
5
           maintain not having the name "receivership"
           associated with the project.
7
                        The press listening in should --
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
           will know. Yeah, it's a receiver. And so
8
9
           their -- so it's a model receivership order pared
10
           way down. It does contemplate engagement of
11
           counsel, and it does have -- this is at
12
           paragraph 10, the initial language about security
13
           for the marketing agent. So instead of
14
           receiver's charge, security for the payment of
15
           the fees and those of the counsel.
16
                I did point out that one of the problems
17
           with that is twofold. It's inconsistent with the
18
           distribution order, which doesn't contemplate any
19
           distribution to the marketing agent or its
20
           counsel. It's first to taxes, then to the
21
           parties.
22
                It also isn't on notice to HSBC, who has a
23
           charge on some of the lands. I will say our
           draft order presently doesn't reference HSBC, but
24
25
           it will say, when I come to it, that the charges
26
           under that would be subordinate to HSBC's charge.
27
      THE COURT:
                 Your charges. You mean your client's
28
           charges?
29
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        The proposed receiver's charge and
30
           receiver's borrowings charge. The court-ordered
31
           charges, they would be ahead of everything,
32
           including Sanovest debt, but it would be
33
           subordinate to HSBC's mortgages.
34
      THE COURT: Okay.
35
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Thank you, Justice.
                                              I don't have
36
           anything else. I'm slightly over the hour I
37
           proposed.
38
      THE COURT:
                  That's fine.
39
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Nothing further.
40
      THE COURT: So what is the intention now, then?
41
           have to -- we're starting the CPC at 3:30.
42
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Well, we can do one of two things,
43
           Justice. We can start and then we can break in
44
           15 minutes --
45
      THE COURT: Sure.
46
      CNSL C. FERRIS: -- and do the CPC.
47
      THE COURT: Sure.
```

CNSL C. FERRIS: Or --

```
THE COURT: You can give me an overview, then.
 3
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Okay. Well, then, there's a surprise
 4
            for you.
 5
                  Okay.
      THE COURT:
 6
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Because we've changed up the batting
 7
            order, and Mr. Roberts is going to give you an
 8
            overview of the response to the receivership.
 9
      THE COURT: Okay.
10
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And then I'll come -- I'll come back
11
            probably tomorrow morning.
12
                  Okay.
      THE COURT:
13
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Thank you, Justice.
                                               I think I'm
14
            going to be relatively quick.
15
      THE COURT: All right.
16
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: I'm not sure if I'm 3:15 quick,
17
           but --
18
      THE COURT: All right. Just an overview would be
19
            helpful.
20
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: I'm just going to give you an
21
            overview, and really only because, as Mr. Jackson
22
           mostly went through receivership issues, we
23
           thought, just while they were top of mind for you, we'd address some receivership issues.
24
25
                 And so I'm going to start with our client
26
            supports a resolution. That's why they came out
27
           with their motion. They support a resolution
28
            that preserves value/minimizes prejudice, because
29
            those are flip sides of the same coin.
30
      THE COURT:
                  M'mm-hmm.
31
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         That repays the Sanovest debt, and I
32
            asterisk that, because we're going to come back
            repeatedly to the distinction between Sanovest as
33
34
            lender and partner.
35
      THE COURT:
                   Right.
36
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: So prioritize repaying that debt,
37
            the secured lender should be paid. We want to
38
            preserve claims, and in particular you're going
39
            to hear from Mr. Grant about an arbitration
40
            that's commencing next week where -- I think I'm
41
            right in saying this -- liability has been
42
            determined, and they're moving into damages and
43
            some material claim, meaning it's now. It's next
44
            week.
45
      THE COURT:
                  Is that -- you're going to have to tell me
46
            how that has an impact on the receivership
47
            element.
```

```
CNSL W. ROBERTS: Oh, I will.
                  Okay.
      THE COURT:
3
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: But that whatever resolution is
           being talked about today needs to take into
5
           account the fact that there's an arbitration
           starting next week.
7
      THE COURT: Okay.
8
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: We want a resolution that provides
9
           for what I'm going to call short-term and
10
           medium-term funding, and by short-term I mean the
11
           payables that you've been hearing about.
12
      THE COURT:
                  M'mm-hmm.
13
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Medium-term the continuing
           operations.
14
15
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
16
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Longer-term is paying out Sanovest,
17
           but we have short and medium-term. And again,
18
           you'll hear from Mr. Grant, but we say the reason
19
           why these payables have mounted and why we have
20
           these short and medium-term problems are because
21
           Mr. Kusumoto refuses to allow any sales to occur,
22
           and we want to bring a resolution within a
23
           reasonable period of time, not something that's a
24
           ten-year build-out.
25
                And so our funding application, the one
26
           you've seen, was our imperfect attempt to reach
27
           those goals.
28
      THE COURT:
                 Funding application?
29
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: The application you saw from us with
30
           a limited receivership, which we've called a
31
           funding application.
32
      THE COURT:
                 You call it -- okay.
                                         Because I don't
33
           recall. You have to show me where the funding
34
           aspect of it is.
35
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Funding for the company.
36
      THE COURT: Oh, I see. Okay.
37
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: So the idea was sell off some
38
           identified parcels, generate enough money to fund
39
           operations and pay out Sanovest.
                                             That was the
40
           plan. And we don't come here to tell you it was
41
           perfect at all, but it was an attempt to achieve
           these goals and do the thing that Sanovest said
42
43
           it wanted done. Sanovest made a demand and said,
44
           if you don't pay me my money, I'm going to
45
           commence proceedings and appoint a receiver, and
46
           so we issued this motion, petition, seeking a
47
           vehicle to get Sanovest its money.
```

So we don't say it's perfect, but rather than have Sanovest say to us, well, here will fatal flaws in it, you should say to us, here are the ways you can work. I have a problem with X or Y. I have a problem with the subdivision idea; I don't think you've picked the right parcels.

THE COURT: Yeah.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: Fine. We're happy to talk about those. But you have in front of you a petition, an application from us to approve that limited receivership.

We say that the Sanovest full receivership application is not the reasonable middle ground that they're saying. We say instead it's a blunt instrument, and what we've tried to do is address specific problems that need to be fixed and brought a petition to address those, not saying that the receivership, our limited receivership, can't in the future transition or pivot or do something else.

But rather than -- if all you have is a hammer, the world are nails. Rather than just say, we should have a blanket receivership that is going to run for years and years and cost many millions of dollars, let's start by addressing the specific problems. Let's address those problems, and as the receiver moves forward, when the receiver decides we should do something differently, the receiver can come tell this court and then move. So we always said, start narrow. Start with a limited-purpose receivership to address the specific problems that we all agree on and then, as things change, maybe the receiver gets discharged. Maybe they move on. Maybe they expand, but those are things we can deal with in the future.

We say that the blunt instrument of a full, non-nuanced receivership does create prejudice, not just in the community of purchasers; we have a larger community. We have members of the golf course and we have -- and I'm sorry, the number -- how many residents? 3,000 residents in that community. They've been through a receivership once already. If we do another full receivership, that's two times. That's going to cause prejudice long-term to the membership and

to the viability operations.

So if we can -- and I'll just do it this way. If we can mitigate the prejudice, why would we not choose to mitigate or minimize? Why would we not have two paths, choose the one that, at least at first glance, minimizes. If it so happens that we have to pivot and do something else, we'll do it. But we should start by choosing the one that minimizes.

We say there are going to be significant and unnecessary costs in a full receivership. This receivership order simply says, receiver, you shall take over all operations.

THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: The only evidence you have in front of you that there's a problem with operations is from somebody who has no involvement with operations, Tian Kusumoto. Tian Kusumoto is the CFO of this company, and he's relying on Dan Matthews' evidence about finances. Mr. Kusumoto has completely abdicated any responsibility for his role as CFO. He has no concept of what's going wrong or right within operations, and so we shouldn't start from the point that we should have a full receiver over all operations.

We also risk -- and I'm just going to say it -- unintended consequences. If you just put a blanket receivership over everything, who knows how that's going to play out, as opposed to building blocks to see so we can control the outcomes.

That being said, you've heard it, there are a lot of points of agreement here. We agree these parties are at loggerheads. We agree there should be a court officer appointed. Two points: One, I look at my friend when I say this. He's disingenuous when he tells you he doesn't know who our proposed receiver is, because we've talked about it many times.

CNSL K. JACKSON: I genuinely don't, Justice.

THE COURT: Sorry.

CNSL K. JACKSON: Last time you told me that was not happening.

THE COURT: I think you want to remember that you're talking to me.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: It's BDO. I had thought our consent was filed. If not, we'll file it first thing in

```
the morning. We have a consent from BDO to act
           as receiver. The title -- and you'll see that we
           call them a marketing agent -- that's only a
           prejudice mitigation exercise, no more than that.
5
                  You're going to have to show me where I
           can actually appoint someone called a mark --
7
           with the nomenclature --
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Agreed.
8
9
      THE COURT:
                 -- marketing agent.
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: And we say that we agree it's a
10
11
           receiver.
                     It's under the receivership power, and
12
           we were changing the title, and if we can't
13
           convince you that you can do it, so be it, but
14
           we're going to make the pitch.
15
                  In essence, what you're really saying
      THE COURT:
16
           is -- if I can summarize it -- what you've put
17
           before me, you acknowledge may not be perfect.
18
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Yes.
19
      THE COURT: But you want to avoid what you think are
20
           runaway costs from a full receivership and come
21
           in with sort of a selected, staged approach,
22
           allowing the receiver to be able to come to the
23
           court and say, it's not working; we need to do
24
           something else; I need full powers, et cetera,
25
           to -- is that --
26
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: I can give you an example.
                                                     If they
27
           go in -- the receiver goes in and says, you know
28
           what, there's no CFO there, we need that, and
29
           they can either fix that problem or come to you
30
           and expand it, yes, but we should start narrow
31
           and move out.
32
      THE COURT:
                  I get -- I'm alive to the points you're
33
           making, but how does that work, though, in this
34
           high-conflict partnership now --
35
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Oh, because --
36
                  -- where you've got these parties accusing
      THE COURT:
37
           each other of mala fide conduct, misuse of funds.
38
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Yes.
39
      THE COURT:
                  I think there's a complaint -- I read
40
           somewhere about Mr. Matthews and what he's being
41
           paid and somebody blocking things. I mean, it's
           just -- it's just this -- it's a complete --
42
43
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        I have two answers --
44
      THE COURT: -- morass of evidence if people --
45
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Agree. And I agree with this point,
46
           and you asked the question earlier, which is, are
47
           you going to be called on today to make any
```

```
findings about bad conduct? And no. And as
           Mr. Ferris said, it goes into the analysis, but
           you're not going to be able to sort that out on
           this application.
5
                The practical answer is Mr. Kusumoto isn't
           in the office. Mr. Matthews is there running it,
7
           and Mr. Kusumoto isn't. But if the court officer
           goes in and decides that there's a problem to be
8
9
           addressed, they can come to you and have it
10
           addressed.
11
      THE COURT:
                 You see, if this were a CCAA and a monitor
12
           was put in, and they came back and told me there
13
           was significant problems with the debtor and
14
           counting --
15
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                       Yeah, you could expand those powers.
16
      THE COURT: I think they become a super monitor at
17
           that point.
18
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        That's right.
19
      THE COURT:
                 And they would take it and run it.
20
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Yes.
21
      THE COURT:
                  It would be incremental.
22
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Yes.
23
      THE COURT: But I guess my concern is, when I looked
24
           at your materials, as briefly as I did, what
25
           you're proposing to me in terms of a staged
26
           approach didn't leap out at me as --
27
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                       Well, then, we just did a bad job
28
           pitching it to you.
29
      THE COURT: Okay. Well, you haven't had time to pitch
30
           it yet, but it's -- when I think, well, if the
31
           order requires me to make an order about
32
           subdivision, well, how does that --
33
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: And we'll address that.
34
      THE COURT: How does that affect the staged approach?
35
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: So I'll -- again, I'll say two
36
           things.
37
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah, all right.
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: One, we'll address that for you, but
38
39
           also, we don't tell you that that's the only
40
           approach. We say it should be staged.
41
      THE COURT:
                 Okay.
42
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: It should start with selling enough
43
           lands to pay off Sanovest. That should be goal
44
           number one. That's what Sanovest says is their
45
           number one goal. That's what we say is our
           number one goal:
46
                             Sell enough lands to pay off
47
           Sanovest. And if -- we put forward these three
```

```
parcels. If it's not those, or if it should be
           done in a different manner, then so be it.
           it be a different manner. But it shouldn't
           change the underlying goal, which is only do that
5
           which is necessary to get those short-term,
           mid-term goals -- problems addressed.
7
                  Well, all right. But then -- two things,
      THE COURT:
8
                  In view of the conflict between the
           then.
9
           parties, is it appropriate to leave Mr. Matthews
10
           running the business, as opposed to the receiver
11
           going in, looking at it and then determining
12
           whether or not it's appropriate for Mr. Matthews
13
           to remain in the business?
14
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        What if I put it the other way?
15
      THE COURT: All right.
16
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Which is Mr. Matthews is running the
17
           business today.
18
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
                       And if the court officer looks and
19
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
20
           says he shouldn't be, then he can come to you --
21
           the court officer can come to you and say so.
22
      THE COURT:
                 Okay.
                        Then that -- I'm glad -- that's a
23
           good point you've raised, because then it takes
24
           me to look at it this way. What I hear you
25
           saying is, look, it might get to the point of a
26
           full receivership.
27
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Yes.
28
                  It might.
      THE COURT:
                             So --
29
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: And we say hopefully not, but yeah.
30
      THE COURT:
                  But instead of staged multiple
31
           applications -- they may occur in any event --
32
           what if a full receivership order is granted, but
33
           it includes one that specifically says to the
34
           receiver, before you do anything else, you must
35
           go in and you must determine, firstly, what
36
           properties should be sold to pay off Sanovest;
37
           and secondly, determine whether -- look at the
           operations of the company and determine whether
38
39
           Mr. Matthews is appropriate to run it and then
40
           come back to the court and report.
41
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Yes.
42
      THE COURT: And then -- and then he gives you what
43
           you -- it lets the receiver know that they can
44
           say to the court at that point, I've got the
45
           authority if I need it. I need to get permission
46
           from the court.
47
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: What I think you're saying is at
```

```
some point the court officer comes back to you
           and says, here's what I've found.
3
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
4
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: And here's what I think should
5
           happen.
                    What we say to you is they shouldn't --
           we shouldn't put the stigma of receiver on them
7
           to do that, because if we can -- if we can avoid
8
           a stigma, why don't we? So if you could achieve
9
           that goal by having what we propose is our
10
           limited-purpose receiver go and do those same
11
           things and give you that reporting, we say that
12
           mitigates, as much as you can in these
13
           circumstances.
14
      THE COURT: But don't you already have the stigma if I
15
           appoint a limited receiver in any event?
16
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Maybe. But if we can do something
17
           that might mitigate, why wouldn't we? Why
18
           wouldn't Sanovest support something that might
19
           mitigate prejudice and preserve value?
20
      THE COURT:
                 All right. Interesting.
21
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: And so I note the time.
22
                  Yeah, all right.
      THE COURT:
23
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: I don't know if you want to break
24
           and --
25
      THE COURT: We should.
26
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Okay.
27
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Justice.
28
      THE COURT:
                 Yes.
29
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        I think some of us, me particularly,
30
           will not be helpful for the CPC. If I may be
31
           excused.
32
      THE COURT: All right. Because I'm not sure who's who
           in what actions. I know it's Mr. Nathanson.
33
34
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Mr. Byma is going to deal with the
35
           case planning conference, but I will stay to
36
           assist, and I'm not sure who from my friends'
37
           team.
38
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Ms. Ohama-Darcus is going to handle
39
           it.
40
                  All right. But until last night when the
      THE COURT:
41
           CPC files were brought, I didn't even know about
42
           these other actions.
43
      CNSL C. FERRIS: It was a condition of the adjournment
44
           of the trial that we have a CPC to set hard
45
           deadlines so we can actually make the new trial
46
           date.
47
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
```

39
Reporter certification

1 2	CNSL C. FERRIS: And so that's why it's important to proceed with it.
3	THE COURT: So it's the oppression action is part of
4	the CPC and other lawsuits as well; right?
5	CNSL C. FERRIS: There's three lawsuits.
6	THE COURT: Okay. And I take it what I'm going to
7	hear in the CPC doesn't bear on the insolvency
8	matter?
9	CNSL W. ROBERTS: It's not our two fights.
10	CNSL K. JACKSON: No.
11	CNSL W. ROBERTS: We've put ourself in a box, and that
12 13	box is leaving. CNSL K. JACKSON: As I said, I studiously ignored all
14	of that, Justice.
15	THE COURT: All right. Okay, very good, then. I'll
16	wait for Madam Clerk to get me when everyone is
17	really. Thank you, and we'll come back, then, at
18	10 o'clock tomorrow.
19	THE CLERK: Order in chambers. This chambers is stood
20	down.
21	
22	(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 3:19 PM TO
23	SEPTEMBER 11, 2024)
24	
25	REPORTER CERTIFICATION
26	

I, Tiffany Vincent, Official Reporter in the Province of British Columbia, Canada, BCSRA No. 576, do hereby certify:

That the proceedings were transcribed by me from audio provided of recorded proceedings, and the same is a true and correct and complete transcript of said proceedings to the best of my skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name on this day, the 20th of September, $2024\,.$

Tiffany Vincent

Authorized Reporter

¢	21 [2] - 9:39, 12:29		28:4, 36:9, 36:10,	anomaly [1] - 21:14
\$	22,000 [1] - 8:5	8	37:6	answer [1] - 36:5
\$2.000 cm 0.10		9 rs. 12:12 12:12	addressing [2] - 28:9,	
\$2,000 [1] - 8:10	24 [3] - 19:33, 20:40,	8 [5] - 13:12, 13:13,	33:26	answers [1] - 35:43
\$20,000 [3] - 8:13,	20:44	19:2, 20:43, 20:44		AP [2] - 7:15, 23:40
23:9, 24:9	25th [1] - 22:5	86 [1] - 13:4	adds [1] - 27:34	apart [2] - 27:13,
\$200 [1] - 23:7	26 [1] - 23:21	88 [2] - 19:33, 19:36	ADJOURNED[1] -	29:28
\$200,000 [1] - 2:45	2:06 [1] - 1:7		39:22	apologize [1] - 3:16
\$22,000 [1] - 8:5	2nd [1] - 20:32	9	adjournment [1] -	Appeal [1] - 13:41
\$25,000 [1] - 8:12	_		38:43	appear [1] - 20:22
\$3,000 [2] - 7:28, 7:30	3	9 [1] - 13:14	adjusted [1] - 20:34	application [12] -
\$4,000 [1] - 8:17		94 [1] - 20:2	adjustment [1] - 20:36	14:17, 15:26, 15:29,
\$575,000 [1] - 8:19	3 [2] - 23:43, 29:23	99(a [1] - 23:26	advanced [1] - 15:2	24:1, 29:13, 32:25,
\$7,000 [1] - 7:32	3,000 [2] - 7:39, 33:43	_	advantages [1] - 19:3	32:28, 32:29, 32:31,
\$780,000 [2] - 7:2,	30 [1] - 27:19	Α	adversaries [1] -	33:11, 33:14, 36:4
7:12	31 [3] - 16:6, 22:25,		15:34	applications [3] -
\$900,000 [1] - 8:20	22:29	abdicated [1] - 34:21	affect [1] - 36:34	19:5, 27:34, 37:31
	31st [1] - 22:23	ability [4] - 18:14,	affected [3] - 3:25,	apply [1] - 18:44
0	38 [1] - 18:25	20:6, 22:18, 39:35	5:39, 5:47	appoint [5] - 17:5,
	3:15 [1] - 31:16	able [4] - 2:32, 6:21,	affidavit [5] - 3:37,	25:39, 32:45, 35:6,
0.5 [1] - 1:40	3:19 [1] - 39:22	35:22, 36:3	15:39, 20:40, 20:41,	38:15
	3:30 [1] - 30:41	absolutely [2] - 10:21,	21:7	appointed [13] - 2:34,
1		27:25	afforded [3] - 18:2,	9:11, 13:22, 13:39,
-	4	accept [3] - 8:30,	18:19, 19:2	13:47, 16:12, 17:23,
1 [2] - 22:25, 22:29	•	13:37, 27:29	afternoon [1] - 1:13	25:46, 26:9, 27:9,
10 [10] - 1:1, 3:44,	4 [2] - 14:24, 21:23	accepted [2] - 13:28,	aged [2] - 3:11, 23:40	28:40, 28:46, 34:35
4:24, 16:4, 20:31,		26:4	agent [7] - 10:19,	appointment [7] -
21:19, 21:26, 22:20,	5	according [2] - 6:32,	10:39, 29:42, 30:13,	12:34, 14:3, 14:12,
30:12, 39:18		23:47	30:19, 35:3, 35:9	15:27, 16:19, 17:17,
10:11 [1] - 1:6	5 [4] - 21:8, 21:22,	account [12] - 7:28,	aggrieved [1] - 19:19	29:8
11 [2] - 13:34, 39:23	21:24, 21:25	7:29, 7:41, 7:47, 8:1,	ago [1] - 22:47	Appointment [1] -
118 [5] - 4:37, 4:45,	5,000 [1] - 8:17	8:5, 8:6, 8:7, 8:9,	agree [9] - 10:7,	16:37
4:46, 5:31, 6:15	50 [1] - 1:34	8:21, 23:30, 32:5	24:15, 26:47, 33:34,	appraisal [1] - 4:26
12 [1] - 15:25	51 [1] - 7:41	accounts [8] - 2:47,	34:33, 34:34, 35:10,	approach [7] - 5:9,
15 [5] - 14:17, 15:30,	55 [1] - 16:16	3:1, 7:24, 8:20, 9:11,	35:45	23:27, 24:18, 35:21,
16:9, 22:6, 30:44	56 [1] - 16:21	9:12, 9:33, 22:34	agreed [2] - 24:4, 35:8	36:26, 36:34, 36:40
16 [3] - 4:24, 4:27,	575,000 [1] - 7:46	accrued [2] - 2:47, 3:1	agreement [1] - 34:33	Approaches [2] -
5:16	576 [1] - 39:29	accurate [1] - 2:1	agreements [1] - 26:7	4:44, 5:3
17 [1] - 4:22	58 [1] - 17:8	accuses [1] - 15:35	ah-ha [1] - 12:6	approaches [1] - 5:26
18 [2] - 7:16, 17:39	599 [11] - 1:33, 3:28,	accusing [1] - 35:36		appropriate [9] -
1st [1] - 7:19	4:9, 4:27, 8:27,	achieve [2] - 32:41,	ahead [3] - 21:20,	14:12, 18:22, 19:18,
	11:27, 12:33, 23:29,	38:8	29:34, 30:31	19:28, 19:39, 28:31,
2	25:6, 25:23, 26:19	acknowledge [1] -	aired [2] - 4:13, 4:16	37:9, 37:12, 37:39
		35:17	alive [1] - 35:32	approve [2] - 14:19,
2 [5] - 2:46, 3:5, 6:46,	6	acquiring [1] - 5:34	allay [1] - 12:24	33:11
7:12, 23:36		act [1] - 35:1	alleviated [1] - 6:17	approved [2] - 12:23,
2(b [2] - 29:32, 29:36	6 [3] - 15:4, 21:42,	action [9] - 17:41,	allow [3] - 18:21,	26:35
2,500 [1] - 15:30	22:6	17:43, 17:47, 18:4,	24:23, 32:21	AR [1] - 3:11
20 [2] - 10:17, 10:25	66 [4] - 2:26, 2:39,	18:11, 18:17, 18:28,	allowing [1] - 35:22	arbitration [2] - 31:39,
2008 [1] - 22:1	2:42, 6:46	18:32, 39:3	allows [4] - 24:17,	32:5
2016 [2] - 22:30, 22:39	68 [1] - 17:45	actions [6] - 15:2,	24:24, 24:25, 28:17	
2010 [2] - 22.30, 22.39 2022 [1] - 4:7	68-87 [1] - 13:41	15:33, 18:44, 18:46,	almost [1] - 13:13	argument [1] - 15:41 arise [2] - 17:32, 19:18
2022 [1] - 4.7 2023 [6] - 3:18, 4:10,	69 [2] - 7:1, 7:2	38:33, 38:42	alternative [1] - 17:21	
4:31, 6:9, 6:11,	6th [1] - 7:25	actively [1] - 14:1	altogether [1] - 28:26	arises [1] - 17:33
22:25		actual [1] - 1:34	Alvarez[1] - 28:44	arising [1] - 15:21
2024 [13] - 1:1, 7:19,	7	adding [1] - 12:22	AM [1] - 1:6	articles [1] - 4:1
8:2, 21:15, 21:29,	'	addrig [1] - 12.22 address [8] - 11:11,	amount [10] - 2:46,	aspect [2] - 10:29,
21:34, 21:36, 21:40,	7,000 [1] - 7:38	31:24, 33:16, 33:18,	3:47, 7:23, 7:24, 8:6,	32:34
22:23, 22:29, 39:23,	72 [1] - 18:47	33:27, 33:33, 36:33,	14:36, 15:15, 16:3,	asphalt [1] - 13:24
39:39	78,000 [1] - 7:46	36:38	17:11, 19:11	assertion [1] - 17:19
20th [1] - 39:38	780,000 [1] - 8:24	addressed [5] - 13:46,	amounts [1] - 18:37	asset [2] - 16:25,
_J[1] 00.00	-,,	aaai 0000a [J] - 10.70,	analysis [1] - 36:2	17:22

assets [9] - 3:30, 16:47, 23:34, 24:4, 24:5, 24:12, 24:37, 24:45, 25:3 assist [1] - 38:36 assistance [1] - 17:27 associated [1] - 30:6 assume [1] - 5:22 assuming [2] - 26:26 asterisk [1] - 31:32 **AT**[3] - 1:6, 1:7, 39:22 attached [2] - 4:5, 29:13 attaining [1] - 6:28 attempt [2] - 32:26, 32:41 **audio** [1] - 39:32 August [4] - 7:19, 7:25, 8:2, 9:18 authorities [1] - 13:8 authority [2] - 12:42, 37:45 authorize [1] - 29:14 **Authorized** [1] - 39:45 available [2] - 24:38, 25:25 avoid [2] - 35:19, 38:7 avoided [1] - 7:4

В

background [1] -15:30 **backwards** [1] - 13:14 **bad** [7] - 3:30, 9:1, 9:2, 15:36, 28:47, 36:1, 36:27 baked [1] - 27:16 balance [4] - 7:37, 8:13, 25:5, 25:19 balances [1] - 7:18 bank [7] - 7:18, 7:28, 8:1, 8:21, 23:9, 24:9 bankruptcy [1] - 18:25 **bar** [1] - 13:38 **bare** [1] - 10:24 **bargained** [1] - 9:2 basis [4] - 9:38, 12:27, 14:3, 20:36 **batting** [1] - 31:6 BC [2] - 1:2, 15:12 BCSRA[1] - 39:28 **BDO** [2] - 34:46, 35:1 Bear [9] - 1:35, 4:8, 4:14, 4:29, 5:36, 5:41, 6:18, 21:45, 22.1 bear [3] - 13:38, 27:42, 39:7 become [1] - 36:16

begin [2] - 26:24, 26:32 beginning [1] - 12:38 **BEGINS** [1] - 1:7 behalf [1] - 18:6 believes [1] - 18:17 belonging [1] - 17:47 below [2] - 1:41, 8:7 benefit [2] - 16:39, 18.1 best [6] - 10:6, 10:20, 12:14, 22:39, 24:22, better [5] - 6:31, 22:35, 23:1, 27:43, 29:6 between [6] - 7:43, 8:1, 22:24, 23:8, 31:33, 37:8 bill [1] - 13:24 bit [14] - 2:30, 2:32, 2:38, 7:26, 8:26, 10:11, 10:14, 13:1, 13:2, 13:31, 14:8, 14:16, 23:23, 28:3 Blakes [1] - 28:45

blanket [2] - 33:24,

bloc [4] - 5:5, 5:28,

blocking [2] - 4:12,

blocks [1] - 34:30

blunt [2] - 33:15,

bodies [1] - 1:17

13:7, 29:25

borrowings [1] -

bottom [5] - 7:29,

7:32, 7:34, 8:14,

bought [1] - 12:17

bouncing [1] - 8:47

box [2] - 39:11, 39:12

breakage [2] - 21:46,

bound [2] - 10:18,

BRANDT [1] - 21:6

break [2] - 30:43,

briefly [1] - 36:24

bring [1] - 32:22

British [1] - 39:28

brought [2] - 33:18,

book [4] - 3:42, 3:44,

bookings [1] - 21:34

borrowing [1] - 11:18

6:31. 28:19

34:28

35:41

33:38

30:30

13:34

11:20

38:23

22:12

38:41

C

Brunswick [4] - 15:19,

15:28, 16:29, 17:14

Brunswick's [1] - 16:4

build-out [1] - 32:24

building [1] - 34:30

bundled [1] - 25:31

Business [1] - 4:10

business [23] - 1:47,

8:32. 8:34. 8:36.

2:36, 3:31, 4:2, 7:35,

7:36, 8:4, 8:16, 8:29,

8:44, 9:3, 9:6, 9:11,

9:47, 21:37, 24:29,

25:42, 37:10, 37:13,

business-effective [1]

businesses [1] -

Byma[1] - 38:34

buy [1] - 6:35

bunch [2] - 3:38,

29:19

37:17

- 9.47

20:19

build [1] - 32:24

calculated [1] - 25:18 Canada [1] - 39:28 Canadian [1] - 7:37 cannot [2] - 26:23 capacity [1] - 10:1 care [1] - 16:27 careless [1] - 15:35 carried [1] - 27:15 carry [3] - 20:27, 25:11, 26:10 case [18] - 4:19, 13:18, 13:43, 14:1, 14:15, 14:32, 16:19, 16:35, 17:25, 17:32, 17:33, 18:26, 19:8, 19:14, 19:15, 26:1, 26:11, 38:35 cases [4] - 4:19, 13:1, 14:4, 16:15 cash [4] - 7:38, 8:5, 8:17, 11:14 caused [2] - 20:13, 20:16 cautiously [1] - 26:4 caveats [1] - 26:5 **CCAA**[3] - 11:12, 16:29, 36:11 certain [2] - 15:28, 25:30 certainly [1] - 12:16 certainty [3] - 15:12, 26:28, 26:29 certificate [1] - 11:18

39:25 certify [1] - 39:29 cetera [1] - 35:24 CFO [3] - 34:19, 34:22, 35:28 chambers [3] - 15:42, 39:19 change [4] - 4:18, 22:34, 33:34, 37:4 changed [1] - 31:6 changing [1] - 35:12 characteristics [1] -17:24 charge [5] - 30:14, 30:23, 30:26, 30:29, 30:30 charged [1] - 10:33 charges [4] - 30:25, 30:27, 30:28, 30:31 chart [2] - 1:19, 1:32 cheaper [1] - 27:37 check [3] - 21:10, 21:15, 21:29 Chek [1] - 4:3 cheque [1] - 11:33 cheques [9] - 3:19, 7:14, 7:23, 7:46, 8:19, 8:47, 9:33, 23:5, 23:6 choose [3] - 18:10, 34:4, 34:5 chooses [2] - 18:5, 18:16 choosing [1] - 34:9 chose [2] - 18:11, 18:16 choses [5] - 17:40, 17:43. 18:4. 18:28. 18:31 Choses [1] - 17:47 circumstances [5] -3:36, 4:16, 12:2, 28:35, 38:13 city [1] - 29:6 City [1] - 4:13 claim [3] - 18:5, 18:22, 31:43 claiming [1] - 4:11 claims [10] - 15:2, 15:20, 16:4, 17:26, 17:41, 18:14, 18:38, 18:39, 18:41, 31:38 classic [1] - 20:18 clause [1] - 19:2 clear [3] - 3:16, 10:45, 16:47 Clerk [1] - 39:16 **CLERK** [1] - 39:19 client [3] - 10:16,

CERTIFICATION[1] -

12:16, 31:25 client's [2] - 10:37, 30:27 clients [1] - 15:33 cloaked [1] - 30:1 close [1] - 4:46 CMI [1] - 13:6 CMI's [1] - 13:37 CNSL [175] - 1:10, 1:16, 1:22, 1:26, 1:40, 1:45, 2:1, 2:3, 2:7, 2:11, 2:12, 2:15, 2:17, 2:18, 2:19, 2:21, 2:23, 3:5, 3:7, 3:10, 3:13, 3:15, 3:23, 3:28, 3:41, 3:43, 3:46, 4:39, 4:41, 4:43, 4:46, 5:2, 5:12, 5:14, 5:22, 5:27, 5:31, 6:9, 6:13, 6:31, 6:35, 7:18, 7:22, 7:34, 7:37, 7:45, 8:9, 8:12, 8:16, 9:44, 10:2, 10:6, 10:36, 10:41, 10:43, 11:4, 11:7, 11:10, 11:17, 11:25, 11:36, 11:41, 12:1, 12:6, 12:11, 12:20, 12:26, 12:29, 12:31, 12:41, 12:47, 13:6, 13:10, 13:12, 13:17, 19:33, 19:36, 20:23, 20:26, 20:41, 20:44, 20:46, 21:4, 21:6, 21:8, 21:18, 21:21, 21:23, 21:27, 23:3, 23:6, 23:20, 26:19, 28:42, 29:11, 29:16, 29:19, 29:23, 29:25, 29:27, 29:29, 29:31, 29:36, 29:39, 29:44, 29:46, 30:3, 30:7, 30:29, 30:35, 30:39, 30:42, 30:46, 31:1, 31:3, 31:6, 31:10, 31:13, 31:16, 31:20, 31:31, 31:36, 32:1, 32:3, 32:8, 32:13, 32:16, 32:29, 32:35, 32:37, 33:9, 34:15, 34:40, 34:42, 34:46, 35:8, 35:10, 35:18, 35:26, 35:35, 35:38, 35:43, 35:45, 36:15, 36:18, 36:20, 36:22, 36:27, 36:33, 36:35, 36:38, 36:42, 37:14, 37:16, 37:19, 37:27, 37:29, 37:41, 37:47, 38:4,

38:16, 38:21, 38:23, 38:26, 38:27, 38:29, 38:34, 38:38, 38:43, 39:1, 39:5, 39:9, 39:10, 39:11, 39:13 coin [1] - 31:29 collateral [6] - 8:45, 9:1, 9:7, 19:43, 24:29, 27:26 **colleagues** [2] - 1:11, 6:14 collectively [2] -14:27, 23:8 **Colliers** [5] - 4:31, 5:10, 5:18, 6:5, 6:32 Columbia [1] - 39:28 Columnist [1] - 4:3 combination [1] -21:37 comfort [1] - 9:10 **coming** [1] - 3:8 commence [1] - 32:45 COMMENCED[1] -1:6 commenced [2] -15:3, 16:6 commencing [1] -31:40 comment [1] - 27:40 comments [1] - 17:38 commissioned [1] -13:26 community [5] - 5:34, 5:41, 33:40, 33:41, 33:44 companies [1] - 20:19 company [7] - 1:36, 1:46, 14:20, 18:39, 32:35, 34:19, 37:38 compared [1] - 22:29 comparison [2] -23:17, 23:24 competing [1] - 17:25 complaint [1] - 35:39 complete [23] - 3:33, 6:13, 19:27, 20:4, 20:40, 23:43, 24:10, 24:17, 24:41, 24:44, 25:21, 25:23, 25:25, 26:37, 26:45, 27:3, 27:5, 27:13, 27:14, 27:44, 28:12, 35:42, 39:33 completed [1] - 25:12 completely [3] - 2:1, 15:28, 34:21 **component** [1] - 5:35 **components** [1] - 5:35 compounded [1] -15:8

comprehend [1] contentious [2] -26:20 17:30, 26:11 comprehensive [2] contested [1] - 8:37 24:18, 24:24 context [8] - 15:44, concede [1] - 30:1 16:28, 16:32, 17:28, conceivable [1] -18:23, 18:45, 25:25, 17:13 28:15 continue [2] - 8:42, concept [3] - 12:17, 28:8, 34:22 9:3 concern [12] - 4:20, continues [1] - 20:35 6:27, 8:38, 8:40, continuing [3] - 6:14, 10:27, 10:38, 11:1, 16:23, 32:13 18:27, 22:17, 22:36, contracted [1] - 17:5 25:34, 36:23 **contractual** [1] - 25:15 concerning [2] - 5:42, contrary [1] - 25:15 16:2 contributing [1] concerns [8] - 4:25, 21:39 6:20, 6:43, 8:35, control [2] - 25:27, 12:24, 18:25, 21:38, 34:30 25:36 controlled [1] - 24:13 condensed [6] - 3:42, convenience [1] -3:44, 4:23, 7:16, 25:19 20:42, 29:25 convenient [1] - 16:11 condition [1] - 38:43 converse [1] - 3:14 conduct [3] - 14:46, convince [1] - 35:13 35:37, 36:1 cooperation [1] - 5:45 **conference** [1] - 38:35 copy [1] - 4:28 confidence [1] - 9:17 correct [1] - 39:33 conflict [3] - 5:37, corrected [1] - 2:12 35:34, 37:8 correctly [1] - 2:11 conflicting [2] - 14:1, cost [6] - 8:30, 9:19, 14:9 27:20, 27:30, 28:4, conflicts [4] - 6:1, 33:25 14:13, 15:38, 15:43 costs [9] - 9:30, 11:23, confusion [1] - 3:17 11:39, 24:47, 27:18, Connecticut [1] - 15:3 27:24, 27:32, 34:11, connection [1] - 15:21 35:20 consensus [1] - 21:35 counsel [10] - 15:31, consent [4] - 18:42, 28:40, 29:5, 29:8, 19:10, 34:46, 35:1 29:33, 29:37, 29:40, consequences [1] -30:11, 30:15, 30:20 34:27 counting [1] - 36:14 consider [1] - 29:2 couple [4] - 1:16, considerable [1] -8:33, 13:1, 26:40 15:32 course [18] - 3:2, 3:46, considerations [1] -6:40, 9:21, 9:25, 16:18 9:27, 10:9, 16:14, considers [1] - 18:31 19:11, 20:10, 21:46, consistent [1] - 14:3 22:7, 22:17, 22:33, constitute [1] - 14:28 24:42, 25:28, 27:23, consultants [1] -33:42 27:33 courses [1] - 22:14 contact [1] - 21:32 Court [2] - 13:40, 15:3 contemplate [4] court [42] - 9:18, 25:16, 29:31, 30:10, 12:23, 12:42, 13:31, 14:24. 15:25. 16:14. 30.18 17:21, 17:23, 17:27, contemplated [3] -17:28, 17:36, 17:44, 26:7, 28:40, 29:9

18:8, 18:20, 18:33,

18:43, 19:5, 19:16,

contemplates [1] -

19:4

33:31, 34:35, 35:23, 36:7, 37:19, 37:21, 37:40, 37:44, 37:46, 38:1 COURT [157] - 1:9, 1:15, 1:21, 1:25, 1:39, 1:44, 2:6, 2:9, 2:14, 2:16, 2:20, 2:22, 3:4, 3:6, 3:9, 3:11, 3:14, 3:22, 3:27, 3:40, 3:42, 3:45, 4:38, 4:40, 4:42, 4:45, 5:1, 5:10, 5:13, 5:21, 5:25, 5:30, 6:8, 6:12, 6:30, 6:33, 7:17, 7:21, 7:33, 7:36, 7:44, 8:8, 8:11, 8:15, 9:42, 9:45, 10:3, 10:27, 10:37, 10:42, 10:44, 11:6, 11:9, 11:16, 11:24, 11:35, 11:37, 11:47, 12:5, 12:10, 12:19, 12:25, 12:28, 12:30, 12:40, 12:46, 13:5, 13:9, 13:11, 13:16, 19:32, 19:35, 20:22, 20:25, 20:45, 21:20, 21:22, 21:25, 22:47, 23:4, 23:19, 26:18, 28:39, 29:7, 29:15, 29:17, 29:22, 29:24, 29:26, 29:28, 29:30, 29:35, 29:38, 29:42, 29:45, 30:27, 30:34, 30:38, 30:40, 30:45, 30:47, 31:2, 31:5, 31:9, 31:12, 31:15, 31:18, 31:30, 31:35, 31:45, 32:2, 32:7, 32:12, 32:15, 32:28, 32:32, 32:36, 33:8, 34:14, 34:41, 34:44, 35:5, 35:9, 35:15, 35:19, 35:32, 35:36, 35:39, 35:44, 36:11, 36:16, 36:19, 36:21, 36:23, 36:29, 36:34, 36:37, 36:41, 37:7, 37:15, 37:18, 37:22, 37:28, 37:30, 37:42, 38:3, 38:14, 38:20, 38:22, 38:25, 38:28, 38:32, 38:40, 38:47, 39:3, 39:6, 39.15 court's [4] - 10:42,

19:17, 19:40, 24:2, 23:47, 24:26, 27:38 26:9, 26:15, 26:34, court-appointed [2] -26:38, 27:45, 28:34, 17:23, 26:9 28:46, 29:9, 30:30, court-ordered [1] -30:30 courts [1] - 19:23 court's [1] - 18:20 cover[1] - 11:38 **CPC** [7] - 30:41, 30:46, 38:30, 38:41, 38:44, 39:4, 39:7 create [1] - 33:39 creditor [5] - 8:46, 13:19, 14:19, 14:28, 17:4 creditors [5] - 7:11, 16:40, 18:2, 18:43, 23:42 cribbed [1] - 29:21 **crisis** [1] - 7:3 critical [1] - 21:45 cross [1] - 15:40 cross-examination [1] - 15:40 current [3] - 6:43, 7:14, 23:11 cut [3] - 11:3, 11:33, 11:40 D d) [1] - 24:37

Daily [1] - 4:3 daily [2] - 20:34, 22:27 damage [1] - 20:16 damages [1] - 31:42 **Dan** [1] - 34:19 Darcus [1] - 38:38 date [3] - 6:10, 22:22, 38:46 dated [1] - 4:31 day-to-day [1] - 10:4 days [2] - 7:25, 15:41 deadlines [1] - 38:45 deadlock [1] - 19:44 deal [6] - 24:41, 28:10, 28:13, 28:37, 33:37, 38:34 dealing [1] - 19:46 deals [3] - 23:44, 24:10, 29:17 debt [4] - 24:35, 30:32, 31:31, 31:36 debtor [6] - 14:20, 15:26, 18:39, 18:42, 36:13 debtors [2] - 13:20, 19:9 debtors' [1] - 24:37 debts [1] - 15:7

decide [1] - 14:10 decided [2] - 10:22, 23:16 decides [3] - 12:13, 33:29, 36:8 decision [3] - 13:6, 14:24, 15:44 default [1] - 14:37 deferred [1] - 2:46 delay [4] - 27:16, 28:1, delivered [2] - 5:18, 20:41 demand [1] - 32:43 describe [1] - 14:40 described [2] - 1:19, 23:27 detail [2] - 14:16, 15:32 deteriorating[1] -17:3 determination [1] -19:13 determinative[1] -10:9 determine [3] - 37:35, 37:37, 37:38 determined [2] -19:12, 31:42 **determines** [1] - 18:31 determining [1] -37:11 devalued [1] - 9:8 develop [2] - 10:17, 10:25 developer [2] - 4:11, 5:42 development [6] -5:34. 5:38. 5:40. 5:45, 7:45, 24:16 development's [1] -1:43 developments [1] -8:2 Developments [5] -1:35, 1:38, 5:24, 7:19, 7:27 different [6] - 5:25, 5:26, 12:3, 30:1, 37:2, 37:3 differently [1] - 33:30 difficulty [1] - 26:22 dire [1] - 20:5 direct [1] - 28:35 direction [1] - 18:20 directions [1] - 17:29 disagree [1] - 21:1 discern [1] - 18:4 discharged [1] - 33:35 discretion [1] - 24:25

discussed [1] - 30:3 discussion [1] - 16:7 disingenuous [1] -34:37 dispute [7] - 3:35, 4:13, 4:15, 14:29, 14:36, 15:17, 16:3 disputed [1] - 14:1 disputes [8] - 6:34, 13:30, 15:45, 17:26, 17:35, 19:44, 26:12, 28:29 dissimilar [1] - 16:35 distinction [1] - 31:33 distract [1] - 24:31 distress [1] - 2:40 distribution [5] -19:31, 25:14, 29:18, 30:18, 30:19 dive [1] - 13:2 divert [1] - 22:13 document [1] - 7:22 documentation [1] -25:38 dollars [1] - 33:26 done [5] - 19:24, 21:11, 22:43, 32:43, 37.2 doubt [1] - 11:43 down [16] - 4:29, 5:7, 5:31, 6:47, 7:2, 7:11, 8:9, 8:24, 21:1, 26:16, 27:40, 29:21, 29:36, 30:10, 39:20 downturn [1] - 21:39 draft [1] - 30:24 drive [1] - 21:47 drops [1] - 21:33 due [3] - 3:19, 15:7, 25:2 duplicative [1] - 24:30 during [3] - 24:7, 25:34, 27:27 **duties** [1] - 26:10

Ε

early [4] - 7:8, 14:8, 22:40, 23:13 ease [1] - 1:30 equivocal [1] - 2:27 easier [1] - 13:13 **especially** [1] - 28:12 easily [1] - 19:22 **essence** [1] - 35:15 eastbound [1] - 22:47 establishes [1] - 14:2 easy [1] - 18:9 et [1] - 35:24 **EBMD**[4] - 1:34, 1:41, event [4] - 11:44, 1:43. 1:45 Ecoasis [8] - 1:35, evidence [33] - 2:27, 1:37, 5:24, 5:37, 5:43, 5:47, 6:20, 7:27

economic [2] - 16:46, 21:38 effective [1] - 9:47 effectively [2] - 12:14, 19:16 efficient [1] - 12:13 eight [2] - 4:38, 4:39 either [2] - 27:2, 35:29 Either [1] - 17:17 element [1] - 31:47 eliminate [1] - 6:19 **employees**[1] - 19:45 en [4] - 5:5, 5:28, 6:31, 28:19 encyclopedia[1] -20:29 end [4] - 2:21, 4:46, 21:19, 22:9 ends [1] - 8:45 enforcement [3] -23:42, 24:8, 25:44 engage [2] - 29:32, 29:40 engaged [1] - 28:44 engagement [1] -30.10 engaging [1] - 6:5 **engineers** [1] - 27:33 ensues [1] - 25:13 ensure [10] - 9:7, 9:8, 9:14, 9:34, 12:23, 20:21, 21:12, 24:11, 25:29, 27:27 ensures [1] - 24:45 enterprise [3] - 2:35, 14:18. 20:1 entirely [2] - 27:35, 28:13 entirety [1] - 6:19 entities [2] - 1:23, 1:28 entitlements [1] -25:15 enumerates [1] - 1:30 equipment [5] - 13:20, 20:15, 20:16, 22:19, 22:37 equity [3] - 16:30,

16:44, 17:15

28:45, 37:31, 38:15

2:39, 2:41, 3:34, 6:6,

6:44, 8:22, 8:39,

9:17, 10:8, 11:42,

14:2, 14:9, 14:13,

15:31, 15:39, 15:40,

19:39, 20:37, 21:4,

21:5, 22:40, 22:44,

23:11, 23:33, 25:6,

25:7, 26:25, 27:41,

34:15, 34:20, 35:44

exact [3] - 6:10, 6:45,

exactly [2] - 11:5,

examination [1] -

example [2] - 20:18,

exceed [1] - 14:35

EXCERPT [2] - 1:4,

excused [1] - 38:31

execute [1] - 6:21

exercise [1] - 35:4

Exhibit [5] - 4:10,

exhibits [1] - 4:6

existing [4] - 9:24,

exists [1] - 27:43

expect [1] - 7:6

expenditure [2] -

16:23, 16:31

2:44, 24:46

expand [4] - 19:37,

expected [1] - 20:11

expenses [3] - 2:43,

explaining [1] - 15:33

exposes [1] - 24:32

exposure [1] - 20:36

expressed [1] - 8:37

extensive [1] - 15:39

extensively [1] - 4:17

33:36, 35:30, 36:15

9:31, 11:13, 15:24

7:16, 7:42, 8:4, 8:18

27:1

23:10

15:40

35:26

Faced [1] - 15:39 facie [1] - 18:29 facilitate [2] - 16:37, 17.18 facilitating [1] - 24:46 facilities [1] - 21:33 fact [7] - 8:47, 9:25, 11:41, 12:22, 26:6, 28:14, 32:5 factor [1] - 21:44 factors [4] - 12:45, 23:16, 23:18, 23:23 facts [4] - 13:3, 13:37, 13:47, 19:15

factual [1] - 17:26 failed [1] - 22:4 failure [1] - 20:12 fair [3] - 6:27, 11:4, 12:2 fairly [2] - 9:40, 29:2 faith [1] - 15:36 fall [3] - 7:8, 22:40, 23:13 fallout [1] - 19:47 familiar [1] - 28:46 far [4] - 1:33, 4:6, 7:10, 19:38 fashion [1] - 22:35 fast [1] - 26:21 faster [2] - 26:45, 27:2 **fatal** [1] - 33:3 favour [3] - 16:18, 17:12, 25:42 fear [1] - 25:35 feasible [1] - 27:35 fee/cart [1] - 21:11 fees [1] - 30:15 fees/carts [1] - 22:26 fell [1] - 29:28 FERRIS [16] - 2:1, 2:11, 2:18, 21:4, 21:18, 30:3, 30:42, 30:46, 31:1, 31:3, 31:6, 31:10, 38:38, 38:43, 39:1, 39:5 Ferris [3] - 2:10, 2:30, 36.2 Ferris's [1] - 10:37 few [1] - 25:20 fewer [1] - 1:17 fide [1] - 35:37 fights [1] - 39:9 figure [1] - 28:29

extraordinary [3] filed [2] - 4:8, 34:47 26:3, 26:8 files [1] - 38:41 filing [1] - 9:12 F final [1] - 28:24 finalized [1] - 20:42 Finance [1] - 14:5 finances [2] - 6:44, 34:20 financial [6] - 2:28, 2:40. 4:15. 15:8. 20:5, 22:42 financially [1] - 3:35 financing [8] - 10:32, 11:14, 11:15, 11:17, 11:40, 11:43, 12:4, 28:10 **findings** [1] - 36:1 fine [4] - 4:21, 8:23,

figured [1] - 3:6

file [1] - 34:47

30:38, 33:9 finish [1] - 6:23 first [10] - 3:6, 3:31, 4:7, 4:35, 16:47, 17:39, 18:29, 30:20, 34:6, 34:47 firstly [1] - 37:35 five [2] - 4:28, 7:25 fix [1] - 35:29 fixed [1] - 33:17 flabbergasted [1] -10:22 flaws [1] - 33:3 flip [3] - 7:42, 13:13, 31:29 flipping [1] - 8:18 flooding [1] - 20:13 floored [1] - 10:22 flows [1] - 11:14 fluid [1] - 28:25 focus [1] - 2:32 focusses [1] - 24:28 foisting [1] - 27:37 following [2] - 15:9, 16.18 forget [1] - 3:31 forms [1] - 27:21 forth [1] - 7:43 forum [2] - 17:34, 19:13 forward [5] - 5:8, 5:9, 6:6, 33:28, 36:47 four [1] - 4:29 fraudulent [1] - 14:44 free [2] - 8:17, 17:21 Free [1] - 4:3 frequency [1] - 21:47 friend [4] - 10:13, 22:20, 28:3, 34:36 friend's [1] - 11:5 friends [3] - 28:23, 29:10, 29:47 friends' [1] - 38:36 FROM [1] - 1:4 front [2] - 33:10, 34:15 fulcrum [1] - 17:4 full [15] - 3:47, 17:2, 19:17, 27:36, 28:39, 29:12, 33:13, 33:38, 33:45, 34:11, 34:25, 35:20, 35:24, 37:26, 37:32 fund [6] - 10:28, 10:33, 11:3, 16:31, 18:10, 32:38 funded [1] - 25:33 funding [16] - 9:35, 9:36, 10:47, 23:38, 23:44, 24:11, 24:46, 26:26, 27:13, 27:27,

32:10, 32:25, 32:28, 32:31, 32:33, 32:35 funds [8] - 11:28, 16:23, 16:26, 17:15, 20:20, 24:6, 24:38, 35:37 future [2] - 33:20,

G

33:37

gap [3] - 27:13, 27:14 general [8] - 2:2, 2:4, 2:6, 2:8, 2:9, 20:39, 21:32, 21:35 generally [1] - 9:22 generate [2] - 25:1, 32:38 genuinely [1] - 34:40 given [9] - 5:36, 9:17, 10:8, 12:35, 19:23, 21:13, 23:40, 26:2 glad [2] - 3:15, 37:22 glance [1] - 34:6 **goal** [5] - 36:43, 36:45, 36:46. 37:4. 38:9 goals [3] - 32:27, 32:42, 37:6 golf [9] - 9:21, 9:24, 9:26, 20:9, 21:34, 21:36, 25:28, 27:22, 33:41 goods [1] - 13:25 goodwill [1] - 3:24 **GP**[1] - 2:13 grant [3] - 12:42, 31:39, 32:18 granted [2] - 26:4, 37:32 great [2] - 22:36, 22:38 greater [1] - 27:30 greatest [2] - 10:3, 16:46 green [2] - 21:10, 22:26 ground [1] - 33:14 group [1] - 5:37 GSAs [1] - 25:40 guarantors [1] - 1:26 guess [3] - 13:15, 27:16, 36:23

Н

h) [1] - 25:45 halfway [1] - 8:9 hall [1] - 1:12 hammer [1] - 33:23

guy [1] - 10:19

13:10 handing [1] - 12:18 handle [1] - 38:38 handy [1] - 1:28 happily [1] - 19:23 happy [3] - 11:31, 11:33, 33:9 hard [2] - 4:20, 38:44 harder [1] - 28:15 harked [1] - 2:37 harm [3] - 23:27, 23:39. 23:41 harming [1] - 8:42 harping [1] - 3:7 hear [4] - 31:39, 32:18, 37:24, 39:7 heard [5] - 6:45, 10:13, 12:37, 15:41, 34:32 hearing [1] - 32:11 heat [1] - 21:37 held [1] - 1:42 help[1] - 2:31 helpful [2] - 31:19, 38:30 hereby [1] - 39:29 hereunto [1] - 39:37 Hiebert [4] - 1:20, 6:23, 20:24, 20:26 HIEBERT [1] - 20:41 high [1] - 35:34 high-conflict [1] -35:34 highest [1] - 22:28 himself [1] - 23:12 **hmm** [4] - 8:15, 31:30, 32:12, 34:14 hold [1] - 4:20 holding [1] - 3:19 holes [2] - 20:17, 22:6 hope [2] - 16:43, 21:2 hopefully [1] - 37:29 hour [2] - 2:25, 30:36 HSBC [2] - 30:22, 30:24 **HSBC's** [2] - 30:26, 30:33

handed [2] - 7:13,

idea [5] - 4:17, 25:17, 27:4, 32:37, 33:6 identified [1] - 32:38 ignored [1] - 39:13 ignoring [1] - 14:13 imagine [1] - 18:9 immaterial [1] - 14:13 immediate [2] - 7:3, 26:13

31:46 impaired [1] - 18:13 imperfect [1] - 32:26 implication [1] - 22:43 importance [1] - 17:25 important [7] - 6:34, 9:27, 15:44, 15:45, 22:27, 25:7, 39:1 improvements [1] -22:42 IN [1] - 39:37 include [1] - 15:27 includes [3] - 12:11, 17:43. 37:33 including [10] - 2:35, 2:44, 8:43, 11:27, 23:31, 24:7, 24:29, 24:39, 29:33, 30:32 incomplete [1] - 23:29 inconsistent [1] -30:17 increase [2] - 20:35, 22:3 incremental [4] - 8:30, 9:19, 27:24, 36:21 incrementally [1] -27:30 incurred [1] - 20:32 indebtedness [1] -1:27 independent [1] - 18:7 induced [1] - 14:44 informed [1] - 27:45 infrastructure [1] -9:31 inherent [1] - 27:16 initial [2] - 16:7, 30:12 initiate [2] - 26:35, 26:41 inject [1] - 16:30 input [2] - 24:1, 24:24 insignificant [1] -16:44 insolvency [2] - 19:23, 39:7 insolvent [1] - 15:6 installed [1] - 22:1 instead [3] - 30:13, 33:15, 37:30 instrument [3] -

25:46, 33:16, 33:38

insufficient [1] - 2:43

insurance [3] - 24:10,

24:12, 24:40

insure [1] - 20:7

intense [1] - 21:37

interest [2] - 1:40,

intention [1] - 30:40

immediately [1] - 6:45

impact [2] - 23:34,

13:22 interested [3] - 18:12, 18:17, 18:21 interesting [1] - 38:20 interests [2] - 1:37, 1.42 interim [1] - 16:7 internal [1] - 6:33 invariable [1] - 21:47 investigate [1] - 18:3 investing [1] - 14:47 investor [1] - 17:15 involved [3] - 13:19, 24:13, 29:4 involvement [1] -34:17 involves [1] - 27:33 involving [2] - 17:25, 19:9 Irene [1] - 3:37 irreparable [3] - 23:26, 23:38, 23:41 irrespective [1] -28:11 Island [1] - 4:3 issue [2] - 1:13, 12:39 issued [1] - 32:46 issues [9] - 14:14, 16:1, 17:30, 17:39, 18:36, 19:18, 28:12, 31:22, 31:24 itself [2] - 15:28, 24:47

J

Jackson [2] - 1:9, 31:21 JACKSON [109] - 1:10, 1:16, 1:22, 1:26, 1:40, 1:45, 2:3, 2:7, 2:12, 2:15, 2:17, 2:19, 2:21, 2:23, 3:5, 3:7, 3:10, 3:13, 3:15, 3:23, 3:28, 3:41, 3:43, 3:46, 4:39, 4:41, 4:43, 4:46, 5:2, 5:12, 5:14, 5:22, 5:27, 5:31, 6:9, 6:13, 6:31, 6:35, 7:18, 7:22, 7:34, 7:37, 7:45, 8:9, 8:12, 8:16, 9:44, 10:2, 10:6, 10:36, 10:41, 10:43, 11:4, 11:7, 11:10, 11:17, 11:25, 11:36, 11:41, 12:1, 12:6, 12:11, 12:20, 12:26, 12:29, 12:31, 12:41, 12:47, 13:6, 13:10, 13:12, 13:17, 19:33,

19:36, 20:23, 20:26, 20:44, 20:46, 21:8, 21:21, 21:23, 21:27, 23:3, 23:6, 23:20, 26:19, 28:42, 29:11, 29:16, 29:19, 29:23, 29:25, 29:27, 29:29, 29:31, 29:36, 29:39, 29:44, 29:46, 30:7, 30:29, 30:35, 30:39, 34:40, 34:42, 38:27, 38:29, 39:10, 39:13 January [2] - 22:25, 22:29 jeopardized [1] - 25:3 job [1] - 36:27 joint [2] - 4:23, 13:7 judicial [1] - 24:43 July [10] - 21:15, 21:19, 21:29, 21:34, 21:40, 22:5, 22:22, 22:23, 22:25, 22:29 jumped [1] - 29:33 June [1] - 21:36 Justice [23] - 1:10, 1:18, 2:23, 4:22, 6:40, 9:37, 13:16, 13:29, 13:43, 16:9, 19:25, 19:34, 21:21, 23:22, 26:16, 27:46, 28:43, 30:35, 30:43, 31:13, 34:40, 38:27, 39:14 justified [1] - 12:34

K

keep [2] - 16:26, 21:23 keeping [2] - 9:31, 22:45 kind [2] - 6:36, 10:38 knots [1] - 12:7 knowledge [1] - 10:3 knows [1] - 34:28 Kusumoto [9] - 8:37, 10:7, 26:30, 32:21, 34:18, 34:20, 36:5, 36:7

L

land [3] - 10:23, 10:24, 19:17 landed [1] - 19:16 lands [24] - 6:29, 11:21, 11:33, 11:44, 15:12, 19:41, 23:32, 23:33, 23:34, 24:19, 24:23, 24:28, 24:33, 24:42, 25:9, 25:30,

25:41, 26:23, 26:24, 26:32, 27:22, 30:23, 36:43, 36:46 Langford [1] - 4:13 language [1] - 30:12 languishes [1] - 24:30 larger [2] - 3:47, 33:41 Larocque [2] - 20:38, 20:46 Larocque's [1] - 20:39 last [11] - 3:18, 9:43, 13:13, 13:14, 13:34, 13:35, 21:16, 21:31, 22:9, 34:42, 38:40 law [1] - 10:45 lawsuits [5] - 4:8, 14:21, 17:20, 39:4, 39:5 lean [1] - 8:40 leap [1] - 36:26 least [3] - 7:7, 26:31, 34:6 leave [6] - 17:20, 18:42, 19:10, 29:10, 37:9 leaves [2] - 23:45, 25:21 leaving [2] - 25:5, 39:12 Lee [1] - 3:37 left [5] - 1:33, 2:23, 2:26, 7:34, 19:46 12:26 lemon [1] - 13:25 lend [1] - 11:27

legal [3] - 1:23, 9:38, lender [3] - 16:28, 31:34, 31:37 length [2] - 26:17, 27:2 less [3] - 2:25, 26:8, 27:22 liabilities [1] - 23:31 liability [1] - 31:41 lift [1] - 18:44 light [1] - 9:22 lights [1] - 22:46 likelihood [1] - 27:39 likely [1] - 17:21 limited [7] - 2:2, 32:30, 33:11, 33:19, 33:32, 38:10, 38:15

limited-purpose [2] -

7:34, 13:34, 29:36

lines [2] - 4:28, 4:29

14:23, 14:47, 15:19,

Lionsbridge [5] -

16:5, 18:46

33:32, 38:10

line [5] - 5:7, 7:26,

liquidity [1] - 24:6 list [2] - 1:22, 1:29 listening [1] - 30:7 litigation [7] - 14:41, 15:22, 15:24, 17:22, 19:21, 28:30, 29:3 LLP [6] - 1:38, 2:12, 2:14, 2:15, 2:21, 5:24 loggerheads [1] -34:34 logic [1] - 5:39 long-term [1] - 33:47 longer-term [1] -32:16 look [15] - 4:34, 7:26, 7:34, 7:40, 9:5, 9:32, 9:33, 9:46, 13:33, 21:3, 29:21, 34:36, 37:24, 37:25, 37:37 looked [1] - 36:23 looking [1] - 37:11 looks [2] - 28:20, 37:19

M

loss [1] - 22:5

lost [1] - 28:23

m'mm [4] - 8:15, 31:30, 32:12, 34:14 m'mm-hmm [4] - 8:15, 31:30, 32:12, 34:14 machine [1] - 13:24 Macintosh [2] - 13:16, 13:29 Madam [1] - 39:16 37:39 maintain [5] - 12:14, 20:7, 22:18, 30:4, 30.5 34:20 maintains [1] - 14:43 maintenance [3] -16:27, 22:36, 24:39 27:39 majority [2] - 14:22, 14:43 8:16 mala [1] - 35:37 manage [3] - 8:29, 8:32, 25:30 managed [1] - 1:20 management [2] -9:23, 9:32 manager [5] - 1:36, 26:28 8:31, 9:5, 20:39, 25:39 managers [2] - 21:32, 21:35 25:10 manages [3] - 1:46, 1:47, 2:7 managing [6] - 1:44,

2:4, 2:16, 2:17, 2:18,

27:22 mandated [1] - 9:14 manner [3] - 24:36, 37:2, 37:3 Maple [6] - 12:44, 14:4, 14:11, 16:15, 23:15, 23:23 mark [1] - 35:6 market [3] - 6:26, 11:30, 30:4 market's [1] - 6:20 marketing [9] - 4:30, 5:9, 16:38, 29:42, 29:46, 30:13, 30:19, 35:3, 35:9 Marketing [2] - 4:44, Marsal [1] - 28:44 MasterCard [4] - 7:31, 7:38, 8:1, 8:13 material [3] - 15:38, 22:35, 31:43 materials [5] - 1:29, 3:38, 26:6, 26:20, 36:24 math [1] - 23:10 matter [1] - 39:8 matters [1] - 17:18 Matthews [24] - 4:27, 5:9. 5:11. 6:7. 7:3. 8:38. 9:26. 10:1. 10:27. 11:41. 20:37. 22:32, 23:12, 25:27, 25:30, 26:47, 28:8, 28:36, 35:40, 36:6, 37:9, 37:12, 37:16, Matthews' [5] - 8:22, 22:40, 22:44, 24:22, maximize [1] - 4:32 maximizing [1] -MC [3] - 7:35, 7:36, mean [10] - 8:43, 10:35, 10:36, 11:12, 12:1, 13:18, 25:45, 30:27, 32:10, 35:41 meaning [1] - 31:43 meaningful [1] - 5:33 means [3] - 24:28, meant [2] - 3:3, 22:13 mechanism [1] media [1] - 3:37 medium [4] - 32:10, 32:13, 32:17, 32:20

medium-term [4] -

32:10, 32:13, 32:17, 32:20 meet [3] - 23:2, 25:2, 25:10 members [1] - 33:41 membership [1] -33:47 mentioned [1] - 28:42 mentions [1] - 4:9 merit [1] - 28:36 mess [1] - 14:18 mid [4] - 21:10, 21:14, 21:29, 37:6 mid-month [2] -21:14, 21:29 mid-term [1] - 37:6 middle [1] - 33:14 might [16] - 1:12, 4:19, 5:38, 10:27, 11:7, 12:6, 18:4, 18:10, 18:12, 18:13, 18:20, 18:27, 37:25, 37:28, 38:17, 38:18 mill [1] - 9:21 million [8] - 2:46, 3:5, 6:46, 7:12, 14:34, 14:35, 14:47, 23:7 millions [1] - 33:26 mind [1] - 31:23 mine [6] - 15:10, 15:13, 16:24, 16:27, 16:39, 17:16 mine's [1] - 16:2 minimize [2] - 9:30, 34:4 minimizes [2] - 34:6, 34:9 mining [3] - 14:18, 14:20 minute [2] - 13:11, 29:26 minutes [1] - 30:44 misapprehension [2] - 10:12, 10:15 misrepresentations [1] - 14:45 missed[1] - 2:3mistake [1] - 3:17 misuse [1] - 35:37 mitigate [4] - 34:3, 34:4, 38:17, 38:19 mitigates [1] - 38:12 mitigation [1] - 35:4 mode [1] - 16:27 model [7] - 12:22, 17:43, 18:6, 18:41, 19:3, 29:20, 30:9 moment [1] - 22:47 monetization [1] -23:46

monetize [2] - 24:19, 24.23 money [6] - 3:8, 8:21, 20:8, 32:38, 32:44, 32:47 monitor [2] - 36:11, 36:16 month [7] - 2:45, 21:10, 21:13, 21:14, 21:29, 21:36 months [3] - 26:31, 26:33, 26:40 morass [1] - 35:44 Moreover [1] - 17:4 moreover [1] - 25:14 morning [3] - 13:32, 31:11, 35:1 mortgages [3] - 23:32, 25:40, 30:33 most [7] - 5:45, 9:46, 12:13, 22:26, 23:11, 23:47, 27:47 **mostly** [1] - 31:22 motion [2] - 31:27, 32:46 Mountain [9] - 1:35, 4:8, 4:14, 4:29, 5:36, 5:41, 6:18, 21:45, mounted [1] - 32:19 move [4] - 20:24. 33:31, 33:36, 35:31 moves [1] - 33:28 moving [1] - 31:42 **multiple** [2] - 19:8, 37:30 must [3] - 17:16, 37:34, 37:35

Ν

nails [1] - 33:23 name [5] - 11:32, 18:22, 30:2, 30:5, 39:38 named [1] - 27:9 narrow [2] - 33:32, 35:30 Nathanson [1] - 38:33 NATHANSON[1] -38:34 nature [1] - 24:15 near [1] - 22:32 necessary [8] - 9:19, 16:24, 16:31, 17:14, 19:5, 19:6, 27:25, 37:5 need [16] - 6:23, 8:31, 9:35, 13:44, 15:47, 22:13, 24:3, 26:9,

26:10, 29:1, 33:17, 35:23, 35:24, 35:28, 37.45 needs [3] - 2:34, 19:21, 32:4 negative [1] - 7:47 negotiate [1] - 1:12 negotiated [1] - 26:7 net [1] - 7:47 neutral [1] - 17:24 never [4] - 10:26, 13:26, 15:13 new [1] - 38:45 News [2] - 4:4 next [4] - 16:9, 31:40, 31:43, 32:6 night [1] - 38:40 nomenclature [1] -35:7 nominee [2] - 1:22, 1:28 non [1] - 33:39 non-nuanced [1] -33:39 none [2] - 27:32, 27:34 nonintuitive [1] - 1:19 note [3] - 13:40, 20:25, 38:21 notes [4] - 14:25, 15:25, 16:6, 17:44 nothing [5] - 5:43, 23:10, 23:11, 24:41, 30:39 notice [2] - 29:13, 30:22 noticed [2] - 21:15, 21:30 November [2] - 6:8, 6:10 nuanced [1] - 33:39 number [10] - 16:2, 22:6, 23:36, 23:43, 29:20, 29:32, 33:43,

0

36:44, 36:45, 36:46

numbered [1] - 7:41

o'clock [1] - 39:18 objected [1] - 9:45 objective [1] - 17:23 obligations [4] -10:44, 25:2, 25:11, 25:16 obtained [1] - 5:23 obvious [1] - 8:34 occasionally [1] - 3:17 occasions [2] - 17:33, 27:24 offered [3] - 6:18, 25:6, 25:7 office [1] - 36:6 officer [11] - 10:42, 18:7, 23:47, 24:26, 27:38, 29:9, 34:35, 36:7, 37:19, 37:21, 38:1 Official [1] - 39:27 often [1] - 28:26 Ohama [1] - 38:38 Ohama-Darcus [1] -38:38 once [1] - 33:45 one [57] - 1:18, 1:28, 1:30, 1:45, 1:46, 3:28, 4:7, 4:24, 4:35, 4:38, 4:39, 4:40, 5:27, 6:42, 8:6, 8:25, 8:34, 10:29, 11:7, 12:3, 12:43, 13:3, 13:8, 13:17, 16:2, 16:15, 18:35, 18:43, 18:45, 19:3, 20:2, 20:8, 20:11, 20:30, 20:32, 26:22, 27:4, 27:21, 27:22, 27:42, 28:43, 29:15, 30:16, 30:42, 32:25, 34:5, 34:9, 34:36, 36:38, 36:44, 36:45, 36:46, 37:33 one-eight-zero [1] -4:38 one-one-eight [1] -4:39 one-one-right [1] -4:40 ones [1] - 1:23 ongoing [2] - 9:13, 28:5 open [3] - 23:45, 25:21, 28:34 operate [2] - 8:42, 19:24 operating [2] - 2:43, 24:46 operations [19] - 2:7, 2:21, 7:6, 10:4, 21:2, 21:44, 22:18, 22:19, 23:38, 27:27, 32:14, 32:39, 34:1, 34:13, 34:16, 34:18, 34:23, 34:25, 37:38 opportunity [5] - 18:3, 18:19, 18:33, 28:27, 28:37

oppose [1] - 15:26

occur [3] - 8:33,

32:21, 37:31

opposes [1] - 15:29 oppression [1] - 39:3 optimal [1] - 22:14 optionality [1] - 27:43 options [3] - 5:25, 23:18, 25:22 order [58] - 1:12, 12:20, 12:22, 12:39, 12:43, 17:37, 17:43, 18:6, 18:15, 18:25, 18:40, 18:41, 19:3, 19:27, 19:30, 19:31, 19:37, 23:28, 23:44, 24:10, 24:17, 24:20, 24:27, 24:40, 24:42, 24:44, 25:4, 25:21, 25:24, 26:14, 26:37, 27:10, 27:15, 27:44, 28:12, 28:13, 28:17, 28:24, 28:34, 28:39, 29:2, 29:8, 29:12, 29:20, 29:22, 29:40, 29:43, 30:9, 30:18, 30:24, 31:7, 34:12, 36:31, 37:32, 39:19 ordered [1] - 30:30 orderly [1] - 16:38 orders [1] - 28:21 org [2] - 1:19, 1:32 Otherwise [2] - 16:25, 17:16 otherwise [1] - 16:33 Otso [13] - 14:21, 14:22, 14:36, 15:6, 15:20, 15:25, 16:12, 16:25, 17:20, 17:47, 18:1, 18:39, 18:45 OTSO [1] - 14:21 Otso's [7] - 14:28, 14:43, 15:8, 16:39, 17:12, 18:6, 18:22 ourself [1] - 39:11 outcomes [1] - 34:31 outline [1] - 15:45 outright [1] - 5:40 outset [1] - 24:20 outstanding [2] -7:14. 7:23 overview [4] - 31:2, 31:8, 31:18, 31:21 owe [2] - 13:27 owed [1] - 14:30 owes [1] - 10:44 owing [9] - 6:46, 7:32, 7:37, 14:36, 15:15, 16:3, 17:11, 18:37, 19:11 own [2] - 1:23, 1:34

opposed [2] - 34:29,

37:10

owners [1] - 1:24 ownership [3] - 5:37, 5:40, 5:47 owning [1] - 5:35

Ρ

page [17] - 4:24, 4:37, 6:15, 9:39, 12:28, 12:29, 13:13, 13:14, 13:34, 16:3, 16:4, 16:9, 17:39, 19:32, 19:33, 23:21, 27:19 pages [1] - 15:30 paid [14] - 6:47, 7:1, 9:12, 9:15, 9:34, 13:21, 17:2, 17:13, 20:31, 28:20, 31:37, 35.41 Pandion [18] - 14:16, 14:19, 14:22, 14:27, 14:29, 14:46, 15:15, 15:19, 16:4, 16:5, 16:30, 16:41, 17:4, 17:11, 17:12, 18:10, 18:37, 18:46 paper [1] - 7:13 paragraph [26] - 2:39, 4:24, 4:27, 6:45, 7:1, 7:2, 13:4, 14:24, 15:4, 15:25, 15:30, 16:6, 16:16, 17:45, 19:33, 19:36, 20:2, 21:8, 21:19, 21:23, 21:24, 21:25, 21:42, 22:20, 23:26, 30:12 paraphrasing [1] -11:45 paras [1] - 13:41 parcelled [1] - 25:31 parcels [3] - 32:38, 33:7, 37:1 pardon [1] - 29:44 pared [1] - 30:9 part [7] - 5:31, 8:44, 9:7, 14:46, 24:25, 28:14, 39:3 partial [12] - 19:30, 19:37, 23:28, 24:20, 24:27, 24:40, 25:3, 27:6, 27:10, 27:14, 28:16, 29:7 particular [2] - 17:24, 31:38 particularly [2] - 29:1, 38:29 parties [16] - 9:3, 9:9, 11:32, 17:42, 18:12,

19:45, 23:25, 24:15,

25:35, 27:18, 27:26,

28:28, 30:21, 34:34, 35:36, 37:9 partner [12] - 1:44, 2:2, 2:4, 2:5, 2:6, 2:8, 2:9, 2:16, 2:17, 2:18, 4:12, 31:34 partnership [18] -1:27, 1:37, 1:42, 1:43, 2:2, 2:9, 2:35, 3:35, 3:36, 5:13, 5:19, 5:23, 6:6, 9:4, 12:12, 17:42, 20:1, 35:34 partnership's [6] -2:28, 2:42, 3:19, 3:24, 4:15, 23:31 partnerships [6] -1:47, 20:5, 23:9, 24:39, 25:1, 29:3 partnerships' [3] -2:40, 20:6, 25:41 parts [1] - 6:39 party [8] - 11:21, 11:26, 14:23, 16:41, 18:17, 18:18, 18:21, 19:19 passed [1] - 20:33 past [1] - 12:36 paths [1] - 34:5 pay [12] - 7:11, 8:23, 11:22, 14:38, 15:7, 23:4, 24:34, 32:39, 32:44, 36:43, 36:46, 37:36 payable [5] - 3:1, 7:24, 8:20, 9:33, 22:34 payables [4] - 7:46, 23:7, 32:11, 32:19 paying [1] - 32:16 payment [1] - 30:14 payments [1] - 2:45 payroll [3] - 7:3, 9:15, 23.2 penalty [1] - 20:31 pending [1] - 24:43 people [2] - 29:33, 35:44 per [1] - 2:45 percent [3] - 1:34, 1:40. 20:31 perception [1] - 5:36 perfect [4] - 1:25, 32:41, 33:1, 35:17 perhaps [4] - 8:39, 11:27, 16:40, 18:45 period [4] - 22:24, 22:28, 26:39, 32:23 permission [1] - 37:45 permits [1] - 18:6 person [4] - 6:5, 9:26,

9:29, 27:9 personnel [1] - 9:24 Peter [1] - 28:45 petition [3] - 32:46, 33:10, 33:18 petitioners [1] - 14:27 phrase [1] - 28:26 pick [1] - 16:9 picked [1] - 33:6 picture [1] - 6:34 piece [3] - 7:13, 20:15 piecemeal [2] - 23:29, 28:19 pieces [1] - 6:4 pinpoint [1] - 2:38 pitch [2] - 35:14, 36:29 pitching [1] - 36:28 pivot [2] - 33:20, 34:7 place [3] - 1:30, 9:32, 26:17 plan [2] - 10:25, 32:40 planning [1] - 38:35 play [1] - 34:29 plenty [1] - 3:34 **plug** [1] - 10:31 PM_[2] - 1:7, 39:22 point [27] - 4:21, 6:23, 6:25, 6:36, 8:25, 9:43, 10:10, 11:5, 13:46, 18:30, 20:2, 20:3, 22:38, 22:42, 23:36, 24:19, 28:1, 28:21, 28:22, 30:16, 34:24, 35:45, 36:17, 37:23, 37:25, 37:44, 38:1 pointed [1] - 20:9 points [4] - 27:47, 34:33, 34:35, 35:32 politely [1] - 6:37 portion [1] - 9:38 portions [1] - 25:4 position [3] - 14:37, 15:42, 20:5 possibility [1] - 23:45 Possible [2] - 4:43, 5:2 possible [1] - 26:46 post [1] - 9:12 potential [2] - 15:24, 24.17 potentially [1] - 5:46 power [1] - 35:11 powers [3] - 29:20,

35:24, 36:15

practical [1] - 36:5

preceding [1] - 6:46

precludes [1] - 24:21

predicament [2] -15:8, 17:11 prejudice [7] - 25:23, 31:28, 33:39, 33:47, 34:3. 35:4. 38:19 prejudiced [2] - 9:8, 9.9 prepared [7] - 4:30, 5:18, 5:23, 6:8, 10:28, 11:27, 27:12 present [2] - 15:6, 17:10 presently [1] - 30:24 preservation [3] -16:38, 24:43, 24:45 preserve [3] - 16:24, 31:38, 38:19 preserves [1] - 31:28 press [2] - 3:39, 30:7 **pressure** [1] - 22:3 pressures [1] - 22:2 presupposes [1] -24:21 pretty [1] - 8:40 prevent [1] - 17:19 preview [2] - 2:31, 10:14 previous [1] - 22:35 **prey** [1] - 28:25 prima [1] - 18:29 print [1] - 7:27 prioritize [1] - 31:36 pro [1] - 9:21 problem [8] - 6:28, 11:43, 28:38, 33:4, 33:5, 34:16, 35:29, 36:8 problems [9] - 19:42, 30:16, 32:20, 33:17, 33:27, 33:28, 33:33, 36:13, 37:6 proceed [8] - 19:10, 19:22, 19:28, 19:41, 28:19, 28:30, 39:2 proceeding [4] - 4:32, 16:29, 28:11, 28:25 PROCEEDINGS [3] -1:4, 1:6, 39:22 proceedings [8] -19:9, 23:37, 23:42, 24:30, 32:45, 39:31, 39:32, 39:34 process [11] - 24:7, 24:13, 24:47, 25:35, 26:21, 26:30, 26:34, 26:36, 26:41, 26:45, 27:42 project [1] - 30:6 **properties** [1] - 37:36

property [10] - 1:24,

2:44, 20:7, 20:30, 20:33, 20:35, 24:7, 24:15, 24:16, 25:5 proposal [1] - 4:30 **propose** [1] - 38:9 proposed [5] - 23:27, 25:8, 30:29, 30:37, 34:38 proposing [2] - 18:40, 36:25 **prospects** [1] - 16:2 protect [3] - 24:4, 25:4, 26:14 protection [2] - 24:43, 24:45 provide [1] - 15:43 provided [2] - 14:2, 39:32 provides [2] - 29:14, 32:8 **Province** [1] - 39:28 provision [2] - 12:22, 19:6 **public** [1] - 4:16 publications [1] - 4:2 **pull** [1] - 10:31 pulp [1] - 9:20 pump [5] - 20:13, 20:14, 21:45, 21:47, 22:12 **pumps** [1] - 22:2 purchasers [2] - 5:46, 33:40 purpose [2] - 33:32, 38:10 pursue [7] - 18:5, 18:12, 18:14, 18:16, 18:21, 18:27, 18:31 pursued [1] - 18:18 pursues [1] - 18:30 pursuit [1] - 18:11 put [16] - 4:21, 5:8, 5:9, 6:6, 8:28, 8:31, 9:5, 11:13, 23:19, 34:27, 35:16, 36:12, 36:47, 37:14, 38:6, 39:11 putting [1] - 8:16

Q

quagmire [1] - 14:23 **quick** [2] - 31:14, 31:16 **quickly** [3] - 9:40, 17:35, 19:24 **quo** [2] - 3:20, 12:15 R

raised [3] - 4:26, 11:8, 37:23 ranking [1] - 23:32 rather [5] - 27:37, 28:14, 33:1, 33:22, 33:23 rational [1] - 5:39 rationale [1] - 20:11 reach [1] - 32:26 read [6] - 6:41, 10:37, 21:18, 21:25, 22:20, 35:39 reading [2] - 6:14, 21:6 ready [1] - 19:13 real [1] - 1:24 reality [1] - 5:44 realized [2] - 18:1, 24:35 really [4] - 11:2, 31:21, 35:15, 39:17 realtime [1] - 28:25 reason [3] - 8:41, 11:21, 32:18 reasonable [4] -15:34, 18:19, 32:23, 33:14 reasons [4] - 19:29, 20:12, 26:20, 27:23 receivable [1] - 3:1 receiver [78] - 2:34, 8:28, 8:31, 9:5, 9:10, 9:28, 9:46, 10:16, 10:17, 10:20, 10:22, 10:34, 10:39, 10:44, 10:47, 11:20, 11:29, 11:30, 12:12, 12:13, 12:18, 12:33, 12:34, 13:22, 13:39, 13:46, 14:19, 15:27, 16:11, 16:19, 16:37, 17:6, 17:17, 17:23, 17:26, 18:2, 18:5, 18:8, 18:13, 18:16, 18:27, 18:30, 19:20, 25:28, 25:37, 25:39, 25:46, 26:10, 26:13, 26:17, 26:38, 26:46, 27:40, 27:45. 28:41. 29:32. 29:39, 30:1, 30:8, 32:45, 33:28, 33:29, 33:30, 33:35, 34:12, 34:25, 34:38, 35:2, 35:11, 35:22, 35:27, 37:10, 37:34, 37:43, 38:6, 38:10, 38:15 receiver's [9] - 10:4, 10:12, 10:31, 11:22,

11:38, 18:42, 30:14, 30:29, 30:30 receiver-manager [2] - 8:31, 9:5 receivers [1] - 9:23 receivership [78] -3:29, 3:32, 3:33, 4:17, 6:24, 6:25, 6:27, 10:29, 11:45, 12:17, 12:38, 12:42, 13:8, 14:11, 16:8, 16:32, 17:28, 17:37, 19:4, 19:17, 19:27, 19:30, 23:28, 23:43, 24:10, 24:17, 24:20, 24:27, 24:40, 24:41, 24:44, 24:47, 25:3, 25:21, 25:23, 25:26, 26:37, 26:45, 27:3, 27:5, 27:6, 27:10, 27:15, 27:20, 27:21, 27:28, 27:36, 27:44, 28:13, 28:16, 28:21, 28:31, 28:39, 29:8, 30:5, 30:9, 31:8, 31:22, 31:24, 31:46, 32:30, 33:12, 33:13, 33:19, 33:24, 33:33, 33:39, 33:45, 33:46, 34:11, 34:12, 34:28, 35:11, 35:20, 37:26, 37:32 recently [2] - 9:18, recommendation [1] recommendations [1] - 10:31 record [5] - 4:23, 7:16, 20:40, 20:42 recorded [1] - 39:32 redeem [2] - 28:15, 28:17 **redemption** [1] - 28:8 refer [1] - 23:21 reference [3] - 1:31, 29:37, 30:24 reflect [1] - 24:22 refuses [1] - 32:21 regard [2] - 12:24, 25:34 regional [1] - 21:33 regular [1] - 21:31 regulates [1] - 22:2 relation [1] - 19:18 relative [3] - 1:42, 21:16, 21:31 relatively [1] - 31:14 relevant [2] - 2:33, 16:1

reliability [1] - 4:26 resulting [1] - 22:5 reliant [1] - 27:7 retain [3] - 9:25, 9:47, relief [3] - 26:3, 26:8 25:27 rely [1] - 26:14 retained [3] - 5:10, 9:28, 25:29 relying [1] - 34:19 return [2] - 16:43, remain [2] - 22:23, 37:13 27:39 remainder [1] - 19:47 revenue [2] - 22:27, remaining [1] - 24:29 25:2 remember [3] - 20:14, revenues [10] - 2:42, 20:33, 34:44 21:1, 21:11, 21:14, 21:15, 21:30, 22:22, repaying [1] - 31:36 22:24, 22:26, 23:1 repays [1] - 31:31 rights [1] - 25:44 repeatedly [1] - 31:33 risk [8] - 3:26, 23:39, report [2] - 18:3, 37:40 23:41, 24:3, 24:14, reported [1] - 21:33 24:33, 27:6, 34:26 REPORTER [1] risks [1] - 24:30 39:25 road [1] - 27:40 Reporter [2] - 39:27, Roadbuilding [1] -39:45 13:7 reporting [1] - 38:11 Roberts [1] - 31:7 reproduced [1] - 4:5 ROBERTS [47] reputation [1] - 3:24 31:13, 31:16, 31:20, required [1] - 16:26 31:31, 31:36, 32:1, requires [3] - 5:45, 32:3, 32:8, 32:13, 23:29, 36:31 32:16, 32:29, 32:35, reserve [1] - 25:16 32:37, 33:9, 34:15, residents [2] - 33:43 34:46, 35:8, 35:10, resolution [9] - 17:29, 35:18, 35:26, 35:35, 18:37, 19:11, 24:44, 35:38, 35:43, 35:45, 31:26, 31:27, 32:3, 36:15, 36:18, 36:20, 32:8, 32:22 36:22, 36:27, 36:33, resolve [2] - 15:43, 36:35, 36:38, 36:42, 19:38 37:14, 37:16, 37:19, resolved [5] - 17:12, 37:27, 37:29, 37:41, 17:35, 18:34, 19:22, 37:47, 38:4, 38:16, 28:29 38:21, 38:23, 38:26, resort [4] - 1:41, 2:41, 39:9, 39:11 8:3, 25:43 role [1] - 34:22 resort's [1] - 2:35 Rubin [2] - 28:45, Resorts [2] - 7:19, 28:47 23:37 run [10] - 8:35, 8:36, resorts [6] - 8:3, 8:6, 9:24, 9:26, 12:12, 8:14, 8:19, 8:20, 20:19, 33:25, 36:19, 20:39 37:39 resources [2] - 22:13, runaway [1] - 35:20 24:31 running [4] - 8:39, respect [2] - 6:20,

19:47

31:8

34:21

27:46

respective [1] - 15:33

respond [1] - 21:13

response [5] - 2:31,

responsibility [1] -

restrictions [2] -

11:14, 11:28

4:25, 10:14, 12:33,

rest [4] - 19:42, 19:43,

S

36:6, 37:10, 37:16

safeguard [6] - 9:6, 11:19, 24:4, 24:6, 27:25, 27:26 safeguarded [1] -24:12 safely [1] - 22:4 sale [13] - 5:5, 5:28, 6:18, 6:21, 20:34,

20:36, 23:33, 25:8, 25:13, 26:34, 26:35, 26:41, 26:45 sales [7] - 4:12, 4:32, 23:46, 28:18, 28:19, 32:21 Sanovest [35] - 1:27, 1:33, 4:9, 4:26, 8:44, 9:1, 9:45, 10:28, 10:30, 10:39, 10:46, 11:2, 11:26, 11:40, 24:32, 24:35, 25:38, 25:42, 25:46, 28:20, 30:32, 31:31, 31:33, 32:16, 32:39, 32:42, 32:43, 32:47, 33:2, 33:13, 36:43, 36:44, 36:47, 37:36, 38:18 Sanovest's [2] - 10:19 satisfied [3] - 9:29, 19:40, 20:20 saw [2] - 23:3, 32:29 second [11] - 1:28, 3:34, 5:7, 5:31, 8:14, 8:41, 13:14, 13:35, 20:32, 23:36, 29:36 second-to-last [2] -13:14, 13:35 secondly [1] - 37:37 seconds [1] - 20:27 section [1] - 18:25 **secure** [1] - 20:7 secured [6] - 11:13, 13:19, 14:18, 14:28, 25:41, 31:37 secures [1] - 25:40 security [4] - 13:21, 17:3, 30:12, 30:14 securityholder [3] -24:3, 24:14, 25:44 see [21] - 1:16, 1:32, 1:36, 4:35, 4:42, 4:47, 5:14, 7:33, 8:4, 11:12, 11:19, 11:24, 12:20, 21:13, 27:5, 28:33, 29:36, 32:36, 34:30, 35:2, 36:11 seek [7] - 17:27, 18:19, 25:4, 28:16, 28:28, 28:29 seeking [3] - 3:32, 12:36, 32:46 seem [1] - 28:23 select [5] - 23:32, 23:33, 24:28, 24:33, 25:9 selected [1] - 35:21

sell [6] - 26:23, 26:24,

26:32, 27:4, 32:37,

36.46

selling [2] - 6:4, 36:42 seminal [1] - 16:15 sense [1] - 23:47 sentence [1] - 22:10 SEPTEMBER[1] -39.23 **September** [4] - 1:1, 3:18, 20:32, 39:39 servicing [1] - 10:24 set [1] - 38:44 several [2] - 26:39, 28:1 **shall** [1] - 34:13 **shape** [1] - 22:15 shareholder [2] -14:22, 14:43 shareholders [1] -16:41 shares [1] - 1:34 shop [1] - 9:21 short [6] - 29:2, 32:9, 32:10, 32:17, 32:20, 37:5 short-term [3] - 32:9, 32:10, 37:5 shortfall [1] - 3:20 **show** [2] - 32:33, 35:5 **showed** [1] - 7:14 **shows** [2] - 7:23, 8:39 side [1] - 15:35 sides [1] - 31:29 sift [1] - 14:10 signed [1] - 3:19 significant [6] - 11:34, 20:15, 24:5, 24:16, 34:10, 36:13 similarities [1] - 13:38 **similarity** [1] - 19:15 simply [2] - 30:4, 34:12 single [2] - 5:35, 5:38 SISP [1] - 12:23 sit [1] - 27:46 site [1] - 5:40 sites [4] - 2:39, 5:5, 5:29, 6:17 **situation** [3] - 14:5, 17:19, 28:33 **situations** [1] - 8:34 six [2] - 26:31, 26:33 skill [1] - 39:35 **skip** [5] - 6:38, 12:31, 12:41, 12:44, 26:16 skipped [1] - 18:38 skittishness [2] -5:33, 6:26 slightly [1] - 30:36 **slowly** [1] - 22:3 small [4] - 4:41, 4:47,

7:27, 8:6 smaller [1] - 13:8 sold [4] - 13:24, 17:16, 25:32, 37:36 solution [2] - 24:18, 24.24 someone [2] - 8:47, 35.6 sometimes [1] - 8:31 somewhere [1] -35:40 sorry [14] - 2:3, 4:23, 6:13, 7:30, 18:38, 19:33, 20:38, 20:41, 23:20, 27:31, 29:29, 29:33, 33:42, 34:41 sort [7] - 2:24, 2:26, 20:3, 23:17, 28:24, 35:21, 36:3 sought [2] - 14:12, 14:19 source [2] - 11:15, 12:3 **speaking** [1] - 9:22 specific [4] - 17:38, 33:17, 33:27, 33:33 specifically [1] - 37:33 **stabilizing** [1] - 17:18 staged [5] - 35:21, 36:25, 36:34, 36:40, 37:30 stake [1] - 16:46 stakeholders [5] -8:43, 10:45, 24:1, 24:33 standard [1] - 12:21 start [12] - 9:39, 13:3, 21:21, 30:43, 31:25, 33:26, 33:31, 33:32, 34:8, 34:24, 35:30, 36:42 started [1] - 2:26 starting [5] - 18:30, 23:26, 26:42, 30:41, starts [1] - 8:47 state [1] - 2:28 status [4] - 3:20, 6:43, 12:15, 23:12 stay [8] - 5:46, 9:13, 18:44, 19:2, 23:37, 23:41, 23:45, 38:35 stays [1] - 18:41 steps [3] - 8:46, 18:9, 24:8 stigma [3] - 38:6, 38:8, 38:14 still [7] - 7:46, 22:41, 23:1, 23:4, 23:6, 23:7, 28:7

stood [1] - 39:19 stories [1] - 10:17 straight [1] - 11:30 strained [1] - 3:36 stream [1] - 22:27 strong [1] - 21:36 struggling [1] - 29:47 studiously [1] - 39:13 **sub** [2] - 18:35, 27:18 subdivide [1] - 26:26 subdivided 131 -25:31, 26:24, 27:1 subdivision [10] -25:8, 26:27, 26:30, 26:43, 27:7, 27:32, 27:36, 29:17, 33:5, 36:32 submissions [7] -2:32, 2:33, 6:39, 9:39, 13:37, 15:31, 19:25 subordinate [2] -30:26, 30:33 subscribed [1] - 39:38 successful [3] - 5:44, 21:2, 26:2 sues [1] - 8:47 sufficient [9] - 10:33, 11:22, 11:37, 11:38, 17:1, 21:12, 24:34, 25:1, 27:41 suggest [2] - 5:39, 19:16 suggested [1] - 23:24 suggests [1] - 5:44 suing [2] - 4:14, 15:19 suited [1] - 29:6 **summarize** [1] - 35:16 summer [5] - 7:7, 8:23, 20:10, 21:38, 22.41 super [1] - 36:16 **supplied** [1] - 13:19 suppliers [2] - 9:14, 19:45 **supply** [1] - 9:13 **support** [3] - 2:43, 31:27, 38:18 supports [1] - 31:26 suppose [1] - 10:27 **surprise** [1] - 31:3 **surprised** [1] - 28:33 suspect [1] - 11:29 sustainable [2] - 3:21, 22:39 sustained [1] - 7:7 **sway** [1] - 10:46

swore [1] - 3:23

system [1] - 22:4

Т

tab [15] - 3:44, 4:7,

4:22, 4:34, 4:35,

4:36, 7:16, 8:4,

13:12, 13:13, 13:14,

14:17, 20:40, 20:44, 29:23 tax [2] - 20:35, 25:16 taxes [4] - 2:44, 20:31, 20:33, 30:20 team [2] - 21:12, 38:37 ten [2] - 11:32, 32:24 ten-year [1] - 32:24 term [12] - 18:15, 29:47, 32:9, 32:10, 32:13, 32:16, 32:17, 32:20, 33:47, 37:5, 37.6 terminate [1] - 28:31 terminated [1] - 28:22 terms [5] - 9:23, 14:12, 15:28, 18:22, 36:25 tests [1] - 14:4 Textron [1] - 16:14 theme [1] - 24:38 they've [2] - 12:36, 33:44 thin [2] - 20:19 thing's [1] - 13:23 thinking [1] - 10:38 thinks [5] - 6:23, 10:20, 19:19, 25:30, 26:30 third [6] - 9:3, 9:9, 17:42, 19:45, 25:35, 27:26 three [6] - 1:11, 5:26, 15:41, 15:45, 36:47, **Tian** [2] - 34:18 tie [3] - 11:28, 12:7, 24:31 **Tiffany** [2] - 39:27, 39:44 timely [1] - 24:36 title [2] - 35:2, 35:12 **TO**[1] - 39:22 today [3] - 32:4, 35:47, 37:17 together [1] - 8:17 tomorrow [2] - 31:11, 39:18 took [1] - 29:15 top [3] - 4:43, 7:26, 31:23 total [1] - 8:12 touch [2] - 12:47, 13:1 touches [1] - 9:22

tough [1] - 6:3 tracking [2] - 21:16, 21:30 trade [1] - 23:18 Trade [6] - 12:44, 14:5, 14:11, 16:15, 23:15, 23:23 transcribed [1] - 39:31 transcript [1] - 39:34 transition [1] - 33:20 trial [2] - 38:44, 38:45 tried [1] - 33:16 trouble [1] - 8:45 true [5] - 4:19, 4:28, 8:30, 28:27, 39:33 trusted [1] - 18:8 **try** [1] - 2:24 trying [4] - 1:12, 2:25, 10:35, 11:28 turf [1] - 22:14 turn [4] - 4:36, 9:38, 13:43, 22:3 turns [1] - 27:36 two [16] - 1:10, 1:18, 17:10, 20:16, 20:27, 23:8, 23:17, 27:21, 30:42, 33:46, 34:5, 34:35, 35:43, 36:35, 37:7, 39:9 twofold [1] - 30:17

U ultimately [1] - 17:37

unable [2] - 15:7, 16:28 uncanny [1] - 19:14 uncertain [3] - 15:10, 15:15, 23:28 under [20] - 7:32, 7:38, 11:18, 14:11, 19:2, 23:27, 23:36, 25:37, 25:40, 26:7, 26:15, 26:37, 27:9, 27:44, 28:39, 29:7, 29:39, 29:42, 30:26, 35:11 underlying [1] - 37:4 understood [1] - 3:2 undisputed [1] - 25:38 unequivocally [1] -5.15 unexpected [1] -21:39 unfair [1] - 21:6 unfortunately [1] -22:12 unhappy [2] - 10:30, 11:2

unintended [1] - 34:27

unique [1] - 21:44

unit [1] - 1:37 unnecessarily [1] -24:32 unnecessary [1] -34:11 unreleased [2] - 7:45, 8.19 untested [1] - 15:40 unwilling [1] - 16:30 **up** [11] - 4:20, 7:13, 8:45, 10:24, 12:7, 13:10, 16:9, 17:14, 24:31, 28:9, 31:6 **US** [1] - 8:9 **US\$26** [1] - 14:34 US\$27 [1] - 14:47 **US\$95** [1] - 14:35

V vacations [1] - 21:38

valley [3] - 21:46, 22:7

value [15] - 3:30, 4:32,

6:29, 11:22, 11:34,

valuation [2] - 4:30,

5:8

11:38, 15:10, 15:13, 16:24, 17:1, 17:2, 24:5, 24:34, 24:42, 38:19 value/minimizes [1] -31:28 values [1] - 4:25 Vancouver [4] - 1:2, 4:2, 4:11 various [2] - 4:1, 17:42 vary[1] - 28:28 vehicle [1] - 32:47 vertical [1] - 10:17 VFD [1] - 22:1 viability [2] - 3:25, vicinity [1] - 14:34 Victoria [2] - 4:3, 4:4 view [2] - 15:32, 37:8 views [1] - 24:22 Vincent [2] - 39:27, 39:44 volume [2] - 20:43, 20:44 volumes [1] - 3:47 vulnerable [1] - 25:5

W

wait [2] - 23:14, 39:16 wants [1] - 13:43 Ward [2] - 13:38, 13:40 wash [1] - 13:32 wastage [1] - 25:36 waste [1] - 24:37 wasting [2] - 16:25, 17:22 water [5] - 21:45, 22:2, 22:3, 22:6, 22:13 **ways** [2] - 17:10, 33:4 week [4] - 26:42, 31:40, 31:44, 32:6 weeks [1] - 26:40 Western [2] - 13:39, 13:40 whereas [1] - 23:43 **WHEREOF** [1] - 39:37 whole [5] - 2:35, 3:38, 6:4, 17:37, 29:19 willing [1] - 16:31 wish [3] - 18:12, 18:44, 26:41 withholding [2] - 23:5, 23:6 **WITNESS** [1] - 39:37 words [4] - 4:12, 6:3, 9:9, 9:30 world [2] - 26:38, 33:23 worried [1] - 11:39 worry [1] - 25:47 worse [1] - 28:6 written [3] - 3:11, 6:39, 19:25 wrongful [2] - 14:45, 15:35

Υ

year [6] - 21:16, 21:31, 22:5, 22:22, 22:39, 32:24 year-to-date [1] -22:22 years [5] - 10:25, 22:30, 22:35, 33:25

Ζ

zero [1] - 4:38

No. S234048 Vancouver Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA (BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE WALKER)

Vancouver, BC September 11, 2024

BETWEEN:

599315 B.C. LTD. and DANIEL MATTHEWS

Petitioners

AND:

ECOASIS BEAR MOUNTAIN DEVELOPMENTS LTD., ECOASIS DEVELOPMENTS LLP, and ECOASIS RESORT AND GOLF LLP, TIAN KUSUMOTO, and SANOVEST HOLDINGS LTD.

Respondents

* * * * *

No. S243389 Vancouver Registry

IN BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY

IN THE MATTER OF THE RECEIVERSHIP OF ECOASIS DEVELOPMENTS LLP AND OTHERS

BETWEEN:

SANOVEST HOLDINGS LTD.

Petitioners

AND:

ECOASIS DEVELOPMENTS LLP,
ECOASIS BEAR MOUNTAIN DEVELOPMENTS LTD.,
ECOASIS RESORT AND GOLF LLP, 0884185 B.C. LTD.,
0884188 B.C. LTD., 0884190 B.C. LTD., 0884194 B.C. LTD.,
BM 81/82 LANDS LTD., BM 83 LANDS LTD., BM 84 LANDS LTD.,
BM CAPELLA LANDS LTD., BM HIGHLANDS GOLF COURSE LTD.,
BM HIGHLANDS LANDS LTD., BM MOUNTAIN GOLF COURSE LTD.
and BEAR MOUNTAIN ADVENTURES LTD.

Respondents

PROCEEDINGS IN CHAMBERS

COPY

Charest Legal Solutions Inc.
CharestLS.com

APPEARANCES

A.I. Nathanson, KC D. Byma K. Jackson L. Hiebert Counsel for Sanovest Holdings:

C.A.B. Ferris, KC G. Brandt W.L. Roberts Counsel for 599315 B.C. Ltd.:

C. Ohama-Darcus

Charest Legal Solutions Inc. CharestLS.com

PROCEEDINGS IN CHAMBERS SEPTEMBER 11, 2024

PROCEEDINGS

Witness	Proceedings	Page
	Submissions by Cnsl W. Roberts	1
	Submissions by Cnsl C. Ferris	13
	Submissions by Cnsl G. Brandt	34
	Discussion re timing	51
	Submissions by Cnsl G. Brandt (continued)	55
	Reporter certification	101

EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description	Page
---------	-------------	------

No exhibits marked.

```
1
                                        September 11, 2024
 2
                                        Vancouver, BC
 3
 4
                 (PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 10:17 AM)
 5
 6
      THE COURT: Sorry for the late start.
                                                There was
 7
            another matter. If you want to come back at
 8
            quarter to 2 o'clock, I can make it up to you
 9
            that way.
10
      THE CLERK: Justice, in the matter of Sanovest
11
            Holdings Limited versus Ecoasis Developments LLP,
12
            Justice.
13
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         Good morning, Justice.
14
      THE COURT:
                   Yes, Mr. Roberts.
15
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         Just a quick bit of housekeeping.
16
      THE COURT: Yes.
17
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Two things. One, I somewhat
18
            facetiously called my friends disingenuous
19
            yesterday. He and I have discussed it and have
20
            come to an accord as to why he honestly believed
21
            the thing he said, and I honestly believe the
22
            thing I said.
23
      THE COURT:
                  All right.
24
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: And I think we should leave it at
25
            that.
26
                   All right. Very good.
      THE COURT:
27
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: I had thought these materials had
           been filed. I'll just pass you a copy. It just the consents from BDO to act as either
28
29
30
            receiver or marketing agent or whatever, but as
31
            contemplated by our materials, what we call the
32
            funding application.
33
      THE COURT: And do they have counsel lined up?
34
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         They do not yet have counsel lined
35
            up, but obviously will if this goes ahead.
36
                   So I was thinking about your opening
      THE COURT:
37
            yesterday.
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
38
                        Yes, okay.
39
      THE COURT:
                  And it just occurred to me -- these things
40
            occurred to me right off the top. It would be
41
            helpful if I actually saw a form of order that,
42
            in light of --
43
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Understood.
44
      THE COURT: -- what you said yesterday, I could
45
            actually look at to see what it is that is being
            proposed, because it's different than what's in
46
47
            the -- in your client's NOA, given what you said
```

```
yesterday.
                Then I was wondering about my jurisdiction
           under the BIA to actually order some form of
           limited receivership, no matter what the
5
           nomenclature is.
 6
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Right. Right.
7
      THE COURT:
                 And then I was thinking, well, if I go the
8
           other way that you propose, this staged
9
           approach --
10
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         Yes.
11
      THE COURT: -- wouldn't it make sense to put in a
12
           provision that gives the receiver liberty to
13
           apply for further directions to --
14
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Agreed.
15
                 -- expand the scope of powers on some very
      THE COURT:
16
           short notice.
17
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Agreed.
                                  Yeah.
18
      THE COURT:
                  So it sort of -- it's a reverse of what
19
           Mr. Jackson's client is seeking, but it
20
           effectively does the same thing. Receiver
21
           basically is told, the first thing you do is go
22
           in and assess what needs to be monetized to meet
23
           payroll and meet the accounts payables, and then
           to operate the business and to pay off Sanovest,
24
25
           and then also to consider what -- who should be
26
           operating the business, including Mr. Matthews,
27
           and come back to court within a defined
28
           timeframe, and you've also got the right to seek
29
           broader powers necessary.
30
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Yes.
31
      THE COURT:
                  I mean, that's --
32
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        So you've just read out what I was
33
           going to say over the next ten minutes.
34
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
35
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: But I'm going to put to you a slight
36
           change of wording.
37
      THE COURT:
                  All right.
38
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Which is, for the receiver to decide
39
           if it should take over operations. And so my
40
           first ten minutes were going to be, after having
41
           worked on, after having listened to Mr. Jackson
42
           yesterday and heard your comments, we worked on
           this last night and are going to, over the
43
44
           next -- over today, pitch to you the concept of
45
           this -- let's call it interim -- and I don't use
46
           that in a capital-I way; I just mean an interim
47
           appointment of a court officer -- to go and
```

investigate and report back on both operations and the sales program, but we don't have the receiver take possession and control. They just need to go in and have sufficient powers to get access to information, and then come back to you and make a report and say, here's what should happen next, and I think we would give them some priorities on, you know, what happens next so that we can achieve the goals of repaying Sanovest, make a decision about whether operations need oversight or not, whether a marketing plan should look like X or Y or a combination, et cetera.

And then we would come back in front of you or this court and -- on short notice, where the receiver can make its application and make its recommendations about what happens next.

But one, we can draft something that -- an order for that. Two, you asked about jurisdiction, and I say it's this simple. Both the BIA and Law and Equity Act, which give you the joint powers to do what you're doing today, don't prescribe any powers that you must or should give to a receiver. Where we get that is the model receivership order. The model receivership order is not binding on you ever. What it does is give you a precedent, a template, to work from.

THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: And we say it's as simple as this. If you have the power to give a receiver this many powers, well, then, by definition, you have the power to give them this many, a subset. And so -- and the BIA contemplates interim receivers -- capital-I Interim Receivers -- which is the same kind of idea: a shorter form, sometimes limited powers receiver. And so I don't think there should be any issue about you having jurisdiction to do a staged approach, because if you can do the whole thing, you should do a subset.

THE COURT: It would be helpful if you just take me back to that section. I brought my copy of the BIA.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: Oh, so it's going to be in 244, and I didn't bring mine.

THE COURT: Yeah, okay. You can find it later.

```
CNSL W. ROBERTS: I'll bring it for you.
                  Yeah, so I can --
      THE COURT:
 3
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: So that's the jurisdiction issue.
                But on the -- there's details, though -- and
 5
           I think the details is where there might be a
           dispute and why I think you're going to need to
 7
           hear from Mr. Brandt and Mr. Ferris, because --
 8
           and I'm going to give you some foreshadowing of
 9
           the details.
10
                We're going to say, okay, that investigative
11
           court officer should go out and do these things,
12
           but my friends are very worried about payables.
13
           We're going to tell you that payables aren't a
14
           worry. They've mischaracterized what the
15
           payables are. I don't need you to make any
16
           finding on that, but we're going to tell you
17
           that's wrong. But what we should do is give that
18
           court officer the power in this interim order to
19
           borrow moneys and pay what payables it thinks is
20
           necessary.
21
                You're going to hear about an arbitration
22
           that's scheduled to proceed in --
23
      THE COURT: Next week.
24
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                       -- ten days.
25
      THE COURT:
                  Ten days.
26
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Mr. Ferris will tell you that's
27
           really important, and for material sums of money,
28
           and we say should proceed, and the receivership
29
           shouldn't interfere with that. That's been
30
           something that's been going on for four years
31
           leading to its culmination. But meaning -- all I
32
           mean to say is there's going to be some details
33
           on what we propose in an interim staged order
34
           that you're going to have to listen to us talk
35
           about.
36
      THE COURT: Right. And so who would fund this?
37
           Mr. Jackson's client won't fund it, then who
38
           would fund it?
39
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Well, up until now, Mr. Matthews has
40
           been funding the arbitration.
41
      THE COURT: Okay. No, but who would fund this limited
42
           receivership?
43
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Oh, we would give power to the
44
           receiver to go borrow money.
45
      THE COURT: Right, okay.
46
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: And they could borrow from any third
47
           party they choose.
```

```
THE COURT:
                  Okay.
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: And if Sanovest wants to get in the
           mix and offer to lend that money, they can do so.
 3
           But there's a lot of parties out there who lend
5
           into receiverships where they have the power of a
           receiver, or the backing of a receiver's
7
           certificate against significant lands.
8
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
9
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: I don't think you're going to have
10
           any trouble with a receiver borrowing what are
11
           relatively modest sums to get through this next
12
                  So that's where I was going to start.
           phase.
13
           what we'll do for you is --
14
      THE COURT:
                  And just so --
15
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Please.
16
      THE COURT:
                  So again, seeing the actual -- the terms
17
           of the proposed order would be helpful.
18
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Okay.
19
      THE COURT:
                 But what about a stay?
20
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: I don't think -- we would say there
21
           should be no stay in this interim period.
22
           doesn't need to be one.
                  All right.
2.3
      THE COURT:
24
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Until, if the receiver thinks there
           should be something -- let me make up a timeline.
25
26
           Let's pretend you said, receiver, I'd like to see
27
           a report in 60 days, let's set a hearing.
28
           during this period the receiver thought something
29
           needed to be addressed immediately, we would give
30
           in the order the power for the receiver to come
31
           back and deal with it.
32
                We say there's nothing imminent.
                                                   There's no
33
           payable problem that's imminent, other than
34
           getting Sanovest repaid, and that's the path
35
           we're on.
      THE COURT: What about the money that's owing to
36
37
           the -- I think Langford? I'm worried about a
38
           third party --
39
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Understood.
40
      THE COURT: -- kind of stepping in basically doing
41
           something that makes all of this for naught.
42
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: I'll let my friends give you the
43
           details of it, but what we say is there's a --
44
           you would expect payables to accrue over the
45
           summer when they're busy.
46
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
47
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: And then start to be repaid over
```

time. But what Sanovest is doing is mixing up two categories of payables, payables on the development side and operations, and what you'll see in the materials is the operations are self-sustaining. The operations of the golf course, tennis courts, fitness centre are not insolvent.

On the development side, there are moneys owing that need to be paid, but the reason they're not paying is because Sanovest won't agree to allow things to be sold. And so we'll give you the details.

THE COURT: Okay.

 CNSL W. ROBERTS: But we say that the risk that you're concerned about is overblown.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: That being said, we would happily give the receiver the power to borrow moneys in that intervening period to pay whatever amounts the receiver decides need to be paid to avoid exactly that risk.

We say two things: One, the result -- the resolution should preserve value, minimize prejudice, and as part of that, we absolutely agree that there should be a way to deal with any acute crises that arise. We say the answer to that is not to start with a full-blown receiver. The answer is to have a court officer go out, decide what should happen next, make that recommendation.

Which sort of gets me into the next point. THE COURT: All right.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: We say -- and we're going to hear -- we say there's no need for a receivership over operations. The receivership order put forward by Sanovest is a blanket receivership that would immediately have them take over operations and maybe get carved back. They're asking for a receivership that lasts years, and they're going to run the golf course for years, and we say if that's not necessary, it shouldn't be ordered, so let's start small and build up.

On a more technical level, we say the Sanovest application blurs the distinction between a secured creditor's right to appoint a receiver, which we don't quibble with the fact that a secured creditor has a contractual right

to do so, and a partner's right to seek a receiver. What they're asking for is not a receiver that is limited to paying back the secured creditor. They're acting with their hat on as partner for a receiver to resolve the partnership problems, and it matters because there are very different threshold tests for those two things.

Again, we're not quibbling that the threshold for a secured creditor after default to get a receiver isn't that high. There's still Maple Trade factors to be looked at. There's still rights of redemption to be considered, but it's a lower threshold.

A partner seeking to put partnership assets into receivership is extraordinary relief. It's available, and you can do it, but it's a much higher threshold than for a secured creditor, and their materials don't draw that distinction. So one of the things we say is, with the direction given to a court officer when assessing next steps under the preserve/maintain value should be repaying Sanovest its secured debt. We want it repaid. It's accruing interest. It's decreasing the equity available to the other partners. We want it repaid, which is why we have an application to have it repaid by the sale of specific assets.

THE COURT: But you wouldn't, in this case, in terms of the modified approach you're taking now -- you wouldn't dictate to the receiver which assets to be sold.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: Correct. We would not.

THE COURT: Yeah.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: And we would expect the receiver to look at all options: en bloc sales. Practically speaking, this is a really big site. En bloc sales may be great, but there's a limited pool of people who have -- pick the number \$200 million -- to buy golf courses and the full development. It's just a smaller pool of purchasers.

There's a larger pool of purchasers to divide -- to buy pieces, and so we want the receiver to look at both. In the material is a plan that Dan Matthews engaged a realtor, put a plan together how to do this.

```
THE COURT:
                   That was Colliers.
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Colliers, exactly. And we don't say
            that this court is going to direct the receiver
           what the answer is, but we want the receiver to
 5
            look at all of that, but with a view to -- maybe
           priority is the wrong word -- keep your mind on
7
           the -- keep your eye on the ball, which is
            Sanovest needs to be repaid.
9
                 We say that Sanovest is mischaracterizing in
10
           our order the subdivision issue. These companies
           are in the business of assembling lands,
11
12
           subdividing lands and selling them.
                                                 That's their
13
                      So in our order, when we say a court
           business.
14
           officer should do the things this company already
15
           does, this isn't a complicated thing.
                                                    This is
16
           what we do. For ten years -- 14 years now --
17
           Mr. Matthews and Tian Kusumoto's father were in
18
           the business of doing exactly these things. This
19
           is not some insurmountable task. This is the
           thing they do every day. They've sold -- and I forget the number -- there are 3,000 families
20
21
22
           living, from lots that were divided, built and
23
           sold.
24
                 And so in our -- when it's not some fatal
25
            flaw in our order, we say this is entirely
26
            consistent with what this company has been doing
27
            and should have been continuing to do if not for
28
            the fight between partners.
29
      THE COURT: But on the amended approach now you're not
30
            asking me to issue an order --
31
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Correct.
32
      THE COURT:
                  -- that directs a subdivision.
33
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Correct.
34
      THE COURT:
                   Okay.
35
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Only for the receiver to consider
36
            it. That's it. And then we also say that the
37
            full receivership being put forward by Sanovest
38
            is -- this is where you're going to have to hear
39
            the details.
40
      THE COURT:
                   Right.
41
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Is an attempt to achieve a goal that
42
            Tian Kusumoto can't achieve in the existing
43
           litigation. So there are claims back and forth,
44
            and the blunt instrument of a full-blown receiver
45
           is a strategic attempt to avoid the repercussions
           of conduct. And I don't ask you to make any
46
47
           finding, and you'll have to hear my friends on
```

the details of that. But the receivership -- the point of a receiver is an equitable remedy, whether it's by secured creditor or partner, and so all we say is you need mindful of, and you're going to have to hear today's submissions on what the -- what we say would be your unintended consequences of doing a full-blown receivership that then allows Mr. Kusumoto to avoid the repercussions of his conduct.

I'll give you another example. The blanket receivership order includes the Bear Mountain BMA, the BMA lands, that we say they shouldn't be in there. They don't owe any money to Sanovest. It's an attempt to blur a line and achieve a result.

Tian Kusumoto doesn't like the fact that his father transferred lands and is trying to use this receivership as a way of pulling them back without actually taking you to evidence of why those lands should be in there. These issues, we say, would all be addressed by a court officer who comes back and reports to you.

So I'm going to stop there with -- but I take the two things: One, we're going to prepare a draft order.

THE COURT: Yeah.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: I anticipate there's going to be fights between my friend and I on some of the details that might go with that.

THE COURT: Yeah.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: But we'll at least try and identify those details so that we can see where this goes.

THE COURT: Yeah, because, to use that phrase, on your client's amended approach, the devil is in the details.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: The devil is in the details.

37 THE COURT: It is.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: Exactly.

THE COURT: Very much so.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: Yeah. But we do say that that allows this court the flexibility to do the things we say everyone should strive to do, which is don't inadvertently prejudice or impair value. Do it in a staged approach where we have -- these parties are never going to trust each other.

46 THE COURT: Right.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: I'll give you an example. We're

```
going to have a fight over who the court officer
            should be. We've put forward BDO; they've put
3
            forward A&M.
 4
      THE COURT: Well, I was going to ask you what -- A&M
5
            already has counsel lined up, and they're ready
 6
            to go.
7
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: BDO is also ready to go.
8
            haven't had counsel because they don't have
9
            any -- they're not appointed.
      THE COURT: All right.
10
11
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: A&M doesn't have counsel.
12
           not appointed yet. They don't have a hat on in
13
           which to hire. They certainly have asked
14
           Mr. Rubin --
15
      THE COURT: Mr. Rubin.
16
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- and Mr. Rubin is great; don't get
17
           me wrong. But BDO is ready to go as well.
18
           highlight for you the worry that, for this to
19
           work long term, these parties are going to --
20
           both sides are going to have to some faith that
21
            this court officer does it.
22
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
23
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: And here's what they're going to
           both think: Well, A&M's been talking to Tian
24
25
           Kusumoto for months. BDO's been talking to Dan
26
            for months.
                         They're never -- and so we may get
27
            to a point where we say to you, or I say to my
           friend, we're going to have to pick somebody else with that mistrust, because if we don't start
28
29
30
           with these parties having some faith in that
31
           court officer, we're going to be back in front of
32
           you repeatedly having fights. Again, I just
33
           highlight that.
34
      THE COURT: But if you take out -- if you take out BDO
35
            and A&M, you know, who's left in the pool?
36
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: I can tell you my friends and I
37
           would agree on a short list of people who are
38
            appropriate --
39
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Justice, I mean -- sorry.
                                                     That's --
40
            I appreciate my friend's optimism about us
41
            agreeing on something like this, and I also
           think -- just to be clear, he's giving you
42
43
            evidence that A&M has been in discussions with
44
            Tian Kusumoto for months.
45
      THE COURT: Yeah.
46
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         That is absolutely not true, and if
47
           we need somebody from A&M, I think they have met
```

```
once, and I think he's left you with the wrong
           impression.
 3
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
 4
      CNSL K. JACKSON: But I should say also, they've met
 5
           with Mr. Matthews.
 6
                 All right.
      THE COURT:
 7
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: I want to be clear, I'm saying the
 8
           view from each side will be the mistrust.
 9
           no -- A&M, I have all the -- I have all the
10
           respect for in the world. But I also think there
11
           are two or three or four other firms in this city
12
           who could absolutely do as good a job that would
13
           take away those problems.
14
      THE COURT:
                 All right. And are you going to -- is it
15
           Mr. Ferris going to be up next?
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Yes.
16
17
      THE COURT: Because I do want to hear about this --
18
           the jurisdiction.
19
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: I'm going to deal with a draft order
20
           and jurisdiction.
21
      THE COURT:
                  So you'll come back to that?
22
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Yes.
23
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
24
                          Justice.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                  Yes, Mr. Nathanson?
25
      THE COURT:
26
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: May I address you just for a
27
           moment before Mr. --
28
                  Yes, of course.
      THE COURT:
29
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: So I just want to register this
30
           concern. I'm responding to an injunction
31
           application under the oppression remedy, which I
32
           think Mr. --
33
      THE COURT:
                  Ferris.
34
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- Roberts -- well, Mr. Ferris is
35
           going to, but Mr. Roberts has already said
36
           they're not seeking the order that they're
37
           seeking, and they're going to change the order.
38
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
39
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          It's very important, so that we
40
           can keep this on the rails, that I see the motion
41
           I am responding to.
42
      THE COURT: Right.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
43
                          So I'd like to see the text of the
44
           draft order --
45
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
46
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- by this afternoon, like, after
47
           the lunch break so that I'm not prejudiced and I
```

```
can deal with this. We've had our materials in
            for quite a long time.
 3
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          I understand things can change,
 5
           but it's necessary that I know the precise order
            that I'm responding to.
 7
      THE COURT: Fair enough. I mean, that's why I asked. I need to know what -- I'll just say to
 8
 9
           Mr. Roberts, at the end of the day, what
           Mr. Jackson's proposing, the broad form but the
10
11
           right to come back and limit it, what you're
12
           proposing is start out by saying to the receiver,
13
           here's what we need to know, but you can come
14
           back at any time -- any time on short notice and
15
            say, it's not working; I need to do this.
16
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Yeah.
17
      THE COURT: It's just two different sides of the same
18
            coin, but I wonder if it gets you to the same
19
           place. I was thinking that, all right,
20
            jurisdiction, I need to see specifically what
21
           you're proposing and who's going to fund it and
22
           also who would the court's officer be.
23
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         Two things.
                                      One, we have no
            instructions to withdraw the motion in front of
24
25
            you for that funding application. What I'm
26
            saying is, as this progresses and things move --
27
      THE COURT: Right.
28
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- I'm going to come up with
29
            something else. But just to Mr. Nathanson's
30
           comment, that application still stands, and until
31
           otherwise, he should respond to it. But I also
32
           very much take his point. I am going to, on the
33
           lunch break and start right now, draft a form of
34
            order for people to comment on.
35
                  All right. Okay.
      THE COURT:
36
                 Okay, Mr. Ferris.
                                   What should I have in
37
            front of me, then?
38
      CNSL C. FERRIS: So let me just give you a little bit
39
            of a roadmap.
40
      THE COURT:
                   Okay.
41
      CNSL C. FERRIS: So if you have our argument, our
42
           written argument.
                  Hang on a second. I've got your book of
43
      THE COURT:
44
            authorities.
45
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Actually, we're --
46
      THE COURT: Yeah, I have your written argument.
47
      CNSL C. FERRIS: We're going to give you a new copy.
```

```
THE COURT: Should I give you the other one?
           haven't even marked it.
 3
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Yes, you can give me that one back,
 4
           and I'm going to tell you why I'm giving you a
 5
           new copy.
 6
                  Okay. Madam Clerk, just give this back to
      THE COURT:
 7
           Mr. Ferris.
 8
      CNSL C. FERRIS: I'm giving you a new copy, not
 9
           because anything substantively has changed; only
           because we've created a condensed book, and
10
11
           there's references to the condensed book in this
12
           new one.
13
      THE COURT:
                  So the condensed book that Ms. Hiebert
14
           handed me, I should put aside?
15
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Yes.
16
      THE COURT:
                  All right.
17
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And you can put these condensed books
18
           up.
19
      THE COURT:
                  Just give me a minute, then.
                                                 Just bear
20
           with me while I organize.
21
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Justice, we don't have the tab
22
           numbers. This argument has condensed book tab
23
           numbers, not the other tab numbers, and we don't
24
           have a condensed book or even an index.
25
      THE COURT: So you need a concordance of some type.
26
      CNSL K. JACKSON: We don't have an index at all.
27
           have no way of knowing which tabs they're
28
           referring to.
29
      CNSL C. FERRIS: What I'm going to do is I'm going to
30
           give you my condensed book.
31
      THE COURT: Why don't you take a look at it before we
32
           carry on, just to make sure that --
33
      CNSL K. JACKSON: As long as we have a condensed book,
34
           we're fine.
35
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        I'll give you mine, because I'm only
36
           going to refer the two different documents, and
37
           then you can have that.
38
      THE COURT:
                  The affidavits under seal, do I need those
39
           at hand right now?
40
      CNSL C. FERRIS: You don't need them at hand right
41
           now.
42
                  Okay.
      THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
43
      CNSL C. FERRIS: So Justice, I'm in the argument.
44
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
45
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And I'll just tell you -- you'll see
46
           that the argument has a table of contents.
47
      THE COURT: Right. Your co-counsel will upload this
```

```
to the FTS?
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Yes.
3
      THE COURT:
                  Okay, good.
4
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And if you take a look at the -- if
5
           you take a look at the index, you'll see there's
           an overview.
7
                  Okay.
      THE COURT:
      CNSL C. FERRIS: I'm going to deal with the overview.
8
9
                  Okay.
      THE COURT:
10
      CNSL C. FERRIS: You'll see there then there's a more
           detailed review of the facts, which goes down to
11
12
           part 5, the selected sites. Mr. Brandt is going
13
           to take you through those sections.
                  Okay.
14
      THE COURT:
15
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Then there's the proper scope of
16
           appointment.
17
                  Yeah.
      THE COURT:
18
      CNSL C. FERRIS: That's one you'll hear from
19
           Mr. Roberts again and myself.
                                          I'm going to do
20
           the conclusion.
21
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
22
                        So that's the batting order.
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
23
      THE COURT:
                  Good.
24
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And so if I can take you to the
25
           overview, start on the -- part 1, the overview,
26
           and having -- having said that, I'm going to just
27
           try to situate you here a little bit before I
28
           start into the text.
29
                  Okay.
      THE COURT:
30
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And I want you to -- I want you to
31
           try to remember two facts: The first fact is
32
           this, is that this is a very unusual application,
33
           because generally when a company finds itself in
34
           financial circumstances, there's been some
35
           external factor which has happened to the
36
           company. There's been a change of market,
37
           there's been a loss of customers.
38
                In this circumstance, absolutely nothing has
39
           happened to the business of the company.
40
           company operated for a decade with the exact same
41
           sources of revenue that it has today.
                                                   It would
42
           sell land strategically when it needed to to
43
           continue selling -- paying its bills, and it
44
           would draw on its financing when it needed to in
45
           between those land sales.
                The only thing that's happened to this
46
47
           company, to it business, is that Tom Kusumoto,
```

who's in the courtroom, was replaced by Tian Kusumoto, and Tian Kusumoto decided to cut off both of those funding sources, and I'll take you through this, but he's refused about \$300 million of offers for land, and he refused to advance moneys under the loan, even though the loan has not been topped out. And so that's the only change.

And so what we have is we essentially have a fabricated insolvency. This was an insolvency caused by Mr. Tian Kusumoto. And why would he do that? Well, I'm going to explain to you why I think he would do it, but this is the oddest situation, in that — is that we have a creditor who does not want to be repaid. Mr. Matthews says, desperately tried for the last three years to repay, and Mr. Kusumoto has refused attempts for refinancing, and he's refused all sales. So that's the first fact.

The second fact that I want you to keep in your mind is the sum of \$13,500 a day. That is the sum, roughly, that 599 and Mr. Matthews is being diluted every single day by Mr. -- by the Sanovest financing. And you'll hear from Mr. Brandt that that's exactly what Mr. Kusumoto said to Mr. Matthews, is that, I'll just sit here and I'll dilute you.

And so why is Mr. Kusumoto doing this? doing it as a means to acquire Mr. Matthews' interest cheap. That's the end game. does a full receivership order prejudice Mr. Matthews? Because it fundamentally alters the relationship between the shareholders and the partners here to something which was not contemplated by the expectations of the parties. These parties expected that Mr. Matthews would be operating the business as he had for over a decade, that there would be an entitlement to sell land to pay bills. The most basic expectation of any partner or shareholder is that a company will pay its bills when it's able, and this company is able. It just won't. And he's doing this because he wants to get rid of Mr. Matthews.

Now, my friend Mr. Jackson started off by saying, oh, you don't have to deal with any of these issues of oppression; leave them aside.

```
Well, of course he did, because, as Mr. Roberts
           said to you, Mr. Kusumoto doesn't want to deal with any of those allegations. He wants you to
           consider this without considering his conduct.
5
           He wants you to consider it without any of the
           distractions of why he's doing this. And it's
7
           very telling, in my mind -- very telling -- and I
8
           think -- I could be wrong here -- I think these
9
           are the only three pieces of evidence that
10
           Mr. Jackson really took you to.
                 The first was the Colliers report, and the
11
12
           reference in the joint book -- I have it here.
13
           What's the reference in the joint book?
14
      CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS:
                              In the joint -- the condensed
15
           book?
16
      CNSL C. FERRIS: The condensed book.
17
      CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS: It's at tab 3.
                                               Tab 3 of the
18
            condensed book.
19
      THE COURT:
                   Your book or Ms. Hiebert's condensed book?
20
                       No, in my condensed book it's tab 3.
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
21
      THE COURT:
                   Okay.
22
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And this is the Colliers report.
23
                   Okay.
      THE COURT:
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And if I can take you to the page --
24
25
      THE COURT:
                   This is not under seal, this one.
26
      CNSL C. FERRIS: This is not under seal.
27
      THE COURT:
                  All right.
28
      CNSL C. FERRIS: So if I can take you to the heading
29
            "Possible Marketing Approaches," which is on
30
           page 118 of that document.
31
      THE COURT:
                  All right.
32
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Yeah, it's 118. It says "Possible
33
           Marketing Approaches."
34
      THE COURT: Oh, these were the three -- Mr. Jackson
35
            took me to these.
36
                              So Mr. Jackson -- so there's
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Yeah.
37
            three distinct approaches that are being
38
           considered.
39
                 The next page, this is where Mr. Jackson
40
           took you to. He read you the rationale for the
41
            en bloc sales.
42
      THE COURT: Right.
43
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And said, well, that was the
44
            recommendation that was being made, but what's
45
           happening on this page is they're considering the
46
           pros and cons of the three different approaches.
47
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
```

CNSL C. FERRIS: And then the recommendation is on the next page where he didn't take you to, and the recommendation is:

After careful consideration of the three proposed disposition strategies, Colliers has selected option 1, market the major sites, but excluding Village Core for the time being, as the best possible strategies for Ecoasis, for the reasons set out in the executive summary.

THE COURT: And what's Village Core? CNSL C. FERRIS: It's the centre of town.

THE COURT: I see. Okay.

CNSL C. FERRIS: So what he -- what Colliers came to was the conclusion that -- essentially what we've proposed on this application -- is to pick a few sites to sell, was the best marketing strategy, not en bloc. And so while Mr. Jackson took you to the concerns, that wasn't the overriding recommendation of Colliers.

And so what happens next? Well, there's tons of offers. And so can I take you to paragraph -- I'm going to ask you to flip forward in the written argument.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL C. FERRIS: To paragraph 72.

THE COURT: Right.

CNSL C. FERRIS: You'll see that there's an aggregate value of \$332 million worth of offers over two years. Sanovest and Tian Kusumoto did not permit any of these to proceed to sale. You can look at it. Any combination would have paid them off years ago, instead of having the drip, drip, drip of \$13,500 a day from Mr. Matthews. What creditor doesn't want to get paid?

THE COURT: And the pinpoint, then, in paragraph 73, which backs up your oral submission, but not permitting them to proceed to sale, that's -- could you just show me that. Are you going to come back to that later?

CNSL C. FERRIS: Mr. Brandt is going to take you through the details.

THE COURT: Oh, okay. All right. Okay, great.

CNSL C. FERRIS: But that is -- he did not permit any of them to proceed.

```
THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
      CNSL C. FERRIS: So what does Mr. Jackson refer to
                   Well, he refers to the evidence of Dave
            next?
            Clarke -- Dave Clarke, the former CEO of
 5
            Ecoasis -- and he just mentions him as someone
            who should be listened to.
 7
            Well, actually, I'm going to come to Mr. Clarke later. So let's just go to one
 8
 9
            further tab.
       THE COURT: Okay.
10
11
      CNSL C. FERRIS: So in your -- in, I think it's the
12
            second volume of the condensed book.
13
            first tab in that book. It's the letter of --
14
            it's the letter of April 22nd.
15
       THE COURT: Right, okay. It says "without
            prejudice" -- oh, it's with prejudice.
16
                                                       All
17
            right.
18
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                         So this is the letter that
19
            Mr. Jackson took you to, and he referred to
20
            what's page 38 there, that Mr. Matthews was
21
            proposing that he would accept anything,
22
            including an en bloc listing. You see there --
23
       THE COURT: Oh, yeah, yeah.
24
       CNSL C. FERRIS: -- under C, heading C(b). But you'll
25
            see the purpose of this letter, if I can take you
26
            back to the first paragraph of it. You'll see
27
            that there is, first of all, an offer of
            financing from Timber Creek Mortgage Services,
28
29
            and that Sanovest, as lender, somehow is going to
30
            reject the replacement financing, on page 37 in
31
            the first full unnumbered paragraph.
32
                 Then there's a term sheet that's been
            offered by Sanovest, which the issues with that term sheet are noted, including the fact that \frac{1}{2}
33
34
35
            there's a $280,000 fee to be paid, not upon the
36
            loan being funded, but upon the signing of a term
            sheet, whether or not the loan is funded.
37
38
            that's at the top of page 38, paragraph (c).
39
                 Then I'm going to read to you under
40
            "Financing Alternatives" (c):
41
42
                 As set out in our March 26th, 2024 email,
43
                 Mr. Matthews continues to support an orderly
44
                 sale of assets as a means to pay out the
45
                 Sanovest loan.
46
47
            So three months before this receivership petition
```

```
is filed, Mr. Matthews is saying, anything here
           (a) to (f) we can do to pay out the loan. So we
           can have land and lot sales; we can do an en bloc
           listing; we can do land sales to the partners.
 5
           So he's saying, we'll give you land.
           don't like the prices, we'll give Sanovest and
 7
           Mr. Kusumoto land. He can take it and sell it
 8
           himself or keep it. An enforceable buy/sell
 9
           process; a partition of all of the assets of the
10
           partners; anything Mr. Matthews is prepared to
11
           discuss, any of the above-noted options as an
12
           alternative for pursuing refinancing.
13
                  So that's (e) is the enforceable buy/sell
      THE COURT:
14
           process.
15
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        Yeah.
      THE COURT: Okay.
16
17
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Nothing. Rejected, all. Holus-bolus
18
           rejected.
19
                Instead they demanded on the loan, and we're
20
           here today. So we're now April to September,
21
           drip, drip, $13,500 every day of money from
22
           Mr. Matthews' pocket going into Mr. Kusumoto's
23
           because he won't respond to any alternative.
24
                So now I'm going to take you to Mr. Clarke,
25
           who is said to be this independent witness. Can
26
           I take you to paragraph 122 in the argument.
27
           in the arbitration with the third party, there
28
           was a liability fund. What's happening in ten
29
           days is the next phase of the arbitration.
30
      THE COURT: Yeah.
31
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Because of the confidentiality I'm
32
           just --
33
                  Someone is going to tell me some more
      THE COURT:
34
           about that arbitration.
35
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Well, we're going to have you read
36
           some more of the arbitration. I don't want to
37
           say it out loud.
38
      THE COURT: Okay. All right.
39
      CNSL C. FERRIS: So what I'm going to do here,
40
           Mr. Clarke was the previous CEO of Ecoasis.
41
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
42
      CNSL C. FERRIS: CFO.
43
      THE COURT:
                  CFO.
      CNSL C. FERRIS: He's now employed by the other side
44
45
           of the arbitration. And I want you to read
           paragraph 122 to yourself. This is from the
46
47
           arbitrator's decision.
```

```
THE COURT: Okay. I just read the first paragraph.
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Okay. If you could read it all.
           that's the person being put forward, a person who
           is engaged in that type of conduct, in that kind
5
           of activity, is being put forward as somebody who
           has provided independent evidence here.
                                                     He was
7
           in the courtroom yesterday, Mr. Clarke.
8
           would Mr. Clarke be in the courtroom? Well, I
9
           think probably -- and I don't know this -- but my
10
           supposition is that Mr. Clarke would very
11
           desperately like to avoid the arbitration going
12
           forward.
13
                Now, just building on what Mr. Roberts had
14
           to say, in our submission -- and I'll just take
15
           you to this paragraph 1 here in our overview,
16
           which is that there is a -- sorry, I'm back in my
17
           argument.
18
      THE COURT:
                  I have to just get there.
19
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Apologies.
20
      THE COURT: And is the arbitrator's decision that is
21
           excerpted there in the evidence somewhere?
22
      CNSL C. FERRIS: It is. And I've been informed by my
23
           colleagues that I was overly cautious, that the
24
           arbitrator's decision was filed because there was
25
           an appeal filed.
26
      THE COURT:
                  Oh, all right.
27
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Which has been dismissed -- or
           withdrawn; I can't remember.
28
29
      THE COURT: So it's public.
30
      CNSL C. FERRIS: So it's a public document.
31
           arbitrator's decision, somebody will give me the
32
           reference.
                       Tab 68.
33
      THE COURT:
                 All right.
34
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Condensed book, tab 68, volume 2.
35
                  Okay.
      THE COURT:
36
      CNSL C. FERRIS: So if I can just take you to
           paragraph 1 in the overview.
37
38
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
39
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Which is, to say it narrowly, is
40
           fine, but there's a single narrow issue before
41
           the court, which is what is the proper scope of
42
           the appointee's powers over some of the -- all of
43
           the assets of Ecoasis Developments LLP. And so
44
           we say -- and we continue to say -- that this
           court should be very mindful and very concerned
45
46
           about getting too far into this relationship
47
           between these two partners in light of the
```

 conduct. And my friend will talk about conduct as well. But in light of this conduct, we should do -- follow the principle of doing as little as possible, interfere as little as possible, alter the status quo as little as possible, do only what needs to be done: pay off this loan and don't alter the relationship meaningfully between these two parties. There's lots of litigation over that relationship, but this receivership should not be the vehicle for parties to avoid the consequences of their conduct. So that's my off-the-cuff.

THE COURT: And I take it, then, that the issues surrounding their respective conduct is what's going to trial in January 2026.

CNSL C. FERRIS: Correct. And you'll hear -- I suspect you'll hear, because you heard it a little bit in the case planning conference yesterday from Mr. Byma, that one of the things that Mr. Tian Kusumoto wants is he wants this receivership order to affect that very litigation that's going to deal with the parties inter se. He stood up and said, well, the receivership order might impact, because in a --

THE COURT: I don't know that he said he wanted to. He said it might.

CNSL C. FERRIS: He said it might, and we said it didn't. But you can see where this is going. We're going to avoid the consequences of the conduct even further. We're going to say this receivership order somehow impacts that and pushes it off further.

And so when I say that we have to be very concerned about the consequences of what we do here so these parties can get their conduct between themselves dealt with, they need -- we need to be careful and cautious.

So I'm now going to go to the argument.

THE COURT: Sure.

CNSL C. FERRIS: So I'm at paragraph 2, and I think I've said that, which is that the appropriate scope of the appointment is limited to the relief that will end Sanovest's intentional blockage of the partnership's development business and allow the partnership to repay the Sanovest loan.

And I just -- just again, let's go up a level. This is a land development company. It's

like a mining company that's a mineral exploration company. It has no cash flow until it can sell its land. It's got golf course operations, which you've heard from Mr. Roberts are self-funding, but the golf course is there to support the land development. And if it can't sell land, then it's got no money. And every year there's property taxes. So the only source of money for this company is land sales, and that's exactly what they did for ten years, or they drew down on loans to ultimately pay back through land sales. And so this company needs to be allowed to do the business that it was intended to do, and that's what we're trying to accomplish.

We say that -- and I think Mr. Roberts has said this -- that it's a blunt hammer, a full receivership, which is unnecessary in the circumstances. The current reality is that Sanovest has manufactured a default under its loan and seeks to leverage that default to enhance its own position as a partner and shareholder to the detriment of 599 and Matthews. This is an attempt to stymy and oppress Mr. Matthews and 599.

So I'm over on page 2 here, and this builds on what Mr. Roberts has to say, but you have to remember the hats that are worn by the parties. So Sanovest, on this application, is a creditor seeking repayment on its debt. That's evidenced from the pleading and the relief sought. It purports to protect and demand repayment on a debt owing to it by the partnership.

And I just, you know, remind you that the debt is somewhere between 50 or \$60 million, and you've seen the estimate of value, appraised value of the assets. And so it seeks an order over many hundreds of millions of dollars of assets to protect a loan of about one-fifth of the size of the assets.

So just at that very basic level, there's no risk here that they're not going to get repaid. Like, not even close. They could be repaid many times over. So we've put in their pleadings there in paragraph 10, and it demands that it be repaid, but at the same time, it expresses a willingness to keep refinancing the project,

agreeing that the project has significant value, but purporting to disagree with the strategy to realize on this value, a strategy that has been in place for a decade with Tom Kusumoto and Mr. Matthews.

The partners are currently unable to generate revenue from the sale or development of land because the partners agree that the project has significant potential value; they disagree on the appropriate strategy to realize on that value.

Now, two things: One, the strategy has already been employed for a decade. Lots of sites have been sold. Secondly, does it really sit well with the court that you have bills to pay, there's people out there who are owed money by this company. There's offers. Even if you disagree with the overall strategy, couldn't you just sell one little property, something that doesn't impact the overall strategy, to pay off those people that need their money? Does it really make sense to spend three years driving this company into a receivership application and not try to pay off anybody just for your own purposes? Is that really the type of conduct that this court wants to reward?

You know, we say that this shows the oppressive character of Sanovest's position in its attempt to wear both hats before the court. It seeks to exercise its right to be repaid while simultaneously saying that repayment and debt owing is unnecessary, provided that a neutral third party with control of key aspects of the operations is appointed to address partner issues. It's trying to do both under the hat of insolvency.

Tian Kusumoto claims to believe that a receiver manager is required to ensure that the partnership assets are safeguarded and their value maximized for the benefit of the partnership and other stakeholders. The receiver manager is best — is best positioned to determine how best to monetize the partnership assets, specifically its lands, including with input from its partners.

Similarly, in Sanovest's written submissions in the receivership petition, Sanovest and Tian

 Kusumoto's view is expressed in these terms: Sanovest and Tian Kusumoto are of the view that, since the parties are unable to advance, development of the partnership's assets should be sold en bloc. So that's their view. The only -- and you've heard that about how many people are out there who have hundreds of millions of dollars versus how many people are out there who have 20 or 30 or \$40 million. So query whether what he's really saying is, I want to buy them all at a distressed price from Mr. Matthews.

The only practical and appropriate path forward is the partnership assets and business to be put in the hands of a court-appointed receiver who can best determine how to monetize the assets and who will be sufficiently funded to safeguard the assets and ensure the continued operation of the partnership during that process.

However, as stated by Tian Kusumoto in other evidence given in support of the receivership petition, I believe that a comprehensive and coordinated approach is required. I believe the respondents require access to funds to conduct the process and the operating expenses. Sanovest is prepare to provide those funds, but only if there's a receiver in control of all of the assets to ensure the process and expenses are commercially reasonable and that it has over sight to the process to safeguard shareholders' interests.

Sanovest's interest is continuing as the partnership's primary lender is also evident in its recent presentation of a term sheet for a loan of 85 million, and that's cited.

So seen for what it really is, Sanovest seeks the appointed receiver, not to be repaid as a creditor, though it's chosen the vehicle for receivership position, but in order to circumvent the substance of the ongoing litigation between Sanovest and Matthews and further entrench its position under the partner to the detriment of Matthews.

And so the \$13,500 a day will continue, but it will be more, because not only is it going to be the ongoing debts of the company, there's going to be the cost of the receiver, and not just the receiver who's marketing, a receiver

who's coming in and running the whole thing. most expensive receivership possible is going to be funded by Mr. Kusumoto, who will be fully supportive, and it will dilute Mr. Matthews on top of the \$13,500. And so that's the goal. That's what's happening here.

So I'm over at page 4 now. I'll try to get through this section, and then --

THE COURT: Sure.

CNSL C. FERRIS: -- we can take the morning break. So this is a continuation, as we've said, of a long pattern of oppressive conduct by Sanovest and Tian Kusumoto. Sanovest asserts that the total amount owing under the Sanovest loan is approximately \$62 million, and this is the interest accruing per day. Every day the Sanovest loans remains due, 599 and Mr. Matthews's equity in the partnership erodes. This erosion is taking place to Sanovest's benefit as both creditor and partner.

Although the amount that is due on the Sanovest loan is a matter of dispute, the following table illustrates the interest that would allow to the partnership over five years if Sanovest were to continue to lend to the partnership of 8 percent.

So if this receivership goes until the end of 2025, all of a sudden we're up at \$71 million; 76 in 2026. Does it take two years to sell this en bloc? Maybe. '27, 83 million. So you can see the impact that that has on Mr. Matthews, who is not the secured lender.

So erosion of 599 and Matthews' equity in the partnership to Sanovest's benefit, as both creditor and partner, has to have been Tian Kusumoto's intent since at least 2021, when he stopped paying any bills to anyone. As Mr. Matthews has deposed:

> Through the fall and summer of 2021, Tian stated to me on several occasions --

And just so you know, we don't call him Tian in the affidavits for any disrespect. It's just because there's so many Kusumotos here, it's easier.

THE COURT: Right.

38 39

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30 31

32

33 34

35

36

37

40

41

42 43

44

45

46

47

CNSL C. FERRIS:

 Tian stated to me on several occasions that his ultimate goal was to have Sanovest purchase 599's equity in Bear Mountain on a discounted or distressed basis, and that he had the benefit of time to do so, since Sanovest was continuing to earn interest on the Sanovest loan, effectively eroding 599's interest.

On August 13th, 2021, the partnership's external accountant relayed the same message to me in a telephone conversation that he had had a conversation with Tian in which Tian had stated that he was happy to wait ten years and let the interest on the Sanovest loan eat up all of 599's equity in the project.

So how do you do that? You get the most broad receivership, you ask the receiver to sell the thing en bloc and you wait, and eventually Mr. Matthews ends up with nothing.

Sanovest has effectively shut the taps to funding under the Sanovest loan, while also blocking the development's land sales and third party financing, despite the balance of the loan still being well below the current cap of 70 million.

At Exhibit M -- the cite is there -- Mr. Kusumoto attaches a loan summary showing that, from June 30th, 2019, to March 15th, 2024, Sanovest only advanced approximately \$6 million to the partnership -- now, just think about that for a second, because Mr. Jackson told you that the property taxes are about \$1.6 million a year. So in five years, Sanovest has advanced \$6 million -- that doesn't cover the property taxes -- less than the partnership's total property taxes for the same period, while receiving more than \$38 million from land sales in repayments towards the Sanovest loan over the same period.

This is the mischief of the relief sought by Sanovest on this receivership petition. Such mischief should not be sanctioned by this court, considering Sanovest's relief. This needs to be brought to an end. There needs to be what we say

 is someone to go with limited powers and to get the Sanovest loan paid off, and that's where we say this application should land, and so that's probably a good spot for the morning break. COURT: Very good. All right, thank you.

THE COURT: Very good. All right, thank you.
THE CLERK: Order in chambers. These chambers are
adjourned for the morning recess.

(PROCEEDINGS RECESSED AT 11:16 AM) (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED AT 11:39 AM)

THE COURT: Just before you carry on, Madam Clerk has identified -- brought to my attention that new numbers seem to be calling in or signing in to the link, and she tried to find out who they were, and they hung up. So when we see them try to sign in again, I'm going to ask who they are, because the first day someone asked if anyone was counsel. I know that a media individual asked to be admitted, and it was cleared through Mr. Cohen, former Justice Cohen, and a link was provided, and they know the rules about not recording and about participating virtually.

But I want to make sure the other individuals do as well, and I think one of them is -- I did say that -- you know, one of them -- he didn't say, but I think Madam Clerk has been given a number, that's Mr. Clarke, who you referred to, and presumably -- well, I'll make sure he knows the rules about recording and the like. So if you see me interrupt you for a minute, it's because we're trying to figure out who's calling in.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL C. FERRIS: Okay, Justice. I'm at the bottom of page 5.

THE COURT: Right.

CNSL C. FERRIS: Sum of response. And I'm going to take you through this section, and then I'm going to pass this over to Mr. Brandt.

And so in opposing the funding application and advancing the receivership position, we say that there's five core points to Sanovest and Tian Kusumoto's position, and those are summarized at paragraph 4 of their funding

submissions.

And so their first point is that they say that the relief sought on our application will not address the partnership's liquidity crisis. And we say the statement is incorrect, that this is a liquidity crisis that was created by Sanovest now for over years, and that there has been serious interest and offers from investors to purchase development sites, and there's been offers to finance, and so we don't see any real problem with -- as Mr. Roberts said -- obtaining some liquidity if that was limited receiver put in place.

Second point, they say that the court can't make the order, and whether this order is — this is the order that's referred to in our notice of application, but in evidence, we say that that too is incorrect. The relief sought in the funding application is for the appointment of an agent with powers to conduct a marketing and sales process. It's not an order for subdivision, nor does it contemplate a rewrite of Sanovest's securities. Essentially, it gives directions to that agent, if they needed to subdivide, that they could do that and go through the process.

On the contrary, 599 and Matthews seek relief directed at paying off and eliminating the need for the security held by Sanovest, which at least on the face of the demand, is what Sanovest should want. Indeed, Sanovest and Tian themselves purport to recognize the need to monetize the partnership's assets by asking the courts to appoint a full receiver. So again, we say it's an order that can be made.

They say that it doesn't address the outstanding litigation, and I just want to take you to where Mr. Jackson took you, which was this list of litigation, which I think is attached to my friend's oppression submissions as an exhibit at the end, because there's some context here. You see the schedule 1.

THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.

CNSL C. FERRIS: So you'll see the first two actions there.

THE COURT: Yes.

CNSL C. FERRIS: So those are actions which have been

```
settled, and the problem with the actions is
           they're been settled within -- by Mr. Matthews at
           a mediation at a level that is below what
           Mr. Kusumoto wanted to settle for, but he's
 5
           refused to fund the settlement, and so that's why
           those litigation matters are still outstanding,
 7
           is because there's been a settlement, and they've
 8
           sued to enforce the settlement.
 9
                Well, Mr. Kusumoto didn't attend the
10
           mediation, so he needs to approve it, and first
           of all approve it, and then the settlement needs
11
12
           to be funded. But there's no real outstanding
13
                  There's nothing pending in those
14
           applications at this point in time, but that's
15
           just another --
16
      THE COURT: Are the settlement amounts confidential,
17
           if they're suing to enforce? I could just make a
18
           note of each one.
19
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       We'll check and we'll get you the
20
           number.
21
      THE COURT:
                  All right.
22
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Thank you. It's not confidential.
23
      THE COURT:
                  I could make a note of each one.
24
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       So that takes care of the first two.
25
                  Okay.
      THE COURT:
26
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       The next one is one of these matters,
27
           Sanovest actions.
28
      THE COURT: Right.
29
      CNSL C. FERRIS: So that's what we say should be
30
           ongoing.
31
                The next is Mr. Kusumoto's debt action
32
           against Mr. Matthews and the counterclaim of
33
           Mr. Matthews against Mr. Tom Kusumoto.
34
      THE COURT: Sorry, number 3 is the insolvency action;
35
           right?
36
      CNSL C. FERRIS: No, this is the action that was
37
           filed --
38
      THE COURT: Oh, the oppression action.
39
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                      No, this is not.
                                          This is Sanovest
40
           filed an action in May of 2022 against
41
           Mr. Matthews -- his father, Tom Kusumoto.
42
           is over the parcel of land which --
43
      THE COURT:
                 Oh, that's what's going to trial in
44
           January?
45
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Yes, this is one of them that's going
46
           to trial in January.
47
      THE COURT: Right, one of them. Right.
```

CNSL C. FERRIS: And so that's that one.

```
THE COURT:
                  That's the one I heard about yesterday.
3
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Yeah.
4
      THE COURT:
                  All right.
5
                       The next one is the one you also
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
           heard about. This is the one where there's --
7
                  There's an application that's outstanding.
      THE COURT:
8
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Correct.
9
      THE COURT:
                  To join it.
10
      CNSL C. FERRIS: But that -- it's in the whole mix.
11
           It's the same related parties.
12
                The next one is the oppression proceeding,
13
           which is, again, going to trial in January.
14
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
15
      CNSL C. FERRIS: The next one after that is -- it's a
16
           derivative action brought by Mr. Matthews and 599
17
           on behalf of the partnership. Again, it's one of
18
           the ones that's going to trial in January.
19
                Number 7 is, again, the result of the
           inability to sell any land, is that you can't pay
20
21
           property taxes, and so that there will be a
22
           charge on title with respect to that, and at some
23
           point I guess the City of Langford could apply,
24
           but there's been no applications in that made,
           and it just -- it sits there.
25
26
                And the last one is this receivership
27
           petition. And so what you really have with
28
           respect to third parties is you have two cases --
29
           one is a settlement which needs to be approved
30
           and funded, and one is property taxes which
31
           should have been paid -- but there's nothing
32
           pending or urgent about any of them.
                                                  They've
33
           been sitting for quite a while.
34
                And so we say that there really is nothing
35
           that would need to be dealt with with the
36
           outstanding litigation, that the interparty
37
           litigation needs to proceed.
                                         The other
38
           litigation is not urgent or pending, and if
39
           somebody was to do that, then a limited appointed
40
           receiver could come to this court and ask for
41
           some relief.
                         So --
42
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Justice, I just want to be clear on
43
           one thing. My friend is talking about property
44
           taxes being paid. They haven't. I just wanted
45
           to be clear on that.
46
      CNSL C. FERRIS: No, I said they have not been paid.
47
      CNSL K. JACKSON: They have not been.
```

```
THE COURT:
                  They haven't been paid.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: But that's not part of the
3
           litigation is what I'm saying, Justice.
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
5
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        There's no litigation around
           property tax.
7
                  There's a --
      THE COURT:
8
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: It wouldn't be on the list, is what
9
           I'm saying.
10
      THE COURT:
                  There's claim. Well, it's in the list.
11
      CNSL K. JACKSON: But that's litigation. I think if
12
           my friend is talking about the Langford action,
13
           it's not about property taxes.
14
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Sorry, it's --
15
      THE COURT:
                  Oh, it's not?
16
      CNSL K. JACKSON: No.
17
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Sorry, I apologize. It was a fee
18
           payable to Langford for a parkway extension.
19
      THE COURT: Oh. So there's no charge there.
20
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                      No charge there.
21
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
22
      CNSL C. FERRIS: But again, it's just something which
23
           would be an ordinary-course expense which has
           been filed. Nothing's been pursued.
24
                                                  There's no
25
                                        It's not like
           urgency with respect to it.
26
           there's a pending application or anything like
27
           that.
28
                  Okay. All right.
      THE COURT:
                                      Thank you.
29
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Apologies.
30
                  That's fine.
      THE COURT:
31
      CNSL C. FERRIS: So what should be (d), which looks
           like a second (b) on the page on my copy,
32
33
           Sanovest says that the relief sought in the
34
           funding application will not address the
35
           deadlock. And again, we beg to disagree on this
36
           minimalist approach that we suggest that you
37
                 As we've noted, the only deadlock is one
38
           of Sanovest's own making, as Tian and Sanovest
39
           seek to leverage their dual position as lender
40
           and partner to benefit and entrench their
41
           position to the detriment of 599 and Matthews.
42
                The relief sought in the funding application
43
           will address this deadlock by eliminating
44
           Sanovest's status as lender and thereby
45
           eliminating their incentive to delay and limit
46
           cooperation. If they actually start paying
47
           interest to a third party, that should
```

incentivize them to be more cooperative.

And I should say that the financing that Mr. Matthews had in place required that there be land sales at some point to pay down the loan, and that was why they wouldn't be approved. Again, cut off the funding.

And then the last point is that Sanovest and Tian Kusumoto say that relief from oppression is not available to address issues within the partnership. And again, we say that's incorrect. And while there are limits to the scope of relief under the corporate oppression remedy, you'll remember that each of these partnerships is operated by a company that manages them, and the decisions that are made with respect to each of those companies are decisions that are made with respect by the board of each of those companies. And so the approval of purchases, financing, that goes to a board meeting at that corporate level.

And so this isn't a bare trust situation where the corporation does nothing. These are actually corporations that operate and make fundamental decisions, and we say that that distinguishes them from the cases that you'll hear about from my friend Mr. Nathanson and brings them within the corporate oppression remedy.

THE COURT: One question I have for you, and others may want to weigh in it on it as well, is if the nature of the conflicting evidence relating to the oppression action and the relief sought in your client's application is such that it's -- I determine it's inappropriate for a summary application -- or put it another way, do I need to -- I'll be more artful.

If I accept what Mr. Roberts is putting forward, do I need -- is the only basis of which I can accept that within the context of your client's application in the oppression proceeding, or can I make the type of order Mr. Roberts is advocating -- perhaps not fully, but with some changes -- within the context of the insolvency proceeding and the application brought by Sanovest?

CNSL C. FERRIS: So my answer --

THE COURT: Isn't there jurisdiction for me to do that?

33 Submissions by Cnsl C. Ferris

```
CNSL C. FERRIS: Yeah, so my answer to you is you
           could do it in both.
3
                  Okay.
      THE COURT:
4
      CNSL C. FERRIS: You can do it in our application,
5
           because our application is brought both under the
           Law and Equity Act, as well as the oppression
7
           proceeding.
8
                  Okay.
      THE COURT:
9
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And you can do it in my friend's
10
           proceeding because it's brought under the Law and
11
           Equity Act, and you're not bound to accept their
12
                  It's in your discretion.
           order.
13
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
14
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       So you can carve up our order.
           can carve down their order. It's really, at the
15
16
           end of the day, where you see all the factors
17
           landing.
18
      THE COURT: Right. Because you told me at the outset
19
           your -- the relief sought under your client's
20
           application is premised on -- is injunctive
21
           relief, serious issue to be tried. But it
22
           occurred to me, what if the test is different,
23
           it's a prima facie case and it's a higher test or
24
           more stringent test? Do I need to go that far
25
           if, at the end of the day, the parties are
26
           deadlocked and I look at them in terms of
27
           receivership appointment under the BIA?
28
                      Yeah, so my answer to you is you
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
29
           don't have to, but you can.
30
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
31
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And so, just to be clear here, like
32
           my friends explained this up, ours is maybe a
33
           little less surgical than theirs.
34
      THE COURT: Okay.
35
      CNSL C. FERRIS: But I'm trying to address a little
36
           bit of both.
                  Yeah, right.
37
      THE COURT:
38
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                      And Mr. Roberts is dealing just with
39
           receivership.
40
                  Well, what you're -- in effect what you're
      THE COURT:
41
           doing is giving me context -- factual context in
42
           which you hope to persuade me that I shouldn't
43
           issue the broad form of receivership order, at
44
           least not at this juncture.
45
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Correct.
46
      THE COURT:
                 Given the -- what you say are the facts
47
           surrounding this deadlock.
```

```
CNSL C. FERRIS: Correct.
      THE COURT: Yeah, okay. All right.
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And so I'll just finish up with this
3
           point here, this last point.
                                         This is just on the
5
           oppression point, the last sentence here that
           this managing partner company -- and this is
7
           important -- is the corporate vehicle that the
8
           partners set up to manage their affairs. And so
9
           that's what separates it from some of the other
10
           vehicles that Mr. Nathanson will take you
11
           through.
                    This is the same vehicle that Sanovest
12
           and Tian Kusumoto have sought to use their
13
           efforts to oppress 599 and Matthews. So it's in
14
           that vehicle that the suppression has occurred.
15
                And so that is why we say that this is a
16
           case where, notwithstanding the fact that there's
17
           partnerships in place, the corporate oppression
18
           remedies apply.
19
                And with that, I'm going to turn the floor
20
           over to -- the podium over to my friend
21
           Mr. Brandt, who will take you through the facts
22
           in a bit more detail.
23
      THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Brandt?
24
                      Thank you, Justice.
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                                             Just before I
25
           begin, there is one other volume I wish to hand
26
           up, and we've provided a copy of it to my
27
           friends. It is a condensed book of just the
28
           bodies of the affidavits, the core ones that I'm
           going to be referring to in the factual
29
30
           submissions. Just it makes a far smaller binder
31
           than with the exhibits.
32
      THE COURT:
                  Thank you.
33
                       So Justice, I'm at page -- I'm at
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
34
           paragraph 30 of the argument, beginning at
35
           part 2, and in this section I'm providing a
36
           snapshot of the partnership as it was during the
37
           first eight years of its operation beginning in
38
           2013, and some discussion of the parties'
39
           reasonable expectations. And again, as my friend
40
           Mr. Ferris said, this goes to both the relief
41
           being sought in the oppression proceeding, and
42
           also the factual background for the type of
43
           receivership order that may be appropriate.
44
                Just at paragraph 30 at the beginning, at
45
           the Bear Mountain master-planned resort community
           north of Victoria on Vancouver Island, as we've
46
47
           heard, it's partly within the city of Langford
```

```
and partly within the municipal district of
           Highlands. As a master-planned community -- and
3
           we'll talk a bit more about what that means.
4
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
5
      CNSL G. BRANDT: But they're structured to the land
                      There are some house covenants with
           planning.
7
           respect to conformity and quality of
8
           construction, and the community is centred around
9
           amenities, including golf, but also tennis,
           cycling, hiking, running, et cetera.
10
11
                As a master-planned community, there are
12
           many stakeholders, including residents, many of
13
           whom are members of the golf -- golf course,
14
           members, which includes nonresidents as well,
15
           builders, businessowners, guests and visitors.
16
           There are multiple amenities, multiple real
17
           estate opportunities, including single-family,
18
           townhouse, condominium, purpose-built rental and
19
           hotels.
20
                Mr. Matthews has been the president and CEO
21
           of EBMD, which is the managing partner of both
22
           the land partnership and the resort partnership,
23
           since 2013.
24
                 I'm just going to go into this binder of
25
           affidavits here at tab F, and paragraph 14.
26
      THE COURT: And just to relate it back to which
27
           paragraph of your written submissions does this
28
           relate to?
29
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       I'm still at paragraph 30 here, but
30
           I'm in the --
31
      THE COURT:
                  In which sub?
32
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       30(a).
33
      THE COURT:
                  Okay, great.
34
      CNSL G. BRANDT: And I'm just at the reference here to
35
           Matthews #1, receivership, number 14.
36
      THE COURT: Oh, yeah, okay. So that's tab --
                       Tab 7 of this -- sorry, tab F of this
37
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
38
           affidavit binder.
39
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
40
      CNSL G. BRANDT: And just over -- at page 7, which is
41
           tab 14, and then just over the page to page 8,
           Mr. Matthews sets out a list of his duties and
42
43
           responsibilities in his role as CEO, and that's
44
           important, in part, because it goes to the -- one
45
           of the financial factors here, which is the
46
           management fee, and Mr. Tian Kusumoto's evidence
47
           provided in his first affidavit in the
```

receivership proceeding that it's unclear -- it's unclear what role Mr. Matthews served for -- or to earn his management fee.

And so here -- I won't read them all -- but from (a) to (k) is the listing of Mr. Matthews' duties and responsibilities as the CEO of EBMD, as the person on the ground who's been overseeing and managing this project since inception.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL G. BRANDT: Then there is also a reference here -- I won't take the court to it, and it's not in our condensed book -- but it's the same Matthews #1 affidavit. Exhibits A to E are just excerpts from the website that illustrate the golf course, the tennis, the amenities of the resort, and they show a professionally run, high-caliber golf and tennis facilities there.

Today -- I'm at (b) now -- Bear Mountain consists of approximately 1,400 single-family residences, townhouses and condominiums, and is home to more than 3,000 residents. Over the next ten years Bear Mountain is projected to have at least 3,000 homes and more than 8,000 additional residents.

The assets -- we call them Bear Mountain -- consist of approximately 775 acres of land. It includes two golf courses, tennis facility and at least nine distinct potential development sites, future development sites.

We've heard about the appraised value. I won't repeat the number here. Obviously the fact that the land vastly exceeds the amount of the obligations owed by the partnership.

In addition to the current development sites -- so those are the nine identified here -- there are some 540 acres of the partnership's lands that are zoned for golf course and open space, including -- and this is significant -- significant tracks of unused land that may be subject to future rezoning.

And this is again important because it goes to one of the points raised yesterday, and I'm just into this affidavit binder again at tab C. This is an affidavit that Mr. Matthews has provided in this proceeding. And just over to paragraph 12(a) that's on page 7, and here Mr. Matthews responds to the assertion that was

 made yesterday, which is that if the three sites that are being sought in our funding application are ordered to be made part of a marketing process, that would essentially take up or eviscerate most of the partnership's developable land. That is not fact.

So what Mr. Matthews deposes here at paragraph 12(a) is that:

It's not correct that if the selected lands are sold, the partnership will be left with less than half of its developable land. The partnership has land in both Langford and District of Highlands that can be rezoned for development. The reason why the partnership has not applied for more density to date is because we have significant existing density. Prematurely increasing the partnership's zoned developable land base has the effect of increasing the total amount of property taxes payable by the partnership on an annual basis.

Mr. Matthews goes on to say that he's advised by Mr. Mogensen, who's the land development manager at the partnership, and he verily believes that, based on land-planning exercises, we could potentially increase our developable area within the District of Highlands from 18 hectares to 76.5 with future rezoning, and on this basis, the sales proposed in the funding application would leave intact about 75 percent of the developable area.

So we've heard evidence of the amount of property taxes that the partnership already pays, and Mr. Matthews' evidence here is clear that this future land sits bare, the way the land was when Bear Mountain was a mountain, and this whole project, since inception, has been about taking land, preparing it for development, including through subdivision, rezoning, et cetera.

I'm at (f). The partnership and the resort partnership employ approximately 80 to 150 managers and staff, depending on the season, including five employees on the partnership's development side and between 75 and 125 to 145 on the golf and recreation side. The resort

partnership has -- it's a large operation.

Here under paragraph 31 is an aerial plan for all of the partnership's Bear Mountain assets, just so the court can see a picture of it, and what's identified here are the three development sites that are proposed as part of our funding application, the Victoria Peak site, the Hole 5 site and the Players Drive site.

Notably, the Players Drive site, which has substantial value, is — the evidence is it's ready to be sold as is. That site doesn't require any subdivision or any other type of bundling to be sold. It is ready to be marketed without those steps. The other sites are also ready to be marketed relatively quickly, and we'll come to that evidence. And obviously, as happens in a marketing process, the site may be marketed with subdivision and so on to follow under an LOI or as part of a marketing process. It's — these things happen concurrently over time, because all of these take time for conditional removal and take time to close.

I'm at paragraph 32. In or around 2011, Matthews became interested in the Bear Mountain project as a potential business opportunity. At that time development at Bear Mountain was well underway; however, the existing owners had run into financial difficulties with the project's asset -- and the project's assets had come under creditor protection -- reorganized into the control of HSBC.

And this, Justice, is part of what gives rise to the concern over the full receivership order in this case, is the stigma not only of a receivership, but the stigma here of a second receivership.

And I've just put -- I won't take the court to it, but I've put a cite here to a news article -- that's what's cited here at Exhibit B -- from that time that demonstrates the negative public perception that arose from the receivership. And Matthews also gives evidence on that, and I'll just read it. It's at -- Mr. Matthews' evidence is at F of the affidavit binder.

He says in his last paragraph of the affidavit:

Having gone to market for third-party
funding, for both refinancing --

4 5

THE COURT: Just a minute, let me get there. Last paragraph of the whole affidavit?
CNSL G. BRANDT: Of this affidavit, of tab F here.

THE COURT: Okay, just a minute.

CNSL G. BRANDT: He says two things in this paragraph. THE COURT: Just let me get it. Okay, go ahead.

CNSL G. BRANDT: Thank you, sorry.

He says two things that are important in this affidavit: one, that there's significant market support for financing the partnership's land assets, and that's on the basis that there can be a sale of lands, and he says:

I am confident that there is strong market support for financing the Partnership's land assets. Therefore, there would be ample financing available under a monitored sale process to provide liquidity while land is sold to provide operating capital and to repay the Sanovest Loan.

And then says:

By contrast, I fear that appointment of a receiver over all Partnership assets, including the Resort Partnership's operations, will reverberate negatively through the Bear Mountain community, as it would be perceived as similar to the 2009 creditor protection reorganization ... which resulted in long-term reputational impact and value suppression of the Bear Mountain Project.

He believes such an outcome is unnecessary and should be avoided.

The news article I referred to -- I won't take the court to it. Actually, I'll provide that reference subsequently.

THE COURT: All right.

CNSL G. BRANDT: I think it's in the condensed book.

All right. I'm at 33. In October 2013,
having previously partnered on a land development

project at Whistler Mountain -- and that was Mr. Matthews with Mr. Tom Kusumoto -- 599 and Sanovest agreed to jointly acquire assets associated with the Bear Mountain project. At that time the Bear Mountain assets included the two golf courses and practice facilities, the hotel and extensive real estate holdings. And of course, that was Mr. Tom Kusumoto.

The acquisition of the assets was carried out through two limited liability partnerships. We've heard about those two, and one we simply call "the partnership" -- that's Ecoasis Developments LLP -- and the other is Ecoasis Resort and Golf LLP that we refer to as "the resort partnership," and then there's the managing partner, EBMD. It was incorporated for that purpose, to be the managing partner for each of the two partnerships, and it acquired one partnership unit in each. Of course the balance, as we've heard, are divided between 599 and Sanovest.

Corporate documents are exhibited here at (a) to (i). I won't take -- I won't go there right now.

Now, upon -- when EBMD was incorporated, Matthews and Tom Kusumoto were each appointed as directors of the company. Matthews was appointed as CEO and president of EBMD, responsible for managing Bear Mountain's overall operation.

Paragraph 36. The partnership's acquisition of the assets was financed by Sanovest under a commitment letter dated October 8th, 2013, and I believe we've already seen the Sanovest loan agreement here. The terms of the -- and just to begin with the term of this, because the term of the loan here is for just over four years, and in my submission, this speaks to the parties' reasonable expectations as to the time horizon that they were looking to.

And Matthews as well deposes to that, and that is in this affidavit binder at A, and at paragraph 22. And Mr. Matthews says:

At that time, Tom and I were uncertain as to the time horizon for our involvement in the Bear Mountain Project; however, we discussed and anticipated a timeline of 10 years or

less for realizing a reasonable profit on our investment and exiting the project through asset sales. With the time horizon somewhat unknown, we agreed to the Sanovest Loan having a term to November 30, 2017, on the understanding that it may need to be extended or increased.

Mr. Matthews has also given evidence in this -in the oppression proceeding that a priority
would be for repayment down of the Sanovest loan.
Of course, we're now 11 years into the project,
and we see the Sanovest loan not having been paid
down and no plan in place, certainly not since
June of 2021, to pay down the Sanovest loan.

June of 2021, to pay down the Sanovest loan.

And that reference, Justice, is at paragraph 14 of that same tab A in the affidavits, where Mr. Matthews gives evidence as to how he expected this would go and paragraph (e) there's reference to generating significant revenues from initial sales to pay down the financing provided by Sanovest.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL G. BRANDT: So the loan was 8 percent annually. It's compounded quarterly. \$700,000 lender's fee paid from the initial advance, and the concept of this loan was that Sanovest would advance funds to the partnership for -- on notice, and the loan document speaks to advances being made on -- I believe it's two business days' notice for partnership activities, and the loan sets out the purposes and use of that, and that's reproduced over at the next -- underneath this paragraph 38. Purposes and use of the loan are set out here: purchasing the property, construction and developing the property, funding operations of the golf courses and the hotel, other approved uses, and the loan will be advanced in multiple advances after not less than two business days' prior written notice.

That is what is contemplated in the loan. The loan was extended, of course, and a first modification agreement was entered into on June 15th, 2016. That extended the loan to November 1st, 2021.

If we look, Justice, at the second extension -- sorry, the first extension, and that

44

45

46

47

```
is at tab 6.
      THE COURT: Of the condensed book?
3
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Of the condensed book.
4
      THE COURT: Okay.
5
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Paragraph 3 here states that:
7
                Interest shall continue to accrue --
8
9
      THE COURT:
                  Tab 6, paragraph?
10
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Tab 6. I'm just at paragraph 3.
      THE COURT: Oh, it's a letter; right? June 15th.
11
12
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Correct. It's a letter, June 15th,
13
                  This is what is the first modification to
           2016.
14
           the original Sanovest loan agreement.
15
      THE COURT: Right. So where's interest accruing?
16
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Just over the page at "Term and
17
           Interest Rate."
18
      THE COURT: Oh, yes. All right. Okay, got it.
19
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
20
                The term of the loan shall be extended to
21
                November 1, 2021.
                                   Interest will continue to
22
                accrue on the balance outstanding under the
23
                loan at the rate of 8 percent per annum,
24
                calculated daily, not in advance, and
25
                compounded quarterly from the funding date,
26
                as defined in the commitment letter, for the
27
                term of the loan.
28
29
           So the point here is that interest continues to
30
           accrue, compounded quarterly, and the repayment
31
           of interest or of principal is really -- is
32
           coming from Sanovest's charge and Sanovest's
33
           right to repayment from the sale of lands. There
34
           is no obligation for regular quarterly or monthly
35
           payments under the loan. And so it's incorrect
36
           to suggest that, prior to the loan expiry date,
37
           that there was a default of the partnership's
38
           repayment obligations under the loan. The loan
39
           was further extended by a second modification
40
           agreement.
41
                Between -- now I'm in paragraph 44.
                                                      Between
42
           October 2013 and late 2016, the partnership
43
           accomplished a number of key objectives with
```

respect to increasing land value, infrastructure

and other sporting amenities. In Mr. Matthews's

profile of the resort communities golf courses

development, community engagement and raising the

5 6

78

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

affidavit -- I won't take the court to that right now -- but in Matthews first affidavit in the oppression proceeding, paragraph 29, he speaks to a number of key objectives that were achieved. Prime among those is achieving an increase in the value of the land at Bear Mountain. And this is one of the key aspects of the business model here that would ultimately lead to the realization of profits within a reasonable period of time, the horizon that Matthews deposed to, which is you take a community that is undeveloped -- there is, essentially, an underdeveloped community there. The project had started, of course, previously, run into financial trouble. And by building out communities, by servicing land, by achieving rezoning and subdivision, by -- we just talked about the parkway extension -- bringing transit service to the mountain, you end up creating a community that has its own momentum in terms of driving land values.

And there's more evidence -- we'll come to that -- but that's one of the key aspects of this business model, is that the whole value of the community, including the land assets held by Bear Mountain, increases as a result of the prestige development of the community that becomes generated there.

And the evidence is -- well, we'll go there -- that, by comparables to other neighbourhoods in the greater Victoria area, the Bear Mountain property achieved kind of a doubling of its relative value to other communities in the great Victoria area.

During this period the partnership also planned and executed strategic sales of single-family lots and development sites to vertical builders. By 2016, the partnership had received numerous expressions of interest for bulk sites, including the *en bloc* sale of nearly all of the Bear Mountain assets.

In response to this interest, Matthews and Tom Kusumoto concluded that better market information was needed in order to set pricing, leading them to engage a commercial real estate broker.

So what happened was in late 2016, the partnership brought in the real estate marketing

firm Jones Lang & LaSalle, JLL, to review the Bear Mountain assets and prepare a marketing strategy that would consider bulk sales and a global sale of all or most of the Bear Mountain assets, and that engagement was announced to the public in February of 2017.

Just at page -- tab 9 of the condensed book, this is a newsletter that went out to homeowners in the Bear Mountain community, message from Dan Matthews, President and CEO of Ecoasis Developments LLP, and Matthews goes on here to discuss the engagement of JLL to move the community into a next phase.

At tab 8, just behind -- back one tab, this is a news article from Western Investor, and here you see the headline, Justice, "Bear Mountain Golf Resort Owners Ponder Sale." So it becomes notorious fact known to the public by 2017 that what is now being contemplated by the Ecoasis ownership at Bear Mountain is sale -- substantial sale of either the entire project or bulk site sales for others to purchase and engage in a next phase of development at Bear Mountain.

In 2017 JLL prepared a confidential information circular for circulation to potential purchaser groups, attracting expressions of interest from several groups. In response to those expressions of interest, Tian Kusumoto, who at this point is not the director appointed by Sanovest -- his father, Tom, is the director appointed by Sanovest -- and Matthews evidence was that, at times in this period, Tom Kusumoto would engage Tian Kusumoto to provide some assistance and perhaps provide some tax planning advice or assistance to Tom in considering next steps.

So Mr. Tian Kusumoto is involved, but he's not the decisionmaker, and Mr. Matthews' evidence on that point is that, whenever there was a conflict, it was Tom Kusumoto that made the final decision.

But here at this stage -- still at this stage we see Mr. Tian Kusumoto being an enthusiastic advocate for this sales process over here, and here the cite here is from Mr. Matthews' affidavit. There's an email from Tian Kusumoto stating to the representative JLL:

As I mentioned on the call, we do not expect JLL to determine price, as this is up to the bidders. We do expect from JLL to create a fair and competitive market, and we are comfortable accepting the price a fair market decides. It is extremely important to us that this process ends with a sale.

 That was Mr. Kusumoto's view in 2017, and, as I'll come to, in 2021 that attitude and approach changes substantially at a time that is coincident with Mr. Tian Kusumoto assuming what we assume to be managing control of Sanovest. That letter, just for reference -- I won't go there -- it's at tab 10 of the condensed book -- that email, rather.

Matthews' evidence is that he and Tom Kusumoto took a somewhat more sanguine or balanced view of things. He's deposed that:

At times Tian expressed a desire for sales that, in my view, would be at the expense of the premier brand that the partnership had worked hard to cultivate for Bear Mountain. In contrast to Tian's sentiments, Tom and I wished to pursue sales, but not for below-market value or in a manner that diminished the Bear Mountain project's unique brand as an urban resort development.

That's Matthews' number 1 in the oppression proceeding.

But I do want to also point out that Mr. Tom Kusumoto, at this stage, is still quite a keen seller, and I just need to identify that reference.

THE COURT: Tom or Tian?

CNSL G. BRANDT: Tom. Tom Kusumoto is also still a keen seller.

THE COURT: All right.

CNSL G. BRANDT: I'm just going to -- I think I'm going to, unfortunately, have to go to the main record here. Apologies.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL G. BRANDT: It's at tab 14 of volume 4.

THE COURT: Of the -- okay, of the application record.

```
Okav.
      CNSL G. BRANDT: It's also in the condensed book at
 3
           11, but we're here. So this is from Tom Kusumoto
           to Dan Matthews, and you'll see, Justice --
5
                  If it's in 11, I'll just go to that.
      THE COURT:
 6
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Go to that. Let's do that.
7
           Apologies.
8
      THE COURT:
                  That's fine.
9
      CNSL G. BRANDT: This is from Tom Kusumoto to Dan
10
           Matthews, and you'll see here that
11
           tra@sanovestholdings, that's Tian Kusumoto's
12
           email address.
13
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
14
      CNSL G. BRANDT: And Tom here is writing to Matthews
15
           and Tian about some of the different offers
16
           they're receiving, which is better, and there's
17
           discussion here about a proposal in which the
18
           potential purchaser was going to have
19
           Mr. Matthews remain as a 20 percent operating
20
                         That's the discussion.
           shareholder.
21
                Over at the next page, Mr. Tom Kusumoto says
22
           as follows:
23
24
                We are blessed with the best time to sell
25
                BM.
26
27
           Bear Mountain.
28
29
                This project is probably the best large real
30
                estate development available in Canada.
31
32
           So the partnership is looking to sell, Matthews
33
           and Mr. Tom Kusumoto, and they believe the time
34
           is right to do so.
35
      THE COURT: That's April 2021.
36
                       This is April 2021.
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                My next email is from May 3rd, and here --
37
38
           so just background here is, again, the
39
           partnership was receiving expressions of interest
40
           from a new potential purchaser. Although
41
           discussions and due diligence ensued with them,
42
           that deal collapsed in early 2021 when the
43
           purchaser group sought a significant price
44
           reduction at the conditional removal stage.
45
           Kusumoto and Matthews did not agree to that price
           reduction, although Mr. Tian Kusumoto continued
46
47
           to press for a return to negotiations with the
```

purchaser group. And that is at Exhibit P to Mr. Matthews' number 1, and that is the next page, page 12 of the condensed -- next tab of the condensed book. 5 And just the first line here -- and again, this is May 3rd: 7 8 Hi, Dan. Please feel free to contact the 9 purchaser if you think you can revive the 10 deal in any way. As I said ... 11 12 And it goes on about the role of Mr. Matthews 13 potentially continuing to operate there, and 14 Mr. Tian Kusumoto saying here as well that it 15 would be a sacrifice -- he understands it would be a sacrifice for Mr. Matthews to remain for 16 17 several years, but his view is that Mr. Matthews' 18 involvement is what's going to help facilitate 19 this deal and get the best price for the 20 partnership. That's the context for Mr. Tian 21 Kusumoto's exhortation to Mr. Matthews to revive 22 the deal in any way he can. 23 So you're showing me all this to say THE COURT: something happened, which it changed. 24 25 CNSL G. BRANDT: Something changed. 26 THE COURT: At this point he wants Mr. Matthews to 27 remain. He sees the value in him being there, 28 and let's see if we can sell these things, even 29 if some of it means it's a lower price than we 30 first thought; right? 31 CNSL G. BRANDT: Well, here I think he's saying that 32 this would be an increased price if Mr. Matthews 33 is able to remain. 34 THE COURT: Right. Right. But the previous emails 35 are, let's go back to this potential purchaser --36 CNSL G. BRANDT: Oh, correct. 37 THE COURT: -- and see what we can do, even though 38 they came back with a lower price. And the next 39 one is a month -- less than a month later, we want you to stay, Mr. Matthews. 40 41 CNSL G. BRANDT: Correct. We want Mr. Matthews to 42 stay in the context of a sale to a third party. 43 THE COURT: Increase value. 44 CNSL G. BRANDT: Increase the -- to a third party. 45 THE COURT: Just let me make a note of that, please. 46 CNSL G. BRANDT: Thank you. 47 THE COURT: Okay.

```
CNSL G. BRANDT: All right. So what changed?
      THE COURT: Right.
3
      CNSL G. BRANDT: So in and around this time, the
           partnership had been engaged with Colliers
5
           International, a new firm now, to create an
           approach of creating distinct development sites
7
           on Bear Mountain lands, the idea being what we
8
           heard from Mr. Ferris this morning, similar
9
           concept, that you're going to get better value,
10
           you're going to get more purchasers with
11
           competition involving purchasing of potential
12
           distinct sites, as opposed to -- and perhaps in
13
           conjunction, though -- with an en bloc sale, as
14
           opposed to exclusive en bloc sale process.
15
                So that's Colliers' strategy, and Colliers
16
           had scheduled a marketing launch for the Players
17
           Peak site. That was scheduled for May 19th,
18
19
                And now we see where this change occurs, and
20
           we're talking about a period between May 3rd and
21
           May 17th, 2021, where Mr. Tian Kusumoto
22
           unilaterally halts that sales process, and that's
23
           here at paragraph 55 of the argument.
                                                   The email
           doing this is at tab 14 of the joint book -- of
24
25
           the condensed book, and that is at -- partway
26
           into the book at -- or into the exhibit. It's at
27
           exhibit page 274 on the top right.
28
      THE COURT:
                 Right.
29
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Tian Kusumoto writes to the Colliers
30
           representative and says:
31
32
                We've had to delay board meeting and, as a
                result, we haven't formed a special
33
34
                committee yet to deal with sales.
35
                Unfortunately, I think we'll have to delay
36
                the launch until tomorrow.
37
38
           The launch was scheduled for the next day.
39
40
                Until the board of directors meets.
41
42
      THE COURT:
                  That's on 275 on my page.
43
      CNSL G. BRANDT: That's over the page on 275, correct.
44
      THE COURT: Okay. All right.
45
      CNSL G. BRANDT: 274/75. And this is Mr. --
                  But that doesn't explain why the change.
46
      THE COURT:
47
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Why the change.
```

2.3

THE COURT: It just says there's a change.

CNSL G. BRANDT: So at this point the director of Sanovest -- the director appointed by Sanovest to EBMD was still Mr. Tom Kusumoto, but it was around this time that Mr. Matthews learned that there had been a change of control within Sanovest, and Mr. Matthews learns at this time that Tian Kusumoto had replaced his father in the -- he's, I suppose, the president, I believe, or director of Sanovest.

And shortly afterwards, within a couple of weeks, on June 1st, Sanovest would replace Tom Kusumoto with Tian Kusumoto as the new nominee. So the change here that we submit explains this change that occurred between May 3rd and May 17th, is that now Mr. Tian Kusumoto sees himself as in charge at Sanovest and is taking a different approach than his father took previously.

THE COURT: It still doesn't explain why. Because you've shown me lead-up emails that show a different approach to sales and the value of Mr. Matthews.

CNSL G. BRANDT: So the inference is that Mr. Tian Kusumoto is taking it -- now perhaps sees himself as being in control of these assets and is perhaps looking at things with a different time horizon, a different risk appetite, a different approach to development, all of which -- all of which, of course, anyone moving into a new leadership position at a family company is entitled to take if those shareholders agree to it.

But the difference here is that it was Mr. Matthews and Mr. Tom Kusumoto who went into business eight years earlier with a set of common expectations that they held, and so that change in Mr. Tian Kusumoto's approach is now -- begins the process of what we see is the oppression designed to force Mr. Matthews out. He doesn't want to be in business with Mr. Matthews anymore, and he's going to take a series of steps to use the levers he has, now in control of Sanovest, to ensure that that occurs.

Perhaps this is a convenient time.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, did you want to come back a bit early, or do you need that time to review

```
this draft order?
      CNSL C. FERRIS: I think we probably would need that
           time for the order and to take our clients
           through it.
 5
      THE COURT: All right.
                              And Mr. Nathanson wants to --
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Perhaps my friends could give me
 7
           an update on how long they expect to be, because
 8
           I want to make sure we have time to complete
 9
           tomorrow.
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
10
                       Again, I would need to do that over
11
           lunch, speak with Mr. Brandt about what his
12
           timing looks like, and speak with Mr. Roberts.
13
           Maybe we can come back five or ten minutes early
14
           and we can talk about the timing.
15
      THE COURT: All right. So you want to come back --
16
           you'll confer five or ten minutes early, or you
17
           want to start court five or ten minutes early?
18
      CNSL C. FERRIS: I'm in their hands. I can confer
19
           with Mr. Nathanson five or ten minutes and then
20
           we can tell.
21
      THE COURT: Sure.
                        Let's do that. All right. So I'll
22
           come back -- Madam Clerk will call me, but
23
           hopefully come back right at 2 o'clock.
24
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Thank you.
25
      THE COURT:
                 It takes me a few minutes to walk down
26
           here, for obvious reasons.
27
      THE CLERK: Order in chambers.
                                       These chambers are
28
           adjourned for the lunch break.
29
30
                 (PROCEEDINGS RECESSED AT 12:34 PM)
31
                 (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED AT 2:02 PM)
32
33
      THE COURT: Mr. Ferris.
34
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Justice, just two housekeeping
35
           matters, one I don't think is contentious, one I
36
           think probably will be.
37
                The first is the draft order that
38
           Mr. Roberts was speaking of, I believe he's
39
           circulated it to counsel.
40
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Future tense.
41
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Future tense.
                                       He's about to.
42
                 Will be, okay.
      THE COURT:
43
      CNSL C. FERRIS: He's about to, but what that probably
44
           means is he won't be in a position to sort of
45
           circulate it to the court or discuss it with you
46
           until tomorrow morning.
47
      THE COURT: Okay.
```

```
CNSL C. FERRIS: The second is timing.
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And so this is what I think will be
           contentious. Given what was said, our view is
5
           that it's important to take the court through the
           evidence, and so we think we need to book another
           day. My friend, I think, takes a different view, and I'll let him speak to that.
7
8
9
                But I'll just give you one example before I
10
           sit down. Mr. Jackson said there was $14 million
11
           in improvident transactions undertaken by
12
           Mr. Matthews in a one-line sentence. We think
13
           it's important to take you through the evidence
14
           on that to explain that to you and why that's not
           true, and that takes some time.
15
16
                 And so, you know, we'll be in your hands.
17
           If you say, no, no, you've got to get done, we'll
18
           get it done. But our view is, to present our
19
           case properly, we need to take you through the
20
           evidence.
21
      THE COURT:
                   So when you say another day, that means
22
           for your side to finish --
23
      CNSL C. FERRIS: No, I --
      THE COURT: -- or another day in total?
24
25
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       -- think we could be finished at some
26
           point tomorrow, maybe around lunch tomorrow or
27
           maybe a little bit later, but I think probably by
28
           lunch tomorrow. But I don't think a half a day
29
           is enough for my friend and reply, so I think we
30
           would need to book another day.
31
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
                         Who am I going to hear from next,
32
           then?
                  Mr. Nathanson?
33
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Thank you, Justice.
34
                 So I'm concerned. I'm concerned that this
35
           is only arising at our prompting, having listened
36
                          So just to -- the bottom line is,
           to my friend.
37
           in my submission, we should be managing to our
38
           time estimate. There's no good reason we should
39
                 And as you've observed a number of times,
40
           both by reason of the convergence, the changes in
41
           my friends' position, the commercial convergence
42
           of the parties' positions and that you're not in
43
           a position to make determinations on all this
44
           contested evidence, and it's not necessary to do
45
           so to decide what order you're going to make,
46
           this little detail which is causing the delay
47
           problem.
```

```
But let me just -- so my essential position
           is either you should --
 3
      THE COURT:
                 Let me just -- I think Mr. Ferris -- I
4
           don't know that he agrees with that, in the
5
           sense, I think, they're going to be asking me to
           make findings of fact. I think that's what I --
7
                         Well, what Mr. Ferris told you
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
8
           yesterday is that the injunction -- and I agree
9
           with this -- he's got an injunction application.
10
      THE COURT:
                 Right.
11
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          The injunction test applies, so
12
           it's a question of is it a fair question or
13
           strong prima facie case.
14
      THE COURT: Right.
15
                          But either way, you're not making
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
16
           final findings of fact --
17
      THE COURT:
                 Right.
18
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- about who did what to whom
19
           here; right? And what you're going to be doing
20
           is assessing the evidence to decide on the
21
           relative merits of the two orders that are being
22
           promoted.
23
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
24
                          But my central point is either I'm
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
25
           seeking a direction that my friends manage to
26
           their time estimate or slightly beyond.
27
           willing to even compromise my time a bit further.
28
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
29
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          Or, if there's to be more time, it
30
           has to be quick, because there's commercial
31
           urgency here.
32
      THE COURT:
                 Right.
33
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          So I just want to give you two
34
           minutes of context.
35
                So these motions originally came on -- or my
36
           friend delivered their motion May 10th.
37
           time estimate was 90 minutes; right? They're
38
           multiples of that already with almost a day to
39
           go. This came on before Justice Basran on
40
           June 24th.
41
      THE COURT: Oh.
42
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          Both motions.
                                          The common time
43
           estimate at that time was two days. There were
44
           discussions that didn't come to fruition that
45
           resulted in insufficient court time. The matter
46
           was put over.
47
                My friend Mr. Ferris at that time said,
```

let's have three days to be safe; right? The expansion continues. My friends are experienced counsel. They knew the scope of the materials. This was already set for hearing in June, so there can't be any surprise.

And the further point I'll make is this. agreed to what, at least in my view -- but my friends may not agree -- is an accommodation to permit them to combine their response to Mr. Jackson's motion and then make their motion in the oppression proceeding. But the effect of that is now we have counsel standing up and standing down, and that was on the basis of the shared three-day time estimate, and the effect of that is that my friends are the big bulk in the middle, and we're getting squeezed on the back end. And so we can't have a procedural accommodation become the occasion for what I regretfully have to say is looking like a filibuster to me.

So in my respectful submission, again, if Your Lordship can give us -- if Justice can give us a day next week, although Mr. Ferris says he only has Thursday of next week -- that might resolve the problem. But if we're looking at a multi-week continuation --

- THE COURT: No, I can tell you, it went through my mind last night and this morning that I'd see how it went today, that you might run out of time tomorrow, and what could I do next week? I was going to speak to Mr. Gallagher downstairs. There are a couple of days I can't, but there are some days I can give you a -- I can, if they can give me a courtroom next week.
- CNSL A. NATHANSON: So what I'm trying to say, in the spirit of being somewhat constructive, is, if it's next week, Mr. Jackson and I will turn ourselves upside down, and we will get here.

THE COURT: Yeah.

- CNSL A. NATHANSON: But there's not a good reason for it, and if it's to go beyond next week, we shouldn't do it, and my friends should huddle and right-size what they want to do and be done by the break tomorrow to give us a modicum of the time that they agreed to.
- THE COURT: Okay. My other hope had been that there might be something coming from Mr. Roberts' draft

```
order that might lead to -- Mr. Jackson is
            shaking his head.
 3
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          We have tried.
                                            This is part of
           what derailed the hearing in June, is we thought
 5
            we would get an accommodation, and it hasn't
            happened, and there's questions about why I
 7
            haven't got instructions yet, and all these kinds
 8
            of things.
 9
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
10
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           So I just -- I can't be optimistic
11
            about that, Justice.
12
                  Okay, all right.
                                      Fair enough.
      THE COURT:
                                                     So what
13
            I'll do is, at the afternoon break, I'll -- I'm
14
            reluctant to deny anyone when they say they need
            time to do a proper job to present their case,
15
16
           but at the same time, there have to be limits
17
            recognizing -- particularly in this case -- the
18
            commercial urgency of it.
19
                 So if we do go into next week, I'm going to
20
            need to have to set some fixed-in-stone deadlines
21
            for remaining submissions.
22
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Thank you, Justice.
                                                 Appreciate
23
            that.
24
      THE COURT:
                   Okay.
25
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Given what's been said, I don't think
26
            I need to say anything other than my friends
27
            delivered, I think, four affidavits after the
28
            June hearing.
29
      THE COURT: But is Thursday the only day you're free
30
            next week?
31
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Yes, I have cross-examinations in a
           federal court matter on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. I'm in the court of appeal on Friday.
32
33
34
      THE COURT:
                  Well, is it something that your able
35
            co-counsel can deal with, or is it something
36
           where you have to be here to --
37
      CNSL C. FERRIS: If the court can't do Thursday, and
38
            it can only do some other day, I'll take some
39
            instructions from the client and talk to them
40
            about it.
41
      THE COURT:
                   Okay.
42
      CNSL C. FERRIS: But at this point, I'm trying to have
43
            everybody here.
44
                  Okay. Well, let me see what I can do, but
45
            if that's the way it's going to be, then I need
            you to commit before 4 o'clock today as to how
46
47
           much time you're going to need for the remainder
```

```
of the day -- for the remainder of your
           submissions in the main and then firm reply.
3
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Yes.
4
      THE COURT:
                  I need that so that Mr. Jackson and
5
           Mr. Nathanson can know that as well.
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        Thank you.
7
      THE COURT:
                  All right. Okay, Mr. Brandt.
8
                       Thank you, Justice.
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
9
                Before the break I was at paragraph --
           actually, just the beginning of part 3 of the
10
11
           argument, in and around paragraph 53. We had
12
           gone through the communications to Colliers, and
13
           we've now hit the change on June 1st.
14
                Your Lordship asked -- Justice asked prior
15
           to the break, was there a reason for the change
16
           in approach, other than just the change in
17
           person?
18
      THE COURT: Right.
19
      CNSL G. BRANDT: And what I can say at this point,
20
           there may be some inferences you can draw from
21
           the evidence as we go, Justice, but there was
22
           certainly no explanation given at that time to
23
           Mr. Matthews.
24
      THE COURT:
                  There's nothing in the evidence to --
25
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       There's nothing other than inferences
26
           that may be drawn, positions that Mr. Tian
27
           Kusumoto takes as we go around partnerships with
28
           vertical developers, things like that.
29
                  I see.
      THE COURT:
30
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       There's substantive -- substantial
           amount of discussion on the issue of absorption
31
           and absorption rates, and I'm going to come to
32
           that as well as -- put it forward as, perhaps, an
33
34
           excuse more than a reality for Mr. Kusumoto. But
35
           beyond that type of evidence, there isn't
36
           anything more direct.
37
      THE COURT:
                 Because this is not in the evidence, and
38
           this is why I -- yesterday during the CPC when I
39
           asked about why Mr. Tom Kusumoto was a defendant
40
           and how that worked when he was the -- was a
41
           principal of Sanovest, I was told that Tian
42
           Kusumoto stepped in and took over, when he
43
           alleges he discovered improprieties on the part
44
           of his father in running the business -- running
45
           Sanovest and dealing with the business. That's
           just an allegation, but I was wondering if
46
47
           there's anything in the evidence that would say,
```

```
that's the reason why there was a change in
           attitude. He came in and saw there's significant
 3
           problem and said, that's it; this has got to
           stop.
5
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        I'm not even sure if that much is in
           the evidence.
7
      THE COURT: Okay.
8
                        I don't think we have --
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
9
      THE COURT: I mean --
10
      CNSL G. BRANDT: -- much.
11
      THE COURT: There's no evidence about any of that?
12
      CNSL G. BRANDT: About the internal workings of
13
           Sanovest.
      THE COURT: Okay.
14
15
      CNSL G. BRANDT: We have Mr. Matthews', you know,
16
           evidence as to what he was told.
17
      THE COURT: Yeah.
18
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Which is that he learned around this
19
           time that, in fact, there had been a change in
20
           February of 2021 within Sanovest, that Tian was
21
           the acting president, and that -- and that,
22
           sorry -- that Tian was the acting president, that
23
           Tom had remained involved from February for a
24
           period of time to deal with the Colliers process
25
           that was ongoing and other sales processes.
26
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
27
      CNSL G. BRANDT: And that Tian had been sort of newly
28
           appointed to the board of Sanovest at that time.
           That's in Mr. Matthews' affidavit #1 in the
29
30
           oppression proceeding. That's what we know, is
31
           what he was told or what he learned at that time
32
           from Tom.
33
      THE COURT:
                  Okay. So I'll disabuse my mind of any of
34
           that, and we'll leave it on the basis that what
35
           you say is in the evidence is a change in the
36
           position regarding sales and Mr. Matthews from
37
           father to son, and also from son's position up
38
           until May -- early May, and then a complete
39
           change with no reason provided.
40
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       I think that's a fair --
41
      THE COURT: Nothing arising from the evidence.
42
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       -- a fair summary.
43
      THE COURT: And then now it appears he's objecting --
44
           blocking sales and not prepared to fund, and
45
           that's what's created the financial disparity or
46
           [indiscernible] circumstances with the business.
47
           Is that a fair summary?
```

47

```
CNSL G. BRANDT: That's a fair summary.
                                                There's a
           third element to this.
3
                  Just a minute. Oh, okay. Go ahead.
      THE COURT:
4
           third element?
5
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       That is refinancing refusal.
 6
      THE COURT: Oh, okay. All right.
7
      CNSL G. BRANDT: So there's no funding, there's no
8
           sales and there's no refinance. And that's how
9
           this -- those are the three prongs, I'll call
10
           them, of the conduct that has -- you know, we say
           is oppressive, but certainly has put the company
11
12
           and the partnership into the positions they are
13
           in today.
                  Okay.
14
      THE COURT:
15
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Mr. Matthews deposes -- and I'm at
           paragraph --
16
17
      THE COURT:
                  Sorry, and that then informs the equitable
18
           considerations that I have to deal with when I
19
           consider the scope of the receivership order.
20
      CNSL G. BRANDT: That's correct, Justice, especially,
21
           as Mr. Roberts said earlier, we're looking --
22
           we're also under the realm of section 39 of the
23
           Law and Equity Act.
24
      THE COURT:
                 Right.
25
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       We're also under the realm of
26
           equitable receivership under the rules of court.
27
      THE COURT: Okay.
28
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Mr. -- I'm at paragraph 58 of the
29
           written argument.
30
      THE COURT:
                 All right.
31
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Mr. Matthews has deposed about his
32
           expectations here, and this is where we say no
33
           explanation is given, but the key factor here is
34
           this is different than how the company had
35
           operated and different than what Matthews
36
           expected. He says that Tian's conduct in
           blocking sales and applying various forms of
37
38
           pressure was inconsistent --
39
40
                 ... is wholly inconsistent with the
41
                expectations I had when EBMD was established
42
                and contrary to how Tom and I managed EBMD
43
                between 2013 and 2021.
44
45
           He had no intention, he says, of remaining in the
46
           project indefinitely while his equity is eroded
```

without distributions, and with a different

business partner than he had started with. That's just a summary there.

That's just a summary there.

Mr. Matthews -- I'm over at 59 here -- has given a lengthy excerpt, which I won't read, in view of the time constraints, but Matthews gives a summary here of his reasonable expectations, and he also just notes here factually that:

In June 2021, the loan --

And we have this in Mr. -- in the loan schedule in Mr. Kusumoto's affidavit, but the amount of the loan outstanding is well below the \$70 million limit. So in other words, there is funding room under the Sanovest loan at this point.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL G. BRANDT: And then he states, just the last paragraph in this block quote:

Despite the available borrowing room under the Sanovest loan agreement, Tian refused to advance funds that I had requested in my role as president and CEO. He indicated that Sanovest would not be advancing further funding to the partnership any time soon. Proceeds of sale closings, which were occurring in this period, must be paid to Sanovest directly, without any reserve funds retained within the partnership.

And there was provision in the Sanovest loan for some of those funds to be held back in the company to deal with taxes and other adjustments, and Mr. Matthews' evidence here is that wasn't occurring, so there isn't even that being held into the property -- held into the company.

So starting at paragraph 61 here we deal with the marketing and sales prong of the oppression, and Matthews says that this has been a constant theme since June of 2021.

An early example he cites at paragraph 62 is -- so this is the Colliers launch. It was already put on hold on May 17th, as we saw, and here again on June 7th, Mr. Kusumoto writes to a Colliers representative asking to place the marketing on hold. That's at tab 16 of the

condensed book.

After some discussion, Mr. Tian Kusumoto allowed the marketing process to move forward, and then there were three letters of intent received from three separate purchaser groups, and they all provided nonbinding, but letters of intend with values for their offer, and they were all within the appraised value in the valuation that Colliers had projected for the site. So these were all offers received that were very much in line with the orderly sales process that Colliers had started on before Mr. Tian Kusumoto was appointed as the Sanovest director.

So here Mr. Tian Kusumoto proposes to Colliers that the partnership seek a revised letter of intent for a higher price and remain as a partner in future developments. So I'm going to go to the section here. This is in the combined affidavit binder at tab A, paragraphs 58 and 59.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL G. BRANDT: And Mr. Matthews says:

... in response to the first offer received, Tian proposed on July 26, 2021 to Colliers that the Partnership ask them to provide a new letter of intent with a higher price, and that the Partnership remain a partner in future development.

So he wants both those things.

Tian's email of July 26, 2021, stated in part as follows:

What do you think if we asked them to revise their LOI for a higher prices but with us being passive/active partners? I would think a BM partner would command a higher valuation than a cash offer and a commitment to the BM future prospects. I would like to see their pro forma to see how and how much they will make off this acquisition. I would recommend to the BoD that if possible, we pursue a partnership that will allow participation in the

 vertical development of Players Peak if the pro forma justifies.

And this is a very different approach than everything that existed in the eight years before, and we saw only a month before Mr. Kusumoto essentially imploring Mr. Matthews, I know this isn't what we talked about, but why don't you stay on; it will help us get the deal closed. Now Mr. Kusumoto is talking about the partnership as a whole joining with a vertical developer.

As of -- back at 65. As of August of 2021, two candidates remained for the Players Peak site. Colliers strongly recommended engaging with one of those candidates with a view to entering into a purchase and sale agreement. Colliers executive vice-president advised that, quote:

In all of our engagements, we have never, ever witnessed a vendor turn down a record-breaking value.

And Colliers further warned that refusal to engage with either candidate risked reputational damage in the investor/developer community by creating the perception that the partnership was not a serious vendor.

Now, this email exchange is set out at tab 17 of the joint book -- sorry, not the joint book -- the condensed book. I'm just starting at the back of the email here.

THE COURT: So book of affidavits?

 CNSL G. BRANDT: This is the joint book of -- sorry, the condensed book of documents at tab 17.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL G. BRANDT: And at the top of page 304 there is a heading "Not Moving Forward With Either Offer, and then over the page, this is the prophesy of Colliers saying that:

Ecoasis and Bear Mountain faces reputational damage by not following through with either offer.

The response to all of this from Mr. Kusumoto is

quite terse. It's at the front of that tab 17:

We cannot at this time accept the offer as offer to purchase, as the price and terms are unacceptable. Please set up a call so we can advise on the messaging on our withdrawal of the Players Peak offer.

So in my submission, not a well-explained response, other than saying it's not acceptable. And the reason this is important is because we heard yesterday from my friend Mr. Jackson around what Colliers, in its 2023 marking proposal, described as skittishness in the market given Bear Mountain's past history.

Well, this is a source of that skittishness, and that's, in a sense, self-evident -- self-evidently the result of withdrawal from a process that had commenced before Mr. Tian Kusumoto became a director, that he stopped and started and ultimately withdrew from.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL G. BRANDT: I'm at paragraph 66. Mr. Matthews describes here that Mr. Tian Kusumoto continues with proposals around vertical development that had not been contemplated in Colliers' offering memorandum, that this was also not what

Mr. Matthews agreed with, and that was shut down.

Over at paragraph 67, there was a similar example of this type of event in October of 2021 when Mr. Tian Kusumoto wrote to a potential purchaser group without consulting Mr. Matthews saying:

I believe Dan has told you we are on pause as we finish reviewing the development strategy.

And this was -- this not an accurate statement, and subsequently counsel for Matthews and 599 wrote to counsel for Kusumoto putting on the record that this communication was not authorized or coordinated and that the idea that Mr. Matthews had delivered a similar message was knowingly false.

I won't go there, but that letter is at tab 19 of the condensed book.

As a result of this intervention -- I'm at paragraph 68 -- the discussions with that proposed purchaser did not proceed further, and again, that letter objected to this event and to other issues arising in the parties' ability to work together.

Mr. Kusumoto has continued this pattern of conduct and has continued to refuse the authorize the sale of lands associated with the Bear Tian Kusumoto's efforts to Mountain project. extract concessions for Mr. Matthews are illustrated by an exchange between Mr. Kusumoto and the partnership's lawyers in July of 2022, when Mr. Kusumoto indicated that Matthews should agree to amend the 2013 partnership agreement and sign certain resolutions before meeting with certain prospective purchasers.

This was -- there was a negotiation that proceeded, to some extent, in 2022. I'm going to come to that here. So that is involving a particular party whose name is in the argument here at paragraph 70. Those discussions had been going on in some form since 2021.

In June 2022 there was a letter of intent with the partnership for the development of all of the partnership lands.

In August 2022 Mr. Kusumoto delivered a response proposal that significantly increased the sale price bring significantly more, as is indicated at (b) here, than had been initially discussed.

There was an email in response, and I will go to this email. It's at tab 24 of the condensed book, and I'm just at the email that's received from the potential purchaser at page 94 on the top right. And the purchaser here writes to provide their initial feedback. They state some concerns that they say requires further contemplation on our end regarding a number of matters here. And even on the purchase price they say:

The overall unit value is --

A certain amount.

-- more than was initially discussed.

40 41

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

42

43 44

45 46 47

need appropriate time prior to the commitment of any nonrefundable deposit to come to a mutually agreeable valuation on price for sale.

So there's no outright refusal, but there are some concerns expressed that they say warrants further discussion.

And if we go over the page to 93, we have the response in Mr. Kusumoto to Mr. Matthews:

I think we should take a pause on trying to sell BM/finding a partner and work towards developing a master development plan and so on.

So that process comes to a grinding halt at that point, and Mr. Matthews' evidence is that he had the impression that there was no meaningful desire to engage here. That's what he says at paragraphs 4 and 9 of his affidavit number 5.

THE COURT: Just a minute. So may I ask who -- we've just admitted someone into the courtroom. Can I ask who you are.

D. CLARKE: Yeah, it's David Clarke. THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Okay.

CNSL G. BRANDT: I'm at paragraph 71. There's an attempt here to extract concessions from Matthews, signing a banking resolution and a related party agreement. And what this email says here is:

Hi, Dan. Please see the attached PSA banking resolutions and confirm agreement to the related party agreement. I will forward the PSA to [that group] once received.

So that's what's happening here is the negotiations are predicated on Matthews taking certain steps that he doesn't agree fit the parties' reasonable expectations with their existing agreements and so on.

Paragraph 72, Mr. Ferris took you to earlier, Justice, and this shows the aggregate value of the different offers that were received beginning in 2021 and all the way to September 2023. This is enough to have paid off

the Sanovest loan several times over.

The example that we're dealing with, just with this group that collapsed in 2022 -- I'm just at paragraph 75 of my argument -- is the only example that Tian Kusumoto can point to of engagement in any substantive way with a potential purchaser, and he deals with that in his affidavit #3 saying he hasn't blocked sales; here's what he's done to try and forward this process and it collapsed. But in his affidavit #3, he does not include that Exhibit E that we just saw, the "I believe we should take a pause on trying to sell BM." That exhibit is not included in his affidavit, and he makes no mention of him being the person who ultimately led that process to come to an end.

So in view of Matthews' evidence which, again, highlights the admissions in Mr. Kusumoto's affidavit, the assertion he says that he actively participated in the discussions and advanced the terms of a potential transaction and assisted the partnership in pursuing opportunities, that should be viewed with caution, and we say ultimately is a position that would be rejected.

So what is the impact on the result of the blocked sales? This is at paragraph 77. What this comes to is the loan at that time, only three years ago, was \$46 million, in contrast to where it is today, and even that is in part disputed. We say it's lower because of amounts on that loan that are actually attributable to a separate loan that Tom advanced. But regardless, it's very higher today.

And while there have been repayments from lot sales during this period and very limited advances from Sanovest, as we have needed, to last them the amount needed to pay property taxes, the interest accrued is approximately 12.8 million over that period.

The offer received in -- based on the offer received in '21 and '22, which are noted previously, taking just two of those, one that had -- one that -- those two in aggregate actually equal or slightly exceed the current amount of the Sanovest loan, and they had -- one had a four-month closing period; the other had an

eight-month closing period. Those two together, there would have been no loan by June of 2022 if only two of those had been able to proceed, and on that basis, we're looking at about \$11 million in excess interest that's accrued on the loan since June of '22.

Justice, so that is -- that is prong one. That is the first aspect of this, which is sales refusal.

The second aspect -- I'm starting at paragraph 78 -- deals with funding and financing, and here this takes various forms, including, as we've talked about, failure or the advance funds under the Sanovest loan agreement, but also failure to approve payments for money that was in the company and the use of property taxes, again, as a tool to try and extract various forms of concessions from Mr. Matthews.

So regarding property taxes -- I'm at paragraph 79 -- in connection with the 2021 property taxes, Matthews deposed to discussions with Mr. Kusumoto in which he stated, among other things -- and this was on the eve of the partnership's deadline to pay the 2021 taxes -- that Sanovest would only allow replacement of the Sanovest loan -- sorry -- would not allow a replacement of the Sanovest loan, but would only provide financing at the partnership's 18 percent cash call rate, not at the 8 percent rate as contemplated under the loan agreement.

So here Sanovest is saying, we're not going to advance you money as your lender, but as your partner, we'll advance you cash at the cash call rate of the partner. And I'm going to come to this in a minute, but this is in the context of the allegations against Mr. Matthews, as we say is a pretext to further this aspect of the oppression.

In that same conversation, Mr. Kusumoto stated to Matthews that Sanovest could play market price for its half-interest in the Bear Mountain assets -- that's if Matthews was to buy -- but Sanovest would only pay for Matthews' half-interest at a distressed value if Sanovest were to purchase.

Ultimately those property taxes were paid late, again in a circumstance where there was

borrowing room, vast amounts of borrowing room, under the Sanovest loan agreement, incurred a 10 percent penalty of approximately \$140,000, and at that point, because the loan was coming up, it agreed to a further extension agreement to a term to May 1st, 2024, with a 700,000 extension fee to Sanovest. The property taxes were actually paid not -- were paid in this situation from the closing on a vendor take-back mortgage. THE COURT: But you said that was \$700,000 fee paid to Sanovest? CNSL G. BRANDT: It's a -- like, an extension fee. THE COURT: Extension fee, right, but was it just added to the indebtedness? CNSL G. BRANDT: It's added to the indebtedness, as far as I understand. THE COURT: All right.

CNSL G. BRANDT: This happened again in June of 2022. On the very eve of the partnership's deadline to pay the 2022 partnership taxes, Matthews -- Tian Kusumoto wrote to Matthews saying that he wants a managing partner resolution giving him authority to act on behalf of the managing partners and the partnerships to instruct, close, transact, administer all the bank and credit card accounts for the managing partner and the partnership.

This should include the ability for Tian to appoint himself sole signing authority if he seems it to be in the best interests of the managing partner and the partnership. Initially accounts will be set up for Tian and Dan or staff, signature required, if HSBC can correct the current signatory file.

So again, property taxes are due, and Mr. Kusumoto is making a play to leave things for now, but of course, he will have the sole ability to change that at his whim.

Ultimately on August 18th of 2022, Sanovest funded property taxes for partnership. That payment was late, and that resulted in a 5 percent penalty.

In connection with other property taxes, as of August 26th, 2022, Sanovest funded property taxes for the Gondola lands, which are owned by BMA, but only did so in the context of Tian

 Kusumoto seeking, again, concessions from Matthews, and even while paying for the Gondola lands, Sanovest refused to fund taxes for the Bear Mountain Activity Centre property, which was also owned by BMA. We're going to talk about both of these a little more, the properties held by BMA.

In 2023 Sanovest again refused to fund property taxes for the BMAC property, despite Matthews' exhortation that BMAC is a resort partnership asset and should be formally integrated with the resort partnership, a step that Mr. Kusumoto has so far refused to carry out, and Mr. Matthews alleges that that was done for the purpose of maintaining BMAC as a point of contention in the litigation in any event. Mr. Tian Kusumoto, who also has no lack of control over BMAC or BMA, given that he replaced Mr. Tom Kusumoto as a director of BMA.

So I'll just pause just to give a tiny bit of background on BMA. We're going to get to it a little further. BMA is a company that was set up, I believe, in 2016. It was set up by Mr. Tom Kusumoto and Mr. Matthews at Mr. Tom Kusumoto's request. The idea at that time that it was going to hold certain opportunities that were best held outside of the partnership, and that this would create a certain amount of leverage in sales processes.

From Mr. Matthews' point of view, or from his side a different shareholder, and not 599315, but a different shareholder, is the shareholder in -- the 50 percent shareholder in BMA, and the other 50 percent shareholder in BMA is a company called SJN holdings.

THE COURT: SJN?

CNSL G. BRANDT: SJN, which is a company associated with Mr. Tom Kusumoto, and it's not Sanovest. So it has its own separate shareholders.

THE COURT: And you have 50 percent to SJN. The other 50 percent is to whom?

CNSL G. BRANDT: Is to a separate company associated with Matthews. It's a different numbered company associated with Matthews.

And so from Matthews' perspective, transferring, for example, the Gondola lands made sense commercially, because it was an aspect of a

sale strategy that certain -- we're going to sell the whole thing, but this is a different thing, separate opportunity that could be held back in the sale as well. That was the idea behind it.

From Mr. Matthews' perspective, he has no concerns about this, because he owns 599. He owns the other numbered company. And Tom Kusumoto, who is the director appointed by Sanovest, tells him, I'm going to -- essentially, I'm going to consent to this on behalf of the Sanovest. We're going to move this property into a separate company that I also control. And Matthews had no reason not to accept that. And so that's why these properties end up getting transferred into BMA.

In terms of the BMAC property, this was funded by the resort partnership and assigned into BMA, owned by a nominee of BMA, but funded by the resort partnership. And when Mr. Tian Kusumoto -- and we'll come to some issues that arose with BMA -- says this is a problem, this was funded by the resort partnership; it needs to go back into the resort partnership.

Mr. Matthews says, yes, it should be reintegrated into the partnership.

THE COURT: But why am I hearing about this? How does it bear on --

CNSL G. BRANDT: Yeah. No, fair question.
THE COURT: Because it's getting a bit granular.
CNSL G. BRANDT: I am getting a bit granular. So it's -- to the immediate issue here.
THE COURT: Yeah.

CNSL G. BRANDT: We have a property that Mr. Tian Kusumoto says should be made an asset of the partnership. Mr. Matthews agrees it should be made an asset of the partnership. We say Mr. Tian Kusumoto doesn't allow that to actually happen, holds it out as an issue of contention and refuses to allow the property taxes to be paid. That's one with BMAC. The second issue we're going to come to when we talk about this \$14 million amount.

The BMAC is itself -- and I'll just give a small background on what it is. It was formally known as the North Langford Recreation Centre, and it's effectively a community centre that the City of Langford sold to Bear Mountain, and it

```
has a gym, a pool, a restaurant, et cetera, and a
           membership program, and it's an integral part of
           the -- it's one of the integral amenities that
           are at the heart of this community, so it's a
5
           centrally located amenity at the heart of the
           Bear Mountain community.
7
                So I won't go through all of the detail on
8
           the next pages at paragraph 80. All this to say
9
           is that that was an issue with Mr. Tian Kusumoto
10
           interrupting the payroll for BMAC on a very short
11
           notice, again trying to seek concessions from
12
           Mr. Matthews, alleging that Mr. Matthews had
13
           diverted funds to BMA, resulting in Mr. Matthews
           having to pay payroll on very short notice.
14
           since that time, BMAC has operated with its own
15
16
           revenues and its own expenses.
                I'm at paragraph 81. There's a second
17
18
           example here -- so another aspect of the
19
           financial oppression relates to management fees,
20
           and the way this occurred was in January 2023,
21
           Tian Kusumoto rejected payment of what the
22
           partnership's controller described as Matthews',
23
           quote, standard monthly management fee of 15,750.
24
           Tian Kusumoto asserted that he would not be
25
           signing any cheques for signature until the
26
           controller's payment authorization was revoked so
27
           the company's controller could no longer
28
           authorize ordinary-course payments, and that
29
           management fee payment was cancelled.
30
                I'm going to take the court to
31
           Mr. Kusumoto's affidavit #1, which is in the
32
           record at --
33
      THE COURT:
                  In the --
34
      CNSL G. BRANDT: In the larger record at tab 6, and
35
           volume 1.
36
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
37
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Oh, sorry. I'm at tab 6, volume 1 of
38
           the main record.
39
      THE COURT:
                  Page or exhibit number?
40
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        I apologize, Justice?
41
                  I'm in there, so where do I go?
      THE COURT:
42
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       Paragraph 61.
43
                  Okay.
      THE COURT:
44
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Here Matthews says -- sorry, not
45
           Matthews -- Mr. Tian Kusumoto says:
46
47
                When I became a director of Sanovest and
```

EBMD in 2021, I learned that the Developments Partnership, Mr. Matthews (through Ecoasis Innovative Communities Inc.) received a management fee of \$15,000 per month, but that there was no written agreement. Although Mr. Matthews has exercised overall management of the Partnerships, based on my involvement, it is not clear what services are being provided in exchange for this management fee.

And so what occurred here is this is obviously Mr. Matthews' full-time job since 2013. He's being paid a monthly management fee of \$15,000 a month. Mr. Kusumoto takes the step in January 2023 of stopping that payment, and he provides evidence that this was somehow news to him when he became a director in 2021.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: Well, sorry, Justice. In fairness, my friend should refer you to the next two paragraphs of the affidavit.

CNSL G. BRANDT: Mr. Matthews is -- Mr. Kusumoto advises Mr. Matthews that there ought to be a formal agreement.

THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.

CNSL G. BRANDT: And that there is no discussion about that agreement and that, as a result, he has not authorized such payments.

There's another instance here at paragraph 82 where there was — there are funds siting in the resort partnership's account, so we've seen, Justice, that there are accounts payable, both by the resort partnership and by the partnership, and what's occurring here is what's happened over a very lengthy period of time, is that revenues are earned by the resort partnership, and the resort — and then the management of the partnership and the resort partnership try and work out what expenditures need to be paid on a priority basis, and that involves funds being transferred on a very regular basis from the resort partnership into the partnership to pay the partnership's bills.

And Mr. Matthews' evidence in this regard is that the monthly expenditures of the partnership are approximately \$100,000 before property taxes, and that, because there are effectively no

revenues retained and little earned in the partnership, that the only reason the partnership's expenditures have been paid at all is as a result of a transfer of funding from the resort partnership into the partnership.

And so later when we come to talk about what the appropriate order is going to be, we're going to say -- and we have said -- there is no issue with the resort partnership. It is self-sustaining, and the reason why it's showing accounts payable and aged accounts is because its resources are being diverted on a very regular basis to pay the partnership's accounts.

And this is an example here where Mr. Kusumoto -- Mr. Matthews is requesting that Mr. Kusumoto transfer funds -- authorizing a transfer of funds from the resort partnership to the partnership. Mr. Kusumoto does not do so, and counsel here writes -- counsel for Mr. Matthews writes to counsel for Mr. Kusumoto objecting to this, and stating that cheques are going to be bounced by the end of the day due to insufficient funds. This is creating chaos for staff, and that the controller, Mr. Gondoyano [phonetic] is on the verge of a breakdown as a result of the stress placed on him, and he later, in fact, resigns as controller.

After this objection, the funds are ultimately released, and there's a letter from -- there's two letters at tabs 44 and 45 of the condensed book that have that exchange between counsel.

To the extent that Mr. Kusumoto has justified these refusals by a stated desire to implement financial control, this stated desire has not prevented Mr. Kusumoto from acting unilaterally and without Matthews' authorization. The evidence is here that approximately \$165,000 has been repaid to the CRA through payments that Mr. Kusumoto initiated, and Mr. Matthews complains that these payments were reckless because --

THE COURT: Whose obligation?

CNSL G. BRANDT: It's a partnership obligation.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL G. BRANDT: To pay the CRA, but, while Matthews requires Tian Kusumoto's sign-off for cheques and

 for transfers, Mr. Tian Kusumoto succeeded in issuing these payments to the CRA, which has impaired the partnership's ability to carefully plan, which is a problem, given its cash scenario. So that's the compliant here.

And what is stated in counsel's letter is that here the reason that Mr. Tian Kusumoto effected -- was able to effect these transfers is because of Sanovest's desire to ensure that it has first priority in any insolvency or realization proceedings, rather than the CRA having a priority over Sanovest's interests. And that payment's been paid. Other payments withheld, as we've seen, and that is part of the overall picture of the financial oppression, all while there's room under the Sanovest loan and advances not being made.

I'm on to paragraph 85, and I'm into the refinancing attempts of the Sanovest loan. Matthews has deposed that, since the fall of -- and this is from his affidavit #1 in the receivership proceeding -- that:

Since the fall of 2023, I have been going to market in an effort to secure third party financing for the partnership. In response there has been series interest among investors, but only provided that the partnership has the ability to carry out land sales. My counsel described these efforts to Sanovest and Tian Kusumoto's counsel in a letter dated October 19th regarding financing, among other matters. That letter noted, among other things, that a potential lender was interested in principle in advancing financing secured by the Bear Mountain lands, but that he had reviewed the pleadings in the various litigation matters and is not prepared to proceed under the current structure where all land sales are effectively frozen, and the lender was justifiably concerned that the partnership will not have access to the cash flow required to service and ultimately repay a loan at maturity.

And Matthews says that was his evidence -- sorry,

 that that was his -- that was true.

Accordingly, the Sanovest loan is unable to be replaced, effectively, because there is no revenue coming in and sales are blocked, and as a result, a lender has no assurance that they will ultimately get repaid from sales, because that is the partnership's business. That's its asset. That's what it does. It's unable to develop and sell land. It's unable to repay a lender. And we've gone through the reason why those sales have not occurred.

Early in 2024 Sanovest presented a term sheet of its own, and that is at tab 17 -- sorry, that is at tab 1 of the condensed book. And Sanovest, in its term sheet, provides for a loan to a cap of \$85 million at a rate of prime plus 3.05, prime being 7.2 at that time, increasing to prime plus 6.05 thereafter, with a floor of 9.5 -- higher than the current loan -- paid for a fee of 1 percent of the loan at closing, but the fee would be earned on execution of the term sheet. So query what happens if the term sheet is executed and not closed.

The term of the loan was for 12 months only. In sum, the term sheet would have put \$850,000 in Sanovest's pocket immediately as a 1 percent extension fee, increase the interest rate with a need to renegotiate in 12 months' time, and based on experience with Sanovest as lender, significant questions as to whether there would be funding, the extent of the funding and how that would assist the partnership's current funding situation.

On March of 2024 Matthews presented a term sheet from Timber Creek Capital to replace the Sanovest financing in full. The term sheet was for a \$65 million loan, 24-month term, lower interest rates than Sanovest term sheet and a lower lender's fee that was only payable on closing. The Timber Creek term sheet required payment down of \$30 million from lot sales or cash equity within 14 months or minimum monthly payments of 3 million for the last ten months of the term.

So here we have a lender who is willing to advance funds to the partnership, but, like any lender, seeks some assurance of either repayment

from sales or at least monthly minimum payments after a certain period of time.

On April 5th, 2024, Sanovest and Mr. Kusumoto asked Mr. Matthews to return back and eliminate the initial covenant, and when Matthews attempted to do so, that potential lender -- prospective lender viewed this as a nonstarter and did not agree to continue the negotiations. So this is entrenchment, entrenchment of Sanovest's position as lender.

One of the objections that Sanovest has set out is in the requirement to pay down the loan over -- sorry. One of the objections that Sanovest has raised is the requirement the pay down the principle of the loan over the two-year term of the loan and that that would be insufficient to fully retire the Sanovest loan. So the \$65 million is insufficient, and as a result, Sanovest could not -- has issued this demand and brought enforcement proceedings on its loan requiring repayment.

Sanovest objects to the funding application proposal on the basis — on similar bases. They say it's insufficient and they say it will take too long. But we heard yesterday from my friend Mr. Jackson that there's no assurance that a full receivership process would be any shorter than the process contemplated under the funding application, and in fact, in our submission, it's likely to be significantly longer, given the scope of a full receiver exercising control over all the lands and the operations.

As Mr. Ferris took the court to earlier, on April 22nd, we -- counsel for Mr. Matthews set out a list of six or any other reasonable options that would resolve the issue with the loan.

THE COURT: Right.

CNSL G. BRANDT: And there was no response to that, no engagement, and further no response to a letter of intent delivered but Mr. Matthews to purchase Sanovest's interest, and that is at paragraph 53 -- sorry, at tab 53 and 54 of the condensed book, with Mr. Matthews having delivered a letter of intent.

So we have every option on the table for this lender to be paid, and this lender wants none of them. This is a lender that wants a

```
receivership but does not want to be repaid.
                Perhaps this would be a convenient time.
3
      THE COURT: Okay. I'll check on Thursday of next
4
           week, and then you give some thought to how much
5
           time your side needs to finish up --
 6
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Yes, Justice.
7
      THE COURT: -- all of the submissions, and then we'll
8
           take it from there.
                                 Thank you.
9
      THE CLERK: Order in chambers.
                                       These chambers are
10
           adjourned for the afternoon recess.
11
12
                 (PROCEEDINGS RECESSED AT 3:01 PM)
13
                 (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED AT 3:20 PM)
14
15
      THE COURT: So I've been able to move something, a
16
           personal matter, and also organize with
           scheduling next Thursday. We have the day set
17
18
           for next Thursday.
19
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Very grateful, Justice.
20
           you.
21
      THE COURT:
                  Thank you. I was able to work it out.
22
           Start at 10 o'clock.
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Justice, we commit that we'll be
2.3
24
           finished by the lunch break tomorrow.
25
      THE COURT: All right. So what happens then is I hear
26
           from Mr. Nathanson? Then from Mr. Jackson?
27
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Mr. Jackson will reply on his
28
           motion, then I will respond to my friend's
29
           oppression motion.
30
      THE COURT:
                 And that will take us into next Thursday.
31
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Yeah, I -- yes. Like, I think
32
           Mr. Jackson will make his reply and I'll begin,
33
           but I assume we don't with done.
34
      THE COURT:
                  Yes. And then is there a right of --
35
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Yes, my friends have a right of
36
           reply at the end, and we've discussed our time
           estimate, and I've told Mr. Ferris I will be done
37
38
           by the afternoon break on next Thursday.
39
      THE COURT:
                  Okay, great. All right.
40
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And that would -- having not heard --
41
           I will take what time is allotted to me.
42
      THE COURT: Okay, thank you.
43
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Thank you, Justice. Just before I
44
           move on to my next section, I just wanted to go
45
           back to paragraph 81 of my written argument,
46
           I had been speaking here about Mr. Matthews'
47
           management fee and the unilateral step to prevent
```

 that from being paid in January of 2023. There's just an additional reference that I wanted to draw the court's attention to. That's at paragraph -- sorry -- at tab 43 of our condensed book. It's an email exchange with Mr. Clarke, who at that time was the chief financial officer, from 2015. And here Mr. Clarke is providing a listing of the cheques issued that week on the development and resort companies, and Tom Kusumoto responds saying:

Please provide details for the expense of 15,750 for Ecoasis innovative expenses. [Indiscernible] my review.

And Clarke responds saying:

Hello, Tom. This is not an expense report, but rather the monthly management fee of 15,000 plus GST.

Tom Kusumoto says:

David, I feel silly. Sorry about that.

It's copied to Mr. Matthews and to TRK, to Mr. Kusumoto. And there are other examples in the record, but this is just one of this management fee being a known, reported, recorded expense, and despite those additional paragraphs in Mr. Kusumoto's affidavit as to his reasons for withholding them, the first paragraph, that he learned about it in 2021, is not supported by the long history of that, including this exchange where he is copied on it.

I'm going to move to just a section here on the current state of the partnership's affairs. THE COURT: That's at page 25? Or here we are. CNSL G. BRANDT: At the beginning of page 102 of the -- paragraph 102 of the argument.

THE COURT: All right.

CNSL G. BRANDT: As noted above, the partnership holds all the units in the resort partnership, apart from one held by EBMD, and therefore the resort partnership comes under the general umbrella of the assets belonging to the partnership. However, since their inception in 2013, they have

always operated in distinct spheres, with the resort partnership carrying on the golf, tennis and recreation business, and the partnership carrying on the real estate holding and development business. That division is reflected in the partnership agreements, and on a day-to-day business, the resort partnership owns and operates the sporting and recreational facilities at Bear Mountain. Those are, of course, the two Nicklaus-designed golf courses, the mountain course and the valley course, and the Bear Mountain Tennis Centre, which has Canada's largest indoor and outdoor -- outdoor rec play courts.

It was also intended that the resort partnership operate the activity centre, which I have discussed already and here's the full listing of the amenities associated with that community centre, and that has not been transferred back into the resort partnership. We understand that Sanovest is not seeking the appointment of a receiver over BMAC or the operations of BMAC in this petition.

Matthews' duties in overseeing the resort partnership's overall operations include the golf, tennis and retail operations, along with all future resort operating components, and that's part of the plan to continually build out the amenities here as part of the overall plan to -- trend or trajectory of increasing the land values through amenities.

Matthews also leads and works with the employees, including the golf and tennis managers, the [indiscernible] team, horticulture team and administration team. We heard evidence of the number of employees there that vary seasonably, but it's a large operation. Matthews leads the golf and tennis membership engagement and oversees the maintenance and renovation of those assets.

Golf is a key part of this community, and Matthews' personal involvement in golf and organizations has been an essential ingredient in the growth of the Bear Mountain community. That's one of the unique aspects that Matthews has brought since 2013 here.

Mr. Larocque is the general manager of the

47

resort partnership operations. He's provided two affidavits in these proceedings, and we say as well that the resort partnership's business itself, when viewed in isolation, is profitable, 5 but it's due to the access of revenues from land sales that the resort partnership has been 7 funding the partnership to meet the partnership's 8 basic operating needs of \$100,000 a month before 9 property taxes. 10 Currently the resort partnership is 11 experiencing strong revenues. We heard some of 12 this yesterday, the evidence of Mr. Larocque 13 showing that, despite the failure of a water 14 pump, the year-over-year revenues are the highest 15 that been since 2013. 16 THE COURT: Mr. Jackson's point was that, in spite of 17 that, even though it's a sensational year, the 18 overall accounts payable are still roughly the 19 same as they were. And I take it your point earlier was, well, that's because the resort 20 21 partnership subsidizing the partnership. 22 CNSL G. BRANDT: Correct. 23 THE COURT: All right. 24 CNSL G. BRANDT: I have some additional points on 25 that. 26 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 27 CNSL G. BRANDT: Just very briefly, though, that if you compare the two, the aged accounts are coming closer to being paid, so aging is not as serious 28 29 30 The overall amounts are comparable. as it was. 31 That being said, the resort partnership obviously 32 money comes in and out of the account at various 33 times. I don't have evidence on this, but I'm 34 instructed that the cash position is somewhat 35 better than it was. That was a low day. 36 THE COURT: No, but --37 All this is variance. CNSL G. BRANDT: THE COURT: No, but here -- I don't think I should 38 39 consider anything that's not in the evidence, 40 unless everyone agrees it's a fact I can rely on. 41 But the point Mr. Jackson made is, if it's that great, why aren't the accounts payable --42 43 why isn't the overall number coming down, or why 44 isn't it coming down for at least the resort 45 partnership if it's doing that well? And I thought you said earlier that, well, their 46

financial ability -- resources are constrained

```
because they're supporting the partnership.
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       Correct.
3
                  And I don't recall where the evidence is
      THE COURT:
4
           on that, but I assume you're going to take me to
5
           that in due course.
      CNSL G. BRANDT: I will do that. And my only point
7
           earlier was not -- not intending to give
           evidence, but rather, just -- what we're looking
8
9
           at are two snapshots, and neither certainly gives
10
           the full picture of what's happening.
11
      THE COURT: No, I know, but in terms of the evidence,
12
           Mr. Jackson's point is, well, if it's -- I really
13
           can't place any weight on that evidence for the
14
           purpose of considering the receivership aspect of
15
           the application, because if it's that good, you'd
           expect a greater dent in the accounts payable.
16
17
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Correct. So I'll take the court to
18
           the affidavit.
19
      THE COURT: Have I -- I hope I didn't -- have I
20
           summarized that right?
21
      CNSL K. JACKSON: No, I think that's right, Justice.
22
      THE COURT:
                  Mr. Jackson, sorry if it wasn't right.
23
      CNSL K. JACKSON: No, my point on that was -- you're
24
           right -- I mean, apart from the CapEx on
25
           maintenance, there was the point that revenue is
26
           revenue. Bottom line is more important than
27
           revenue, and having a great revenue in a year in
28
           history doesn't mean that you're actually doing
           well profitably, and you're not paying down the
29
30
           aged payables. And that was where I took you to
31
           the two comparisons from May to August.
32
      THE COURT: Right.
33
      CNSL K. JACKSON: That doesn't show any meaningful
34
           decrease.
35
      THE COURT: Okay. And so I understand Mr. Brandt's
36
           point, the answer to that -- the answer to that
           submission is -- and I'll hear from you in
37
38
           reply -- is, well, that's because resort is
39
           supporting partnership.
40
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Yeah, I think they said historically
41
           they paid property taxes which is, you know,
42
           1.6 million a month, and that didn't happen this
43
           year, of course.
44
      THE COURT:
                 A year.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: A year. Oh, my goodness. A year. THE COURT: I'll let you reply.
45
46
47
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Right, right.
```

```
THE COURT: But I want to hear -- I'll have to -- I
           want to see the evidence, but that's what I took
3
           the answer to your submission to be.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Right. I think that's -- yeah.
5
      THE COURT:
                  And so if that's the case, I need some
           help seeing that, because --
      CNSL G. BRANDT: So I have a couple of references
7
8
           here. One is the affidavit #2 of Mr. Matthews.
9
           It's at tab B of the book of affidavits here, the
10
           condensed book of affidavits, paragraph 28,
11
           Mr. --
12
      THE COURT: Just a minute. Let me just get that out
13
                  So which paragraph? You said paragraph
           here.
14
           number?
15
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        28.
16
      THE COURT: Okay.
17
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
18
                Although sufficient to maintain the golf and
19
                recreation operations in isolation --
20
21
           So this is Mr. Matthews' evidence here.
22
23
                -- operating revenue from the Resort
24
                Partnership is not enough to cover the Bear
25
                Mountain Project's total outstanding
26
                payables and ongoing expenses.
27
28
           So that's what Mr. Matthews' evidence is, is the
29
           revenue from the resort partnership can't pay for
30
           everything, and it was never the intention to pay
31
           for everything.
32
      THE COURT: No, but you went further than that, and
33
           you said the reason the resort is in -- can't
34
           deal with all its payables is because it's
35
           diverting some of its funds to support the
36
           partnership.
37
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       That's right.
                                       And --
38
      THE COURT: Yeah, and so I just want to see where I
39
           can -- where that's tethered to some evidence.
40
      CNSL G. BRANDT: And at paragraph 27, so just above,
41
           this is where Mr. Matthews makes this point here.
42
      THE COURT: Okay.
43
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
44
                Funds earned by the Resort Partnership have
45
                been regularly transferred to the
46
                Partnership by way of intercompany loan,
47
                with virtually no revenue retained in the
```

47

Resort Partnership resulting in the Resort 2 Partnership having significant accounts 3 payable ... 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 CNSL G. BRANDT: So that's Mr. Matthews' evidence, and 7 his evidence as well in his affidavit #1 --8 sorry, his affidavit #2 provided in the 9 oppression proceeding -- oh, that is there -- is 10 that cash is being managed on a day-by-day basis, 11 and that includes the management of cash required 12 to cover the expenses of both the partnership and 13 the resort partnership. 14 And so when they manage cash, they look at it wholistically, what needs to be paid in 15 priority, but the only source of revenue, in 16 17 effect, is the resort partnership, and that's at 18 paragraph 31, the daily management strategy. 19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 I'll also point out, when we see CNSL G. BRANDT: 21 these accounts payable, they've been accruing for 22 a period of time that long precedes -- long precedes -- the May 1st term date on the Sanovest 23 24 loan, and so the reason for this accrual of 25 accounts payable is not only because of the need 26 to divert revenues from the resort partnership to 27 the partnership, but also because there are no 28 land sales, so no revenue. There are very 29 limited advances under the Sanovest loan 30 agreement, and there's no refinancing. This is 31 not an issue that's arisen since May 1st, not by 32 any means. 33 THE COURT: Okay. 34 CNSL G. BRANDT: So at paragraphs 112 and 113 I 35 discuss the cash flow situation here. Revenues 36 are good, and as I say, there has been some 37 reduction to the older accounts payable. Now, one of the resort partnership's largest 38 39 recurring expenses has been \$360,000 for the cost 40 of lease space at the hotel, and I'm going to 41 discuss the next section, that the resort 42 partnership has not renewed its resort 43 partnership lease with the hotel, and as of 44 July 1st, 2024, it's effected a transition of 45 operations away from the leased facilities. Paragraph 115. When the partnership and 46

resort partnership purchased the hotel --

purchased, sorry, the project in 2013, those assets included the -- what's known as the Westin Bear Mountain Hotel. There's been a fraught relationship with the hotel. The current owners purchased the hotel from the resort partnership in 2019, and the parties' arrangements included two agreements by which the resort partnership was to continue to operate from the hotel premises, including office space, pro shop, locker rooms and storage space.

An arbitration was commenced regarding contractual relationships between the resort partnership and the hotel, and the court has reviewed a portion of the hotel liability decision that my friend Mr. Ferris took the court to earlier.

Just in paragraph 119 here, this notes the circumstances by which the hotel liability decision has become part of the public record due to an appeal and a petition that were launched to challenge.

THE COURT: And what was the decision? I was only taken to the comments regarding Mr. Clarke.

CNSL G. BRANDT: Yes, Justice. So the application for leave to appeal was dismissed by the court of appeal.

THE COURT: Right.

CNSL G. BRANDT: And there are reported reasons that are referenced at 120 of the argument. The hotel petition was discontinued.

THE COURT: So the arbitration decision was to dismiss the petition?

CNSL G. BRANDT: I apologize. So there was an appeal of the arbitration decision.

THE COURT: Yeah, but I don't know what the arbitration decision was is what I'm trying to get at.

CNSL G. BRANDT: So the appeal was dismissed. So the decision on --

THE COURT: I've got that. What was the decision at first instance?

CNSL G. BRANDT: So the decision on liability --

THE COURT: Yes.

CNSL G. BRANDT: There was a decision on liability.

THE COURT: And what was it?

CNSL G. BRANDT: That -- and I'm just cautious about what I'm going the say about it, although I think

```
it is all in evidence. Yeah, the decision is in
           evidence.
 3
                 So did the arbitrator dismiss the claim
      THE COURT:
           and that was the appeal?
 5
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                      No.
                            So the arbitrator allowed the
           resort partnership's -- like, the resort
 7
           partnership was successful in the arbitration
 8
           on --
 9
                  Oh, so they were the --
      THE COURT:
10
      CNSL G. BRANDT: They were the claimants.
11
      THE COURT: Okay. I thought it was the other way
12
           around.
13
      CNSL G. BRANDT: They were the claimants alleging
14
           breaches of the contractual relationship with the
15
           hotel.
16
      THE COURT: Against the --
17
      CNSL G. BRANDT: The hotel operators.
18
      THE COURT: Okay. And they were successful?
19
      CNSL G. BRANDT: They were successful on liability.
20
                  All right.
      THE COURT:
21
      CNSL G. BRANDT: And what remains in the hotel
22
           arbitration is described at paragraph 124, which
23
           I'll just invite the court to read.
24
      THE COURT: So what I don't understand is in
25
           paragraph 120 it says:
26
27
                The hotel entities filed a notice of
28
                discontinuance of the hotel petition.
29
30
           That's why I thought they were the claims.
31
      CNSL G. BRANDT: So they were -- so there were two
32
           proceedings in the BC Supreme Court that
33
           challenged the arbitration.
34
      THE COURT: Oh, I see.
35
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       The first was an outright appeal.
36
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
                      And the second was a petition --
37
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
38
      THE COURT:
                  Okay. All right.
                       -- seeking to set it aside.
39
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
40
                  So then what's happening now is the
      THE COURT:
41
           assessment of damages at arbitration?
42
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Correct.
43
      THE COURT: Okay. And that's -- when does that start?
44
      CNSL G. BRANDT: So that's what's set to begin -- that
45
           next phase is set to begin on September 23rd.
46
      THE COURT: And how does a receivership order -- no
47
           matter how broad or narrow it is -- affect the
```

```
arbitration?
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Well, we say there should be no stay
3
           of the arbitration.
4
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah, but if your client's -- but if the
5
           partnership is -- I'm sorry, is it the resort or
           the partnership? It's the resort? If they're
7
           the claimant and they are successful on liability
8
           at the arbitration, why would there be a stay of
9
           their claim? Stays against them are stayed;
10
           right?
11
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Correct. So there should be no
12
           effect.
13
      THE COURT: Right.
                          But the other side is not seeking
14
           a stay, are they?
15
      CNSL K. JACKSON: No, Justice. It wouldn't arise --
16
           sorry, the ordinary stay provision, of course,
17
           wouldn't affect that.
18
      THE COURT: Yeah.
19
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Hence we've sought nothing.
20
      THE COURT:
                 No relief in relation to the arbitration.
21
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Not at all. Not at all.
22
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
23
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Sorry, Justice.
24
           [indiscernible]. I know almost nothing about
25
           this, but I note that my friend's submission
26
           seems to describe that there are claims going
27
           both ways and there was some accounting claimed
28
           by the hotel against the partnership as well as
29
           claim from --
30
      THE COURT: Okay, that's what I was wondering what
31
           was --
32
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Right. So I don't know the
33
                    I'm just trying to observe that there
           answer.
34
           seems to be a cross-claim.
35
                  Yeah. But I thought the way it landed was
      THE COURT:
36
           there's only one liability decision in favour of
           the resort -- let's call it the resort
37
38
           partnership -- and whatever -- whatever might
39
           have been advanced by the other side has been
40
           dismissed.
41
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Justice, I think if you read the next
           paragraph, 125, it will explain all that to you.
42
43
      THE COURT: Okay. All right.
44
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Thank you.
45
      THE COURT:
                  125?
46
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Yes.
47
      THE COURT: Okay. Well, what are those accounting
```

```
claims? So that's the cross-claim, then, the
           accounting claims?
      CNSL G. BRANDT: So there's a cross-claim there.
           There are two -- already essentially cross-claims
5
           for equivalent value, but the main claim on
           liability exceeds those cross-claims by a very
7
           substantial amount. So by far and away, the main
8
           issue, by scale alone, is the damages for the
9
           matters that were found in the liability decision
10
           by which the hotel entities are liable to the
11
           resort partnership.
12
      THE COURT:
                  So your concern is that a receivership
13
           order would affect a stay of the claims
14
           against -- the cross-claims against the
15
           partnership.
16
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Well, my friend says that's not being
17
           sought.
18
      THE COURT: Okay.
19
      CNSL G. BRANDT: So in that case, I have no concern.
      CNSL C. FERRIS: There's two worries. One is, does
20
21
           the receiver get conduct of that arbitration on
22
           behalf of the resort partnership? Under the full
23
           receivership order, the receiver would now have
           conduct of it. We don't want that.
24
                                                 This has
25
           been going on for five years. The receiver knows
26
           nothing about it. So the first step is, does the
27
           receiver get conduct of it?
28
                And then for the cross-claims back, if those
29
           are stayed, then that party, the hotel, could
30
           say, well, this isn't fair. My claims are
31
           stayed, but yours aren't, and so it turns into a
32
           mess. Or the short answer is, we say that
33
           whatever order is made shouldn't impact --
34
      THE COURT: In other words, whatever happens, carve
35
           out the arbitration.
36
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Correct. Exactly.
37
      THE COURT: Mr. Jackson, is there --
38
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Well, you know, I mean, I think --
39
           Justice, I think, just by operation of the way
40
           these things work, if the proceeding continues at
41
           the instance of the debtor company, there's no --
42
           you can't say, well, we get to go and you don't.
43
      THE COURT:
                 Right.
44
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        That's just not how it works, of
45
           course. And so that's not a concern. But
46
           practically speaking, if this arbitration can
47
           proceed, then it should proceed.
```

```
THE COURT: Right. And the concern is the receiver,
           under the broad-form order, might be said to have
 3
           had --
 4
      CNSL K. JACKSON: I think it would.
 5
      THE COURT: -- control of it well. Is there some
           way -- are you seeking that -- if your friends
           say, well, that should be carved out?
 7
 8
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Yeah. Right. I mean, so two
 9
           things. I mean, it would -- you know, at first
10
           instance, if there's a receivership order made,
11
           the chose in action invests in the receiver's
12
           control; right?
13
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
14
      CNSL K. JACKSON: You know, practically speaking, that
15
           happens all the time, and if they want, they just
           allow counsel -- existing counsel to continue,
16
17
           and it doesn't look any different whatsoever,
18
           despite the fact that they're taking instructions
19
           from the receiver and not principal of the
20
           company. So what?
21
                So I don't think there's any mischief in
22
           that whatsoever. I can talk with my friend and
23
           get instructions, because I don't think there's
           any concern about a receiver saying, look, you
24
25
           know, three weeks from now, if they want to go
26
           ahead with it and it's got funding, then go
27
           ahead. So I can get instructions. I don't
28
           think -- this isn't going to be an issue.
29
                  And a stay wouldn't prohibit, then, the
      THE COURT:
30
           cross-claim.
31
      CNSL K. JACKSON: No, not at all, and to the extent we
32
           need to clarify, that's fine.
33
      THE COURT: Okay.
34
      CNSL K. JACKSON: I don't think there's any concerns
35
           here.
36
      THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'll let you work that out
37
           with Mr. Roberts, then. Thank you. All right.
38
                Mr. Brandt, thank you.
39
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       Thank you. This is why I'm doing the
40
           facts.
41
      THE COURT: All right.
42
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       Thank you, Justice.
                So there's been -- I'm just going to skip
43
44
           down to paragraph 128 here of my argument.
45
      THE COURT: All right.
46
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       In parallel to the arbitration -- and
47
           I just want to be careful because there is some
```

```
overlap here with details of the commercial
           arrangements.
3
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
4
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       There has been a dissatisfaction with
5
           the space that is being used -- that was being
           used at the hotel, and there's a letter at -- in
7
           one of the unfiled affidavits, which I'll take
8
           the court to, that summarizes the -- some of the
9
           outstanding issues.
10
      THE COURT:
                  And why do I need to know about this?
11
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                      You don't need to know -- you don't
12
           need to know that, actually, and to the extent
13
           you do, it's set out in paragraphs (e) to (h)
14
           here of the argument.
15
      THE COURT:
                 Let me just read that, then.
                                                 This is
16
           paragraph 129?
17
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       Yes.
18
      THE COURT:
                  This bears on the arbitration right?
19
      CNSL G. BRANDT: It bears on several matters, which
20
           I'll come to, in part on the arbitration, in part
21
           on the way that Mr. Matthews' management
22
           decisions have been impugned.
23
      THE COURT: Oh, I see. Okay.
24
      CNSL G. BRANDT: All right. And Mr. Larocque here has
25
           given evidence as well on some of the issues that
26
           this has caused.
27
                Now, we have evidence in this proceeding
28
           from Mr. Malak and Mr. Clarke. They provided
29
           affidavit evidence, which was referenced here,
30
           that the hotel is prepared to renew its lease to
31
           the partnership on, quote, commercial terms,
32
           provided that Mr. Matthews is not involved.
33
                And so what we have here -- so what has
34
           occurred is there's been a transition away from
35
           the hotel. We'll come to some of the evidence of
36
           what's happened. Bear Mountain Activity Centre
37
           is being used as a check-in place. There is a
38
           pro shop there, and that is golf cart storage and
39
           charging that was done in the hotel.
                                                  That's
40
           happening in a separate location. And so despite
41
           the fact that this is saving $360,000 a year,
42
           despite the significant dissatisfactions and
43
           dysfunctions and the sworn evidence from
44
           Mr. Malak and Mr. Clarke that they would love to
45
           work with the project, but not with Mr. Matthews,
46
           this -- the evidence coming from Mr. Tian
47
           Kusumoto is that that was somehow a wrong
```

decision to separate from the hotel, and an example of Matthews' mismanagement. THE COURT: Okay. 3 All right. 4 CNSL G. BRANDT: Okay. So here's what I'm going to 5 come to on this. So at paragraph 135, Matthews and 599 submit -- first, before I go there, I just have reproduced in the argument 133. 7 8 is affidavit under seal. Mr. Matthews deposes as 9 to his concerns as to what's occurring in the 10 other relationships. 11 And here we say that the evidence of 12 Mr. Tian Kusumoto, Mr. Clarke and Mr. Malak 13 should be treated cautiously in determining what 14 is in the best interests of the resort 15 partnership. Ultimately we say this is a fact -this is not a factor that should result in a 16 17 receiver being appointed over the resort 18 partnership operations. 19 And we're particularly concerned about the 20 evidence of Mr. Clarke, and I'm going to go to 21 this. We've already seen the findings made in 22 respect to Mr. Clarke at -- in the hotel 23 liability decision. I'm going to start with just the affidavit of Mr. Clarke. It's at volume 8 24 25 and tab 18. 26 THE COURT: All right. 27 CNSL G. BRANDT: All right. So this is the affidavit 28 that Mr. Clarke has given in this proceeding. THE COURT: All right. 29 30 CNSL G. BRANDT: And beginning at paragraph 25, 31 Mr. Clarke gives evidence as to what he asserts 32 to be Mr. Matthews' mismanagement of the project. 33 He states at 25 that he has concerns over 34 marketing and sales' management, that he doesn't 35 believe Matthews operates strategically. 36 27, that he has found that Matthews has 37 often acted in a self-interested manner with 38 respect to the partnership, and that there were 39 assets, and at 27: 40 41 As a result of such transactions and other 42 issues, I formed the view that Matthews was 43 not acting in the interests of the 44

28:

45 46

47

Partnership.

```
In late 2019, I raised my concerns with Tom
                Kusumoto and Matthews and resigned from my
 3
                      I told Tom and Matthews that I could
                role.
 4
                not continue in my role as CFO with the
 5
                ongoing lack of direction in the company,
                the instability of the Partnership and what
 7
                I saw as financial mismanagement and
 8
                misconduct under Matthews' leadership.
 9
10
           So those are the -- this is the evidence given by
11
           Mr. Clarke as to Matthews' mismanagement.
12
                Now, as a result of the --
13
      THE COURT:
                  So his business associate and his wife are
14
           the owners/operators of the Westin Bear Mountain
15
           Golf Resort. That's the hotel?
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Westin is the hotel.
16
17
      THE COURT:
                  That's the hotel.
18
      CNSL G. BRANDT: That's the hotel.
19
      THE COURT: Okay. So his partner is an owner and
20
           operated the hotel. All right.
21
           Associate. Business associate.
22
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Now, previously --
23
      THE COURT: What do you need me to go to next?
24
      CNSL G. BRANDT: So now I'm asking you to go to our
25
           condensed book, please.
26
      THE COURT:
                  Okay. Right.
27
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Here Mr. --
28
      THE COURT:
                  Tab?
29
      CNSL G. BRANDT: I'm at volume 2 of the condensed
30
           book, and tab 73.
31
      THE COURT: Okay, just a minute. Okay.
32
      CNSL G. BRANDT: And here Mr. Clarke has given a
33
           witness statement in the arbitration, and this
34
           witness statement came in to -- it was filed into
35
           court as part of the challenge to the
36
           arbitration.
37
      THE COURT:
                  So where do I find that in here?
38
      CNSL G. BRANDT: So at --
39
      THE COURT:
                  Oh, here it is.
                                   I've got it.
40
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       Yeah.
41
                 All right. Page 144.
      THE COURT:
42
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Exactly. And Matthews -- sorry.
43
           Mr. Clarke states that, for two separate reasons,
44
           he made the decision to cease working in his
45
           role, his prior role. First he says:
46
47
                Since the fall of 2016, the GT operator --
```

4 5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

And I take this to be a subset of the partnership.

for the real estate and hotel assets.

CNSL G. BRANDT:

primary role is to assist with information packages, site visits and any due diligence requests for potential deals. The GT operator was not interested in continuing their ownership of Bear Mountain. There was no assurance that any current staff would have continued employment with a new purchaser. As such, there was uncertainty regarding my situation.

-- had been publicly trying to find a buyer

In addition, as the chief financial officer, I was often put into difficult positions between the two GT operator partners and their representatives when it came to providing information.

20 21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THE COURT: So GT operator, that's --CNSL G. BRANDT: I understand that's an entity associated with the resort partnership. THE COURT: Okay. No, the hotel or the resort? CNSL G. BRANDT: The partnership. It is the formal --I'm told it's the resort partnership. That is That's one and the same. the resort partnership. Okay. All right. All right. Okay. THE COURT:

29 30 31

In addition, as the chief financial officer --

There's no dispute this is Mr. Clarke acting in his role as the chief financial officer.

36 37 38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47

-- I was put into difficult positions between the two GT operator partners and the representatives when it came to providing This created unnecessary information. stress for me, and I was often blamed for a variety of issues, including a lack of information, providing too much information, unclear financial disclosure and missed budgets and timelines. All these issues were often out of my control or had occurred at the direction of one partner at the

expense of the other. It became all too clear to me that the internal conflict of the GT operator would not be resolving itself in the near term, and I no longer wanted to be part of these struggles.

7 8

So that's one issue. And then he cites a personal issue that -- I'm told GT stands for golf and tennis operator, and that that is the resort partnership.

Mr. Clarke then gives evidence as to a second personal issue which relates to a conflict over a family situation he had and discovering correspondence from Mr. Matthews to Mr. Tom Kusumoto where there was a loss in faith of him. And he, as a result, decided that he could no longer work there. He says:

I unequivocally declare that the decision not to renew my agreements with the GT operator had nothing to do with any enticement or inducement from any outside source.

So -- and again, at just paragraph 13, he met with Matthews and Kusumoto in Vancouver and explained to them that he was not happy with the events of the past 18 months and could not see a way to continue with them. He stated that he could not -- that he would not leave them without a transition plan and he would work out a way to stay on for a few months beyond his contract date.

So his explanation here is very different, markedly different, from the explanation provided in the affidavit sworn in this proceeding, that he left because of Matthews' management concerns.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL G. BRANDT: And what's more than that -- what's more than that, we have recent evidence that Mr. Clarke and Mr. Tian Kusumoto have been having some communications which cause significant amount of concern.

So there's a photograph in Mr. Tian Kusumoto's affidavit number 3. It's at tab 22, and that's at volume $8\,.$

THE COURT: Sorry, affidavit #2, you said?

```
CNSL G. BRANDT: Sorry, it is in the condensed book.
            So it's just here. It's affidavit #3 of
           Mr. Kusumoto, Exhibit Q.
                                      I'm going to just take
            the court to that in the condensed book.
 5
      THE COURT:
                   Okay. Just so which tab is it in the
            condensed book, then?
 7
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Tab 74 here.
                  Okay, just a minute while I get it.
 8
      THE COURT:
 9
            you're saying that there's something about their
10
            relationship that raises further concerns?
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Yes, Justice. It will just take me a
11
12
           moment to get here, but I will get here.
13
                 So these are -- there's three photographs
14
           here at 74. One is a picture of the transition
15
            into the new pro shop. A second one is a
16
           photograph of what -- of the person directing
17
            someone to the new front desk for the golf
18
            operations and so on.
19
                 And then at page 3 there's a photograph of a
20
            cart charging facility.
21
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
22
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Mr. Kusumoto does not identify the
23
            source of that image. We've made requests for
           the image source, and ultimately on the morning of an application brought to compel disclosure,
24
25
26
           Mr. Kusumoto identified David Clarke as the
27
            source of that image, and that is --
                   Okay. But how does this --
28
      THE COURT:
29
      CNSL G. BRANDT: How is that relevant?
30
      THE COURT:
                   So what? Why does it matter?
31
      CNSL G. BRANDT: So the -- so that image --
32
      THE COURT:
                   I have to tell you what I'm looking at is
33
            a pretty poor copy, so I don't know if there's --
34
           maybe that doesn't matter.
35
      CNSL G. BRANDT: A poor copy?
36
      THE COURT: A poor copy of the photo.
37
      CNSL G. BRANDT: So that image --
38
      THE COURT:
                  I wouldn't have known it's a charging
39
            station. Anyway, I'll take your word for it now.
40
      CNSL G. BRANDT: It's a charging station. I do have a
41
            better photograph of it as well.
42
      THE COURT: For golf carts; right? Okay, so why does
43
            this matter?
44
      CNSL G. BRANDT: So over at tab 75 of the condensed
45
           book.
46
      THE COURT:
                   Okay.
47
      CNSL G. BRANDT: This is Mr. Clarke providing that
```

```
image to Mr. Kusumoto.
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
3
      CNSL G. BRANDT: And it's a much better image here.
4
      THE COURT:
                  All right. Okay.
5
                      Now, what's striking is the very same
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
           image surfaced two months earlier as an
7
           attachment to an anonymous email from
8
           2024bminfo@protonemail.com, essentially an
9
           anonymous email address, to Island Golf Carts,
10
           which is a local golf cart dealer and servicer
11
           and a company with which the resort partnership
12
           has a long-standing and important business
13
           relationship. And that email is over at the next
14
           tab.
15
      THE COURT:
                  76?
16
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       And you can see --
17
      THE COURT: 76?
18
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        76, and you can see this is the
19
           identical photograph.
20
      THE COURT:
                  One second.
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Over at page 4.
21
22
                  Oh, yeah, okay. All right.
      THE COURT:
23
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Over at page 4. And this anonymous
           email address is writing to the supplier saying:
24
25
26
                Nice way the golf cart fleet is being kept
27
                at Bear Mountain. These will be worth
28
                nothing after a few months of being kept
29
                outside and uncovered. The garbage
30
                can-covered chargers is a nice touch too ...
31
32
           And then this goes from Island Golf Carts to
33
           Mr. Larocque, who has provided evidence in this
34
           proceeding:
35
36
                Not sure who sent this to us.
37
38
           And the point is that it appears that Mr. Clarke
39
           is the source of both images.
40
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
41
      CNSL G. BRANDT: And he is, on the one hand,
42
           collaborating very closely with Mr. Tian
43
           Kusumoto; on the other hand, sending emails to
44
           the suppliers of the partnership undermining and
45
           denigrating the partnership's trade
46
           relationships, and as currently the person who
47
           acts as CFO for the hotel is asking for the hotel
```

45

46 47

to continue its relationship with the resort partnership and denigrating Mr. Matthews. 3 And what comes across is a very clear split 4 in allegiances, which we say is not, by any 5 means, in the best interests of the resort 6 partnership. 7 THE COURT: So apart from the obvious point that you 8 said -- you're suggesting I shouldn't give any 9 weight to Mr. Clarke's evidence -- are you going further than that saying there's something 10 11 inappropriate in the relationship between 12 Mr. Clarke and Mr. Tian Kusumoto? 13 CNSL G. BRANDT: I'm saying the court should be very 14 careful about -- in all the context of how this 15 proceeding has come forward, to then grant a 16 receiver over the partnership and the resort 17 partnership and the operations of the resort 18 partnership in a way that takes control away from 19 Mr. Matthews, in the context of the other 20 elements of the oppressive conduct here, because 21 all of this appears to be a control play against 22 Mr. Matthews. That's the point. 23 And the court's process should not be --24 should not be allowed to be the vehicle by which 25 oppressive conduct and this type of cooperation 26 can be used to wrest control away from one of the 27 partners, particularly -- and the CEO who's been in place since 2013 -- particularly in the 28 absence of any final determination on any of 29 30 these issues. 31 And then just, again, with respect to alignment here, we have Mr. Clarke, who is the 32 33 CFO of the hotel where there is a very large 34 proceeding upcoming. 35 THE COURT: Right. 36 CNSL G. BRANDT: And again, this is a factor that 37 bears on the motivation of what happens and bears 38 on what we say is the appropriate order that 39 should be made with respect to the arbitration 40 proceedings. 41 THE COURT: All right. But if I take Mr. Clarke's evidence out of the -- out of consideration 42 43 because I view that I shouldn't give any weight 44 to it, at least for the purpose of this -- these

applications, what you're saying, then, effectively, although you haven't said it

directly, is there's no other evidence before me

```
to suggests that Mr. Matthews should not -- that
           I should issue an order that presumptively denies
           Mr. Matthews the ability to continue to operate
           the business. That's something I should leave to
5
           the receiver to determine.
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Well, we're saying there should be no
7
           receivership order placed over the resort
8
           partnership.
9
                  Oh, the resort partnership.
      THE COURT:
10
      CNSL G. BRANDT: In general. There's no basis for it.
      THE COURT: All right. Okay. But he's also -- so
11
12
           that it should only be over the partnership, but
13
           isn't he -- I mean, perhaps I conflated the two,
14
           but I thought he was also running the operation
15
           of that on a day-to-day basis. Am I wrong in
16
           that?
17
      CNSL G. BRANDT: He is also running the operation of
18
           the partnership, but the partnership's main
19
           function --
                 No, I've got --
20
      THE COURT:
21
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       -- is to develop lands.
22
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
23
      CNSL G. BRANDT: And it has no revenue right now;
24
           right?
25
      THE COURT: No, I know. But if I grant even a limited
26
           receivership, one of the things I wanted was to
27
           hear back from the receiver as to the propriety
28
           of Mr. Matthews continuing to operate the
29
           business, and I had, in my mind, conflated the
30
           two.
31
      CNSL G. BRANDT: And we say that those are separable.
32
      THE COURT: So if we keep the resort out of it,
33
           there's still the issue of who runs -- who runs
34
           the partnership's business; right? And so
35
           would -- even on the limited receivership order,
36
           wouldn't I ask -- why wouldn't I ask the receiver
37
           to provide me with its recommendation on that
           basis?
38
39
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       You may wind up with an order asking
40
           the receiver to opine as to whether it's
41
           appropriate for Mr. Matthews to remain the CEO
42
           with respect to the partnership business, but
43
           there's no reason to seek a parallel --
44
      THE COURT: Order of the resort.
45
      CNSL G. BRANDT: In order to make the first order,
46
           right.
47
      THE COURT: Okay.
```

```
CNSL G. BRANDT: And currently -- and I think,
           Justice, you had it correctly sort of in your
3
           mind -- is because my friend is seeking a full
           receivership order that covers both.
5
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
 6
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       That's what they are --
7
      THE COURT: Mind you, if I order a receiver appointed
8
           over the partnership business alone, presumably
9
           the receiver steps in and takes control of it in
10
           any event, but may decide it's appropriate to
11
           delegate day-to-day operations to Mr. Matthews.
12
      CNSL G. BRANDT: It is correct that the resort
13
           partnership is an asset of the partnership.
      THE COURT:
14
                 All right.
15
      CNSL G. BRANDT: But as I say, the operations are
16
           entirely separable.
17
      THE COURT: No, I got that. I'm just dealing with
18
           what happens if I issue a receivership order that
19
           doesn't cover the resort assets, that deals with
20
           everything else the partnership has.
21
           operation of the order, the receiver takes
22
           control. But the receiver would nonetheless come
23
           back with a recommendation as to who should run
24
           that business; right?
25
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Well, again, functionally these are
26
           separate businesses.
27
      THE COURT:
                 I have that.
                                I have that point.
28
           dealing with a different point in terms of, all
29
           right, Mr. Clarke's evidence is out of the
30
           consideration, out of the piece; I don't make an
31
           order -- a receivership order that deals with the
32
           resort. What you're saying, then, is, apart from
33
           Mr. Clarke's evidence, there's nothing else that
34
           impugns Mr. Matthews' ability to run the
35
           business.
36
                       Well, there are allegations against
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
37
           Mr. Matthews --
38
      THE COURT: But they're allegations.
39
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       -- that he's made -- that he has
40
           engaged in certain self-interested dealings.
41
      THE COURT:
                 Right.
42
      CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       And presumably my friend is going to
43
           say that this means that Mr. Matthews is not a
44
           trustworthy person to run the resort partnership.
45
      THE COURT:
                 Right.
46
      CNSL G. BRANDT: And we're going to -- in the morning
47
           I'm going to deal with those allegations and why
```

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

they should not be given any weight either. Right. But one of the things Mr. Jackson THE COURT: had said to me early on in his submissions when I put them to him is he said, look, the receiver can come back and provide a recommendation that perhaps it is appropriate for Mr. Matthews to run the businesses, because he has intimate knowledge of the day-to-day operations. So I guess what I'm trying to get at is, even if I grant the order your client is seeking, it's appropriate to ask the receiver for its recommendation about Mr. Matthews' ability to run the partnership business. CNSL G. BRANDT: So again, we go back to where my friend Mr. Roberts began, which is if we can -if we can -- if the order that results from this hearing is the order that interferes the least with the operation of this business and that stigmatizes the least -- to the least extent the operation of this business, then why wouldn't the court do that? THE COURT: Right. CNSL G. BRANDT: And so if the starting place is an order that addresses the partnership and the land issue, which is really where the funding is going to come from to repay the Sanovest loan, there's no amount of money that's going to come in from the resort partnership operation that's going to meaningfully pay down the Sanovest loan. operation is self-sustaining. It may be profitable, but it's not going to pay down the \$63 million or whatever the figure is; right? And so dealing with that principle of impairing the least, interfering the least with the operation of this business --THE COURT: Right. CNSL G. BRANDT: -- we'd be looking at the receiver coming in, if that's what's appointed or whatever the title is, to investigate what should be a sales strategy to enable repayment of the loan. And in order to do that, there's no reason to engage in the resort partnership business. THE COURT: No, but given that the resort partnership is an asset of the partnership, even on a limited-basis receivership order, wouldn't I -why wouldn't I ask the receiver to come back and give me its recommendations, taking a look at all

```
of the assets to appropriately monetize them?
                If the receiver steps in and looks at it and
 3
           said, look, I know you asked me to look at what
           properties can be sold to monetize it to pay
5
           creditors, meet payroll and pay Sanovest, but I
           can tell you that the resort partnership is in
7
           trouble and needs to be managed as well --
8
      CNSL G. BRANDT: And so --
9
      THE COURT:
                 -- by an independent person, why wouldn't
10
           I get that, still look at the matter
11
           wholistically?
12
      CNSL G. BRANDT: So a receiver may well come back and
13
           say, this is a problem, there's some reason to
14
           look at this, but we say the starting place is
15
           to -- and again, we're monetizing assets to
16
           repay --
17
      THE COURT: No, I know that's what you're --
18
      CNSL G. BRANDT: And there's no monetization that is
19
           meaningfully going to come from the resort
20
           partnership.
21
      THE COURT:
                  I know that's your client's position, but
22
           you see, I don't know that, and there's a dispute
23
           between the parties about that.
                                            So even if I
24
           grant a limited receivership order now that
25
           doesn't cover the resort, given that it's an
26
           asset of the partnership, why wouldn't I ask the
27
           receiver for its recommendation concerning all of
           the assets? The receiver will talk to your
28
29
           client, get its input, talk to Mr. Kusumoto and
30
           come back with a recommendation.
31
                And the receiver may say, look, the resort
32
           needs to be sold or there needs to be somebody
33
           step in and run it for effectively. I don't know
34
           that.
35
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Justice, sorry. I know we're
36
           running a bit late.
37
                  That's all right.
      THE COURT:
38
      CNSL K. JACKSON: I might be able to assist on this
39
           point.
40
      THE COURT:
                  All right. Am I missing something?
41
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Not at all, Justice, and in fact, I
42
           may be able to advance that very discussion.
43
      THE COURT: All right.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: We've had this conversation over the
44
45
           break today with our client, and the suggestion
           is, from u\bar{s} now, is if you put the receiver in
46
47
           over the assets, all of the assets, and that
```

includes the business, the resort business, because that's an asset, and the receiver deals with the lands -- now, I don't -- it doesn't sound like there's anything happening with the lands particularly -- we can carve out the management.

And so in other words, you leave EBMD to manage the resort business. Not the resort lands -- I mean, to the extent that they're using them, of course, but not to have to sell the resort, so just to manage the resort business. And then a month later, or whatever the court decides, comes back and says, this is working fine or it's not.

It addresses a couple of concerns: One, the cost, at least for the first month, and maybe longer; it addresses the concern that I suppose Mr. Matthews has that he shouldn't have control of that operation wrested from him.

THE COURT: Right.

CNSL K. JACKSON: At least not without the receiver's recommendation in that regard; and three, this arbitration that seems to be a concerning coming up in ten days, that's the resort's arbitration. There's no stay attached to the resort business. The operation carries on. And so --

THE COURT: But if I do it the other way, even on the limited basis I had been discussing with your friend, if it's broad enough to instruct the receiver to come back with his recommendation about what to do with the resort --

CNSL K. JACKSON: I think you'll have a difficult time incrementally ratcheting up in the sense that you're not appointed over the assets.

THE COURT: I know.

CNSL K. JACKSON: You don't have access to the books and records. I mean, there's no difference. It's not going to change --

THE COURT: Well, I have to provide that appointment.

CNSL K. JACKSON: Exactly, and so --

THE COURT: And that's why I've got to hear from Mr. Roberts tomorrow about what jurisdiction do I have under the BA?

CNSL K. JACKSON: Well, I've seen his order, and I don't know that you do. Not what he's proposing, Justice.

THE COURT: Okay. Because, you know, ultimately if I

```
have these competing allegations and there is a
           concern over stigma and staged approach, and I've
 3
           got allegations that it's your client that's
           causing the financial liquidity issues, of course
 5
           the least harm done with an order the better, but
           at the same time, wouldn't I want -- why wouldn't
7
           I want the report from the receiver on a
8
           wholistic basis on the appropriate things to do
9
           that doesn't tie its hands?
10
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Well, the receiver has to be put in
11
           place over the assets, and then it can come back
12
           about the operations.
13
                  Yeah. Anyway, that's --
      THE COURT:
14
      CNSL K. JACKSON: That makes a lot of sense.
                                                     I agree,
15
           Justice.
16
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Justice, we don't have a major
17
           concern with a reporting -- a reporting mandate.
18
      THE COURT:
                 Yeah, okay. Okay. Anyway, so we'll
19
           adjourn to tomorrow and -- okay, very good.
20
           and Ms. Ohama; right?
21
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Ohama-Darcus.
22
      CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS:
                             Yes.
23
      THE COURT: You're going to get me an order from the
24
           CPC at some point?
25
      CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS:
                             Yes, we haven't been able to
26
           prepare it yet, but we'll get it to you tomorrow.
27
      THE COURT:
                  Tomorrow? Okay, very good.
28
                              Thank you.
      CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS:
29
      THE COURT: Okay, thank you very much, everyone.
30
31
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Thank you, Justice.
32
33
34
35
36
```

101
Reporter certification

THE CLERK: Order in chambers. These chambers are adjourned.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 4:12 PM TO SEPTEMBER 12, 2024)

REPORTER CERTIFICATION

I, Tiffany Vincent, Official Reporter in the Province of British Columbia, Canada, BCSRA No. 576, do hereby certify:

That the proceedings were transcribed by me from audio provided of recorded proceedings, and the same is a true and correct and complete transcript of said proceedings to the best of my skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name on this day, the 25th of September, 2024.

Tiffany Vincent Authorized Reporter

\$	115 [1] - 81:46 118 [2] - 16:30, 16:32	2015 [1] - 76:7 2016 [7] - 41:44,	29:34, 42:5, 42:10, 55:10, 64:8, 64:11,	6
\$100,000 [2] - 70:46,	119 [1] - 82:17	42:13, 42:42, 43:37,	73:43, 91:45, 92:2,	6 [7] - 26:32, 26:37,
78:8	11:16 [1] - 27:9	43:46, 67:23, 89:47	92:19	42:1, 42:9, 42:10,
\$11 [1] - 65:4	11:39 [1] - 27:10	2017 [5] - 41:5, 44:6,	3,000 [3] - 8:21, 36:21,	69:34, 69:37
\$13,500 [5] - 15:21,	12 [4] - 47:3, 73:24,	44:18, 44:24, 45:10	36:23	6.05 [1] - 73:18
17:36, 19:21, 24:43,	73:28, 101:5	2019 [3] - 26:31, 82:6,	3.05 [1] - 73:17	60 [1] - 5:27
25:5	12(a [2] - 36:46, 37:8	89:1 2021 _[27] - 25:36,	30 [5] - 24:9, 34:34, 34:44, 35:29, 41:5	61 [2] - 58:38, 69:42
\$14 [2] - 51:10, 68:42 \$140,000 [1] - 66:3	12.8 [1] - 64:40 120 [2] - 82:29, 83:25	25:40, 26:10, 41:15,	30(a) [1] - 35:32	62 [1] - 58:42 65 [1] - 60:13
\$15,000 [2] - 70:4,	120 [2] - 02:29, 03:23 122 [2] - 19:26, 19:46	41:45, 42:21, 45:11,	304 [1] - 60:38	66 [1] - 61:23
70:14	124 [1] - 83:22	46:35, 46:36, 46:42,	30th [1] - 26:31	67 [1] - 61:29
\$165,000 [1] - 71:38	125 [3] - 37:46, 84:42,	48:18, 48:21, 56:20,	31 [2] - 38:2, 81:18	68 [3] - 20:32, 20:34,
\$200 [1] - 7:40	84:45	57:43, 58:9, 58:41,	32 [1] - 38:23	62:2
\$280,000 [1] - 18:35	128 [1] - 86:44	59:25, 59:33, 60:13,	33 [1] - 39:46	
\$30 [1] - 73:41	129 [1] - 87:16	61:30, 62:23, 63:46,	36 [1] - 40:30	7
\$300 [1] - 15:4	12:34 [1] - 50:30	65:20, 65:24, 70:1, 70:18, 76:33	37 [1] - 18:30	7 00.40 05.07
\$332 [1] - 17:31	13 [1] - 91:25	2022 [11] - 29:40,	38 [3] - 18:20, 18:38,	7 [4] - 30:19, 35:37, 35:40, 36:46
\$360,000 [2] - 81:39, 87:41	133 [1] - 88:7	62:13, 62:19, 62:24,	41:33 39 [1] - 57:22	7.2 [1] - 73:17
\$7:41 \$38[1] - 26:40	135 [1] - 88:5 13th [1] - 26:10	62:27, 64:3, 65:2,	3:01 [1] - 75:12	70 [2] - 26:28, 62:22
\$40 [1] - 24:9	13th [1] - 26.10 14 [8] - 8:16, 35:25,	66:18, 66:20, 66:40,	3:20 [1] - 75:13	700,000 [1] - 66:6
\$46 [1] - 64:29	35:35, 35:41, 41:17,	66:45	3rd [4] - 46:37, 47:6,	71 [1] - 63:27
\$60 [1] - 22:35	45:46, 48:24, 73:42	2023 [7] - 61:13,	48:20, 49:15	72 [2] - 17:28, 63:43
\$62 [1] - 25:15	144 [2] - 89:39, 89:41	63:47, 67:8, 69:20,		73 [2] - 17:38, 89:30
\$63 [1] - 97:32	145 [1] - 37:46	70:16, 72:24, 76:1	4	74 [2] - 92:7, 92:14
\$65 [2] - 73:37, 74:18	15,000 [1] - 76:20	2024 [10] - 1:1, 18:42, 26:31, 66:6, 73:12,	A : 05.7 07.47	75 [4] - 37:32, 37:46,
\$70 [1] - 58:14	15,750 [2] - 69:23,	73:34, 74:3, 81:44,	4 _[7] - 25:7, 27:47, 45:46, 54:46, 63:21,	64:4, 92:44
\$700,000 [2] - 41:25,	76:13	101:5, 101:21	93:21, 93:23	76 [4] - 25:29, 93:15, 93:17, 93:18
66:10 \$71 [1] - 25:28	150 [1] - 37:43	2024bminfo@	43 [1] - 76:4	76.5 [1] - 37:30
\$85 [1] - 73:16	15th [4] - 26:31, 41:44, 42:11, 42:12	protonemail.com [1]	44 [2] - 42:41, 71:30	77 [1] - 64:27
\$850,000 [1] - 73:25	16 [1] - 58:47	- 93:8	45 [1] - 71:30	775 [1] - 36:26
, ,	17 [4] - 60:31, 60:36,	2025 [1] - 25:28	4:12 [1] - 101:4	78 [1] - 65:11
•	61:1, 73:13	2026 [2] - 21:15, 25:29 22 [2] - 40:42, 91:45	_	79 [1] - 65:20
104 0440	17th [3] - 48:21, 49:16,	22 [2] - 40.42, 91.45 22nd [2] - 18:14, 74:34	5	7th [1] - 58:45
'21 [1] - 64:42	58:44	23rd [1] - 83:45	5 [5] - 14:12, 27:38,	•
'22 [2] - 64:42, 65:6 '27 [1] - 25:30	18 [4] - 37:29, 65:28,	24 [1] - 62:33	38:8, 63:21, 66:43	8
21 [1] - 25.50	88:25, 91:28 18th [1] - 66:40	24-month [1] - 73:37	50 [5] - 22:35, 67:33,	8 [8] - 25:26, 35:41,
1	19 [1] - 61:47	244 [1] - 3:45	67:34, 67:40, 67:41	41:24, 42:23, 44:14,
'	19th [2] - 48:17, 72:32	24th [1] - 52:40	53 [3] - 55:11, 74:42	65:29, 88:24, 91:46
1 [19] - 14:25, 17:7,	1st [7] - 41:45, 49:12,	25 [3] - 76:38, 88:30,	54 [1] - 74:42	8,000 [1] - 36:23
20:15, 20:37, 28:42,	55:13, 66:6, 81:23,	88:33	540 [1] - 36:36	80 [2] - 37:43, 69:8
35:35, 36:13, 42:21,	81:31, 81:44	25th [1] - 101:20	55 [1] - 48:23	81 [2] - 69:17, 75:45
45:32, 47:3, 56:29, 69:31, 69:35, 69:37,		26 [2] - 59:25, 59:33 26th [2] - 18:42, 66:45	576 [1] - 101:11 58 [2] - 57:28, 59:19	82 [1] - 70:30
72:21, 73:14, 73:20,	2	27 [3] - 80:40, 88:36,	59 [2] - 58:3, 59:20	83 [1] - 25:30 85 [2] - 24:34, 72:18
73:26, 81:7	2 [10] - 1:8, 20:34,	88:39	599 [14] - 15:22, 22:23,	8th [1] - 40:32
1,400 [1] - 36:19	21:40, 22:26, 34:35,	274 [1] - 48:27	22:25, 25:17, 25:33,	
1.6 [2] - 26:35, 79:42	50:23, 80:8, 81:8,	274/75 [1] - 48:45	28:27, 30:16, 31:41,	9
10 [5] - 22:45, 40:47,	89:29, 91:47	275 [2] - 48:42, 48:43	34:13, 40:2, 40:20,	
45:16, 66:3, 75:22	20 [2] - 24:9, 46:19	28 [3] - 80:10, 80:15,	61:40, 68:6, 88:6	9 [2] - 44:7, 63:21
102 [2] - 76:39, 76:40	2009 [1] - 39:33	88:46 29 [1] - 43:3	599's [3] - 26:4, 26:8, 26:16	9.5 [1] - 73:19 90 [1] - 52:37
10:17 [1] - 1:4 10th [1] - 52:36	2011 [1] - 38:23	2:02 [1] - 45.3	599315 [1] - 67:31	90 [1] - 52.37 93 [1] - 63:9
11 [4] - 1:1, 41:12,	2013 [13] - 34:38, 35:23, 39:46, 40:32,		5th [1] - 74:3	94 [1] - 62:35
46:3, 46:5	42:42, 57:43, 62:15,	3		
112 [1] - 81:34	70:13, 76:47, 77:46,			
113 [1] - 81:34	78:15, 82:1, 94:28	3 [13] - 16:17, 16:20,		

Α

A&M [7] - 10:3, 10:4, 10:11, 10:35, 10:43, 10:47, 11:9 **A&M's** [1] - 10:24 ability [10] - 62:5, 66:28, 66:38, 72:3, 72:29, 78:47, 95:3, 96:34, 97:12, 101:17 able [11] - 15:41, 15:42, 47:33, 54:34, 65:3, 72:8, 75:15, 75:21, 98:38, 98:42, 100:25 above-noted [1] -19:11 absence [1] - 94:29 absolutely [4] - 6:24, 10:46, 11:12, 14:38 absorption [2] -55:31, 55:32 accept [6] - 18:21, 32:36, 32:38, 33:11, 61:3, 68:13 acceptable [1] - 61:10 accepting [1] - 45:6 access [5] - 3:5, 24:23, 72:43, 78:5, 99:36 accommodation [3] -53:8, 53:18, 54:5 accomplish [1] -22:15 accomplished [1] -42:43 accord [1] - 1:20 accordingly [1] - 73:2 account [2] - 70:31, 78:32 accountant [1] - 26:11 accounting [3] -84:27, 84:47, 85:2 accounts [15] - 2:23, 66:25, 66:32, 70:32, 71:11, 71:13, 78:18, 78:28, 78:42, 79:16, 81:2, 81:21, 81:25, 81:37 accrual [1] - 81:24 accrue [4] - 5:44, 42:7, 42:22, 42:30 accrued [2] - 64:39, 65:5 accruing [4] - 7:24, 25:16, 42:15, 81:21 accurate [1] - 61:39 achieve [4] - 3:9, 8:41, 8:42, 9:14 achieved [2] - 43:4,

43:31 achieving [2] - 43:5, 43:15 acquire [2] - 15:29, 40:3 acquired [1] - 40:18 acquisition [3] - 40:9, 40:30, 59:44 acres [2] - 36:26, 36:36 Act [4] - 3:21, 33:6, 33:11, 57:23 act [2] - 1:29, 66:23 acted [1] - 88:37 acting [6] - 7:4, 56:21, 56:22, 71:36, 88:43, action [9] - 29:31, 29:34, 29:36, 29:38, 29:40, 30:16, 31:12, 32:31, 86:11 actions [4] - 28:44, 28:47, 29:1, 29:27 actively [1] - 64:20 activities [1] - 41:31 Activity [2] - 67:4, 87:36 activity [2] - 20:5, 77:16 acts [1] - 93:47 actual [1] - 5:16 acute [1] - 6:26 added [2] - 66:14, 66:15 addition [3] - 36:34, 90:16, 90:31 additional [4] - 36:23, 76:2, 76:30, 78:24 address [11] - 11:26, 23:34, 28:4, 28:36, 31:34, 31:43, 32:9, 33:35, 46:12, 93:9, 93:24 addressed [2] - 5:29, 9:21 addresses [3] - 97:24, 99:15, 99:17 adjourn [1] - 100:19 adjourned [4] - 27:7, 50:28, 75:10, 101:2 ADJOURNED[1] -101:4 adjustments [1] -58:34 administer [1] - 66:25 administration [1] -77:35 admissions [1] -

64:18

admitted [2] - 27:20,

63:23 advance [11] - 15:5, 24:3, 41:26, 41:27, 42:24, 58:23, 65:13, 65:32, 65:33, 73:46, 98:42 advanced [6] - 26:32, 26:36, 41:38, 64:21, 64:33, 84:39 advances [5] - 41:29, 41:39, 64:37, 72:17, 81.29 advancing [3] - 27:44, 58:25, 72:36 advice [1] - 44:35 advise [1] - 61:6 advised [2] - 37:24, 60:18 advises [1] - 70:23 advocate [1] - 44:44 advocating [1] - 32:41 aerial [1] - 38:2 affairs [2] - 34:8, 76:37 affect [4] - 21:21, 83:47, 84:17, 85:13 affidavit [38] - 35:38, 35:47, 36:13, 36:43, 36:44, 38:44, 38:47, 39:6, 39:7, 39:13, 40:41, 43:1, 43:2, 44:46, 56:29, 58:12, 59:19, 63:21, 64:8, 64:11, 64:14, 64:19, 69:31, 70:21, 72:21, 76:31, 79:18, 80:8, 81:7, 81:8, 87:29, 88:8, 88:24, 88:27, 91:36, 91:45, 91:47, 92:2 affidavits [11] - 13:38, 25:44. 34:28. 35:25. 41:18, 54:27, 60:34, 78:2, 80:9, 80:10, 87:7 afternoon [4] - 11:46, 54:13, 75:10, 75:38 afterwards [1] - 49:11 aged [3] - 71:11, 78:28, 79:30 agent [3] - 1:30, 28:20, 28:24 aggregate [3] - 17:30, 63:44, 64:44 aging [1] - 78:29 ago [2] - 17:35, 64:29 agree [12] - 6:11, 6:25, 10:37, 23:8, 46:45, 49:32, 52:8, 53:8, 62:15, 63:40, 74:8,

100:14 agreeable [1] - 63:3 agreed [8] - 2:14, 2:17, 40:3, 41:4, 53:7, 53:45, 61:28, 66:5 agreeing [2] - 10:41, 23:1 agreement [18] -40:34, 41:43, 42:14, 42:40, 58:22, 60:17, 62:15, 63:30, 63:34, 63:35, 65:14, 65:30, 66:2, 66:5, 70:6, 70:24, 70:27, 81:30 agreements [4] -63:42, 77:6, 82:7, 91:20 agrees [3] - 52:4, 68:35, 78:40 ahead [5] - 1:35, 39:10, 57:3, 86:26, 86:27 alignment [1] - 94:32 allegation [1] - 55:46 allegations [7] - 16:3, 65:36, 96:36, 96:38, 96:47, 100:1, 100:3 alleges [2] - 55:43, 67:14 allegiances [1] - 94:4 alleging [2] - 69:12, 83:13 allotted [1] - 75:41 allow [9] - 6:11, 21:44, 25:24, 59:47, 65:25, 65:26, 68:37, 68:39, 86:16 allowed [4] - 22:13, 59:3, 83:5, 94:24 allows [2] - 9:8, 9:41 almost [2] - 52:38, 84:24 alone [2] - 85:8, 96:8 alter [2] - 21:4, 21:7 alternative [2] - 19:12, 19:23 Alternatives [1] -18:40 alters [1] - 15:32 **AM** [3] - 1:4, 27:9, 27:10 amend [1] - 62:15 amended [2] - 8:29, 9:34 amenities [8] - 35:9, 35:16, 36:15, 42:47, 69:3, 77:18, 77:29, 77:31 amenity [1] - 69:5

amount [15] - 25:14, 25:21, 36:32, 37:21, 37:34, 55:31, 58:12, 62:45, 64:38, 64:46, 67:28, 68:42, 85:7, 91:43, 97:27 amounts [5] - 6:19, 29:16, 64:31, 66:1, 78:30 ample [1] - 39:20 announced [1] - 44:5 annual [1] - 37:22 annually [1] - 41:24 annum [1] - 42:23 anonymous [3] - 93:7, 93:9, 93:23 answer [11] - 6:26, 6:28, 8:4, 32:45, 33:1, 33:28, 79:36, 80:3, 84:33, 85:32 anticipate [1] - 9:27 anticipated [1] - 40:47 anyway [3] - 92:39, 100:13, 100:18 apart [4] - 76:43, 79:24, 94:7, 96:32 apologies [4] - 20:19, 31:29, 45:44, 46:7 apologize [3] - 31:17, 69:40, 82:33 appeal 191 - 20:25. 54:33, 82:20, 82:25, 82:26. 82:33. 82:38. 83:4, 83:35 appetite [1] - 49:28 application [37] -1:32, 3:16, 6:44, 7:27, 11:31, 12:25, 12:30, 14:32, 17:18, 22:29, 23:23, 27:3, 27:43, 28:3, 28:17, 28:19, 30:7, 31:26, 31:34, 31:42, 32:32, 32:34, 32:39, 32:43, 33:4, 33:5, 33:20, 37:2, 37:31, 38:7, 45:47, 52:9, 74:22, 74:29, 79:15, 82:24, 92:25 applications [3] -29:14, 30:24, 94:45 applied [1] - 37:16 applies [1] - 52:11 apply [3] - 2:13, 30:23, 34:18 applying [1] - 57:37 appoint [3] - 6:45, 28:34, 66:29 appointed [18] - 10:9, 10:12, 23:34, 24:14,

24:36, 30:39, 40:26, 40:27, 44:29, 44:31, 49:3, 56:28, 59:13, 68:8, 88:17, 96:7, 97:38, 99:34 appointee's [1] -20:42 appointment [8] -2:47, 14:16, 21:42, 28:19, 33:27, 39:28, 77:22, 99:39 appraised [3] - 22:36, 36:30, 59:8 appreciate [2] - 10:40, 54:22 approach [17] - 2:9, 3:39, 7:30, 8:29, 9:34, 9:44, 24:22, 31:36, 45:11, 48:6, 49:18, 49:22, 49:29, 49:38, 55:16, 60:4, Approaches [2] -16:29, 16:33 approaches [2] -16:37, 16:46 appropriate [13] -10:38, 21:41, 23:10, 24:12, 34:43, 63:1, 71:7, 94:38, 95:41, 96:10, 97:6, 97:11, 100:8 appropriately [1] -98:1 approval [1] - 32:18 approve [3] - 29:10, 29:11, 65:15 approved [3] - 30:29, 32:5, 41:37 April [6] - 18:14, 19:20, 46:35, 46:36, 74:3, 74:34 arbitration [31] - 4:21, 4:40. 19:27. 19:29. 19:34, 19:36, 19:45, 20:11, 82:11, 82:31, 82:34, 82:36, 83:7, 83:22, 83:33, 83:41, 84:1, 84:3, 84:8, 84:20, 85:21, 85:35, 85:46, 86:46, 87:18, 87:20, 89:33, 89:36, 94:39, 99:23, 99:24 arbitrator [2] - 83:3, 83.5 arbitrator's [4] -19:47, 20:20, 20:24, 20:31 area [4] - 37:28, 37:33, 43:30, 43:33

argument [22] - 12:41, 12:42, 12:46, 13:22, 13:43, 13:46, 17:26, 19:26, 20:17, 21:38, 34:34, 48:23, 55:11, 57:29, 62:21, 64:4, 75:45, 76:40, 82:29, 86:44. 87:14. 88:7 arise [2] - 6:26, 84:15 arisen [1] - 81:31 arising [3] - 51:35, 56:41, 62:5 arose [2] - 38:41, 68:21 arrangements [2] -82:6, 87:2 artful [1] - 32:35 article [3] - 38:39, 39:41, 44:15 aside [3] - 13:14, 15:47, 83:39 aspect [6] - 65:8, 65:10, 65:37, 67:47, 69:18, 79:14 aspects [4] - 23:33, 43:7, 43:22, 77:45 assembling [1] - 8:11 asserted [1] - 69:24 assertion [2] - 36:47, 64:19 asserts [2] - 25:13, 88:31 assess [1] - 2:22 $\pmb{\text{assessing}}\, [2] - 7{:}21,$ 52:20 assessment [1] -83:41 asset [10] - 38:29, 41:3, 67:11, 68:34, 68:36, 73:7, 96:13, 97:44, 98:26, 99:2 assets [46] - 7:15, 7:28, 7:31, 18:44, 19:9, 20:43, 22:37, 22:39, 22:40, 23:39, 23:44, 24:4, 24:13, 24:15, 24:17, 24:27, 28:33, 36:25, 38:4, 38:29, 39:15, 39:20, 39:29, 40:3, 40:5, 40:9, 40:31, 43:24, 43:40, 44:2, 44:5, 49:26, 65:42, 76:46, 77:40, 82:2, 88:39, 90:6, 96:19, 98:1, 98:15, 98:28, 98:47, 99:34, 100:11 assigned [1] - 68:17 assist [3] - 73:32, 90:7, 98:38

assistance [2] - 44:34, 44:35 assisted [1] - 64:22 associate [3] - 89:13, associated [7] - 40:4, 62:9, 67:37, 67:42, 67:44, 77:18, 90:24 assume [3] - 45:14, 75:33, 79:4 assuming [1] - 45:13 assurance [4] - 73:5, 73:47, 74:26, 90:12 AT [8] - 1:4, 27:9, 27:10, 50:30, 50:31, 75:12, 75:13, 101:4 attached [3] - 28:39, 63:33, 99:25 attaches [1] - 26:30 attachment [1] - 93:7 attempt [6] - 8:41, 8:45, 9:14, 22:24, 23:29, 63:28 attempted [1] - 74:6 attempts [2] - 15:17, 72:19 attend [1] - 29:9 attention [2] - 27:13, 76:3 attitude [2] - 45:11, 56:2 attracting [1] - 44:26 attributable [1] -64:32 audio [1] - 101:14 August [6] - 26:10, 60:13, 62:27, 66:40, 66:45, 79:31 authorities [1] - 12:44 authority [2] - 66:22, 66:29 authorization [2] -69:26, 71:37 authorize [2] - 62:8, 69:28 Authorized [1] -101:27 authorized [2] - 61:42, 70:28 authorizing [1] - 71:16 available [6] - 7:17, 7:25, 32:9, 39:21, 46:30, 58:21 avoid [6] - 6:20, 8:45, 9:8, 20:11, 21:10, 21:29 avoided [1] - 39:40

В BA [1] - 99:43 background [4] -34:42, 46:38, 67:21, 68.44 backing [1] - 5:6 backs [1] - 17:39 balance [3] - 26:26, 40:19, 42:22 balanced [1] - 45:20 ball [1] - 8:7 bank [1] - 66:25 banking [2] - 63:29, 63:34 bare [2] - 32:20, 37:37 **base** [1] - 37:20 based [4] - 37:27, 64:41, 70:8, 73:28 bases [1] - 74:23 basic [3] - 15:39, 22:41, 78:8 basis [19] - 26:5, 32:37, 37:22, 37:30, 39:15, 53:13, 56:34, 65:4, 70:40, 70:42, 71:13, 74:23, 81:10, 95:10, 95:15, 95:38, 97:45, 99:28, 100:8 Basran [1] - 52:39 batting [1] - 14:22 BC [2] - 1:2, 83:32 BCSRA[1] - 101:10 BDO [5] - 1:29, 10:2, 10:7, 10:17, 10:34 BDO's [1] - 10:25 bear [2] - 13:19, 68:27 Bear [47] - 9:11, 26:4, 34:45, 36:18, 36:22, 36:25, 37:38, 38:3, 38:24, 38:26, 39:32, 39:36, 40:4, 40:5, 40:29, 40:46, 43:6, 43:24, 43:31, 43:40, 44:2, 44:4, 44:9, 44:16, 44:20, 44:23, 45:25, 45:29, 46:27, 48:7, 60:43, 61:15, 62:9, 65:41, 67:4, 68:47, 69:6, 72:37, 77:9, 77:12, 77:44, 80:24, 82:3, 87:36, 89:14, 90:11, 93:27 bears [4] - 87:18, 87:19, 94:37 became [5] - 38:24, 61:20, 69:47, 70:18, become [2] - 53:18,

82:19

becomes [2] - 43:26, 44:17 beg [1] - 31:35 began [1] - 97:15 begin [5] - 34:25, 40:35, 75:32, 83:44, 83:45 beginning [7] - 34:34, 34:37, 34:44, 55:10, 63:46, 76:39, 88:30 begins [1] - 49:38 behalf [4] - 30:17, 66:23, 68:10, 85:22 behind [2] - 44:14, 68:4 believes [2] - 37:26, 39:39 belonging [1] - 76:46 below [4] - 26:27, 29:3, 45:28, 58:13 below-market [1] -45:28 benefit [5] - 23:40, 25:20, 25:34, 26:6, 31:40 best [14] - 17:9, 17:19, 23:42, 23:43, 24:15, 46:24, 46:29, 47:19, 66:30, 67:26, 88:14, 94:5, 101:16 better [7] - 43:42, 46:16, 48:9, 78:35, 92:41. 93:3. 100:5 between [24] - 6:45, 8:28, 9:28, 14:45, 15:33, 20:47, 21:7, 21:36, 22:35, 24:39, 37:46, 40:20, 42:41, 48:20, 49:15, 57:43, 62:12, 71:31, 82:12, 90:18, 90:38, 94:11, 98:23 beyond [4] - 52:26, 53:41, 55:35, 91:32 **BIA** [5] - 2:3, 3:21, 3:34, 3:44, 33:27 bidders [1] - 45:4 big [2] - 7:37, 53:15 **bills** [6] - 14:43, 15:39, 15:41, 23:15, 25:37, 70:43 binder [7] - 34:30, 35:24, 35:38, 36:43, 38:45, 40:41, 59:19 binding [1] - 3:26 bit [14] - 1:15, 12:38, 14:27, 21:18, 33:36, 34:22, 35:3, 49:47, 51:27, 52:27, 67:20, 68:29, 68:30, 98:36

77:4

cart [4] - 87:38, 92:20,

Carts [2] - 93:9, 93:32

93:10, 93:26

carts [1] - 92:42

blamed [1] - 90:41 blanket [2] - 6:36, 9:10 blessed [1] - 46:24 **bloc** [12] - 7:36, 7:37, 16:41, 17:20, 18:22, 19:3, 24:5, 25:30, 26:21, 43:39, 48:13, 48:14 block [1] - 58:19 blockage [1] - 21:43 blocked [3] - 64:8, 64:27, 73:4 blocking [3] - 26:25, 56:44, 57:37 blown [3] - 6:27, 8:44, 9:7 blunt [2] - 8:44, 22:17 **blur** [1] - 9:14 **blurs** [1] - 6:44 BM [4] - 46:25, 59:39, 59:41, 64:13 **BM/finding** [1] - 63:13 BMA [16] - 9:12, 66:47, 67:5, 67:7, 67:18, 67:19, 67:21, 67:22, 67:33, 67:34, 68:15, 68:18, 68:21, 69:13 BMAC [11] - 67:9, 67:10. 67:15. 67:18. 68:16. 68:40. 68:43. 69:10, 69:15, 77:22, 77:23 board [5] - 32:17, 32:19, 48:32, 48:40, 56:28 **BoD** [1] - 59:45 bodies [1] - 34:28 **bolus** [1] - 19:17 book [54] - 12:43, 13:10, 13:11, 13:13, 13:22, 13:24, 13:30, 13:33, 16:12, 16:13, 16:15, 16:16, 16:18, 16:19, 16:20, 18:12, 18:13, 20:34, 34:27, 36:12, 39:45, 42:2, 42:3, 44:7, 45:16, 46:2, 47:4, 48:24, 48:25, 48:26, 51:6, 51:30, 59:1, 60:31, 60:32, 60:34, 60:35, 60:36, 61:47, 62:34, 71:31, 73:14, 74:43, 76:5, 80:9, 80:10, 89:25, 89:30, 92:1, 92:4, 92:6, 92:45 books [2] - 13:17, 99:36

borrow [4] - 4:19, 4:44, 4:46, 6:18 borrowing [4] - 5:10, 58:21, 66:1 bottom [3] - 27:37, 51:36, 79:26 bounced [1] - 71:22 bound [1] - 33:11 brand [2] - 45:24, 45:30 Brandt [10] - 4:7, 14:12, 15:25, 17:43, 27:42, 34:21, 34:23, 50:11, 55:7, 86:38 BRANDT [201] - 34:24, 34:33, 35:5, 35:29, 35:32, 35:34, 35:37, 35:40, 36:10, 39:7, 39:9, 39:11, 39:45, 41:24, 42:3, 42:5, 42:10, 42:12, 42:16, 42:19, 45:39, 45:42, 45:46, 46:2, 46:6, 46:9, 46:14, 46:36, 47:25, 47:31, 47:36, 47:41, 47:44, 47:46, 48:1. 48:3. 48:29. 48:43, 48:45, 48:47, 49:2, 49:24, 55:8, 55:19, 55:25, 55:30, 56:5, 56:8, 56:10, 56:12, 56:15, 56:18, 56:27, 56:40, 56:42, 57:1, 57:5, 57:7, 57:15, 57:20, 57:25, 57:28, 57:31, 58:18, 59:22, 60:35, 60:38, 61:23, 63:27, 66:12, 66:15, 66:18, 67:37, 67:42, 68:28, 68:30, 68:33, 69:34, 69:37, 69:40, 69:42, 69:44, 70:22, 70:26, 71:44, 71:46, 74:38, 75:6, 75:43, 76:39, 76:42, 78:22, 78:24, 78:27, 78:37, 79:2, 79:6, 79:17, 80:7, 80:15, 80:17, 80:37, 80:40, 80:43, 81:6, 81:20, 81:34, 82:24, 82:28, 82:33, 82:38, 82:42, 82:44, 82:46, 83:5, 83:10, 83:13, 83:17, 83:19, 83:21, 83:31, 83:35, 83:37, 83:39, 83:42, 83:44, 84:2, 84:11, 85:3, 85:16, 85:19, 86:39, 86:42, 86:46, 87:4, 87:11,

89:16, 89:18, 89:22, 89:24, 89:27, 89:29, 89:32, 89:38, 89:40, 89:42, 90:23, 90:26, 90:30, 91:39, 92:1, 92:7, 92:11, 92:22, 92:29, 92:31, 92:35, 92:37, 92:40, 92:44, 92:47, 93:3, 93:5, 93:16, 93:18, 93:21, 93:23, 93:41, 94:13, 94:36, 95:6, 95:10, 95:17, 95:21, 95:23, 95:31, 95:39, 95:45, 96:1, 96:6, 96:12, 96:15. 96:25. 96:36. 96:39. 96:42. 96:46. 97:14. 97:23. 97:37. 98:8. 98:12. 98:18. 100:16, 100:30 Brandt's [1] - 79:35 breaches [1] - 83:14 break [12] - 11:47, 12:33, 25:10, 27:4, 50:28, 53:44, 54:13, 55:9, 55:15, 75:24, 75:38, 98:45 breakdown [1] - 71:25 breaking [1] - 60:23 briefly [1] - 78:27 bring [3] - 3:46, 4:1, 62:29 bringing [1] - 43:17 brings [1] - 32:26 British [1] - 101:10 broad [6] - 12:10, 26:19, 33:43, 83:47, 86:2, 99:29 **broad-form** [1] - 86:2 broader [1] - 2:29 **broker** [1] - 43:45 brought [11] - 3:43, 26:47, 27:13, 30:16, 32:44, 33:5, 33:10, 43:47, 74:20, 77:46, 92:25 **budgets** [1] - 90:45 build [2] - 6:42, 77:28 builders [2] - 35:15, 43:37 building [2] - 20:13, 43:14 builds [1] - 22:26 built [2] - 8:22, 35:18 bulk [4] - 43:39, 44:3, 44:21, 53:15

bundling [1] - 38:13

business [47] - 2:24,

87:17, 87:19, 87:24,

88:4, 88:27, 88:30,

2:26, 8:11, 8:13, 8:18, 14:39, 14:47, 15:37, 21:44, 22:13, 24:13, 38:25, 41:30, 41:39, 43:7, 43:23, 49:36, 49:41, 55:44, 55:45, 56:46, 58:1, 73:7, 77:3, 77:5, 77:7, 78:3, 89:13, 89:21, 93:12, 95:4, 95:29, 95:34, 95:42, 96:8, 96:24, 96:35, 97:13, 97:18, 97:20, 97:35, 97:42, 99:1, 99:8, 99:11, 99:25 businesses [2] -96:26, 97:7 businessowners [1] -35:15 busy [1] - 5:45 buy [4] - 7:40, 7:44, 24:10, 65:43 buy/sell [2] - 19:8, 19:13 buyer [1] - 90:5 Byma[1] - 21:19

C

C(b) [1] - 18:24 c) [1] - 18:38 calculated [1] - 42:24 caliber [1] - 36:17 can-covered [1] -93:30 Canada [2] - 46:30, 101:10 Canada's [1] - 77:13 cancelled [1] - 69:29 candidate [1] - 60:26 candidates [2] -60:14, 60:16 cannot [1] - 61:3 cap [2] - 26:27, 73:16 CapEx [1] - 79:24 capital [3] - 2:46, 3:35, 39:23 Capital [1] - 73:35 capital-I [2] - 2:46, 3:35 card [1] - 66:25 care [1] - 29:24 careful [4] - 17:5, 21:37, 86:47, 94:14 carefully [1] - 72:3 carried [1] - 40:9 carries [1] - 99:26 carry [4] - 13:32, 27:12, 67:13, 72:29 carrying [2] - 77:2,

carve [4] - 33:14, 33:15, 85:34, 99:5 carved [2] - 6:38, 86:7 case [11] - 7:29, 21:18, 33:23, 34:16, 38:34, 51:19, 52:13, 54:15, 54:17, 80:5, 85:19 cases [2] - 30:28, 32:24 cash [13] - 22:2, 59:41, 65:29, 65:33, 72:4, 72:44, 73:42, 78:34, 81:10, 81:11, 81:14, 81:35 categories [1] - 6:2 caused [2] - 15:11, 87:26 causing [2] - 51:46, 100:4 caution [1] - 64:24 cautious [3] - 20:23, 21:37, 82:46 cautiously [1] - 88:13 cease [1] - 89:44 central [1] - 52:24 centrally [1] - 69:5 centre [5] - 6:6, 17:14, 68:46, 77:16, 77:19 Centre [4] - 67:4, 68:45, 77:12, 87:36 centred [1] - 35:8 CEO [10] - 18:4, 19:40, 35:20, 35:43, 36:6, 40:28, 44:10, 58:24, 94:27, 95:41 certain [9] - 62:16, 62:17, 62:45, 63:40, 67:26, 67:28, 68:1, 74:2, 96:40 certainly [5] - 10:13, 41:14, 55:22, 57:11, 79.9 certificate [1] - 5:7 CERTIFICATION[1] -101:7 certify [1] - 101:11 cetera [4] - 3:13, 35:10, 37:41, 69:1 CFO [5] - 19:42, 19:43, 89:4, 93:47, 94:33 challenge [2] - 82:21, 89:35 challenged [1] - 83:33 chambers [8] - 27:6,

E0:07 7E:0 404:4
50:27, 75:9, 101:1
change [22] - 2:36,
11:37, 12:4, 14:36,
15:8, 48:19, 48:46,
48:47, 49:1, 49:6,
49:14, 49:15, 49:37,
55:13, 55:15, 55:16,
56:1, 56:19, 56:35,
56:39, 66:39, 99:38
changed [4] - 13:9,
47:24, 47:25, 48:1
changes [3] - 32:42,
45:12, 51:40
chaos [1] - 71:23
character [1] - 23:28
charge [5] - 30:22,
31:19, 31:20, 42:32,
49:17
chargers [1] - 93:30
charging [4] - 87:39,
92:20, 92:38, 92:40
cheap [1] - 15:30
check [3] - 29:19,
75:3, 87:37
check-in [1] - 87:37
cheques [4] - 69:25,
71:21, 71:47, 76:8
chief [4] - 76:6, 90:16,
90:31, 90:35
choose [1] - 4:47
chose [1] - 86:11
chosen [1] - 24:37
circular [1] - 44:25
circulate [1] - 50:45
circulated [1] - 50:39
circulation [1] - 44:25
circumstance [2] -
14:38, 65:47
circumstances [4] -
14:34, 22:19, 56:46,
82:18
circumvent [1] - 24:38
cite [3] - 26:29, 38:38,
44:45
cited [2] - 24:34, 38:39
cites [2] - 58:42, 91:7
city [2] - 11:11, 34:47
City [2] - 30:23, 68:47
claim [9] - 31:10, 83:3,
84:9, 84:29, 84:34,
85:1, 85:3, 85:5,
86:30
claimant [1] - 84:7
claimants [2] - 83:10,
83:13
claimed [1] - 84:27
claims [12] - 8:43,
23:37, 83:30, 84:26,
85:1, 85:2, 85:4,
85:6, 85:13, 85:14,

85:28, 85:30 clarify [1] - 86:32 **CLARKE** [1] - 63:25 Clarke [33] - 18:4, 18:8, 19:24, 19:40, 20:7, 20:8, 20:10, 27:28, 63:25, 76:5, 76:7, 76:16, 82:23, 87:28, 87:44, 88:12, 88:20, 88:22, 88:24, 88:28, 88:31, 89:11, 89:32, 89:43, 90:34, 91:11, 91:41, 92:26, 92:47, 93:38, 94:12, 94:32 Clarke's [4] - 94:9, 94:41, 96:29, 96:33 clear [9] - 10:42, 11:7, 30:42, 30:45, 33:31, 37:36, 70:9, 91:2, 94:3 cleared [1] - 27:20 Clerk [4] - 13:6, 27:12, 27:27, 50:22 CLERK [5] - 1:10, 27:6, 50:27, 75:9, 101:1 client [7] - 2:19, 4:37, 54:39, 97:10, 98:29, 98:45, 100:3 client's [7] - 1:47, 9:34, 32:32, 32:39, 33:19, 84:4, 98:21 **clients** [1] - 50:3 close [3] - 22:43, 38:22, 66:24 closed [2] - 60:10, 73:23 closely [1] - 93:42 closer [1] - 78:29 closing [5] - 64:47, 65:1, 66:9, 73:20, 73:40 closings [1] - 58:27 CNSL [465] - 1:13, 1:15, 1:17, 1:24, 1:27, 1:34, 1:38, 1:43, 2:6, 2:10, 2:14, 2:17, 2:30, 2:32, 2:35, 2:38, 3:30, 3:45, 4:1, 4:3, 4:24, 4:26, 4:39, 4:43, 4:46, 5:2, 5:9, 5:15, 5:18, 5:20, 5:24, 5:39, 5:42, 5:47, 6:14, 6:17, 6:33, 7:33, 7:35, 8:2, 8:31, 8:33, 8:35, 8:41, 9:27, 9:31, 9:36,

9:38, 9:40, 9:47,

10:7, 10:11, 10:16, 10:23, 10:36, 10:39, 10:46, 11:4, 11:7, 11:16, 11:19, 11:22, 11:24, 11:26, 11:29, 11:34, 11:39, 11:43, 11:46, 12:4, 12:16, 12:23, 12:28, 12:38, 12:41, 12:45, 12:47, 13:3, 13:8, 13:15, 13:17, 13:21, 13:26, 13:29, 13:33, 13:35, 13:40, 13:43, 13:45, 14:2. 14:4. 14:8. 14:10, 14:15, 14:18, 14:22, 14:24, 14:30, 16:14, 16:16, 16:17, 16:20, 16:22, 16:24, 16:26, 16:28, 16:32, 16:36. 16:43. 17:1. 17:14, 17:16, 17:28, 17:30, 17:43, 17:46, 18:2, 18:11, 18:18, 18:24, 19:15, 19:17, 19:31, 19:35, 19:39, 19:42, 19:44, 20:2, 20:19, 20:22, 20:27, 20:30, 20:34, 20:36, 20:39, 21:16, 21:27, 21:40, 25:10, 26:1, 27:34, 27:37, 27:40, 28:44, 28:47, 29:19, 29:22, 29:24, 29:26, 29:29, 29:36, 29:39, 29:45, 30:1, 30:3, 30:5, 30:8, 30:10, 30:15, 30:42, 30:46, 30:47, 31:2, 31:5, 31:8, 31:11, 31:14, 31:16, 31:17, 31:20, 31:22, 31:29, 31:31, 32:45, 33:1, 33:4, 33:9, 33:14, 33:28, 33:31, 33:35, 33:38, 33:45, 34:1, 34:3, 34:24, 34:33, 35:5, 35:29, 35:32, 35:34, 35:37, 35:40, 36:10, 39:7, 39:9, 39:11, 39:45, 41:24, 42:3, 42:5, 42:10, 42:12, 42:16, 42:19, 45:39, 45:42, 45:46, 46:2, 46:6, 46:9, 46:14, 46:36, 47:25, 47:31, 47:36, 47:41, 47:44, 47:46, 48:1, 48:3, 48:29, 48:43, 48:45, 48:47, 49:2, 49:24, 50:2, 50:6, 50:10, 50:18, 50:24, 50:34,

50:40, 50:41, 50:43, 51:1, 51:3, 51:23, 51:25, 51:33, 52:7, 52:11, 52:15, 52:18, 52:24, 52:29, 52:33, 52:42, 53:35, 53:40, 54:3, 54:10, 54:22, 54:25, 54:31, 54:37, 54:42, 55:3, 55:6, 55:8, 55:19, 55:25, 55:30, 56:5, 56:8, 56:10, 56:12, 56:15, 56:18, 56:27, 56:40, 56:42, 57:1, 57:5, 57:7, 57:15, 57:20, 57:25, 57:28, 57:31, 58:18, 59:22, 60:35, 60:38. 61:23. 63:27. 66:12. 66:15. 66:18. 67:37. 67:42. 68:28. 68:30, 68:33, 69:34, 69:37, 69:40, 69:42, 69:44, 70:19, 70:22, 70:26, 71:44, 71:46, 74:38, 75:6, 75:19, 75:23, 75:27, 75:31, 75:35, 75:40, 75:43, 76:39, 76:42, 78:22, 78:24, 78:27, 78:37, 79:2, 79:6, 79:17, 79:21, 79:23, 79:33, 79:40, 79:45, 79:47, 80:4, 80:7, 80:15, 80:17, 80:37, 80:40, 80:43, 81:6, 81:20, 81:34, 82:24, 82:28, 82:33, 82:38, 82:42, 82:44, 82:46, 83:5, 83:10, 83:13, 83:17, 83:19, 83:21, 83:31, 83:35, 83:37, 83:39, 83:42, 83:44, 84:2, 84:11, 84:15, 84:19, 84:21, 84:23, 84:32, 84:41, 84:44, 84:46, 85:3, 85:16, 85:19, 85:20, 85:36, 85:38, 85:44, 86:4, 86:8, 86:14, 86:31, 86:34, 86:39, 86:42, 86:46, 87:4, 87:11, 87:17, 87:19, 87:24, 88:4, 88:27, 88:30, 89:16, 89:18, 89:22, 89:24, 89:27, 89:29, 89:32, 89:38, 89:40, 89:42, 90:23, 90:26, 90:30, 91:39, 92:1, 92:7, 92:11, 92:22, 92:29, 92:31, 92:35, 92:37, 92:40, 92:44, 92:47,

93:3, 93:5, 93:16, 93:18, 93:21, 93:23, 93:41, 94:13, 94:36, 95:6, 95:10, 95:17, 95:21, 95:23, 95:31, 95:39, 95:45, 96:1, 96:6, 96:12, 96:15, 96:25, 96:36, 96:39, 96:42, 96:46, 97:14, 97:23, 97:37, 98:8, 98:12, 98:18, 98:35, 98:38, 98:41, 98:44, 99:21, 99:32, 99:36, 99:40, 99:44, 100:10, 100:14, 100:16, 100:21, 100:22, 100:25, 100:28, 100:30 **co** [2] - 13:47, 54:35 co-counsel [2] -13:47, 54:35 Cohen [2] - 27:21 coin [1] - 12:18 coincident [1] - 45:13 collaborating [1] -93:42 collapsed [3] - 46:42, 64:3, 64:10 colleagues [1] - 20:23 Colliers [23] - 8:1, 8:2, 16:11, 16:22, 17:6, 17:16, 17:22, 48:4, 48:15, 48:29, 55:12, 56:24, 58:43, 58:46, 59:9, 59:12, 59:15, 59:25, 60:15, 60:18, 60:25, 60:41, 61:13 Colliers' [2] - 48:15, 61:26 Columbia [1] - 101:10 combination [2] -3:13, 17:34 combine [1] - 53:9 combined [1] - 59:19 comfortable [1] - 45:6 coming [11] - 25:1, 42:32, 53:47, 66:4, 73:4, 78:28, 78:43, 78:44, 87:46, 97:38, 99:23 command [1] - 59:40 commenced [2] -61:19, 82:11 COMMENCED [1] comment [2] - 12:30, 12:34 comments [2] - 2:42, 82:23

commercial [6] -

43:44, 51:41, 52:30, 54:18, 87:1, 87:31 commercially [2] -24:28, 67:47 commit [2] - 54:46, 75:23 commitment [4] -40:32, 42:26, 59:41, 63.2 committee [1] - 48:34 **common** [2] - 49:36, 52:42 communication [1] -61:42 communications [2] -55:12, 91:42 communities [3] -42:46, 43:15, 43:33 Communities [1] -70:3 community [20] -34:45, 35:2, 35:8, 35:11, 39:32, 42:45, 43:11, 43:12, 43:19, 43:24, 43:26, 44:9, 44:13, 60:27, 68:46, 69:4, 69:6, 77:19, 77:41, 77:44 companies [4] - 8:10, 32:16, 32:17, 76:9 company [37] - 8:14, 8:26, 14:33, 14:36, 14:39, 14:40, 14:47, 15:41, 15:42, 21:47, 22:1, 22:2, 22:9, 22:12, 23:17, 23:23, 24:45, 32:14, 34:6, 40:27, 49:31, 57:11, 57:34, 58:34, 58:37, 65:16, 67:22, 67:34, 67:37, 67:42, 67:43, 68:7, 68:12, 85:41, 86:20, 89:5, 93:11 company's [1] - 69:27 comparable [1] -78:30 comparables [1] -43:29 compare [1] - 78:28 comparisons [1] -79:31 compel [1] - 92:25 competing [1] - 100:1 competition [1] -48:11 competitive [1] - 45:5 complains [1] - 71:41 complete [3] - 50:8, 56:38, 101:15 compliant [1] - 72:5

41:26, 48:9 concern [11] - 11:30, 38:33, 85:12, 85:19, 85:45, 86:1, 86:24, 91:43, 99:17, 100:2, 100:17 concerned [7] - 6:15, 20:45, 21:34, 51:34, 72:42, 88:19 concerning [2] -98:27, 99:23 concerns [11] - 17:21, 62:38, 63:7, 68:6, 86:34, 88:9, 88:33, 89:1, 91:37, 92:10, 99.15 concessions [5] -62:11, 63:28, 65:18, 67:1, 69:11 concluded [1] - 43:42 conclusion [2] -14:20, 17:17 concordance [1] -13:25 concurrently [1] -38:20 condensed [42] -13:10, 13:11, 13:13, 13:17, 13:22, 13:24, 13:30, 13:33, 16:14, 16:16, 16:18, 16:19, 16:20, 18:12, 20:34, 34:27, 36:12, 39:45, 42:2, 42:3, 44:7, 45:16, 46:2, 47:4, 48:25, 59:1, 60:32, 60:36, 61:47, 62:34, 71:31, 73:14, 74:43, 76:4, 80:10, 89:25, 89:29, 92:1, 92:4, 92:6, 92:44 conditional [2] -38:22, 46:44 condominium [1] -35:18 condominiums [1] -36:20 conduct [23] - 8:46, 9:9, 16:4, 20:4, 21:1, 21:2, 21:11, 21:14,

complicated [1] - 8:15

41:25, 42:25, 42:30

comprehensive [1] -

compromise [1] -

concept [3] - 2:44,

components [1] -

compounded [3] -

77:27

24.21

52:27

21:30, 21:35, 23:25, 24:23, 25:12, 28:20, 57:10, 57:36, 62:8, 85:21, 85:24, 85:27, 94:20, 94:25 confer [2] - 50:16, 50:18 conference [1] - 21:18 confident [1] - 39:18 confidential [3] -29:16, 29:22, 44:24 confidentiality [1] -19:31 confirm [1] - 63:34 conflated [2] - 95:13, conflict [3] - 44:40, 91:2, 91:12 conflicting [1] - 32:30 **conformity** [1] - 35:7 conjunction [1] -48:13 connection [2] -65:20, 66:44 cons [1] - 16:46 consent [1] - 68:10 consents [1] - 1:29 consequences [4] -9:7, 21:11, 21:29, 21:34 consider [7] - 2:25, 8:35, 16:4, 16:5, 44:3, 57:19, 78:39 consideration [3] -17:5, 94:42, 96:30 considerations [1] -57:18 considered [2] - 7:13, 16:38 **considering** [5] - 16:4, 16:45, 26:46, 44:35, consist [1] - 36:26 consistent [1] - 8:26 consists [1] - 36:19 constant [1] - 58:41 constrained [1] -78:47 constraints [1] - 58:5 construction [2] -35:8, 41:35 constructive [1] -53:36 **consulting** [1] - 61:32 contact [1] - 47:8 contemplate [1] -28:22 contemplated [7] -1:31, 15:35, 41:41, 44:19, 61:26, 65:30,

74:28 contemplates [1] -3:34 contemplation [1] -62:39 contention [2] - 67:16, 68:38 contentious [2] -50:35, 51:4 contents [1] - 13:46 contested [1] - 51:44 context [12] - 28:41, 32:38, 32:42, 33:41, 47:20, 47:42, 52:34, 65:35, 66:47, 94:14, 94:19 continually [1] - 77:28 continuation [2] -25:11, 53:26 continue [13] - 14:43, 20:44, 24:43, 25:25, 42:7, 42:21, 74:8, 82:8, 86:16, 89:4, 91:29, 94:1, 95:3 continued [5] - 24:17, 46:46, 62:7, 62:8, 90:13 continues [5] - 18:43, 42:29, 53:2, 61:24, 85:40 continuing [6] - 8:27, 24:31, 26:7, 47:13, 90:10, 95:28 contract [1] - 91:32 contractual [3] - 6:47, 82:12, 83:14 contrary [2] - 28:27, 57.42 contrast [3] - 39:28, 45:26, 64:29 control [21] - 3:3, 23:33, 24:26, 38:31, 45:14, 49:6, 49:26, 49:43, 67:18, 68:12, 71:35, 74:31, 86:5, 86:12, 90:46, 94:18, 94:21, 94:26, 96:9, 96:22, 99:18 controller [4] - 69:22, 69:27, 71:24, 71:27 controller's [1] - 69:26 convenient [2] -49:45, 75:2 convergence [2] -51:40, 51:41 conversation [4] -26:12, 26:13, 65:39. 98:44 cooperation [2] -

31:46, 94:25

cooperative [1] - 32:1 coordinated [2] -24:22, 61:43 copied [2] - 76:26, 76:35 copy [10] - 1:28, 3:43, 12:47, 13:5, 13:8, 31:32, 34:26, 92:33, 92:35, 92:36 core [2] - 27:45, 34:28 Core [2] - 17:8, 17:13 corporate [6] - 32:12, 32:19, 32:26, 34:7, 34:17, 40:22 corporation [1] -32:21 corporations [1] -32:22 correct [22] - 7:33, 8:31, 8:33, 21:16, 30:8, 33:45, 34:1, 37:10, 42:12, 47:36, 47:41, 48:43, 57:20, 66:34, 78:22, 79:2, 79:17, 83:42, 84:11, 85:36, 96:12, 101:15 correctly [1] - 96:2 correspondence [1] -91:14 cost [3] - 24:46, 81:39, 99:16 counsel [22] - 1:33, 1:34, 10:5, 10:8, 10:11, 13:47, 27:19, 50:39, 53:3, 53:12, 54:35, 61:40, 61:41, 71:19, 71:20, 71:32, 72:30, 72:32, 74:34, 86:16 counsel's [1] - 72:6 counterclaim [1] -29:32 couple [4] - 49:11, 53:32, 80:7, 99:15 course [27] - 6:6, 6:40, 11:28, 16:1, 22:3, 22:5, 31:23, 35:13, 36:15, 36:37, 40:8, 40:19, 41:12, 41:42, 43:13, 49:30, 66:38, 69:28, 77:10, 77:11, 79:5, 79:43, 84:16, 85:45, 99:10, 100:4 courses [6] - 7:40, 36:27, 40:6, 41:37, 42:46, 77:10 court [49] - 2:27, 2:47, 3:15, 4:11, 4:18, 6:28, 7:21, 8:3, 8:13, 9:21, 9:41, 10:1,

date [5] - 37:17, 42:25,

10:21, 10:31, 20:41, 20:45, 23:15, 23:26, 23:29, 24:14, 26:45, 28:14, 30:40, 36:11, 38:4, 38:37, 39:42, 43:1, 50:17, 50:45, 51:5, 52:45, 54:32, 54:33, 54:37, 57:26, 69:30, 74:33, 79:17, 82:13, 82:15, 82:25, 83:23, 87:8, 89:35, 92:4, 94:13, 97:21, 99:12 Court [1] - 83:32 COURT [450] - 1:6, 1:14, 1:16, 1:23, 1:26, 1:33, 1:36, 1:39, 1:44, 2:7, 2:11, 2:15, 2:18, 2:31, 2:34, 2:37, 3:29, 3:42, 3:47, 4:2, 4:23, 4:25, 4:36, 4:41, 4:45, 5:1, 5:8, 5:14, 5:16, 5:19, 5:23, 5:36, 5:40, 5:46, 6:13, 6:16, 6:32, 7:29, 7:34, 8:1, 8:29, 8:32, 8:34, 8:40, 9:26, 9:30, 9:33, 9:37, 9:39, 9:46, 10:4, 10:10, 10:15, 10:22, 10:34, 10:45, 11:3, 11:6, 11:14, 11:17, 11:21, 11:23, 11:25, 11:28, 11:33, 11:38, 11:42, 11:45, 12:3, 12:7, 12:17, 12:27, 12:35, 12:40, 12:43, 12:46, 13:1, 13:6, 13:13, 13:16, 13:19, 13:25, 13:31, 13:38, 13:42, 13:44, 13:47, 14:3, 14:7, 14:9, 14:14, 14:17, 14:21, 14:23, 14:29, 16:19, 16:21, 16:23, 16:25, 16:27, 16:31, 16:34, 16:42, 16:47, 17:13, 17:15, 17:27, 17:29, 17:38, 17:45, 18:1, 18:10, 18:15, 18:23, 19:13, 19:16, 19:30, 19:33, 19:38, 19:41, 19:43, 20:1, 20:18, 20:20, 20:26, 20:29, 20:33, 20:35, 20:38, 21:13, 21:25, 21:39, 25:9, 25:47, 27:5, 27:12, 27:36, 27:39, 28:43, 28:46, 29:16, 29:21, 29:23,

29:25, 29:28, 29:34, 29:38, 29:43, 29:47, 30:2, 30:4, 30:7, 30:9, 30:14, 31:1, 31:4, 31:7, 31:10, 31:15, 31:19, 31:21, 31:28, 31:30, 32:28, 32:46, 33:3, 33:8, 33:13, 33:18, 33:30, 33:34, 33:37, 33:40, 33:46, 34:2, 34:23, 34:32, 35:4, 35:26, 35:31, 35:33, 35:36, 35:39, 36:9, 39:5, 39:8, 39:10, 39:44, 41:23, 42:2, 42:4, 42:9, 42:11, 42:15, 42:18, 45:38, 45:41, 45:45. 45:47. 46:5. 46:8. 46:13. 46:35. 47:23, 47:26, 47:34, 47:37, 47:43, 47:45, 47:47, 48:2, 48:28, 48:42, 48:44, 48:46, 49:1, 49:20, 49:46, 50:5, 50:15, 50:21, 50:25, 50:33, 50:42, 50:47, 51:2, 51:21, 51:24, 51:31, 52:3, 52:10, 52:14, 52:17, 52:23, 52:28, 52:32, 52:41, 53:27, 53:39, 53:46, 54:9, 54:12, 54:24, 54:29, 54:34, 54:41, 54:44, 55:4, 55:7, 55:18, 55:24, 55:29, 55:37, 56:7, 56:9, 56:11, 56:14, 56:17, 56:26, 56:33, 56:41, 56:43, 57:3, 57:6, 57:14, 57:17, 57:24, 57:27, 57:30, 58:17, 59:21, 60:34, 60:37, 61:22, 63:22, 63:26, 66:10, 66:13, 66:17, 67:36, 67:40, 68:26, 68:29, 68:32, 69:33, 69:36, 69:39, 69:41, 69:43, 70:25, 71:43, 71:45, 74:37, 75:3, 75:7, 75:15, 75:21, 75:25, 75:30, 75:34, 75:39, 75:42, 76:38, 76:41, 78:16, 78:23, 78:26, 78:36, 78:38, 79:3, 79:11, 79:19, 79:22, 79:32, 79:35, 79:44, 79:46, 80:1, 80:5, 80:12, 80:16, 80:32, 80:38, 80:42, 81:5, 81:19,

81:33, 82:22, 82:27, 82:31, 82:35, 82:40, 82:43, 82:45, 83:3, 83:9, 83:11, 83:16, 83:18, 83:20, 83:24, 83:34, 83:36, 83:38, 83:40, 83:43, 83:46, 84:4, 84:13, 84:18, 84:20, 84:22, 84:30, 84:35, 84:43, 84:45, 84:47, 85:12, 85:18, 85:34, 85:37, 85:43, 86:1, 86:5, 86:13, 86:29, 86:33, 86:36, 86:41, 86:45, 87:3, 87:10, 87:15, 87:18, 87:23, 88:3, 88:26, 88:29. 89:13. 89:17. 89:19. 89:23. 89:26. 89:28. 89:31. 89:37. 89:39, 89:41, 90:22, 90:25, 90:29, 91:38, 91:47, 92:5, 92:8, 92:21, 92:28, 92:30, 92:32, 92:36, 92:38, 92:42, 92:46, 93:2, 93:4, 93:15, 93:17, 93:20, 93:22, 93:40, 94:7, 94:35, 94:41, 95:9, 95:11, 95:20, 95:22, 95:25, 95:32, 95:44, 95:47, 96:5, 96:7, 96:14, 96:17, 96:27, 96:38, 96:41, 96:45, 97:2, 97:22, 97:36, 97:43, 98:9, 98:17, 98:21, 98:37, 98:40, 98:43, 99:20, 99:27, 99:35, 99:39, 99:41, 99:47, 100:13, 100:18, 100:23, 100:27, 100:29 court's [3] - 12:22, 76:3, 94:23 court-appointed [1] courtroom [5] - 15:1, 20:7, 20:8, 53:34, 63:23 courts [3] - 6:6, 28:34, 77:14 **covenant** [1] - 74:5 covenants [1] - 35:6 **cover** [5] - 26:37, 80:24, 81:12, 96:19, 98:25 covered [1] - 93:30

covers [1] - 96:4

CPC [2] - 55:38,

100:24 CRA [4] - 71:39, 71:46, 72:2, 72:11 create [3] - 45:4, 48:5, 67:28 created [4] - 13:10, 28:6, 56:45, 90:40 creating [4] - 43:18, 48:6, 60:28, 71:23 credit [1] - 66:25 creditor [13] - 6:47, 7:4, 7:10, 7:18, 9:3, 15:14, 17:37, 22:29, 24:37, 25:20, 25:35, 38:30, 39:34 creditor's [1] - 6:45 creditors [1] - 98:5 Creek [3] - 18:28, 73:35, 73:40 crises [1] - 6:26 crisis [2] - 28:4, 28:6 cross [9] - 54:31, 84:34, 85:1, 85:3, 85:4, 85:6, 85:14, 85:28, 86:30 cross-claim [4] -84:34, 85:1, 85:3, 86:30 cross-claims [4] -85:4, 85:6, 85:14, 85:28 cross-examinations 111 - 54:31 cuff [1] - 21:12 culmination [1] - 4:31 cultivate [1] - 45:25 current [11] - 22:19, 26:27, 36:34, 64:45, 66:34, 72:40, 73:19, 73:32, 76:37, 82:4, 90:12 customers [1] - 14:37 cut [2] - 15:2, 32:6 cycling [1] - 35:10

D

daily [2] - 42:24, 81:18 damage [2] - 60:27, 60:44 damages [2] - 83:41, 85:8 Dan [9] - 7:46, 10:25, 44:9, 46:4, 46:9, 47:8, 61:35, 63:33, 66:33 Darcus [1] - 100:21 DARCUS [5] - 16:14,

16:17, 100:22,

100:25, 100:28

42:36, 81:23, 91:33 dated [2] - 40:32, 72:32 Dave [2] - 18:3, 18:4 David [3] - 63:25, 76:24, 92:26 day-by-day [1] - 81:10 day-to-day [4] - 77:7, 95:15, 96:11, 97:8 days [9] - 4:24, 4:25, 5:27, 19:29, 52:43, 53:1, 53:32, 53:33, 99:24 days' [2] - 41:30, 41:39 deadline [2] - 65:24, 66:19 deadlines [1] - 54:20 deadlock [4] - 31:35, 31:37, 31:43, 33:47 deadlocked [1] -33:26 deal [21] - 5:31, 6:25, 11:19, 12:1, 14:8, 15:46, 16:2, 21:22, 46:42, 47:10, 47:19, 47:22, 48:34, 54:35, 56:24, 57:18, 58:34, 58:38, 60:9, 80:34, 96:47 dealer [1] - 93:10 dealing [6] - 33:38. 55:45, 64:2, 96:17, 96:28, 97:33 dealings [1] - 96:40 deals [6] - 64:7, 65:11, 90:9, 96:19, 96:31, 99:2 dealt [2] - 21:36, 30:35 debt [6] - 7:23, 22:30, 22:33, 22:35, 23:31, 29:31 debtor [1] - 85:41 debts [1] - 24:45 decade [4] - 14:40, 15:38, 23:4, 23:13 decide [5] - 2:38, 6:29, 51:45, 52:20, 96:10 decided [2] - 15:2, 91.16 decides [3] - 6:20, 45:7, 99:13 decision [23] - 3:10, 19:47, 20:20, 20:24, 20:31, 44:41, 82:15, 82:19, 82:22, 82:31, 82:34, 82:36, 82:39, 82:40, 82:42, 82:44,

83:1, 84:36, 85:9,

88:1, 88:23, 89:44, 91:19 decisionmaker [1] -44:38 decisions [4] - 32:15, 32:16, 32:23, 87:22 declare [1] - 91:19 decrease [1] - 79:34 decreasing [1] - 7:24 default [4] - 7:10, 22:20, 22:21, 42:37 defendant [1] - 55:39 defined [2] - 2:27, 42:26 definition [1] - 3:32 delay [4] - 31:45, 48:32, 48:35, 51:46 delegate [1] - 96:11 delivered [6] - 52:36, 54:27, 61:44, 62:27, 74:40, 74:44 demand [3] - 22:32, 28:30, 74:20 demanded [1] - 19:19 demands [1] - 22:45 demonstrates [1] -38:40 denies [1] - 95:2 denigrating [2] -93:45, 94:2 density [2] - 37:16, 37:18 dent [1] - 79:16 deny [1] - 54:14 deposed [6] - 25:38, 43:10, 45:20, 57:31, 65:21, 72:20 deposes [4] - 37:7, 40:40. 57:15. 88:8 deposit [1] - 63:2 derailed [1] - 54:4 derivative [1] - 30:16 describe [1] - 84:26 described [4] - 61:14, 69:22, 72:30, 83:22 describes [1] - 61:24 designed [2] - 49:40, 77:10 desire [5] - 45:22, 63:20, 71:34, 71:35, 72:9 desk [1] - 92:17 desperately [2] -15:16, 20:11 despite [8] - 26:26, 58:21, 67:9, 76:30, 78:13, 86:18, 87:40, 87:42 detail [3] - 34:22,

51:46, 69:7

detailed [1] - 14:11 details [15] - 4:4, 4:5, 4:9, 4:32, 5:43, 6:12, 8:39, 9:1, 9:29, 9:32, 9:35. 9:36. 17:44. 76:12. 87:1 determination [1] -94:29 determinations [1] -51:43 determine [5] - 23:43, 24:15, 32:33, 45:3, 95.5 determining [1] -88:13 detriment [3] - 22:23, 24:41, 31:41 develop [2] - 73:8, 95:21 developable [5] -37:5, 37:12, 37:19, 37:28, 37:32 developer [1] - 60:12 developers [1] - 55:28 developing [2] -41:36, 63:14 development [35] -6:3, 6:8, 7:41, 21:44, 21:47, 22:6, 23:7, 24:4, 28:9, 36:28, 36:29, 36:34, 37:15, 37:25, 37:40, 37:46, 38:6, 38:26, 39:47, 42:45, 43:26, 43:36, 44:23, 45:30, 46:30, 48:6, 49:29, 59:29, 60:1, 61:25, 61:36, 62:25, 63:14, 76:9, 77:5 development's [1] -26:25 developments [1] -59:17 Developments [5] -1:11, 20:43, 40:13, 44:11, 70:2 devil [2] - 9:34, 9:36 dictate [1] - 7:31 difference [2] - 49:34, 99:37 different [26] - 1:46, 7:7, 12:17, 13:36, 16:46, 33:22, 46:15, 49:18, 49:22, 49:27, 49:28, 51:7, 57:34, 57:35, 57:47, 60:4, 63:45, 67:31, 67:32, 67:43, 68:2, 86:17, 91:34, 91:35, 96:28

difficult [3] - 90:17,

90:37, 99:32 difficulties [1] - 38:28 diligence [2] - 46:41, 90:8 dilute [2] - 15:27, 25:4 diluted [1] - 15:23 diminished [1] - 45:29 direct [2] - 8:3, 55:36 directed [1] - 28:28 directing [1] - 92:16 direction [4] - 7:20, 52:25, 89:5, 90:47 directions [2] - 2:13, 28:24 directly [2] - 58:29, 94:47 director [11] - 44:29, 44:30, 49:2, 49:3, 49:10, 59:13, 61:20, 67:19, 68:8, 69:47, 70:18 directors [2] - 40:27, 48:40 directs [1] - 8:32 disabuse [1] - 56:33 disagree [4] - 23:2, 23:9, 23:18, 31:35 disclosure [2] - 90:44, 92.25 discontinuance [1] -83:28 discontinued [1] -82:30 discounted [1] - 26:5 discovered [1] - 55:43 discovering [1] -91:13 discretion [1] - 33:12 discuss [5] - 19:11. 44:12, 50:45, 81:35, 81:41 discussed [6] - 1:19, 40:46, 62:31, 62:47, 75:36, 77:17 discussing [1] - 99:28 discussion [8] -34:38, 46:17, 46:20, 55:31, 59:2, 63:8, 70:26, 98:42 discussions [7] -10:43, 46:41, 52:44, 62:2, 62:22, 64:20, 65:21 disingenuous [1] -1:18 dismiss [2] - 82:31, 83:3 dismissed [4] - 20:27, 82:25, 82:38, 84:40 **disparity** [1] - 56:45

dissatisfaction [1] -87.4 dissatisfactions [1] -87.42 distinct [5] - 16:37, 36:28, 48:6, 48:12, 77:1 distinction [2] - 6:44, 7:19 distinguishes [1] -32:24 distractions [1] - 16:6 distressed [3] - 24:11, 26:5, 65:44 distributions [1] -57:47 district [1] - 35:1 District [2] - 37:14, 37:29 divert [1] - 81:26 diverted [2] - 69:13, 71:12 diverting [1] - 80:35 divide [1] - 7:44 divided [2] - 8:22, 40.20 division [1] - 77:5 document [3] - 16:30, 20:30, 41:29 documents [3] -13:36, 40:22, 60:36 dollars [2] - 22:38, 24:8 done [10] - 21:6. 51:17, 51:18, 53:43, 64:9, 67:14, 75:33, 75:37, 87:39, 100:5 doubling [1] - 43:32 down [23] - 14:11, 22:11, 32:4, 33:15, 41:11, 41:14, 41:15, 41:22, 50:25, 51:10, 53:13, 53:38, 60:22, 61:28, 73:41, 74:12, 74:15, 78:43, 78:44, 79:29, 86:44, 97:29, 97:31 downstairs [1] - 53:31 draft [8] - 3:18, 9:25, 11:19, 11:44, 12:33, 50:1, 50:37, 53:47 draw [4] - 7:19, 14:44, 55:20, 76:3 drawn [1] - 55:26 drew [1] - 22:11

disposition [1] - 17:6

25:22, 90:34, 98:22

disputed [1] - 64:31

disrespect [1] - 25:44

dispute [4] - 4:6,

drip [5] - 17:35, 19:21 Drive [2] - 38:8, 38:9 driving [2] - 23:22, 43:20 dual [1] - 31:39 due [9] - 25:17, 25:21, 46:41, 66:36, 71:22, 78:5, 79:5, 82:19, 90:8 during [6] - 5:28, 24:18, 34:36, 43:34, 55:38, 64:36 duties [3] - 35:42, 36:6, 77:24 dysfunctions [1] -87:43

Ε

early [9] - 46:42, 49:47, 50:13, 50:16, 50:17, 56:38, 58:42, 73:12, 97:3 earn [2] - 26:7, 36:3 earned [4] - 70:36, 71:1, 73:21, 80:44 easier [1] - 25:46 eat [1] - 26:16 EBMD [11] - 35:21, 36:6, 40:16, 40:25, 40:28, 49:4, 57:41, 57:42, 70:1, 76:44, 99:7 Ecoasis [12] - 1:11, 17:10, 18:5, 19:40, 20:43, 40:12, 40:13, 44:10, 44:19, 60:43, 70:3, 76:13 effect [7] - 33:40, 37:20, 53:11, 53:14, 72:8, 81:17, 84:12 effected [2] - 72:8, 81:44 effectively [9] - 2:20, 26:8, 26:23, 68:46, 70:47, 72:41, 73:3, 94:46, 98:33 effort [1] - 72:25 efforts [3] - 34:13, 62:10, 72:31 eight [4] - 34:37, 49:36, 60:5, 65:1 eight-month [1] - 65:1 Either [1] - 60:39 either [9] - 1:29, 44:21, 52:2, 52:15, 52:24, 60:26, 60:44, 73:47, 97:1 element [2] - 57:2,

57:4

elements [1] - 94:20 eliminate [1] - 74:5 eliminating [3] -28:28, 31:43, 31:45 email [18] - 18:42, 44:46, 45:17, 46:12, 46:37, 48:23, 59:33, 60:30, 60:33, 62:32, 62:33, 62:34, 63:30, 76:5, 93:7, 93:9, 93:13, 93:24 emails [3] - 47:34, 49:21, 93:43 employ [1] - 37:43 employed [2] - 19:44, 23:13 employees [3] - 37:45, 77:33, 77:36 employment [1] -90:13 en [12] - 7:36, 7:37, 16:41, 17:20, 18:22, 19:3, 24:5, 25:30, 26:21, 43:39, 48:13, 48:14 enable [1] - 97:40 end [15] - 12:9, 15:30, 21:43, 25:27, 26:47, 28:41, 33:16, 33:25, 43:18, 53:17, 62:39, 64:16, 68:14, 71:22, 75:36 ends [2] - 26:22, 45:8 enforce [2] - 29:8, 29:17 enforceable [2] - 19:8, 19:13 enforcement [1] -74.20 engage [6] - 43:44, 44:22, 44:33, 60:26, 63:20, 97:42 engaged [4] - 7:46, 20:4, 48:4, 96:40 engagement [6] -42:45, 44:5, 44:12, 64:6, 74:39, 77:38 engagements [1] -60:21 engaging [1] - 60:15 enhance [1] - 22:22 ensued [1] - 46:41 ensure [5] - 23:38, 24:17, 24:27, 49:44, 72:9 entered [1] - 41:43 entering [1] - 60:17 enthusiastic [1] -44:44 enticement [1] - 91:22

entire [1] - 44:21 entirely [2] - 8:25, 96:16 entities [2] - 83:27, 85:10 entitled [1] - 49:32 **entitlement** [1] - 15:38 entity [1] - 90:23 entrench [2] - 24:40, 31:40 entrenchment [2] -74:9, 74:10 equal [1] - 64:45 equitable [3] - 9:2, 57:17, 57:26 Equity [4] - 3:21, 33:6, 33:11, 57:23 equity [7] - 7:25, 25:18, 25:33, 26:4, 26:16, 57:46, 73:42 **equivalent** [1] - 85:5 eroded [1] - 57:46 erodes [1] - 25:18 eroding [1] - 26:8 erosion [2] - 25:19, 25:33 especially [1] - 57:20 essential [2] - 52:1, 77:43 essentially [9] - 15:9, 17:17, 28:23, 37:4, 43:12, 60:7, 68:9, 85:4, 93:8 established [1] -57:41 estate [7] - 35:17, 40:7, 43:44, 43:47, 46:30, 77:4, 90:6 estimate [7] - 22:36, 51:38, 52:26, 52:37, 52:43, 53:14, 75:37 et [4] - 3:13, 35:10, 37:41, 69:1 eve [2] - 65:23, 66:19 event [4] - 61:30, 62:4, 67:16, 96:10 events [1] - 91:28 eventually [1] - 26:21 evidence [79] - 9:19, 10:43, 16:9, 18:3, 20:6, 20:21, 24:20, 28:17, 32:30, 35:46, 37:34, 37:36, 38:10, 38:16, 38:42, 38:44, 41:9, 41:18, 43:21, 43:28, 44:31, 44:38, 45:18, 51:6, 51:13, 51:20, 51:44, 52:20, 55:21, 55:24, 55:35,

55:37, 55:47, 56:6,

56:11, 56:16, 56:35, 56:41, 58:35, 63:18, 64:17, 70:17, 70:44, 71:38, 72:47, 77:35, 78:12, 78:33, 78:39, 79:3, 79:8, 79:11, 79:13, 80:2, 80:21, 80:28, 80:39, 81:6, 81:7, 83:1, 83:2, 87:25, 87:27, 87:29, 87:35, 87:43, 87:46, 88:11, 88:20, 88:31, 89:10, 91:11, 91:40, 93:33, 94:9, 94:42, 94:47, 96:29, 96:33 evidenced [1] - 22:30 evident [2] - 24:32, 61.17 evidently [1] - 61:18 eviscerate[1] - 37:5 exact [1] - 14:40 exactly [9] - 6:21, 8:2, 8:18, 9:38, 15:25, 22:10, 85:36, 89:42, 99:40 examinations [1] -54:31 example [11] - 9:10, 9:47, 51:9, 58:42, 61:30, 64:2, 64:5, 67:46, 69:18, 71:14, 88.2 examples [1] - 76:27 **exceed** [1] - 64:45 exceeds [2] - 36:32, 85:6 excerpt [1] - 58:4 excerpted [1] - 20:21 excerpts [1] - 36:14 excess [1] - 65:5 exchange [6] - 60:30, 62:12, 70:10, 71:31, 76:5, 76:34 **excluding** [1] - 17:8 **exclusive** [1] - 48:14 excuse [1] - 55:34 **executed** [2] - 43:35, 73.23 execution [1] - 73:21 executive [2] - 17:11, 60:18 exercise [1] - 23:30 **exercised** [1] - 70:7 **exercises** [1] - 37:27 exercising [1] - 74:31 Exhibit [5] - 26:29, 38:40, 47:2, 64:11, 92:3 exhibit [5] - 28:40, 48:26, 48:27, 64:13,

Exhibits [1] - 36:13 exhibits [1] - 34:31 exhortation [2] -47:21, 67:10 existed [1] - 60:5 existing [5] - 8:42, 37:18, 38:27, 63:42, 86.16 exiting [1] - 41:2 expand [1] - 2:15 expansion [1] - 53:2 expect [6] - 5:44, 7:35, 45:2, 45:4, 50:7, 79:16 expectation [1] -15:40 expectations [8] -15:35, 34:39, 40:38, 49:37, 57:32, 57:41, 58:6, 63:41 expected [3] - 15:36, 41:19, 57:36 expenditures [3] -70:39, 70:45, 71:3 expense [6] - 31:23, 45:23, 76:12, 76:18, 76:30, 91:1 expenses [7] - 24:24, 24:27. 69:16. 76:13. 80:26. 81:12. 81:39 expensive [1] - 25:2 **experience** [1] - 73:29 experienced [1] - 53:2 experiencing [1] -78:11 expiry [1] - 42:36 explain [5] - 15:12, 48:46, 49:20, 51:14, 84:42 explained [3] - 33:32, 61:9, 91:27 explains [1] - 49:14 explanation [4] -55:22, 57:33, 91:34, 91:35 exploration [1] - 22:2 **expressed** [3] - 24:1, 45:22, 63:7 expresses [1] - 22:46 expressions [4] -43:38, 44:26, 44:28, 46:39 extended [5] - 41:7, 41:42, 41:44, 42:20, 42:39 extension [9] - 31:18,

41:47, 43:17, 66:5,

66:6, 66:12, 66:13,

69:39

exhibited [1] - 40:22

73:27
extensive [1] - 40:7
extent [7] - 62:19,
71:33, 73:31, 86:31,
87:12, 97:19, 99:9
external [2] - 14:35,
26:11
extract [3] - 62:11,
63:28, 65:17
extraordinary [1] 7:16
extremely [1] - 45:7
eye [1] - 8:7

F

f) [1] - 37:42 fabricated [1] - 15:10 face [1] - 28:30 faces [1] - 60:43 facetiously [1] - 1:18 facie [2] - 33:23, 52:13 facilitate [1] - 47:18 facilities [4] - 36:17, 40:6, 77:9, 81:45 facility [2] - 36:27, 92:20 fact [20] - 6:46, 9:16, 14:31, 15:19, 15:20, 18:34, 34:16, 36:31, 37:6, 44:18, 52:6, 52:16, 56:19, 71:27, 74:29, 78:40, 86:18, 87:41, 88:15, 98:41 factor [4] - 14:35, 57:33, 88:16, 94:36 factors [3] - 7:12, 33:16, 35:45 facts [5] - 14:11, 14:31, 33:46, 34:21, 86:40 factual [3] - 33:41, 34:29, 34:42 factually [1] - 58:7 failure [3] - 65:13, 65:15, 78:13 fair [11] - 12:7, 45:5, 45:6, 52:12, 54:12, 56:40, 56:42, 56:47, 57:1, 68:28, 85:30 fairness [1] - 70:19 faith [3] - 10:20, 10:30, 91:15 fall [4] - 25:40, 72:20, 72:24, 89:47 false [1] - 61:45 families [1] - 8:21 family [5] - 35:17, 36:19, 43:36, 49:31, 91:13

far [6] - 20:46, 33:24, 34:30, 66:16, 67:13, fatal [1] - 8:24 father [8] - 8:17, 9:17, 29:41, 44:30, 49:8, 49:18, 55:44, 56:37 favour [1] - 84:36 fear [1] - 39:28 February [3] - 44:6, 56:20, 56:23 federal [1] - 54:32 fee [21] - 18:35, 31:17, 35:46, 36:3, 41:25, 66:6, 66:10, 66:12, 66:13, 69:23, 69:29, 70:4, 70:10, 70:14, 73:20, 73:21, 73:27, 73:39, 75:47, 76:19, 76:29 feedback [1] - 62:37 fees [1] - 69:19 Ferris [18] - 4:7, 4:26, 11:15, 11:33, 11:34, 12:36, 13:7, 34:40, 48:8, 50:33, 52:3, 52:7, 52:47, 53:23, 63:43, 74:33, 75:37, 82:15 FERRIS [125] - 12:38, 12:41, 12:45, 12:47, 13:3, 13:8, 13:15, 13:17, 13:29, 13:35, 13:40, 13:43, 13:45, 14:2, 14:4, 14:8, 14:10, 14:15, 14:18, 14:22, 14:24, 14:30, 16:16, 16:20, 16:22, 16:24, 16:26, 16:28, 16:32, 16:36, 16:43, 17:1, 17:14, 17:16, 17:28, 17:30, 17:43, 17:46, 18:2, 18:11, 18:18, 18:24, 19:15, 19:17, 19:31, 19:35, 19:39, 19:42, 19:44, 20:2, 20:19, 20:22, 20:27, 20:30, 20:34, 20:36, 20:39, 21:16, 21:27, 21:40, 25:10, 26:1, 27:34, 27:37, 27:40, 28:44, 28:47, 29:19, 29:22, 29:24, 29:26, 29:29, 29:36, 29:39, 29:45, 30:1, 30:3, 30:5, 30:8, 30:10. 30:15. 30:46. 31:14. 31:17. 31:20. 31:22, 31:29, 31:31, 32:45, 33:1, 33:4,

33:9, 33:14, 33:28, 33:31, 33:35, 33:38, 33:45, 34:1, 34:3, 50:2, 50:10, 50:18, 50:24, 50:34, 50:41, 50:43, 51:1, 51:3, 51:23, 51:25, 54:25, 54:31, 54:37, 54:42, 55:3, 55:6, 75:23, 75:40, 84:41, 84:44, 84:46, 85:20, 85:36, 100:21 few [4] - 17:18, 50:25, 91:32, 93:28 fifth [1] - 22:39 fight [2] - 8:28, 10:1 fights [2] - 9:28, 10:32 figure [2] - 27:32, 97:32 file [1] - 66:34 filed [9] - 1:28, 19:1, 20:24, 20:25, 29:37, 29:40, 31:24, 83:27, 89:34 filibuster [1] - 53:20 final [3] - 44:40, 52:16, 94:29 finance [1] - 28:10 financed [1] - 40:31 financial [16] - 14:34, 35:45, 38:28, 43:14, 56:45, 69:19, 71:35, 72:15, 76:6, 78:47, 89:7, 90:16, 90:31, 90:35, 90:44, 100:4 Financing [1] - 18:40 financing [17] - 14:44, 15:24, 18:28, 18:30, 26:26, 32:2, 32:18, 39:14, 39:19, 39:21, 41:22, 65:11, 65:28, 72:26, 72:33, 72:36, 73:36 findings [3] - 52:6, 52:16, 88:21 fine [6] - 13:34, 20:40. 31:30, 46:8, 86:32, 99:14 finish [4] - 34:3, 51:22, 61:36, 75:5 finished [2] - 51:25, 75:24 firm [3] - 44:1, 48:5, 55:2 firms [1] - 11:11 first [36] - 2:21, 2:40, 14:31, 15:19, 16:11, 18:13, 18:26, 18:27,

18:31, 20:1, 27:18,

28:2, 28:44, 29:10,

29:24, 34:37, 35:47, 41:42, 41:47, 42:13, 43:2, 47:5, 47:30, 50:37, 59:24, 65:8, 72:10, 76:32, 82:41, 83:35, 85:26, 86:9, 88:6, 89:45, 95:45, 99:16 fit [1] - 63:40 fitness [1] - 6:6 five [9] - 25:24, 26:36, 27:45, 37:45, 50:13, 50:16, 50:17, 50:19, 85:25 **fixed** [1] - 54:20 fixed-in-stone [1] -54:20 flaw [1] - 8:25 fleet [1] - 93:26 flexibility [1] - 9:41 flip [1] - 17:25 floor [2] - 34:19, 73:18 flow [3] - 22:2, 72:44, 81:35 follow [2] - 21:3, 38:18 following [2] - 25:23, 60:44 follows [2] - 46:22, 59:34 force [1] - 49:40 foreshadowing [1] -4:8 forget [1] - 8:21 **form** [8] - 1:41, 2:3, 3:36, 12:10, 12:33, 33:43, 62:23, 86:2 **forma** [2] - 59:43, 60:2 formal [2] - 70:24, 90:26 formally [2] - 67:11, 68:44 formed [2] - 48:33, 88:42 former [2] - 18:4, 27:21 forms [3] - 57:37, 65:12, 65:17 forth [1] - 8:43 forward [15] - 6:35, 8:37, 10:2, 10:3, 17:25, 20:3, 20:5, 20:12, 24:13, 32:37, 55:33, 59:3, 63:35, 64:9, 94:15 Forward [1] - 60:39 four [5] - 4:30, 11:11, 40:36, 54:27, 64:47 four-month [1] - 64:47 fraught [1] - 82:3 free [2] - 47:8, 54:29

10:28, 15:45, 21:1, 30:43, 31:12, 32:25, 34:20. 34:39. 51:7. 51:29. 51:36. 52:36. 52:47, 61:12, 70:20, 74:25, 82:15, 85:16, 86:22, 96:3, 96:42, 97:15, 99:29 friend's [5] - 10:40, 28:40, 33:9, 75:28, 84:25 friends [16] - 1:18, 4:12, 5:42, 8:47, 10:36, 33:32, 34:27, 50:6, 52:25, 53:2, 53:8, 53:15, 53:42, 54:26, 75:35, 86:6 friends' [1] - 51:41 front [6] - 3:14, 10:31, 12:24, 12:37, 61:1, frozen [1] - 72:41 fruition [1] - 52:44 FTS [1] - 14:1 full [18] - 6:27, 7:40, 8:37, 8:44, 9:7, 15:31, 18:31, 22:17, 28:34, 38:33, 70:13, 73:36, 74:26, 74:31, 77:17, 79:10, 85:22, 96:3 full-blown [3] - 6:27, 8:44, 9:7 full-time [1] - 70:13 fully [3] - 25:3, 32:41, 74:17 function [1] - 95:19 functionally [1] -96:25 fund [10] - 4:36, 4:37, 4:38, 4:41, 12:21, 19:28, 29:5, 56:44, 67:3, 67:8 fundamental [1] -32:23 fundamentally [1] -15:32 funded [11] - 18:36, 18:37, 24:16, 25:3, 29:12, 30:30, 66:41, 66:45, 68:17, 68:18, 68:22 funding [31] - 1:32, 4:40, 12:25, 15:3, 22:5, 26:24, 27:43, 27:47, 28:19, 31:34, 31:42, 32:6, 37:2, 37:31, 38:7, 39:3,

Friday [1] - 54:33

friend [24] - 9:28,

41:36, 42:25, 57:7, 58:15, 58:26, 65:11, 71:4, 73:31, 73:33, 74:22, 74:28, 78:7, 86:26, 97:25 funds [16] - 24:23, 24:25, 41:27, 58:23, 58:29. 58:33. 65:13. 69:13, 70:30, 70:41, 71:16, 71:17, 71:23, 71:28, 73:46, 80:35 Funds [1] - 80:44 future [10] - 36:29, 36:40, 37:30, 37:37, 50:40, 50:41, 59:17, 59:29, 59:42, 77:27

G

Gallagher [1] - 53:31 game [1] - 15:30 garbage [1] - 93:29 general [3] - 76:45, 77:47, 95:10 generally [1] - 14:33 generate [1] - 23:7 generated [1] - 43:27 generating [1] - 41:20 given [22] - 1:47, 7:21, 24:20, 27:28, 33:46, 41:9, 51:4, 54:25, 55:22, 57:33, 58:4, 61:14, 67:18, 72:4, 74:30, 87:25, 88:28, 89:10, 89:32, 97:1, 97:43, 98:25 global [1] - 44:4 goal [3] - 8:41, 25:5, 26:3 goals [1] - 3:9 Golf [5] - 40:14, 44:17, 89:15, 93:9, 93:32 golf [30] - 6:5, 6:40, 7:40, 22:3, 22:5, 35:9. 35:13. 36:15. 36:17, 36:27, 36:37, 37:47, 40:6, 41:37, 42:46, 77:2, 77:10, 77:26, 77:33, 77:38, 77:41, 77:42, 80:18, 87:38, 91:9, 92:17, 92:42, 93:10, 93:26 Gondola [3] - 66:46, 67:2, 67:46 Gondoyano [1] -71:24 goodness [1] - 79:45 grant [4] - 94:15, 95:25, 97:10, 98:24

granular [2] - 68:29,

68:30 grateful [1] - 75:19 great [8] - 7:38, 10:16, 17:45, 35:33, 43:33, 75:39, 78:42, 79:27 greater [2] - 43:30, 79:16 grinding [1] - 63:17 ground [1] - 36:7 group [5] - 46:43, 47:1, 61:32, 63:36, 64:3 groups [3] - 44:26, 44:27, 59:5 growth [1] - 77:44 GST [1] - 76:20 GT [8] - 89:47, 90:9, 90:18, 90:22, 90:38, 91:3, 91:8, 91:20 guess [2] - 30:23, 97:9 guests [1] - 35:15 gym [1] - 69:1

Н

half [4] - 37:12, 51:28. 65:41, 65:44 half-interest [2] -65:41, 65:44 halt [1] - 63:17 halts [1] - 48:22 hammer [1] - 22:17 hand [5] - 13:39. 13:40, 34:25, 93:41, 93:43 handed [1] - 13:14 hands [4] - 24:14, 50:18, 51:16, 100:9 hang [1] - 12:43 happily [1] - 6:17 happy [2] - 26:14, 91:27 hard [1] - 45:25 harm [1] - 100:5 hat [3] - 7:4, 10:12, 23:35 hats [2] - 22:28, 23:29 head [1] - 54:2 heading [3] - 16:28, 18:24, 60:39 headline [1] - 44:16 hear [18] - 4:7, 4:21, 6:33, 8:38, 8:47, 9:5, 11:17, 14:18, 15:24, 21:16, 21:17, 32:25, 51:31, 75:25, 79:37, 80:1, 95:27, 99:41 heard [17] - 2:42, 21:17, 22:4, 24:6, 30:2, 30:6, 34:47,

36:30, 37:34, 40:11, 40:20, 48:8, 61:12, 74:25, 75:40, 77:35, hearing [6] - 5:27, 53:4, 54:4, 54:28, 68:26, 97:17

heart [2] - 69:4, 69:5 hectares [1] - 37:29 held [10] - 28:29, 43:24, 49:37, 58:33, 58:36, 58:37, 67:6, 67:26, 68:3, 76:44 hello [1] - 76:18 help [3] - 47:18, 60:9, 80:6

helpful [3] - 1:41, 3:42, 5:17 hence [1] - 84:19 hereby [1] - 101:11 hereunto [1] - 101:19 hi [2] - 47:8, 63:33 Hiebert [1] - 13:13 Hiebert's [1] - 16:19

high [2] - 7:11, 36:17 high-caliber [1] -36.17 higher [8] - 7:18, 33:23, 59:16, 59:27, 59:37, 59:40, 64:34, 73:19

highest [1] - 78:14 highlands [1] - 35:2 Highlands [2] - 37:14, 37:29

highlight [2] - 10:18, 10:33 highlights [1] - 64:18

hiking [1] - 35:10 himself [4] - 19:8, 49:17, 49:25, 66:29 hire [1] - 10:13 historically [1] - 79:40 **history** [3] - 61:15,

76:34, 79:28 hit [1] - 55:13 **hmm** [5] - 3:29, 16:47, 28:43, 69:36, 70:25

hold [3] - 58:44, 58:47, 67:26 holding [1] - 77:4 holdings [2] - 40:7,

67:35 Holdings [1] - 1:11

holds [2] - 68:38, 76:42 Hole [1] - 38:8

holus [1] - 19:17 holus-bolus [1] -19:17

home [1] - 36:21 homeowners [1] -44:8

homes [1] - 36:23 honestly [2] - 1:20, 1.21

hope [3] - 33:42, 53:46, 79:19 hopefully [1] - 50:23

horizon [5] - 40:38, 40:45, 41:3, 43:10, 49:28

horticulture [1] -77:34 Hotel [1] - 82:3

hotel [36] - 40:7, 41:37, 81:40, 81:43, 81:47, 82:4, 82:5, 82:8, 82:13, 82:14, 82:18, 82:29, 83:15,

83:17, 83:21, 83:27, 83:28, 84:28, 85:10, 85:29, 87:6, 87:30, 87:35, 87:39, 88:1,

88:22, 89:15, 89:16, 89:17, 89:18, 89:20, 90:6, 90:25, 93:47, 94:33

hotels [1] - 35:19 house [1] - 35:6 housekeeping [2] -1:15, 50:34

HSBC [2] - 38:31, 66:34

huddle [1] - 53:42 hundreds [2] - 22:38, 24:7

hung [1] - 27:16

ı

i) [1] - 40:23 idea [5] - 3:36, 48:7, 61:43, 67:25, 68:4 identical [1] - 93:19 identified [4] - 27:13, 36:35, 38:5, 92:26 identify [3] - 9:31, 45:36, 92:22 illustrate [1] - 36:14 illustrated [1] - 62:12 illustrates [1] - 25:23 image [8] - 92:23, 92:24, 92:27, 92:31, 92:37, 93:1, 93:3, 93.6 images [1] - 93:39 immediate [1] - 68:31

immediately [3] -

5:29, 6:37, 73:26

impact [6] - 21:24, 23:20, 25:31, 39:35, 64:26. 85:33 impacts [1] - 21:31 impair [1] - 9:43 impaired [1] - 72:3 impairing [1] - 97:34 implement [1] - 71:35 imploring [1] - 60:7 important [12] - 4:27, 11:39, 34:7, 35:44, 36:41. 39:12. 45:7. 51:5. 51:13. 61:11. 79:26, 93:12

imminent [2] - 5:32,

5:33

impression [2] - 11:2, 63:19 improprieties [1] -55:43

improvident [1] -51:11 impugned [1] - 87:22

impugns [1] - 96:34 IN [1] - 101:19 inability [1] - 30:20 inadvertently [1] -9:43

inappropriate [2] -32:33, 94:11 Inc [1] - 70:4 incentive [1] - 31:45

incentivize [1] - 32:1 inception [3] - 36:8, 37:39, 76:47 include [3] - 64:11, 66:28, 77:25

included [4] - 40:5. 64:14, 82:2, 82:6 includes [5] - 9:11, 35:14, 36:27, 81:11.

99.1

including [18] - 2:26, 18:22, 18:34, 23:44, 35:9, 35:12, 35:17, 36:38, 37:40, 37:45, 39:30, 43:24, 43:39, 65:12, 76:34, 77:33, 82:9, 90:42

inconsistent [2] -57:38, 57:40 incorporated [2] -40:16, 40:25 incorrect [4] - 28:5, 28:18, 32:10, 42:35 increase [5] - 37:28, 43:5. 47:43. 47:44.

73:27

increased [3] - 41:7, 47:32, 62:28

increases [1] - 43:25 increasing [5] - 37:18, 37:20, 42:44, 73:17, 77:30

incrementally [1] -99:33

incurred [1] - 66:2 indebtedness [2] -66:14, 66:15 indeed [1] - 28:31 indefinitely [1] - 57:46 independent [3] -

19:25, 20:6, 98:9 index [3] - 13:24, 13:26, 14:5

indicated [3] - 58:24, 62:14, 62:30

indiscernible [3] -56:46, 76:14, 77:34 indiscernible] [1] -

84:24

individual [1] - 27:19 individuals [1] - 27:25 indoor [1] - 77:13

inducement [1] -91:22

inference [1] - 49:24 inferences [2] - 55:20, 55:25

information [8] - 3:5, 43:43, 44:25, 90:7, 90:20, 90:40, 90:43

informed [1] - 20:22 informs [1] - 57:17

infrastructure [1] -42:44

ingredient [1] - 77:43 initial [4] - 41:21. 41:26, 62:37, 74:5 initiated [1] - 71:40

injunction [4] - 11:30, 52:8, 52:9, 52:11

injunctive [1] - 33:20 innovative [1] - 76:13 **Innovative** [1] - 70:3

input [2] - 23:45, 98:29 insolvency [6] - 15:10,

23:36, 29:34, 32:43, 72:10

insolvent [1] - 6:7 instability [1] - 89:6 instance [4] - 70:29, 82:41, 85:41, 86:10 instead [2] - 17:35,

19:19

instruct [2] - 66:24, 99:29

instructed [1] - 78:34 instructions [6] -

12:24, 54:7, 54:39, 86:18, 86:23, 86:27 instrument [1] - 8:44 insufficient [5] -52:45. 71:23. 74:17. 74:18. 74:24 insurmountable [1] -8:19 intact [1] - 37:32 integral [2] - 69:2, 69:3 integrated [1] - 67:12 intend [1] - 59:7 intended [2] - 22:14, 77:15 intending [1] - 79:7 intent [7] - 25:36, 59:4, 59:16, 59:27, 62:24, 74:40, 74:44 intention [2] - 57:45, 80:30 intentional [1] - 21:43 inter [1] - 21:22 intercompany [1] -80:46 Interest [1] - 42:17 interest [28] - 7:24, 15:30, 24:31, 25:16, 25:23, 26:7, 26:9, 26:15, 28:8, 31:47, 42:7. 42:15. 42:21. 42:29, 42:31, 43:38, 43:41, 44:27, 44:28, 46:39, 64:39, 65:5, 65:41, 65:44, 72:27, 73:27, 73:38, 74:41 interested [5] - 38:24, 72:35, 88:37, 90:10, 96:40 interests [6] - 24:30, 66:30, 72:12, 88:14, 88:43, 94:5 interfere [2] - 4:29, 21:4 interferes [1] - 97:17 interfering [1] - 97:34 interim [6] - 2:45, 2:46, 3:34, 4:18, 4:33, 5:21 Interim [1] - 3:35 internal [2] - 56:12, 91:2 International [1] -48:5 interparty [1] - 30:36 interrupt [1] - 27:31 interrupting [1] -69:10 intervening [1] - 6:19 intervention [1] - 62:1

intimate [1] - 97:7 investigate [2] - 3:1, 97:39 investigative [1] -4.10 investment [1] - 41:2 Investor [1] - 44:15 investor/developer [1] - 60:27 investors [2] - 28:8, 72:28 invests [1] - 86:11 invite [1] - 83:23 involved [3] - 44:37, 56:23, 87:32 involvement [4] -40:45, 47:18, 70:8, 77:42 involves [1] - 70:41 involving [2] - 48:11, 62:20 Island [3] - 34:46, 93:9, 93:32 isolation [2] - 78:4, 80:19 issue [24] - 3:38, 4:3, 8:10, 8:30, 20:40, 33:21, 33:43, 55:31, 68:31, 68:38, 68:40, 69:9, 71:8, 74:36, 81:31, 85:8, 86:28, 91:7, 91:8, 91:12. 95:2, 95:33, 96:18, 97:25 issued [2] - 74:19, 76:8 issues [15] - 9:20, 15:47, 18:33, 21:13, 23:35, 32:9, 62:5, 68:20, 87:9, 87:25, 88:42, 90:42, 90:45, 94:30, 100:4 issuing [1] - 72:2 itself [4] - 14:33, 68:43, 78:4, 91:4

J

Jackson [24] - 2:41, 15:45, 16:10, 16:34, 16:36, 16:39, 17:20, 18:2, 18:19, 26:34, 28:38, 51:10, 53:37, 54:1, 55:4, 61:12, 74:26, 75:26, 75:27, 75:32, 78:41, 79:22, 85:37, 97:2 JACKSON [40] -10:39, 10:46, 11:4, 13:21, 13:26, 13:33,

30:42, 30:47, 31:2, 31:5, 31:11, 31:16, 79:21, 79:23, 79:33, 79:40, 79:45, 79:47, 80:4, 84:15, 84:19, 84:21, 85:38, 85:44, 86:4, 86:8, 86:14, 86:31, 86:34, 98:35, 98:38, 98:41, 98:44, 99:21, 99:32, 99:36, 99:40, 99:44, 100:10, 100:14 Jackson's [6] - 2:19, 4:37, 12:10, 53:10, 78:16, 79:12 January [8] - 21:15, 29:44, 29:46, 30:13, 30:18, 69:20, 70:15, JLL [6] - 44:1, 44:12, 44:24, 44:47, 45:3, 45:4 **job** [3] - 11:12, 54:15, 70:13 join [1] - 30:9 joining [1] - 60:11 joint [8] - 3:22, 16:12, 16:13, 16:14, 48:24, 60:31, 60:35 jointly [1] - 40:3 Jones [1] - 44:1 July [4] - 59:25, 59:33, 62:13, 81:44 juncture [1] - 33:44 June [18] - 26:31, 41:15, 41:44, 42:11, 42:12, 49:12, 52:40, 53:4, 54:4, 54:28, 55:13, 58:9, 58:41, 58:45, 62:24, 65:2, 65:6, 66:18 jurisdiction [9] - 2:2, 3:20, 3:39, 4:3, 11:18, 11:20, 12:20, 32:46, 99:42 Justice [52] - 1:10, 1:12, 1:13, 10:39, 11:24, 13:21, 13:43, 27:21, 27:37, 30:42, 31:3, 34:24, 34:33, 38:32, 41:16, 41:46, 44:16, 46:4, 50:34, 51:33, 52:39, 53:22, 54:11, 54:22, 55:8, 55:14, 55:21, 57:20, 63:44, 65:7, 69:40, 70:19, 70:32, 75:6, 75:19, 75:23, 75:43,

79:21, 82:24, 84:15,

84:23, 84:41, 85:39,

86:42, 92:11, 96:2, 98:35, 98:41, 99:46, 100:15, 100:16, 100:30 justifiably [1] - 72:42 justified [1] - 71:34 justifies [1] - 60:2

K keen [2] - 45:35, 45:40

keep [7] - 8:6, 8:7,

11:40, 15:20, 19:8,

22:47, 95:32 kept [2] - 93:26, 93:28 key [7] - 23:33, 42:43, 43:4, 43:7, 43:22, 57:33, 77:41 kind [4] - 3:36, 5:40, 20:4, 43:31 kinds [1] - 54:7 knowing [1] - 13:27 knowingly [1] - 61:45 knowledge [1] - 97:7 known [5] - 44:18, 68:45, 76:29, 82:2, 92:38 knows [2] - 27:30, 85:25 Kusumoto [127] -8:42, 9:8, 9:16, 10:25, 10:44, 14:47, 15:2, 15:11, 15:17, 15:25, 15:28, 16:2, 17:32, 19:7, 21:20, 23:4, 23:37, 24:2, 24:19, 25:3, 25:13, 26:30, 29:4, 29:9, 29:33, 29:41, 32:8, 34:12, 40:2, 40:8, 40:26, 43:42, 44:28, 44:32, 44:33, 44:37, 44:40, 44:43, 44:47, 45:13, 45:19, 45:35, 45:39, 46:3, 46:9, 46:21, 46:33, 46:45, 46:46, 47:14, 48:21, 48:29, 49:4, 49:8, 49:13, 49:16, 49:25, 49:35, 55:27, 55:34, 55:39, 55:42, 58:45, 59:2, 59:12, 59:14, 60:7, 60:10, 60:47, 61:20, 61:24, 61:31, 61:41, 62:7, 62:12, 62:14, 62:27, 63:10, 64:5, 65:22, 65:39, 66:21. 66:37. 67:1. 67:13, 67:17, 67:19, 67:24, 67:38, 68:8,

69:9, 69:21, 69:24, 69:45, 70:15, 70:22, 71:15, 71:16, 71:18, 71:20, 71:33, 71:36, 71:40, 72:1, 72:7, 74:4, 76:10, 76:22, 76:27, 87:47, 88:12, 89:2, 91:15, 91:26, 91:41, 92:3, 92:22, 92:26, 93:1, 93:43, 94:12, 98:29 Kusumoto's [20] -8:17, 19:22, 24:1, 25:36, 27:46, 29:31, 35:46, 45:10, 46:11, 47:21, 49:38, 58:12, 62:10, 64:19, 67:24, 69:31, 71:47, 72:31,

68:20, 68:34, 68:37,

L

76:31, 91:45

25:45

Kusumotos [1] -

lack [3] - 67:17, 89:5, 90.42 land [51] - 14:42, 14:45, 15:5, 15:39, 19:3, 19:4, 19:5, 19:7, 21:47, 22:3, 22:6, 22:7, 22:9, 22:12, 23:8, 26:25, 26:40, 27:3, 29:42, 30:20, 32:4, 35:5, 35:22, 36:26, 36:32, 36:39, 37:6, 37:12, 37:13, 37:19, 37:25, 37:27, 37:37, 37:40, 39:15, 39:19, 39:22, 39:47, 42:44, 43:6, 43:15, 43:20, 43:24, 72:30, 72:41, 73:9, 77:30, 78:5, 81:28, 97:24 land-planning [1] -37:27 landed [1] - 84:35 landing [1] - 33:17 lands [23] - 5:7, 8:11, 8:12, 9:12, 9:17, 9:20, 23:44, 36:37, 37:10, 39:16, 42:33, 48:7, 62:9, 62:26, 66:46, 67:3, 67:46, 72:37, 74:32, 95:21, 99:3, 99:5, 99:9 Lang [1] - 44:1 Langford [8] - 5:37, 30:23, 31:12, 31:18,

34:47, 37:13, 68:45, 68:47 large [4] - 38:1, 46:29, 77:37, 94:33 larger [2] - 7:43, 69:34 largest [2] - 77:13, 81:38 Larocque [4] - 77:47, 78:12, 87:24, 93:33 **LaSalle** [1] - 44:1 last [12] - 2:43, 15:16, 30:26, 32:7, 34:4, 34:5, 38:46, 39:5, 53:28, 58:18, 64:38, 73:43 lasts [1] - 6:39 late [7] - 1:6, 42:42, 43:46, 65:47, 66:42, 89:1, 98:36 launch [4] - 48:16, 48:36, 48:38, 58:43 launched [1] - 82:20 Law [4] - 3:21, 33:6, 33:10, 57:23 lawyers [1] - 62:13 lead [3] - 43:8, 49:21, 54:1 lead-up [1] - 49:21 leadership [2] - 49:31, 89:8 leading [2] - 4:31, 43:44 $\textbf{leads} \ [2] \ \textbf{-} \ 77:32,$ 77:38 learned [5] - 49:5, 56:18, 56:31, 70:1, 76:33 learns [1] - 49:7 lease [3] - 81:40, 81:43, 87:30 leased [1] - 81:45 least [18] - 9:31, 25:36, 28:30, 33:44, 36:23, 36:28, 53:7, 74:1, 78:44, 94:44, 97:17, 97:19, 97:34, 99:16, 99:21, 100:5 leave [9] - 1:24, 15:47, 37:32, 56:34, 66:37, 82:25, 91:30, 95:4, 99:7 **led** [1] - 64:16 **left** [4] - 10:35, 11:1, 37:11, 91:37 lend [3] - 5:3, 5:4, 25:25 lender [19] - 18:29, 24:32, 25:32, 31:39, 31:44, 65:32, 72:35, 72:42, 73:5, 73:9,

73:29, 73:45, 73:47, 74:7, 74:10, 74:46, 74.47 lender's [2] - 41:25, 73:39 lengthy [2] - 58:4, 70:35 less [6] - 26:38, 33:33, 37:12, 41:1, 41:39, 47:39 letter [21] - 18:13, 18:14, 18:18, 18:25, 40:32, 42:11, 42:12, 42:26, 45:15, 59:16, 59:27, 61:46, 62:4, 62:24, 71:29, 72:6, 72:32, 72:34, 74:39, 74:44, 87:6 letters [3] - 59:4, 59:6, 71:30 level [5] - 6:43, 21:47, 22:41, 29:3, 32:19 leverage [3] - 22:21, 31:39, 67:28 levers [1] - 49:43 liability [12] - 19:28, 40:10, 82:14, 82:18, 82:42, 82:44, 83:19, 84:7, 84:36, 85:6, 85:9, 88:23 liable [1] - 85:10 liberty [1] - 2:12 light [3] - 1:42, 20:47, 21:2 likely [1] - 74:30 limit [3] - 12:11, 31:45, 58.14 Limited [1] - 1:11 limited [17] - 2:4, 3:37, 4:41, 7:3, 7:38, 21:42, 27:1, 28:12, 30:39, 40:10, 64:36, 81:29, 95:25, 95:35, 97:45, 98:24, 99:28 limited-basis [1] -97:45 **limits** [2] - 32:11, 54:16 line [6] - 9:14, 47:5, 51:12, 51:36, 59:11, 79:26 lined [3] - 1:33, 1:34, 10:5 link [2] - 27:15, 27:21 liquidity [5] - 28:4, 28:6, 28:12, 39:22, 100.4

list [6] - 10:37, 28:39.

31:8, 31:10, 35:42,

74:35

18:6, 51:35 listing [5] - 18:22, 19:4, 36:5, 76:8, 77:18 litigation [15] - 8:43, 21:8, 21:21, 24:39, 28:37, 28:39, 29:6, 30:36, 30:37, 30:38, 31:3, 31:5, 31:11, 67:16, 72:39 living [1] - 8:22 **LLP** [5] - 1:11, 20:43, 40:13, 40:14, 44:11 Loan [2] - 39:24, 41:5 loan [84] - 15:6, 18:36, 18:37, 18:45, 19:2, 19:19, 21:6, 21:45, 22:21, 22:39, 24:34, 25:14, 25:22, 26:8, 26:16, 26:24, 26:26, 26:30, 26:41, 27:2, 32:4, 40:33, 40:36, 41:11, 41:13, 41:15, 41:24, 41:27, 41:28, 41:31, 41:34, 41:38, 41:41, 41:42, 41:44, 42:14, 42:20, 42:23, 42:27, 42:35, 42:36, 42:38, 58:9, 58:11, 58:13, 58:15, 58:22, 58:32, 64:1, 64:28, 64:32, 64:33, 64:46, 65:2, 65:5, 65:14, 65:26, 65:27, 65:30, 66:2, 66:4, 72:16, 72:19, 72:45, 73:2, 73:15, 73:19, 73:20, 73:24, 73:37, 74:12, 74:15, 74:16, 74:17, 74:21, 74:36, 80:46, 81:24, 81:29, 97:26, 97:29, 97:40 loans [2] - 22:11, 25:17 local [1] - 93:10 located [1] - 69:5 location [1] - 87:40 locker [1] - 82:10 LOI [2] - 38:19, 59:37 long-standing [1] -93:12 long-term [1] - 39:35 look [21] - 1:45, 3:12, 7:36, 7:45, 8:5, 13:31, 14:4, 14:5, 17:33, 33:26, 41:46, 81:14, 86:17, 86:24, 97:4, 97:47, 98:3,

listen [1] - 4:34

listened [3] - 2:41,

98:10, 98:14, 98:31 looked [1] - 7:12 looking [10] - 40:39, 46:32, 49:27, 53:19, 53:25, 57:21, 65:4, 79:8, 92:32, 97:37 looks [3] - 31:31, 50:12, 98:2 **Lordship** [2] - 53:22, 55:14 loss [2] - 14:37, 91:15 loud [1] - 19:37 love [1] - 87:44 low [1] - 78:35 lower [6] - 7:14, 47:29, 47:38, 64:31, 73:37, 73:39 lunch [7] - 11:47, 12:33, 50:11, 50:28, 51:26, 51:28, 75:24 M 16:47, 28:43, 69:36,

m'mm [5] - 3:29, 70:25 m'mm-hmm [5] - 3:29, 16:47, 28:43, 69:36, 70:25 Madam [4] - 13:6, 27:12, 27:27, 50:22 main [6] - 45:43, 55:2, 69:38, 85:5, 85:7, 95:18 maintain [1] - 80:18 maintaining [1] -67:15 maintenance [2] -77:39, 79:25 major [2] - 17:7, 100:16 Malak [3] - 87:28, 87:44, 88:12 manage [5] - 34:8, 52:25, 81:14, 99:8, 99:11 managed [3] - 57:42, 81:10, 98:7 management [19] -35:46, 36:3, 69:19, 69:23, 69:29, 70:4, 70:7, 70:10, 70:14, 70:38, 75:47, 76:19, 76:29, 81:11, 81:18, 87:21, 88:34, 91:37, manager [4] - 23:38, 23:42, 37:25, 77:47 managers [2] - 37:44, 77:34

manages [1] - 32:14 managing [12] - 34:6, 35:21, 36:8, 40:16, 40:17, 40:29, 45:14, 51:37, 66:22, 66:23, 66:26. 66:31 mandate [1] - 100:17 manner [2] - 45:28, 88:37 manufactured [1] -22:20 Maple [1] - 7:12 March [3] - 18:42, 26:31, 73:34 marked [1] - 13:2 markedly [1] - 91:35 market [12] - 14:36, 17:7, 39:2, 39:14, 39:18, 43:42, 45:5, 45:7, 45:28, 61:14, 65:41, 72:25 marketed [3] - 38:13, 38:15, 38:18 Marketing [2] - 16:29, 16:33 marketing [15] - 1:30, 3:12, 17:19, 24:47, 28:20, 37:3, 38:17, 38:19, 43:47, 44:2, 48:16, 58:39, 58:47, 59:3, 88:34 marking [1] - 61:13 master [4] - 34:45, 35:2, 35:11, 63:14 master-planned [3] -34:45, 35:2, 35:11 material [2] - 4:27, 7:45 materials [6] - 1:27, 1:31, 6:4, 7:19, 12:1, 53:3 matter [12] - 1:7, 1:10, 2:4, 25:22, 52:45, 54:32, 75:16, 83:47, 92:30, 92:34, 92:43, 98:10 matters [9] - 7:6, 29:6,

29:26, 50:35, 62:40,

72:33, 72:39, 85:9,

Matthews [165] - 2:26,

11:5, 15:15, 15:22,

15:26, 15:32, 15:36,

15:44, 17:36, 18:20,

18:43, 19:1, 19:10,

22:23, 22:25, 23:5,

24:11, 24:40, 24:42,

25:4, 25:31, 25:38,

26:22, 28:27, 29:2,

4:39, 7:46, 8:17,

87:19

20.22 20.22 20.44
29:32, 29:33, 29:41,
30:16, 31:41, 32:3,
34:13, 35:20, 35:35,
35:42, 36:2, 36:13,
36:44, 36:47, 37:7,
07.04.00.04.00.40
37:24, 38:24, 38:42,
40:2, 40:26, 40:27,
40:40, 40:42, 41:9,
41:18, 43:2, 43:10,
43:41, 44:10, 44:11,
44:31, 46:4, 46:10,
46:14, 46:19, 46:32,
46:45, 47:12, 47:16,
47:21, 47:26, 47:32,
47:40, 47:41, 49:5,
49:7, 49:23, 49:35,
49:40, 49:41, 51:12,
55:23, 56:36, 57:15,
57:31, 57:35, 58:3,
58:5, 58:40, 59:22,
60:7, 61:23, 61:28,
61:32, 61:40, 61:44,
62:11, 62:14, 63:10,
63:29, 63:39, 65:18,
65:21, 65:36, 65:40,
65:42, 66:20, 66:21,
67:2, 67:14, 67:24,
67:43, 67:44, 68:13,
68:24, 68:35, 69:12,
69:13, 69:44, 69:45,
70:2, 70:6, 70:22,
70:23, 71:15, 71:20,
71:40, 71:46, 72:20,
72:47 72:24 74:4
72:47, 73:34, 74:4,
74:6, 74:34, 74:40,
74:43, 76:26, 77:32,
77:37, 77:45, 80:8,
80:41, 87:32, 87:45,
88:5, 88:8, 88:35,
88:36, 88:42, 89:2,
89:3, 89:42, 91:14,
91:26, 94:2, 94:19,
94:22, 95:1, 95:3,
95:28, 95:41, 96:11,
96:37, 96:43, 97:6,
99:18
Matthews' [40] -
15:29, 19:22, 25:33,
36:5, 37:36, 38:44,
44:38, 44:46, 45:18,
45:32, 47:2, 47:17,
56:15, 56:29, 58:35,
63:18, 64:17, 65:43,
67:10, 67:30, 67:45,
68:5, 69:22, 70:13,
70:44, 71:37, 75:46,
77:24, 77:42, 80:21,
80:28, 81:6, 87:21,
88:2, 88:32, 89:8,
89:11, 91:37, 96:34,
97:12

Matthews's [2] -25:18, 42:47 maturity [1] - 72:45 maximized [1] - 23:40 mean [14] - 2:31, 2:46, 4:32, 10:39, 12:7, 56:9, 79:24, 79:28, 85:38, 86:8, 86:9, 95:13, 99:9, 99:37 meaning [1] - 4:31 meaningful [2] -63:19, 79:33 meaningfully [3] -21:7, 97:29, 98:19 means [9] - 15:29, 18:44, 35:3, 47:29, 50:44, 51:21, 81:32, 94:5, 96:43 media [1] - 27:19 mediation [2] - 29:3, 29:10 meet [4] - 2:22, 2:23, 78:7, 98:5 meeting [3] - 32:19, 48:32, 62:16 meets [1] - 48:40 members [2] - 35:13, 35:14 membership [2] -69:2, 77:38 memorandum [1] -61:27 **mention** [1] - 64:15 mentioned [1] - 45:2 mentions [1] - 18:5 merits [1] - 52:21 mess [1] - 85:32 message [3] - 26:11, 44:9, 61:44 messaging [1] - 61:6 met [3] - 10:47, 11:4, 91:25 middle [1] - 53:16 might [12] - 4:5, 9:29, 21:24, 21:26, 21:27, 53:24, 53:29, 53:47, 54:1, 84:38, 86:2, 98:38 million [27] - 7:40, 15:4, 17:31, 22:35, 24:9, 24:34, 25:15, 25:28, 25:30, 26:28, 26:32, 26:35, 26:37, 26:40, 51:10, 58:14, 64:29, 64:40, 65:4, 68:42, 73:16, 73:37, 73:41, 73:43, 74:18, 79:42, 97:32 millions [2] - 22:38,

24:7

mind [8] - 8:6, 15:21, 16:7, 53:28, 56:33, 95:29, 96:3, 96:7 mindful [2] - 9:4, 20:45 mine [2] - 3:46, 13:35 mineral [1] - 22:1 **minimalist** [1] - 31:36 minimize [1] - 6:23 minimum [2] - 73:42, 74:1 mining [1] - 22:1 minute [10] - 13:19, 27:32. 39:5. 39:8. 57:3, 63:22, 65:35, 80:12, 89:31, 92:8 minutes [9] - 2:33, 2:40, 50:13, 50:16, 50:17, 50:19, 50:25, 52:34, 52:37 mischaracterized [1] -4:14 mischaracterizing [1] - 8:9 mischief [3] - 26:43, 26:45, 86:21 misconduct [1] - 89:8 mismanagement [4] -88:2, 88:32, 89:7, 89:11 missed [1] - 90:44 missing [1] - 98:40 mistrust [2] - 10:29, 11:8 **mix** [2] - 5:3, 30:10 mixing [1] - 6:1 model [4] - 3:25, 43:7, 43:23 modest [1] - 5:11 modicum [1] - 53:44 modification [3] -41:43, 42:13, 42:39 modified [1] - 7:30 Mogensen [1] - 37:25 moment [2] - 11:27, 92:12 momentum [1] - 43:19 Monday [1] - 54:32 monetization [1] -98:18 monetize [5] - 23:43, 24:15, 28:33, 98:1, 98.4 monetized [1] - 2:22 monetizing [1] - 98:15 money [14] - 4:27, 4:44, 5:3, 5:36, 9:13, 19:21, 22:7, 22:9, 23:16, 23:21, 65:15, 65:32, 78:32, 97:27

6:18, 15:6 monitored [1] - 39:21 month [11] - 47:39, 60:6, 64:47, 65:1, 70:5, 70:15, 78:8, 79:42, 99:12, 99:16 monthly [7] - 42:34, 69:23, 70:14, 70:45, 73:42, 74:1, 76:19 months [11] - 10:25, 10:26, 10:44, 18:47, 73:24, 73:42, 73:43, 91:28, 91:32, 93:6, 93:28 months' [1] - 73:28 morning [9] - 1:13, 25:10, 27:4, 27:7, 48:8, 50:46, 53:28, 92:24, 96:46 Mortgage [1] - 18:28 **mortgage** [1] - 66:9 most [5] - 15:39, 25:2, 26:19, 37:5, 44:4 motion [7] - 11:40, 12:24, 52:36, 53:10, 75:28, 75:29 motions [2] - 52:35, 52:42 motivation [1] - 94:37 mountain [3] - 37:38, 43:18, 77:11 Mountain [46] - 9:11, 26:4, 34:45, 36:18, 36:22, 36:25, 37:38, 38:3, 38:24, 38:26, 39:32, 39:36, 40:1, 40:4, 40:5, 40:46, 43:6, 43:25, 43:31, 43:40, 44:2, 44:4, 44:9, 44:16, 44:20, 44:23, 45:25, 45:29, 46:27, 48:7, 60:43, 62:10, 65:42, 67:4, 68:47, 69:6, 72:37, 77:9, 77:12, 77:44, 80:25, 82:3, 87:36, 89:14, 90:11, 93:27 Mountain's [2] -40:29, 61:15 move [7] - 12:26, 44:12, 59:3, 68:11, 75:15, 75:44, 76:36 Moving [1] - 60:39 moving [1] - 49:30 multi [1] - 53:26 multi-week [1] - 53:26 multiple [3] - 35:16, 41:38 multiples [1] - 52:38

moneys [4] - 4:19, 6:8,

municipal [1] - 35:1 must [2] - 3:23, 58:28 mutually [1] - 63:3

Ν

name [2] - 62:21, 101:20 narrow [2] - 20:40, 83:47 narrowly [1] - 20:39 NATHANSON [29] -11:24, 11:26, 11:29, 11:34, 11:39, 11:43, 11:46, 12:4, 50:6, 51:33, 52:7, 52:11, 52:15, 52:18, 52:24, 52:29, 52:33, 52:42, 53:35, 53:40, 54:3, 54:10, 54:22, 75:19, 75:27, 75:31, 75:35, 84:23, 84:32 Nathanson [8] -11:25, 32:25, 34:10, 50:5, 50:19, 51:32, 55:5, 75:26 Nathanson's [1] -12:29 nature [1] - 32:30 naught [1] - 5:41 near [1] - 91:4 **nearly** [1] - 43:39 necessary [5] - 2:29, 4:20, 6:41, 12:5, 51:44 need [50] - 3:4, 3:11, 4:6, 4:15, 5:22, 6:9, 6:20, 6:34, 9:4, 10:47, 12:8, 12:13, 12:15, 12:20, 13:25, 13:38, 13:40, 21:36, 21:37, 23:21, 28:29, 28:32, 30:35, 32:34, 32:37, 33:24, 41:6, 45:36, 49:47, 50:2, 50:10, 51:6, 51:19, 51:30, 54:14, 54:20, 54:26, 54:45, 54:47, 55:4, 63:1, 70:40, 73:28, 80:5, 81:25, 86:32, 87:10, 87:11, 87:12, 89:23 needed [7] - 5:29, 14:42, 14:44, 28:24, 43:43, 64:37, 64:38 needs [17] - 2:22, 8:8, 21:6, 22:12, 26:46, 26:47, 29:10, 29:11,

30:29, 30:37, 68:22,

75:5, 78:8, 81:15,

opine [1] - 95:40

98:7, 98:32 negative [1] - 38:41 negatively [1] - 39:31 negotiation [1] - 62:18 negotiations [3] -46:47, 63:39, 74:9 neighbourhoods [1] -43:30 neutral [1] - 23:32 never [4] - 9:45, 10:26, 60:21, 80:30 **new** [13] - 12:47, 13:5, 13:8, 13:12, 27:13, 46:40, 48:5, 49:13, 49:30, 59:27, 90:13, 92:15, 92:17 newly [1] - 56:27 news [4] - 38:38, 39:41, 44:15, 70:17 newsletter [1] - 44:8 next [54] - 2:33, 2:44, 3:7, 3:8, 3:17, 4:23, 5:11, 6:29, 6:31, 7:21, 11:15, 16:39, 17:2, 17:23, 18:3, 19:29, 29:26, 29:31, 30:5, 30:12, 30:15, 36:21, 41:33, 44:13, 44:22, 44:35, 46:21, 46:37, 47:3, 47:4, 47:38, 48:38, 51:31, 53:23, 53:24, 53:30, 53:34, 53:37, 53:41, 54:19, 54:30, 69:8, 70:20, 75:3, 75:17, 75:18, 75:30, 75:38, 75:44, 81:41, 83:45, 84:41, 89:23, 93:13 nice [2] - 93:26, 93:30 Nicklaus [1] - 77:10 Nicklaus-designed [1] - 77:10 night [2] - 2:43, 53:28 nine [2] - 36:28, 36:35 NOA [1] - 1:47 nomenclature [1] nominee [2] - 49:13, 68:18 **nonbinding** [1] - 59:6 none [1] - 74:47 nonetheless [1] -96:22 nonrefundable [1] -63:2 nonresidents [1] -35:14 nonstarter [1] - 74:8 North [1] - 68:45 north [1] - 34:46

notably [1] - 38:9 note [4] - 29:18, 29:23, 47:45, 84:25 noted [6] - 18:34, 19:11, 31:37, 64:42, 72:34, 76:42 notes [2] - 58:7, 82:17 nothing [17] - 5:32, 14:38, 19:17, 26:22, 29:13, 30:31, 30:34, 32:21, 55:24, 55:25, 56:41, 84:19, 84:24, 85:26, 91:21, 93:28, 96:33 nothing's [1] - 31:24 notice [10] - 2:16, 3:15, 12:14, 28:16, 41:28, 41:30, 41:40, 69:11, 69:14, 83:27 notorious [1] - 44:18 notwithstanding [1] -34.16 November [3] - 41:5, 41:45, 42:21 number [20] - 7:39, 8:21, 27:28, 29:20, 29:34, 30:19, 35:35, 36:31, 42:43, 43:4, 45:32, 47:3, 51:39, 62:39, 63:21, 69:39, 77:36, 78:43, 80:14, 91:45 numbered [2] - 67:43, 68:7 numbers [4] - 13:22, 13:23, 27:14 numerous [1] - 43:38

0

o'clock [4] - 1:8, 50:23, 54:46, 75:22 objected [1] - 62:4 **objecting** [2] - 56:43, 71:21 objection [1] - 71:28 objections [2] - 74:11, 74:13 objectives [2] - 42:43, 43:4 objects [1] - 74:22 **obligation** [3] - 42:34, 71:43, 71:44 obligations [2] -36:33, 42:38 observe[1] - 84:33 observed [1] - 51:39 obtaining [1] - 28:11 obvious [2] - 50:26,

94:7

occasion [1] - 53:18 occasions [2] - 25:41, occurred [10] - 1:39, 1:40, 33:22, 34:14, 49:15, 69:20, 70:12, 73:11, 87:34, 90:46 occurring [4] - 58:28, 58:36, 70:34, 88:9 occurs [2] - 48:19, 49:44 October [5] - 39:46, 40:32, 42:42, 61:30, 72:32 oddest [1] - 15:13 off-the-cuff [1] - 21:12 offer [11] - 5:3, 18:27, 59:7, 59:24, 59:41, 60:45, 61:3, 61:4, 61:7, 64:41 Offer [1] - 60:39 offered [1] - 18:33 offering [1] - 61:26 offers [9] - 15:5, 17:24, 17:31, 23:17, 28:8, 28:10, 46:15, 59:10, 63:45 office [1] - 82:9 officer [15] - 2:47. 4:11, 4:18, 6:28, 7:21, 8:14, 9:21, 10:1, 10:21, 10:31, 12:22, 76:6, 90:17, 90:32, 90:35 Official [1] - 101:9 often [4] - 88:37, 90:17, 90:41, 90:46 **OHAMA** [5] - 16:14, 16:17, 100:22, 100:25, 100:28 Ohama [2] - 100:20, 100:21 OHAMA-DARCUS [5] - 16:14, 16:17, 100:22, 100:25, 100:28 Ohama-Darcus [1] -100:21 older [1] - 81:37 once [2] - 11:1, 63:36

one [81] - 1:17, 3:18,

5:22, 6:22, 7:20,

9:24, 12:23, 13:1,

13:3, 13:12, 14:18,

16:25, 18:8, 21:19,

22:39, 23:12, 23:19,

27:25, 27:26, 29:18,

obviously [5] - 1:35,

36:31, 38:16, 70:12,

29:23, 29:26, 29:45, 29:47, 30:1, 30:2, 30:5, 30:6, 30:12, 30:15, 30:17, 30:26, 30:29, 30:30, 30:43, 31:37, 32:28, 34:25, 35:44, 36:42, 39:13, 40:11, 40:18, 43:7, 43:22, 44:14, 47:39, 50:35, 51:9, 51:12, 60:16, 64:43, 64:44, 64:46, 65:7, 68:40, 69:3, 74:11, 74:13, 76:28, 76:44, 77:45, 80:8, 81:38, 84:36, 85:20, 87:7, 90:28, 90:47, 91:7, 92:14, 92:15, 93:20, 93:41, 94:26, 95:26, 97:2, 99:15 one-fifth [1] - 22:39 one-line [1] - 51:12 ones [2] - 30:18, 34:28 ongoing [6] - 24:39, 24:45, 29:30, 56:25, 80:26, 89:5 open [1] - 36:37 opening [1] - 1:36 operate [7] - 2:24, 32:22, 47:13, 77:16, 82:8, 95:3, 95:28 operated [6] - 14:40, 32:14, 57:35, 69:15, 77:1, 89:20 operates [2] - 77:8, 88:35 operating [8] - 2:26, 15:37, 24:24, 39:23, 46:19, 77:27, 78:8, 80:23 operation [16] - 24:17, 34:37, 38:1, 40:29, 77:37, 85:39, 95:14, 95:17, 96:21, 97:18, 97:20, 97:28, 97:30, 97:35, 99:19, 99:26 operations [26] - 2:39, 3:1, 3:11, 6:3, 6:4, 6:5, 6:35, 6:37, 22:4, 23:34, 39:31, 41:36, 74:32, 77:23, 77:25, 77:26, 78:1, 80:19, 81:45, 88:18, 92:18, 94:17, 96:11, 96:15, 97:8, 100:12 operator [8] - 89:47, 90:10, 90:18, 90:22, 90:38, 91:3, 91:9, 91:21

operators [1] - 83:17

opportunities [3] -35:17, 64:23, 67:26 opportunity [2] -38:25, 68:3 opposed [2] - 48:12, 48.14 opposing [1] - 27:43 oppress [2] - 22:24, 34:13 oppression [26] -11:31, 15:47, 28:40, 29:38, 30:12, 32:8, 32:12, 32:26, 32:31, 32:39, 33:6, 34:5, 34:17, 34:41, 41:10, 43:3, 45:32, 49:39, 53:11, 56:30, 58:40, 65:38, 69:19, 72:15, 75:29, 81:9 oppressive [5] -23:28, 25:12, 57:11, 94:20, 94:25 optimism [1] - 10:40 optimistic [1] - 54:10 option [2] - 17:7, 74:45 options [3] - 7:36, 19:11, 74:35 oral [1] - 17:39 order [83] - 1:41, 2:3, 3:19, 3:25, 3:26, 4:18, 4:33, 5:17, 5:30, 6:35, 8:10, 8:13, 8:25, 8:30, 9:11, 9:25, 11:19, 11:36, 11:37, 11:44, 12:5, 12:34, 14:22, 15:31, 21:21, 21:24, 21:31, 22:37, 24:38, 27:6, 28:15, 28:16, 28:21, 28:35, 32:40, 33:12, 33:14, 33:15, 33:43. 34:43. 38:34. 43:43. 50:1. 50:3. 50:27, 50:37, 51:45, 54:1, 57:19, 71:7, 75:9, 83:46, 85:13, 85:23, 85:33, 86:2, 86:10, 94:38, 95:2, 95:7, 95:35, 95:39, 95:44, 95:45, 96:4, 96:7, 96:18, 96:21, 96:31, 97:10, 97:16, 97:17, 97:24, 97:41, 97:45, 98:24, 99:44, 100:5, 100:23, 101:1 ordered [2] - 6:41, 37:3 orderly [2] - 18:43,

59:11 orders [1] - 52:21 ordinary [3] - 31:23, 69:28, 84:16 ordinary-course [2] -31:23, 69:28 organizations [1] -77.43 organize [2] - 13:20, 75:16 original [1] - 42:14 originally [1] - 52:35 otherwise [1] - 12:31 ought [1] - 70:23 ourselves [1] - 53:38 outcome [1] - 39:39 **outdoor** [2] - 77:13 outright [2] - 63:6, 83:35 outset [1] - 33:18 outside [3] - 67:27, 91:22, 93:29 outstanding [9] -28:37, 29:6, 29:12, 30:7, 30:36, 42:22, 58:13, 80:25, 87:9 overall [11] - 23:18, 23:20, 40:29, 62:43, 70:7, 72:15, 77:25, 77:29, 78:18, 78:30, 78.43 overblown [1] - 6:15 overlap [1] - 87:1 overly [1] - 20:23 overriding [1] - 17:21 overseeing [2] - 36:7, 77:24 oversees [1] - 77:39 oversight [1] - 3:11 overview [6] - 14:6, 14:8, 14:25, 20:15, 20:37 owe [1] - 9:13 owed [2] - 23:16, 36:33 owing [5] - 5:36, 6:9, 22:33, 23:32, 25:14 own [8] - 22:22, 23:24, 31:38, 43:19, 67:39, 69:15, 69:16, 73:13 owned [3] - 66:46, 67:5, 68:18 owner [1] - 89:19 owners [2] - 38:27, 82.4 Owners [1] - 44:17 owners/operators [1] - 89:14 ownership [2] - 44:20, 90:11

owns [3] **-** 68:6, 68:7, 77:7

Ρ

packages [1] - 90:8 page [36] - 16:24, 16:30, 16:39, 16:45, 17:2, 18:20, 18:30, 18:38, 22:26, 25:7, 27:38, 31:32, 34:33, 35:40, 35:41, 36:46, 42:16, 44:7, 46:21, 47:3, 48:27, 48:42, 48:43, 60:38, 60:40, 62:35, 63:9, 69:39, 76:38, 76:39, 89:41, 92:19, 93:21, 93:23 pages [1] - 69:8 paid [29] - 6:9, 6:20, 17:34, 17:37, 18:35, 27:2, 30:31, 30:44, 30:46, 31:1, 41:13, 41:26, 58:28, 63:47, 65:46, 66:7, 66:8, 66:10, 68:40, 70:14, 70:40, 71:3, 72:13, 73:19, 74:46, 76:1, 78:29, 79:41, 81:15 paragraph [79] -17:25, 17:28, 17:38, 18:26, 18:31, 18:38, 19:26, 19:46, 20:1, 20:15, 20:37, 21:40, 22:45, 27:47, 34:34, 34:44, 35:25, 35:27, 35:29, 36:46, 37:8, 38:2, 38:23, 38:46, 39:6, 39:9, 40:30, 40:42, 41:17, 41:20, 41:33, 42:5, 42:9, 42:10, 42:41, 43:3, 48:23, 55:9, 55:11, 57:16, 57:28, 58:19, 58:38, 58:42, 61:23, 61:29, 62:2, 62:22, 63:27, 63:43, 64:4, 64:27, 65:11, 65:20, 69:8, 69:17, 69:42, 70:30, 72:18, 74:42, 75:45, 76:4, 76:32, 76:40, 80:10, 80:13, 80:40, 81:18, 81:46, 82:17, 83:22, 83:25, 84:42, 86:44, 87:16, 88:5, 88:30, 91:25 paragraphs [6] -

59:19, 63:21, 70:21,

76:30, 81:34, 87:13

parallel [2] - 86:46,

95:43

parcel [1] - 29:42 parkway [2] - 31:18, 43:17 part [25] - 6:24, 14:12, 14:25, 31:2, 34:35, 35:44, 37:3, 38:6, 38:19, 38:32, 54:3, 55:10, 55:43, 59:34, 64:30, 69:2, 72:14, 77:28, 77:29, 77:41, 82:19, 87:20, 89:35, 91.5 participated [1] -64:20 participating [1] -27:23 participation [1] -59:47 particular [1] - 62:21 particularly [5] -54:17, 88:19, 94:27, 94:28, 99:5 parties [16] - 5:4, 9:45, 10:19, 10:30, 15:35, 15:36, 21:8, 21:10, 21:22, 21:35, 22:28, 24:3, 30:11, 30:28, 33:25, 98:23 parties' [6] - 34:38, 40:37, 51:42, 62:5, 63:41, 82:6 **partition** [1] - 19:9 partly [2] - 34:47, 35:1 partner [26] - 7:5, 7:15, 9:3, 15:40, 22:22, 23:34, 24:41, 25:20, 25:35, 31:40, 34:6, 35:21, 40:16, 40:17, 58:1, 59:17, 59:28, 59:39, 63:13, 65:33, 65:34, 66:22, 66:26, 66:31, 89:19, 90:47 partner's [1] - 7:1 partnered [1] - 39:47 partners [15] - 7:25, 8:28, 15:34, 19:4, 19:10, 20:47, 23:6, 23:8, 23:45, 34:8, 59:39, 66:23, 90:19, 90:38, 94:27 partnership [167] -7:6, 7:15, 21:45, 22:33, 23:39, 23:41, 23:43, 24:13, 24:18, 25:18, 25:24, 25:26, 25:34, 26:33, 30:17, 32:10, 34:36, 35:22, 36:33, 37:11, 37:13, 37:16, 37:22, 37:26,

37:35, 37:42, 37:43, 38:1, 40:12, 40:15, 40:19, 41:28, 41:31, 42:42, 43:34, 43:37, 43:47, 45:24, 46:32, 46:39, 47:20, 48:4, 57:12, 58:26, 58:30, 59:15, 59:46, 60:11, 60:28, 62:15, 62:25, 62:26, 64:22, 66:20, 66:26, 66:31, 66:41, 67:11, 67:12, 67:27, 68:17, 68:19, 68:22, 68:23, 68:25, 68:35, 68:36, 70:33, 70:34, 70:37, 70:38, 70:39, 70:42, 70:43, 70:45, 71:2. 71:5. 71:9. 71:17. 71:18. 71:44. 72:26, 72:29, 72:43, 73:46, 76:42, 76:43, 76:45, 76:46, 77:2, 77:3, 77:6, 77:7, 77:16, 77:20, 78:1, 78:6, 78:7, 78:10, 78:21, 78:31, 78:45, 79:1, 79:39, 80:29, 80:36, 81:12, 81:13, 81:17, 81:26, 81:27, 81:42, 81:43, 81:46, 81:47, 82:5, 82:7, 82:13, 83:7, 84:5, 84:6, 84:28, 84:38, 85:11, 85:15, 85:22, 87:31, 88:15, 88:18, 88:38, 88:44, 89:6, 90:3, 90:24, 90:26, 90:27, 90:28, 91:10, 93:11, 93:44, 94:2, 94:6, 94:16, 94:17, 94:18, 95:8, 95:9, 95:12, 95:18, 95:42, 96:8, 96:13, 96:20, 96:44, 97:13, 97:24, 97:28, 97:42, 97:43, 97:44, 98:6, 98:20, 98:26 Partnership [9] -39:29, 59:26, 59:28, 70:2, 80:24, 80:44, 80:46, 81:1, 81:2 partnership's [36] -21:44, 24:4, 24:32, 26:10, 26:38, 28:4, 28:33, 36:36, 37:5, 37:19, 37:45, 38:3, 39:14, 40:30, 42:37, 62:13, 65:24, 65:28,

66:19, 69:22, 70:31,

70:43, 71:3, 71:13,

72:3, 73:7, 73:32,

76:37, 77:25, 78:3, 78:7, 81:38, 83:6, 93:45, 95:18, 95:34 Partnership's [2] -39:19, 39:30 partnerships [6] -32:13, 34:17, 40:10, 40:18, 55:27, 66:24 Partnerships [1] -70.8 partway [1] - 48:25 party [14] - 4:47, 5:38, 19:27, 23:33, 26:26, 31:47, 39:2, 47:42, 47:44, 62:21, 63:30, 63:35, 72:25, 85:29 pass [2] - 1:28, 27:42 passive/active [1] -59:38 past [2] - 61:15, 91:28 path [2] - 5:34, 24:12 pattern [2] - 25:12, 62:7 pause [4] - 61:35, 63:12, 64:13, 67:20 pay [32] - 2:24, 4:19, 6:19, 15:39, 15:41, 18:44, 19:2, 21:6, 22:11, 23:16, 23:20, 23:24, 30:20, 32:4, 41:15, 41:21, 64:38, 65:24, 65:43, 66:20, 69:14, 70:43, 71:13, 71:46, 74:12, 74:14, 80:29, 80:30, 97:29, 97:31, 98:4, 98:5 payable [13] - 5:33, 31:18, 37:21, 70:33, 71:11, 73:39, 78:18, 78:42, 79:16, 81:3, 81:21, 81:25, 81:37 payables [11] - 2:23, 4:12, 4:13, 4:15, 4:19. 5:44. 6:2. 79:30, 80:26, 80:34 paying [8] - 6:10, 7:3, 14:43, 25:37, 28:28, 31:46, 67:2, 79:29 payment [6] - 66:42, 69:21, 69:26, 69:29, 70:16, 73:41 payment's [1] - 72:13 payments [10] - 42:35, 65:15, 69:28, 70:28, 71:39, 71:41, 72:2, 72:13, 73:43, 74:1 payroll [4] - 2:23, 69:10, 69:14, 98:5 pays [1] - 37:35 Peak [5] - 38:7, 48:17,

60:1, 60:14, 61:7 penalty [2] - 66:3, 66:43 pending [4] - 29:13, 30:32, 30:38, 31:26 people [7] - 7:39, 10:37, 12:34, 23:16, 23:21, 24:6, 24:8 **per** [3] - 25:16, 42:23, 70:5 **perceived** [1] - 39:33 percent [15] - 25:26, 37:32, 41:24, 42:23, 46:19, 65:28, 65:29, 66:3, 66:43, 67:33, 67:34, 67:40, 67:41, 73:20, 73:26 perception [2] - 38:41, 60:28 perhaps [11] - 32:41, 44:34, 48:12, 49:25, 49:27, 49:45, 50:6, 55:33, 75:2, 95:13, 97.6 period [18] - 5:21, 5:28, 6:19, 26:39, 26:42, 43:9, 43:34, 44:32, 48:20, 56:24, 58:28, 64:36, 64:40, 64:47, 65:1, 70:35, 74:2, 81:22 permit [3] - 17:32, 17:46, 53:9 permitting [1] - 17:40 person [9] - 20:3, 36:7, 55:17, 64:15, 92:16, 93:46, 96:44, personal [4] - 75:16, 77:42, 91:8, 91:12 perspective [2] -67:45, 68:5 persuade [1] - 33:42 petition [11] - 18:47, 23:47, 24:21, 26:44, 30:27, 77:23, 82:20, 82:30, 82:32, 83:28, 83:37 **phase** [5] - 5:12, 19:29, 44:13, 44:23, 83:45 phonetic [1] - 71:25 **photo** [1] - 92:36 photograph [5] -91:44, 92:16, 92:19, 92:41, 93:19 photographs [1] -92:13 phrase [1] - 9:33 pick [3] - 7:39, 10:28,

17:18 picture [4] - 38:4, 72:15, 79:10, 92:14 piece [1] - 96:30 pieces [2] - 7:44, 16:9 pinpoint [1] - 17:38 pitch [1] - 2:44 place [14] - 12:19, 23:4, 25:19, 28:13, 32:3, 34:17, 41:14, 58:46, 79:13, 87:37, 94:28, 97:23, 98:14, 100:11 placed [2] - 71:26, 95:7 plan [10] - 3:12, 7:46, 7:47, 38:2, 41:14, 63:14, 72:4, 77:28, 77:29, 91:31 planned [4] - 34:45, 35:2, 35:11, 43:35 planning [4] - 21:18, 35:6, 37:27, 44:34 play [4] - 65:40, 66:37, 77:14, 94:21 Players [6] - 38:8, 38:9, 48:16, 60:1, 60:14, 61:7 pleading [1] - 22:31 pleadings [2] - 22:44, 72:38 plus [3] - 73:16, 73:18, 76:20 **PM** [5] - 50:30, 50:31, 75:12, 75:13, 101:4 pocket [2] - 19:22, 73:26 podium [1] - 34:20 point [47] - 6:31, 9:2, 10:27, 12:32, 28:2, 28:14, 29:14, 30:23, 32:4, 32:7, 34:4, 34:5, 42:29, 44:29, 44:39, 45:34, 47:26, 49:2, 51:26, 52:24, 53:6, 54:42, 55:19, 58:16, 63:18, 64:5, 66:4, 67:15, 67:30, 78:16, 78:19, 78:41, 79:6, 79:12, 79:23, 79:25, 79:36, 80:41, 81:20, 93:38, 94:7, 94:22, 96:27, 96:28, 98:39, 100:24 points [3] - 27:45, 36:42, 78:24 Ponder [1] - 44:17 pool [5] - 7:38, 7:41, 7:43, 10:35, 69:1

poor [3] - 92:33,

54:15

92:35, 92:36 portion [1] - 82:14 position [19] - 22:22, 23:28, 24:38, 24:41, 27:44. 27:46. 31:39. 31:41, 49:31, 50:44, 51:41. 51:43. 52:1. 56:36, 56:37, 64:24, 74:10, 78:34, 98:21 positioned [1] - 23:42 positions [5] - 51:42, 55:26, 57:12, 90:18, 90:37 **possession** [1] - 3:3 Possible [2] - 16:29, 16:32 possible [6] - 17:9, 21:4, 21:5, 25:2, 59:46 potential [15] - 23:9, 36:28, 38:25, 44:25, 46:18, 46:40, 47:35, 48:11, 61:31, 62:35, 64:7, 64:21, 72:35, 74:6. 90:9 potentially [2] - 37:28, 47:13 power [7] - 3:31, 3:33, 4:18, 4:43, 5:5, 5:30, 6:18 powers [10] - 2:15, 2:29, 3:4, 3:22, 3:23, 3:32, 3:37, 20:42, 27:1, 28:20 practical [1] - 24:12 practically [3] - 7:36, 85:46, 86:14 practice [1] - 40:6 precedent [1] - 3:27 precedes [2] - 81:22, 81:23 precise [1] - 12:5 predicated [1] - 63:39 prejudice [5] - 6:24, 9:43, 15:31, 18:16 prejudiced [1] - 11:47 prematurely [1] -37:18 premier [1] - 45:24 premised [1] - 33:20 premises [1] - 82:9 prepare [4] - 9:24, 24:25, 44:2, 100:26 prepared [5] - 19:10, 44:24, 56:44, 72:39, 87:30 preparing [1] - 37:40 prescribe [1] - 3:23 present [2] - 51:18,

presentation [1] -24:33 presented [2] - 73:12, 73:34 preserve[1] - 6:23 preserve/maintain [1] - 7.22 President [1] - 44:10 president [7] - 35:20, 40:28, 49:9, 56:21, 56:22, 58:24, 60:18 press [1] - 46:47 pressure [1] - 57:38 prestige [1] - 43:25 presumably [3] -27:29, 96:8, 96:42 presumptively [1] -95:2 pretend [1] - 5:26 pretext [1] - 65:37 pretty [1] - 92:33 prevent [1] - 75:47 prevented [1] - 71:36 previous [2] - 19:40, 47:34 previously [5] - 39:47, 43:13, 49:19, 64:43, 89:22 price [16] - 24:11, 45:3, 45:6, 46:43, 46:45, 47:19, 47:29, 47:32, 47:38, 59:16, 59:27, 61:4, 62:29, 62:40, 63:4, 65:41 prices [2] - 19:6, 59:37 pricing [1] - 43:43 prima [2] - 33:23, 52:13 primary [2] - 24:32, 90:7 prime [4] - 43:5, 73:16, 73:17, 73:18 principal [3] - 42:31, 55:41, 86:19 principle [4] - 21:3, 72:36, 74:15, 97:33 priorities [1] - 3:8 priority [6] - 8:6, 41:10, 70:40, 72:10, 72:12, 81:16 pro [5] - 59:43, 60:2, 82:9, 87:38, 92:15 problem [9] - 5:33, 28:11, 29:1, 51:47, 53:25. 56:3. 68:21. 72:4. 98:13 problems [2] - 7:6, 11:13 procedural [1] - 53:17

proceed [11] - 4:22, 4:28, 17:33, 17:40, 17:47, 30:37, 62:3, 65:3, 72:40, 85:47 proceeded [1] - 62:19 proceeding [22] -30:12, 32:40, 32:43, 33:7, 33:10, 34:41, 36:1, 36:45, 41:10, 43:3, 45:33, 53:11, 56:30, 72:22, 81:9, $85{:}40,\,87{:}27,\,88{:}28,$ 91:36, 93:34, 94:15, 94:34 PROCEEDINGS [8] -1:4, 27:9, 27:10, 50:30, 50:31, 75:12, 75:13, 101:4 proceedings [8] -72:11, 74:20, 78:2, 83:32, 94:40, 101:13, 101:14, 101:16 proceeds [1] - 58:27 process [27] - 19:9, 19:14, 24:18, 24:24, 24:27. 24:29. 28:21. 28:26, 37:4, 38:17, 38:19, 39:22, 44:44, 45:8, 48:14, 48:22, 49:39, 56:24, 59:3, 59:11, 61:19, 63:17, 64:10, 64:16, 74:27, 74:28, 94:23 processes [2] - 56:25, 67:29 professionally [1] -36:16 profile [1] - 42:46 profit [1] - 41:1 profitable [2] - 78:4, 97:31 profitably [1] - 79:29 **profits** [1] - 43:9 program [2] - 3:2, 69:2 progresses [1] - 12:26 prohibit [1] - 86:29 project [19] - 22:47, 23:1, 23:8, 26:17, 36:8, 37:39, 38:25, 40:1, 40:4, 41:2, 41:12, 43:13, 44:21, 46:29, 57:46, 62:10, 82:1, 87:45, 88:32 Project [2] - 39:37, 40:46 Project's [1] - 80:25 project's [3] - 38:28,

38:29, 45:29

projected [2] - 36:22, 59.9 promoted [1] - 52:22 prompting [1] - 51:35 prong [2] - 58:39, 65:7 **prongs** [1] - 57:9 proper [3] - 14:15, 20:41, 54:15 properly [1] - 51:19 properties [3] - 67:6, 68:14, 98:4 property [36] - 22:8, 23:19, 26:35, 26:37, 26:39. 30:21. 30:30. 30:43, 31:6, 31:13, 37:21, 37:35, 41:35, 41:36, 43:31, 58:37, 64:38, 65:16, 65:19, 65:21, 65:46, 66:7, 66:36, 66:41, 66:44, 66:45, 67:4, 67:9, 68:11, 68:16, 68:33, 68:39, 70:46, 78:9, 79.41 prophesy [1] - 60:40 proposal [4] - 46:17, 61:13, 62:28, 74:23 proposals [1] - 61:25 propose [2] - 2:8, 4:33 proposed [8] - 1:46, 5:17, 17:6, 17:18, 37:31, 38:6, 59:25, 62:3 proposes [1] - 59:14 proposing [5] - 12:10, 12:12, 12:21, 18:21, 99:45 propriety [1] - 95:27 **pros** [1] - 16:46 prospective [2] -62:17, 74:7 prospects [1] - 59:42 protect [2] - 22:32, 22:39 protection [2] - 38:30, 39:34 provide [13] - 24:25, 39:22, 39:23, 39:42, 44:33, 44:34, 59:26, 62:37, 65:28, 76:12, 95:37, 97:5, 99:39 provided [18] - 20:6, 23:32, 27:22, 34:26, 35:47, 36:45, 41:22, 56:39, 59:6, 70:9, 72:28, 78:1, 81:8, 87:28, 87:32, 91:35, 93:33, 101:14 provides [2] - 70:16, 73:15

providing [6] - 34:35, 76:7, 90:20, 90:39, 90:43, 92:47 Province [1] - 101:10 provision [3] - 2:12, 58:32, 84:16 PSA [2] - 63:33, 63:36 public [6] - 20:29, 20:30, 38:41, 44:6, 44:18, 82:19 publicly [1] - 90:5 **pulling** [1] - 9:18 pump [1] - 78:14 purchase [8] - 26:4, 28:9, 44:22, 60:17, 61:4, 62:40, 65:45, 74:40 purchased [3] - 81:47, 82:1, 82:5 purchaser [14] -44:26, 46:18, 46:40, 46:43, 47:1, 47:9, 47:35, 59:5, 61:32, 62:3, 62:35, 62:36, 64:7, 90:14 purchasers [4] - 7:42, 7:43, 48:10, 62:17 purchases [1] - 32:18 purchasing [2] -41:35, 48:11 purport [1] - 28:32 **purporting** [1] - 23:2 purports [1] - 22:32 purpose [6] - 18:25, 35:18, 40:17, 67:15, 79:14, 94:44 purpose-built [1] -35:18 purposes [3] - 23:25, 41:32, 41:34 pursue [2] - 45:27, 59:46 pursued [1] - 31:24 pursuing [2] - 19:12, 64:22 pushes [1] - 21:32 put [28] - 2:11, 2:35, 6:35, 7:15, 7:46, 8:37, 10:2, 13:14, 13:17, 20:3, 20:5, 22:44, 24:14, 28:12, 32:34, 38:37, 38:38, 52:46, 55:33, 57:11, 58:44, 73:25, 90:17, 90:37, 97:4, 98:46,

100:10

61:41

putting [2] - 32:36,

Q

quality [1] - 35:7 quarter [1] - 1:8 quarterly [4] - 41:25, 42:25, 42:30, 42:34 query [2] - 24:9, 73:22 questions [2] - 54:6, 73:30 quibble [1] - 6:46 quibbling [1] - 7:9 quick [2] - 1:15, 52:30 quickly [1] - 38:15 quite [4] - 12:2, 30:33, 45:35, 61:1 quo [1] - 21:5 quote [4] - 58:19, 60:19, 69:23, 87:31

R

rails [1] - 11:40 raised [3] - 36:42, 74:14, 89:1 raises [1] - 92:10 raising [1] - 42:45 ratcheting [1] - 99:33 Rate [1] - 42:17 rate [6] - 42:23, 65:29, 65:34, 73:16, 73:27 rates [2] - 55:32, 73:38 rather [4] - 45:17, 72:11, 76:19, 79:8 rationale [1] - 16:40 read [13] - 2:32, 16:40, 18:39, 19:35, 19:45, 20:1, 20:2, 36:4, 38:43, 58:4, 83:23, 84:41, 87:15 ready [6] - 10:5, 10:7, 10:17, 38:11, 38:13, 38:15 real [9] - 28:10, 29:12, 35:16, 40:7, 43:44, 43:47, 46:29, 77:4, 90:6 reality [2] - 22:19, 55:34 realization [2] - 43:8, 72:11 realize [2] - 23:3, 23:10 realizing [1] - 41:1 really [14] - 4:27, 7:37, 16:10, 23:14, 23:22, 23:25, 24:10, 24:35, 30:27, 30:34, 33:15, 42:31, 79:12, 97:25 realm [2] - 57:22,

57:25

realtor [1] - 7:46 reason [19] - 6:9, 37:15, 51:38, 51:40, 53:40, 55:15, 56:1, 56:39. 61:11. 68:13. 71:2, 71:10, 72:7, 73:10, 80:33, 81:24, 95:43, 97:41, 98:13 reasonable [8] -24:28, 34:39, 40:38, 41:1, 43:9, 58:6, 63:41, 74:35 reasons [5] - 17:10, 50:26, 76:31, 82:28, 89:43 rec [1] - 77:14 received [10] - 43:38, 59:5, 59:10, 59:24, 62:35, 63:36, 63:45, 64:41, 64:42, 70:4 receiver [79] - 1:30, 2:12, 2:20, 2:38, 3:3, 3:16, 3:24, 3:31, 3:37, 4:44, 5:6, 5:10, 5:24, 5:26, 5:28, 5:30, 6:18, 6:20, 6:27. 6:46. 7:2. 7:3. 7:5, 7:11, 7:31, 7:35, 7:45, 8:3, 8:4, 8:35, 8:44, 9:2, 12:12, 23:38, 23:41, 24:14, 24:26, 24:36, 24:46, 24:47, 26:20, 28:12, 28:34, 30:40, 39:29, 74:31, 77:22, 85:21, 85:23, 85:25, 85:27, 86:1, 86:19, 86:24, 88:17, 94:16, 95:5, 95:27, 95:36, 95:40, 96:7, 96:9, 96:21, 96:22, 97:4, 97:11, 97:37, 97:46, 98:2, 98:12, 98:27, 98:28, 98:31, 98:46, 99:2, 99:30, 100:7, 100:10 receiver's [3] - 5:6, 86:11, 99:21 receivers [1] - 3:35 Receivers [1] - 3:35 receivership [60] -2:4, 3:25, 3:26, 4:28, 4:42, 6:34, 6:35, 6:36, 6:39, 7:16, 8:37, 9:1, 9:7, 9:11, 9:18, 15:31, 18:47, 21:9, 21:21, 21:23, 21:31, 22:18, 23:23, 23:47, 24:20, 24:38, 25:2, 25:27, 26:20, 26:44, 27:44, 30:26,

33:27, 33:39, 33:43, 34:43, 35:35, 36:1, 38:33, 38:35, 38:36, 38:42, 57:19, 57:26, 72:22, 74:27, 75:1, 79:14, 83:46, 85:12, 85:23, 86:10, 95:7, 95:26, 95:35, 96:4, 96:18, 96:31, 97:45, 98:24 receiverships [1] - 5:5 receiving [3] - 26:40, 46:16, 46:39 recent [2] - 24:33, 91:40 recess [2] - 27:7, 75:10 **RECESSED**[3] - 27:9, 50:30, 75:12 reckless [1] - 71:41 recognize [1] - 28:32 recognizing [1] -54:17 recommend [1] -59:45 recommendation [13] - 6:30, 16:44, 17:1, 17:3, 17:22, 95:37, 96:23, 97:5, 97:12, 98:27, 98:30, 99:22, 99:30 recommendations [2] - 3:17, 97:47 recommended [1] -60:15 RECONVENED [3] -27:10, 50:31, 75:13 record [9] - 45:44, 45:47, 60:23, 61:42, 69:32, 69:34, 69:38, 76:28, 82:19 record-breaking [1] -60:23 recorded [2] - 76:29, 101.14 recording [2] - 27:23, 27:30 records [1] - 99:37 recreation [3] - 37:47, 77:3, 80:19 **Recreation** [1] - 68:45 recreational [1] - 77:8 recurring [1] - 81:39 redemption [1] - 7:13 reduction [3] - 46:44, 46:46, 81:37 refer [4] - 13:36, 18:2, 40:14, 70:20 reference [11] - 16:12, 16:13, 20:32, 35:34,

36:10, 39:43, 41:16, 41:20, 45:15, 45:37, referenced [2] - 82:29, 87:29 references [2] - 13:11, 80:7 referred [4] - 18:19, 27:29, 28:16, 39:41 referring [2] - 13:28, 34:29 refers [1] - 18:3 refinance [1] - 57:8 refinancing [7] -15:18, 19:12, 22:47, 39:3, 57:5, 72:19, 81:30 reflected [1] - 77:5 refusal [4] - 57:5, 60:25, 63:6, 65:9 refusals [1] - 71:34 refuse [1] - 62:8 refused [9] - 15:4, 15:5, 15:17, 15:18, 29:5, 58:22, 67:3, 67:8, 67:13 refuses [1] - 68:39 regard [2] - 70:44, 99.22 regarding [7] - 56:36, 62:39, 65:19, 72:33, 82:11, 82:23, 90:15 regardless [1] - 64:33 register [1] - 11:29 **regretfully** [1] - 53:19 regular [3] - 42:34, 70:42, 71:12 regularly [1] - 80:45 reintegrated [1] -68:24 reject [1] - 18:30 rejected [4] - 19:17, 19:18, 64:25, 69:21 relate [2] - 35:26, 35:28 related [3] - 30:11, 63:30, 63:35 relates [2] - 69:19, 91:12 relating [1] - 32:30 relation [1] - 84:20 relationship [10] -15:33, 20:46, 21:7, 21:9, 82:4, 83:14, 92:10, 93:13, 94:1, 94:11 relationships 131 -82:12. 88:10. 93:46 relative [2] - 43:32, 52:21

relatively [2] - 5:11, 26:41, 64:35 38:15 repeat [1] - 36:31 relayed [1] - 26:11 repeatedly [1] - 10:32 released [1] - 71:29 repercussions [2] relevant [1] - 92:29 8:45. 9:9 relief [18] - 7:16, replace [2] - 49:12, 73:35 21:42, 22:31, 26:43, 26:46, 28:3, 28:18, replaced [4] - 15:1, 28:28, 30:41, 31:33, 49:8, 67:18, 73:3 31:42, 32:8, 32:11, replacement [3] -32:31, 33:19, 33:21, 18:30, 65:25, 65:27 34:40, 84:20 reply [7] - 51:29, 55:2, reluctant [1] - 54:14 75:27, 75:32, 75:36, 79:38, 79:46 rely [1] - 78:40 remain [7] - 46:19, report [7] - 3:1, 3:6, 47:16, 47:27, 47:33, 5:27, 16:11, 16:22, 59:16, 59:28, 95:41 76:18, 100:7 remainder [2] - 54:47, reported [2] - 76:29, 55:1 82:28 remained [2] - 56:23, REPORTER [1] -60.14 101:7 remaining [2] - 54:21, Reporter [2] - 101:9, 57:45 101:27 remains [2] - 25:17, reporting [2] - 100:17 83:21 reports [1] - 9:22 remedies [1] - 34:18 representative [3] remedy [4] - 9:2, 44:47, 48:30, 58:46 11:31, 32:12, 32:27 representatives [2] remember [4] - 14:31, 90:19, 90:39 20:28, 22:28, 32:13 reproduced [2] remind [1] - 22:34 41:32. 88:7 removal [2] - 38:22, reputational [3] -46:44 39:35, 60:26, 60:43 renegotiate [1] - 73:28 request [1] - 67:25 requested [1] - 58:23 renew [2] - 87:30, 91:20 requesting [1] - 71:15 renewed [1] - 81:42 requests [2] - 90:9, renovation [1] - 77:39 92:23 rental [1] - 35:18 require [2] - 24:23, reorganization [1] -38:12 39:34 required [7] - 23:38, reorganized [1] -24:22, 32:3, 66:33, 38:30 72:44, 73:40, 81:11 repaid [15] - 5:34, requirement [2] -74:12, 74:14 5:47, 7:24, 7:26, 7:27, 8:8, 15:15, requires [2] - 62:38, 22:42, 22:43, 22:46, 71:47 23:30, 24:36, 71:39, requiring [1] - 74:21 73:6, 75:1 reserve[1] - 58:29 repay [7] - 15:17, residences [1] - 36:20 21:45, 39:24, 72:45, residents [3] - 35:12, 73:9, 97:26, 98:16 36:21, 36:24 repaying [2] - 3:9, resigned [1] - 89:2 7:23 resigns [1] - 71:27 repayment [10] resolution [3] - 6:23, 22:30, 22:32, 23:31, 63:29, 66:22 41:11, 42:30, 42:33, resolutions [2] -42:38, 73:47, 74:21, 62:16, 63:34

97:40

repayments [2] -

resolve [3] - 7:5,

53:25, 74:36

resolving [1] - 91:3 Resort [8] - 39:30, 40:14, 44:17, 80:23, 80:44, 81:1, 89:15 resort [94] - 34:45, 35:22, 36:16, 37:42, 37:47, 40:15, 42:46, 45:30, 67:10, 67:12, 68:17, 68:19, 68:22, 68:23, 70:31, 70:33, 70:36, 70:37, 70:38, 70:42, 71:5, 71:9, 71:17, 76:9, 76:43, 76:44, 77:2, 77:7, 77:15, 77:20, 77:24, 77:27, 78:1, 78:3, 78:6, 78:10, 78:20, 78:31, 78:44, 79:38, 80:29, 80:33, 81:13, 81:17, 81:26, 81:38, 81:41, 81:42, 81:47, 82:5, 82:7, 82:12, 83:6, 84:5, 84:6, 84:37, 85:11, 85:22, 88:14, 88:17, 90:24, 90:25, 90:27, 90:28, 91:10, 93:11, 94:1, 94:5, 94:16, 94:17, 95:7, 95:9, 95:32, 95:44, 96:12, 96:19, 96:32, 96:44, 97:28, 97:42, 97:43, 98:6, 98:19, 98:25, 98:31, 99:1, 99:8, 99:11, 99:25, 99:31 resort's [1] - 99:24 resources [2] - 71:12, 78:47 respect [13] - 11:10, 30:22, 30:28, 31:25, 32:15, 32:17, 35:7, 42:44, 88:22, 88:38, 94:31, 94:39, 95:42 respectful [1] - 53:21 respective [1] - 21:14 respond [3] - 12:31, 19:23, 75:28 respondents [1] -24:23 responding [3] -11:30, 11:41, 12:6 responds [3] - 36:47, 76:10, 76:16 response [13] - 27:40, 43:41. 44:27. 53:9. 59:24, 60:47, 61:10, 62:28, 62:32, 63:10, 72:26, 74:38, 74:39 responsibilities [2] -35:43, 36:6

responsible [1] -40:28 restaurant [1] - 69:1 result [17] - 6:22, 9:15, 30:19, 43:25, 48:33, 61:18, 62:1, 64:26, 70:27, 71:4, 71:26, 73:5, 74:19, 88:16, 88:41, 89:12, 91:16 resulted [3] - 39:35, 52:45, 66:42 resulting [2] - 69:13, 81.1 results [1] - 97:16 retail [1] - 77:26 retained [3] - 58:30, 71:1, 80:47 retire [1] - 74:17 return [2] - 46:47, 74:4 revenue [13] - 14:41, 23:7, 73:4, 79:25, 79:26, 79:27, 80:23, 80:29, 80:47, 81:16, 81:28, 95:23 revenues [9] - 41:21, 69:16, 70:36, 71:1, 78:5, 78:11, 78:14, 81:26, 81:35 reverberate[1] - 39:31 reverse [1] - 2:18 review [4] - 14:11, 44:1, 49:47, 76:14 reviewed [2] - 72:38, 82:14 reviewing [1] - 61:36 revise [1] - 59:37 revised [1] - 59:15 revive [2] - 47:9, 47:21 revoked [1] - 69:26 reward [1] - 23:26 rewrite [1] - 28:22 rezoned [1] - 37:14 rezoning [4] - 36:40, 37:30, 37:41, 43:16 rid [1] - 15:43 **right-size** [1] - 53:43 **rights** [1] - 7:13 rise [1] - 38:33 risk [5] - 6:14, 6:21, 22:42, 29:13, 49:28 risked [1] - 60:26 roadmap [1] - 12:39 **ROBERTS** [65] - 1:13, 1:15, 1:17, 1:24, 1:27, 1:34, 1:38, 1:43, 2:6, 2:10, 2:14, 2:17, 2:30, 2:32, 2:35, 2:38, 3:30, 3:45, 4:1, 4:3, 4:24, 4:26, 4:39, 4:43,

4:46, 5:2, 5:9, 5:15, 5:18, 5:20, 5:24, 5:39, 5:42, 5:47, 6:14, 6:17, 6:33, 7:33, 7:35, 8:2, 8:31, 8:33, 8:35, 8:41, 9:27, 9:31, 9:36, 9:38, 9:40, 9:47, 10:7, 10:11, 10:16, 10:23, 10:36, 11:7, 11:16, 11:19, 11:22, 12:16, 12:23, 12:28, 31:8, 50:40, 70:19 Roberts [20] - 1:14, 11:34, 11:35, 12:9, 14:19, 16:1, 20:13, 22:4, 22:16, 22:27, 28:11, 32:36, 32:41, 33:38, 50:12, 50:38, 57:21, 86:37, 97:15, 99:42 Roberts' [1] - 53:47 **role** [10] - 35:43, 36:2, 47:12, 58:24, 89:3, 89:4, 89:45, 90:7, 90:35 room [5] - 58:15, 58:21, 66:1, 72:16 rooms [1] - 82:10 roughly [2] - 15:22, 78:18 Rubin [3] - 10:14, 10:15, 10:16 rules [3] - 27:22, 27:30, 57:26 run [11] - 6:40, 36:16, 38:27, 43:14, 53:29, 96:23, 96:34, 96:44, 97:6, 97:12, 98:33 running [7] - 25:1, 35:10, 55:44, 95:14, 95:17, 98:36 runs [2] - 95:33

S

sacrifice [2] - 47:15, 47:16 safe [1] - 53:1 safeguard [2] - 24:16, 24:29 safeguarded [1] -23:39 Sale [1] - 44:17 sale [23] - 7:27, 17:33, 17:40, 18:44, 23:7, 39:16, 39:21, 42:33, 43:39, 44:4, 44:20, 44:21, 45:8, 47:42, 48:13, 48:14, 58:27,

60:17, 62:9, 62:29, 63:4, 68:1, 68:4 sales [48] - 3:2, 7:36, 7:38, 14:45, 15:18, 16:41, 19:3, 19:4, 22:9, 22:12, 26:25, 26:40, 28:21, 32:4, 37:31. 41:3. 41:21. 43:35, 44:3, 44:22, 44:44, 45:22, 45:27, 48:22, 48:34, 49:22, 56:25, 56:36, 56:44, 57:8, 57:37, 58:39, 59:11, 64:8, 64:27, 64:36, 65:8, 67:28, 72:30, 72:41, 73:4, 73:6, 73:10, 73:41, 74:1, 78:6, 81:28, 97:40 sales' [1] - 88:34 sanctioned [1] - 26:45 **sanguine** [1] - 45:19 Sanovest [133] - 1:10, 2:24, 3:10, 5:2, 5:34, 6:1, 6:10, 6:36, 6:44, 7:23, 8:8, 8:9, 8:37, 9:13, 15:24, 17:32, 18:29, 18:33, 18:45, 19:6, 21:45, 22:20, 22:29, 23:47, 24:2, 24:24, 24:35, 24:40, 25:12, 25:13, 25:14, 25:17, 25:22, 25:25, 26:3, 26:7, 26:8, 26:16, 26:23, 26:24, 26:32, 26:36, 26:41, 26:44, 27:2, 27:45, 28:7, 28:29, 28:30, 28:31, 29:27, 29:39, 31:33, 31:38, 32:7, 32:44, 34:11, 39:24, 40:3, 40:21, 40:31, 40:33, 41:4, 41:11, 41:13, 41:15, 41:22, 41:27, 42:14, 44:30, 44:31, 45:14, 49:3, 49:7, 49:10, 49:12, 49:17, 49:43, 55:41, 55:45, 56:13, 56:20, 56:28, 58:15, 58:22, 58:25, 58:29, 58:32, 59:13, 64:1, 64:37, 64:46, 65:14, 65:25, 65:26, 65:27, 65:31, 65:40, 65:43, 65:44, 66:2, 66:7, 66:11, 66:40, 66:45, 67:3, 67:8, 67:38, 68:9, 68:11, 69:47, 72:16, 72:19, 72:31, 73:2,

73:12, 73:15, 73:29, 73:36, 73:38, 74:3, 74:11, 74:14, 74:17, 74:19, 74:22, 77:21, 81:23, 81:29, 97:26, 97:29, 98:5 Sanovest's [17] -21:43. 23:28. 23:46. 24:31, 25:19, 25:34, 26:46, 28:23, 31:38, 31:44, 42:32, 72:9, 72:12, 73:26, 74:10, 74:41 saving [1] - 87:41 saw [6] - 1:41, 56:2, 58:44, 60:6, 64:12, 89.7 scale [1] - 85:8 scenario [1] - 72:5 schedule [2] - 28:42, scheduled [4] - 4:22, 48:16, 48:17, 48:38 scheduling [1] - 75:17 scope [8] - 2:15, 14:15, 20:41, 21:42, 32:11, 53:3, 57:19, 74:31 **se** [1] - 21:22 seal [4] - 13:38, 16:25, 16:26, 88:8 season [1] - 37:44 seasonably [1] - 77:37 second [17] - 12:43, 15:20, 18:12, 26:34, 28:14, 31:32, 38:35, 41:46, 42:39, 51:1, 65:10, 68:40, 69:17, 83:37, 91:12, 92:15, 93:20 secondly [1] - 23:14 section [9] - 3:43, 25:8, 27:41, 34:35, 57:22, 59:18, 75:44, 76:36, 81:41 **sections** [1] - 14:13 **secure** [1] - 72:25 secured [9] - 6:45, 6:47, 7:4, 7:10, 7:18, 7:23, 9:3, 25:32, 72:36 securities [1] - 28:23 security [1] - 28:29 see [49] - 1:45, 5:26, 6:4, 9:32, 11:40, 11:43, 12:20, 13:45, 14:5, 14:10, 17:15, 17:30, 18:22, 18:25, 18:26, 21:28, 25:31, 27:16, 27:31, 27:35,

28:10, 28:42, 28:44, 33:16, 38:4, 41:13, 44:16, 44:43, 46:4, 46:10, 47:28, 47:37, 48:19, 49:39, 53:28, 54:44, 55:29, 59:42, 59:43, 63:33, 80:2, 80:38, 81:20, 83:34, 87:23, 91:28, 93:16, 93:18, 98:22 seeing [2] - 5:16, 80:6 seek [7] - 2:28, 7:1, 28:27, 31:39, 59:15, 69:11, 95:43 seeking [13] - 2:19, 7:15, 11:36, 11:37, 22:30, 52:25, 67:1, 77:21, 83:39, 84:13, 86:6, 96:3, 97:10 seeks [5] - 22:21, 22:37, 23:30, 24:36, 73:47 seem [1] - 27:14 sees [3] - 47:27, 49:16, 49:25 selected [3] - 14:12, 17:7. 37:10 self [8] - 6:5, 22:5, 61:17, 61:18, 71:10, 88:37, 96:40, 97:30 self-evident [1] -61:17 self-evidently [1] -61:18 self-funding [1] - 22:5 self-interested [2] -88:37, 96:40 self-sustaining [3] -6:5, 71:10, 97:30 sell [18] - 14:42, 15:39, 17:19, 19:7, 22:3, 22:7, 23:19, 25:29, 26:20, 30:20, 46:24, 46:32. 47:28. 63:13. 64:13, 68:1, 73:9, 99:10 seller [2] - 45:36, 45:40 selling [2] - 8:12, 14:43 sending [1] - 93:43 sensational [1] -78:17 sense [7] - 2:11, 23:22, 52:5, 61:17, 67:47, 99:33, 100:14 sent [1] - 93:36 sentence [2] - 34:5, 51:12 sentiments [1] - 45:26

separable [2] - 95:31, 96.16 separate [10] - 59:5, 64:33, 67:39, 67:42, 68:3, 68:12, 87:40, 88:1, 89:43, 96:26 separates [1] - 34:9 **September** [5] - 1:1, 19:20, 63:47, 83:45, 101:21 SEPTEMBER[1] -101:5 series [2] - 49:42, 72:27 serious [4] - 28:8, 33:21, 60:29, 78:29 served [1] - 36:2 service [2] - 43:18, 72:44 servicer [1] - 93:10 Services [1] - 18:28 **services** [1] - 70:9 servicing [1] - 43:15 set [21] - 5:27, 17:10, 18:42, 34:8, 41:34, 43:43, 49:36, 53:4, 54:20, 60:30, 61:5, 66:32, 67:22, 67:23, 74:11, 74:34, 75:17, 83:39, 83:44, 83:45, 87:13 sets [2] - 35:42, 41:31 settle [1] - 29:4 settled [2] - 29:1, 29:2 **settlement** [6] - 29:5, 29:7, 29:8, 29:11, 29:16, 30:29 several [6] - 25:41, 26:2, 44:27, 47:17, 64:1, 87:19 **shaking** [1] - 54:2 **shall** [2] - 42:7, 42:20 shared [1] - 53:14 shareholder [8] -15:40, 22:23, 46:20, 67:31, 67:32, 67:33, 67:34 shareholders [3] -15:33, 49:32, 67:39 shareholders' [1] -24:29 sheet [13] - 18:32, 18:34, 18:37, 24:33, 73:13, 73:15, 73:22, 73:25, 73:35, 73:36, 73:38, 73:40 shop [3] - 82:9, 87:38, 92:15 **short** [7] - 2:16, 3:15, 10:37, 12:14, 69:10,

69:14, 85:32 shorter [2] - 3:36, 74:27 shortly [1] - 49:11 show [4] - 17:41, 36:16, 49:21, 79:33 showing [4] - 26:30, 47:23, 71:10, 78:13 shown [1] - 49:21 shows [2] - 23:27, 63:44 shut [2] - 26:23, 61:28 side [11] - 6:3, 6:8, 11:8, 19:44, 37:46, 37:47, 51:22, 67:31, 75:5, 84:13, 84:39 sides [2] - 10:20, 12:17 sight [1] - 24:29 sign [3] - 27:17, 62:16, 71:47 sign-off [1] - 71:47 **signatory** [1] - 66:34 signature [2] - 66:33, 69:25 significant [14] - 5:7, 23:1, 23:9, 36:38, 36:39, 37:17, 39:13, 41:21, 46:43, 56:2, 73:30, 81:2, 87:42, 91:42 significantly [3] -62:28, 62:29, 74:30 signing [5] - 18:36, 27:14, 63:29, 66:29, 69.25 silly [1] - 76:24 **similar** [5] **-** 39:33, 48:8, 61:29, 61:44, 74:23 similarly [1] - 23:46 simple [2] - 3:20, 3:30 simply [1] - 40:11 simultaneously [1] -23:31 single [5] - 15:23, 20:40, 35:17, 36:19, 43:36 single-family [3] -35:17, 36:19, 43:36 sit [3] - 15:26, 23:15, 51:10 site [12] - 7:37, 38:7, 38:8, 38:9, 38:11, 38:17, 44:21, 48:17, 59:9, 60:15, 90:8 sites [15] - 14:12, 17:8, 17:19, 23:14, 28:9, 36:28, 36:29, 36:35, 37:1, 38:6,

38:14, 43:36, 43:39, 48:6, 48:12 siting [1] - 70:31 sits [2] - 30:25, 37:37 sitting [1] - 30:33 situate [1] - 14:27 situation [7] - 15:14, 32:20, 66:8, 73:33, 81:35, 90:15, 91:13 six [1] - 74:35 **size** [2] - 22:40, 53:43 **SJN**[4] - 67:35, 67:36, 67:37, 67:40 skill [1] - 101:17 skip [1] - 86:43 skittishness [2] -61:14, 61:16 slight [1] - 2:35 slightly [2] - 52:26, 64:45 small [2] - 6:42, 68:44 smaller [2] - 7:41, 34:30 snapshot [1] - 34:36 **snapshots** [1] - 79:9 sold [13] - 6:11, 7:32, 8:20, 8:23, 23:14, 24:5, 37:11, 38:11, 38:13, 39:23, 68:47, 98:4, 98:32 **sole** [2] **-** 66:29, 66:38 someone [6] - 18:5, 19:33, 27:1, 27:18, 63:23, 92:17 sometimes [1] - 3:37 somewhat [5] - 1:17, 41:4, 45:19, 53:36, 78:34 somewhere [2] -20:21, 22:35 son [1] - 56:37 son's [1] - 56:37 soon [1] - 58:26 sorry [33] - 1:6, 10:39, 20:16, 29:34, 31:14, 31:17, 35:37, 39:11, 41:47, 56:22, 57:17, 60:31, 60:35, 65:26, 69:37, 69:44, 70:19, 72:47, 73:13, 74:13, 74:42, 76:4, 76:24, 79:22, 81:8, 82:1, 84:5, 84:16, 84:23, 89:42, 91:47, 92:1, 98:35 sort [5] - 2:18, 6:31, 50:44, 56:27, 96:2 sought [14] - 22:31, 26:43, 28:3, 28:18,

31:33, 31:42, 32:31,

33:19, 34:12, 34:41, 37:2, 46:43, 84:19, 85.17 sound [1] - 99:4 source [8] - 22:8, 61:16. 81:16. 91:23. 92:23, 92:24, 92:27, 93:39 sources [2] - 14:41, 15:3 space [5] - 36:38, 81:40, 82:9, 82:10, 87:5 **speaking** [5] - 7:37, 50:38, 75:46, 85:46, 86:14 speaks [3] - 40:37, 41:29, 43:3 special [1] - 48:33 **specific** [1] - 7:28 specifically [2] -12:20, 23:44 spend [1] - 23:22 spheres [1] - 77:1 spirit [1] - 53:36 **spite** [1] - 78:16 split [1] - 94:3 sporting [2] - 42:47, 77:8 spot [1] - 27:4 **squeezed** [1] - 53:16 staff [4] - 37:44, 66:33, 71:24, 90:12 stage [4] - 44:42, 44:43, 45:35, 46:44 staged [5] - 2:8, 3:39, 4:33, 9:44, 100:2 stakeholders [2] -23:41, 35:12 standard [1] - 69:23 standing [3] - 53:12, 53:13, 93:12 stands [2] - 12:30, 91.8 start [15] - 1:6, 5:12, 5:47, 6:27, 6:42, 10:29, 12:12, 12:33, 14:25, 14:28, 31:46, 50:17, 75:22, 83:43, 88:23 started [5] - 15:45, 43:13, 58:1, 59:12, 61:21 starting [5] - 58:38, 60:32, 65:10, 97:23, 98:14 state [2] - 62:37, 76:37 statement [4] - 28:5, 61:39, 89:33, 89:34 states [4] - 42:5,

58:18, 88:33, 89:43 stating [2] - 44:47, 71:21 station [2] - 92:39, 92:40 status [2] - 21:5, 31:44 **stay** [13] - 5:19, 5:21, 47:40, 47:42, 60:9, 84:2, 84:8, 84:14, 84:16, 85:13, 86:29, 91:32, 99:25 stayed [3] - 84:9, 85:29, 85:31 stays [1] - 84:9 step [5] - 67:12, 70:15, 75:47, 85:26, 98:33 stepped [1] - 55:42 stepping [1] - 5:40 steps [7] - 7:22, 38:14, 44:36, 49:42, 63:40, 96:9, 98:2 stigma [3] - 38:34, 38:35, 100:2 stigmatizes [1] -97:19 still [14] - 7:11, 7:13, 12:30, 26:27, 29:6, 35:29, 44:42, 45:35, 45:39, 49:4, 49:20, 78:18, 95:33, 98:10 stone [1] - 54:20 stood [1] - 21:23 stop [2] - 9:23, 56:4 stopped [2] - 25:37, 61:20 **stopping** [1] - 70:16 storage [2] - 82:10, 87:38 strategic [2] - 8:45, 43:35 strategically [2] -14:42, 88:35 strategies [2] - 17:6, 17:9 strategy [13] - 17:19, 23:2, 23:3, 23:10, 23:12, 23:18, 23:20, 44:3, 48:15, 61:37, 68:1, 81:18, 97:40 stress [2] - 71:26, 90:41 **striking** [1] - 93:5 stringent [1] - 33:24 strive [1] - 9:42 strong [3] - 39:18, 52:13, 78:11 **strongly** [1] - 60:15

structure [1] - 72:40

structured [1] - 35:5

struggles [1] - 91:5 stymy [1] - 22:24 sub [1] - 35:31 subdivide [1] - 28:25 **subdividing** [1] - 8:12 **subdivision** [7] - 8:10, 8:32, 28:22, 37:41, 38:12, 38:18, 43:16 subject [1] - 36:40 submission [10] -17:39, 20:14, 40:37, 51:37, 53:21, 61:9, 74:29, 79:37, 80:3, 84:25 submissions [10] -9:5, 23:46, 28:1, 28:40, 34:30, 35:27, 54:21, 55:2, 75:7, 97:3 submit [2] - 49:14, 88:6 subscribed [1] -101:20 subsequently [2] -39:43, 61:40 subset [3] - 3:33, 3:41, 90:2 subsidizing [1] -78:21 **substance** [1] - 24:39 substantial [4] -38:10, 44:20, 55:30, 85:7 substantially [1] -45:12 substantive [2] -55:30, 64:6 substantively [1] -13:9 succeeded [1] - 72:1 successful [4] - 83:7, 83:18, 83:19, 84:7 sudden [1] - 25:28 sued [1] - 29:8 sufficient [2] - 3:4, 80:18 sufficiently [1] - 24:16 suggest [2] - 31:36, 42:36 **suggesting** [1] - 94:8 suggestion [1] - 98:45 suggests [1] - 95:1 suing [1] - 29:17 sum [4] - 15:21, 15:22, 27:40. 73:25 summarized [2] -27:47, 79:20 **summarizes** [1] - 87:8 summary [8] - 17:11, 26:30, 32:33, 56:42,

56:47, 57:1, 58:2, 58:6 summer [2] - 5:45, 25:40 sums [2] - 4:27, 5:11 supplier [1] - 93:24 suppliers [1] - 93:44 support [6] - 18:43, 22:6, 24:20, 39:14, 39:19, 80:35 **supported** [1] - 76:33 **supporting** [2] - 79:1, **supportive** [1] - 25:4 suppose [2] - 49:9, 99:17 supposition [1] -20:10 suppression [2] -34:14, 39:36 **Supreme** [1] - 83:32 **surfaced** [1] - 93:6 surgical [1] - 33:33 **surprise** [1] - 53:5 surrounding [2] -21:14, 33:47 suspect [1] - 21:17 **sustaining** [3] - 6:5, 71:10, 97:30 sworn [2] - 87:43, 91:36

T

tab [50] - 13:21, 13:22, 13:23, 16:17, 16:20, 18:9, 18:13, 20:32, 20:34, 35:25, 35:36, 35:37, 35:41, 36:43, 39:7, 41:17, 42:1, 42:9, 42:10, 44:7, 44:14, 45:16, 45:46, 47:4, 48:24, 58:47, 59:19, 60:31, 60:36, 61:1, 61:47, 62:33, 69:34, 69:37, 73:13, 73:14, 74:42, 76:4, 80:9, 88:25, 89:28, 89:30, 91:45, 92:5, 92:7, 92:44, 93:14 table [3] - 13:46, 25:23, 74:45 tabs [2] - 13:27, 71:30 take-back [1] - 66:9 taps [1] - 26:23 task [1] - 8:19 tax [2] - 31:6, 44:34 taxes [29] - 22:8, 26:35, 26:38, 26:39, 30:21, 30:30, 30:44,

31:13, 37:21, 37:35, 58:34, 64:39, 65:16, 65:19, 65:21, 65:24, 65:46, 66:7, 66:20, 66:36, 66:41, 66:44, 66:46, 67:3, 67:9, 68:39, 70:46, 78:9, 79:41 team [3] - 77:34, 77:35 technical [1] - 6:43 telephone [1] - 26:12 template [1] - 3:27 ten [15] - 2:33, 2:40, 4:24, 4:25, 8:16, 19:28, 22:10, 26:15, 36:22, 50:13, 50:16, 50:17, 50:19, 73:43, 99:24 Tennis [1] - 77:12 tennis [10] - 6:6, 35:9, 36:15, 36:17, 36:27, 77:2, 77:26, 77:33, 77:38, 91:9 tense [2] - 50:40, 50:41 Term [1] - 42:16 term [27] - 10:19, 18:32, 18:34, 18:36, 24:33, 39:35, 40:35, 41:5, 42:20, 42:27, 66:5, 73:12, 73:15, 73:21, 73:22, 73:24, 73:25, 73:34, 73:36, 73:37, 73:38, 73:40, 73:44, 74:16, 81:23, 91:4 terms [12] - 5:16, 7:29, 24:1, 33:26, 40:34, 43:19, 61:4, 64:21, 68:16, 79:11, 87:31, 96:28 terse [1] - 61:1 test [4] - 33:22, 33:23, 33:24, 52:11 tests [1] - 7:7 tethered [1] - 80:39 text [2] - 11:43, 14:28

theirs [1] - 33:33

theme [1] - 58:41

themselves [2] -

21:36, 28:32

thereafter [1] - 73:18

Therefore [1] - 39:20

therefore [1] - 76:44

they've [7] - 4:14,

8:20, 10:2, 11:4,

thinking [3] - 1:36,

2:7, 12:19

29:7, 30:32, 81:21

thereby [1] - 31:44

thinks [2] - 4:19, 5:24 third [13] - 4:46, 5:38, 19:27, 23:33, 26:25, 30:28, 31:47, 39:2, 47:42. 47:44. 57:2. 57:4. 72:25 third-party [1] - 39:2 three [20] - 11:11, 15:16, 16:9, 16:34, 16:37, 16:46, 17:5, 18:47, 23:22, 37:1, 38:5, 53:1, 53:14, 57:9, 59:4, 59:5, 64:29, 86:25, 92:13, 99.22 three-day [1] - 53:14 threshold [4] - 7:7, 7:10, 7:14, 7:18 throw [1] - 27:34 Thursday [8] - 53:24, 54:29, 54:37, 75:3, 75:17, 75:18, 75:30, 75:38 Tian [84] - 8:17, 8:42, 9:16, 10:24, 10:44, 15:1, 15:2, 15:11, 17:32, 21:20, 23:37, 23:47, 24:2, 24:19, 25:13, 25:35, 25:40, 25:43, 26:2, 26:13, 26:14, 27:46, 28:31, 31:38, 32:8, 34:12, 35:46, 44:28, 44:33, 44:37, 44:43, 44:47, 45:13, 45:22, 45:38, 46:11, 46:15, 46:46, 47:14, 47:20, 48:21, 48:29, 49:8, 49:13, 49:16, 49:24, 49:38, 55:26, 55:41, 56:20, 56:22, 56:27, 58:22, 59:2, 59:12, 59:14, 59:25, 61:19, 61:24, 61:31, 62:10, 64:5, 66:20, 66:28, 66:32, 66:47, 67:17, 68:19, 68:33, 68:37, 69:9, 69:21, 69:24, 69:45, 71:47, 72:1, 72:7, 72:31, 87:46, 88:12, 91:41, 91:44, 93:42, 94:12 Tian's [3] - 45:26, 57:36, 59:33 tie [1] - 100:9 **Tiffany** [2] - 101:9, 101:26 Timber 131 - 18:28. 73:35, 73:40

timeframe [1] - 2:28

timeline [2] - 5:25, 40.47 timelines [1] - 90:45 timing [3] - 50:12, 50:14, 51:1 tiny [1] - 67:20 title [2] - 30:22, 97:39 TO [1] - 101:4 today [11] - 2:44, 3:22, 14:41, 19:20, 36:18, 53:29, 54:46, 57:13, 64:30, 64:34, 98:45 today's [1] - 9:5 together [3] - 7:47, 62:6, 65:1 Tom [44] - 14:47, 23:4, 29:33, 29:41, 40:2, 40:8, 40:26, 40:44, 43:42, 44:30, 44:32, 44:35, 44:40, 45:18, 45:26, 45:34, 45:38, 45:39, 46:3, 46:9, 46:14, 46:21, 46:33, 46:44, 49:4, 49:12, 49:35, 55:39, 56:23, 56:32, 57:42, 64:33, 67:19, 67:23, 67:24, 67:38, 68:7, 76:9, 76:18, 76:22, 89:1, 89:3, 91:14 tomorrow [13] - 48:36, 50:9, 50:46, 51:26, 51:28, 53:30, 53:44, 75:24, 99:42, 100:19, 100:26, 100:27 tons [1] - 17:24 took [14] - 16:10, 16:35, 16:40, 17:20, 18:19, 28:38, 45:19, 49:18, 55:42, 63:43, 74:33, 79:30, 80:2, 82:15 tool [1] - 65:17 top [6] - 1:40, 18:38, 25:5, 48:27, 60:38, 62:36 topped [1] - 15:7 total [5] - 25:14, 26:38, 37:20, 51:24, 80:25 touch [1] - 93:30 towards [2] - 26:41, 63:13 town [1] - 17:14 townhouse [1] - 35:18 townhouses [1] -36:20 tra@ sanovestholdings

[1] - 46:11 tracks [1] - 36:39 trade [1] - 93:45 Trade [1] - 7:12 trajectory[1] - 77:30 transact [1] - 66:24 transaction [1] - 64:21 transactions [2] -51:11, 88:41 transcribed [1] -101:13 transcript [1] - 101:16 transfer [3] - 71:4, 71:16, 71:17 transferred [5] - 9:17, 68:15, 70:41, 77:20, 80:45 transferring[1] -67:46 transfers [2] - 72:1, 72:8 transit [1] - 43:17 transition [4] - 81:44, 87:34, 91:31, 92:14 treated [1] - 88:13 trend [1] - 77:30 trial [5] - 21:15, 29:43, 29:46, 30:13, 30:18 tried [4] - 15:16, 27:15, 33:21, 54:3 TRK [1] - 76:26 trouble [3] - 5:10, 43:14, 98:7 true [4] - 10:46, 51:15, 73:1, 101:15 trust [2] - 9:45, 32:20 trustworthy [1] -96:44 try [9] - 9:31, 14:27, 14:31, 23:24, 25:7, 27:16, 64:9, 65:17, 70:39 trying [14] - 9:17, 22:14, 23:35, 27:32, 33:35, 53:35, 54:42, 63:12, 64:13, 69:11, 82:36, 84:33, 90:5, 97:9 Tuesday [1] - 54:32 turn [3] - 34:19, 53:37, 60:22 turns [1] - 85:31 two [56] - 1:17, 3:19, 6:2, 6:22, 7:8, 9:24, 11:11, 12:17, 12:23, 13:36. 14:31. 17:31. 20:47. 21:8. 23:12. 25:29, 28:44, 29:24, 30:28, 36:27, 39:9, 39:12, 40:6, 40:10,

40:11, 40:18, 41:30, 41:39, 50:34, 52:21, 52:33, 52:43, 60:14, 64:43, 64:44, 65:1, 65:3, 70:20, 71:30, 74:15, 77:10, 78:1, 78:28, 79:9, 79:31, 82:7, 83:31, 85:4, 85:20, 86:8, 89:43, 90:18, 90:38, 93:6, 95:13, 95:30 two-year [1] - 74:15 type [9] - 13:25, 20:4, 23:25, 32:40, 34:42, 38:12, 55:35, 61:30, 94:25

U

ultimate [1] - 26:3 ultimately [13] - 22:11, 43:8, 61:21, 64:15, 64:24, 65:46, 66:40, 71:29, 72:44, 73:6, 88:15, 92:24, 99:47 umbrella [1] - 76:45 unable [5] - 23:6, 24:3, 73:2, 73:8, 73:9 unacceptable [1] uncertain [1] - 40:44 uncertainty [1] - 90:14 unclear [3] - 36:1, 36:2, 90:44 uncovered [1] - 93:29 under [45] - 2:3, 7:22, 11:31, 13:38, 15:6, 16:25, 16:26, 18:24, 18:39, 22:20, 23:35, 24:41, 25:14, 26:24, 32:12, 33:5, 33:10, 33:19, 33:27, 38:2, 38:19, 38:29, 39:21, 40:31, 42:22, 42:35, 42:38, 57:22, 57:25, 57:26, 58:15, 58:21, 65:14, 65:30, 66:2, 72:16, 72:40, 74:28, 76:45, 81:29, 85:22, 86:2, 88:8, 89:8, 99:43 underdeveloped [1] -43:12 undermining [1] -93:44 underneath [1] -

41:33

5:39

understood [2] - 1:43,

undertaken [1] - 51:11 underway [1] - 38:27 undeveloped [1] -43.11 unequivocally [1] -91.19 unfiled [1] - 87:7 unfortunately [2] -45:43, 48:35 unilateral [1] - 75:47 unilaterally [2] -48:22, 71:37 unintended [1] - 9:6 unique [2] - 45:30, 77:45 unit [2] - 40:19, 62:43 **units** [1] - 76:43 unknown [1] - 41:4 unless [1] - 78:40 unnecessary [4] -22:18, 23:32, 39:39, 90:40 unnumbered [1] -18:31 unused [1] - 36:39 unusual [1] - 14:32 **up** [39] - 1:8, 1:33, 1:35, 4:39, 5:25, 6:1, 6:42, 10:5, 11:15, 12:28, 13:18, 17:39, 21:23, 21:46, 25:28, 26:16, 26:22, 27:16, 33:14, 33:32, 34:3, 34:8, 34:26, 37:4, 43:18, 45:3, 49:21, 53:12, 56:37, 61:5, 66:4, 66:32, 67:23, 68:14, 75:5, 95:39, 99:24, 99:33 upcoming [1] - 94:34 update [1] - 50:7 upload [1] - 13:47 upside [1] - 53:38 urban [1] - 45:30 urgency [3] - 31:25, 52:31, 54:18 urgent [2] - 30:32, 30:38

V

uses [1] - 41:38

valley [1] - 77:11 valuation [3] - 59:8, 59:40, 63:3 value [29] - 6:23, 7:22, 9:43, 17:31, 22:36, 22:37, 23:1, 23:3, 23:9, 23:11, 23:40, 36:30, 38:10, 39:36,

42:44, 43:6, 43:23, 43:32, 45:28, 47:27, 47:43, 48:9, 49:22, 59:8, 60:23, 62:43, 63:45, 65:44, 85:5 values [3] - 43:20, 59:7, 77:31 Vancouver is - 1:2. 34:46, 91:26 variance [1] - 78:37 variety [1] - 90:42 various [5] - 57:37, 65:12, 65:17, 72:38, vary [1] - 77:36 vast [1] - 66:1 vastly[1] - 36:32 vehicle [6] - 21:10, 24:37, 34:7, 34:11, 34:14, 94:24 vehicles [1] - 34:10 vendor [3] - 60:22, 60:29, 66:9 verge [1] - 71:25 verily[1] - 37:26 versus [2] - 1:11, 24:8 vertical [5] - 43:37, 55:28, 60:1, 60:11, 61:25 vice [1] - 60:18 vice-president [1] -60:18 Victoria [4] - 34:46, 38:7, 43:30, 43:33 view [19] - 8:5, 11:8, 24:1, 24:2, 24:5, 45:10, 45:20, 45:23, 47:17, 51:4, 51:7, 51:18, 53:7, 58:5, 60:16, 64:17, 67:30, 88:42, 94:43 viewed [3] - 64:23, 74:7, 78:4 Village [2] - 17:8, 17:13 Vincent [2] - 101:9, 101:26 virtually [2] - 27:23, 80:47 visitors [1] - 35:15 visits [1] - 90:8 volume [9] - 18:12, 20:34, 34:25, 45:46, 69:35, 69:37, 88:24, 89:29, 91:46

W

76:32

WITNESS [1] - 101:19

witness [3] - 19:25,

witnessed [1] - 60:22

89:33, 89:34

wait [2] - 26:14, 26:21 walk [1] - 50:25

wants [13] - 5:2, 15:43, 16:3, 16:5, 21:20, 23:26, 47:26, 50:5, 59:31, 66:21, 74:46, 74:47 warned [1] - 60:25 warrants [1] - 63:7 water [1] - 78:13 ways [1] - 84:27 wear [1] - 23:29 website [1] - 36:14 Wednesday [1] -54:33 week [12] - 4:23, 53:23. 53:24. 53:26. 53:30, 53:34, 53:37, 53:41, 54:19, 54:30, 75:4, 76:8 weeks [2] - 49:12, 86:25 weigh [1] - 32:29 weight [4] - 79:13, 94:9, 94:43, 97:1 well-explained [1] -61:9 Western [1] - 44:15 Westin [3] - 82:2, 89:14, 89:16 whatsoever [2] -86:17. 86:22 WHEREOF [1] -101:19 whim [1] - 66:39 Whistler [1] - 40:1 whole [8] - 3:40, 25:1, 30:10, 37:38, 39:6, 43:23, 60:11, 68:2 wholistic [1] - 100:8 wholistically [2] -81:15, 98:11 wholly [1] - 57:40 wife [1] - 89:13 willing [2] - 52:27, 73:45 willingness [1] - 22:47 wind [1] - 95:39 wish [1] - 34:25 wished [1] - 45:27 withdraw [1] - 12:24 withdrawal [2] - 61:7, 61:18 withdrawn [1] - 20:28 withdrew [1] - 61:21 withheld [1] - 72:14 withholding [1] -

wonder [1] - 12:18 wondering [3] - 2:2, 55:46, 84:30 word [2] - 8:6, 92:39 wording [1] - 2:36 words [3] - 58:14, 85:34, 99:7 workings [1] - 56:12 works [2] - 77:32, 85:44 world [1] - 11:10 worn [1] - 22:28 worried [2] - 4:12, 5:37 worries [1] - 85:20 worry [2] - 4:14, 10:18 worth [2] - 17:31, 93:27 wrest [1] - 94:26 wrested [1] - 99:19 writes [5] - 48:29, 58:45, 62:36, 71:19, 71:20 writing [2] - 46:14, 93:24 written [9] - 12:42, 12:46, 17:26, 23:46, 35:27, 41:40, 57:29, 70:5, 75:45 wrote [3] - 61:31, 61:41, 66:21 Υ

year [12] - 22:8, 26:35,

74:15, 78:14, 78:17, 79:27, 79:43, 79:44, 79:45, 87:41 year-over-year [1] -78:14 years [25] - 4:30, 6:39, 6:40, 8:16, 15:16, 17:32, 17:35, 22:10, 23:22, 25:24, 25:29, 26:15, 26:36, 28:7, 34:37, 36:22, 40:36, 40:47, 41:12, 47:17, 49:36, 60:5, 64:29, 85:25 yesterday [15] - 1:19, 1:37, 1:44, 2:1, 2:42,

20:7, 21:19, 30:2, 36:42, 37:1, 52:8, 55:38, 61:12, 74:25, 78:12

yourself [1] - 19:46

Ζ

zoned [2] - 36:37,

37:19

No. S234048 Vancouver Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA (BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE WALKER)

Vancouver, BC September 12, 2024

BETWEEN:

599315 B.C. Ltd. and Daniel Matthews

Petitioners

AND:

Ecoasis Bear Mountain Developments Ltd., Ecoasis Developments LLP, and Ecoasis Resort and Golf LLP, Tian Kusumoto, and Sanovest Holdings Ltd.

Respondents

* * * * *

No. S243389 Vancouver Registry

IN BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY

IN THE MATTER OF THE RECEIVERSHIP OF ECOASIS DEVELOPMENTS LLP AND OTHERS

BETWEEN:

Sanovest Holdings Ltd.

Petitioners

AND:

Ecoasis Developments LLP,
Ecoasis Bear Mountain Developments Ltd.,
Ecoasis Resort and golf LLP, 0884185 B.C. Ltd.,
0884188 B.C. Ltd., 0884190 B.C. Ltd., 0884194 B.C. Ltd.,
BM 81/82 Lands Ltd., BM 83 Lands Ltd., BM 84 Lands Ltd.,
BM Capella Lands Ltd., BM Highlands Golf Course Ltd.,
BM Highlands Lands Ltd., BM Mountain Golf Course Ltd.,
and Bear Mountain Adventures Ltd.

Respondents

EXCERPT FROM PROCEEDINGS IN CHAMBERS (Proceedings from 10:02 AM to 10:25 AM, 10:40:00 AM to 11:48:37 AM, and 3:01:20 PM to 4:05:42 PM)

COPY

APPEARANCES

Counsel for Sanovest Holdings: A.I. Nathanson, KC

D. Byma K. Jackson L. Hiebert

Counsel for 599315 B.C. Ltd.: C.A.B. Ferris, KC G. Brandt

W.L. Roberts C. Ohama-Darcus J. Reid

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXCERPT FROM PROCEEDINGS IN CHAMBERS SEPTEMBER 12, 2024 (Proceedings from 10:02 AM to 10:25 AM, 10:40:00 AM to 11:48:37 AM, and 3:01:20 PM to 4:05:42 PM)

PROCEEDINGS

Witness	Proceedings	Page
	Submissions re notice of application by Cnsl G. Brandt	1
	Submissions re receivership matter by Cnsl W. Roberts	11
	Discussions re scheduling	28
	Discussion re case plan orders by Cnsl C. Ohama-Darcus	30
	Submissions re notice of application by Cnsl A. Nathanson	31
	Reporter certification	53

EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description	Page
---------	-------------	------

No exhibits marked.

RULINGS, REASONS, ORDERS

Description	Page
Description	Page

Nil.

```
1
                                         September 12, 2024
 2
                                         Vancouver, BC
 3
 4
                  (EXCERPT FROM PROCEEDINGS)
 5
                  (PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED) ([10:02:39 AM])
 7
 8
       THE CLERK: In the matter of 599315 BC Limited versus
 9
            Ecoasis and Bear Mountain Developments Limited on
10
            action S234048 and Sanovest Holdings Limited
11
            versus Ecoasis Developments LLP in action
12
            S2433889, Justice.
13
       THE COURT: Thank you.
14
                 Mr. Brandt?
15
16
       SUBMISSIONS RE NOTICE OF APPLICATION BY CNSL G. BRANDT:
17
18
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        Thank you, Justice.
                 I'll try and be quick this morning and go
19
20
            through some of the essential things. I'm not
21
            going to spend all -- all my time this morning in
22
            written argument, so --
23
       THE COURT: Okay.
24
       CNSL G. BRANDT: -- I'll let the court know once I --
25
            I -- I'm out of there.
       THE COURT:
26
                   Okay.
27
       CNSL G. BRANDT: For now, I'm going to start at
28
            paragraph 158 of the written argument.
29
       THE COURT: Yesterday, you left off at 135 or
30
                        So you're going to move ahead, then?
            something.
31
            Okay.
32
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        I'm going to move ahead.
33
       THE COURT:
                  158?
                       Yeah. For now.
34
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                  Okay. Okay.
35
       THE COURT:
       CNSL G. BRANDT: I -- I can certainly commend that the
36
            court will rely on the written argument for some
37
38
            of the details regarding the transition out of the
39
                   That's the section 141 to 148.
            hotel.
40
                 And the -- the next section, from 149 to 153,
41
            deals with the current financial situation of the
42
            partnership, and that's been addressed to some
43
            extent already.
44
       THE COURT: Okay.
                         Thank you.
45
       CNSL G. BRANDT: We're relying on the argument on -- on
46
            the filing matters, essentially. Not -- not an
47
            urgent matter.
```

THE COURT: All right. 2 CNSL G. BRANDT: In -- into paragraph 158, the status 3 of financial statements, Sanovest and Mr. Tian 4 Kusumoto have asserted as one of the issues here 5 said to affect the partnership is the financial statements not being available. 7 Mr. Matthews -- this is at tab 77 of the 8 condensed book -- has provided a -- his 9 comprehensive response to this and a letter from 10 counsel. 11 And the material part is actually set out in 12 the submission -- in our written submission. 13 THE COURT: Yeah. 14 CNSL G. BRANDT: So I won't go to tab 77. But it says, as follows -- and, actually, I'll just ask the 15 16 court just to read this, given that it relates to 17 the arbitration. 18 THE COURT: So they are completed but not filed yet. 19 So does Mr. Tian Kusumoto have copies of what's --20 what's in draft? Because I understand in 10 -- in 21 160, there are disagreements about --22 CNSL G. BRANDT: Yes. Yes, so -- so, yes, exactly. 23 Paragraph 160, what it addresses here -- this is 24 Mr. Matthews's evidence --25 THE COURT: Yeah. 26 CNSL G. BRANDT: -- is that the two -- 2019 and 2020 27 statements are in draft and that -- and he's 28 prepared to sign those draft statements, but 29 Mr. Kusumoto refuses to accept this. And, as a 30 result, that has a knock-on effect on the 31 subsequent financial statements. 32 And what these -- the -- these 2019 and 2020 33 statements and the transactions there relate to, 34 among other things, the characterization of the purchase of the $\bar{\text{BMAC}}$ property. And -- and so 35 36 it's, in part, the dispute -- it's, in part, the 37 unavailability of information and delay and, in 38 part, dispute over the transactions that are in 39 issue that have resulted in current financial 40 statements not being available. 41 THE COURT: All right. 42 CNSL A. NATHANSON: Justice, I hesitate to interrupt my friend. It's a small point. But at paragraph 159 43 44 of his written submissions, the quote is 45 inaccurately -- this is a typographical error. 46 It's attributed to Mr. Kusumoto when it should be 47 to Mr. Matthews.

```
So the quote -- the inset quote at the top of
 2
            page 37 -- you see the reference? It says
 3
            "Kusumoto number 1," and that should be Matthews
 4
            number 1.
 5
       THE COURT:
                   Oh, okay.
                             All right.
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: I just wanted you to know that so
 7
            you don't think that's my client's evidence.
 8
       THE COURT: All right.
 9
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       Apologies for that.
10
       THE COURT:
                  All right. Thank you. Okay.
11
                       All right. Now, I just want -- just
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
12
            in terms of dealing with some of the third-party
13
            litigation matters, the court asked yesterday
14
            about the Gold Tees matters, the two proceedings
15
            there. And there is a settlement agreement.
16
            There is settlement -- settlement terms that were
            reached at mediation that were never ratified --
17
            that were not ratified by Mr. Kusumoto and,
18
19
            therefore, not ratified by the board of directors
20
            of EBMD. And so the matter remains outstanding.
21
            It's being defended by the partnership on the
22
            basis that there is no settlement.
23
                 But the application to enforce the
24
            settlement -- and this is the -- the two matters
25
            involving Mr. Constable and Gold Tees.
26
            application-enforced settlement is for $1.5
27
                      That's effectively the net amount that's
            million.
28
            in issue in both of those litigation matters.
29
                 I do have a copy of the application that I've
30
            given to my friend. I'm not sure if the court --
31
       THE COURT:
                   These are the Nanaimo registered matters?
32
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       Correct. Correct.
33
       THE COURT: I don't need them. So, essentially, your
            clients are -- are putting the blame on
34
            Mr. Kusumoto's feet. There's a settlement, he's
35
36
            refused to endorse it, therefore, the board can't
37
            approve it, and there's a lawsuit to enforce the
38
            settlement?
39
                        The lawsuit would be resolved if
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
40
            the -- the -- both lawsuits would be resolved if
41
            the settlement were endorsed.
42
       THE COURT: And -- and who's -- and who's defending the
43
            lawsuit?
                     The partnership?
44
       CNSL G. BRANDT: The partnership is defending the
45
            lawsuit jointly. Jointly instructed.
46
            there's, yeah, counsel specifically retained for
47
            that purpose.
```

```
THE COURT: Separate law -- separate counsel?
 2
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                         Separate counsel.
 3
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
 4
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        All right. Paragraph 165, these are
 5
            the -- what we've called the selected sites.
            Again, I'm -- that there are three sites that have
 7
            been identified for sale in Victoria. Peaks
 8
            Height [phonetic], which has a -- a valued
 9
            estimate that's set out here.
10
                  At paragraph 169, the Hole 5 multi-parcel --
11
                   Can -- can I just go back? Sorry.
            does that work, then? If the partnership's
12
13
            defending on the basis no settlement was agreed
14
            but your client -- Mr. Matthews is saying it was
15
            reached? How does -- how do you -- how does that
16
            reconcile?
17
                         Well ...
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
       THE COURT: Because it seems to be that if I were on
18
19
            for the plaintiffs in those actions, I would be
            pointing to your client's evidence in this action.
20
21
       CNSL G. BRANDT: Well, so --
22
       THE COURT: And there's no defence.
23
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                         So Mr. Matthews is also -- we're --
24
            we're also separately counsel for Mr. Matthews
25
            also -- also defending on the basis that the
26
            settlement required approval of the board of
27
            directors.
28
       THE COURT:
                   Oh, I see. Okay. Okay. Condition
29
                         There was a -- there was a condition
            precedent.
30
            to the settlement.
31
       CNSL G. BRANDT: That's -- that's the position of both
32
            the partnership and Mr. Matthews.
33
                   Okay. All right.
       THE COURT:
                                       So Mr. Matthews is being
34
            separately represented?
35
       CNSL G. BRANDT: So -- so Mr. Matthews -- we're
36
            representing Mr. Matthews --
37
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
38
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                         -- in that matter.
39
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
40
       CNSL G. BRANDT: And the partnership is separately
41
            represented on joint instructions.
42
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
                          Okay.
       CNSL G. BRANDT: So I -- just this next section of the argument, which I -- I don't propose to go to in
43
44
45
            great detail, are the sites that have been
46
            identified -- three sites that collectively have,
47
            we say, value that will more than retire the
```

Sanovest loan.

And just noting that the Player -- that the Players Peak parcel, that's the one at paragraph 173, is ready to be marketed and sold without any further bundling or -- of any kind.

And for the other two sites, they can be prepared for marketing quickly — the Victoria Peak within 60 days. And obviously, as was pointed out yesterday, the business of this partnership — land partnership has always been to market and sell. That's going to involve certain bundling or subdivisions to effect that. That's a part of their ordinary business.

And the marketing process can begin before all the steps are finalized.

All right. I -- some of this -- some of these next paragraphs have already been dealt with to the extent that the 2023 Colliers report recommends a selected site approach. That's what's being advanced here.

Just in the next section, I've already made submissions yesterday that this will be approximately 75 percent of the total expected development area in tact, even though certain of that land has not yet been rezoned for development.

All right. I'm going to move off my written argument address.

The allegation that there -- that there is sort of a \$14 million amount that's being removed from the partnership, and this \$14 million amount has somehow created an illiquidity crisis for the partnership. I'm going to start just into the record at tab 14, the joint application record. It's the affidavit number 1 of Mr. Matthews.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL G. BRANDT: And I'm at Exhibit DD. It's an email from Mr. Kusumoto to Mr. Matthews.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL G. BRANDT: So this is -- this is part of the correspondence that starts to be exchanged between Mr. Matthews and Mr. Kusumoto following Mr. Kusumoto taking on the role of Sanovest's nominee to the directors. I'm just into the fourth paragraph here with regards to shareholder loans.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL G. BRANDT: Just in the -- in the middle, we have Mr. Kusumoto stating:

In addition, I feel that security on your home is warranted given that we are unresolved on how to move forward and your plan for repayment for the more than \$12 million of indebtedness that's in the air. I was extremely troubled to learn that the gondola site that was taken from Ecoasis without consultation is actually worth 5 million, and the CRA would likely ask for 1.3 million in taxes from its sale in 2019. This should be your liability as the gondola site should be returned to Ecoasis as you have no means to pay for it.

So -- so this is -- I'm going to go through several of these examples --

THE COURT: Right.

CNSL G. BRANDT: -- where these allegations are raised.
THE COURT: You're going to have to help me explain
 what that's about.

CNSL G. BRANDT: So ...

THE COURT: Why -- why it matters.

CNSL G. BRANDT: Why it matters. So the allegation is that \$14 million was removed by Mr. Matthews from the partnership. And as -- as -- as has been said, this -- that the liquidity crisis -- effectively part of the reason that my friends say a receiver is required to assume conduct of both the partnership and the Resort partnership is because -- it's not because Sanovest has refused land sales. It's not because Sanovest has refused advances under the loan. It's not because Sanovest has refused refinancing of the loan. It's because there's 14 million missing dollars that Matthews took.

CNSL K. JACKSON: Justice, I'm going to rise briefly on that. I think my friend is -- is not correct in his summary of our submissions. It has nothing to do with liquidity. We never suggested that these allegations related to the liquidity crisis faced by Resorts.

It is a reference to -- it was -- it was raised as a reference to the issues that exist between the partners and the allegations going

```
back and forth.
 2
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Oh, I -- I -- Justice, sorry.
 3
            This -- this is the challenge of a complicated
 4
            matter coming on quickly. I think I have to
 5
            correct Mr. Jackson and be a little bit fair to
            Mr. Brandt here.
 7
                  There were -- are documents where our
 8
            client -- and you'll see some in my submissions
 9
            this afternoon where my client said, we wouldn't
            be in this pickle if you didn't take all this
10
11
            money.
12
       THE COURT:
                   M'mm-hmm.
13
                           So I -- I think Mr. Brandt is fair
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
14
            to -- to make the point that he does.
                                                     We don't
15
            say it's the whole reason, but I think Mr. Jackson
16
            maybe didn't appreciate there's some evidence
17
            buried that does kind of connect --
18
       THE COURT: It's not something Mr. Jackson raised, it's
19
            something --
20
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           No, no, no.
21
       THE COURT:
                    You're --
22
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            That's why I'm -- no, but I'm just
23
            saying --
24
                   You're going to raise it.
       THE COURT:
25
                           -- I'm -- I'm defending Mr. Brandt
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
26
            in saying he's being fair in this instance --
27
                   Yeah, I understand.
       THE COURT:
28
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- in the submission he's making.
29
                   Right. Right.
       THE COURT:
30
       CNSL G. BRANDT: It's not -- sorry. My point --
31
       THE COURT:
                   Yes.
32
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                         -- is, Justice, it wasn't the reason
33
            that it was in my submissions.
       THE COURT: Yeah. And it's not -- it doesn't ground, necessarily, the -- the receivership application.
34
35
36
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                        No.
37
       THE COURT:
                    You -- you say it's a whole -- a whole
38
            different --
39
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Well, reasons for -- reasons for
40
            the illiquidity are -- are --
41
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
42
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- not relevant at all.
43
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
44
       CNSL G. BRANDT: So, Justice, three things in response
45
            to that.
46
                  First, it was -- it was raised yesterday as
47
            part of the factual matrix here.
```

```
THE COURT: Yeah.
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       Secondly, it's an allegation that's
 3
            used to justify a receiver that's going to remove
 4
            Mr. Matthews from his position, effectively.
 5
                 And -- and -- and, thirdly, because we say
            part of the unfairness and part of the oppression,
            the grounds and remedy we're seeking, is the
 7
            refusal of funding under the Sanovest loan.
8
 9
                 One of the justifications put forward -- and
10
            this is what Mr. Nathanson --
11
       THE COURT: Oh, I see. Okay.
       CNSL G. BRANDT: -- was referring to is we're not going
12
            to fund only to have our money misappropriated by
13
14
            Mr. Matthews.
15
                 And we see that theme or trope through in the
16
            last three years.
                              And -- and that's, in part, why
17
            I'm responding to it.
18
       THE COURT: Is that, then -- I asked you yesterday,
19
            what was the reason for the sudden change? If you
20
            recall, we just had this colloquy yesterday
21
            because you pointed to Mr. Tian Kusumoto's
22
            position up to early in May and then the sudden
23
            change. And you say there was no evidence about
24
            that; I had to make -- draw inferences. Is this,
25
            potentially, one of the reasons?
26
       CNSL G. BRANDT: Yeah, so -- so what we're going to see
27
            here -- and -- and I'm going to come to the
28
            submission -- is one of the changes that occurs is
29
            Mr. Tian Kusumoto comes in as a Sanovest
30
            representative to EBMD.
31
       THE COURT: Right.
32
       CNSL G. BRANDT:
                       Starts to disagree with decisions that
33
            Mr. Tom Kusumoto made while he was in that
34
            position.
35
       THE COURT:
                  Right.
36
       CNSL G. BRANDT: And -- and that -- and that is what we
37
            see happening here is Mr. Tian Kusumoto trying to
38
            undo transactions that were authorized by Mr. Tom
39
            Kusumoto, presumably because he believes and --
40
            and he's alleged in the claim initiated by
41
            Sanovest that those were the results of Mr. Tom
42
            Kusumoto's breaches of duty.
                                         They were not in the
43
            best interest of Sanovest.
44
                 And so I think it is fair to infer that
45
            that's part what -- what represents the change,
46
            the overall -- not only on sales but the overall
47
            change of direction here is Mr. Tian Kusumoto
```

coming in and saying, well, part of what was done here while his father was in place is not in the 3 best interest of the company. And -- and, in 4 part, Mr. Matthews -- the other side of that is 5 pivoting and -- and pinning that on Mr. Matthews. I'm into tab 85 now back in the -- in the 7 condensed book. 8 THE COURT: Just a second. 9 CNSL G. BRANDT: Second volume. 10 THE COURT: Yeah, just a moment. 11 CNSL G. BRANDT: And so this -- this is an email from 12 August 18th, 2021, from Mr. Kusumoto to Mr. Matthews. And I'm just going to just take the 13 14 court just to the first paragraph in that email 15 where Mr. Kusumoto says to Mr. Matthews: 16 17 I'm surprised and disappointed by your 18 characterization of my comments during our 19 monthly telephone conferences. It appears 20 that you are trying to paint me up as the bad 21 guy by purposely deflecting the primary issue 22 of you owing --23 24 Matthews owing, 25 26 -- Ecoasis more than 14 million. 27 28 And then: 29 30 If you simply repaid all the money you owed 31 to Ecoasis, there would be no liquidity 32 issue. 33 34 And that -- that's the allegation is that this \$14 million has created a liquidity issue. 35 36 So over at the next tab of the ... Tab 86? 37 THE COURT: 38 CNSL G. BRANDT: Just need to correct that reference. 39 I'll come -- I'll come back to this in just one moment. 40 41 THE COURT: All right. 42 CNSL G. BRANDT: I'll provide the reference in a 43 moment. It's -- it's a letter from my friend 44 Mr. Nathanson to Mr. Ferris on April the 5th, 45 2024, that also simply just refers to there being 46 a solvency crisis of Mr. Matthews's own making.

47

THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.

CNSL G. BRANDT: That's -- that's a minor point. don't need to go into that detail. 3 So I do want -- what I do want to get into is 4 what the alleged self-interested transactions are. 5 What -- what is this \$14 million said to be made up from. 7 And to assist there, I'm going to go into 8 Mr. -- into tab 17 of the -- of the main record 9 again. 10 THE COURT: Just a second. Can I put away tab 14, or 11 do I need that out? 12 CNSL G. BRANDT: No, I think you can ... THE COURT: So I -- what you're showing me is you're 13 14 showing me evidence of Mr. Tian Kusumoto blames 15 Mr. Matthews for creating the liquidity crisis. 16 Your clients have taken -- you've taken the evidence -- or your client's showing me that they 17 blame Mr. Tian Kusumoto for the present crisis 18 19 because he's not advancing funds, blocking sales, 20 et cetera. 21 And you've -- you've told -- so I take it 22 you're showing me all of this to say there's a 23 contested -- there's contested evidence between 24 parties as to who's responsible for the liquidity 25 crisis and the -- the deadlock. Right? 26 Right. Right. I mean, what I'm CNSL G. BRANDT: 27 saying here is this -- is this \$14 million 28 number --29 THE COURT: Yeah. 30 CNSL G. BRANDT: -- is -- two things about it. There's 31 nothing about this number -- or the -- the amount 32 of this figure that actually represents cash is 33 very -- is -- is not anywhere near \$14 million and 34 that the transactions that are complained of were 35 all transactions that were authorized by Tom 36 Kusumoto. Those are -- those are my --No, but, presumably -- but there's an issue 37 THE COURT: 38 with that because the allegation is he acted -- he acted improper -- well, malafide. He's into 39 40 self-dealing -- self-interested dealing. 41 So where I was going to go next is how can I 42 decide any of this on -- on these -- these competing applications? What I'm faced with is 43 44 competing allegations between the parties and

conflicting evidence as to who did what to cause

the present deadlock and the liquidity crisis .

can't -- how can I decide if Tom Kusumoto acted

45

46

47

11 Submissions re receivership matter by Cnsl W. Roberts

properly or not, whether he acted *malafide*, whether Mr. Tian Kusumoto was properly -- properly saying, look, I'm not going to advance any more money in the wake of all of these things? Right?

What I'm facing is the parties have come before the court saying each of the other is fully responsible for the present problem, the present deadlock.

(EXCERPT ENDS) ([10:25:05 AM]) [SUBMISSIONS BY CNSL G. BRANT] (EXCERPT BEGINS) ([10:40:00 AM])

THE COURT: Mr. Roberts.

SUBMISSIONS RE RECEIVERSHIP MATTER BY CNSL W. ROBERTS:

CNSL W. ROBERTS: Thank you, Justice.

I'm going to try and take you reasonably quickly through a few issues.

One, we say the line is -- when you're considering a receivership order or competing receivership orders, you should be striving to interfere with the operations as little as possible.

Two, that what Sanovest is asking for is overly broad. They're asking for, (a), to be repaid their debt, and, (b), effectively to wind up the partnership.

And they haven't met the threshold for that latter portion. We're not really disputing that they haven't met the threshold for the former as secured creditor. But for the latter, we say they haven't met their threshold.

And what we've proposed, as modified -- and I'll take you through -- meets both of those criteria. One, it's as little as possible -- as necessary, maybe, is better to say. As little as necessary. It acknowledges their position of secured creditor and moves them towards repayment, interferes as little as possible, and it is open-ended. To --

THE COURT: You said the law is clear on that point.

Do you have any cases you can point me to?

CNSL W. ROBERTS: I'm going -- I'm -- I'm going to take you there. And I don't know if I said "clear," but I'm going to take you to law.

```
THE COURT: I took -- I took that as an effect of your
 2
            submission that is law is clear.
 3
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: On the -- on the do as little as
            possible?
 4
 5
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         Yes.
 7
       THE COURT: And only as necessary.
 8
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Yeah. How about this: Madam Justice
 9
            Fitzpatrick seems to think it's clear, so I'll --
10
            I'll start.
11
                 I'm in the written argument. I'm not going
12
            to take you through a lot, but I want to highlight
13
            a few points.
14
                 I'll just get my argument back up. Hang on a
15
            second.
                   That's the written argument of ...
16
       THE COURT:
17
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Of 599, again, and Matthews.
       THE COURT: Yeah, regarding the receivership
18
19
            application.
20
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        So I'm three-quarters of the way in,
21
            page 47, paragraph 206.
22
       THE COURT: You have -- this must be an extra copy.
23
            You handed me one that was cerlox-bound?
24
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: I -- it's the same one you should
25
            have had moments ago --
26
       THE COURT:
                   Oh.
27
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        -- that Mr. Brandt was referring to.
28
       THE COURT: Oh, the written -- oh, right. Okay. So
29
            this is -- okay. All right.
                                          So this is ...
30
            Okay.
                   Thank you.
31
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: So the first bit I'm going to --
32
       THE COURT:
                   So which paragraph are you in? I'm sorry.
33
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        I'm at page 47, paragraph 206.
34
       THE COURT: Okay. Okay.
35
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        And I'm going to start with just the
36
            basics.
37
                 And there's actually no disagreement about
38
            what is the legal test for the appointment of a
39
            receiver. And I do want to highlight, again, the
40
            distinction between the right to appoint a
41
            receiver as a secured creditor and the application
42
            under the Corporations Act, the Law and Equity Act
43
            of a partner.
44
                 And so we have the applicable -- well,
45
            starting at 206, the applicable test, there's no
46
            dispute.
47
                 We rely also on section 227 of the
```

```
Corporations Act, which, again, leaves the court
 2
            with a broad discretion to do what it thinks is
 3
            right.
 4
                 I'm at 212:
 5
                 However, contrary to Sanovest and Tian
 7
                 Kusumoto's submissions, it is not clear that
 8
                 the standard of a strong prima facie case
 9
                 necessarily applies to the relief sought in
10
                 the funding application.
11
12
            I want to draw that distinction.
13
                 In order -- I'm going to call their -- their
            partnership receivership, and I don't mean that in
14
15
            capitals. I just wanted to distinguish between
16
            two hats they're wearing. In their partnership
17
            receivership application, they're effectively
18
            seeking interim relief akin to an injunction.
19
                 And because they have no contractual right to
20
            seek that as a partner, they have to do it under
21
            either the Law and Equity Act or the Company Act.
22
                 And so the test for that is similar to an
23
            injunction order. [Indiscernible] and it has to
24
            be a prong -- strong prima facie case.
25
       THE COURT:
                   Just hang on.
26
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         Please.
27
       THE COURT:
                   I thought the application of the receiver
28
            was based on the BIA and section 39 of the Law and
29
            Equity Act and nothing -- and --
30
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: There's --
31
       THE COURT: -- including whether that was a contractual
32
            right to appoint a receiver. But it was -- I
33
            didn't appreciate it was grounded on --
34
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Our --
35
       THE COURT: -- the partnership. The way you said
            "their" -- "their," so I thought you meant
36
37
            Sanovest.
38
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         They brought theirs under 243 and
39
            section 39 in the Law and Equity Act.
       THE COURT: Right.
40
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Ours is also under section 227 of the
41
42
            Company Act.
                           But a moment ago, you said "their
43
       THE COURT:
                  Right.
44
            partnership."
45
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Oh, then I misstated, then.
46
       THE COURT:
                   I thought --
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: I'm -- I'm -- I'm -- what I'm trying
47
```

```
to do is draw the distinction --
 2
       THE COURT: Yeah.
 3
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         -- between them bringing an
 4
            application as a secured creditor --
 5
       THE COURT:
                  Right.
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- which we say, if they were only
 7
            saying as secured creditor, I want my money
 8
            back --
       THE COURT: Right.
 9
10
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- then the receivership application
11
            should be crafted to do that.
12
       THE COURT: Right.
13
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Which we say ours does. Which is, if
14
            you sold these three things, their debt is repaid,
15
            and it's over.
16
       THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
17
                         They're asking for more.
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
18
            want -- I'm going to go to big picture.
19
                   Yeah.
       THE COURT:
20
                        There's Developments and Resorts.
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
21
       THE COURT: Right.
22
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Developments is where all the land
23
            is. Resorts is operations.
24
       THE COURT: Okay.
25
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        If they only wanted to be repaid as a
26
            secured creditor, they would only be seeking a
27
            receiver over Developments to sell just enough
28
            land to pay them 60 million or $70 million.
29
                 They're not.
                               They're seeking a receiver over
30
            both Developments and Resorts. Resorts is not
31
            going to get them repaid any money.
       THE COURT: Right.
32
33
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: The land is what's going to get them
34
            their money as secured creditor. But they want a
35
            full receiver.
36
                 And so the distinction -- the point I want to
37
            make is they're asking for a full receivership
38
            wearing two hats: one as secured creditor, one as
39
            a partner in this business.
40
                 I say the tests are different for those two
41
            things.
42
                 The former is a lower threshold because they
43
            have a contractual right to seek it.
44
       THE COURT: Okay. Well, even apart from the
45
            contractual right, it's a --
46
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Apart from a contractual right --
47
       THE COURT: -- lower threshold.
```

```
CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- it's an extraordinary remedy.
                 And so if they want the extraordinary remedy,
 3
            they want receivership that does more than repays
 4
            the debt, they have to meet a higher threshold,
 5
            and that higher threshold includes a strong prima
            facie case on their evidence of what's going wrong
 7
            here.
 8
                 And so what we say is we've crafted an order
 9
            that we say does what needs to be done, the
10
            minimum necessary to, (a), get them repaid as
11
            secured creditor, which is, let's go out and sell
12
            what needs to be sold to pay your $60 million.
13
            And we've added in -- in the submissions over the
14
            last two days an investigatory power so that if
15
            there is more that needs to be done, this receiver
16
            can then make the report about what more needs to
17
                      Because we say they haven't met the test
            be done.
            for the extraordinary relief for the receivership
18
19
            over Resorts and the receivership over more assets
20
            than are necessary to repay them their debt.
21
       THE COURT:
                   So, I'm sorry, I thought the other day your
22
            client had moved to a broader approach, which was
23
            keep Resorts out of it, but in terms of
24
            Developments, the partnership, appoint a receiver,
25
            and let the receiver come back and tell the court
26
            what a proper approach would be, and a --
27
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         Right.
28
       THE COURT: -- receiver could also tell the court,
29
            look, one of the assets is resorts, and that needs to be folded in or it -\!\!\!- or it doesn't.
30
31
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: That's where we've moved to.
       THE COURT: Okay.
32
33
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         Correct.
34
       THE COURT: Because right now, I'm hearing you say,
35
            well, no, it's back to --
36
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         Sorry.
37
       THE COURT: -- well, don't -- tell the receiver it's
38
            these specific profits that you have to deal with.
39
            So I want to make sure I'm clear.
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
40
                                    Thank you. So let's start
                         So, yeah.
41
            with the -- the applications that were originally
42
            in front of you --
43
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- which is full receiver and this
44
45
            one.
46
       CNSL K. JACKSON: I wonder if it might be helpful --
47
            we've seen the draft order. It might be --
```

```
I'm -- I'm going to take you to it.
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
 2
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Okay.
 3
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         I promise.
 4
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Okay.
 5
       THE COURT:
                   I'm aware that there was a -- the original
            application -- one was very broad.
 7
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Yeah.
 8
       THE COURT: And your client was, look, tell the
 9
            receiver he can only sell these specific pieces of
10
            property.
11
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Yes.
12
       THE COURT: And then you -- you moved away from that
13
            the other day.
14
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         Yes.
15
       THE COURT: Yeah.
                         Okay.
16
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         And where we -- where we've moved --
17
            we've tried to move into here.
18
       THE COURT:
                  Yeah. All right.
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: In fact, by noon today, I'm going to
19
20
            tell you we'll move even farther --
21
       THE COURT:
                  All right.
22
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- to get -- to get to what we say is
23
            only that which is necessary.
24
       THE COURT: Okay.
25
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: But it's -- exactly, in broad
26
            strokes, it's receiver over Developments with the
27
            only power to come back to develop a sales program
            and make a recommendation to you about it, not a
28
29
            receiver over Resorts because we say, (a), it's
30
            not necessary today and, (b), the high threshold
31
            hasn't been met.
32
                 But the power for that receiver to
33
            investigate and come back to you -- and just as
            you put it, if the receiver says, this needs to be
34
35
            brought in, and they make that recommendation, you
36
            can make the order that you see fit with a couple
37
            of corollaries to it -- of course, devil in the
38
            details -- power to get funding and for the
39
            arbitration proceedings to be carved out so those
40
            aren't interfered with over the next two weeks.
41
       THE COURT:
                   But why would I, in your model, tell the
42
            receiver, specifically develop a proper sales -- a
43
            sales program? Why wouldn't I say to the
44
            receiver, you step in and take control of the
45
            assets, and you come back and tell me what can be
46
            done, if anything, to monetize the assets?
47
                 In other words, why go any -- why go further
```

```
than to specifically say to the receiver, your
 2
            role is limited to developing a sales program?
 3
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         I -- I agree.
 4
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
 5
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         And we'd be perfectly happy with
            that.
 7
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
 8
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        What we didn't -- what we didn't want
 9
            to do was constrain -- maybe a different way.
10
            We're trying to find something here.
11
                   You want -- you don't want the Resorts --
12
            you don't want Resorts to be brought in the
13
            receivership; correct?
14
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: At least not yet.
15
       THE COURT:
                   Not yet.
16
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
17
                   I got -- yeah.
       THE COURT:
18
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: And what we say is if the receiver
19
            comes back and decides that he should, then my
20
            friends will end up where they want to be. My
21
            friends want to be all the way over here with the
22
                            If the receiver agrees with them,
            full receiver.
23
            that's where we'll end up.
24
       THE COURT: Right.
25
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        We don't think the receiver is going
26
            to agree with them.
27
                   And does your -- and does your model as the
       THE COURT:
28
            receiver have the -- the right and authority to go
29
            in and look at the books of Resorts?
30
                               And so the draft -- I'll take
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Yes.
31
            you through it. The draft order we had was the
32
            receiver has -- if you remember under -- under the
33
            model were 2(a) through (1) are powers to go in.
34
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
35
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         And in 3, we included all of that --
36
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
37
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- so that the receiver can compel
38
            all of the Ecoasis parties --
39
       THE COURT: Right.
40
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- and the two partners to give over
41
            whatever information the receiver needs to make
42
            that determination.
43
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
44
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         So --
45
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
46
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        -- the first point I just wanted to
47
            make was that the extraordinary relief being
```

```
sought --
 2
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
 3
                         -- I say you're not there, that they
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
 4
            haven't given you enough to make that
 5
            determination.
                 And I'm going to, then, skip to -- you had
 7
            asked what jurisdiction there is --
 8
       THE COURT: Right.
 9
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         -- to do an invest -- I called it an
10
            investigatory receivership but not for any real
11
            reason. And I'm going to pass you up a couple
12
            things: one, the case in the Ontario court of
13
            appeal talking about investigatory receivers, and
14
            then I'm going to pass up two orders made by Madam
15
            Justice Fitzpatrick, where she appointed BDO first
16
            as an investigator and then converted that
17
            investigation into a receivership.
18
            receiver -- the investigator was told to go out
19
            and investigate, come back, tell me what I should
20
            do, and then converted it.
21
                  And just I reference --
22
                         Do you have copies for anyone else?
       CNSL L. HIEBERT:
23
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Yeah. Yes, I have copies for
24
            everybody else. Hence the stack.
25
                  Ms. Jess Reid from MLT Aikins is here, the
26
            proposed receiver's counsel. And her comment
27
            on --
                    So there's -- there's a new counsel? Who?
28
       THE COURT:
29
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Oh, sorry.
30
       THE COURT:
                   She's here?
31
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: She's here.
32
       THE COURT: All right.
33
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: And she's the proposed BDO -- our
34
            proposed receiver. She's proposed counsel for the
35
            proposed receiver just in case you had questions
36
            on what happened in the one that Madam Justice
37
            Fitzpatrick did --
38
       THE COURT:
                   I see.
39
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         -- when she appointed an investigator
40
            or on the workability of our investigatory
41
            receiver proposal.
42
       THE COURT: And I take it that the premise -- the
43
            starting point in the analysis is section 243, and
            you're saying -- are you saying under 243-1(a) I -- the order -- that the BIA authorizes me to
44
45
46
            issue an order that permits the receiver to take
47
            possession of -- of all or substantially all of
```

```
the inventory --
                         Correct.
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
 3
       THE COURT: -- not the assets? So you say that's the
 4
            basis of which I can hive off Resorts.
 5
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        And the three subsections of 243 are
            disjunctive.
 7
       THE COURT: Right.
 8
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: So it starts with all or
 9
            substantially all.
10
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
11
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: And then -- and then in (c) --
12
       THE COURT: So --
13
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Anything -- anything else you deem
14
            advisable.
15
       THE COURT: All right.
16
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        And the case I'm going to take you to
17
            in the Ontario court of appeal is going to be
18
            Ontario Superior -- Courts of Justice Act.
       THE COURT: Okay.
19
20
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Which is similar to our Law and
21
            Equity Act --
22
       THE COURT: Okay.
23
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        -- and essentially says -- just going
24
            to be passing up the language for it.
25
       THE COURT: All right.
26
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Assuming I can find it.
27
                 So just for ease of reference, it's essential
            section 39 of the Law and Equity Act.
28
29
       THE COURT: Thank you.
30
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: And section 101 of the Courts of
31
            Justice Act just so you can see all --
32
       THE COURT:
                   Thank you.
                        -- the ...
33
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
34
                 So in section 39 of the Law and Equity Act --
35
       THE COURT: Right.
36
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        -- and you've seen this dozens of
37
            times -- in 39(1) where it's just and convenient
38
            as the broad --
39
       THE COURT: Right.
                        -- wording.
40
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
41
                 And then in 101 of the Courts of Justice Act,
42
            the tail end where it appears to a judge of the
43
            court to be just or convenient to do so.
44
       THE COURT:
                  Effectively the same language.
45
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        So if I can take you to Akagi --
46
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
47
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- which is the court of appeal. A
```

different scenario -- a quite different scenario. It was dealing with enforcement of a judgment. But there -- the court went on to discuss exactly the issue -- we're talking about investigatory receiverships.

At paragraph 65 of that decision, they start the discussion.

THE COURT: Right. CNSL W. ROBERTS:

The idea of appointing a receiver or monitor with investigative powers -- and sometimes, with only those powers --

I'll stop there for a second 'cause that was one of the questions you had asked yesterday: Can it be investigative only?

-- and sometimes, with only those powers -- has emerged in recent years. This court has not previously been asked to consider whether, or in what circumstances, a section [sic] 101 receiver may be empowered in this fashion.

And they're just talking about what would be, for us, a section 39 receiver:

For the purposes of this appeal, it is not necessary that the contours of such an appointment be traced in a detailed manner. Suffice it to say that the idea of appointing a receiver investigate into the affairs of a debtor is not itself unsound. Rather, it is the runaway niche of the use to which the concept has been put in this case that gives rise to the problem.

So this case had other issues in it:

Indeed, whether it is labelled as [sic] an 'investigative' receivership or not, there is much to be said in favour of such a tool, in my view -- when it is utilized in appropriate circumstances and with appropriate restraints. Clearly, there are situations where the appointment of a receiver to

investigate the affairs of ... a debtor or to review certain transactions -- including even, in proper circumstances, the affairs ... and transactions concerning related non-parties -- will be a proper exercise of the court's 'just and convenient' authority ...

And cites:

It goes without saying that the root principles governing the appointment of any receiver remain in play in this context, however ... in this respect, two 'bookend' considerations, are particularly germane. the one hand, the authority of the court to appoint a receiver under section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act 'where it appears ... just or convenient to do so' is undoubtedly broad and must be shaped by the circumstances of individual cases. At the same time, however, the appointment of a receiver is an extraordinary and intrusive remedy and one that should be granted only after a careful balancing of the effect of such an order on all of the parties and others who may be affected ...

I'll stop there for a second.

THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: Again, I -- I take that as support of what we're pitching to you, which is building up. Start with the least intrusive thing possible and then, as necessary, increase:

In the case of a receivership in aid of execution, at least, the appointment requires evidence that the creditor's right to recovery is in serious jeopardy.

Not an issue here:

It is the tension between those two considerations that defines the parameters of a [sic] receivership orders ... in aid of execution.

So then they go on and discuss a couple of other cases where it's happened.

THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: At 69:

The first is Stroh V. Millers Cove Resources Inc. ... Because it involved an oppression remedy claim --

Just like here,

-- the appointment ... of an inspector under the OBCA was an available option. Justice Farley appointed a receiver to take control of the assets of a company and to investigate and conduct an independent review of certain self-dealing transactions by the company's majority shareholder, of which the company's directors were unaware. In affirming his decision, the Divisional Court underlined that 'the main thrust' of the order was to ensure that the company's assets and arrangements '[could] be fully examined and considered so that future actions [could] then be planned'.

Which is exactly what we're proposing:

It is important to note that in *Stroh* the defendant corporation was not an operating company and that Farley J. only granted the receivership remedy after giving counsel the opportunity to reattend ... and make further submissions about whether the officer to be appointed should be a receiver/manager, a monitor, an inspector or something else.

And the inspector is a Company Act -- THE COURT: Right.
CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- animal:

He ultimately concluded that the only way the investigation stood any chance of discuss (because of the secrecy of the majority shareholder and the power it exercised) was to appoint a receiver with the authority sought [sic].

```
2
            If I can take you down to 81.
 3
                  So the issue, then, is what -- what
       THE COURT:
 4
            authority -- and not authority but what statute
 5
            should be given to the receiver under your model
            to investigate -- to take control of and
 7
            investigate --
8
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
 9
       THE COURT: -- without running the business of -- of
10
            the -- of the Resorts.
11
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: So if -- if I could divide them into
12
            two things. One, can I satisfy you with a good
13
            idea --
14
       THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
15
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        -- in deciding this? Two, under what
16
            jurisdiction?
17
                 What we say is you have multiple sources of
            jurisdiction here. Section 39 or under the
18
19
            Company Act, which our application is going under
20
            227, which is similar to an investigative --
21
       THE COURT: An inspector has different rights --
22
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Agreed.
23
       THE COURT: -- than --
24
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: And we -- we actually think, in this
25
            case, the receivership order gives more powers
26
            because then -- I'll take you through what we've
27
            proposed.
28
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
29
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Because then you have a court order
30
            that that receiver can show to the people and say,
31
            I need information X; please give it to me,
32
            including third parties. And we say that's the
33
            least -- it's the least intrusive.
34
                  Okay.
       THE COURT:
35
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: So I'm at 81. And, again, this is
36
            just on the least intrusive idea --
37
38
                 Secondly, the Loblaw -- Loblaw receivership
39
                 was very carefully tailored to preserve
40
                 Loblaw's right to recover without providing
                 the receiver with overreaching powers to
41
42
                 interfere with the rights of others. The
43
                 Loblaw's receivers mandate was 'to locate,
44
                 investigate and monitor' ... it was not
45
                 empowered to seize and freeze, as was the
46
                 receiver here. Nor were the targeted
47
                 individuals and entities whose assets were
```

```
encumbered and affairs interfered with
 2
                 anywhere nearly as widespread or tangentially
 3
                 associated with the parties to proceeding as
 4
                 is the case here ...
 5
            Again, I just want to say they're commenting,
 7
            essentially, on let's interfere as little as
 8
            necessary in the circumstances.
 9
                 Then I want to give you -- I passed up two
10
            orders of Justice Fitzpatrick where BDO was
11
            appointed.
12
       THE COURT: All right.
13
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: First, as --
                   Which one would you like -- oh, they're
14
       THE COURT:
15
            both the same case.
16
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        They're the same case. And just by
17
            date, the first one is -- is Justice Fitzpatrick
18
            appointing BDO as an investigator under the
19
            Companies Act to go out and take steps to
20
            investigate and report back.
21
                   Okay.
       THE COURT:
22
                        And then the second -- so the first
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
23
            is January 25th, 2023 --
24
       THE COURT:
                  Okay.
25
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         -- and the second is her appointing
26
            BDO or converting -- because I'm looking at the
27
            second order, the first paragraph.
                                                So they
            discharged as investigator, and then, in
28
29
            section 3, appointed as receiver to transition.
30
                 There's going to be two things: one,
31
            jurisdiction to start the investigation and
32
            transition to receiver; two, crafting -- even
33
            across statutory jurisdictions, crafting a remedy
34
            that works in any particular situation is what she
35
            did.
36
                 And we say, in support of BDO's appointment,
37
            it's a task they've done before and can do again.
38
                 So if I can -- I just want to take you to the
39
            order put forward -- the order put forward by
40
            Sanovest because I want to draw a distinction.
41
            Volume 1, tab 1, the first thing anybody looks at
42
            when they look at these 42 volumes of paper.
            Attached to that is their -- is their draft order.
43
44
       THE COURT: Just a minute. All right.
                        It's -- it's not numbered -- did vou
45
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
46
            find their draft order in there?
47
       THE COURT: It says "order" --
```

```
CNSL W. ROBERTS: Yeah.
 2
       THE COURT: -- right here?
 3
                         That's it.
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                                      Thank you.
 4
                   Okay.
       THE COURT:
 5
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         So I'm going to start with the
            appointment at paragraph 1. So "Partnership" --
 7
            you'll see at the top of that page -- partnership
 8
            are all collectively -- all of the entities.
 9
       THE COURT: Oh, hang on.
10
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: The top of page 2, just the
11
            definition, "Partnership."
12
       THE COURT: Oh, yeah. Right. CNSL W. ROBERTS: So it's ever
                                      Thank you.
13
                         So it's everybody.
14
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
15
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: And then under paragraph 1, "The
            Appointment," you'll see the appointment is as
16
17
            receiver --
18
       THE COURT: Yeah.
                          Yeah.
19
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- first the BMA lands, which we say
20
            they certainly haven't satisfied you today that
21
            there should be any receiver over the BMA lands.
22
            That's a point very much in dispute.
                                                   And then,
23
            two, the property of all of the partnership.
24
            Everything. No distinction made between Resorts
25
            and Developments. No distinction made between
26
            what lands are necessary to be sold or dealt with.
27
            Full receiver over everything.
28
                 Over at paragraph 2(c):
29
30
                 To manage, operate, and carry on the business
31
                 of the partnership.
32
33
                        To take on every management role
            Full stop.
34
            involved in the resort, the golf course, land
35
            development, everything. As you heard, this is
36
            going to be a long process. It's going to be
37
            however many months to get you a plan and however
38
            many months to implement the plan and close the
39
            payout. Anyone who says that's less than two
40
            years is fooling themselves. This is a receiver
41
            to run this for two or more years. At whose cost?
42
                         Justice -- Justice, what -- what
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
43
            evidence is there of that? That's -- that's --
            that's -- that's a pure hype -- that's a pure
44
45
            supposition and, frankly, hyperbole.
46
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Well, okay. So if there's any
47
            confusion about how long this process would
```

```
take -- this order contemplates that their
            receiver will go and make you a report, and
 3
            there's no fixed timeline -- will make a report on
 4
            a sales process.
                             That sales process itself, the
 5
            marketing of lands, is not a two-month process, is
            not a three- or four-month process. It's a long
 7
            process. It's very significant.
 8
       THE COURT: So even under your model, it's --
 9
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Agreed. I -- I just say under
10
            anyone's model, we -- we -- none of us should be
11
            blind to the practical ramifications of what's
12
            being asked.
13
                 And for that whole time, we're proposing that
14
            that a receiver run it.
15
                 Under 2(j):
16
17
                 To initiate, manage, and direct all legal
18
                 proceedings.
19
20
            No distinctions made between what's happening in
21
            the future, what's happening now, or the
22
            arbitration that's happening --
23
       THE COURT: Well, I'm going to suggest to carve that
24
            out.
25
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         And then you saw in 3 --
26
       THE COURT:
                  Right.
27
                        -- is they are to come back and seek
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
28
            approval.
29
       THE COURT: Right.
30
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: And -- and the point I want to make
31
            is this is not a targeted, nuanced approach.
32
       THE COURT: Right.
33
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: This is a hammer. We say there
            should be no doubt that, in the resort operations,
34
35
            they run golf courses, and they have golf
36
            tournaments, they have venues, they have events.
37
            It should be apparent to anyone that a receiver
38
            appointed to run this puts uncertainty -- I'll go
39
            no farther than that -- puts uncertainty into the
40
            marketplace. And so anybody who's booking a
41
            tournament, booking an event, booking anything is
42
            going to have uncertainty. And all I mean by that
43
            is it doesn't enhance value. Having a receiver
44
            run the resort doesn't enhance value. We say
45
            it -- it has to prejudice value in terms of
46
            ongoing operations.
47
       THE COURT: Okay.
```

```
CNSL W. ROBERTS: What you haven't heard yet is
            Sanovest's willingness -- other than carving out
 3
            the arbitration -- to move off a full
 4
            receivership. And, again, if I can go back, this
 5
            is -- this is a commercial divorce, really.
            of these parties, despite whatever personal
 7
            hamminess and mistrust they have with each other,
 8
            shouldn't be coming here and doing things that
 9
            causes unnecessary harm to the business.
10
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          Sorry, Justice. I -- I -- just in
11
            the interest of time, we did say, yesterday,
12
            that -- that -- that Sanovest is fine carving out
13
            the -- the management of the resort's operation,
14
            of the golf and tennis operations, and -- and
15
            having the receiver report back about the
            necessity for someone else to do that.
16
17
            was -- that was what I said yesterday. So -- so
            my friend doesn't get bogged down in that, I think
18
19
            we can move past that point.
20
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Excellent. I can tell you right now,
21
            we're not that far apart.
22
       THE COURT: Okay.
23
                        I'm looking for and can't find a
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
24
            draft order I want to -- I want to give you.
25
            so I want --
26
       THE COURT:
                   I'm hanging in suspense waiting --
27
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: I know.
28
       THE COURT: -- waiting for you.
29
                        This is me -- this is me stalling
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
30
            because I can't find it.
       THE COURT: If you're not that far apart ...
31
32
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: All right. We're not far off the
33
            break. Can -- could we possibly --
34
       THE COURT: All right.
35
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- get a break --
36
       THE COURT:
                   All right.
                              Sure.
37
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- and I will find somewhere --
38
       THE COURT:
                   All right.
39
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- that stack of paper, the thing I'm
40
            looking for?
41
       THE COURT: Okay. All right.
42
       THE CLERK:
                   Order in chambers. Chambers is adjourned
43
            for the morning recess.
44
45
                 (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED FOR MORNING RECESS)
46
                 ([11:09:13 AM])
47
                 (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED) ([11:48:37 AM])
```

28
Discussions re scheduling

```
(EXCERPT ENDS) ([11:48:37 AM])
 2
                 [DISCUSSION RE RECEIVERSHIP AGREEMENT]
 3
                 [SUBMISSIONS BY COUNSEL]
 4
                  (EXCERPT BEGINS) ([3:01:20 PM])
 5
                 (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED FOR AFTERNOON RECESS)
                 ([3:01:20 PM])
 7
                 (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED) ([3:25:22 PM])
 8
 9
       THE COURT:
                   Mr. Jackson.
10
       THE CLERK:
                   Back on the record, Justice.
11
       THE COURT:
                   Thank you.
12
13
       DISCUSSIONS RE SCHEDULING:
14
15
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Thank you, Justice. Working parallel
16
            here on -- as we go.
17
                 I gathered from my friend Mr. Roberts that
18
            the agreement is back on, if you will. Not that
19
            I'd say it was ever off.
20
                 But what we're going to do, with leave, is
21
            Ms. Hiebert and Mr. Roberts will leave and work on
22
            some language. It's not going to get done before
23
            4:00 today. I trust that the tweaks we see from
24
            Mr. Roberts are -- are -- are not too
25
            consequential and not too different from what was
26
            put before the court. We will see.
27
                 What I'm hoping we can do is reserve that one
28
            hour on Wednesday. And -- and one of two things
29
            will happen. One, we'll have a settled form of
30
            order between us where we come to you and say,
31
            here it is, and speak to that. The other one is
32
            we don't, in which case I may be here saying, I
33
            wish to enforce the agreement we have that was on
34
            record.
                    And we'll have a transcript, and we'll go
35
            through the order then.
36
       THE COURT:
                  I -- I'm supposed to be hearing a -- a
37
            matter on -- on Tuesday at 10:15. It's a
38
            continuation that involves -- Mr. Brusan's
39
            [phonetic] involved, Mr. Gruber.
                                               It's a
40
            continuation, ongoing matter.
41
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Yes.
42
       THE COURT:
                   And every time it's set for a day, it lasts
43
            an hour --
44
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Well ...
45
       THE COURT:
                  -- or an hour and a half.
46
       CNSL K. JACKSON: On Tuesday.
47
       THE COURT: So I think what we should do is -- is plan
```

29 Discussions re scheduling

```
on -- on Tuesday afternoon.
 2
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        Yes.
 3
       THE COURT: And -- and I'm going to have schedule -- I
 4
            mean, I can do it on Wednesday. I just spoke to
 5
            scheduling.
                        But I'm already here Tuesday.
            think, if the parties can get this done sooner,
 7
            it's better.
 8
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        We -- we will -- we will be available
 9
            Tuesday afternoon.
10
       THE COURT: So I think plan at 2:00, but we'll have
11
            them reach out to Mr. Brusan and find out Mr. --
12
            is it going -- going to go past 2:00? If it is,
13
            we'll go to -- I'll just tell them they have to
14
            stop at 3:00.
15
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Sure.
                   So I'll just set this down at 2:00.
16
       THE COURT:
17
                         We'll send down a requisition, then.
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
18
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
19
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Very good.
20
       THE COURT:
                  On Tuesday.
21
                        And we'll get it done.
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                                                  Thank you,
22
            Justice.
23
       THE COURT:
                   Okay. If there is a form of order that you
24
            agree to in the meantime --
25
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        It's not agreed to.
26
       THE COURT:
                          Set -- let's schedule, and I'll post
                   Okay.
27
            it to the FDS --
28
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Okay. Great.
29
       THE COURT: -- immediately. If you have two competing
30
            drafts and it's just a matter of me sealing [sic]
31
            the order, post them to the FTS. I can look at
32
            them Monday.
33
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Very good.
34
                   I'll actually be here on Monday.
       THE COURT:
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Very good.
35
                   But I -- and if I need to speak to
36
       THE COURT:
37
            everyone, I'll do it by Teams. But I won't be
38
            here all day Monday. But Tuesday, I'm here.
39
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Very good. We will -- we will work
40
            together to do that, Justice.
41
       THE COURT: All right. Okay.
42
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: And I -- Justice, I'll just say
43
            briefly my clients have asked that I say the
44
            agreement was always on.
45
       THE COURT:
                  Okay.
46
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: We just want to make sure we put in
47
            front of you the terms of that agreement.
```

Discussion re case plan orders by Cnsl C. Ohama-Darcus

```
THE COURT: Okay. All right.
 2
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Which, hopefully, we'll do by
 3
            Tuesday.
 4
       THE COURT: Okay. And I'll -- I'll keep Thursday
 5
            booked in any event.
                 Mr. Nathanson.
 7
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: And if --
 8
       THE COURT: Hopefully it won't be necessary.
 9
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- I can be excused.
10
       THE COURT:
                   Yes, of course.
11
                 Ms. Hiebert, you can be excused.
12
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Justice, I -- I -- I think what I'm
13
            going to suggest, in view of the --
14
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
15
                           -- twists and turns we've had, is
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
16
            that I should continue --
17
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
18
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- and not lose the half hour.
19
       THE COURT:
                  Yeah, I agree.
20
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: But -- I hope it will be
21
            unnecessary, but I -- I'm in your hands, of
22
            course.
23
       THE COURT:
                  No, I think -- I think we should carry on.
24
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           So I'm going to be nearly done my
25
            lengthy introduction.
26
       THE COURT: And just for a -- Madam Clerk told me you
27
            have -- you have an order.
                                        I'm sorry.
28
       THE CLERK: For the CPC?
                                 Yes.
29
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
30
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS:
                              Yes.
31
       THE COURT:
                   And just deal with it -- just --
32
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Of course.
33
       THE COURT: -- get that out of the way.
34
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Yes, of course.
35
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS:
                              Thank you.
36
37
       DISCUSSION RE CASE PLAN ORDERS BY
38
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS:
39
40
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS: We have three orders. Everyone
            has signed off. All counsel signed off on them.
41
42
       THE COURT: Okay.
43
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS:
                              The terms are mirrored --
44
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
45
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS:
                              -- between three orders.
46
            been vetted. They've been all -- all --
47
       THE COURT: This is what I -- I ordered the other day?
```

```
CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS: Yes.
       THE COURT: All right.
                                Okay. Okay.
 3
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS: Thank you, Justice.
                 And as well, while I'm standing, we had
 4
 5
            the -- thank you -- the debt action that we had
            discussed --
 7
       THE COURT: Oh, yeah.
 8
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS:
                              -- resetting the -- the
 9
            application for a hearing.
10
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
11
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS: I have a notice of application
12
            that I can hand up for the court. We are happy to
13
            set down the matter for half a day, and we would
14
            be grateful for the court's help in --
15
       THE COURT:
                   Right. But you were going to give me --
16
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS: Yes, I have two dates.
17
       THE COURT:
                    Okay.
18
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS: October 11th and October 15th
19
            are the two dates that work across counsel.
20
       THE COURT:
                  I had hoped counsel could give me block --
21
            greater blocks. I've got to go downstairs and say
22
            to them, look --
23
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS:
                               Okay.
24
       THE COURT: -- this is important. It's not just two dates, it's a whole series of dates that they're
25
26
            available. So can you let me know that on
27
            Tuesday, please?
28
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS: I will get you a whole series of
29
            dates.
30
       THE COURT: This is not --
31
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS: Absolutely.
32
       THE COURT: I mean, maybe it will work, but, look, it's
33
            like ...
34
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS:
                              Better chances.
35
       THE COURT: Right.
36
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS: Yes.
37
                   Weeks -- I need much greater blocks of time
       THE COURT:
38
            than that.
39
       CNSL C. OHAMA-DARCUS: Thank you. We will provide that
40
            on Tuesday.
41
                   Okay.
       THE COURT:
                           Thank you.
42
                  All right, Mr. Nathanson.
43
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Thank you, Justice.
44
45
       SUBMISSIONS RE NOTICE OF APPLICATION BY
46
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
```

47

```
CNSL A. NATHANSON: So I'm just completing my
 2
            introductions.
                            I'm not in the --
 3
       THE COURT: Right.
 4
                           -- written submissions.
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
 5
                 But so the -- the two other prongs, the short
            answers.
                      So the second prong is we say that Tian
 7
            Kusumoto and Sanovest did not block lot sales. So
 8
            the first point is you were shown -- and I'll come
 9
            back to this -- in my friend's submission a long
10
            chart with over $300 million of what were said to
11
            be sales that Mr. Kusumoto blocked.
12
       THE COURT: Right.
13
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          But substantially all of those were
14
            superseded by a different plan: to sell the
15
            entirety of the assets with two small exceptions
            to a company in Victoria that's referred to in the
16
            submissions. I'll come back to it.
17
18
       THE COURT: To sell on-block to a company?
19
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: An on-block. So, in other words,
20
            it doesn't -- my point is it's academic because
21
            there were offers, offers, offers.
22
       THE COURT:
                  Right.
23
                           They weren't actually offers.
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                                                           They
24
            were tire-kicking.
25
       THE COURT:
                   They were --
26
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          They weren't offers that could be
27
            accepted.
28
       THE COURT: -- letters of intent, I think.
29
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Yes. But -- but, like, conditional
30
            and not ones capable of acceptance.
31
                 But some of them even came from the person
32
            who then they presented a joint on-block offer
33
                 So the loan gets overtaken. Right?
34
            can't sell the same property twice, as Ms. Hiebert
35
            likes to remind me.
                 So the individual offers you were told that
36
37
            were blocked were superseded.
38
                 And then the other thing that you weren't
39
            told about was that the partners signed -- so,
40
            again, the -- the -- the burden of it is
            Mr. Kusumoto's Dr. No and he shuts all the doors.
41
42
       THE COURT: Right.
43
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Right? But the other thing you
44
            weren't told about was an extraordinary joint
45
            resolution of the partners to find an equity
46
            investor that Mr. Kusumoto and Mr. Matthews both
47
            signed in July of 2022. Right?
```

So a different -- all -- all kinds of different potential solutions to the problem. 3 But you're being told that my client's 4 shutting all the doors like -- like one of those 5 rooms that compacts someone. But that's not the case. 7 And, as I told you, the last summary point 8 here is that Mr. Kusumoto didn't block. He said 9 he wanted the alternatives evaluated. And we'll 10 see that evidence. 11 THE COURT: He wanted what? CNSL A. NATHANSON: 12 The alternatives evaluated. 13 THE COURT: All right. 14 CNSL A. NATHANSON: I'm not going to sign on to this 15 until we've looked at -- and then the two that 16 you'll see in the evidence are either let's 17 partner with someone else -- it's referred to as vertical developments. So rather than just 18 19 selling off land to have somebody else develop and 20 make a higher profit margin -- higher risk, 21 potentially higher margin -- he wanted an 22 investigation of should they be in that business, 23 or should they be looking at on-block sales? 24 Mr. Matthews didn't want to do that. 25 The third prong -- sorry, I'm ahead of 26 myself. 27 THE COURT: That's all right. 28 CNSL A. NATHANSON: The third prong is that Sanovest 29 and Tian Kusumoto did not refuse to permit 30 refinancing. And you're going to see a 31 substantial body of evidence from me in board 32 minutes, in correspondence, in letters to counsel, 33 all of which say that Mr. Kusumoto was prepared to 34 look at refinancing, authorized Mr. Matthews to 35 bring refinancing proposals. 36 But Mr. Matthews didn't bring refinancing 37 proposals. 38 And the only one that came -- there's only one prospective alternative lender that's ever 39 turned up twice, and the first one wasn't until 40 41 November 24th, 2023. 42 And you can see the poverty of this 43 submission, which is you wouldn't permit anyone 44 else. Like, you wanted to keep your boot on our 45 throat, and it can only be you. 46 By the way, we'll see the agreements that 47 Sanovest is entitled to be the preferred lender.

But Mr. Kusumoto said he was prepared to step aside if there was a -- an actual concrete, better deal.

But the proof here is in 2022, after you can see this evidence of correspondence in 2021 where Mr. Kusumoto says, well, I don't agree with a bunch of things you're doing, but if you can get a better offer, I'll look at it. And then nothing comes. And then what does Mr. Matthews do the next year? He renews the Sanovest loan again in 2022.

And, Justice, the last point here is that even as this end game became evident in the spring of this year -- right? Like, there was a -- May 1st, 2024, the loan is due. What are we going to do? And you're going to see some -- you're going to see Sanovest offering to renew again, despite all the defaults, even -- and Mr. Matthews baulking.

But even as that is happening, Sanovest was saying, we're prepared to renew the loan on a without-prejudice basis and -- and keep the partnership from going under, and we'll step aside. So, in other words, we'll do a temporary renewal. And if you can find something better, we'll look at it, and we'll step aside.

And he was -- Mr. Matthews was -- despite his strong optimism expressed here, he wasn't able to come up with anything new. And we're going to see that one Timber Creek letter that he was able to come up with. And -- and you were referred to a bit of evidence where Timber Creek ultimately said, we're not lending it.

So those, again, are not the actions of someone who's shutting that door, who's saying, there's no lender but me.

Justice, just to finish the introduction -- and, sorry, I may -- I -- I need to make this last commercial point. For part of the period that you'll recall when interest rates spike -- for part of the period, the Sanovest loan is under market. Right? The interest rate of 8 percent was below market. And, in fact, the -- the one proposal that Mr. Matthews gave was significantly above 8 percent interest rate.

And so that's, again, contrary to the narrative of Sanovest choking off its partner

because it's not in its interests to have the money extended at 8 percent if the market is 3 several points above that. 4 And, in fact, you'll see in one of the 5 documents I'll show you, Mr. Kusumoto says, yes, I'm prepared to step aside because I can earn a 7 higher return with my money elsewhere. 8 So the whole narrative of oppressive --9 oppression and engineering of insolvency, in my 10 submission, is built on sand. Doesn't exist. 11 So to complete my introduction, I just want 12 to show you the introduction -- sorry, the table 13 of contents, which is inadequate. Normally, I 14 would say I have three points here. I have more 15 than three points. 16 THE COURT: Yeah. 17 CNSL A. NATHANSON: But the table of contents. 18 go a couple pages back, bottom of page i. 19 THE COURT: M'mm-hmm. CNSL A. NATHANSON: 20 You're there? 21 THE COURT: Yeah. 22 CNSL A. NATHANSON: You can note my eight points. 23 I'm not -- I'm not going to do them all as lengthy 24 as I have. 25 So the first one is the line on the very 26 bottom of the page. 27 M'mm-hmm. THE COURT: 28 CNSL A. NATHANSON: My first point is: 29 30 Resort to the oppression remedy --31 32 THE COURT: Right. CNSL A. NATHANSON: 33 34 35 -- is not available in a partnership dispute. 36 37 That's what Mr. Ferris was addressing. I'll come 38 back to that. 39 Over the page, second proposition: 40 41 599 does not have a strong case that Sanovest 42 breached its reasonable expectations. 43 44 And can I make one more pre-loaded 45 [indiscernible]? I think where Mr. Ferris and I 46 part company on this -- this -- this nice 47 corporate law question of does the oppression

remedy apply here -- and I'll show you some cases. What Mr. Ferris is overlooking is that the cornerstone of the oppression remedy is the protection of reasonable expectations of shareholders qua shareholders. But all of the reasonable expectations that are being asserted here are qua partner, not qua shareholder.

And as I'm going to show you in the relief --well, we'll come to it in the oppression claim --Mr. Ferris showed you some paragraphs about trying to alter the control. For example, Mr. Kusumoto out, new director in or a buy-out or whatever.

But, Justice, think of the substance for a second. What would -- what would removing Mr. Kusumoto or appointing a new director or making 599 the only shareholder of EBMD accomplish? It would change control of the partnership. It would change control of the fiduciary that operates the partnership.

What is the relief in the oppression case? Rewrite the partnership agreement, deny Sanovest interest under its loan agreement.

Those -- the expectations that have been asserted here are not expectations qua shareholder. The shareholder -- it's true there's a corporate vehicle, but the corporate vehicle is performing an agency function. And the expectations that Mr. Matthews describes are all expectations about the substance of the venture, which the parties agreed would happen as partners.

So Mr. Ferris is wanting you to myopically focus on stage 1, which is, is there a corporation? Yes. Like, I'm not -- I'm not making a standing argument. I'm making a question of substance.

Justice Harris in the court of appeal says the oppression remedy cannot be an imperial remedy. Right? It's powerful. It's about fairness. Right? It's wide. It's highly discretionary. But if you let it roam, it can be a tiger.

And what Justice Newbury and Justice Harris and other judges have said in their decisions is we have to keep it within appropriate limits. It's the charter of rights on share -- minority shareholders.

But the fact that, within this -- if we had

```
the -- you know, the [indiscernible] org chart
 2
            that we were able to give you, the fact there's a
 3
            corporation somewhere in the org chart doesn't
 4
            change the substance of the relationship that
 5
            these parties agreed to and embarked on, which was
            partnership.
 7
                 So that's why I say they can't get to the
8
            oppression remedy.
 9
                 But I hasten to add that doesn't end the
10
                    You still have your insolvency
11
            jurisdiction.
12
       THE COURT:
                   M'mm-hmm.
13
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Right?
                                   So --
       THE COURT:
14
                   Yeah.
15
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- I want to be clear.
                                                    I -- all
            that -- I think I -- I know you have this point.
16
17
            Forgive me. But the whole point of all of these
            submissions is really to do two things: turn you
18
            to the right jurisdictional direction and show you
19
20
            the full range of the equities that are at play in
21
            the insolvency land and show you you should turn
22
            yourself away from what I say is jurisdictional
23
            danger by treating this as an interim oppression
24
            agreement.
25
                 That's the -- my whole [indiscernible].
26
       THE COURT:
                   M'mm-hmm.
27
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           So my third proposition is halfway
28
            down the page in this table of contents.
29
       THE COURT: Okay.
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
30
                           And it is that damages are an
31
            adequate remedy for Mr. Matthews and 599.
32
            want to make a 3 beside that.
33
                 And then three lines down, my fourth
34
            proposition is the court has no power to order the
35
            partnership's property subdivided.
36
                 You've heard a lot about that.
                                                  Just -- I'll
37
            make just two quick points on that.
38
                 One is subdivision is a statutory process.
39
            It's not a process that's ordered by a court.
40
            It's decided by an approving officer under the
41
            Land Act with a whole bunch of conditions. And so
42
            it's not anything that you could order.
43
       THE COURT:
                  I thought I'd been told I'm not being --
44
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Well --
45
       THE COURT: -- I'm not being asked about it.
46
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- that's what my friends say.
47
            That's not the language of the order --
```

```
THE COURT:
                   Right.
 2
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- I say.
 3
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
 4
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: But you could get past that.
 5
            you could -- you could say, okay, well, I'm just
            directing the receiver to investigate that.
 7
            I'm not against that.
 8
                 But I'm making maybe a small point, but as I
 9
            read the order, there has to --
10
       THE COURT: That's what -- that's what it says.
11
            I -- I thought Mr. Roberts said they backed away
12
            from it.
13
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Well, yes. Okay.
                                              So let me move
14
            on. But I -- I just wanted to make sure you have
15
            that.
                   There's a jurisdiction --
16
                   And I asked the question, what jurisdiction
17
            do I have? And my jurisdiction --
18
                 Something's happened to my mic. It's just
19
            blasting. Now -- now it's okay.
20
                 Do I have to order a subdivision? And -- and
21
            that's what I was told.
22
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: I think, happily, where we're going
23
            to get to is you're going to make an order.
24
            You're going to make it on terms, and you're going
25
            to avoid that problem.
26
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
27
                           And it's true that, ultimately,
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
28
            I -- I suppose the work-around that my friends
29
            have identified in their inelegant draft order is
30
            that you can direct investigation in pursuit of
31
            that but only that it's pursuit; like, it's not a
32
            quarantee.
33
                 Which kind of comes to our point, which is
34
            that whole process that my friends say, what will
35
            shake the money out of the tree to pay Sanovest --
36
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
37
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- is a lengthy, costly, very
38
            uncertain process.
39
       THE COURT: Well, I think I said when Mr. Jackson was
40
            on his feet, wouldn't -- wouldn't the receiver
41
            be -- have the authority to investigate all
42
            avenues, including a potential subdivision and
43
            provide that recommendation?
44
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: And -- and -- and we're with you.
45
       THE COURT: Okay.
46
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           That's -- that's our point.
47
            don't want -- Justice, you've said, why would you
```

not ask the question? Like, that's the burden of what you've been saying. Like, why -- why put any kind of constraints on? Why wouldn't we try to 3 4 find the right answer and --5 THE COURT: Right. CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- look at all the alternatives? 7 That's my point too. 8 THE COURT: Yeah. 9 CNSL A. NATHANSON: I'm completely with you on that. 10 I'm -- I'm not trying to stop any question being 11 asked. I want the commercial right answer. 12 THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. CNSL A. NATHANSON: The next proposition, Justice, is 13 two down. So this is number 6, if I'm counting 14 15 correctly. I had -- before or after? 16 THE COURT: 17 CNSL A. NATHANSON: I'm sorry. Sorry, yes. You're 18 exactly right. The next one is the very next 19 line, 5: 20 21 It would not be equitable to rewrite the 22 parties' security agreements or deprive 23 Sanovest of its mortgage and other security 24 while leaving it unpaid. 25 26 And the point there is that you -- you call my 27 friends and said this several times -- we don't 28 agree on the amount owing on the Sanovest loan. 29 We agree at -- that, at minimum -- we agree that 30 50 million is owed. We say it's 64. But there's 31 a very real problem if Sanovest's security is sold 32 out from under it and it's not -- its loan is not 33 repaid and it's left holding the bag. And you'll recall the -- my next point 34 35 involves a distribution order, which, according to 36 my friends, if they're still prosecuting this, 37 there'd be money that would be paid contrary to 38 waterfalls and the parties' agreements and 39 contrary to the security. 40 The court can't -- I mean, have you seen --41 the oppression normally does give you broad 42 powers, but it wouldn't be equitable to rewrite 43 the parties' agreements and it would result in an 44 unjust enrichment. 45 So that's point 5. 46 The next line is point 6. That's what I just

47

said:

2 3 4

20

21

13

27

28

35

41 42 43

44 45

46

THE COURT: Okay. 47

The distribution scheme is contrary to the express terms of the parties' agreements.

The next line, my seventh point:

Appointing a receiver is consistent with a parties' reasonable expectations, a judicial sale of the properties is not.

The simple point there is the receiver is, as you would expect, a specifically available contractual remedy under the GSA and the mortgages. There's a specific term in the partnership agreement that says partners will not seek judicial sale of the properties owned by the partnership.

And then my -- my eighth point is the one opposite page 87, that:

> The protection of third parties and the public interest favour the appointment of a receiver, not a partial sale of the properties.

And you've asked questions that show you're alive to that concern. You're alive to the challenges faced by other creditors, the actions that other creditors might take that might cause upset, ensuring that we don't have an unseemly race to the courthouse, equitable treatment, all those kinds of considerations.

And my friends have done a good job of showing all the various stakeholders who are interested in the outcome, including, dare I say, municipal and other levels of government who have tax entitlements who need to plan for the services they're giving, who are not having their taxes That is a very real concern that would remitted. be addressed by the appointment of a receiver that will -- that is a risk that will continue if present -- we have present management.

But I -- I'm not resiling from what we've said, which is we can take this one step at a time.

All right. That's my introduction, Justice.

CNSL A. NATHANSON: If I can take you to the facts,

I'll just do what I can. I won't rush you. 2 THE COURT: No. 3 CNSL A. NATHANSON: So I'm at page 4, paragraph 15. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 CNSL A. NATHANSON: I'm going to try to point out sometimes headings, because the headings will help you, to just bring you in the structure of the 7 8 argument. But I won't be --9 THE COURT: Yes. 10 CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- plodding. 11 So this section deals with what's the -- this 12 is in narrative form -- what's the structure of 13 the management of the partnership and the organization? 14 15 So you've heard it's a limited liability 16 partnership managed by EBMD. 17 And then you'll see at paragraph 17 that: 18 19 At all material times, Mr. Matthews has been 20 a director and the president and chief 21 executive officer of EBMD. 22 23 So -- and he's invoked that authority as in, I'm 24 the highest ranking member of management. 25 And then you'll see in the succeeding 26 paragraphs what you've already heard about, which 27 is originally Tom Kusumoto was a director. 28 2021, he was replaced by his son, Tian. 29 The next -- over the page on paragraph 20, 30 this is -- the point is important. You've heard 31 it, but I'm not sure the importance was really 32 conveyed yet. 33 So you've heard that Tian Kusumoto is the 34 CFO, but this is what Mr. Matthews says about that. He describes him -- well, I -- "nominally" 35 36 is my word, but this is what Mr. Matthews says, 37 and I'll show you this evidence. He says: 38 39 This title was not reflected -- intended to 40 reflect the role of an organization's working 41 CFO. 42 43 And then when, for example, in August 2023, Tian 44 Kusumoto asked Mr. Matthews to let him instruct 45 the accounting staff -- as one might expect a CFO

to do -- and speak to them directly, Mr. Matthews'

response was, as president and CEO, I am primarily

46

47

responsible for instructing the accounting staff in their day-to-day operations.

The reason that's important is because there are all kinds of accounting, tax, statutory remittance, books and records problems. And they lie at the feet of Mr. Matthews because he's kept the power for himself. And they're not Mr. Kusumoto's fault. They -- you might think that the CFO would bear responsibility if the accounting is a mess, as is the evidence we're going to see. But it's Mr. Matthews that's kept the reigns on the books.

And so if I can just show you in the -- my fatter -- this -- the condensed book, and the other is the supplementary condensed book.

THE COURT: Right.

CNSL A. NATHANSON: If we could turn to tab 4, please. This is Mr. Matthews' affidavit number 1 in the oppression proceeding. If you turn to the -- the page numbers I'll use are at the top right, Bates numbers. So 45, the second page in. It's paragraph 49 if you're with me, Justice.

THE COURT: Right.

CNSL A. NATHANSON: So there's -- he -- there -- they're talking about May 2021, so just Tian becomes a director. There's reference to a -- discussions about a special committee.

And then Mr. Matthews says:

As I understand it, there was an internal Sanovest decision that Tian would wholly replace Tom as Sanovest's representative to EBMD's board. I agreed that Tian would hold the officer position of CFO. As EBMD already employed a controller and an external accountant, this title was not intended to reflect the role of an organization's working CFO.

So, again, that's -- my point is just the accounting books and records problems, Mr. Tian Kusumoto's on the outside, Mr. Matthews is on the inside.

The next section of the argument is the partnership's current business and assets. You've heard enough about this. You have a good sense of this. I don't need to go through how this is all

22

28 29 30

31

32

33 34 35

> 36 37

38 39

40 41 42

43

44

45 46

THE COURT: Yeah. 47

I'm reading from paragraph --

held and organized.

If you go on to page 7, paragraph 33, under the heading "The Partnership and the Partnership Agreement." I'm just going to summarize from here, and then I'll show you the agreement very briefly, Justice.

So as you've heard, the partners' respective interests are Sanovest and 599 equally as to almost 50 percent and then EBMD owns -- owns a small share, which is what -- units, which is what entitled it to be a managing partner.

Paragraph 34:

Sanovest and 599 own the shares of EBMD equally. Historically, they've each nominated a director. And, as a result, the partnership is a 50/50 partnership, and the governance of the partnership requires the agreement of both.

And, in fact, you'll see that in the partnership agreement where there are provisions for extraordinary resolutions. So it preserves this equality, which my client also describes as part of its reasonable expectations, which is good. But when the parties are disagreeing and it's a 50/50 partnership, then it's deadlocked. Right? Over the page:

> The partnership is governed by a written limited liability agreement made in 2013.

And that, Justice, if you can just open up -- and I'll continue -- is at tab 5 of the condensed book -- an excerpt of it is, in any case.

THE COURT: Okay. CNSL A. NATHANSON: I'll just continue. Well, I'll show you some specific provisions in a moment. But in paragraph 36:

> So under the terms of this agreement, EBMD is the managing partner. It has exclusive authority to manage and operate --

CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- 36, Justice,

-- and to bind the partnership and the partners in respect of the business and assets.

So the partnership — the partnership acts only through the managing partner EBMD, and the partnership's property is held by EBMD for the benefit of the partners in accordance with the agreement and the Act.

And -- and, Justice, this is obvious -- forgive me -- but this isn't a corporation governed by the constitutional document of a shareholders agreement. This is a partnership whose constitutional document is a limited liability partnership agreement.

So, again, the point of that is my -- oppression is the wrong framework. The fact that there's a corporation in the org chart doesn't let the oppression remedy run around like a tiger.

Paragraph 38 of my written submissions. The business of the partnership is set out in section 2.3. It's excerpted there on page 9. Justice, I won't read it to you, but you'll just -- this is the salient point. Under 2.3(b), the business includes to develop, construct, sell, and operate the property.

One of the arguments that's been made is development isn't part of our Bear Mountain business terms. It's not part of our business plan. We've never been developers. We're just servicing lots and then selling them off to other people to develop.

Well, I'm going to show that that's not actually true as -- in terms of how the partnership conducted itself. But in terms of its constitutional document, it's part of the business of the partnership. Doesn't mean that they always will, but it's one of the -- what the parties agreed were their purposes.

And continuing at paragraph 39. And you see this. It continues to be suffused throughout the agreement. And I just refer to it here in 39. EBMD, as a managing partner, is empowered, for example, to enter into agreements to construct, develop, redevelop, sell, or operate the partnership property, which includes all the

development land you've been hearing about.

Paragraph 40, the partnership agreement provided that EBMD is required, as you would expect, to keep proper, complete, and accurate books of accounting and records of the business of the partnership. It was required to prepare and submit to the partners -- including Sanovest -- for their approval an overall business plan for the development of the lands, Justice, a development budget, annual operating budgets, annual updates, and financial reports.

And you see that, over the page in the written submissions -- you see at page 10, the proper, complete, and accurate books under 13.2.

And then look at the heading, 13.3.

(a) an overall business plan for the development of the lands --

And then, Justice, this is important. If you see at the end of (a),

-- with annual updates thereto.

Makes total sense. Right? Market conditions change, business changes, interest rates change, whatever.

Development budget, annual operating budget. Justice, is there such a document? No, there's not. What does Mr. Matthews say? That's the Bear Mountain business terms. We didn't write them down anywhere. But he says, that was our business plan.

And you'll see throughout the evidence Tian Kusumoto saying and Sanovest writing -- including through counsel, saying, we want the business plan that our agreement says we're supposed to have, Mr. Matthews.

And then you see the reporting by the management committee.

And then in the last two lines of 13.4, there should be a summary report regarding the status of the development of the partnership property in relation to the approved business plan.

So the partners have to approve. It's not Mr. Matthews saying, I'm the CEO; I get to decide what we do. The partners are supposed to do that,

and that makes obvious sense.

Just a couple more quick points, Justice.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL A. NATHANSON: And paragraph 41, the budgets' work plans contemplated under section 13.3 had to be approved by extraordinary resolution. This is my point. An extraordinary resolution is like a special resolution, so it requires here --

THE COURT: Yeah.

CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- three-quarters. So, in other words, the overall business plan, development plan, operating budgets had to be approved by both. So they're equal, and they can both block and veto.

Paragraph 42, partnership agreement's set out a scheme for the allocation of net income and the distribution -- and the distribution of what's called distributable cash. So this is what I call the waterfall.

And so the way the waterfall works is summarized here. It goes first to the partners to satisfy tax liabilities, then to pay off any partner loans — there are none here. Then, equally, pari passu up to 15 million. Then, if you're with me at point 4, the partners holding class C units up to 30 million. Only Sanovest owns class C, so that's Sanovest's preference in the waterfall. My friends say in the footnote that this is still disputed, and it's certainly something they're trying to rewrite in their oppression case, but it's right in the agreement. And then, thereafter, pari passu for the balance.

So you see it's just a tiered waterfall.

And -- and I think you have the point, which is if you mentally compare that to what my friends call the funding order in their notice of application, it's a different waterfall.

So paragraph 43 is -- what I say is common ground, but my friends tell me it, apparently, is not.

Paragraph 45, this is the point I've made that no partner would seek to compel the sale of any property of the partnership. And it's reproduced there in 3.4. I won't read it to you.

And then 46, the partnership agreement modified the general no-conflict rule that applies to fiduciaries. It provided that the partners

```
could hold interest in other businesses, even if
            competitive, and, if so, they would not be
 3
                                  And that's set out in 3.9.
            required to account.
 4
                 And the -- the further point is that the
 5
            partners agree that Sanovest would be the
            preferred lender. So I say the effect of that is
 7
            when my friends say Mr. Kusumoto has conflict and
 8
            he can't decide on anything to do -- that has
            anything to do with financing, I say, no, the
 9
10
            structure, the architecture that the parties
11
            agreed on at the outset contemplated that he
12
            could.
13
                 And if it were otherwise, then Mr. Matthews
14
            truly would have imperial authority.
15
                 So, Justice, if I could just -- I'm just
16
            going to --
17
       THE COURT:
                  Yes.
18
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- do -- I'm just going to turn
19
            pages for you, and then I think that will be --
20
            actually, I see the time, so I -- I won't.
21
                 But paragraph 5 is an excerpt of the
22
            condensed book. It's an excerpt at tab 5 of the
23
            partnership --
24
       THE COURT:
                   Oh.
25
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- agreement.
26
       THE COURT: Oh, at tab -- yeah.
27
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           It has many of those provisions.
            put them all in the agreement because I -- or the
28
29
            argument because I just thought it would be easier
30
            for you.
31
       THE COURT: So what you're in the process of doing is
32
            showing me the evidence that you say answers the
33
            question I put to Mr. Brandt several times: Why?
34
            Why? Why is Mr. Tian Kusumoto taking the
35
            positions now that he's taking?
                           'Cause he doesn't have the things
36
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
37
            that he's supposed to have.
38
       THE COURT:
                  Right.
                           And --
39
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           That's the point.
40
       THE COURT: And just -- I think, before we adjourn, you
            said early -- a few moments ago that -- that --
41
42
            that supposedly the individual letters of -- the
43
            expressions of interest to purchase that I -- I
44
            was told Mr. Kusumoto blocked, you said --
45
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Yeah.
46
       THE COURT: -- they were superseded by -- by an actual
47
            offer to buy on-block --
```

```
CNSL A. NATHANSON: But -- but --
 2
       THE COURT: -- by -- by an individual who had made some
 3
            of those primary --
 4
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Yes. Yes, but -- sorry, in the --
 5
            just to clarify.
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
 7
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: It was Mr. Kusumoto and
 8
            Mr. Matthews --
 9
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
10
                          -- jointly signed and proffered an
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
11
            agreement after negotiations to sell all of this.
12
       THE COURT:
                   Can -- can you just show me where that is?
13
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Yeah.
                   I just --
14
       THE COURT:
15
                           It's -- if you look at my small --
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
16
       THE COURT:
                   Start --
17
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- my small condensed book.
18
       THE COURT: Right.
                           Jumped out -- that jumped out at
19
            {\tt me.}
20
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Good.
                                  So it should.
21
                 So if you could turn -- it's over two
22
                        So at tab 2 of the small condensed
            documents.
23
            book, Justice.
24
       THE COURT: Right.
                           Okay. Just a minute.
25
                           So the thin, grey book.
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
26
       THE COURT:
                          We just get -- right.
                   Yeah.
27
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           So the -- the first one -- this
28
            is -- this is -- leads up to it. This is the
29
            joint partners resolution that I mentioned to you
30
            a few minutes ago signed by both 599 and
31
            Sanovest -- by Matthews --
32
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
33
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- and Tian Kusumoto -- where they
34
            resolve that the partners are -- authorized the
35
            partnership through the managing partner to pursue
36
            a direct or indirect equity investment.
37
       THE COURT: That was the other thing I was going to ask
38
            you.
39
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Yes.
40
       THE COURT: All right.
41
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- including to but not limited to
42
            selling 100 percent of the assets.
43
                 So they -- what -- when my friends
            say "blockage," I say, there's an extraordinary
44
45
            resolution in 2022 where they agree what they're
46
            going to try and do. That's not blocking.
47
            fact that Mr. Kusumoto doesn't sign on to
```

1 2	everything Mr. Matthews wants to do doesn't mean he's shutting every door.
3	THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
4 5	CNSL A. NATHANSON: So that's that. And then the sale you don't have the
6	contract, but what you have is the email that
7	attaches it.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Where's that?
9	CNSL A. NATHANSON: So the next very next tab.
10	THE COURT: Great. All right.
11 12	CNSL A. NATHANSON: So August you can see August 9th, 2022 I won't name the the
13	THE COURT: Yeah.
14	CNSL A. NATHANSON: company. It's got the name of
15	one of the recipients in the email. And you see
16	Dan Matthews is copied, and the subject is
17	"Agreement for purchase and sale for Bear
18	Mountain."
19 20	THE COURT: Right. CNSL A. NATHANSON: And you can see the attachment is a
21	signed PDF. Are you with me, Justice?
22	THE COURT: Right.
23	CNSL A. NATHANSON: And then this is what Tian writes:
24	
25	As discussed, please find the attached
26 27	THE COURT: Yeah.
28	CNSL A. NATHANSON:
29	
30	agreement of purchase and sale which Dan
31	and I have agreed to and signed. The main
32	points are as follows and are inline with
33 34	what we discussed.
35	The purchase price is redacted, but:
36	ine parendse price is readecod, sae.
37	It's for all the properties we own except
38	Cypress Gates and the rec centre.
39	
40 41	Acceptance is said to be by the end of the month. A not a refundable deposit, some other dates.
42	And Tian Kusumoto Tian Kusumoto says:
43	That I all madamed I am madamed Sajo.
44	Dan and I have agreed to begin work on a
45	master development plan with
46	
47	And then the entity the buyer's the putative

```
buyer's name:
 2
 3
                 Please reach out to Ryan, who is the land
 4
                 development manager, to discuss first steps,
 5
                 budget, and timeline. I propose we submit
                 the costs initially with the end owners of BM
 7
                 bearing the cost proportionally.
                                                    We look
 8
                 forward to working with --
 9
10
            The entity,
11
12
                 -- in preparing a master development plan for
13
                 Bear Mountain.
14
15
            So part of the sale contemplates that there --
16
            they might stay in as equity for the deal.
17
                 And -- and what Mr. Byma has reminded me is
18
            that we've excluded the actual attachment for
19
            confidentiality reasons, but it could be provided
20
            to you.
21
                 My only point is, again, the doors aren't all
22
            being shut. There are a bunch of things that they
23
            are agreeing on. And because they didn't come to
24
            fruition doesn't make this all oppressive.
25
       THE COURT:
                   So what happened here?
                                           Is it --
26
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           It -- the buyer --
27
       THE COURT:
                  -- is there --
28
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- didn't proceed.
29
       CNSL G. BRANDT: No, that's -- that's not correct.
            That's not correct.
30
31
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Well, my friend can correct me,
32
            then.
33
       CNSL G. BRANDT: So what happened is -- is -- what
34
            occurred at tab 24 of our condensed book is that
35
            there was a letter that was sent from that
36
            potential buyer that expressed some concerns about
37
            a response that Mr. Kusumoto had given around
38
            purchase price and a number of other things.
                 And on receipt of that letter, Mr. Kusumoto
39
40
            writes to Mr. Matthews and says, I think we should
41
            take a pause in selling BM at the mountain -- at
42
            the moment. That -- that's why that process ends.
43
            That's at tab 24 of our --
44
       THE COURT: I remember you showed me --
45
       CNSL G. BRANDT: -- condensed --
46
       THE COURT:
                  -- that.
47
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: So we'll -- we'll come
```

back to you on this because I think I understand from Mr. Byma, who is a bit more [indiscernible] on this than I am, that we'll -- when we come --if we need to come back next week -- which I truly hope we won't -- we'll deal with that. But we say this happened differently. And -- and, again, if you just take on what my friend said -- so my friend's saying, well, there was something in the further negotiation process that Tian Kusumoto said that he didn't That's a far cry from he's been Dr. No and blocked everything. Right? There's no -- those two documents are pretty significant steps, both of which are jointly agreed by him and Mr. Matthews that would have unblocked all of this.

So it -- that's my only point. The difference between my friends and I, I'm saying it's way less black and white. I'm not -- you know, then my friends want to say -- and that's why I say they can't get over a strong prima facie case.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. So we'll adjourn over the -- to 2:00 on Tuesday. And probably, Mr. -- Mr. Jackson, if you happen to speak to Mr. Brusan and Mr. Gruber, I'll probably hear before scheduling gets ahold of them --

CNSL K. JACKSON: Right.

THE COURT: -- that you're -- you're going to be in front of me at 2:00 that day.

CNSL K. JACKSON: Very good.

THE COURT: And I'll work something out with them if they have to go.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: We -- we very much appreciate your assistance, Justice.

THE COURT: I'm -- I'm hopeful that if -- if what Mr. Roberts says, if there's a deal and they never resiled from the deal, that -- that it's just a matter of paper. And -- and if there's a dispute over the terms of the order, I can help resolve that on -- on Tuesday.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: It should be resolvable, Justice.

And if there's one or two minor points --

THE COURT: Yeah.

CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- we do have you.

THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. Okay. Well, thank you very much, everyone.

```
CNSL W. ROBERTS: Thank you, Justice.
 2
        THE COURT: We'll adjourn.
       THE CLERK: Order in chambers. This chambers is
 3
 4
             adjourned.
 5
6
7
                   (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED) ([4:05:42 PM])
 8
9
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
```

REPORTER CERTIFICATION

I certify that proceedings from timestamp 10:02:39 AM to timestamp 10:25:05 AM, from 10:40:00 AM to timestamp 11:48:37 AM, and from 3:01:20 PM to timestamp 4:05:42 PM, inclusive, are a true and accurate transcript of these proceedings, recorded on a sound recording apparatus, transcribed to the best of my skill and ability in accordance with applicable standards.

Eveliene Symonds Authorized Reporter

\$	149 [1] - 1:40	34 [1] - 43:12	8	added [1] - 15:13
Ð	15 [2] - 41:3, 46:24	36 [2] - 43:39, 43:47	0	addition [1] - 6:4
\$12 [1] - 6:7	153 [1] - 1:40	37 [1] - 3:2	8 [3] - 34:42, 34:45,	address [1] - 5:28
\$14 [7] - 5:30, 5:31,		38 [1] - 44:21	35:2	
6:27, 9:35, 10:5,	158 [3] - 1:28, 1:33, 2:2	39 [8] - 13:28, 13:39,	81 [2] - 23:2, 23:35	addressed [2] - 1:42, 40:39
10:27, 10:33		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
,	159 [1] - 2:43	19:28, 19:34, 20:27,	81/82 [1] - 1:21	addresses [1] - 2:23
\$300 [1] - 32:10	15th [1] - 31:18	23:18, 44:41, 44:43	83 [1] - 1:21	addressing [1] - 35:37
\$60 [1] - 15:12	160 [2] - 2:21, 2:23	39(1 [1] - 19:37	84 [1] - 1:21	adequate [1] - 37:31
\$70 [1] - 14:28	165 [1] - 4:4	3:00 [1] - 29:14	85 [1] - 9:6	adjourn [3] - 47:40,
	169 [1] - 4:10	3:01:20 [4] - 1:26, 1:5,	86 [1] - 9:37	51:23, 52:2
•	17 [2] - 10:8, 41:17	28:6, 53:6	87 [1] - 40:18	adjourned [2] - 27:42,
IF 11 00 00	173 [1] - 5:4			52:4
'[could [1] - 22:23	18th [1] - 9:12	4	9	ADJOURNED [2] -
'bookend' [1] - 21:14	1st [1] - 34:15			27:45, 28:5
'investigative' [1] -		4 [3] - 41:3, 42:17,	9 [1] - 44:23	ADJOURNED)([4:05:
20:42	2	46:25	9th [1] - 49:12	42 [1] - 52:6
'just [1] - 21:6		40 [1] - 45:2		advance [1] - 11:3
'the [1] - 22:21	2 [2] - 25:10, 48:22	41 [1] - 46:4	Α	advanced [1] - 5:20
'to [1] - 23:43	2(a [1] - 17:33	42 [2] - 24:42, 46:15		advances [1] - 6:35
'where [1] - 21:18	2(c [1] - 25:28	43 [1] - 46:38	A.I [1] - 2:2	
	2(j [1] - 26:15	45 [2] - 42:21, 46:41	ability [1] - 53:10	advancing [1] - 10:19
0	2.3 [1] - 44:23	46 [1] - 46:45	able [3] - 34:28, 34:30,	Adventures [1] - 1:22
<u>_</u>		47 [2] - 12:21, 12:33	37:2	advisable [1] - 19:14
0884185 [1] - 1:20	2.3(b [1] - 44:25	47 [2] - 12.21, 12.33 49 [1] - 42:22	absolutely [1] - 31:31	affairs [4] - 20:33,
0884188 [1] - 1:20	20 [1] - 41:29		academic [1] - 32:20	21:1, 21:4, 24:1
0884190 [1] - 1:20	2013 [1] - 43:31	4:00 [1] - 28:23	accept [1] - 2:29	affect [1] - 2:5
0884194 [1] - 1:20	2019 [3] - 2:26, 2:32,	4:05:42 [3] - 1:26, 1:5,	acceptance [2] -	affected [1] - 21:27
0004134[1] = 1:20	6:13	53:6	32:30, 49:40	affidavit [2] - 5:35,
1	2020 [2] - 2:26, 2:32	_		42:18
'	2021 [4] - 9:12, 34:5,	5	accepted [1] - 32:27	affirming [1] - 22:19
1 [10] - 1:10, 3:3, 3:4,	41:28, 42:25	5 4.40 0.44	accomplish [1] -	AFTERNOON [1] -
5:35, 24:41, 25:6,	2022 [5] - 32:47, 34:4,	5 [7] - 4:10, 6:11,	36:17	28:5
25:15, 36:32, 42:18	34:11, 48:45, 49:12	39:19, 39:45, 43:34,	accordance [2] - 44:9,	afternoon [3] - 7:9,
1.3 [1] - 6:12	2023 [4] - 5:18, 24:23,	47:21, 47:22	53:10	29:1, 29:9
1.5 [1] - 0.12 1.5 [1] - 3:26	33:41, 41:43	50 [2] - 39:30, 43:9	according [1] - 39:35	agency [1] - 36:27
	2024 [5] - 1:4, 1:3, 1:1,	50/50 [2] - 43:17,	account [1] - 47:3	ago [4] - 12:25, 13:43,
10 [2] - 2:20, 45:13	9:45, 34:15	43:27	accountant [1] - 42:36	47:41, 48:30
100 [1] - 48:42	206 [3] - 12:21, 12:33,	53 [1] - 1:16	accounting [6] -	agree [10] - 17:3,
101 [4] - 19:30, 19:41,	12:45	599 [7] - 12:17, 35:41,	41:45, 42:1, 42:4,	17:26, 29:24, 30:19,
20:23, 21:17	212 [1] - 13:4	36:16, 37:31, 43:8,	42:10, 42:41, 45:5	
10:02 [2] - 1:25, 1:4	227 [3] - 12:47, 13:41,	43:14, 48:30	accurate [3] - 45:4,	34:6, 39:28, 39:29, 47:5, 48:45
10:02:39 [1] - 53:4	23:20	599315 [3] - 1:5, 2:5,	45:14, 53:7	
10:15 [1] - 28:37	24 [2] - 50:34, 50:43	1:8	acknowledges [1] -	agreed [12] - 4:13,
10:25 [2] - 1:25, 1:4		5th [1] - 9:44	11:39	23:22, 26:9, 29:25,
10:25:05 [1] - 53:4	243 [3] - 13:38, 18:43,		Act [20] - 12:42, 13:1,	36:30, 37:5, 42:33,
10:40:00 [3] - 1:26,	19:5	6	13:21, 13:29, 13:39,	44:40, 47:11, 49:31,
1:4, 53:5	243-1(a [1] - 18:44		13:42, 19:18, 19:21,	49:44, 51:14
11 [1] - 1:11	24th [1] - 33:41	6 [2] - 39:14, 39:46	19:28, 19:31, 19:34,	agreeing [1] - 50:23
11:09:13 [1] - 27:46	25th [1] - 24:23	60 [2] - 5:8, 14:28	19:41, 21:18, 22:38,	agreement [26] - 3:15,
11:48:37 [3] - 1:26,	28 [1] - 1:12	64 [1] - 39:30	23:19, 24:19, 37:41,	28:18, 28:33, 29:44,
1:4, 53:5	2:00 [6] - 29:10, 29:12,	65 [1] - 20:6	44:10	29:47, 36:21, 36:22,
11th [1] - 31:18	29:16, 51:24, 51:30	69 [1] - 22:4	acted [4] - 10:38,	37:24, 40:14, 43:5,
12 [3] - 1:4, 1:3, 1:1		00 [i] 22.T		43:19, 43:22, 43:31,
12 [3] - 1.4, 1.3, 1.1 13.2 [1] - 45:14	3	7	10:39, 10:47, 11:1	43:41, 44:10, 44:14,
		7	action [4] - 1:10, 1:11,	44:16, 44:43, 45:2,
13.3 [2] - 45:15, 46:5	3 [4] - 17:35, 24:29,	7 [1] - 43:2	4:20, 31:5	45:37, 46:31, 46:45,
13.4 [1] - 45:41	26:25, 37:32	75 [1] - 5:23	actions [4] - 4:19,	47:25, 47:28, 48:11,
135 [1] - 1:29	3.4 [1] - 46:44		22:24, 34:34, 40:27	49:30
14 [4] - 5:34, 6:37,	3.9 [1] - 47:3	77 [2] - 2:7, 2:14	acts [1] - 44:6	AGREEMENT[1] -
9:26, 10:10	30 [2] - 1:13, 46:26		actual [3] - 34:2,	28:2
141 [1] - 1:39	31 [1] - 1:15		47:46, 50:18	Agreement [2] - 43:4,
148 [1] - 1:39	33 [1] - 43:2		add [1] - 37:9	49:17
				I

agreement's [1] -46.15 agreements [6] -33:46, 39:22, 39:38, 39:43, 40:3, 44:45 agrees [1] - 17:22 ahead [3] - 1:30, 1:32, 33:25 ahold [1] - 51:27 aid [2] - 21:36, 21:45 Aikins [1] - 18:25 air [1] - 6:8 Akaqi [1] - 19:45 akin [1] - 13:18 alive [2] - 40:25, 40:26 allegation [5] - 5:29, 6:26, 8:2, 9:34, 10:38 allegations [4] - 6:21, 6:43, 6:47, 10:44 alleged [2] - 8:40, 10:4 allocation [1] - 46:16 almost [1] - 43:9 alter [1] - 36:11 alternative [1] - 33:39 alternatives [3] - 33:9, 33:12, 39:6 AM [18] - 1:25, 1:26, 1:4, 1:4, 1:6, 11:10, 11:12, 27:46, 27:47, 28:1, 53:4, 53:5 amount [5] - 3:27, 5:30, 5:31, 10:31, analysis [1] - 18:43 AND [4] - 1:7, 1:14, 1:15, 1:18 animal [1] - 22:40 annual [4] - 45:10, 45:11, 45:23, 45:28 answer [2] - 39:4, 39:11 answers [2] - 32:6, 47:32 apart [4] - 14:44, 14:46, 27:21, 27:31 apologies [1] - 3:9 apparatus [1] - 53:9 apparent [1] - 26:37 appeal [5] - 18:13, 19:17, 19:47, 20:29, 36:36 APPEARANCES[1] applicable [3] - 12:44, 12:45, 53:10 APPLICATION[2] -1:16, 31:45 application [19] - 1:9, 1:14, 3:23, 3:26,

14:10, 16:6, 23:19, 31:9, 31:11, 46:37 application-enforced [1] - 3:26 applications [2] -10:43, 15:41 applies [2] - 13:9, 46:46 apply [1] - 36:1 appoint [5] - 12:40, 13:32, 15:24, 21:17, 22:46 appointed [7] - 18:15, 18:39, 22:14, 22:35, 24:11, 24:29, 26:38 appointing [6] - 20:11, 20:32, 24:18, 24:25, 36:15, 40:7 Appointment [1] -25:16 appointment [12] -12:38, 20:31, 20:47, 21:12, 21:22, 21:37, 22:12, 24:36, 25:6, 25:16, 40:21, 40:39 appreciate [3] - 7:16, 13:33, 51:34 approach [4] - 5:19, 15:22, 15:26, 26:31 appropriate [3] -20:44, 20:45, 36:44 approval [3] - 4:26, 26:28, 45:8 approve [2] - 3:37, 45:45 approved [3] - 45:44, 46:6. 46:12 approving [1] - 37:40 April [1] - 9:44 **arbitration** [4] - 2:17, 16:39, 26:22, 27:3 architecture [1] -47:10 area [1] - 5:24 argument [13] - 1:22, 1:28, 1:37, 1:45, 4:44, 5:28, 12:11,

12:14, 12:16, 36:34,

41:8, 42:44, 47:29

arrangements [1] -

34:26, 35:6

36:6, 36:24

asserted [3] - 2:4,

assets [12] - 15:19,

22.23

arguments [1] - 44:28

aside [4] - 34:2, 34:24,

3:29, 5:34, 7:35,

12:19, 12:41, 13:10,

13:17, 13:27, 14:4,

15:29, 16:45, 16:46, 19:3, 22:15, 22:22, 23:47, 32:15, 42:45, 44:4, 48:42 assist [1] - 10:7 assistance [1] - 51:35 associated [1] - 24:3 **assume** [1] - 6:31 assuming [1] - 19:26 attached [2] - 24:43, 49:25 attaches [1] - 49:7 attachment [2] -49:20, 50:18 attributed [1] - 2:46 August [4] - 9:12, 41:43, 49:11, 49:12 authority [10] - 17:28, 21:7, 21:16, 22:46, 23:4, 38:41, 41:23, 43:43, 47:14 Authorized [1] - 53:17 authorized [4] - 8:38, 10:35, 33:34, 48:34 authorizes [1] - 18:45 available [7] - 2:6, 2:40, 22:13, 29:8, 31:26, 35:35, 40:12 avenues [1] - 38:42 avoid [1] - 38:25 aware [1] - 16:5 В

B.C [6] - 1:5, 1:20, 1:20, 2:5 backed [1] - 38:11 bad [1] - 9:20 **bag** [1] - 39:33 **balance** [1] - 46:32 **balancing** [1] - 21:25 BANKRUPTCY [1] -1:14 based [1] - 13:28 basics [1] - 12:36 basis [5] - 3:22, 4:13, 4:25, 19:4, 34:22 Bates [1] - 42:20 baulking [1] - 34:19 BC [3] - 1:4, 1:2, 1:8 BDO [5] - 18:15, 18:33, 24:10, 24:18, 24:26 BDO's [1] - 24:36 Bear [8] - 1:8, 1:19, 1:22, 1:9, 44:29, 45:31, 49:17, 50:13 bear [1] - 42:9 bearing [1] - 50:7 became [1] - 34:13

becomes [1] - 42:26 **BEFORE** [1] - 1:3 begin [2] - 5:14, 49:44 BEGINS)([10:40:00 [1] - 11:12 BEGINS)([3:01:20 [1] - 28:4 believes [1] - 8:39 below [1] - 34:43 benefit [1] - 44:9 beside [1] - 37:32 best [3] - 8:43, 9:3, 53:9 better [6] - 11:38, 29:7, 31:34, 34:2, 34:8, 34:25 **BETWEEN** [2] - 1:5, 1:16 between [14] - 5:41, 6:47, 10:23, 10:44, 12:40, 13:15, 14:3, 21:43, 25:24, 25:25, 26:20, 28:30, 30:45, 51:18 BIA [2] - 13:28, 18:45 big [1] - 14:18 bind [1] - 44:2 bit [4] - 7:5, 12:31, 34:32, 51:2 black [1] - 51:19 **blame** [2] - 3:34, 10:18 blames [1] - 10:14 blasting [1] - 38:19 blind [1] - 26:11 block [9] - 31:20, 32:7, 32:18, 32:19, 32:32, 33:8, 33:23, 46:13, 47:47 blockage [1] - 48:44 blocked [4] - 32:11, 32:37, 47:44, 51:12 blocking [2] - 10:19, 48:46 **blocks** [2] - 31:21, 31:37 BM [9] - 1:21, 1:21, 1:22, 50:6, 50:41 BMA [2] - 25:19, 25:21 BMAC [1] - 2:35 board [5] - 3:19, 3:36, 4:26, 33:31, 42:33 body [1] - 33:31 **bogged** [1] - 27:18 **book** [10] - 2:8, 9:7, 42:14, 42:15, 43:35, 47:22, 48:17, 48:23, 48:25, 50:34 booked [1] - 30:5 booking [3] - 26:40,

26:41

books [6] - 17:29, 42:5, 42:12, 42:41, 45:5, 45:14 boot [1] - 33:44 bottom [2] - 35:18, 35:26 bound [1] - 12:23 **BRANDT** [53] - 1:16, 1:18, 1:24, 1:27, 1:32, 1:34, 1:36, 1:45, 2:2, 2:14, 2:22, 2:26, 3:9, 3:11, 3:32, 3:39, 3:44, 4:2, 4:4, 4:17, 4:21, 4:23, 4:31, 4:35, 4:38, 4:40, 4:43, 5:37, 5:40, 6:1, 6:21, 6:24, 6:26, 7:30, 7:32, 7:36, 7:44, 8:2, 8:12, 8:26, 8:32, 8:36, 9:9, 9:11, 9:38, 9:42, 10:1, 10:12, 10:26, 10:30, 50:29, 50:33, 50:45 Brandt [8] - 2:5, 1:10, 1:14, 7:6, 7:13, 7:25, 12:27, 47:33 BRANT[1] - 11:11 breached [1] - 35:42 **breaches** [1] - 8:42 break [2] - 27:33, 27:35 briefly [3] - 6:39, 29:43, 43:6 bring [3] - 33:35, 33:36, 41:7 bringing [1] - 14:3 BRITISH [1] - 1:2 broad [7] - 11:27, 13:2, 16:6, 16:25, 19:38, 21:20, 39:41 broader [1] - 15:22 brought [3] - 13:38, 16:35, 17:12 brusan [1] - 51:26 Brusan [1] - 29:11 brusan's [1] - 28:38 budget [4] - 45:10, 45:28, 50:5 budgets [2] - 45:10, 46:12 budgets' [1] - 46:4 **building** [1] - 21:32 built [1] - 35:10 bunch [3] - 34:7, 37:41, 50:22 bundling [2] - 5:5, 5:12 burden [2] - 32:40, 39:1

buried [1] - 7:17 business [23] - 5:9, 5:13, 14:39, 23:9, 25:30, 27:9, 33:22, 42:45. 44:3. 44:22. 44:26, 44:30, 44:37, 45:5, 45:8, 45:17, 45:26, 45:31, 45:33, 45:36, 45:44, 46:11 businesses [1] - 47:1 buy [2] - 36:12, 47:47 buy-out [1] - 36:12 buyer [2] - 50:26, 50:36 buyer's [2] - 49:47, 50:1 BY [6] - 1:16, 11:11, 11:16, 28:3, 30:37, 31:45 Byma [3] - 2:3, 50:17, 51:2

C

C.A.B [1] - 2:5 cannot [1] - 36:37 capable [1] - 32:30 Capella [1] - 1:21 capitals [1] - 13:15 careful [1] - 21:24 carefully [1] - 23:39 carry [2] - 25:30, 30:23 carve [1] - 26:23 carved [1] - 16:39 carving [2] - 27:2, 27:12 CASE[1] - 30:37 case [21] - 1:13, 13:8, 13:24, 15:6, 18:12, 18:35, 19:16, 20:36, 20:39, 21:36, 23:25, 24:4, 24:15, 24:16, 28:32, 33:6, 35:41, 36:20, 43:35, 46:31, 51:22 cases [4] - 11:44, 21:21, 22:2, 36:1 cash [2] - 10:32, 46:18 causes [1] - 27:9 centre [1] - 49:38 **CEO** [2] - 41:47, 45:46 cerlox [1] - 12:23 cerlox-bound [1] -12:23 certain [4] - 5:11, 5:24, 21:2, 22:16 certainly [3] - 1:36, 25:20, 46:29

certification [1] - 1:16

CERTIFICATION [1] -53.1 certify [1] - 53:3 cetera [1] - 10:20 CFO [6] - 41:34, 41:41, 41:45, 42:9, 42:34, 42:38 challenge [1] - 7:3 challenges [1] - 40:26 chambers [4] - 27:42, 52:3 CHAMBERS [2] -1:25, 1:3 chance [1] - 22:43 chances [1] - 31:34 change [9] - 8:19, 8:23, 8:45, 8:47, 36:17, 36:18, 37:4, 45:26 changes [2] - 8:28, 45:26 characterization [2] -2:34, 9:18 chart [4] - 32:10, 37:1, 37:3, 44:19 charter [1] - 36:45 chief [1] - 41:20 choking [1] - 34:47 circumstances [5] -20:22, 20:45, 21:3, 21:20, 24:8 cites [1] - 21:9 claim [3] - 8:40, 22:8, 36.9 clarify [1] - 48:5 class [2] - 46:26, 46:27 clear [7] - 11:43, 11:46, 12:2, 12:9, 13:7, 15:39, 37:15 clearly [1] - 20:46 Clerk [1] - 30:26 CLERK [5] - 1:8, 27:42, 28:10, 30:28, 52:3 client [6] - 4:14, 7:8, 7:9, 15:22, 16:8, 43:24 client's [4] - 3:7, 4:20, 10:17, 33:3 clients [3] - 3:34, 10:16, 29:43 close [1] - 25:38 CNSL [317] - 1:16, 1:18, 1:24, 1:27, 1:32, 1:34, 1:36, 1:45, 2:2, 2:14, 2:22,

2:26, 2:42, 3:6, 3:9,

3:44, 4:2, 4:4, 4:17,

3:11, 3:32, 3:39,

4:21, 4:23, 4:31, 4:35, 4:38, 4:40, 4:43, 5:37, 5:40, 6:1, 6:21, 6:24, 6:26, 6:39, 7:2, 7:13, 7:20, 7:22, 7:25, 7:28, 7:30, 7:32, 7:36, 7:39, 7:42, 7:44, 8:2, 8:12, 8:26, 8:32, 8:36, 9:9, 9:11, 9:38, 9:42, 10:1, 10:12, 10:26, 10:30, 11:11, 11:16, 11:18, 11:45, 12:3, 12:6, 12:8, 12:17, 12:20, 12:24, 12:27, 12:31, 12:33, 12:35, 13:26, 13:30, 13:34, 13:38, 13:41, 13:45, 13:47, 14:3, 14:6. 14:10. 14:13. 14:17, 14:20, 14:22, 14:25, 14:33, 14:46, 15:1, 15:27, 15:31, 15:33, 15:36, 15:40, 15:44, 15:46, 16:1, 16:2, 16:3, 16:4, 16:7, 16:11, 16:14, 16:16, 16:19, 16:22, 16:25, 17:3, 17:5, 17:8, 17:14, 17:16, 17:18, 17:25, 17:30, 17:35, 17:37, 17:40, 17:44, 17:46, 18:3, 18:9, 18:22, 18:23, 18:29, 18:31, 18:33, 18:39, 19:2, 19:5, 19:8, 19:11, 19:13, 19:16, 19:20, 19:23, 19:26, 19:30, 19:33, 19:36, 19:40, 19:45, 19:47, 20:9, 21:31, 22:4, 22:40, 23:8, 23:11, 23:15, 23:22, 23:24, 23:29, 23:35, 24:13, 24:16, 24:22, 24:25, 24:45, 25:1, 25:3, 25:5, 25:10, 25:13, 25:15, 25:19, 25:42, 25:46, 26:9, 26:25, 26:27, 26:30, 26:33, 27:1, 27:10, 27:20, 27:23, 27:27, 27:29, 27:32, 27:35, 27:37, 27:39, 28:15, 28:41, 28:44, 28:46, 29:2, 29:8, 29:15, 29:17, 29:19, 29:21, 29:25, 29:28, 29:33, 29:35, 29:39, 29:42, 29:46, 30:2, 30:7, 30:9, 30:12, 30:15,

30:18, 30:20, 30:24, 30:30, 30:32, 30:34, 30:35, 30:38, 30:40, 30:43, 30:45, 31:1, 31:3, 31:8, 31:11, 31:16, 31:18, 31:23, 31:28, 31:31, 31:34, 31:36, 31:39, 31:43, 31:46, 32:1, 32:4, 32:13, 32:19, 32:23, 32:26, 32:29, 32:43, 33:12, 33:14, 33:28, 35:17, 35:20, 35:22, 35:28, 35:33, 37:13, 37:15, 37:27, 37:30, 37:44, 37:46, 38:2, 38:4, 38:13, 38:22, 38:27, 38:37, 38:44, 38:46, 39:6, 39:9, 39:13, 39:17, 40:47, 41:3, 41:5, 41:10, 42:17, 42:24, 43:37, 43:47, 46:4, 46:10, 47:18, 47:25, 47:27, 47:36, 47:39, 47:45, 48:1, 48:4, 48:7, 48:10, 48:13, 48:15, 48:17, 48:20, 48:25, 48:27, 48:33, 48:39, 48:41, 49:4, 49:9, 49:11, 49:14, 49:20, 49:23, 49:28, 50:26, 50:28, 50:29, 50:31, 50:33, 50:45, 50:47, 51:28, 51:31, 51:34, 51:42, 51:45, 52:1 Cnsl [3] - 1:10, 1:11, 1:15 collectively [2] - 4:46, 25:8 Colliers [1] - 5:18 colloquy [1] - 8:20 **COLUMBIA**[1] - 1:2 coming [3] - 7:4, 9:1, 27:8 COMMENCED)([10: **02:39** [1] - 1:6 **commend** [1] - 1:36 comment [1] - 18:26 commenting [1] - 24:6 comments [1] - 9:18 commercial [3] - 27:5, 34:39, 39:11 committee [2] - 42:27, 45:40 common [1] - 46:38 compacts [1] - 33:5 Companies [1] - 24:19 Company [4] - 13:21, 13:42, 22:38, 23:19

company [7] - 9:3, 22:15, 22:31, 32:16, 32:18, 35:46, 49:14 company's [3] -22:17, 22:18, 22:22 compare [1] - 46:35 compel [2] - 17:37, 46:42 competing [4] - 10:43, 10:44, 11:22, 29:29 competitive [1] - 47:2 complained [1] -10:34 complete [3] - 35:11, 45:4, 45:14 **completed** [1] - 2:18 completely [1] - 39:9 completing [1] - 32:1 complicated [1] - 7:3 comprehensive [1] -2:9 concept [1] - 20:36 concern [2] - 40:26, 40:38 concerning [1] - 21:4 concerns [1] - 50:36 concluded [1] - 22:42 concrete [1] - 34:2 condensed [10] - 2:8, 9:7, 42:14, 42:15, 43:34, 47:22, 48:17, 48:22, 50:34, 50:45 condition [2] - 4:28, conditional [1] - 32:29 conditions [2] - 37:41, 45:25 conduct [2] - 6:31, 22:16 conducted [1] - 44:36 conferences [1] - 9:19 confidentiality [1] -50:19 conflict [2] - 46:46, 47:7 **conflicting** [1] - 10:45 confusion [1] - 25:47 connect [1] - 7:17 consequential [1] -28:25 consider [1] - 20:21 considerations [3] -21:15, 21:44, 40:31 considered [1] - 22:24 considering [1] -11:22 consistent [1] - 40:7 Constable [1] - 3:25 constitutional [3] -44:13, 44:15, 44:37

constrain [1] - 17:9 constraints [1] - 39:3 construct [2] - 44:26, 44:45 consultation [1] - 6:11 contemplated [2] -46:5, 47:11 contemplates [2] -26:1, 50:15 **CONTENTS**[1] - 1:2 contents [3] - 35:13, 35:17, 37:28 contested [2] - 10:23 context [1] - 21:13 continuation [2] -28:38, 28:40 continue [4] - 30:16, 40:40, 43:34, 43:37 continues [1] - 44:42 continuing [1] - 44:41 contours [1] - 20:30 contract [1] - 49:6 contractual [6] -13:19, 13:31, 14:43, 14:45, 14:46, 40:12 contrary [5] - 13:6, 34:46, 39:37, 39:39, 40.2 control [6] - 16:44, 22:14, 23:6, 36:11, 36:17, 36:18 controller [1] - 42:35 convenient [3] -19:37, 19:43, 21:19 convenient' [1] - 21:6 converted [2] - 18:16, 18:20 converting [1] - 24:26 conveyed [1] - 41:32 copied [1] - 49:16 **copies** [3] - 2:19, 18:22, 18:23 COPY [1] - 1:28 **copy** [2] - 3:29, 12:22 cornerstone [1] - 36:3 corollaries [1] - 16:37 corporate [3] - 35:47, 36:26 corporation [5] -22:30, 36:33, 37:3, 44:12, 44:19 Corporations [2] -12:42, 13:1 correct [11] - 3:32, 6:40, 7:5, 9:38, 15:33, 17:13, 19:2, 50:29, 50:30, 50:31 correctly [1] - 39:15 correspondence [3] -5:41, 33:32, 34:5

cost [2] - 25:41, 50:7 costly [1] - 38:37 costs [1] - 50:6 counsel [14] - 2:10, 3:46, 4:1, 4:2, 4:24, 18:26, 18:28, 18:34, 22:32, 30:41, 31:19, 31:20, 33:32, 45:36 COUNSEL [1] - 28:3 Counsel [2] - 2:2, 2:5 counting [1] - 39:14 couple [5] - 16:36, 18:11, 22:1, 35:18, 46:2 Course [2] - 1:21, 1:22 course [6] - 16:37, 25:34, 30:10, 30:22, 30:32, 30:34 courses [1] - 26:35 COURT [299] - 1:2, 1:13, 1:23, 1:26, 1:29, 1:33, 1:35, 1:44, 2:1, 2:13, 2:18, 2:25, 2:41, 3:5, 3:8, 3:10, 3:31, 3:33, 3:42, 4:1, 4:3, 4:11, 4:18, 4:22, 4:28, 4:33, 4:37, 4:39, 4:42, 5:36, 5:39, 5:47, 6:20, 6:22, 6:25, 7:12, 7:18, 7:21, 7:24, 7:27, 7:29, 7:31, 7:34, 7:37, 7:41, 7:43, 8:1, 8:11, 8:18, 8:31, 8:35, 9:8, 9:10, 9:37, 9:41, 9:47, 10:10, 10:13, 10:29, 10:37, 11:14, 11:43, 12:1, 12:5, 12:7, 12:16, 12:18, 12:22, 12:26, 12:28, 12:32, 12:34, 13:25, 13:27, 13:31, 13:35, 13:40, 13:43, 13:46, 14:2, 14:5, 14:9, 14:12, 14:16, 14:19, 14:21, 14:24, 14:32, 14:44, 14:47, 15:21, 15:28, 15:32, 15:34, 15:37, 15:43, 16:5, 16:8, 16:12, 16:15, 16:18, 16:21, 16:24, 16:41, 17:4, 17:7, 17:11, 17:15, 17:17, 17:24, 17:27, 17:34, 17:36, 17:39, 17:43. 17:45. 18:2. 18:8, 18:28, 18:30, 18:32, 18:38, 18:42, 19:3, 19:7, 19:10,

19:12, 19:15, 19:19, 19:22, 19:25, 19:29, 19:32, 19:35, 19:39, 19:44, 19:46, 20:8, 21:30, 22:3, 22:39, 23:3, 23:9, 23:14, 23:21, 23:23, 23:28, 23:34, 24:12, 24:14, 24:21, 24:24, 24:44, 24:47, 25:2, 25:4, 25:9, 25:12, 25:14, 25:18, 26:8, 26:23, 26:26, 26:29, 26:32, 26:47, 27:22, 27:26, 27:28, 27:31, 27:34, 27:36, 27:38, 27:41, 28:9, 28:11, 28:36, 28:42. 28:45. 28:47. 29:3. 29:10. 29:16. 29:18. 29:20. 29:23. 29:26, 29:29, 29:34, 29:36, 29:41, 29:45, 30:1, 30:4, 30:8, 30:10, 30:14, 30:17, 30:19, 30:23, 30:26, 30:29, 30:31, 30:33, 30:42, 30:44, 30:47, 31:2, 31:7, 31:10, 31:15, 31:17, 31:20, 31:24, 31:30, 31:32, 31:35, 31:37, 31:41, 32:3, 32:12, 32:18, 32:22, 32:25, 32:28, 32:42, 33:11, 33:13, 33:27, 35:16, 35:19, 35:21, 35:27, 35:32, 37:12, 37:14, 37:26, 37:29, 37:43, 37:45, 38:1, 38:3, 38:10, 38:16, 38:26, 38:36, 38:39, 38:45, 39:5, 39:8, 39:12, 39:16, 40:46, 41:2, 41:4, 41:9, 42:16, 42:23, 43:36, 43:46, 46:3, 46:9, 47:17, 47:24, 47:26, 47:31, 47:38, 47:40, 47:46, 48:2, 48:6, 48:9, 48:12, 48:14, 48:16, 48:18, 48:24, 48:26, 48:32, 48:37, 48:40, 49:3, 49:8, 49:10, 49:13, 49:19, 49:22, 49:27, 50:25, 50:27, 50:44, 50:46, 51:23, 51:29, 51:32, 51:36, 51:44, 51:46, 52:2 Court [1] - 22:20

court [24] - 1:24, 1:37,

2:16, 3:13, 3:30,

9:14, 11:6, 13:1, 15:25, 15:28, 18:12, 19:17, 19:43, 19:47, 20:3, 20:20, 21:16, 23:29, 28:26, 31:12, 36:36, 37:34, 37:39, 39:40 court's [2] - 21:6, 31:14 courthouse [1] -40:30 Courts [4] - 19:18, 19:30, 19:41, 21:18 Cove [1] - 22:6 CPC [1] - 30:28 CRA [1] - 6:12 crafted [2] - 14:11, 15:8 crafting [2] - 24:32, 24:33 created [2] - 5:32, 9:35 creating [1] - 10:15 creditor [9] - 11:33, 11:40, 12:41, 14:4, 14:7, 14:26, 14:34, 14:38, 15:11 creditor's [1] - 21:38 creditors [2] - 40:27, 40:28 Creek [2] - 34:30, 34:32 crisis [8] - 5:32, 6:29, 6:43, 9:46, 10:15, 10:18, 10:25, 10:46 criteria [1] - 11:37 cry [1] - 51:11 current [3] - 1:41, 2:39, 42:45 Cypress [1] - 49:38 D

damages [1] - 37:30 Dan [3] - 49:16, 49:30, 49:44 danger [1] - 37:23 **Daniel** [1] - 1:5 Darcus [1] - 2:6 DARCUS [18] - 30:30, 30:35, 30:38, 30:40, 30:43, 30:45, 31:1, 31:3, 31:8, 31:11, 31:16, 31:18, 31:23, 31:28, 31:31, 31:34, 31:36, 31:39 dare [1] - 40:34 date [1] - 24:17 dates [6] - 31:16, 31:19, 31:25, 31:29,

49:41 day-to-day [1] - 42:2 days [2] - 5:8, 15:14 **DD**[1] - 5:37 deadlock [3] - 10:25, 10:46, 11:8 deadlocked [1] -43:27 deal [7] - 15:38, 30:31, 34:3, 50:16, 51:5, 51:37, 51:38 dealing [5] - 3:12, 10:40, 20:2, 22:17 deals [2] - 1:41, 41:11 dealt [2] - 5:17, 25:26 debt [5] - 11:28, 14:14, 15:4, 15:20, 31:5 debtor [2] - 20:34, 21:1 decide [4] - 10:42, 10:47, 45:46, 47:8 decided [1] - 37:40 decides [1] - 17:19 deciding [1] - 23:15 decision [3] - 20:6, 22:20, 42:31 decisions [2] - 8:32, 36:43 deem [1] - 19:13 defaults [1] - 34:18 defence [1] - 4:22 defendant [1] - 22:30 defended [1] - 3:21 defending [5] - 3:42, 3:44, 4:13, 4:25, 7:25 defines [1] - 21:44 definition [1] - 25:11 **deflecting** [1] - 9:21 delay [1] - 2:37 deny [1] - 36:21 deposit [1] - 49:41 deprive [1] - 39:22 describes [3] - 36:28, 41:35, 43:24 Description [1] - 1:20 description [1] - 1:25 despite [3] - 27:6, 34:18, 34:27 detail [2] - 4:45, 10:2 detailed [1] - 20:31 details [2] - 1:38, 16:38 determination [2] -17:42, 18:5 develop [6] - 16:27, 16:42, 33:19, 44:26, 44:33, 44:46

developers [1] - 44:31

developing [1] - 17:2 development [14] -5:24, 5:26, 25:35, 44:29, 45:1, 45:9, 45:10. 45:18. 45:28. 45:43, 46:11, 49:45, 50:4. 50:12 developments [2] -14:22, 33:18 Developments [12] -1:8, 1:8, 1:19, 1:19, 1:9, 1:11, 14:20, 14:27, 14:30, 15:24, 16:26, 25:25 DEVELOPMENTS [1] - 1:15 devil [1] - 16:37 difference [1] - 51:18 different [11] - 7:38, 14:40, 17:9, 20:1, 23:21, 28:25, 32:14, 33:1, 33:2, 46:37 differently [1] - 51:6 direct [3] - 26:17, 38:30, 48:36 directing [1] - 38:6 direction [2] - 8:47, 37:19 directly [1] - 41:46 director [6] - 36:12, 36:15, 41:20, 41:27, 42:26, 43:16 directors [4] - 3:19, 4:27, 5:44, 22:19 disagree [1] - 8:32 disagreeing [1] -43:26 disagreement [1] -12:37 disagreements [1] -2:21 disappointed [1] discharged [1] - 24:28 discretion [1] - 13:2 discretionary [1] -36:40 discuss [4] - 20:3, 22:1, 22:43, 50:4 discussed [3] - 31:6, 49:25, 49:33 DISCUSSION [2] -28:2, 30:37 discussion [1] - 20:7 **Discussion** [1] - 1:13 discussions [1] -42:27 Discussions [1] - 1:12 DISCUSSIONS [1] -28:13

disjunctive [1] - 19:6 dispute [6] - 2:36, 2:38, 12:46, 25:22, 35:35, 51:39 disputed [1] - 46:29 disputing [1] - 11:31 distinction [7] - 12:40, 13:12, 14:1, 14:36, 24:40, 25:24, 25:25 distinctions [1] -26:20 distinguish [1] - 13:15 distributable [1] -46:18 distribution [4] -39:35, 40:2, 46:17 divide [1] - 23:11 **Divisional** [1] - 22:20 divorce [1] - 27:5 document [4] - 44:13, 44:15, 44:37, 45:29 documents [4] - 7:7, 35:5, 48:22, 51:13 dollars [1] - 6:37 done [11] - 9:1, 15:9, 15:15, 15:17, 16:46, 24:37, 28:22, 29:6, 29:21, 30:24, 40:32 door [2] - 34:35, 49:2 doors [3] - 32:41, 33:4, 50:21 doubt [1] - 26:34 down [9] - 23:2, 27:18, 29:16, 29:17, 31:13, 37:28, 37:33, 39:14, 45:32 downstairs [1] - 31:21 dozens [1] - 19:36 **Dr** [2] - 32:41, 51:11 draft [10] - 2:20, 2:27, 2:28, 15:47, 17:30, 17:31, 24:43, 24:46, 27:24, 38:29 drafts [1] - 29:30 draw [4] - 8:24, 13:12, 14:1, 24:40 due [1] - 34:15 during [1] - 9:18 duty [1] - 8:42

Ε

early [2] - 8:22, 47:41 earn [1] - 35:6 ease [1] - 19:27 easier [1] - 47:29 EBMD [13] - 3:20, 8:30, 36:16, 41:16, 41:21, 42:34, 43:9, 43:14, 43:41, 44:7,

44:8, 44:44, 45:3 EBMD's [1] - 42:33 Ecoasis [13] - 1:8, 1:8, 1:9, 1:19, 1:19, 1:20, 1:9, 1:11, 6:10, 6:15, 9:26, 9:31, 17:38 **ECOASIS** [1] - 1:15 effect [5] - 2:30, 5:12, 12:1, 21:25, 47:6 effectively [6] - 3:27, 6:30, 8:4, 11:28, 13:17, 19:44 eight [1] - 35:22 eighth [1] - 40:17 either [2] - 13:21, 33:16 elsewhere [1] - 35:7 email [5] - 5:37, 9:11, 9:14, 49:6, 49:15 embarked [1] - 37:5 **emerged** [1] - 20:20 employed [1] - 42:35 empowered [3] -20:23, 23:45, 44:44 encumbered [1] - 24:1 end [8] - 17:20, 17:23, 19:42, 34:13, 37:9, 45:21, 49:40, 50:6 ended [1] - 11:42 endorse [1] - 3:36 endorsed [1] - 3:41 ends [1] - 50:42 ENDS)([10:25:05 [1] -11:10 ENDS)([11:48:37 [1] enforce [3] - 3:23, 3:37, 28:33 enforced [1] - 3:26 enforcement [1] - 20:2 engineering [1] - 35:9 enhance [2] - 26:43, 26:44 enrichment [1] - 39:44 ensure [1] - 22:22 ensuring [1] - 40:29 enter [1] - 44:45 entirety [1] - 32:15 entities [2] - 23:47, 25:8 entitled [2] - 33:47, 43:11 entitlements [1] -40:36 entity [2] - 49:47, 50:10 equal [1] - 46:13 equality [1] - 43:24

equally [3] - 43:8,

43:15, 46:24

equity [3] - 32:45, 48:36, 50:16 Equity [7] - 12:42, 13:21, 13:29, 13:39, 19:21, 19:28, 19:34 error [1] - 2:45 essential [2] - 1:20, essentially [4] - 1:46, 3:33, 19:23, 24:7 estimate [1] - 4:9 et [1] - 10:20 evaluated [2] - 33:9, 33:12 Eveliene [1] - 53:16 event [2] - 26:41, 30:5 events [1] - 26:36 evidence [21] - 2:24, 3:7, 4:20, 7:16, 8:23, 10:14, 10:17, 10:23, 10:45, 15:6, 21:38, 25:43, 33:10, 33:16, 33:31, 34:5, 34:32, 41:37, 42:10, 45:34, 47:32 evident [1] - 34:13 exactly [5] - 2:22, 16:25, 20:3, 22:27, 39:18 examined [1] - 22:23 **example** [3] - 36:11, 41:43, 44:45 **examples** [1] - 6:19 excellent [1] - 27:20 except [1] - 49:37 **exceptions** [1] - 32:15 excerpt [3] - 43:35, 47:21, 47:22 **EXCERPT** [7] - 1:25, 1:3, 1:4, 11:10, 11:12, 28:1, 28:4 excerpted [1] - 44:23 exchanged [1] - 5:41 excluded [1] - 50:18 exclusive [1] - 43:42 excused [2] - 30:9, 30:11 **execution** [2] - 21:37, 21:46 executive [1] - 41:21 **exercise** [1] - 21:6 exercised [1] - 22:45 Exhibit [2] - 1:20, 5:37

EXHIBITS [1] - 1:18

exist [2] - 6:46, 35:10

exhibits [1] - 1:21

expect [3] - 40:12,

equitable [3] - 39:21,

equities [1] - 37:20

39:42, 40:30

41:45, 45:4 expectations [9] -35:42, 36:4, 36:6, 36:23, 36:24, 36:28, 36:29, 40:8, 43:25 expected [1] - 5:23 explain [1] - 6:22 **express** [1] - 40:3 expressed [2] - 34:28, 50:36 expressions [1] -47:43 extended [1] - 35:2 extent [2] - 1:43, 5:18 external [1] - 42:35 extra [1] - 12:22 extraordinary [10] -15:1, 15:2, 15:18, 17:47, 21:23, 32:44, 43:23, 46:6, 46:7, 48:44 **extremely** [1] - 6:9

F

faced [3] - 6:43, 10:43, 40:27 facie [4] - 13:8, 13:24, 15:6, 51:21 facing [1] - 11:5 fact [8] - 16:19, 34:43, 35:4, 36:47, 37:2, 43:21, 44:18, 48:47 facts [1] - 40:47 factual [1] - 7:47 fair [4] - 7:5, 7:13, 7:26, 8:44 fairness [1] - 36:39 far [4] - 27:21, 27:31, 27:32, 51:11 Farley [2] - 22:14, 22:31 fashion [1] - 20:24 father [1] - 9:2 fatter [1] - 42:14 fault [1] - 42:8 favour [2] - 20:43, 40:21 FDS [1] - 29:27 feet [3] - 3:35, 38:40, 42:6 Ferris [7] - 2:5, 9:44, 35:37, 35:45, 36:2, 36:10, 36:31 few [4] - 11:20, 12:13, 47:41, 48:30 fiduciaries [1] - 46:47 fiduciary [1] - 36:19 figure [1] - 10:32 filed [1] - 2:18

filing [1] - 1:46 finalized [1] - 5:15 financial [6] - 1:41, 2:3, 2:5, 2:31, 2:39, 45.11 financing [1] - 47:9 fine [1] - 27:12 finish [1] - 34:37 first [19] - 7:46, 9:14, 12:31, 17:46, 18:15, 22:6, 24:13, 24:17, 24:22, 24:27, 24:41, 25:19, 32:8, 33:40, 35:25, 35:28, 46:21, 48:27, 50:4 fit [1] - 16:36 Fitzpatrick [5] - 12:9, 18:15, 18:37, 24:10, 24:17 fixed [1] - 26:3 focus [1] - 36:32 folded [1] - 15:30 **following** [1] - 5:42 follows [2] - 2:15, 49:32 fooling [1] - 25:40 footnote [1] - 46:28 **FOR** [2] - 27:45, 28:5 forgive [2] - 37:17, 44:12 form [3] - 28:29, 29:23, 41:12 former [2] - 11:32, 14:42 forth [1] - 7:1 forward [5] - 6:6, 8:9, 24:39, 50:8 four [1] - 26:6 four-month [1] - 26:6 fourth [2] - 5:45, 37:33 framework [1] - 44:18 frankly [1] - 25:45 freeze [1] - 23:45 friend [8] - 2:43, 3:30, 6:40, 9:43, 27:18, 28:17, 50:31, 51:8 friend's [2] - 32:9, 51:8 friends [16] - 6:30, 17:20, 17:21, 37:46, 38:28, 38:34, 39:27, 39:36, 40:32, 46:28, 46:35, 46:39, 47:7, 48:43, 51:18, 51:20 FROM [3] - 1:25, 1:3, front [3] - 15:42, 29:47, 51:30 fruition [1] - 50:24 FTS [1] - 29:31

full [8] - 14:35, 14:37, 15:44, 17:22, 25:27, 25:33, 27:3, 37:20 fully [2] - 11:6, 22:23 function [1] - 36:27 fund [1] - 8:13 funding [4] - 8:8, 13:10, 16:38, 46:36 funds [1] - 10:19 future [2] - 22:24, 26:21

G

game [1] - 34:13 Gates [1] - 49:38 gathered [1] - 28:17 general [1] - 46:46 germane [1] - 21:15 given [6] - 2:16, 3:30, 6:5, 18:4, 23:5, 50:37 Gold [2] - 3:14, 3:25 Golf [3] - 1:9, 1:21, 1.22 **golf** [5] - 1:20, 25:34, 26:35, 27:14 gondola [2] - 6:10, 6:14 governance [1] -43:18 governed [2] - 43:30, 44:13 governing [1] - 21:12 government [1] -40:35 granted [2] - 21:24, 22:31 grateful [1] - 31:14 great [3] - 4:45, 29:28, 49:10 greater [2] - 31:21, 31:37 grey [1] - 48:25 ground [2] - 7:34, 46:39 grounded [1] - 13:33 grounds [1] - 8:7 gruber [2] - 28:39, 51:26 GSA [1] - 40:13

Н

guarantee [1] - 38:32

guy [1] - 9:21

half [3] - 28:45, 30:18, 31:13 **halfway** [1] - 37:27

hammer [1] - 26:33

hang [3] - 12:14, 13:25, 25:9 hanging [1] - 27:26 happily [1] - 38:22 **happy** [2] - 17:5, 31:12 harm [1] - 27:9 Harris [2] - 36:36, 36:42 hasten [1] - 37:9 hats [2] - 13:16, 14:38 heading [2] - 43:3, 45:15 headings [2] - 41:6 hear [1] - 51:26 heard [9] - 25:35, 27:1, 37:36, 41:15, 41:26, 41:30, 41:33, 42:46, 43:7 hearing [4] - 15:34, 28:36, 31:9, 45:1 Height [1] - 4:8 held [2] - 43:1, 44:8 help [4] - 6:22, 31:14, 41:6, 51:40 helpful [1] - 15:46 hence [1] - 18:24 hesitate [1] - 2:42 Hiebert [4] - 2:4, 28:21, 30:11, 32:34 HIEBERT [1] - 18:22 high [1] - 16:30 higher [6] - 15:4, 15:5, 33:20, 33:21, 35:7 highest [1] - 41:24 Highlands [2] - 1:21, 1:22 highlight [2] - 12:12, 12:39 highly [1] - 36:39 himself [1] - 42:7 historically [1] - 43:15 hive [1] - 19:4 **hmm** [9] - 7:12, 9:47, 21:30, 22:3, 35:19, 35:27, 37:12, 37:26, 49:3 hold [2] - 42:33, 47:1 holding [2] - 39:33, 46:25

Holdings [4] - 1:9,

1:17, 2:2, 1:10

HONOURABLE[1] -

Hole [1] - 4:10

home [1] - 6:5

hamminess [1] - 27:7

hand [2] - 21:16,

handed [1] - 12:23

hands [1] - 30:21

31:12

hope [2] - 30:20, 51:5 hoped [1] - 31:20 hopeful [1] - 51:36 hopefully [2] - 30:2, 30:8 hoping [1] - 28:27 hotel [1] - 1:39 hour [4] - 28:28, 28:43, 28:45, 30:18 hype [1] - 25:44 hyperbole [1] - 25:45

1:3

ı

idea [4] - 20:11, 20:32, 23:13, 23:36 identified [3] - 4:7, 4:46, 38:29 illiquidity [2] - 5:32, 7:40 immediately [1] -29:29 imperial [2] - 36:37, 47:14 implement [1] - 25:38 **importance** [1] - 41:31 important [5] - 22:29, 31:24, 41:30, 42:3, 45:20 **improper** [1] - 10:39 IN [5] - 1:2, 1:14, 1:15, 1:25, 1:3 inaccurately [1] - 2:45 inadequate [1] - 35:13 Inc [1] - 22:7 included [1] - 17:35 includes [3] - 15:5, 44:26, 44:47 including [8] - 13:31, 21:2, 23:32, 38:42, 40:34, 45:7, 45:35, 48:41 inclusive [1] - 53:6 income [1] - 46:16 increase [1] - 21:34 indebtedness [1] - 6:8 indeed [1] - 20:41 independent [1] -22:16 indirect [1] - 48:36 indiscernible [4] -13:23, 35:45, 37:1, 51:2 indiscernible] [1] -37:25 individual [4] - 21:21, 32:36, 47:42, 48:2 individuals [1] - 23:47

inelegant [1] - 38:29

infer [1] - 8:44 **inferences** [1] - 8:24 **information** [3] - 2:37, 17:41, 23:31 initiate [1] - 26:17 initiated [1] - 8:40 injunction [2] - 13:18, 13:23 inline [1] - 49:32 inset [1] - 3:1 inside [1] - 42:43 INSOLVENCY [1] -1.14 insolvency [3] - 35:9, 37:10. 37:21 inspector [4] - 22:12, 22:36, 22:38, 23:21 instance [1] - 7:26 instruct [1] - 41:44 instructed [1] - 3:45 instructing [1] - 42:1 instructions [1] - 4:41 intended [2] - 41:39, 42:36 intent [1] - 32:28 interest [11] - 8:43, 9:3, 27:11, 34:40, 34:42, 34:45, 36:22, 40:21, 45:26, 47:1, 47:43 interested [3] - 10:4, 10:40, 40:34 interests [2] - 35:1, interfere [3] - 11:24, 23:42, 24:7 interfered [2] - 16:40, 24:1 interferes [1] - 11:41 interim [2] - 13:18, 37:23 internal [1] - 42:30 interrupt [1] - 2:42 introduction [5] -30:25, 34:37, 35:11, 35:12, 40:45 introductions [1] -32:2 intrusive [4] - 21:23, 21:33, 23:33, 23:36 inventory [1] - 19:1 invest [1] - 18:9 investigate [11] -16:33, 18:19, 20:33, 21:1, 22:15, 23:6, 23:7, 23:44, 24:20, 38:6, 38:41

investigation [5] -

33:22, 38:30

18:17, 22:43, 24:31,

investigative [3] -20:12, 20:17, 23:20 investigator [5] -18:16, 18:18, 18:39, 24:18. 24:28 investigatory [5] -15:14, 18:10, 18:13, 18:40, 20:4 **investment** [1] - 48:36 **investor** [1] - 32:46 invoked [1] - 41:23 involve [1] - 5:11 involved [3] - 22:7, 25:34, 28:39 involves [2] - 28:38, 39:35 involving [1] - 3:25 issue [10] - 2:39, 3:28, 9:21, 9:32, 9:35, 10:37, 18:46, 20:4, 21:41, 23:3 issues [4] - 2:4, 6:46, 11:20, 20:39 itself [3] - 20:34, 26:4, 44:36

J

Jackson [7] - 2:3, 7:5, 7:15, 7:18, 28:9, 38:39, 51:25 JACKSON [22] - 6:39, 15:46, 16:2, 16:4, 25:42, 28:15, 28:41, 28:44, 28:46, 29:2, 29:8, 29:15, 29:17, 29:19, 29:21, 29:25, 29:28, 29:33, 29:35, 29:39, 51:28, 51:31 **January** [1] - 24:23 jeopardy [1] - 21:39 Jess [1] - 18:25 **job** [1] - 40:32 joint [5] - 4:41, 5:34, 32:32, 32:44, 48:29 jointly [4] - 3:45, 48:10, 51:14 judge [1] - 19:42 **judges** [1] - 36:43 judgment [1] - 20:2 judicial [2] - 40:8, 40:15 July [1] - 32:47 jumped [2] - 48:18 jurisdiction [8] - 18:7, 23:16, 23:18, 24:31, 37:11, 38:15, 38:16, 38.17 jurisdictional [2] -37:19, 37:22

jurisdictions [1] -24:33 JUSTICE [1] - 1:3 Justice [46] - 1:12, 1:18, 7:2, 7:32, 7:44, 11:18, 12:8, 18:15, 18:36, 19:18, 19:31, 19:41, 21:18, 24:10, 24:17, 25:42, 27:10, 28:10, 28:15, 29:22, 29:40, 29:42, 31:3, 31:43, 34:12, 36:13, 36:36, 36:42, 38:47, 39:13, 40:45, 42:22, 43:6, 43:33, 43:47, 44:11, 45:9, 45:20, 46:2, 47:15, 48:23, 49:21, 51:35, 51:42, 52.1 justice [8] - 2:42, 6:39, 22:13, 25:42, 30:12, 34:37, 44:24, 45:29

K

justifications [1] - 8:9

justify [1] - 8:3

KC [2] - 2:2, 2:5 keep [6] - 15:23, 30:4, 33:44, 34:22, 36:44, 45:4 kept [2] - 42:6, 42:11 kicking [1] - 32:24 kind [4] - 5:5, 7:17, 38:33, 39:3 kinds [3] - 33:1, 40:31, 42:4 knock [1] - 2:30 knock-on [1] - 2:30 **Kusumoto** [49] - 1:9, 2:4, 2:19, 2:29, 2:46, 3:3, 3:18, 5:38, 5:42, 5:43, 6:2, 8:29, 8:33, 8:37, 8:39, 8:47, 9:12, 9:15, 10:14, 10:18, 10:36, 10:47, 11:2, 32:7, 32:11, 32:46, 33:8, 33:29, 33:33, 34:1, 34:6, 35:5, 36:11, 36:15, 41:27, 41:33, 41:44, 45:35, 47:7, 47:34, 47:44, 48:7, 48:33, 48:47, 49:42, 50:37, 50:39, 51:10 Kusumoto's [7] -3:35, 8:21, 8:42, 13:7, 32:41, 42:8, 42:42

L

labelled [1] - 20:41

land [11] - 5:10, 5:25,

6:34, 14:22, 14:28,

37:21, 45:1, 50:3

lands [6] - 25:19,

45:9, 45:18

1:22

Lands [5] - 1:21, 1:21,

25:21, 25:26, 26:5,

language [4] - 19:24,

last [6] - 8:16, 15:14,

19:44, 28:22, 37:47

14:33, 25:34, 33:19,

Land [1] - 37:41

33:7, 34:12, 34:38, 45:41 lasts [1] - 28:42 latter [2] - 11:31, 11:33 **Law** [7] - 12:42, 13:21, 13:28, 13:39, 19:20, 19:28, 19:34 law [5] - 4:1, 11:43, 11:47, 12:2, 35:47 lawsuit [4] - 3:37, 3:39, 3:43, 3:45 lawsuits [1] - 3:40 leads [1] - 48:28 learn [1] - 6:9 least [6] - 17:14. 21:33, 21:37, 23:33, 23:36 leave [2] - 28:20, 28:21 leaves [1] - 13:1 leaving [1] - 39:24 left [2] - 1:29, 39:33 legal [2] - 12:38, 26:17 lender [4] - 33:39, 33:47, 34:36, 47:6 lending [1] - 34:33 lengthy [3] - 30:25, 35:23, 38:37 less [2] - 25:39, 51:19 letter [5] - 2:9, 9:43, 34:30, 50:35, 50:39 letters [3] - 32:28, 33:32, 47:42 levels [1] - 40:35 liabilities [1] - 46:22 liability [4] - 6:14, 41:15, 43:31, 44:16 lie [1] - 42:6 likely [1] - 6:12 limited [5] - 17:2, 41:15, 43:31, 44:15, 48:41 **Limited** [3] - 1:8, 1:9,

1:10 limits [1] - 36:44 line [5] - 11:21, 35:25, 39:19, 39:46, 40:5 lines [2] - 37:33, 45:41 liquidity [8] - 6:29, 6:42, 6:43, 9:31, 9:35, 10:15, 10:24, 10:46 **litigation** [2] - 3:13, 3:28 **LLP** [6] - 1:8, 1:9, 1:15, 1:19, 1:20, 1:11 loaded [1] - 35:44 loan [12] - 5:1, 6:35, 6:36, 8:8, 32:33, 34:10, 34:15, 34:21, 34:41, 36:22, 39:28, 39:32 loans [2] - 5:46, 46:23 Loblaw [2] - 23:38 Loblaw's [2] - 23:40, 23:43 locate [1] - 23:43 look [15] - 11:3, 15:29, 16:8, 17:29, 24:42, 29:31, 31:22, 31:32, 33:34, 34:8, 34:26, 39:6, 45:15, 48:15, 50:7 looked [1] - 33:15 looking [4] - 24:26. 27:23, 27:40, 33:23 looks [1] - 24:41 lose [1] - 30:18 lower [2] - 14:42, 14:47 **Ltd** [18] - 1:5, 1:8, 1:9, 1:17, 1:19, 1:20, 1:20, 1:21, 1:21, 1:22, 1:22, 2:5

М

m'mm [9] - 7:12, 9:47, 21:30, 22:3, 35:19, 35:27, 37:12, 37:26, 49:3 m'mm-hmm [9] - 7:12, 9:47, 21:30, 22:3, 35:19, 35:27, 37:12, 37:26, 49:3 Madam [4] - 12:8, 18:14, 18:36, 30:26 main [3] - 10:8, 22:21, 49:31 majority [2] - 22:18, 22:44 malafide [2] - 10:39,

11:1 manage [3] - 25:30, 26:17, 43:43 managed [1] - 41:16 management [6] -25:33, 27:13, 40:41, 41:13, 41:24, 45:40 manager [1] - 50:4 managing [5] - 43:11, 43:42, 44:7, 44:44, 48:35 mandate [1] - 23:43 manner [1] - 20:31 margin [2] - 33:20, 33:21 marked [1] - 1:21 market [5] - 5:11, 34:42, 34:43, 35:2, 45:25 marketed [1] - 5:4 marketing [3] - 5:7, 5:14, 26:5 marketplace[1] -26:40 master [2] - 49:45, 50:12 material [2] - 2:11, 41:19 matrix [1] - 7:47 matter [11] - 1:11, 1:8, 1:47, 3:20, 4:38, 7:4, 28:37, 28:40, 29:30, 31:13, 51:39 **MATTER** [2] - 1:15, 11:16 matters [8] - 1:46, 3:13, 3:14, 3:24, 3:28, 3:31, 6:25, 6:26 Matthews [53] - 1:5, 2:7, 2:47, 3:3, 4:14, 4:23, 4:24, 4:32, 4:33, 4:35, 4:36, 5:35, 5:38, 5:42, 6:27, 6:38, 8:4, 8:14, 9:4, 9:5, 9:13, 9:15, 9:24, 10:15, 12:17, 32:46, 33:24, 33:34, 33:36, 34:9, 34:18, 34:27, 34:44, 36:28, 37:31, 41:19, 41:34,

41:36, 41:44, 42:6,

42:11, 42:28, 42:42,

45:30, 45:38, 45:46,

47:13, 48:8, 48:31,

49:1, 49:16, 50:40,

Matthews' [2] - 41:46,

Matthews's [2] - 2:24,

51:15

42:18

9:46 mean [8] - 10:26, 13:14, 26:42, 29:4, 31:32, 39:40, 44:38, 49:1 means [1] - 6:16 meant [1] - 13:36 meantime [1] - 29:24 mediation [1] - 3:17 meet [1] - 15:4 meets [1] - 11:36 member [1] - 41:24 mentally [1] - 46:35 mentioned [1] - 48:29 mess [1] - 42:10 met [5] - 11:30, 11:32, 11:34, 15:17, 16:31 mic [1] - 38:18 middle [1] - 6:1 might [7] - 15:46, 15:47, 40:28, 41:45, 42:8, 50:16 Millers [1] - 22:6 million [20] - 3:27, 5:30, 5:31, 6:8, 6:12, 6:13, 6:27, 6:37, 9:26, 9:35, 10:5, 10:27, 10:33, 14:28, 15:12, 32:10, 39:30, 46:24, 46:26 minimum [2] - 15:10, 39.29 minor [2] - 10:1, 51:43 minority [1] - 36:45 minute [2] - 24:44, 48:24 minutes [2] - 33:32, 48:30 mirrored [1] - 30:43 misappropriated [1] -8:13 missing [1] - 6:37 **misstated** [1] - 13:45 mistrust [1] - 27:7 MLT_[1] - 18:25 model [6] - 16:41, 17:27, 17:33, 23:5, 26:8, 26:10 modified [2] - 11:35, 46:46 moment [6] - 9:10, 9:40, 9:43, 13:43, 43:38, 50:42 moments [2] - 12:25, 47.41 Monday [3] - 29:32, 29:34, 29:38 monetize [1] - 16:46 money [11] - 7:11, 8:13, 9:30, 11:4,

14:7, 14:31, 14:34, 35:2, 35:7, 38:35, 39:37 monitor [2] - 20:11, 22:36 monitor' [1] - 23:44 month [3] - 26:5, 26:6, 49:40 **monthly** [1] - 9:19 months [2] - 25:37, 25:38 morning [3] - 1:19, 1:21, 27:43 MORNING [1] - 27:45 mortgage [1] - 39:23 mortgages [1] - 40:13 mountain [1] - 50:41 Mountain [9] - 1:8, 1:19, 1:22, 1:22, 1:9, 44:29, 45:31, 49:18, 50:13 move [9] - 1:30, 1:32, 5:27, 6:6, 16:17, 16:20, 27:3, 27:19, 38:13 moved [4] - 15:22, 15:31, 16:12, 16:16 moves [1] - 11:40 multi [1] - 4:10 multi-parcel [1] - 4:10 multiple [1] - 23:17 municipal [1] - 40:35 must [2] - 12:22, 21:20 myopically [1] - 36:31

N

name [3] - 49:12, 49:14, 50:1 Nanaimo [1] - 3:31 narrative [3] - 34:47, 35:8, 41:12 Nathanson [6] - 2:2, 1:15, 8:10, 9:44, 30:6, 31:42 NATHANSON [94] -2:42, 3:6, 7:2, 7:13, 7:20, 7:22, 7:25, 7:28, 7:39, 7:42, 27:10, 30:12, 30:15, 30:18, 30:20, 30:24, 30:32, 30:34, 31:43, 31:46, 32:1, 32:4, 32:13, 32:19, 32:23, 32:26, 32:29, 32:43, 33:12, 33:14, 33:28, 35:17, 35:20, 35:22, 35:28, 35:33, 37:13, 37:15, 37:27, 37:30,

37:44, 37:46, 38:2, 38:4, 38:13, 38:22, 38:27, 38:37, 38:44, 38:46, 39:6, 39:9, 39:13, 39:17, 40:47, 41:3, 41:5, 41:10, 42:17, 42:24, 43:37, 43:47, 46:4, 46:10, 47:18, 47:25, 47:27, 47:36, 47:39, 47:45, 48:1, 48:4, 48:7, 48:10, 48:13, 48:15, 48:17, 48:20, 48:25, 48:27, 48:33, 48:39, 48:41, 49:4, 49:9, 49:11, 49:14, 49:20, 49:23, 49:28, 50:26, 50:28, 50:31, 50:47 near [1] - 10:33 nearly [2] - 24:2, 30:24 necessarily [2] - 7:35, 13:9 necessary [12] -11:38, 11:39, 12:7, 15:10, 15:20, 16:23,

16:30, 20:30, 21:34, 24:8, 25:26, 30:8 necessity [1] - 27:16 need [11] - 3:33, 9:38, 10:2, 10:11, 23:31, 29:36, 31:37, 34:38, 40:36, 42:47, 51:4 needs [7] - 15:9, 15:12, 15:15, 15:16, 15:29, 16:34, 17:41 negotiation [1] - 51:9 negotiations [1] -48:11 net [2] - 3:27, 46:16 never [4] - 3:17, 6:42, 44:31, 51:37 new [4] - 18:28, 34:29, 36:12, 36:15 **Newbury** [1] - 36:42 next [19] - 1:40, 4:43. 5:17, 5:21, 9:36, 10:41, 16:40, 34:10, 39:13, 39:18, 39:34, 39:46, 40:5, 41:29, 42:44, 49:9, 51:4 nice [1] - 35:46 niche [1] - 20:35 Nil [1] - 1:26 no-conflict [1] - 46:46 nominally [1] - 41:35

nominated [1] - 43:16

non-parties [1] - 21:5

nominee [1] - 5:44

non [1] - 21:5

none [2] - 26:10,

46:23 noon [1] - 16:19 normally [2] - 35:13, 39:41 note [2] - 22:29, 35:22 nothing [4] - 6:41, 10:31, 13:29, 34:8 notice [4] - 1:9, 1:14, 31:11, 46:36 **NOTICE** [2] - 1:16, 31:45 noting [1] - 5:2 November [1] - 33:41 nuanced [1] - 26:31 number [8] - 3:3, 3:4, 5:35, 10:28, 10:31, 39:14, 42:18, 50:38 numbered [1] - 24:45 numbers [2] - 42:20, 42:21

0

OBCA [1] - 22:13 obvious [2] - 44:11, 46:1 obviously [1] - 5:8 occurred [1] - 50:34 occurs [1] - 8:28 October [2] - 31:18 **OF** [6] - 1:2, 1:15, 1:2, 1:16, 31:45 offer [3] - 32:32, 34:8, 47:47 offering [1] - 34:17 offers [6] - 32:21, 32:23, 32:26, 32:36 officer [4] - 22:34, 37:40, 41:21, 42:34 Ohama [1] - 2:6 OHAMA [18] - 30:30, 30:35, 30:38, 30:40, 30:43, 30:45, 31:1, 31:3, 31:8, 31:11, 31:16, 31:18, 31:23, 31:28, 31:31, 31:34, 31:36, 31:39 Ohama-Darcus [1] -OHAMA-DARCUS [18] - 30:30, 30:35, 30:38, 30:40, 30:43, 30:45, 31:1, 31:3, 31:8, 31:11, 31:16, 31:18, 31:23, 31:28, 31:31, 31:34, 31:36, 31:39 on-block [5] - 32:18, 32:19, 32:32, 33:23, 47:47

once [1] - 1:24 one [47] - 2:4, 5:3, 8:9, 8:25, 8:28, 9:40, 11:21, 11:37, 12:23, 12:24, 14:38, 15:29, 15:45. 16:6. 18:12. 18:36, 20:15, 21:16, 21:23, 23:12, 24:14, 24:17, 24:30, 28:27, 28:28, 28:29, 28:31, 33:4, 33:38, 33:39, 33:40, 34:30, 34:43, 35:4, 35:25, 35:44, 37:38, 39:18, 40:17, 40:43, 41:45, 44:28, 44:39, 48:27, 49:15, 51:43 ones [1] - 32:30 ongoing [2] - 26:46, 28:40 Ontario [3] - 18:12, 19:17, 19:18 open [2] - 11:42, 43:33 open-ended [1] -11:42 operate [4] - 25:30, 43:43, 44:27, 44:46 operates [1] - 36:19 operating [4] - 22:30, 45:10, 45:28, 46:12 **operation** [1] - 27:13 operations [6] - 11:24, 14:23, 26:34, 26:46, 27:14, 42:2 opportunity [1] -22:33 opposite [1] - 40:18 oppression [16] - 8:6, 22:7, 35:9, 35:30, 35:47, 36:3, 36:9, 36:20, 36:37, 37:8, 37:23, 39:41, 42:19, 44:18, 44:20, 46:31 oppressive [2] - 35:8, 50:24 optimism [1] - 34:28 option [1] - 22:13 order [38] - 11:22, 13:13, 13:23, 15:8, 15:47, 16:36, 17:31, 18:45, 18:46, 21:25, 22:21, 23:25, 23:29, 24:27, 24:39, 24:43, 24:46, 24:47, 26:1, 27:24, 27:42, 28:30, 28:35, 29:23, 29:31,

30:27, 37:34, 37:42,

37:47, 38:9, 38:20,

38:23, 38:29, 39:35,

46:36, 51:40, 52:3 ordered [2] - 30:47, 37:39 orders [7] - 1:13. 11:23, 18:14, 21:45, 24:10, 30:40, 30:45 ORDERS [2] - 1:23, 30:37 ordinary [1] - 5:13 **org** [3] - 37:1, 37:3, 44:19 organization [1] -41:14 organization's [2] -41:40, 42:37 organized [1] - 43:1 original [1] - 16:5 originally [2] - 15:41, 41.27 **OTHERS** [1] - 1:15 otherwise [1] - 47:13 outcome [1] - 40:34 outset [1] - 47:11 outside [1] - 42:42 outstanding [1] - 3:20 overall [5] - 8:46, 45:8, 45:17, 46:11 overlooking [1] - 36:2 overly [1] - 11:27 overreaching[1] -23:41 overtaken [1] - 32:33 owed [2] - 9:30, 39:30 owing [3] - 9:22, 9:24, 39:28 **own** [3] - 9:46, 43:14, 49:37 owned [1] - 40:16 owners [1] - 50:6 owns [3] - 43:9, 46:27

Ρ

Page [3] - 1:8, 1:20, page [19] - 3:2, 12:21, 12:33, 25:7, 25:10, 35:18, 35:26, 35:39, 37:28, 40:18, 41:3, 41:29, 42:20, 42:21, 43:2, 43:28, 44:23, 45:12, 45:13 pages [2] - 35:18, 47:19 paid [1] - 39:37 paint [1] - 9:20 paper [3] - 24:42, 27:39, 51:39 paragraph [33] - 1:28, 2:2, 2:23, 2:43, 4:4,

20:6, 24:27, 25:6, 25:15, 25:28, 41:3, 41:17, 41:29, 42:22, 43:2, 43:12, 43:39, 43:45, 44:21, 44:41, 45:2, 46:4, 46:15, 46:38, 46:41, 47:21 paragraphs [3] - 5:17, 36:10, 41:26 parallel [1] - 28:15 parameters [1] - 21:44 parcel [2] - 4:10, 5:3 pari [2] - 46:24, 46:32 part [22] - 2:11, 2:36, 2:38, 5:13, 5:40, 6:30, 7:47, 8:6, 8:16, 8:45, 9:1, 9:4, 34:39, 34:41, 35:46, 43:24, 44:29, 44:30, 44:37, 50:15 partial [1] - 40:22 particular [1] - 24:34 particularly [1] - 21:15 parties [16] - 10:24, 10:44, 11:5, 17:38, 21:5, 21:26, 23:32, 24:3, 27:6, 29:6, 36:30, 37:5, 40:20, 43:26, 44:39, 47:10 parties' [5] - 39:22, 39:38, 39:43, 40:3, 40:8 partner [13] - 12:43, 13:20, 14:39, 33:17, 34:47, 36:7, 43:11, 43:42, 44:7, 44:44, 46:23, 46:42, 48:35 partners [17] - 6:47, 17:40, 32:39, 32:45, 36:30, 40:15, 44:3, 44:9, 45:7, 45:45, 45:47, 46:21, 46:25, 46:47, 47:5, 48:29, 48:34 partners' [1] - 43:7 partnership [56] -1:42, 2:5, 3:21, 3:43. 3:44, 4:32, 4:40, 5:10, 5:31, 5:33, 6:28, 6:32, 11:29, 13:14, 13:16, 13:35, 13:44, 15:24, 25:7, 25:23, 25:31, 34:23, 35:35, 36:18, 36:19, 36:21, 37:6, 40:14, 40:16, 41:13, 41:16, 43:17, 43:18, 43:21,

43:27, 43:30, 44:2,

4:10, 5:4, 5:45, 9:14,

12:21, 12:32, 12:33,

44:6, 44:14, 44:16, 44:22, 44:36, 44:38, 44:47, 45:2, 45:6, 45:43, 46:15, 46:43, 46:45, 47:23, 48:35 Partnership [4] - 25:6, 25:11, 43:3 partnership's [4] -4:12, 37:35, 42:45, 44:8 party [1] - 3:12 pass [2] - 18:11, 18:14 passed [1] - 24:9 passing [1] - 19:24 passu [2] - 46:24, past [3] - 27:19, 29:12, 38:4 pause [1] - 50:41 pay [5] - 6:16, 14:28, 15:12, 38:35, 46:22 payout [1] - 25:39 **PDF** [1] - 49:21 Peak [2] - 5:3, 5:8 peaks [1] - 4:7 people [2] - 23:30, 44:33 percent [6] - 5:23, 34:42, 34:45, 35:2, 43:9. 48:42 **perfectly** [1] - 17:5 **performing** [1] - 36:27 period [2] - 34:39, 34:41 permit [2] - 33:29, 33:43 permits [1] - 18:46 person [1] - 32:31 personal [1] - 27:6 Petitioners [2] - 1:6, 1:18 phonetic [2] - 4:8, 28:39 pickle [1] - 7:10 picture [1] - 14:18 pieces [1] - 16:9 pinning [1] - 9:5 pitching [1] - 21:32 **pivoting** [1] - 9:5 place [1] - 9:2 plaintiffs [1] - 4:19 PLAN[1] - 30:37 plan [18] - 1:13, 6:7, 25:37, 25:38, 28:47, 29:10, 32:14, 40:36, 44:31, 45:8, 45:17, 45:33, 45:36, 45:44, 46:11, 46:12, 49:45, 50:12 planned' [1] - 22:25

plans [1] - 46:5 play [2] - 21:13, 37:20 Player [1] - 5:2 Players [1] - 5:3 plodding [1] - 41:10 PM [10] - 1:26, 1:5, 28:4, 28:6, 28:7, 52:6, 53:6 point [44] - 2:43, 7:14, 7:30, 10:1, 11:43, 11:44, 14:36, 17:46, 18:43, 25:22, 26:30, 27:19, 32:8, 32:20, 33:7, 34:12, 34:39, 35:28, 37:16, 37:17, 38:8, 38:33, 38:46, 39:7, 39:26, 39:34, 39:45, 39:46, 40:5, 40:11, 40:17, 41:5, 41:30, 42:40, 44:17, 44:25, 46:7, 46:25, 46:34, 46:41, 47:4, 47:39, 50:21, 51:17 pointed [2] - 5:9, 8:21 pointing [1] - 4:20 points [9] - 12:13, 35:3, 35:14, 35:15, 35:22, 37:37, 46:2, 49:32, 51:43 portion [1] - 11:31 position [6] - 4:31, 8:4, 8:22, 8:34, 11:39, 42:34 positions [1] - 47:35 possession [1] -18:47 possible [5] - 11:25, 11:37, 11:41, 12:4, 21:33 possibly [1] - 27:33 post [2] - 29:26, 29:31 potential [3] - 33:2, 38:42, 50:36 potentially [2] - 8:25, 33:21 poverty [1] - 33:42 power [7] - 15:14, 16:27, 16:32, 16:38, 22:45, 37:34, 42:7 powerful [1] - 36:38 powers [7] - 17:33, 20:12, 20:13, 20:19, 23:25, 23:41, 39:42 practical [1] - 26:11 **pre** [1] - 35:44 pre-loaded [1] - 35:44 precedent [1] - 4:29 preference [1] - 46:27 preferred [2] - 33:47, 47:6

prejudice [2] - 26:45, 34:22 premise [1] - 18:42 prepare [1] - 45:6 prepared [6] - 2:28, 5:7, 33:33, 34:1, 34:21, 35:6 preparing [1] - 50:12 present [6] - 10:18, 10:46, 11:7, 40:41 presented [1] - 32:32 preserve [1] - 23:39 preserves [1] - 43:23 president [2] - 41:20, 41:47 presumably [2] - 8:39, 10:37 **pretty** [1] - 51:13 previously [1] - 20:21 price [2] - 49:35, 50:38 prima [4] - 13:8, 13:24, 15:5, 51:21 primarily [1] - 41:47 primary [2] - 9:21, 48:3 principles [1] - 21:12 problem [5] - 11:7, 20:37, 33:2, 38:25, 39:31 problems [2] - 42:5, 42:41 proceed [1] - 50:28 proceeding [2] - 24:3, 42.19 proceedings [5] -3:14, 16:39, 26:18, 53:3, 53:8 PROCEEDINGS [10] -1:25, 1:3, 1:7, 1:4, 1:6, 27:45, 27:47, 28:5, 28:7, 52:6 Proceedings [3] -1:25, 1:4, 1:8 process [15] - 5:14, 25:36, 25:47, 26:4, 26:5, 26:6, 26:7, 37:38, 37:39, 38:34, 38:38, 47:31, 50:42, 51:10 proffered [1] - 48:10 profit [1] - 33:20 profits [1] - 15:38 program [3] - 16:27, 16:43, 17:2 promise [1] - 16:3 prong [4] - 13:24, 32:6, 33:25, 33:28 **prongs** [1] - 32:5 **proof** [1] - 34:4

proper [6] - 15:26, 16:42, 21:3, 21:5, 45:4, 45:14 properly [3] - 11:1, 11:2 properties [4] - 40:9, 40:16, 40:23, 49:37 property [10] - 2:35, 16:10, 25:23, 32:34, 37:35, 44:8, 44:27, 44:47, 45:43, 46:43 proportionally [1] -50:7 proposal [2] - 18:41, 34:44 proposals [2] - 33:35, 33:37 propose [2] - 4:44, 50:5 proposed [7] - 11:35, 18:26, 18:33, 18:34, 18:35, 23:27 proposing [2] - 22:27, 26:13 proposition [4] -35:39, 37:27, 37:34, 39:13 prosecuting [1] -39:36 prospective[1] -33:39 protection [2] - 36:4, 40:20 provide [3] - 9:42, 31:39, 38:43 provided [4] - 2:8, 45:3, 46:47, 50:19 providing [1] - 23:40 provisions [3] - 43:22, 43:38, 47:27 public [1] - 40:21 purchase [6] - 2:35, 47:43, 49:17, 49:30, 49:35, 50:38 pure [2] - 25:44 purpose [1] - 3:47 purposely [1] - 9:21 purposes [2] - 20:29, 44:40 pursue [1] - 48:35 pursuit [2] - 38:30, 38:31 put [11] - 8:9, 10:10, 16:34, 20:36, 24:39, 28:26, 29:46, 39:2, 47:28, 47:33 putative [1] - 49:47 puts [2] - 26:38, 26:39 putting [1] - 3:34

Q

qua [4] - 36:5, 36:7, 36:24 quarters [2] - 12:20, 46:10 questions [3] - 18:35, 20:16, 40:25 quick [3] - 1:19, 37:37, 46:2 quickly [3] - 5:7, 7:4, 11:20 quite [1] - 20:1 quote [3] - 2:44, 3:1

R race [1] - 40:29 raise [1] - 7:24 raised [4] - 6:21, 6:46, 7:18, 7:46 ramifications [1] range [1] - 37:20 ranking [1] - 41:24 rate [2] - 34:42, 34:45 rates [2] - 34:40, 45:26 rather [2] - 20:34, 33:18 ratified [3] - 3:17, 3:18, 3:19 re [5] - 1:9, 1:11, 1:12, 1:13, 1:14 RE [6] - 1:16, 11:16, 28:2, 28:13, 30:37, 31:45 reach [2] - 29:11, 50:3 reached [2] - 3:17, 4:15 read [4] - 2:16, 38:9. 44:24, 46:44 reading [1] - 43:45 ready [1] - 5:4 real [3] - 18:10, 39:31, 40:38 really [4] - 11:31, 27:5, 37:18, 41:31 reason [6] - 6:30, 7:15, 7:32, 8:19, 18:11, 42:3 reasonable 151 -35:42, 36:4, 36:6, 40:8, 43:25 reasonably [1] - 11:19 reasons [4] - 7:39, 8:25, 50:19 **REASONS** [1] - 1:23 reattend [1] - 22:33

rec [1] - 49:38

receipt [1] - 50:39

receiver [67] - 6:31, 8:3, 12:39, 12:41, 13:27, 13:32, 14:27, 14:29, 14:35, 15:15, 15:24, 15:25, 15:28, 15:37, 15:44, 16:9, 16:26, 16:29, 16:32, 16:34. 16:42. 16:44. 17:1, 17:18, 17:22, 17:25, 17:28, 17:32, 17:37, 17:41, 18:18, 18:34, 18:35, 18:41, 18:46, 20:11, 20:23, 20:27, 20:33, 20:47, 21:13, 21:17, 21:22, 22:14, 22:46, 23:5, 23:30, 23:41, 23:46, 24:29, 24:32, 25:17, 25:21, 25:27, 25:40, 26:2, 26:14, 26:37, 26:43, 27:15, 38:6, 38:40, 40:7, 40:11, 40:22, 40:39 receiver's [1] - 18:26 receiver/manager [1] -22:35receivers [2] - 18:13, 23:43 receivership [22] -1:11, 7:35, 11:22, 11:23, 12:18, 13:14, 13:17, 14:10, 14:37, 15:3, 15:18, 15:19, 17:13, 18:10, 18:17, 20:42, 21:36, 21:45, 22:32, 23:25, 23:38, RECEIVERSHIP [3] -1:15, 11:16, 28:2 receiverships [1] -20:5 recent [1] - 20:20 recess [1] - 27:43 **RECESS** [2] - 27:45, 28:5 recipients [1] - 49:15 recommendation [3] -16:28, 16:35, 38:43 recommends [1] -5:19 reconcile [1] - 4:16 RECONVENED)([11: **48:37** [1] - 27:47 RECONVENED)([3: 25:22 [1] - 28:7 record [5] - 5:34, 10:8, 28:10, 28:34 recorded [1] - 53:8 recording [1] - 53:8

records [3] - 42:5,

42:41, 45:5 recover [1] - 23:40 recovery [1] - 21:39 redacted [1] - 49:35 redevelop [1] - 44:46 refer [1] - 44:43 reference [8] - 3:2, 6:45, 6:46, 9:38, 9:42, 18:21, 19:27, 42.26 referred [3] - 32:16, 33:17, 34:31 referring [2] - 8:12, 12:27 refers [1] - 9:45 refinancing [5] - 6:36, 33:30, 33:34, 33:35, 33:36 reflect [2] - 41:40, 42:37 reflected [1] - 41:39 refundable [1] - 49:41 refusal [1] - 8:8 refuse [1] - 33:29 refused [4] - 3:36, 6:33, 6:34, 6:36 refuses [1] - 2:29 regarding [3] - 1:38, 12:18, 45:42 regards [1] - 5:45 registered [1] - 3:31 Registry [2] - 1:1, 1:13 Reid [2] - 2:7, 18:25 reigns [1] - 42:12 relate [1] - 2:33 related [2] - 6:43, 21:5 relates [1] - 2:16 relation [1] - 45:44 relationship [1] - 37:4 relevant [1] - 7:42 relief [6] - 13:9, 13:18, 15:18, 17:47, 36:8, 36:20 rely [2] - 1:37, 12:47 relying [1] - 1:45 remain [1] - 21:13 remains [1] - 3:20 remedy [16] - 8:7, 15:1, 15:2, 21:23, 22:8, 22:32, 24:33, 35:30, 36:1, 36:3, 36:37, 36:38, 37:8, 37:31, 40:13, 44:20 remember [2] - 17:32, 50:44 remind [1] - 32:35 reminded [1] - 50:17 remittance [1] - 42:5 remitted [1] - 40:38

remove [1] - 8:3 removed [2] - 5:30, 6:27 removing [1] - 36:14 renew [2] - 34:17, 34:21 renewal [1] - 34:25 renews [1] - 34:10 repaid [7] - 9:30, 11:28, 14:14, 14:25, 14:31, 15:10, 39:33 repay [1] - 15:20 repayment [2] - 6:7, 11:40 repays [1] - 15:3 replace [1] - 42:32 replaced [1] - 41:28 report [7] - 5:18, 15:16, 24:20, 26:2, 26:3, 27:15, 45:42 **REPORTER** [1] - 53:1 Reporter [2] - 1:16, 53:17 reporting [1] - 45:39 reports [1] - 45:11 representative [2] -8:30, 42:32 represented [2] - 4:34, 4.41 representing [1] -4:36 represents [2] - 8:45, 10:32 reproduced [1] -46.44 required [5] - 4:26, 6:31, 45:3, 45:6, 47:3 requires [3] - 21:37, 43:18, 46:8 requisition [1] - 29:17 reserve[1] - 28:27 resetting [1] - 31:8 resiled [1] - 51:38 resiling [1] - 40:42 resolution [6] - 32:45, 46:6, 46:7, 46:8, 48:29, 48:45 resolutions [1] - 43:23 resolvable [1] - 51:42 resolve [2] - 48:34, 51:40 resolved [2] - 3:39, 3.40 resort [3] - 25:34, 26:34, 26:44 Resort [4] - 1:9, 1:20, 6:32, 35:30 resort's [1] - 27:13 resorts [3] - 14:23,

14:30, 15:29 Resorts [12] - 6:44, 14:20, 14:30, 15:19, 15:23, 16:29, 17:11, 17:12, 17:29, 19:4, 23:10, 25:24 Resources [1] - 22:6 respect [2] - 21:14, 44.3 respective [1] - 43:7 Respondents [2] -1:10, 1:23 responding [1] - 8:17 response [4] - 2:9, 7:44, 41:47, 50:37 responsibility [1] -42:9 responsible [3] -10:24, 11:7, 42:1 restraints [1] - 20:46 result [3] - 2:30, 39:43, 43:16 resulted [1] - 2:39 results [1] - 8:41 retained [1] - 3:46 retire [1] - 4:47 return [1] - 35:7 returned [1] - 6:15 review [2] - 21:2, 22:16 rewrite [4] - 36:21, 39:21, 39:42, 46:30 rezoned [1] - 5:25 rights [3] - 23:21, 23:42, 36:45 rise [2] - 6:39, 20:37 risk [2] - 33:20, 40:40 roam [1] - 36:40 **ROBERTS** [128] -11:16, 11:18, 11:45, 12:3, 12:6, 12:8, 12:17, 12:20, 12:24, 12:27, 12:31, 12:33, 12:35, 13:26, 13:30, 13:34, 13:38, 13:41, 13:45, 13:47, 14:3, 14:6, 14:10, 14:13, 14:17, 14:20, 14:22, 14:25, 14:33, 14:46, 15:1, 15:27, 15:31, 15:33, 15:36, 15:40, 15:44, 16:1, 16:3, 16:7, 16:11, 16:14, 16:16, 16:19, 16:22, 16:25, 17:3, 17:5, 17:8, 17:14, 17:16, 17:18, 17:25, 17:30, 17:35, 17:37, 17:40, 17:44, 17:46, 18:3, 18:9, 18:23, 18:29,

18:31, 18:33, 18:39, 19:2, 19:5, 19:8, 19:11, 19:13, 19:16, 19:20, 19:23, 19:26, 19:30, 19:33, 19:36, 19:40, 19:45, 19:47, 20:9, 21:31, 22:4, 22:40, 23:8, 23:11, 23:15, 23:22, 23:24, 23:29, 23:35, 24:13, 24:16, 24:22, 24:25, 24:45, 25:1, 25:3, 25:5, 25:10, 25:13, 25:15, 25:19, 25:46, 26:9, 26:25, 26:27, 26:30, 26:33, 27:1, 27:20, 27:23, 27:27, 27:29. 27:32. 27:35. 27:37, 27:39, 29:42, 29:46, 30:2, 30:7, 30:9, 51:34, 51:42, 51:45, 52:1 Roberts [8] - 2:6, 1:11, 11:14, 28:17, 28:21, 28:24, 38:11, 51:37 role [5] - 5:43, 17:2, 25:33, 41:40, 42:37 rooms [1] - 33:5 root [1] - 21:11 rule [1] - 46:46 **RULINGS** [1] - 1:23 run [6] - 25:41, 26:14, 26:35, 26:38, 26:44, 44:20 runaway [1] - 20:35 running [1] - 23:9

S

S234048[2] - 1:1, 1:10

rush [1] - 41:1

Ryan [1] - 50:3

S2433889 [1] - 1:12 **S243389** [1] - 1:12 sale [10] - 4:7, 6:13, 40:9, 40:15, 40:22, 46:42, 49:5, 49:17, 49:30, 50:15 sales [12] - 6:34, 8:46, 10:19, 16:27, 16:42, 16:43, 17:2, 26:4, 32:7, 32:11, 33:23 salient [1] - 44:25 sand [1] - 35:10 Sanovest [39] - 1:9. 1:17, 2:2, 1:10, 2:3, 5:1, 6:33, 6:34, 6:36, 8:8, 8:29, 8:41, 8:43, 11:26, 13:6, 13:37,

33:28, 33:47, 34:10, 34:17, 34:20, 34:41, 34:47, 35:41, 36:21, 38:35, 39:23, 39:28, 42:31, 43:8, 43:14, 45:7, 45:35, 46:26, 47:5, 48:31 Sanovest's [5] - 5:43, 27:2, 39:31, 42:32, 46:27 satisfied [1] - 25:20 satisfy [2] - 23:12, 46:22 **saw** [1] - 26:25 scenario [2] - 20:1 schedule [2] - 29:3, 29:26 SCHEDULING [1] -28:13 scheduling [3] - 1:12, 29:5, 51:27 scheme [2] - 40:2, 46:16 sealing [1] - 29:30 second [13] - 9:8, 9:9, 10:10, 12:15, 20:15, 21:29, 24:22, 24:25, 24:27, 32:6, 35:39, 36:14, 42:21 secondly [2] - 8:2, 23:38 secrecy [1] - 22:44 section [21] - 1:39, 1:40, 4:43, 5:21, 12:47, 13:28, 13:39, 13:41, 18:43, 19:28, 19:30, 19:34, 20:22, 20:27, 21:17, 23:18, 24:29, 41:11, 42:44, 44:23, 46:5 secured [9] - 11:33, 11:40, 12:41, 14:4, 14:7, 14:26, 14:34, 14:38, 15:11 **security** [5] - 6:4, 39:22, 39:23, 39:31, 39:39 see [39] - 3:2, 4:28, 7:8, 8:11, 8:15, 8:26, 8:37, 16:36, 18:38,

19:31, 25:7, 25:16,

28:23, 28:26, 33:10,

33:16, 33:30, 33:42,

33:46, 34:5, 34:16,

34:17, 34:29, 35:4,

41:17, 41:25, 42:11,

43:21, 44:41, 45:12,

45:13, 45:20, 45:34,

45:39, 46:33, 47:20,

24:40, 27:12, 32:7,

49:11, 49:15, 49:20 seek [5] - 13:20, 14:43, 26:27, 40:15, 46:42 seeking [4] - 8:7, 13:18, 14:26, 14:29 seize [1] - 23:45 **selected** [2] - 4:5, 5:19 self [4] - 10:4, 10:40, 22:17 self-dealing [2] -10:40, 22:17 self-interested [2] -10:4, 10:40 sell [10] - 5:11, 14:27, 15:11, 16:9, 32:14, 32:18, 32:34, 44:26, 44:46, 48:11 selling [4] - 33:19, 44:32, 48:42, 50:41 send [1] - 29:17 sense [3] - 42:46, 45:25, 46:1 sent [1] - 50:35 separate [3] - 4:1, 4:2 separately [3] - 4:24, 4:34, 4:40 **SEPTEMBER** [1] - 1:3 **september** [1] - 1:4 September [1] - 1:1 series [2] - 31:25, 31:28 serious [1] - 21:39 **services** [1] - 40:36 servicing [1] - 44:32 set [9] - 2:11, 4:9, 28:42, 29:16, 29:26, 31:13, 44:22, 46:15, 47:3 settled [1] - 28:29 settlement [12] - 3:15, 3:16, 3:22, 3:24, 3:26, 3:35, 3:38, 3:41, 4:13, 4:26, 4:30 seventh [1] - 40:5 several [4] - 6:19, 35:3, 39:27, 47:33 shake [1] - 38:35 shaped [1] - 21:20 share [2] - 36:45, 43:10 shareholder [7] -5:45, 22:18, 22:45,

36:7, 36:16, 36:25

36:5, 36:46, 44:14

shareholders [4] -

shares [1] - 43:14

show [14] - 23:30,

short [1] - 32:5

35:5, 35:12, 36:1, 36:8, 37:19, 37:21, 40:25, 41:37, 42:13, 43:5, 43:38, 44:34, 48.12 showed [2] - 36:10, 50:44 showing [6] - 10:13, 10:14, 10:17, 10:22, 40:33, 47:32 **shown** [1] - 32:8 shut [1] - 50:22 shuts [1] - 32:41 **shutting** [3] - 33:4, 34:35, 49:2 sic [4] - 20:23, 20:41, 21:45, 29:30 sic] [1] - 22:47 **side** [1] - 9:4 sign [3] - 2:28, 33:14, 48.47 signed [8] - 30:41, 32:39, 32:47, 48:10, 48:30, 49:21, 49:31 significant [2] - 26:7, 51:13 significantly [1] -34:44 similar [3] - 13:22, 19:20, 23:20 simple [1] - 40:11 **simply** [2] - 9:30, 9:45 site [3] - 5:19, 6:10, 6:14 sites [5] - 4:5, 4:6, 4:45, 4:46, 5:6 situation [2] - 1:41, 24:34 **situations** [1] - 20:46 skill [1] - 53:9 **skip** [1] - 18:6 small [7] - 2:43, 32:15, 38:8, 43:10, 48:15, 48:17, 48:22 **so'** [1] - 21:19 **sold** [5] - 5:4, 14:14, 15:12, 25:26, 39:31 **solutions** [1] - 33:2 solvency [1] - 9:46 someone [4] - 27:16, 33:5, 33:17, 34:35 something's [1] -38:18 sometimes [3] -20:12, 20:19, 41:6 somewhere [2] -27:37, 37:3 son [1] - 41:28 sooner [1] - 29:6

sorry [15] - 4:11, 7:2,

7:30, 12:32, 15:21, 15:36, 18:29, 27:10, 30:27, 33:25, 34:38, 35:12, 39:17, 48:4 sort [1] - 5:30 sought [3] - 13:9, 18:1, 22:47 sound [1] - 53:8 sources [1] - 23:17 **special** [2] - 42:27, specific [4] - 15:38, 16:9, 40:14, 43:38 specifically [4] - 3:46, 16:42, 17:1, 40:12 spend [1] - 1:21 spike [1] - 34:40 spring [1] - 34:13 stack [2] - 18:24, 27:39 staff [2] - 41:45, 42:1 **stage** [1] - 36:32 stakeholders [1] -40:33 stalling [1] - 27:29 standard [1] - 13:8 standards [1] - 53:10 standing [2] - 31:4, 36:34 start [10] - 1:27, 5:33, 12:10, 12:35, 15:40, 20:6, 21:33, 24:31, 25:5, 48:16 starting [2] - 12:45, 18:43 starts [3] - 5:41, 8:32, 19:8 statements [7] - 2:3, 2:6, 2:27, 2:28, 2:31, 2:33, 2:40 stating [1] - 6:2 status [2] - 2:2, 45:42 statute [1] - 23:4 statutory [3] - 24:33, 37:38, 42:4 stay [1] - 50:16 step [6] - 16:44, 34:1, 34:23, 34:26, 35:6, 40:43 steps [4] - 5:15, 24:19, 50:4, 51:13 still [3] - 37:10, 39:36, 46:29 stood [1] - 22:43 stop [5] - 20:15, 21:29, 25:33, 29:14, 39.10 story [1] - 37:10 striving [1] - 11:23 Stroh [2] - 22:6, 22:29

strokes [1] - 16:26 strong [6] - 13:8, 13:24, 15:5, 34:28, 35:41, 51:21 structure [3] - 41:7, 41:12, 47:10 subdivided [1] - 37:35 subdivision [3] -37:38, 38:20, 38:42 subdivisions [1] -5:12 subject [1] - 49:16 submission [8] - 2:12, 7:28, 8:28, 12:2, 32:9, 33:43, 35:10 SUBMISSIONS [5] -1:16, 11:11, 11:16, 28:3, 31:45 submissions [13] -2:44, 5:22, 6:41, 7:8, 7:33, 13:7, 15:13, 22:34, 32:4, 32:17, 37:18, 44:21, 45:13 Submissions [3] - 1:9, 1:11, 1:14 submit [2] - 45:7, 50:5 subsections [1] - 19:5 subsequent [1] - 2:31 substance [4] - 36:13, 36:29, 36:35, 37:4 substantial [1] - 33:31 substantially [3] -18:47, 19:9, 32:13 succeeding [1] -41:25 sudden [2] - 8:19, 8:22 suffice [1] - 20:32 suffused [1] - 44:42 suggest [2] - 26:23, 30:13 **suggested** [1] - 6:42 **summarize** [1] - 43:4 summarized [1] -46:21 summary [3] - 6:41, 33:7, 45:42 Superior [1] - 19:18 superseded [3] -32:14, 32:37, 47:46 supplementary [1] -42.15 support [2] - 21:31, 24:36 suppose [1] - 38:28 supposed [4] - 28:36, 45:37, 45:47, 47:37 supposedly [1] -

47:42

supposition [1] -

SUPREME [1] - 1:2 surprised [1] - 9:17 suspense [1] - 27:26 Symonds [1] - 53:16 Т tab [17] - 2:7, 2:14, 5:34, 9:6, 9:36, 9:37, 10:8, 10:10, 24:41, 42:17, 43:34, 47:22, 47:26, 48:22, 49:9, 50:34, 50:43 **TABLE**[1] - 1:2 table [3] - 35:12, 35:17, 37:28 tact [1] - 5:24 tail [1] - 19:42 tailored [1] - 23:39 tangentially [1] - 24:2 targeted [2] - 23:46, 26:31 task [1] - 24:37 tax [3] - 40:36, 42:4, 46:22 taxes [2] - 6:13, 40:37 **Teams** [1] - 29:37 **Tees** [2] - 3:14, 3:25 **telephone** [1] - 9:19 temporary [1] - 34:24 tennis [1] - 27:14 tension [1] - 21:43 term [1] - 40:14 terms [14] - 3:12, 3:16, 15:23, 26:45, 29:47, 30:43, 38:24, 40:3, 43:41, 44:30, 44:35, 44:36, 45:31, 51:40 test [4] - 12:38, 12:45, 13:22, 15:17 tests [1] - 14:40 THE [307] - 1:2, 1:3, 1:15, 1:8, 1:13, 1:23, 1:26, 1:29, 1:33, 1:35, 1:44, 2:1, 2:13, 2:18, 2:25, 2:41, 3:5, 3:8, 3:10, 3:31, 3:33, 3:42, 4:1, 4:3, 4:11, 4:18, 4:22, 4:28, 4:33, 4:37, 4:39, 4:42, 5:36, 5:39, 5:47, 6:20, 6:22, 6:25, 7:12, 7:18, 7:21, 7:24, 7:27, 7:29, 7:31, 7:34, 7:37, 7:41, 7:43, 8:1, 8:11, 8:18, 8:31, 8:35, 9:8, 9:10, 9:37, 9:41, 9:47, 10:10,

25:45

10:13, 10:29, 10:37, 11:14, 11:43, 12:1, 12:5, 12:7, 12:16, 12:18, 12:22, 12:26, 12:28, 12:32, 12:34, 13:25, 13:27, 13:31, 13:35, 13:40, 13:43, 13:46, 14:2, 14:5, 14:9, 14:12, 14:16, 14:19, 14:21, 14:24, 14:32, 14:44, 14:47, 15:21, 15:28, 15:32, 15:34, 15:37, 15:43, 16:5, 16:8, 16:12, 16:15, 16:18, 16:21, 16:24, 16:41, 17:4, 17:7, 17:11, 17:15, 17:17, 17:24, 17:27, 17:34, 17:36, 17:39, 17:43, 17:45, 18:2, 18:8, 18:28, 18:30, 18:32, 18:38, 18:42, 19:3, 19:7, 19:10, 19:12, 19:15, 19:19, 19:22, 19:25, 19:29, 19:32, 19:35, 19:39, 19:44, 19:46, 20:8, 21:30, 22:3, 22:39, 23:3, 23:9, 23:14, 23:21, 23:23, 23:28, 23:34, 24:12, 24:14, 24:21, 24:24, 24:44, 24:47, 25:2, 25:4, 25:9, 25:12, 25:14, 25:18, 26:8, 26:23, 26:26, 26:29, 26:32, 26:47, 27:22, 27:26, 27:28, 27:31, 27:34, 27:36, 27:38, 27:41, 27:42, 28:9, 28:10, 28:11, 28:36, 28:42, 28:45, 28:47, 29:3, 29:10, 29:16, 29:18, 29:20, 29:23, 29:26, 29:29, 29:34, 29:36, 29:41, 29:45, 30:1, 30:4, 30:8, 30:10, 30:14, 30:17, 30:19, 30:23, 30:26, 30:28, 30:29, 30:31, 30:33, 30:42, 30:44, 30:47, 31:2, 31:7, 31:10, 31:15, 31:17, 31:20, 31:24, 31:30, 31:32, 31:35, 31:37, 31:41, 32:3, 32:12, 32:18, 32:22, 32:25, 32:28, 32:42, 33:11, 33:13, 33:27, 35:16, 35:19, 35:21, 35:27, 35:32, 37:12, 37:14, 37:26,

37:29, 37:43, 37:45, 38:1, 38:3, 38:10, 38:16, 38:26, 38:36, 38:39, 38:45, 39:5, 39:8, 39:12, 39:16, 40:46, 41:2, 41:4, 41:9, 42:16, 42:23, 43:36, 43:46, 46:3, 46:9, 47:17, 47:24, 47:26, 47:31, 47:38, 47:40, 47:46, 48:2, 48:6, 48:9, 48:12, 48:14, 48:16, 48:18, 48:24, 48:26, 48:32, 48:37, 48:40, 49:3, 49:8, 49:10, 49:13, 49:19, 49:22, 49:27, 50:25. 50:27. 50:44. 50:46. 51:23. 51:29. 51:32, 51:36, 51:44, 51:46, 52:2, 52:3 theirs [1] - 13:38 theme [1] - 8:15 themselves [1] - 25:40 there'd [1] - 39:37 thereafter [1] - 46:32 therefore [2] - 3:19, 3:36 thereto [1] - 45:23 they've [3] - 24:37, 30:46, 43:15 thin [1] - 48:25 thinks [1] - 13:2 third [6] - 3:12, 23:32, 33:25, 33:28, 37:27, 40:20 third-party [1] - 3:12 thirdly [1] - 8:5 three [14] - 4:6, 4:46, 7:44, 8:16, 12:20, 14:14, 19:5, 26:6, 30:40, 30:45, 35:14, 35:15, 37:33, 46:10 three-quarters [2] -12:20, 46:10 threshold [8] - 11:30, 11:32, 11:34, 14:42, 14:47, 15:4, 15:5, 16:30 throat [1] - 33:45 throughout [2] -44:42, 45:34 thrust' [1] - 22:21 Thursday [1] - 30:4 Tian [27] - 1:9, 2:3, 2:19, 8:21, 8:29, 8:37, 8:47, 10:14, 10:18, 11:2, 13:6, 32:6, 33:29, 41:28, 41:33, 41:43, 42:25,

42:31, 42:33, 42:41, 45:34, 47:34, 48:33, 49:23, 49:42, 51:10 tiered [1] - 46:33 tiger [2] - 36:41, 44:20 Timber [2] - 34:30, 34:32 timeline [2] - 26:3, 50:5 timestamp [4] - 53:3, 53:4, 53:5, 53:6 tire [1] - 32:24 tire-kicking [1] - 32:24 title [2] - 41:39, 42:36 today [4] - 16:19, 16:30, 25:20, 28:23 together [1] - 29:40 **Tom** [7] - 8:33, 8:38, 8:41, 10:35, 10:47, 41:27, 42:32 took [3] - 6:38, 12:1 tool [1] - 20:43 top [4] - 3:1, 25:7, 25:10, 42:20 total [2] - 5:23, 45:25 tournament [1] -26:41 tournaments [1] -26:36 towards [1] - 11:40 traced [1] - 20:31 transactions [9] -2:33, 2:38, 8:38, 10:4, 10:34, 10:35, 21:2, 21:4, 22:17 transcribed [1] - 53:9 transcript [2] - 28:34, transition [3] - 1:38, 24:29, 24:32 treating [1] - 37:23 treatment [1] - 40:30 tree [1] - 38:35 tried [1] - 16:17 trope [1] - 8:15 troubled [1] - 6:9 true [4] - 36:25, 38:27, 44:35, 53:7 truly [2] - 47:14, 51:4 trust [1] - 28:23 try [5] - 1:19, 11:19, 39:3, 41:5, 48:46 trying [7] - 8:37, 9:20, 13:47, 17:10, 36:10, 39:10, 46:30 Tuesday [12] - 28:37, 28:46, 29:1, 29:5, 29:9, 29:20, 29:38, 30:3, 31:27, 31:40, 51:24, 51:41

turn [6] - 37:18, 37:21, 42:17, 42:19, 47:18, turned [1] - 33:40 turns [1] - 30:15 tweaks [1] - 28:23 twice [2] - 32:34, 33:40 twists [1] - 30:15 two [39] - 2:26, 3:14, 3:24, 5:6, 10:30, 11:26, 13:16, 14:38, 14:40, 15:14, 16:40, 17:40, 18:14, 21:14, 21:43, 23:12, 23:15, 24:9, 24:30, 24:32, 25:23, 25:39, 25:41, 26:5, 28:28, 29:29, 31:16, 31:19, 31:24, 32:5, 32:15, 33:15, 37:18, 37:37, 39:14, 45:41, 48:21, 51:13, 51:43 two-month [1] - 26:5 typographical [1] -2:45

U

ultimately [3] - 22:42,

34:32, 38:27 unavailability [1] unaware [1] - 22:19 unblocked [1] - 51:15 uncertain [1] - 38:38 uncertainty [3] -26:38, 26:39, 26:42 under [31] - 6:35, 8:8, 12:42, 13:20, 13:38, 13:41, 17:32, 18:44, 21:17, 22:12, 23:5, 23:15, 23:18, 23:19, 24:18, 25:15, 26:8, 26:9, 26:15, 34:23, 34:41, 36:22, 37:40, 39:32, 40:13, 43:2, 43:41, 44:25, 45:14, 46:5 underlined [1] - 22:20 undo [1] - 8:38 undoubtedly [1] -21:19 unfairness [1] - 8:6 units [2] - 43:10, 46:26 unjust [1] - 39:44 unnecessary [2] -27:9, 30:21

unpaid [1] - 39:24

unresolved [1] - 6:6 unseemly [1] - 40:29 unsound [1] - 20:34 up [20] - 8:22, 9:20, 10:6, 11:29, 12:14, 17:20, 17:23, 18:11, 18:14, 19:24, 21:32, 24:9, 31:12, 33:40, 34:29, 34:31, 43:33, 46:24, 46:26, 48:28 updates [2] - 45:11, 45:23 upset [1] - 40:28 urgent [1] - 1:47

value [4] - 4:47, 26:43,

utilized [1] - 20:44

26:44, 26:45

valued [1] - 4:8

1:4, 1:13, 1:2

Vancouver [4] - 1:1,

various [1] - 40:33 vehicle [2] - 36:26 venture [1] - 36:29 venues [1] - 26:36 versus [2] - 1:8, 1:11 vertical [1] - 33:18 veto [1] - 46:14 vetted [1] - 30:46 Victoria [3] - 4:7, 5:7, 32:16 view [2] - 20:44, 30:13 volume [2] - 9:9, 24:41 volumes [1] - 24:42

W

W.L [1] - 2:6 waiting [2] - 27:26, 27:28 wake [1] - 11:4 **WALKER** [1] - 1:3 wants [1] - 49:1 warranted [1] - 6:5 waterfall [5] - 46:19, 46:20, 46:28, 46:33, 46:37 waterfalls [1] - 39:38 wearing [2] - 13:16, 14:38 Wednesday [2] -28:28, 29:4 week [1] - 51:4 weeks [2] - 16:40, 31:37 white [1] - 51:19 whole [11] - 7:15,

7:37, 26:13, 31:25, 31:28, 35:8, 37:17, 37:25, 37:41, 38:34 wholly [1] - 42:31 wide [1] - 36:39 widespread [1] - 24:2 willingness [1] - 27:2 wind [1] - 11:28 wish [1] - 28:33 without-prejudice [1] - 34:22 Witness [1] - 1:8 wonder [1] - 15:46 word [1] - 41:36 wording [1] - 19:40 words [4] - 16:47, 32:19, 34:24, 46:11 work-around [1] -38:28 workability [1] - 18:40 works [2] - 24:34, 46:20 worth [1] - 6:11 write [1] - 45:31 writes [2] - 49:23, 50.40 writing [1] - 45:35 written [13] - 1:22, 1:28, 1:37, 2:12, 2:44, 5:27, 12:11, 12:16, 12:28, 32:4, 43:30, 44:21, 45:13

Υ

year [2] - 34:10, 34:14 years [4] - 8:16, 20:20, 25:40, 25:41 yesterday [10] - 1:29, 3:13, 5:9, 5:22, 7:46, 8:18, 8:20, 20:16, 27:11, 27:17 yourself [1] - 37:22 This is Exhibit "B"

Referred to in the Affidavit of

SUZANNE VOLKOW

Sworn before me this 30 day of

May, 2025

A Commissioner for taking Affidavits in/British Columbia

From: <u>Lars Brusven</u>

To: <u>Gordon Brandt (3167) - 14Flr</u>

Cc: cferris; Caitlin Ohama-Darcus; Andrew I. Nathanson; Eric Pedersen (Velletta Pedersen Christie)

Subject: RE: [EXT] Ecoasis - Actions No. S-234048, S-234047, S-226218, S-223937 [FMD-CANADA.FID4038156]

Date: May-27-25 11:57:45 AM

Gordon:

Thank you for your correspondence proposing to adjourn the June 2025 examinations for discovery, pause further steps in the litigation until September 2025, and adjourn the January 2026 trial.

In the insolvency proceeding, in addition to our proposed application seeking an expansion of the Receivership Order, we now have instructions to bring an application seeking declarations from the court regarding the amount owing to Sanovest by the Respondents, and the validity and priority of the security interests granted in favour of Sanovest pursuant to the Loan Agreement, the guarantees, and the security. We anticipate delivering those application materials by the end of this week.

Sanovest may seek to have additional issues in the litigation between our clients summarily determined within the insolvency. The timing of these steps will be subject to a further applications, but could be as soon as this fall.

With respect to the examinations for discovery, we intend to proceed with Mr. Matthews' continued discoveries on June 23-25, as scheduled.

We agree that the sale price of the Partnership's assets affects the potential damages in the Oppression and Partnership Actions if you are able to establish liability. But those damages are just one issue of many in the litigation. That single issue does not justify adjourning the discoveries. It is the ultimate sale price, (not the Receiver's sales and marketing plan) that is most relevant, and that sale price will not be known until much later than the September 2025 date you have proposed for the parties to move forward.

If Mr. Matthews elects to again adjourn the discovery of Tian Kusumoto, he is taking the risk that Tian Kusumoto will not be examined prior to the potential applications to summarily determine some or all of the issues in the litigation. If you do not proceed with your discovery on the dates we agreed to, we are not available again until late September at the earliest. If you choose to postpone your examinations, we do not agree that they should take priority over the above-mentioned applications.

We do, however, require certainty on whether you are proceeding in June or not. If you do

not send us an appointment to examine Tian Kusumoto by May 30, we will release the dates.

It follows from the foregoing that we do not consent to pause all steps in the litigation until September 2025.

Finally, we do not consent to adjourn the January 2026 trial date. If you provide us with your application materials and more detailed reasons, we will seek instructions. However, if the January 2026 trial date is adjourned, we are not available for a trial commencing in August 2026. Our next available date for a 30 day plus trial is in early 2027.

Lars Brusven (He/Him)

Partner

T +1 604 631 2732 | Ibrusven@fasken.com

Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP

From: Lars Brusven < lbrusven@fasken.com>

Sent: May-23-25 4:42 PM

To: Gordon Brandt <gbrandt@lawsonlundell.com>

Cc: cferris <cferris@lawsonlundell.com>; Caitlin Ohama-Darcus

<cohamadarcus@lawsonlundell.com>; Andrew I. Nathanson <anathanson@fasken.com>; Eric
Pedersen (Velletta Pedersen Christie) Pedersen

Subject: RE: [EXT] Ecoasis - Actions No. S-234048, S-234047, S-226218, S-223937

Thanks Gordon. We are considering your note below and will be in touch. Have a good weekend.

Lars Brusven (He/Him)

Partner

T <u>+1 604 631 2732</u> | <u>Ibrusven@fasken.com</u>

Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP

From: Gordon Brandt < gbrandt@lawsonlundell.com >

Sent: May-21-25 4:15 PM

To: Andrew I. Nathanson <<u>anathanson@fasken.com</u>>; Lars Brusven <<u>lbrusven@fasken.com</u>>; Eric Pedersen (Velletta Pedersen Christie) <<u>pedersen@victorialaw.ca</u>>

Cc: cferris@lawsonlundell.com>; Caitlin Ohama-Darcus

<cohamadarcus@lawsonlundell.com>

Subject: [EXT] Ecoasis - Actions No. S-234048, S-234047, S-226218, S-223937

{CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Fasken. Exercise care before clicking links or opening attachments.}

Andrew, Lars, Eric,

We write with respect to the upcoming examinations for discovery in these matters as well as the trial dates more generally. As you know, we previously adjourned the examinations for discovery of Tian Kusumoto that were set in March 2025. We did so on the basis that we required additional clarity as to the Receiver's intended sales and marketing plan in order to focus the examination. The same considerations apply to the trial overall, given the damages claims arising from the allegations of blocked land sales, among other issues.

Unfortunately, we are today not much further advanced than we were in March. The Receiver has not yet provided an indication as to when it expects to present a sales and marketing plan to the Court, much less the contents of such a plan or the expected timeline of a sales process.

In the circumstances, proceeding with the examinations for discovery of Mr. Matthews and Mr. Kusumoto in June is likely to result in wasted costs, as additional examination time will later be required. Although we understand that delaying examinations at this stage could jeopardize the trial date, that risk arises independently as in the absence of an identified sales process, let alone sales, the facts relating to damages remain in flux. This creates significant evidentiary challenges, including with respect to properly instructing any damages expert in providing an opinion as to loss.

In the circumstances, we propose that the parties agree to pause further steps in the litigation until September 2025. We can further evaluate the timelines at that stage based on the marketing and sales process as it develops over the summer. Given the likelihood that the January trial dates no longer appear to be feasible, we would also propose to adjourn those dates in favour of available dates beginning August 4, 2026.

Please advise as to your clients' position on the above. If your clients are not in agreement, we expect that we will seek instructions to suspend the current case plan timelines and adjourn the trial dates given the extended nature of the Receiver's process, which has run significantly beyond the timelines that were expected last September.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

Gordon



GORDON BRANDT* | Partner

D 604.631.9167 | F 604.669.1620 | E gbrandt@lawsonlundell.com

Lawson Lundell LLP 1600 - 925 West Georgia Street, Vancouver, BC V6C 3L2

Vancouver | Calgary | Yellowknife | Kelowna

*Gordon B. Brandt Law Corporation



Disclaimer

This email and any accompanying attachments contain confidential information that may be subject to solicitor-client privilege and are intended only for the named recipients. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy the email. Our e-mail terms of use can be found at http://www.lawsonlundell.com/disclaimer.html