Clerk's stamp:

| | |
|---|---|
| COURT FILE NUMBER: | |
| COURT | COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA |
| JUDICIAL CENTRE | CALGARY |
| | IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, RSC 1985, c C-36, as amended<br><br>AND IN THE MATTER OF CYXTERA TECHNOLOGIES, INC., CYXTERA CANADA, LLC, CYXTERA COMMUNICATIONS CANADA, ULC and CYXTERA CANADA TRS, ULC |
| APPLICANT | CYXTERA TECHNOLOGIES, INC. |
| DOCUMENT | **BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE FOREIGN REPRESENTATIVE** |
| ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT | Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP<br>421 7 Ave SW Suite 1600<br>Calgary, AB T2P 4K9<br>**Attn: Tom Cumming/Sam Gabor/and Stephen Kroeger**<br>Ph. 1 403 298 1946<br>File No.: A171290 |



**APPLICATION BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE D. B. NIXON**
**JULY 4TH, 2023 AT 2:00 PM. ON THE COMMERCIAL LIST**

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

# TAB 1

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
Part IV — Cross-Border Insolvencies (ss. 44-61) [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]
Purpose [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 44

# s 44. Purpose

Currency

**44.Purpose**

The purpose of this Part is to provide mechanisms for dealing with cases of cross-border insolvencies and to promote

(a) cooperation between the courts and other competent authorities in Canada with those of foreign jurisdictions in cases of cross-border insolvencies;

(b) greater legal certainty for trade and investment;

(c) the fair and efficient administration of cross-border insolvencies that protects the interests of creditors and other interested persons, and those of debtor companies;

(d) the protection and the maximization of the value of debtor company's property; and

(e) the rescue of financially troubled businesses to protect investment and preserve employment.

**Amendment History**

2005, c. 47, s. 131

**Currency**

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to May 24, 2023
Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:11 (May 24, 2023)

**End of Document**

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 49

s 49.

Currency

**49.**

**49(1)Other orders**

If an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made, the court may, on application by the foreign representative who applied for the order, if the court is satisfied that it is necessary for the protection of the debtor company's property or the interests of a creditor or creditors, make any order that it considers appropriate, including an order

(a) if the foreign proceeding is a foreign non-main proceeding, referred to in subsection 48(1);

(b) respecting the examination of witnesses, the taking of evidence or the delivery of information concerning the debtor company's property, business and financial affairs, debts, liabilities and obligations; and

(c) authorizing the foreign representative to monitor the debtor company's business and financial affairs in Canada for the purpose of reorganization.

**49(2)Restriction**

If any proceedings under this Act have been commenced in respect of the debtor company at the time an order recognizing the foreign proceeding is made, an order made under subsection (1) must be consistent with any order that may be made in any proceedings under this Act.

**49(3)Application of this and other Acts**

The making of an order under paragraph (1)(a) does not preclude the commencement or the continuation of proceedings under this Act, the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* in respect of the debtor company.

**Amendment History**

2005, c. 47, s. 131

**Currency**

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to May 24, 2023
Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:11 (May 24, 2023)

**End of Document**

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
Part IV — Cross-Border Insolvencies (ss. 44-61) [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]
Recognition of Foreign Proceeding [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 50

# s 50. Terms and conditions of orders

Currency

**50.Terms and conditions of orders**

An order under this Part may be made on any terms and conditions that the court considers appropriate in the circumstances.

**Amendment History**

2005, c. 47, s. 131

**Currency**

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to May 24, 2023
Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:11 (May 24, 2023)

**End of Document**

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 52

s 52.

Currency

**52.**

**52(1)Cooperation — court**

If an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made, the court shall cooperate, to the maximum extent possible, with the foreign representative and the foreign court involved in the foreign proceeding.

**52(2)Cooperation — other authorities in Canada**

If any proceedings under this Act have been commenced in respect of a debtor company and an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made in respect of the debtor company, every person who exercises powers or performs duties and functions under the proceedings under this Act shall cooperate, to the maximum extent possible, with the foreign representative and the foreign court involved in the foreign proceeding.

**52(3)Forms of cooperation**

For the purpose of this section, cooperation may be provided by any appropriate means, including

(a) the appointment of a person to act at the direction of the court;

(b) the communication of information by any means considered appropriate by the court;

(c) the coordination of the administration and supervision of the debtor company's assets and affairs;

(d) the approval or implementation by courts of agreements concerning the coordination of proceedings; and

(e) the coordination of concurrent proceedings regarding the same debtor company.

**Amendment History**

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 80

**Currency**

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to May 24, 2023
Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:11 (May 24, 2023)

**End of Document**

Canada Federal Statutes
Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
Part IV — Cross-Border Insolvencies (ss. 44-61) [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]
Miscellaneous Provisions [Heading added 2005, c. 47, s. 131.]

R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 61

s 61.

Currency

**61.**

**61(1)Court not prevented from applying certain rules**

Nothing in this Part prevents the court, on the application of a foreign representative or any other interested person, from applying any legal or equitable rules governing the recognition of foreign insolvency orders and assistance to foreign representatives that are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

**61(2)Public policy exception**

Nothing in this Part prevents the court from refusing to do something that would be contrary to public policy.

**Amendment History**

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 81

**Currency**

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to May 24, 2023
Federal English Regulations Current to Gazette Vol. 157:11 (May 24, 2023)

**End of Document**

# TAB 2

2000 CarswellOnt 704
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re

2000 CarswellOnt 704, [2000] O.J. No. 786, 18 C.B.R. (4th) 157, 5 B.L.R. (3d) 75, 95 A.C.W.S. (3d) 608

# In the Matter of Section 18.6 of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended

In the Matter of Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd.

Farley J.

Heard: February 25, 2000
Judgment: February 25, 2000
Docket: 00-CL-3667

Counsel: *Derrick Tay*, for Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd.
*Paul Macdonald*, for Citibank North America Inc., Lenders under the Post-Petition Credit Agreement.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

**Related Abridgment Classifications**

Bankruptcy and insolvency
XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
XIX.1 General principles
XIX.1.c Application of Act
XIX.1.c.iv Miscellaneous

**Headnote**

Corporations --- Arrangements and compromises — Under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Effect of arrangement — Stay of proceedings

Solvent corporation applied for interim order under s. 18.6 of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act for stay of actions and enforcements against corporation in respect of asbestos tort claims — Application granted — Application was to be reviewed in light of doctrine of comity, inherent jurisdiction, and aspect of liberal interpretation of Act generally — Proceedings commenced by corporation's parent corporation in United States and other United States related corporations for protection under c. 11 of United States Bankruptcy Code in connection with mass asbestos tort claims constituted foreign proceeding for purposes of s. 18.6 of Act — Insolvency of debtor in foreign proceeding was not condition precedent for proceeding to be foreign proceeding under definition of s. 18.6 of Act — Corporation was entitled to avail itself of provisions of s. 18.6 of Act — Relief requested was not of nature contrary to provisions of Act — Recourse may be had to s. 18.6 of Act in case of solvent debtor — Chapter 11 proceedings in United States were intended to resolve mass asbestos-related tort claims that seriously threatened long-term viability of corporation's parent — Corporation was significant participant in overall international operation and interdependence existed between corporation and its parent as to facilities and services — Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. 1982, c. 11 — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 18.6.

**Table of Authorities**

**Cases considered by *Farley J.*:**

*Arrowmaster Inc. v. Unique Forming Ltd.* (1993), 17 O.R. (3d) 407, 29 C.P.C. (3d) 65 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — applied

*ATL Industries Inc. v. Han Eol Ind. Co.* (1995), 36 C.P.C. (3d) 288 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — applied

*Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, *(*sub nom. *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada)* [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

 

BW Canada would fit within "any interested person" to bring the subject application to apply the principles of comity and cooperation. It would not appear to me that the relief requested is of a nature contrary to the provisions of the CCAA.

17 Additionally there is s. 18.6(3) whereby once it has been established that there is a foreign proceeding within the meaning of s. 18.6(1) (as I have concluded there is), then this court is given broad powers and wide latitude, all of which is consistent with the general judicial analysis of the CCAA overall, to make any order it thinks appropriate in the circumstances.

> s. 18.6(3) An order of the court under this Section may be made on such terms and conditions as the court considers appropriate in the circumstances.

This subsection reinforces the view expressed previously that the 1997 Amendments contemplated that it would be inappropriate to pigeonhole or otherwise constrain the interpretation of s. 18.6 since it would be not only impracticable but also impossible to contemplate the myriad of circumstances arising under a wide variety of foreign legislation which deal generally and essentially with bankruptcy and insolvency but not exclusively so. Thus, the Court was entrusted to exercise its discretion, but of course in a judicial manner.

18 Even aside from that, I note that the Courts of this country have utilized inherent jurisdiction to fill in any gaps in the legislation and to promote the objectives of the CCAA. Where there is a gap which requires bridging, then the question to be considered is what will be the most practical common sense approach to establishing the connection between the parts of the legislation so as to reach a just and reasonable solution. See *Westar Mining Ltd., Re* (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 88 (B.C. S.C.), at pp. 93-4; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp. v. Sun Life Trust Co.* (1995), 34 C.B.R. (3d) 4 (B.C. C.A.), at p. 2; *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.* at p. 30.

19 The Chapter 11 proceedings are intended to resolve the mass asbestos related tort claims which seriously threaten the long term viability of BWUS and its subsidiaries including BW Canada. BW Canada is a significant participant in the overall Babcock & Wilcox international organization. From the record before me it appears reasonably clear that there is an interdependence between BWUS and BW Canada as to facilities and services. In addition there is the fundamental element of financial and business stability. This interdependence has been increased by the financial assistance given by the BW Canada guarantee of BWUS' obligations.

20 To date the overwhelming thrust of the asbestos related litigation has been focussed in the U.S. In contradistinction BW Canada has not in essence been involved in asbestos litigation to date. The 1994 amendments to the U.S. Bankruptcy Code have provided a specific regime which is designed to deal with the mass tort claims (which number in the hundreds of thousands of claims in the U.S.) which appear to be endemic in the U.S. litigation arena involving asbestos related claims as well as other types of mass torts. This Court's assistance however is being sought to stay asbestos related claims against BW Canada with a view to this stay facilitating an environment in which a global solution may be worked out within the context of the Chapter 11 proceedings trust.

21 In my view, s. 18.6(3) and (4) permit BW Canada to apply to this Court for such a stay and other appropriate relief. Relying upon the existing law on the recognition of foreign insolvency orders and proceedings, the principles and practicalities discussed and illustrated in the Cross-Border Insolvency Concordat and the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvencies and inherent jurisdiction, all as discussed above, I would think that the following may be of assistance in advancing guidelines as to how s. 18.6 should be applied. I do not intend the factors listed below to be exclusive or exhaustive but merely an initial attempt to provide guidance:

> (a) The recognition of comity and cooperation between the courts of various jurisdictions are to be encouraged.
>
> (b) Respect should be accorded to the overall thrust of foreign bankruptcy and insolvency legislation in any analysis, unless in substance generally it is so different from the bankruptcy and insolvency law of Canada or perhaps because the legal process that generates the foreign order diverges radically from the process here in Canada.

 

(c) All stakeholders are to be treated equitably, and to the extent reasonably possible, common or like stakeholders are to be treated equally, regardless of the jurisdiction in which they reside.

(d) The enterprise is to be permitted to implement a plan so as to reorganize as a global unit, especially where there is an established interdependence on a transnational basis of the enterprise and to the extent reasonably practicable, one jurisdiction should take charge of the principal administration of the enterprise's reorganization, where such principal type approach will facilitate a potential reorganization and which respects the claims of the stakeholders and does not inappropriately detract from the net benefits which may be available from alternative approaches.

(e) The role of the court and the extent of the jurisdiction it exercises will vary on a case by case basis and depend to a significant degree upon the court's nexus to that enterprise; in considering the appropriate level of its involvement, the court would consider:

(i) the location of the debtor's principal operations, undertaking and assets;

(ii) the location of the debtor's stakeholders;

(iii) the development of the law in each jurisdiction to address the specific problems of the debtor and the enterprise;

(iv) the substantive and procedural law which may be applied so that the aspect of undue prejudice may be analyzed;

(v) such other factors as may be appropriate in the instant circumstances.

(f) Where one jurisdiction has an ancillary role,

(i) the court in the ancillary jurisdiction should be provided with information on an ongoing basis and be kept apprised of developments in respect of that debtor's reorganizational efforts in the foreign jurisdiction;

(ii) stakeholders in the ancillary jurisdiction should be afforded appropriate access to the proceedings in the principal jurisdiction.

(g) As effective notice as is reasonably practicable in the circumstances should be given to all affected stakeholders, with an opportunity for such stakeholders to come back into the court to review the granted order with a view, if thought desirable, to rescind or vary the granted order or to obtain any other appropriate relief in the circumstances.

22 Taking these factors into consideration, and with the determination that the Chapter 11 proceedings are a "foreign proceeding" within the meaning of s. 18.6 of the CCAA and that it is appropriate to declare that BW Canada is entitled to avail itself of the provisions of s. 18.6, I would also grant the following relief. There is to be a stay against suits and enforcement as requested; the initial time period would appear reasonable in the circumstances to allow BWUS to return to the U.S. Bankruptcy Court. Assuming the injunctive relief is continued there, this will provide some additional time to more fully prepare an initial draft approach with respect to ongoing matters. It should also be recognized that if such future relief is not granted in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court, any interested person could avail themselves of the "comeback" clause in the draft order presented to me and which I find reasonable in the circumstances. It appears appropriate, in the circumstances that BW Canada guarantee BWUS' obligations as aforesaid and to grant security in respect thereof, recognizing that same is permitted pursuant to the general corporate legislation affecting BW Canada, namely the *Business Corporations Act* (Ontario). I note that there is also a provision for an "Information Officer" who will give quarterly reports to this Court. Notices are to be published in the Globe & Mail (National Edition) and the National Post. In accordance with my suggestion at the hearing, the draft order notice has been revised to note that persons are alerted to the fact that they may become a participant in these Canadian proceedings and further that, if so, they may make representations as to pursuing their remedies regarding asbestos related claims in Canada as opposed

 

# TAB 3

2014 ONSC 5811
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

MtGox Co., Re

2014 CarswellOnt 13871, 2014 ONSC 5811, 122 O.R. (3d) 465, 20 C.B.R. (6th) 307, 245 A.C.W.S. (3d) 280

# In the Matter of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1992, C. 27, S.2, as Amended

In the Matter of Mtgox Co., Ltd., the Bankrupt in a Proceeding under Japan's Bankruptcy Act before the Tokyo District Court Twentieth Civil Division

Application of Nobuaki Kobayashi, in his capacity as the bankrupcty Trustee of MtGox Co., Ltd. Pursuant to Japan's Bankruptcy Act Under Part XIII of The Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (Cross-Border Insolvencies)

Newbould J.

Heard: October 3, 2014
Judgment: October 6, 2014
Docket: CV-14-10709-00CL

Counsel: Margaret R. Sims for Applicant

Subject: Insolvency; International

**Related Abridgment Classifications**

Bankruptcy and insolvency
I Bankruptcy and insolvency jurisdiction
I.2 Jurisdiction of courts
I.2.a Jurisdiction of Bankruptcy Court
I.2.a.iv Territorial jurisdiction
I.2.a.iv.A Foreign bankruptcies

**Headnote**

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Bankruptcy and insolvency jurisdiction — Jurisdiction of courts — Jurisdiction of Bankruptcy Court — Territorial jurisdiction — Foreign bankruptcies

M Co. was Japanese corporation that operated online exchange for purchase and sale of bitcoins, a form of digital currency — M Co. was located and headquartered in Tokyo, Japan — In February 2014, M Co. halted all bitcoin withdrawals by its customers after it was subject to a massive theft — These events caused M Co. to become insolvent, and eventually led to bankruptcy proceeding in Japan — M Co. was subsequently named as defendant in pending class action filed in Ontario Superior Court of Justice (Ontario Court) — Trustee of M Co. applied to Ontario Court for initial recognition order recognizing bankruptcy proceeding commenced in Japan, declaring trustee as foreign representative, and staying all proceedings against M Co. — Application granted — Japan bankruptcy proceeding was judicial proceeding dealing with creditors' collective interests generally under Japan Bankruptcy Act (JPA), in which M Co.'s property was subject to supervision by Tokyo District Court — Trustee had authority pursuant to JPA and order of Tokyo District Court to administer M Co.'s property and affairs and to act as foreign representative — Accordingly, Japan bankruptcy proceeding constituted "foreign proceeding" and trustee constituted "foreign representative" under s. 268(1) of Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA) — M Co.'s centre of its main interests was its registered head office in Japan — Accordingly, Japan bankruptcy proceeding was foreign main proceeding, entitling M Co. to automatic stay under s. 271(1) of BIA.

**Table of Authorities**

**Cases considered by *Newbould J.*:**

  

1 Nobuaki Kobayashi, in his capacity as the bankruptcy trustee of MtGox Co., Ltd. applied on October 3, 2014 for an initial recognition order pursuant to Part XIII (section 267 to 284) of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1992, c. 27, s.2, as amended ("BIA"):

> (a) declaring and recognizing the bankruptcy proceedings commenced in respect of MtGox pursuant to the Bankruptcy Act of Japan, Act No. 75 of June 2, 2004 before the Tokyo District Court, Twentieth Civil Division as a foreign main proceeding for the purposes of section 270 of the BIA;
>
> (b) declaring that the Trustee is a foreign representative pursuant to section 268(1) of the BIA, and is entitled to bring this application pursuant to section 269 of the BIA; and
>
> (c) staying and enjoining any claims, rights, liens or proceedings against or in respect of MtGox and the property of MtGox.

2 I concluded at the hearing that the relief sought should be granted, for reasons to follow. These are my reasons.

3 MtGox is a Japanese corporation formed in 2011. It is, and always has been, located and headquartered in Tokyo, Japan. From April 2012 to February 2014, its business was the operation of an online exchange for the purchase and sale of bitcoins through its website located at http://www.mtgox.com. Bitcoins are a form of digital currency. At one time, the MtGox Exchange was reported to be the largest online bitcoin exchange in the world.

4 On or about February 10, 2014, MtGox halted all bitcoin withdrawals by its customers after it was subject to what appears to have been a massive theft or disappearance of bitcoins held by it. MtGox suspended all trading on or about February 24, 2014 after it was discovered that approximately 850,000 bitcoins were missing. These events caused, among other things, MtGox to become insolvent and ultimately led to the Japan bankruptcy proceeding.

5 On February 28, 2014, MtGox filed a petition for the commencement of a civil rehabilitation proceeding in the Tokyo Court pursuant to Article 21(1) of the Japan Civil Rehabilitation Act (JCRA), reporting that it had lost almost 850,000 bitcoins. A civil rehabilitation proceeding under the JCRA is analogous to a restructuring proceeding in Canada pursuant to the BIA or the CCAA.

6 Following the filing of the Japan civil rehabilitation petition, MtGox commenced an investigation with regard to the circumstances that led to the Japan civil rehabilitation. However, by mid-April, 2014, the Tokyo Court decided to dismiss the Japan civil rehabilitation petition pursuant to Article 25(3) of the JCRA, recognizing that under the circumstances it would be very difficult for MtGox to successfully prepare and obtain approval of a rehabilitation plan or otherwise successfully carry out the Japan civil rehabilitation.

7 On April 24, 2014, the Tokyo Court entered the Japan bankruptcy order, formally commencing MtGox's Japan bankruptcy proceeding and appointing the applicant as bankruptcy trustee.

8 MtGox has approximately 120,000 customers who had a bitcoin or fiat currency balance in their accounts as of the date of the Japan petition. The customers live in approximately 175 countries around the world.

9 MtGox has been named as a defendant in a pending class action filed in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice. The notice of action and statement of claim were provided to the Trustee under the Hague Convention on August 29, 2014.

**Applicable law**

10 Various theories as to how multi-national bankruptcies should be dealt with have long existed. Historically many countries adopted a territorialism approach under which insolvency proceedings had an exclusively national or territorial focus that allowed each country to distribute the assets located in that country to local creditors in accordance with its local laws. Universalism is a theory that posits that the bankruptcy law to be applied should be that of the debtor's home jurisdiction, that all

  

of the assets of the insolvent corporation, in whichever country they are situated, should be pooled together and administered by the court of the home country. Local courts in other countries would be expected, under universalism, to recognize and enforce the judgment of the home country's court. This theory of universalism has not taken hold.

11 There is increasingly a move towards what has been called modified universalism. The notion of modified universalism is court recognition of main proceedings in one jurisdiction and non-main proceedings in other jurisdictions, representing some compromise of state sovereignty under domestic proceedings to advance international comity and cooperation. It has been advanced by the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Model Law on Cross Border Insolvency, which Canada largely adopted by 2009 amendments to the CCAA and the BIA.[1] Before this amendment, Canada had gone far down the road in acting on comity principles in international insolvency. See *Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re* (2000), 18 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) and *Lear Canada, Re* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 57 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

12 In the BIA, the Model Law was introduced by the enactment of Part XIII. Section 267 sets out the policy objectives of Part XIII as follows:

> The purpose of this Part is to provide mechanisms for dealing with cases of cross-border insolvencies and to promote
>
> (a) cooperation between the courts and other competent authorities in Canada with those of foreign jurisdictions in cases of cross-border insolvencies;
>
> (b) greater legal certainty for trade and investment;
>
> (c) the fair and efficient administration of cross-border insolvencies that protects the interests of creditors and other interested persons, and those of debtors;
>
> (d) the protection and the maximization of the value of debtors' property; and
>
> (e) the rescue of financially troubled businesses to protect investment and preserve employment.

***(a) Recognition of foreign proceeding***

13 Section 269(1) of the BIA provides for the application by a foreign representative to recognize a foreign proceeding. Pursuant to section 270(1) of the BIA, the court shall make an order recognizing the foreign proceeding if (i) the proceeding is a foreign proceeding and (ii) the applicant is a foreign representative of that proceeding.

14 A foreign proceeding is broadly defined in section 268(1) to mean a judicial or an administrative proceeding in a jurisdiction outside Canada dealing with creditor's collective interests generally under any law relating to bankruptcy or insolvency in which a debtor's property and affairs are subject to control or supervision by a foreign court for the purpose of reorganization or liquidation.

15 The Japan bankruptcy proceeding is a judicial proceeding dealing with creditors' collective interests generally under the Japan Bankruptcy Act, which is a law relating to bankruptcy and insolvency, in which MtGox's property is subject to supervision by the Tokyo District Court, Twentieth Civil Division. As such, the Japan bankruptcy proceeding is a foreign proceeding pursuant to section 268(1) of the BIA.

16 Section 268(1) of the BIA defines a foreign representative as a person or body who is authorized in a foreign proceeding in respect of a debtor company to (a) administer the debtor's property or affairs for the purpose of reorganization or liquidation or (b) act as a representative in respect of the foreign proceeding.

17 The Trustee has authority, pursuant to the Japan Bankruptcy Act and the bankruptcy order made by the Tokyo District Court in the Japan bankruptcy proceeding, to administer MtGox's property and affairs for the purpose of liquidation and to act as a foreign representative. Thus the Trustee is a foreign representative pursuant to section 268(1) of the BIA.

 

# TAB 4

2019 ONSC 3238
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Hollander Sleep Products, LLC et al., Re

2019 CarswellOnt 8720, 2019 ONSC 3238, 307 A.C.W.S. (3d) 462, 72 C.B.R. (6th) 140

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF HOLLANDER SLEEP PRODUCTS, LLC, HOLLANDER SLEEP PRODUCTS CANADA LIMITED, DREAM II HOLDINGS, LLC, HOLLANDER HOME FASHIONS HOLDINGS, LLC, PACIFIC COAST FEATHER, LLC, HOLLANDER SLEEP PRODUCTS KENTUCKY, LLC, AND PACIFIC COAST FEATHER CUSHION, LLC

APPLICATION OF HOLLANDER SLEEP PRODUCTS, LLC UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

Hainey J.

Heard: May 23, 2019
Judgment: May 30, 2019
Docket: CV-19-620484-00CL

Counsel: Shawn Irving, Marc Wasserman, for Applicant
Virginie Gauthier, for KSV Kofman Inc.
L. Joseph Latham, for Wells Fargo
Milly Chow, Kelly Bourassa, for Barings Finance LLC

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency; International
**Related Abridgment Classifications**
Bankruptcy and insolvency
XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
XIX.2 Initial application
XIX.2.b Grant of stay
XIX.2.b.viii Miscellaneous
**Headnote**
Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Grant of stay — Miscellaneous
Company manufactured bedding products — Company had US and Canadian offices, with registered head office in Vancouver — Canadian branch was not profitable — Company sought restructuring as due to outstanding indebtedness and limited access to credit, it was facing severe liquidity constraints — Company brought application for several orders pursuant to Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act including Ch. 11 cases — Ruling was made — Chapter 11 cases, pursuant to US Bankruptcy Code was foreign proceedings for Canadian purposes — Company was appointed foreign representative by US courts in Ch. 11 cases — Company's centre of main interests (COMI) was in United States, which meant that COMI of all Ch. 11 debtors was in United States — Therefore Ch. 11 cases were recognized as foreign main proceedings — Stay of proceedings was necessary in order to implement proposed restructuring — First day order were recognized as Canadian and US operations of company were highly integrated — DIP order was approved.
**Table of Authorities**
**Cases considered by *Hainey J.*:**

  

*Angiotech Pharmaceuticals Inc., Re* (2011), 2011 BCSC 115, 2011 CarswellBC 124, 76 C.B.R. (5th) 317 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) — followed

*Hartford Computer Hardware Inc., Re* (2012), 2012 ONSC 964, 2012 CarswellOnt 2143, 94 C.B.R. (5th) 20 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

*Massachusetts Elephant & Castle Group Inc., Re* (2011), 2011 ONSC 4201, 2011 CarswellOnt 6610, 81 C.B.R. (5th) 102 (Ont. S.C.J.) — considered

*Payless Holdings Inc. LLC, Re* (2017), 2017 ONSC 2321, 2017 CarswellOnt 5925, 47 C.B.R. (6th) 117 (Ont. S.C.J.) — distinguished

**Statutes considered:**

*Bankruptcy Code*, 11 U.S.C.

Chapter 11 — referred to

*Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

Pt. IV — referred to

s. 44 — considered

s. 45(1) "foreign proceeding" — considered

s. 45(2) — considered

ss. 46-49 — referred to

s. 46(1) — considered

s. 47 — considered

s. 47(1) — considered

s. 47(2) — considered

s. 48 — considered

s. 48(1) — considered

s. 49 — considered

s. 52(1) — considered

RULING with respect to procedure under creditors' restructuring legislation including proceedings commenced under US bankruptcy laws.

***Hainey J.*:**

**BACKGROUND**

1 On May 23, 2019 I granted the application brought by Hollander Sleep Products, LLC ("Hollander Sleep Products"), for orders pursuant to Section 46 through 49 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 as amended ("CCAA"). I made the following orders:

a) Recognition of the Chapter 11 Cases as foreign main proceedings pursuant to *Part IV of the CCAA;*

b) Recognition of certain First Day Orders;

  

e) Hollander Canada is reliant on the purchasing power and supplier relationships of the Hollander enterprise, and on its own could not replicate the supply arrangements necessary for its continued functioning;

f) Hollander Canada's books and records are maintained at Hollander's head office in Boca Raton, Florida;

g) All of Hollander Canada's directors reside in the United States;

h) Canadian revenues make up only 10.7% of Hollander's revenues;

i) Hollander Canada is entirely dependent on the U.S. Chapter 11 Debtors for the majority of licensing agreements, design partnerships, and company-owned brands;

j) Substantially all of the trademarks and intellectual property relied on by Hollander Canada are owned by the U.S. Chapter 11 Debtors;

k) The Chapter 11 Debtors, including Hollander Canada, operate an integrated, centralized cash management system; and

l) Hollander Canada is dependent on the U.S. Chapter 11 Debtors for the establishment, maintenance, and administration of certain customer promotional programs involving Hollander Canada's key customers.

36 Since all the Chapter 11 Debtors except Hollander Canada have registered offices in the United States, and since a review of Hollander Canada's business indicates that its COMI is in the United States, The COMI of all the Chapter 11 Debtors is in the United States and therefore the Chapter 11 Cases should be recognized as "foreign main proceedings".

**SHOULD THE INITIAL RECOGNITION ORDER AND SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER BE GRANTED?**

***Is a Stay of Proceedings Required and Appropriate?***

37 Section 48(1) of the CCAA provides that once the Court has found that a foreign proceeding is a "foreign main proceeding", it is required to grant certain mandatory relief, including a stay of proceedings:

38 In addition to the automatic relief provided for in s. 48, s.49 of the CCAA grants me the broad discretion to make any appropriate order if I am satisfied that it is necessary for the protection of the debtor company's property or the interests of creditors.

39 Section 52(1) of the CCAA requires that if an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made, the Court "shall cooperate, to the maximum extent possible, with the foreign representative and the foreign court involved in the foreign proceeding."

40 Because of the circumstances facing Hollander, Hollander Canada and the other Chapter 11 Debtors, I am satisfied that a stay of proceedings is necessary in order to implement the proposed restructuring.

***Should the First Day Orders be Recognized?***

41 The central principle governing Part IV of the CCAA is comity, which mandates that Canadian courts should recognize and enforce the judicial acts of other jurisdictions, provided that those other jurisdictions have assumed jurisdiction on a basis consistent with principles of order, predictability and fairness.

42 Canadian courts have emphasized the importance of comity and cooperation in cross-border insolvency proceedings to avoid multiple proceedings, inconsistent judgments and general uncertainty. Coordination of international insolvency proceedings is particularly critical in ensuring the equal and fair treatment of creditors regardless of their location.

43 I am satisfied that the First Day Orders should be recognized for the following reasons:

  

# TAB 5

2019 ONSC 7042
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Purdue Pharma L.P., Re.

2019 CarswellOnt 21242, 2019 ONSC 7042, 313 A.C.W.S. (3d) 467, 76 C.B.R. (6th) 308

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF AND IN THE MATTER OF PURDUE PHARMA L.P., PURDUE PHARMA INC., RHODES ASSOCIATES L.P., PAUL LAND INC., RHODES TECHNOLOGIES, RHODES PHARMACEUTICALS L.P., UDF LP, SVC PHARMA INC., BUTTON LAND L.P., SVC PHARMA LP, QUIDNICK LAND L.P., SEVEN SEAS HILL CORP., OPHIR GREEN CORP., PURDUE PHARMA OF PUERTO RICO, AVRIO HEALTH L.P., PURDUE TRANSDERMAL TECHNOLOGIES L.P., PURDUE PHARMACEUTICALS L.P., PURDUE PHARMA MANUFACTURING L.P., ALDON THERAPEUTICS L.P., IMBRIUM THERAPEUTICS L.P., GREENFIELD BIOVENTURES L.P., NAYATT COVE LIFESCIENCE INC., PURDUE NEUROSCIENCE COMPANY, PURDUE PHARMACEUTICALS PRODUCTS L.P.

Hainey J.

Heard: November 28, 2019
Judgment: December 30, 2019
Docket: CV-19-00627656-00CL

Counsel: David Byers, Ashley Taylor, Lee Nicholson, for Foreign Representative
Grant Moffat, Reidar Mogerman, for Province of British Columbia
Alex MacFarlane, Cindy Clark, for Purdue Pharma Inc., as the General Partner of Purdue Pharma Limited Partnership (Ontario) and Purdue Pharma Limited Partnership (Ontario)
David Bish, for Ernst & Young, Information Officer
Raymond Slattery, for Directors and Officers
Natalie Renner, for McKesson Canada Corporation and McKesson Corporation
Mark Meland, Avram Fishman, Tina Silverstein, for Quebec Class Action Plaintiff, Riccardo Camarda
Jonathan Lisus, Nadia Campion, for Sackler Family

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency; International
**Related Abridgment Classifications**
Bankruptcy and insolvency
XVII Practice and procedure in courts
XVII.4 Stay of proceedings
**Headnote**
Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Practice and procedure in courts — Stay of proceedings
P Inc., in its capacity as foreign representative of itself, and 23 other debtors in possession, moved for order recognizing and enforcing U.S. Preliminary Injunction Order in Canada, and granting stay of proceedings in favour of certain related parties in Canada — Motion granted — At this early stage in proceedings, court should not allow single stakeholder to frustrate collective process that may benefit much larger group of stakeholders — Excluding Quebec Plaintiff from Related Party Stay Order would do just that.
**Table of Authorities**
**Statutes considered:**
*Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

 

Representative argues that I should respect that intent. Further, none of the other parties in Canada oppose this motion except the Quebec Plaintiff. The Foreign Representative further submits that I should not allow the Quebec Opioid Class Action to proceed because this would result in a single stakeholder frustrating a collective process that may benefit a much larger number of stakeholders.

18 The Quebec Plaintiff submits that I should not stay the Quebec Opioid Class Action because it is the only one of the Pending Actions in Canada that does not assert a claim against any of the Chapter 11 Debtors or the Chapter 11 Debtors' Related Parties. It is, therefore, the "only action which is totally outside of the parameters of any order made by the U.S. Bankruptcy Court" and should be excluded on the basis that it is unique in comparison to the other Pending Actions in Canada. According to the Quebec Plaintiff, to grant a stay of proceedings of the Quebec Opioid Class Action in these recognition proceedings under the *CCAA* would be "a bridge too far" because the Quebec proceeding is unrelated to the Chapter 11 Proceedings. The Quebec Plaintiff submits that the Quebec Opioid Class Action should be permitted to proceed to a certification hearing in the Quebec Superior Court without any interference by the unrelated Chapter 11 Proceedings.

**Analysis**

19 The motion seeking the Related Party Stay Order is unopposed by all parties in Canada except the Quebec Plaintiff. I am satisfied that I should grant the order with respect to the other actions in Canada to support the Bankruptcy Court's primary goal of achieving a global resolution of all of the opioid-related claims. The only issue that I must decide is whether I should exclude the Quebec Plaintiff from the order.

20 Despite counsel for the Quebec Plaintiff's able argument, I have concluded that I should grant the Related Party Stay Order sought by the Foreign Representative and not exclude the Quebec Opioid Class Action from that order for the following reasons.

21 The principles of comity, cooperation and accommodation with foreign courts guide *CCAA* courts in cross-border insolvency cases. Section 52(1) of the *CCAA* provides as follows:

> 52(1) If an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made, the court shall cooperate, to the maximum extent possible, with the foreign representative and the foreign court involved in the foreign proceeding.

22 Section 49(1) of the *CCAA* clearly provides me with jurisdiction to make the Related Party Stay Order if I am satisfied that it is necessary for the "protection of the debtor company's property or the interests of a creditor or creditors". I am satisfied that the order is necessary for this reason.

23 It is clear to me that the Bankruptcy Court intended to pause all of the opioid-related litigation against Purdue, the Chapter 11 Debtors and the Related Parties so that they could pursue a global resolution of all claims in the interests of all stakeholders. Following a full day hearing the Bankruptcy Court concluded that the Chapter 11 Debtors had satisfied the "extraordinary burden" for a stay of proceedings against the Related Parties in the United States. In granting the stay of proceedings the Bankruptcy Court stated as follows:

> But again, this is a limited preliminary injunction. I believe that while I certainly respect the objecting states' interest in laying out the facts and in ultimate determination and in information sharing, I believe that interest here is outweighed on a preliminary basis by the benefits to all the parties to this case who are creditors in pursuing an overall reorganization that I would hope would include reasonable and lasting and binding, as I believe only a bankruptcy plan can bind the parties to, means to use the resources of these Debtors for the maximum benefit to the states, communities and individuals who the Debtors acknowledge have suffered from the opioid crisis.

24 The Related Party Stay Order sought by the Foreign Representative is intended to accomplish the same purpose as the Preliminary Injunction granted by the Bankruptcy Court in the U.S. The stay of proceedings against the Related Parties in Canada will temporarily pause the existing litigation here to allow stakeholders to focus on a global resolution. If I do not grant the stay of proceedings in Canada, Canadian creditors will have an advantage over U.S. creditors by continuing to pursue their actions against Related Parties here while U.S. claimants are at a standstill. This will result in an uneven playing field among

 

# TAB 6

Court File No. CV-22-00683820-00CL

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| THE HONOURABLE | ) | THURSDAY, THE 11TH |
| JUSTICE CAVANAGH | ) | DAY OF AUGUST, 2022 |

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF VOYAGER DIGITAL LTD.

APPLICATION OF VOYAGER DIGITAL LTD. UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

# ORDER
## (Recognition of Foreign Orders)

THIS MOTION, made by Voyager Digital Ltd. ("**VDL**") in its capacity as the foreign representative (in such capacity, the "**Foreign Representative**") of VDL in respect of the proceedings commenced on July 5, 2022 (the "**Foreign Proceeding**"), in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York (the "**U.S. Bankruptcy Court**") for an Order pursuant to Part IV of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the "**CCAA**"), substantially in the form enclosed in the Motion Record, was heard this day by video conference.

ON READING the Notice of Motion, the second affidavit of Stephen Ehrlich sworn August 6, 2022 (the "**Second Ehrlich Affidavit**"), the affidavit of Raajan Aery sworn August 6, 2022 and the first report of Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc., in its capacity as court-appointed

information officer in respect of these proceedings (in such capacity, the "**Information Officer**") dated August 8, 2022, each filed, and upon hearing the submissions of counsel for the Foreign Representative, counsel for the Information Officer and such other counsel that appeared on the motion, no one else appearing although duly served as appears from the affidavit of service of Daniel Richer sworn August 6, 2022, filed:

**SERVICE AND DEFINITIONS**

1. THIS COURT ORDERS that the time for service of the Notice of Motion and the Motion Record is hereby abridged and validated so that this Motion is properly returnable today and hereby dispenses with further service thereof.

2. THIS COURT ORDERS that the capitalized terms used herein and not otherwise defined have the meaning given to them in the Second Ehrlich Affidavit.

**RECOGNITION OF FOREIGN ORDERS**

3. THIS COURT ORDERS that the following orders of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court made in the Foreign Proceeding are hereby recognized and given full force and effect in all provinces and territories of Canada pursuant to section 49 of the CCAA:

(a) order (I) authorizing and approving the appointment of Stretto, Inc. as claims and noticing agent; and (II) granting related relief, a copy of which is attached hereto as **Schedule "A"**;

(b) order (I) authorizing Debtors to (A) pay their obligations under prepetition insurance policies, (B) continue to pay certain brokerage fees, (C) renew, supplement, modify, or purchase insurance coverage, and (D) maintain their surety

bond program; and (II) granting related relief, a copy of which is attached hereto as **Schedule "B"**;

(c) final order (I) approving notification and hearing procedures for certain transfers of and declarations of worthlessness with respect to common stock; and (II) granting related relief, a copy of which is attached hereto as **Schedule "C"**;

(d) final order (I) authorizing the Debtors to (A) pay prepetition employee wages, salaries, other compensation, and reimbursable expenses and (B) continue employee benefits programs; and (II) granting related relief, a copy of which is attached hereto as **Schedule "D"**;

(e) second interim order (I) authorizing the Debtors to (A) continue to operate their cash management system, (B) honor certain prepetition obligations related thereto, (C) maintain existing business forms, and (D) continue to perform intercompany transactions; (II) granting superpriority administrative expense status to postpetition intercompany balances; and (III) granting related relief, a copy of which is attached hereto as **Schedule "E"**;

(f) final order (I) authorizing the payment of certain taxes and fees; and (II) granting related relief, a copy of which is attached hereto as **Schedule "F"**;

(g) order authorizing the retention and compensation of professionals utilized in the ordinary course of business, a copy of which is attached hereto as **Schedule "G"**;

(h) order (I) setting bar dates for submitting proofs of claim; (II) approving procedures for submitting proofs of claim; and (III) approving notice thereof, a copy of which is attached hereto as **Schedule "H"**; and

(i) order (I) approving the bidding procedures; (II) scheduling the bid deadlines and the auction; (III) approving the form and manner of notice thereof; (IV) scheduling hearings and objections deadlines with respect to the Debtors' sale, disclosure statement, and plan confirmation; and (V) granting related relief, a copy of which is attached hereto as **Schedule "I"**.

**GENERAL**

4. THIS COURT HEREBY REQUESTS the aid and recognition of any court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body having jurisdiction in Canada or in the United States of America to give effect to this Order and to assist the Foreign Representative, the Information Officer, and their respective counsel and agents in carrying out the terms of this Order. All courts, tribunals, regulatory and administrative bodies are hereby respectfully requested to make such orders and to provide such assistance to the Foreign Representative, and the Information Officer, the latter as an officer of this Court, as may be necessary or desirable to give effect to this Order, or to assist the Foreign Representative and the Information Officer, and their respective counsel and agents, in carrying out the terms of this Order.

5. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Foreign Representative and the Information Officer shall be at liberty and are hereby authorized and empowered to apply to any court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body, wherever located, for the recognition of this Order and for assistance in carrying out the terms of this Order.

6. THIS COURT ORDERS that any interested party may apply to this Court to vary or amend this Order or seek relief on not less than seven (7) days' notice to the Foreign Representative, the Information Officer, and their respective counsel, and to any other party or parties likely to be affected by the order sought, or upon such other notice, if any, as this Court may order.

7. THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES that this Order shall be effective as of 12:01 AM on the date of this Order.

_____

# TAB 7

2009 CarswellOnt 4467
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Nortel Networks Corp., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 4467, [2009] O.J. No. 3169, 179 A.C.W.S. (3d) 265, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 229

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF NORTEL NETWORKS CORPORATION, NORTEL NETWORKS LIMITED, NORTEL NETWORKS GLOBAL CORPORATION, NORTEL NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION AND NORTEL NETWORKS TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION (Applicants)

APPLICATION UNDER THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

Morawetz J.

Heard: June 29, 2009
Written reasons: July 23, 2009
Docket: 09-CL-7950

Counsel: Derrick Tay, Jennifer Stam for Nortel Networks Corporation, et al
Lyndon Barnes, Adam Hirsh for Board of Directors of Nortel Networks Corporation, Nortel Networks Limited
J. Carfagnini, J. Pasquariello for Monitor, Ernst & Young Inc.
M. Starnino for Superintendent of Financial Services, Administrator of PBGF
S. Philpott for Former Employees
K. Zych for Noteholders
Pamela Huff, Craig Thorburn for MatlinPatterson Global Advisors LLC, MatlinPatterson Global Opportunities Partners III L.P., Matlin Patterson Opportunities Partners (Cayman) III L.P.
David Ward for UK Pension Protection Fund
Leanne Williams for Flextronics Inc.
Alex MacFarlane for Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors
Arthur O. Jacques, Tom McRae for Felske & Sylvain (de facto Continuing Employees' Committee)
Robin B. Schwill, Matthew P. Gottlieb for Nortel Networks UK Limited
A. Kauffman for Export Development Canada
D. Ullman for Verizon Communications Inc.
G. Benchetrit for IBM

Subject: Insolvency; Estates and Trusts
**Related Abridgment Classifications**
Bankruptcy and insolvency
XIV Administration of estate
XIV.6 Sale of assets
XIV.6.f Jurisdiction of court to approve sale
Bankruptcy and insolvency
XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
XIX.1 General principles

 

XIX.1.e Jurisdiction
XIX.1.e.i Court

**Headnote**

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Proposal — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Miscellaneous issues
Telecommunication company entered protection under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("Act") — Company decided to pursue "going concern" sales for various business units — Company entered into sale agreement with respect to assets in Code Division Multiple Access business and Long-Term Evolution Access assets — Company was pursuing sale of its other business units — Company brought motion for approval of bidding procedures and asset sale agreement — Motion granted — Court has jurisdiction to authorize sales process under Act in absence of formal plan of compromise or arrangement and creditor vote — Sale by company which preserved its business as going concern was consistent with objectives of Act — Unless sale was undertaken at this time, long-term viability of business would be in jeopardy.
Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Administration of estate — Sale of assets — Jurisdiction of court to approve sale
Telecommunication company entered protection under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("Act") — Company decided to pursue "going concern" sales for various business units — Company entered into sale agreement with respect to assets in Code Division Multiple Access business and Long-Term Evolution Access assets — Company was pursuing sale of its other business units — Company brought motion for approval of bidding procedures and asset sale agreement — Motion granted — Court has jurisdiction to authorize sales process under Act in absence of formal plan of compromise or arrangement and creditor vote — Sale by company which preserved its business as going concern was consistent with objectives of Act — Unless sale was undertaken at this time, long-term viability of business would be in jeopardy.

**Table of Authorities**

**Cases considered by *Morawetz J.*:**

*Asset Engineering LP v. Forest & Marine Financial Ltd. Partnership* (2009), 2009 BCCA 319, 2009 CarswellBC 1738 (B.C. C.A.) — followed

*ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 2008 ONCA 587, 2008 CarswellOnt 4811, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re)* 240 O.A.C. 245, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re)* 296 D.L.R. (4th) 135, (sub nom. *Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp., Re)* 92 O.R. (3d) 513, 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163, 47 B.L.R. (4th) 123 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

*ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 2008 CarswellOnt 5432, 2008 CarswellOnt 5433 (S.C.C.) — referred to

*Boutiques San Francisco Inc., Re* (2004), 2004 CarswellQue 10918, 7 C.B.R. (5th) 189 (C.S. Que.) — referred to

*Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re* (2007), 2007 CarswellAlta 1050, 2007 ABQB 504, 35 C.B.R. (5th) 1, 415 A.R. 196, 33 B.L.R. (4th) 68 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

*Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re* (1998), 1998 CarswellOnt 3346, 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299, 72 O.T.C. 99 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered

*Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. v. Hard-Rock Paving Co.* (2008), 2008 CarswellOnt 4046, 45 C.B.R. (5th) 87 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

*Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp.* (2008), 2008 BCCA 327, 2008 CarswellBC 1758, 83 B.C.L.R. (4th) 214, 296 D.L.R. (4th) 577, 434 W.A.C. 187, 258 B.C.A.C. 187, 46 C.B.R. (5th) 7, [2008] 10 W.W.R. 575 (B.C. C.A.) — distinguished

*Consumers Packaging Inc., Re* (2001), 150 O.A.C. 384, 27 C.B.R. (4th) 197, 2001 CarswellOnt 3482, 12 C.P.C. (5th) 208 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

*Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24, 9 B.L.R. (2d) 275, 1993 CarswellOnt 183 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

*PSINET Ltd., Re* (2001), 28 C.B.R. (4th) 95, 2001 CarswellOnt 3405 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

*Residential Warranty Co. of Canada Inc., Re* (2006), 2006 ABQB 236, 2006 CarswellAlta 383, (sub nom. *Residential Warranty Co. of Canada Inc. (Bankrupt), Re)* 393 A.R. 340, 62 Alta. L.R. (4th) 168, 21 C.B.R. (5th) 57 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

*Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 83 D.L.R. (4th) 76, 46 O.A.C. 321, 4 O.R. (3d) 1, 1991 CarswellOnt 205 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

  

*Stelco Inc., Re* (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 4084, 6 C.B.R. (5th) 316 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to
*Tiger Brand Knitting Co., Re* (2005), 2005 CarswellOnt 1240, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 315 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to
*Winnipeg Motor Express Inc., Re* (2008), 2008 CarswellMan 560, 2008 MBQB 297, 49 C.B.R. (5th) 302 (Man. Q.B.) — referred to

**Statutes considered:**

*Bankruptcy Code*, 11 U.S.C.
s. 363 — referred to
*Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36
Generally — referred to
s. 11 — referred to
s. 11(4) — considered

MOTION by company for approval of bidding procedures for sale of business and asset sale agreement.

***Morawetz J.*:**

**Introduction**

1 On June 29, 2009, I granted the motion of the Applicants and approved the bidding procedures (the "Bidding Procedures") described in the affidavit of Mr. Riedel sworn June 23, 2009 (the "Riedel Affidavit") and the Fourteenth Report of Ernst & Young, Inc., in its capacity as Monitor (the "Monitor") (the "Fourteenth Report"). The order was granted immediately after His Honour Judge Gross of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware (the "U.S. Court") approved the Bidding Procedures in the Chapter 11 proceedings.

2 I also approved the Asset Sale Agreement dated as of June 19, 2009 (the "Sale Agreement") among Nokia Siemens Networks B.V. ("Nokia Siemens Networks" or the "Purchaser"), as buyer, and Nortel Networks Corporation ("NNC"), Nortel Networks Limited ("NNL"), Nortel Networks, Inc. ("NNI") and certain of their affiliates, as vendors (collectively the "Sellers") in the form attached as Appendix "A" to the Fourteenth Report and I also approved and accepted the Sale Agreement for the purposes of conducting the "stalking horse" bidding process in accordance with the Bidding Procedures including, the Break-Up Fee and the Expense Reimbursement (as both terms are defined in the Sale Agreement).

3 An order was also granted sealing confidential Appendix "B" to the Fourteenth Report containing the schedules and exhibits to the Sale Agreement pending further order of this court.

4 The following are my reasons for granting these orders.

5 The hearing on June 29, 2009 (the "Joint Hearing") was conducted by way of video conference with a similar motion being heard by the U.S. Court. His Honor Judge Gross presided over the hearing in the U.S. Court. The Joint Hearing was conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Cross-Border Protocol, which had previously been approved by both the U.S. Court and this court.

6 The Sale Agreement relates to the Code Division Multiple Access ("CMDA") business Long-Term Evolution ("LTE") Access assets.

7 The Sale Agreement is not insignificant. The Monitor reports that revenues from CDMA comprised over 21% of Nortel's 2008 revenue. The CDMA business employs approximately 3,100 people (approximately 500 in Canada) and the LTE business employs approximately 1,000 people (approximately 500 in Canada). The purchase price under the Sale Agreement is $650 million.

**Background**

 

8 The Applicants were granted CCAA protection on January 14, 2009. Insolvency proceedings have also been commenced in the United States, the United Kingdom, Israel and France.

9 At the time the proceedings were commenced, Nortel's business operated through 143 subsidiaries, with approximately 30,000 employees globally. As of January 2009, Nortel employed approximately 6,000 people in Canada alone.

10 The stated purpose of Nortel's filing under the CCAA was to stabilize the Nortel business to maximize the chances of preserving all or a portion of the enterprise. The Monitor reported that a thorough strategic review of the company's assets and operations would have to be undertaken in consultation with various stakeholder groups.

11 In April 2009, the Monitor updated the court and noted that various restructuring alternatives were being considered.

12 On June 19, 2009, Nortel announced that it had entered into the Sale Agreement with respect to its assets in its CMDA business and LTE Access assets (collectively, the "Business") and that it was pursuing the sale of its other business units. Mr. Riedel in his affidavit states that Nortel has spent many months considering various restructuring alternatives before determining in its business judgment to pursue "going concern" sales for Nortel's various business units.

13 In deciding to pursue specific sales processes, Mr. Riedel also stated that Nortel's management considered:

(a) the impact of the filings on Nortel's various businesses, including deterioration in sales; and

(b) the best way to maximize the value of its operations, to preserve jobs and to continue businesses in Canada and the U.S.

14 Mr. Riedel notes that while the Business possesses significant value, Nortel was faced with the reality that:

(a) the Business operates in a highly competitive environment;

(b) full value cannot be realized by continuing to operate the Business through a restructuring; and

(c) in the absence of continued investment, the long-term viability of the Business would be put into jeopardy.

15 Mr. Riedel concluded that the proposed process for the sale of the Business pursuant to an auction process provided the best way to preserve the Business as a going concern and to maximize value and preserve the jobs of Nortel employees.

16 In addition to the assets covered by the Sale Agreement, certain liabilities are to be assumed by the Purchaser. This issue is covered in a comprehensive manner at paragraph 34 of the Fourteenth Report. Certain liabilities to employees are included on this list. The assumption of these liabilities is consistent with the provisions of the Sale Agreement that requires the Purchaser to extend written offers of employment to at least 2,500 employees in the Business.

17 The Monitor also reports that given that certain of the U.S. Debtors are parties to the Sale Agreement and given the desire to maximize value for the benefit of stakeholders, Nortel determined and it has agreed with the Purchaser that the Sale Agreement is subject to higher or better offers being obtained pursuant to a sale process under s. 363 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code and that the Sale Agreement shall serve as a "stalking horse" bid pursuant to that process.

18 The Bidding Procedures provide that all bids must be received by the Seller by no later than July 21, 2009 and that the Sellers will conduct an auction of the purchased assets on July 24, 2009. It is anticipated that Nortel will ultimately seek a final sales order from the U.S. Court on or about July 28, 2009 and an approval and vesting order from this court in respect of the Sale Agreement and purchased assets on or about July 30, 2009.

19 The Monitor recognizes the expeditious nature of the sale process but the Monitor has been advised that given the nature of the Business and the consolidation occurring in the global market, there are likely to be a limited number of parties interested in acquiring the Business.

 

20 The Monitor also reports that Nortel has consulted with, among others, the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the "UCC") and the bondholder group regarding the Bidding Procedures and is of the view that both are supportive of the timing of this sale process. (It is noted that the UCC did file a limited objection to the motion relating to certain aspects of the Bidding Procedures.)

21 Given the sale efforts made to date by Nortel, the Monitor supports the sale process outlined in the Fourteenth Report and more particularly described in the Bidding Procedures.

22 Objections to the motion were filed in the U.S. Court and this court by MatlinPatterson Global Advisors LLC, MatlinPatterson Global Opportunities Partners III L.P. and Matlin Patterson Opportunities Partners (Cayman) III L.P. (collectively, "MatlinPatterson") as well the UCC.

23 The objections were considered in the hearing before Judge Gross and, with certain limited exceptions, the objections were overruled.

**Issues and Discussion**

24 The threshold issue being raised on this motion by the Applicants is whether the CCAA affords this court the jurisdiction to approve a sales process in the absence of a formal plan of compromise or arrangement and a creditor vote. If the question is answered in the affirmative, the secondary issue is whether this sale should authorize the Applicants to sell the Business.

25 The Applicants submit that it is well established in the jurisprudence that this court has the jurisdiction under the CCAA to approve the sales process and that the requested order should be granted in these circumstances.

26 Counsel to the Applicants submitted a detailed factum which covered both issues.

27 Counsel to the Applicants submits that one of the purposes of the CCAA is to preserve the going concern value of debtors companies and that the court's jurisdiction extends to authorizing sale of the debtor's business, even in the absence of a plan or creditor vote.

28 The CCAA is a flexible statute and it is particularly useful in complex insolvency cases in which the court is required to balance numerous constituents and a myriad of interests.

29 The CCAA has been described as "skeletal in nature". It has also been described as a "sketch, an outline, a supporting framework for the resolution of corporate insolvencies in the public interest". *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163 (Ont. C.A.) at paras. 44, 61, leave to appeal refused [2008] S.C.C.A. No. 337 (S.C.C.). ("ATB Financial").

30 The jurisprudence has identified as sources of the court's discretionary jurisdiction, *inter alia*:

> (a) the power of the court to impose terms and conditions on the granting of a stay under s. 11(4) of the CCAA;
>
> (b) the specific provision of s. 11(4) of the CCAA which provides that the court may make an order "on such terms as it may impose"; and
>
> (c) the inherent jurisdiction of the court to "fill in the gaps" of the CCAA in order to give effect to its objects. *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at para. 43; *PSINET Ltd., Re* (2001), 28 C.B.R. (4th) 95 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 5, *ATB Financial*, *supra*, at paras. 43-52.

31 However, counsel to the Applicants acknowledges that the discretionary authority of the court under s. 11 must be informed by the purpose of the CCAA.

 

> Its exercise must be guided by the scheme and object of the Act and by the legal principles that govern corporate law issues. *Re Stelco Inc.* (2005), 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 44.

32 In support of the court's jurisdiction to grant the order sought in this case, counsel to the Applicants submits that Nortel seeks to invoke the "overarching policy" of the CCAA, namely, to preserve the going concern. *Residential Warranty Co. of Canada Inc., Re* (2006), 21 C.B.R. (5th) 57 (Alta. Q.B.) at para. 78.

33 Counsel to the Applicants further submits that CCAA courts have repeatedly noted that the purpose of the CCAA is to preserve the benefit of a going concern business for all stakeholders, or "the whole economic community":

> The purpose of the CCAA is to facilitate arrangements that might avoid liquidation of the company and allow it to continue in business to the benefit of the whole economic community, including the shareholders, the creditors (both secured and unsecured) and the employees. *Citibank Canada v. Chase Manhattan Bank of Canada* (1991), 5 C.B.R. (3rd) 167 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 29. *Re Consumers Packaging Inc*. (2001) 27 C.B.R. (4th) 197 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 5.

34 Counsel to the Applicants further submits that the CCAA should be given a broad and liberal interpretation to facilitate its underlying purpose, including the preservation of the going concern for the benefit of all stakeholders and further that it should not matter whether the business continues as a going concern under the debtor's stewardship or under new ownership, for as long as the business continues as a going concern, a primary goal of the CCAA will be met.

35 Counsel to the Applicants makes reference to a number of cases where courts in Ontario, in appropriate cases, have exercised their jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets, even in the absence of a plan of arrangement being tendered to stakeholders for a vote. In doing so, counsel to the Applicants submits that the courts have repeatedly recognized that they have jurisdiction under the CCAA to approve asset sales in the absence of a plan of arrangement, where such sale is in the best interests of stakeholders generally. *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re*, *supra*, *Re PSINet*, *supra*, *Consumers Packaging Inc., Re* [2001 CarswellOnt 3482 (Ont. C.A.)], *supra*, *Stelco Inc., Re* (2004), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 316 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 1, *Tiger Brand Knitting Co., Re* (2005), 9 C.B.R. (5th) 315 (Ont. S.C.J.), *Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. v. Hard-Rock Paving Co.* (2008), 45 C.B.R. (5th) 87 (Ont. S.C.J.) and *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

36 In *Re Consumers Packaging*, *supra*, the Court of Appeal for Ontario specifically held that a sale of a business as a going concern during a CCAA proceeding is consistent with the purposes of the CCAA:

> The sale of Consumers' Canadian glass operations as a going concern pursuant to the Owens-Illinois bid allows the preservation of Consumers' business (albeit under new ownership), and is therefore consistent with the purposes of the CCAA.
>
> ...we cannot refrain from commenting that Farley J.'s decision to approve the Owens-Illinois bid is consistent with previous decisions in Ontario and elsewhere that have emphasized the broad remedial purpose of flexibility of the CCAA and have approved the sale and disposition of assets during CCAA proceedings prior to a formal plan being tendered. *Re Consumers Packaging, supra, at paras. 5, 9.*

37 Similarly, in *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re*, *supra*, Blair J. (as he then was) expressly affirmed the court's jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets in the course of a CCAA proceeding before a plan of arrangement had been approved by creditors. *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge, Re*, *supra*, at paras. 43, 45.

38 Similarly, in *PSINet Limited*, *supra*, the court approved a going concern sale in a CCAA proceeding where no plan was presented to creditors and a substantial portion of the debtor's Canadian assets were to be sold. Farley J. noted as follows:

 

> [If the sale was not approved,] there would be a liquidation scenario ensuing which would realize far less than this going concern sale (which appears to me to have involved a transparent process with appropriate exposure designed to maximize the proceeds), thus impacting upon the rest of the creditors, especially as to the unsecured, together with the material enlarging of the unsecured claims by the disruption claims of approximately 8,600 customers (who will be materially disadvantaged by an interrupted transition) plus the job losses for approximately 200 employees. *Re PSINet Limited*, *supra*, at para. 3.

39 In *Re Stelco Inc.*, *supra*, in 2004, Farley J. again addressed the issue of the feasibility of selling the operations as a going concern:

> I would observe that usually it is the creditor side which wishes to terminate CCAA proceedings and that when the creditors threaten to take action, there is a realization that a liquidation scenario will not only have a negative effect upon a CCAA applicant, but also upon its workforce. Hence, the CCAA may be employed to provide stability during a period of necessary financial and operational restructuring - and if a restructuring of the "old company" is not feasible, then there is the exploration of the feasibility of the sale of the operations/enterprise as a going concern (with continued employment) in whole or in part. *Re Stelco Inc*, *supra*, at para. 1.

40 I accept these submissions as being general statements of the law in Ontario. The value of equity in an insolvent debtor is dubious, at best, and, in my view, it follows that the determining factor should not be whether the business continues under the debtor's stewardship or under a structure that recognizes a new equity structure. An equally important factor to consider is whether the case can be made to continue the business as a going concern.

41 Counsel to the Applicants also referred to decisions from the courts in Quebec, Manitoba and Alberta which have similarly recognized the court's jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets during the course of a CCAA proceeding. *Boutiques San Francisco Inc., Re* (2004), 7 C.B.R. (5th) 189 (C.S. Que.), *Winnipeg Motor Express Inc., Re* (2008), 49 C.B.R. (5th) 302 (Man. Q.B.) at paras. 41, 44, and *Calpine Canada Energy Ltd., Re* (2007), 35 C.B.R. (5th) 1 (Alta. Q.B.) at para. 75.

42 Counsel to the Applicants also directed the court's attention to a recent decision of the British Columbia Court of Appeal which questioned whether the court should authorize the sale of substantially all of the debtor's assets where the debtor's plan "will simply propose that the net proceeds from the sale...be distributed to its creditors". In *Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp.* (2008), 46 C.B.R. (5th) 7 (B.C. C.A.) ("*Cliffs Over Maple Bay*"), the court was faced with a debtor who had no active business but who nonetheless sought to stave off its secured creditor indefinitely. The case did not involve any type of sale transaction but the Court of Appeal questioned whether a court should authorize the sale under the CCAA without requiring the matter to be voted upon by creditors.

43 In addressing this matter, it appears to me that the British Columbia Court of Appeal focussed on whether the court should grant the requested relief and not on the question of whether a CCAA court has the jurisdiction to grant the requested relief.

44 I do not disagree with the decision in *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*. However, it involved a situation where the debtor had no active business and did not have the support of its stakeholders. That is not the case with these Applicants.

45 The *Cliffs Over Maple Bay* decision has recently been the subject of further comment by the British Columbia Court of Appeal in *Asset Engineering LP v. Forest & Marine Financial Ltd. Partnership*, 2009 BCCA 319 (B.C. C.A.).

46 At paragraphs 24 - 26 of the *Forest and Marine* decision, Newbury J.A. stated:

> 24. In *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*, the debtor company was a real estate developer whose one project had failed. The company had been dormant for some time. It applied for CCAA protection but described its proposal for restructuring in vague terms that amounted essentially to a plan to "secure sufficient funds" to complete the stalled project (Para. 34). This court, per Tysoe J.A., ruled that although the Act can apply to single-project companies, its purposes are unlikely to be engaged in such instances, since mortgage priorities are fully straight forward and there will be little incentive for

  

> senior secured creditors to compromise their interests (Para. 36). Further, the Court stated, the granting of a stay under s. 11 is "not a free standing remedy that the court may grant whenever an insolvent company wishes to undertake a "restructuring"...Rather, s. 11 is ancillary to the fundamental purpose of the CCAA, and a stay of proceedings freezing the rights of creditors should only be granted in furtherance of the CCAA's fundamental purpose". That purpose has been described in *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank* (1984) 11 D.L.R. (4th) 576 (Alta. Q.B.):
>
> > The legislation is intended to have wide scope and allow a judge to make orders which will effectively maintain the status quo for a period while the insolvent company attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for a proposed arrangement which will enable the company to remain in operation for what is, hopefully, the future benefit of both the company and its creditors. [at 580]
>
> 25. The Court was not satisfied in *Cliffs Over Maple Bay* that the "restructuring" contemplated by the debtor would do anything other than distribute the net proceeds from the sale, winding up or liquidation of its business. The debtor had no intention of proposing a plan of arrangement, and its business would not continue following the execution of its proposal - thus it could not be said the purposes of the statute would be engaged...
>
> 26. In my view, however, the case at bar is quite different from *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*. Here, the main debtor, the Partnership, is at the centre of a complicated corporate group and carries on an active financing business that it hopes to save notwithstanding the current economic cycle. (The business itself which fills a "niche" in the market, has been carried on in one form or another since 1983.) The CCAA is appropriate for situations such as this where it is unknown whether the "restructuring" will ultimately take the form of a refinancing or will involve a reorganization of the corporate entity or entities and a true compromise of the rights of one or more parties. The "fundamental purpose" of the Act - to preserve the *status quo* while the debtor prepares a plan that will enable it to remain in business to the benefit of all concerned - will be furthered by granting a stay so that the means contemplated by the Act - a compromise or arrangement - can be developed, negotiated and voted on if necessary...

47 It seems to me that the foregoing views expressed in *Forest and Marine* are not inconsistent with the views previously expressed by the courts in Ontario. The CCAA is intended to be flexible and must be given a broad and liberal interpretation to achieve its objectives and a sale by the debtor which preserves its business as a going concern is, in my view, consistent with those objectives.

48 I therefore conclude that the court does have the jurisdiction to authorize a sale under the CCAA in the absence of a plan.

49 I now turn to a consideration of whether it is appropriate, in this case, to approve this sales process. Counsel to the Applicants submits that the court should consider the following factors in determining whether to authorize a sale under the CCAA in the absence of a plan:

> (a) is a sale transaction warranted at this time?
>
> (b) will the sale benefit the whole "economic community"?
>
> (c) do any of the debtors' creditors have a *bona fide* reason to object to a sale of the business?
>
> (d) is there a better viable alternative?

I accept this submission.

50 It is the position of the Applicants that Nortel's proposed sale of the Business should be approved as this decision is to the benefit of stakeholders and no creditor is prejudiced. Further, counsel submits that in the absence of a sale, the prospects for the Business are a loss of competitiveness, a loss of value and a loss of jobs.

51 Counsel to the Applicants summarized the facts in support of the argument that the Sale Transaction should be approved, namely:

 

(a) Nortel has been working diligently for many months on a plan to reorganize its business;

(b) in the exercise of its business judgment, Nortel has concluded that it cannot continue to operate the Business successfully within the CCAA framework;

(c) unless a sale is undertaken at this time, the long-term viability of the Business will be in jeopardy;

(d) the Sale Agreement continues the Business as a going concern, will save at least 2,500 jobs and constitutes the best and most valuable proposal for the Business;

(e) the auction process will serve to ensure Nortel receives the highest possible value for the Business;

(f) the sale of the Business at this time is in the best interests of Nortel and its stakeholders; and

(g) the value of the Business is likely to decline over time.

52 The objections of MatlinPatterson and the UCC have been considered. I am satisfied that the issues raised in these objections have been addressed in a satisfactory manner by the ruling of Judge Gross and no useful purpose would be served by adding additional comment.

53 Counsel to the Applicants also emphasize that Nortel will return to court to seek approval of the most favourable transaction to emerge from the auction process and will aim to satisfy the elements established by the court for approval as set out in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 16.

**Disposition**

54 The Applicants are part of a complicated corporate group. They carry on an active international business. I have accepted that an important factor to consider in a CCAA process is whether the case can be made to continue the business as a going concern. I am satisfied having considered the factors referenced at [49], as well as the facts summarized at [51], that the Applicants have met this test. I am therefore satisfied that this motion should be granted.

55 Accordingly, I approve the Bidding Procedures as described in the Riedel Affidavit and the Fourteenth Report of the Monitor, which procedures have been approved by the U.S. Court.

56 I am also satisfied that the Sale Agreement should be approved and further that the Sale Agreement be approved and accepted for the purposes of conducting the "stalking horse" bidding process in accordance with the Bidding Procedures including, without limitation the Break-Up Fee and the Expense Reimbursement (as both terms are defined in the Sale Agreement).

57 Further, I have also been satisfied that Appendix B to the Fourteenth Report contains information which is commercially sensitive, the dissemination of which could be detrimental to the stakeholders and, accordingly, I order that this document be sealed, pending further order of the court.

58 In approving the Bidding Procedures, I have also taken into account that the auction will be conducted prior to the sale approval motion. This process is consistent with the practice of this court.

59 Finally, it is the expectation of this court that the Monitor will continue to review ongoing issues in respect of the Bidding Procedures. The Bidding Procedures permit the Applicants to waive certain components of qualified bids without the consent of the UCC, the bondholder group and the Monitor. However, it is the expectation of this court that, if this situation arises, the Applicants will provide advance notice to the Monitor of its intention to do so.

*Motion granted.*

 

**End of Document** 

# TAB 8

2009 CarswellOnt 8207
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Brainhunter Inc., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 8207, [2009] O.J. No. 5578, 183 A.C.W.S. (3d) 905, 62 C.B.R. (5th) 41

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF BRAINHUNTER INC., BRAINHUNTER CANADA INC., BRAINHUNTER (OTTAWA) INC., PROTEC EMPLOYMENT SERVICES LTD., TREKLOGIC INC. (APPLICANTS)

Morawetz J.

Heard: December 11, 2009
Judgment: December 11, 2009
Written reasons: December 18, 2009
Docket: 09-8482-00CL

Counsel: Jay Swartz, Jim Bunting for Applicants
G. Moffat for Monitor, Deloitte & Touche Inc.
Joseph Bellissimo for Roynat Capital Inc.
Peter J. Osborne for R.N. Singh, Purchaser
Edmond Lamek for Toronto-Dominion Bank
D. Dowdall for Noteholders
D. Ullmann for Procom Consultants Group Inc.

Subject: Insolvency

**Related Abridgment Classifications**

Bankruptcy and insolvency
XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
XIX.3 Arrangements
XIX.3.b Approval by court
XIX.3.b.iv Miscellaneous

**Headnote**

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Approval by court — Miscellaneous

Applicants were protected under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Applicants brought motion for extension of stay period, approval of bid process and approval of "Stalking Horse APA" — Motion granted — Motion was supported by special committee, advisors, key creditor groups and monitor — Opposition came from business competitor and party interested in possibly bidding on assets of applicants — Applicants established that sales transaction was warranted and that sale would benefit economic community — No creditor came forward to object sale of business — It was unnecessary for court to substitute its business judgment for that of applicants.

**Table of Authorities**

**Cases considered by *Morawetz J.*:**

*Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4467, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 229 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

**Statutes considered:**

*Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

 

Generally — referred to

s. 36 — considered

MOTION by applicants for extension of stay and for approval of bid process and agreement.

***Morawetz J.*:**

1 At the conclusion of the hearing on December 11, 2009, I granted the motion with reasons to follow. These are the reasons.

2 The Applicants brought this motion for an extension of the Stay Period, approval of the Bid Process and approval of the Stalking Horse APA between TalentPoint Inc., 2223945 Ontario Ltd., 2223947 Ontario Ltd., and 2223956 Ontario Ltd., as purchasers (collectively, the "Purchasers") and each of the Applicants, as vendors.

3 The affidavit of Mr. Jewitt and the Report of the Monitor dated December 1, 2009 provide a detailed summary of the events that lead to the bringing of this motion.

4 The Monitor recommends that the motion be granted.

5 The motion is also supported by TD Bank, Roynat, and the Noteholders. These parties have the significant economic interest in the Applicants.

6 Counsel on behalf of Mr. Singh and the proposed Purchasers also supports the motion.

7 Opposition has been voiced by counsel on behalf of Procom Consultants Group Inc., a business competitor to the Applicants and a party that has expressed interest in possibly bidding for the assets of the Applicants.

8 The Bid Process, which provides for an auction process, and the proposed Stalking Horse APA have been considered by Breakwall, the independent Special Committee of the Board and the Monitor.

9 Counsel to the Applicants submitted that, absent the certainty that the Applicants' business will continue as a going concern which is created by the Stalking Horse APA and the Bid Process, substantial damage would result to the Applicants' business due to the potential loss of clients, contractors and employees.

10 The Monitor agrees with this assessment. The Monitor has also indicated that it is of the view that the Bid Process is a fair and open process and the best method to either identify the Stalking Horse APA as the highest and best bid for the Applicants' assets or to produce an offer for the Applicants' assets that is superior to the Stalking Horse APA.

11 It is acknowledged that the proposed purchaser under the Stalking Horse APA is an insider and a related party. The Monitor is aware of the complications that arise by having an insider being a bidder. The Monitor has indicated that it is of the view that any competing bids can be evaluated and compared with the Stalking Horse APA, even though the bids may not be based on a standard template.

12 Counsel on behalf of Procom takes issue with the $700,000 break fee which has been provided for in the Stalking Horse APA. He submits that it is neither fair nor necessary to have a break fee. Counsel submits that the break fee will have a chilling effect on the sales process as it will require his client to in effect outbid Mr. Singh's group by in excess of $700,000 before its bid could be considered. The break fee is approximately 2.5% of the total consideration.

13 The use of a stalking horse bid process has become quite popular in recent CCAA filings. In *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, [2009] O.J. No. 3169 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), I approved a stalking horse sale process and set out four factors (the "Nortel Criteria") the court should consider in the exercise of its general statutory discretion to determine whether to authorize a sale process:

(a) Is a sale transaction warranted at this time?

  

(b) Will the sale benefit the whole "economic community"?

(c) Do any of the debtors' creditors have a *bona fide* reason to object to a sale of the business?

(d) Is there a better viable alternative?

14 The Nortel decision predates the recent amendments to the CCAA. This application was filed December 2, 2009 which post-dates the amendments.

15 Section 36 of the CCAA expressly permits the sale of substantially all of the debtors' assets in the absence of a plan. It also sets out certain factors to be considered on such a sale. However, the amendments do not directly assess the factors a court should consider when deciding to approve a sale process.

16 Counsel to the Applicants submitted that a distinction should be drawn between the approval of a sales process and the approval of an actual sale in that the Nortel Criteria is engaged when considering whether to approve a sales process, while s. 36 of the CCAA is engaged when determining whether to approve a sale. Counsel also submitted that s. 36 should also be considered indirectly when applying the Nortel Criteria.

17 I agree with these submissions. There is a distinction between the approval of the sales process and the approval of a sale. Issues can arise after approval of a sales process and prior to the approval of a sale that requires a review in the context of s. 36 of the CCAA. For example, it is only on a sale approval motion that the court can consider whether there has been any unfairness in the working out of the sales process.

18 In this case, the Special Committee, the advisors, the key creditor groups and the Monitor all expressed support for the Applicants' process.

19 In my view, the Applicants have established that a sales transaction is warranted at this time and that the sale will be of benefit to the "economic community". I am also satisfied that no better alternative has been put forward. In addition, no creditor has come forward to object to a sale of the business.

20 With respect to the possibility that the break fee may deter other bidders, this is a business point that has been considered by the Applicants, its advisors and key creditor groups. At 2.5% of the amount of the bid, the break fee is consistent with break fees that have been approved by this court in other proceedings. The record makes it clear that the break fee issue has been considered and, in the exercise of their business judgment, the Special Committee unanimously recommended to the Board and the Board unanimously approved the break fee. In the circumstances of this case, it is not appropriate or necessary for the court to substitute its business judgment for that of the Applicants.

21 For the foregoing reasons, I am satisfied that the Bid Process and the Stalking Horse APA be approved.

22 For greater certainty, a bid will not be disqualified as a Qualified Bid (or a bidder as a Qualified Bidder) for the reason that the bid does not contemplate the bidder offering employment to all or substantially all of the employees of the Applicants or assuming liabilities to employees on terms comparable to those set out in s. 5.6 of the Stalking Horse Bid. However, this may be considered as a factor in comparing the relative value of competing bids.

23 The Applicants also seek an extension of the Stay Period to coincide with the timelines in the Bid Process. The timelines call for the transaction to close in either February or March, 2010 depending on whether there is a plan of arrangement proposed.

24 Having reviewed the record and heard submissions, I am satisfied that the Applicants have acted, and are acting, in good faith and with due diligence and that circumstances exist that make the granting of an extension appropriate. Accordingly, the Stay Period is extended to February 8, 2010.

25 An order shall issue to give effect to the foregoing.

 

# TAB 9

2017 ONSC 673
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Nortel Networks Corp., Re

2017 CarswellOnt 1122, 2017 ONSC 673, 275 A.C.W.S. (3d) 696, 44 C.B.R. (6th) 289

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

IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF NORTEL NETWORKS CORPORATION, NORTEL NETWORKS LIMITED, NORTEL NETWORKS GLOBAL CORPORATION, NORTEL NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION and NORTEL NETWORKS TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION

Newbould J.

Heard: January 12, 2017
Judgment: January 27, 2017
Docket: 09-CL-7950

Counsel: Jessica A. Kimmel for Monitor
Susan Philpott for Former Nortel employees
Lily Harmer for Superintendent of Financial Services as Administrator of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund
Byron Shaw for Administrator of the Nortel Networks Managerial and NonNegotiated Pension Plan and Nortel Networks Negotiated Pension Plan
Thomas McRae for Nortel Canadian continuing employees
Michael E. Barrack, D.J Miller for Nortel Networks UK Pension Trust Limited and Board of the Pension Protection Fund
Adam Slavens for Nortel Networks Inc.
Michael Wunder for Unsecured Creditors Committee
Gavin H. Finlayson, Amanda C. McLachlan for Ad Hoc Group of Bondholders
Matthew-Milne Smith for EMEA Debtors
John Salmas for Indenture Trustee, Wilmington Trust, N.A.

Subject: Insolvency
**Related Abridgment Classifications**
Bankruptcy and insolvency
XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
XIX.2 Initial application
XIX.2.g Monitor
**Headnote**
Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Initial application — Monitor
Passing accounts — Telecommunications company N, which had over 140 corporate entities in 60 jurisdictions, became insolvent — Canadian N debtors filed for Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) protection in 2009 — Monitor was twice granted extraordinary expanded powers, resulting in Monitor and its counsel undertaking significantly greater scope of work than in typical CCAA case — In 2017, Monitor of Canadian debtors brought motion for order passing its accounts in amount of CA$122,972,821.96, accounts of its Canadian legal counsel in amount of CA$99,994,744.85, and accounts of its U.S. legal counsel in amount of $31,352,136.73, incurred between 2009 to 2016 — Motion granted — Accounts approved — Monitor's duties were far more complex than normal due to matrix way in which N's business was operated — Extensive joint discovery process to resolve claims played large role in costs getting out of hand, and was not fault of Monitor — Monitor and counsel tried to be as efficient as possible in difficult circumstances and overall achieved very favourable outcomes for Canadian

 

creditors — Proceedings were unprecedented in terms of size, complexity, international aspects and vast number of competing interests — Nature, extent and value of assets realized for creditors was significant — Billings over relevant period comprised combined total of 384,652.6 professional hours — Monitor and counsel's professional rates and disbursements were reasonable.

**Table of Authorities**

**Cases considered by *Newbould J.*:**

*Bank of Nova Scotia v. Diemer* (2014), 2014 ONSC 365, 2014 CarswellOnt 666 (Ont. S.C.J.) — followed

*Bank of Nova Scotia v. Diemer* (2014), 2014 ONCA 851, 2014 CarswellOnt 16721, 20 C.B.R. (6th) 292, 327 O.A.C. 376 (Ont. C.A.) — followed

*Belyea v. Federal Business Development Bank* (1983), 46 C.B.R. (N.S.) 244, 44 N.B.R. (2d) 248, 116 A.P.R. 248, 1983 CarswellNB 27 (N.B. C.A.) — followed

*Confectionately Yours Inc., Re* (2002), 2002 CarswellOnt 3002, 36 C.B.R. (4th) 200, 164 O.A.C. 84, 25 C.P.C. (5th) 207, 219 D.L.R. (4th) 72 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

*Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (2014), 2014 ONSC 6973, 2014 CarswellOnt 17291, 20 C.B.R. (6th) 171, 17 C.C.P.B. (2nd) 10 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

*Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (2015), 2015 ONSC 2987, 2015 CarswellOnt 7072, 27 C.B.R. (6th) 175 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

*Tepper Holdings Inc., Re* (2011), 2011 NBQB 311, 2011 CarswellNB 592, 82 C.B.R. (5th) 293, 984 A.P.R. 1, 381 N.B.R. (2d) 1, 2011 CarswellNB 849, 2011 NBBR 311 (N.B. T.D.) — referred to

*Triton Tubular Components Corp., Re* (2006), 2006 CarswellOnt 2120, 20 C.B.R. (5th) 278 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

*Winalta Inc., Re* (2011), 2011 ABQB 399, 2011 CarswellAlta 2237, 84 C.B.R. (5th) 157, 521 A.R. 1 (Alta. Q.B.) — followed

**Statutes considered:**

*Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3

Generally — referred to

*Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

*Pensions Act*, 1995, c. 26

s. 75 — considered

*Pensions Act 2004*, 2004, c. 35

Generally — referred to

MOTION by monitor of insolvent company for passing of accounts of monitor and its counsel incurred during *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* proceedings.

***Newbould J.*:**

**Introduction**

1 Ernst & Young Inc. in its capacity as Monitor of Nortel Networks Corporation ("NNC"), Nortel Networks Limited ("NNL"), Nortel Networks Technology Corporation, Nortel Networks International Corporation, Nortel Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Communications Inc., Architel Systems Corporation and Northern Telecom Canada Limited (collectively, the "Canadian Debtors"), moves for an order passing the accounts of the Monitor and of its counsel incurred during the period January 14, 2009, the date these CCAA proceedings were commenced, through to and including May 31, 2016.

2 The background to this sorry saga has been described in a number of decisions. [1]

3 At the time of the filing under the CCAA, Nortel consisted of more than 140 separate corporate entities located in 60 separate sovereign jurisdictions including Canada, the United States and the EMEA [2] region, as well as the Caribbean and

  

10 Most of the core parties in the insolvency proceedings do not object to the accounts as proposed by the Monitor being passed. This is due to the final settlement reached by them. The Canadian allocation decision became final after the Court of Appeal refused leave to appeal the decision of this Court. However appeals were brought in the U.S. from the allocation decision of Judge Gross. These appeals and the allocation of the $7.3 billion sale escrow proceeds were finally settled after mediation by a Settlement Agreement on October 12, 2016. It was a term of the Settlement Agreement that no party to it could contest the fees and disbursements of any other party to it.

11 The UKPC at one point in a pre-hearing conference took the position that the Monitor's motion to approve its fees and disbursements should be adjourned until after January 24, 2017, the date on which motions seeking an order sanctioning the Plan of Compromise and Arrangement proposed by the Canadian Debtors and seeking confirmation of the First Amended Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Arrangement proposed by the US Debtors would be heard in a joint hearing by this Court and by Judge Gross of the US Bankruptcy Court. The UKPC said that if the Plans were sanctioned and the Settlement Agreement became effective, it would take no position on the Monitor's fee approval motion. I declined to adjourn the Monitor's motion. At the hearing of the motion, counsel for the UKPC said that no adjournment request was now being made. Thus there is no opposition to the Monitor's motion by the UKPC.

12 The only opposition to the passing of the accounts of the Monitor was by The Bank of New York Mellon, as Indenture Trustee to some of the bonds issued by Nortel. [3] It took the position that it is not possible based on the material filed by the Monitor to do an analysis required on a passing of accounts and offered a suggestion that a practical solution is to refer the matter to a Master, to an Assessment Officer or to an outside expert. Such person could do due diligence on staffing, hours and rates, and provide the Court with a Report organized around the major activity blocks and identifying any potential issues or matters for consideration by the Court. Counsel for the Indenture Trustee later advised that it was not taking a position on the substance of the motion and did not appear at the hearing of the motion. For reasons that will follow, I do not think such a reference is necessary, nor would it be a practical solution.

**Considerations on a passing of a Monitor's accounts**

13 There are few cases dealing with the factors to consider on a passing of the accounts of a monitor. Most deal with a receiver's accounts. However I agree with Justice Topolniski in *Winalta Inc., Re* (2011), 84 C.B.R. (5th) 157 (Alta. Q.B.) that there should be no difference in dealing with a monitor's accounts and that the onus is on a monitor to make out its case. She stated:

> 30 In my view, the appropriate focus on an application to approve a CCAA monitor's fees is no different than that in a receivership or bankruptcy. The question is whether the fees are fair and reasonable in all of the circumstances. The concerns are ensuring that the monitor is fairly compensated while safeguarding the efficiency and integrity of the CCAA process. As with any inquiry, the evidence proffered will be important in making those determinations.
>
> 32 I am not aware of any reported authority supporting the proposition that there is a presumption of regularity that applies to a monitor's fees. This application is no different than any other. The applicant, here the Monitor, bears the onus of making out its case. A bald assertion by the Monitor that the Fee is reasonable does not necessarily make it so. The Monitor must provide the court with cogent evidence on which the court can base its assessment of whether the Fee is fair and reasonable in all of the circumstances.

14 So far as the test for reviewing a receiver's fees is concerned, the New Brunswick Court of Appeal in *Belyea v. Federal Business Development Bank* (1983), 44 N.B.R. (2d) 248 (N.B. C.A.) referred to a number of factors to be considered. These factors have been accepted in Ontario as being a useful guideline but not an exhaustive list as other factors may be material in any particular case. See *Confectionately Yours Inc., Re* (2002), 36 C.B.R. (4th) 200 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 51 ("*Bakemates*") and *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Diemer*, 2014 ONSC 365 (Ont. S.C.J.) at para. 5, aff'd, (2014), 20 C.B.R. (6th) 292 (Ont. C.A.). In *Diemer*, Pepall J.A. listed the factors as follows:

  

33 The court endorsed the factors applicable to receiver's compensation described by the New Brunswick Court of Appeal in *Belyea: Bakemates*, at para. 51. In *Belyea*, at para. 9, Stratton J.A. listed the following factors:

- the nature, extent and value of the assets;
- the complications and difficulties encountered;
- the degree of assistance provided by the debtor;
- the time spent;
- the receiver's knowledge, experience and skill;
- the diligence and thoroughness displayed;
- the responsibilities assumed;
- the results of the receiver's efforts; and
- the cost of comparable services when performed in a prudent and economical manner.

These factors constitute a useful guideline but are not exhaustive: *Bakemates*, at para. 51.

15 Justice Pepall further stated:

45 ... That said, in proceedings supervised by the court and particularly where the court is asked to give its imprimatur to the legal fees requested for counsel by its court officer, the court must ensure that the compensation sought is indeed fair and reasonable. In making this assessment, all the *Belyea* factors, including time spent, should be considered. However, value provided should pre-dominate over the mathematical calculation reflected in the hours times hourly rate equation. Ideally, the two should be synonymous, but that should not be the starting assumption. Thus, the factors identified in *Belyea* require a consideration of the overall value contributed by the receiver's counsel. The focus of the fair and reasonable assessment should be on what was accomplished, not on how much time it took. Of course, the measurement of accomplishment may include consideration of complications and difficulties encountered in the receivership.

16 As stated, The Bank of New York Mellon, as Indenture Trustee took the position that it is not possible based on the material filed by the Monitor to do an analysis required on a passing of accounts. It offered a suggestion that a practical solution is to refer the matter to a Master, an Assessment Officer or an outside expert. I do not agree with this suggestion. In my view there is sufficient evidence to undertake a proper consideration of the accounts of the Monitor taking into account the factors to be considered in arriving at a fair and reasonable result.

17 The time and expense of referring the accounts to someone else would be very time consuming, create further expense and delay completion of this matter that has gone on far too long. The Initial Order directed the accounts to be passed by this Court. That makes sense, particularly as no other person has the familiarity of what has gone on in the Nortel insolvency as the Court has. These considerations have led other courts to decline to send the accounts out for review by others. See *Tepper Holdings Inc., Re* (2011), 381 N.B.R. (2d) 1 (N.B. T.D.) at para. 3; *Triton Tubular Components Corp., Re* (2006), 20 C.B.R. (5th) 278 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 83.

18 The Superintendent of Financial Services as administrator of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund has been involved in these proceedings from the outset in January, 2009 and has been a member of the Canadian Only Creditors Committee (the "CCC"). The Superintendent supports the motion for an order passing the accounts of the Monitor and opposes the appointment of a special fee examiner to review the Monitor's accounts. It takes the position that his would create unnecessary and unwarranted additional expense and potential delay by virtue of the need to educate the examiner with respect to these hugely complex proceedings, particularly if the examiner was independent of the court with additional professional costs. The

  

Superintendent further states that it is satisfied with a high level assessment of the Monitor's accounts in this case by this Court, given this Court's familiarity with many of the complexities of the proceedings, and by reference to the significantly higher costs incurred by the other Estates.

19 Morneau Shepell Ltd., was appointed the Administrator of the Nortel Networks Managerial and Non-Negotiated Pension Plan and the Nortel Networks Negotiated Pension Plan in October 2010 and has been actively involved in the CCAA restructuring process. It is one of the largest creditors of the Canadian Debtors. It takes the same position as the Superintendent regarding any attempt to have the accounts of the Monitor examined by some other party. It states that more litigation or court process in relation to the Monitor's accounts should be strongly discouraged and avoided. Far too much time and too much of the Canadian estate's resources have been consumed with seemingly endless litigation. More court process only delays, and may diminish, the distribution of assets available to creditors.

20 Michel E. Campbell is a former engineer employed by Nortel. Since the January 2009 CCAA filing, he has been heavily involved in the proceedings as a court-appointed representative of approximately 21,000 Nortel former employees, as an active member of the Nortel Retirees and Former Employees Protection Canada ("NRPC"), and as a claimant against the Nortel estate for the loss of severance and termination pay. He estimates that he has spent over 4,000 hours on issues in the proceedings relating to employee issues. As one of the former employees and as a court-appointed Representative, he has a financial stake in these proceedings. He too supports the passing of the Monitor's accounts and does not think a referral of the accounts to some third party is desirable. He states in his affidavit:

> 44. Moreover, given the volume and nature of the information provided in the Monitor's materials filed for this motion, and the fact that the fees as disclosed are subject to this Court's approval, I see no reason for another third party review or assessment. In any event, such a third party review would create more expense and delay in these proceedings, and would likely further postpone approval of the Plan of Arrangement and distributions on claims, which is far from desirable. The Former Employees have been waiting now for almost eight years to receive some payment for their losses. Further, it would be difficult for a third party who lacks background knowledge of this case to conduct a reliable, meaningful or accurate assessment of the Monitor's fees without the expenditure of considerable additional time and resources of the Monitor to provide information to the third party reviewer. This Court is by far the more appropriate arbiter of the Monitor's fees.

21 This case requires an overall assessment of the work done and a consideration of the results achieved. A line by line particularization of each particular job and each particular invoice would involve no doubt hundreds of thousands of dollars, taken the amount of activity and time involved in various matters. As well, in this case it is by no means the case that each task was discrete and could easily be separated out. As was stated by Justice Pepall, the value provided should pre-dominate the consideration of what a fair and reasonable amount is appropriate. A detailed assessment in this case would not be practical or serve that purpose.

**Consideration of the Monitor's accounts**

22 The Monitor engaged Goodmans LLP ("Goodmans") as its Canadian legal counsel, Allen & Overy LLP ("A&O") as its U.S. legal counsel and Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC ("BIR") as its Delaware local legal counsel. A large number of professionals from the Monitor's firm E & Y, from Goodmans and from A&O were involved throughout these proceedings. The accounts from each of those firms are included in the passing of accounts with affidavits supporting the accounts.

23 The Monitor seeks approval of its accounts in the amount of CA$122,972,821.96, inclusive of applicable taxes. This amount includes billings for 200,065.4 professional hours at an average hourly rate of CA$540.

24 The Monitor also seeks to pass the accounts of Goodmans in the amount of CA$99,994,744.85, inclusive of applicable taxes. This amount includes billings for 134,562.4 professional hours at an average hourly rate of CA$643.

25 The Monitor also seeks to pass the accounts of A&O in the amount of $31,352,136.73, inclusive of applicable taxes. This amount includes billings for 46,448.4 professional hours at an average hourly rate of $639.

 