

This is the 1st Affidavit of Jordan Beaulieu in this case and was made on September 17, 2024

> No. S-243389 Vancouver Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

IN BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY

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

BETWEEN:

SANOVEST HOLDINGS LTD.

PETITIONER

AND:

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

RESPONDENTS

<u>AFFIDAVIT</u>

- I, Jordan Beaulieu, of 2900 550 Burrard Street, Vancouver, B.C., SWEAR THAT:
- 1. I am a legal assistant in the law firm of Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP, solicitors for the Petitioner, Sanovest Holdings Ltd., and as such have personal knowledge of the facts

hereinafter deposed to except where stated to be on information and belief, in which case I verily believe them to be true.

2. Attached and marked as **Exhibit "A"** is a true copy of a transcript of proceedings in chambers from 11:48 to 3:01pm on Thursday, September 12, 2024.

SWORN BEFORE ME at Vancouver, British Columbia, on September 17, 2024.

A Commissioner for taking Affidavits for British Columbia

JORDAN BEAULIEU

LISA HIEBERT
Barrister & Solicitor
Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP
2900 - 550 Burrard Street
Vancouver, BC V6C 0A3
604 631 4977

OO 1

A commissioner for taking Affidavits for British Columbia

No. S234048 Vancouver Registry

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

Vancouver, BC September 12, 2024

BETWEEN:

599315 B.C. LTD. and DANIEL MATTHEWS

Petitioners

AND:

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

Respondents

No. S243389 Vancouver Registry

IN BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY

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

BETWEEN:

SANOVEST HOLDINGS LTD.

AND:

Petitioners

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

Respondents

EXCERPT FROM PROCEEDINGS IN CHAMBERS (Proceedings from 11:48 AM to 3:01 PM)

COPY

Charest Legal Solutions Inc. CharestLS.com

APPEARANCES

Counsel for the petitioners:

G. Brandt C. Ferris W. Roberts C. Ohama-Darcus

Counsel for the respondents:

A. Nathanson L. Herbert K. Jackson D. Byma

Counsel for the receiver:

P. Rubin

Charest Legal Solutions Inc. CharestLS.com

EXCERPT FROM PROCEEDINGS IN CHAMBERS SEPTEMBER 12, 2024 (Proceedings from 11:48 AM to 3:01 PM)

PROCEEDINGS

Witness	Proceedings	Page
	Discussion re terms of receivership agreement	1
	Submissions by Cnsl C. Ferris	9
	Discussion re terms of receivership agreement	19
	Submissions by Cnsl A. Nathanson	23
	Reporter certification	40

EXHIBITS

l I		
Exhibit	- max	
CXIIID	Description	
L		Page

No exhibits marked.

```
September 12, 2024
                                       Vancouver, BC
 3
                 (EXCERPT FROM PROCEEDINGS)
 5
 6
                 (PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 10:02 AM)
 7
                 (EXCERPT BEGINS AT 11:48 PM)
 8
 9
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Just before --
       THE CLERK: We're back on the record, Justice.
10
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: Justice, you've browbeat us into
11
            submission. We've come to what we think is an
12
13
            agreed form of order --
14
       THE COURT: Okay.
15
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- that -- I'm going to give you an
16
            outline of it.
17
       THE COURT: Okay.
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: What our proposal is is between now
18
19
            and 2:00 PM we would go work on it --
20
       THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- and either come to an agreement
21
            on, yes, we've got it right, or if we don't then
22
23
            so be it.
24
       THE COURT:
                  Okay.
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: But the -- the form is there will
25
           be -- A&M will be appointed as receiver over --
26
27
            remember before I said development and resort?
28
           We're not going to draw that distinction -- will
29
           be appointed as receiver over lands with
30
           carveout -- not as receiver over operations.
           to have sufficient power to investigate both
31
32
           lands, sales process, and operations, and to come
33
           back to you and make a report about what happens
34
           next, both in terms of sales process and if the
35
           receiver says they should do something about
           operations, they can make their recommendation as
36
37
           well.
38
      THE COURT:
                  So when you say "lands," you're going to
39
           refer to all of the lands --
40
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Correct.
41
      THE COURT:
                  -- out of the assets? All right.
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Correct. And that's why it gets --
42
43
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
44
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- it's more nuanced.
45
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
46
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Power to borrow --
47
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
```

```
CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- at the receiver's discretion
            including paying payables of either of
            developments or resorts in the receiver's
 3
            discretion, all secured by a priority charge.
            And power to compel sufficient necessary
 5
            information to make that report to you --
 7
       THE COURT: Okay.
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
 8
                         -- and to come back as the receiver
            sees fit to deal with any interim issues that it
 9
10
            sees arising.
11
       THE COURT: Okay.
12
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Yes? Sure.
                                      Yeah, no.
       THE COURT: And I'd like to have some time frame put
13
            on when. So the receiver's told, look, it's not
14
            three months or four months before you come back.
15
16
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         Yes. Good.
17
       THE COURT: It needs to be -- I mean, there's some --
18
            the parties have rightly pointed out some
19
            commercial urgency to this.
20
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         Yes.
21
       THE COURT:
                  Yeah, so I think --
22
       CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        And so our plan was to talk to the
23
            receiver and receiver's counsel over the break.
24
       THE COURT: All right.
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: In my mind it was 60 days.
25
26
            receiver may tell me something different.
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Right. Yeah, we thought there's two
27
28
            things to report on, Justice.
                                           There was the --
29
            the issue about operations and management.
30
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
31
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         We thought -- I think we had 30 days
32
            as a concept for that.
33
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: But we do want to make sure we're
34
35
           not putting the court's officer in a -- in a
36
           bind --
37
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
38
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         -- where he's saying, what are you
39
            talking about.
40
                  Because in my --
      CNSL K. JACKSON: And then there's a separate question
41
42
           which is the -- what to do about a sale process.
43
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: And that probably will take a bit
44
45
           longer.
      THE COURT: Right.
46
47
      CNSL K. JACKSON: And we were content to suggest
```

```
that we leave that to the discretion of the
 2
            receiver, noting that they'll want to get going.
 3
       THE COURT:
                  Right.
       CNSL K. JACKSON: But if the court is more comfortable
 4
 5
            having a deadline, then we should probably put it
 6
            to them as to what that might be.
 7
       THE COURT:
                  All right.
 8
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Receiver [indiscernible] --
      THE COURT: Well, keep -- bear this in mind too, I
 9
10
            start a long trial supposedly on October 7th.
11
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Okay.
      THE COURT: So I want to be able to carve out --
12
13
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: M'mm-hmm.
14
      THE COURT:
                  -- set some specific days that you know
15
            you can come back.
16
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Good.
17
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         That was one of the things we
18
           mentioned we were going to do --
19
                  Because I -- it's supposed to be a
      THE COURT:
20
            nine-week trial.
21
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Sorry.
22
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         Ouch.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: We were going to come back --
23
      THE COURT: There will be some breaks in it, and I --
24
25
           and I have some time away in November. So I want
26
           to be able to say, all right, look --
27
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Right.
28
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         Good.
29
      THE COURT: -- to the parties in the long trial, if it
30
           goes, you're not going to be sitting on this
31
            date.
32
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Yeah.
33
      THE COURT: Because there's an -- you're going to
34
           be -- expectation the receiver comes back.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: I think we will have a pretty good
35
36
           line of sight on that over the lunch hour.
      THE COURT: Yeah, if we could -- because this -- oh,
37
38
           there's Mr. Rubin now.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Right.
39
40
                  If -- if we -- if we set it so that
      THE COURT:
41
           sometime in October you come -- the receiver
42
           comes back --
43
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Right.
      THE COURT: -- we know there's a day there --
44
45
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Exactly.
      THE COURT: -- and I can -- I can carve that out.
46
47
           Because I don't think this should be --
```

```
CNSL K. JACKSON:
                          No.
       THE COURT: I should -- I think I should hear at least
 2
 3
            the next couple of applications.
 4
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Absolutely. No. No.
                                                 No. We --
            well, Justice, we hope -- in the ordinary course
 5
 6
            you would normally be seized of the process.
 7
       THE COURT: Yeah.
 8
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                          And it would be helpful to have that
            here of course again. On the -- and so we'll
 9
10
            come up with a date, but if the report -- you
            know, the first report is within a month or so --
11
12
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
13
       CNSL K. JACKSON: -- end of October.
       THE COURT: Yeah. We --
14
       CNSL K. JACKSON: But we'll ask for some dates from
15
            the receiver's counsel and come back to you with
16
17
            a suggestion.
18
       THE COURT: Yeah, we can -- no, we could come -- I
19
            could carve out a date --
20
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Right.
21
       THE COURT:
                  -- for hearing late -- at the very end of
22
            October.
23
       CNSL K. JACKSON: And what might arise -- anything
24
            that arises from that. Yeah.
25
       THE COURT: Yeah. Otherwise, if there's something
            urgent, I can hear it at 9:00 or 4:30 --
26
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Of course. Of course.
27
       THE COURT: -- or 4:00 o'clock.
28
       CNSL K. JACKSON: All right. And so, Justice, one of
29
            the -- one of the concepts baked in here is -- I
30
            mean, it's -- just to be clear, it's -- it's all assets -- the easier way to do it is not to
31
32
            describe what they're appointed over. I mean,
33
34
            the real assets are the lands, but it's all
35
            assets but not the business and not the
36
            operations.
37
      THE COURT:
                   Right.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: That's really what we're looking at
38
39
            here. And those remain with EBMD, Ecoasis Bear
40
            Mountain will continue to manage.
41
                 There is the borrowings power. My friend --
42
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
43
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         I want to be clear on something
44
            just -- just so it's not lost. My friend pointed
45
            out that there is a borrowings power for the
            receiver, and it has the -- the -- it is -- it
46
47
           is -- it has a discretion, because the -- the
```

```
discretion as to whether to lend funds to the --
            to the business which is not in receivership.
 3
       THE COURT:
                    M'mm-hmm.
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                          So -- so -- which is -- it creates
            an interesting distinction.
 6
       THE COURT:
                    Yeah.
 7
       CNSL K. JACKSON: You wouldn't see that in many
            receiverships, where receivership borrowings are
 9
            being used to fund a business or an operation
10
            outside of the receivership fold.
11
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
12
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Now -- now, my friend's client has
13
            insisted upon that discretion in favour of the
14
            receiver.
15
       THE COURT:
                   So the receiver can obtain borrowings for
16
            the business?
17
       CNSL K. JACKSON: That it's not receiver of.
18
       THE COURT:
                    Right.
19
       CNSL K. JACKSON: It's a bit unusual.
20
       THE COURT: Interesting.
21
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Right.
                                  Right.
                                           Interesting is -- is
22
            right.
       THE COURT: So it would require court approval for
23
24
            that, or ...?
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Well, the intention is to have the
25
26
            borrowings -- the order to authorize that loan, effectively, from the -- from the receiver -- the
27
28
            receivership estate to the business, and that
29
            will be in the receiver's discretion. And one of
30
            the things we said was it's a bit, well, first,
31
            unexpected given submissions about -- about --
32
            about liquidity of the business.
33
                 But leaving that aside for a moment, it
34
            would need to be secured --
35
       THE COURT:
                   That's --
36
      CNSL K. JACKSON: -- back in favour of the estate.
37
            And so where you see --
38
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: -- as you know, in CCAAs where they
39
            all say any intercompany advances during this
40
41
            process are secured in favour of the company --
42
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
43
      CNSL K. JACKSON: -- making the advances, the order that we would propose and that we'll be working
44
45
            on -- and I've talked about this with my
            friend -- is that the advances from the estate to
46
47
            the business outside the receivership would be
```

```
secured with a first charge over the business.
 2
      THE COURT: Okay.
                         So there's not going be a fight
 3
            later over the nature of the security?
      CNSL K. JACKSON: That's right. No.
 4
 5
      THE COURT:
                  I want to make sure you can --
 6
      CNSL K. JACKSON: It would be clear as to what it is.
 7
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: And, you know, this all may be moot
 8
           if in the end the business is brought into the
9
10
           receivership.
11
      THE COURT: Right.
12
      CNSL K. JACKSON: But if it remains outside, it will
13
           simply have an obligation back to the -- to the
14
           estate.
      THE COURT: Okay.
15
16
      CNSL K. JACKSON: So that's the concept.
                                                 I think I've
17
           got that right.
18
      THE COURT:
                  Okay. Very good.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Very good.
19
20
      THE COURT:
                  All right.
21
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Sorry. And I would add -- and
22
           Mr. Brandt just reminded me -- in it we're going
23
           to carve out the arbitration --
24
      THE COURT: Arbitration, of course.
25
                         -- proceedings, so they could just
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
26
            [indiscernible].
27
      THE COURT:
                  Okay. What's that?
28
      CNSL K. JACKSON: One small thing, hardly worth
29
           mentioning, when we said "the lands," we said all
30
           the lands.
                       And I thought that, I just want to be
31
           clear, it includes the BMA lands --
32
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
33
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         -- which I think were one of the
34
           things my friend had raised as being in question.
35
           But I don't see why it wouldn't be. I mean, it
36
           would be strange to have --
37
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
38
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        -- one thing carved out of this
39
           whole fold.
40
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
                          Yeah.
41
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        Lets talk about that.
                                                It's hard to
42
           get instructions over the rail.
43
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
44
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        How long do we need?
45
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Five minutes? Just ...
46
47
      THE COURT: I'll stand you down for five minutes.
```

```
CNSL W. ROBERTS: Very good. Thank you, Justice.
      THE COURT: I think if you can, if it helps, have --
 2
 3
            letting the receiver have the authority over all
            the lands to -- you can see the sense in that.
            And -- and to allay concerns that either party
            may have, the receiver can't do anything with
 7
            them --
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
 8
                         Yeah.
                                Right.
 9
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Right.
10
      THE COURT: -- with the lands.
                                       He can't sell them or
11
            anything until he gets court approval.
12
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Yeah.
13
      THE COURT:
                  So --
14
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Even try to sell them.
15
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
16
      CNSL K. JACKSON: That's right. THE COURT: Yeah. Even -- even
17
                          Even -- even to engage, the lis has
18
            to be worked out.
19
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Right.
20
                  So I think it protects everyone from the
      THE COURT:
21
            other side doing something inappropriate with
22
            the -- the BMA land.
23
      CNSL K. JACKSON: We agree, Justice.
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: We might not agree, but I'll find
24
25
            out.
26
      THE COURT:
                  It just seems to me that given the great
27
            deal of distrust --
28
      CNSL K. JACKSON: M'mm-hmm.
29
      THE COURT:
                  -- that if you -- if you have this
30
            independent officer dealing with all the lands,
31
            including that one, parties know they retain
32
            their rights to come to court and say, we don't
33
            agree, but they know the other one can't do
34
            something untoward or inappropriate --
35
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Right.
36
      THE COURT:
                   -- relating to that piece of property in
37
            the meantime.
38
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Understood.
39
      THE COURT:
                   It just avoids another lawsuit about that.
40
            It just seems to -- I'll leave it at that.
41
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Thank you, Justice.
42
      THE COURT:
                   I'll stand outside waiting.
                                                 Thank you.
43
      THE CLERK:
                   Order in chambers. These chambers are
44
            stood down for a few minutes.
45
46
                 (PROCEEDINGS RECESSED AT 11:56 AM)
47
```

(PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED AT 12:06 PM)

```
THE COURT:
                   Are we on?
       THE CLERK:
                   We're back on record, Justice.
       THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Roberts?
CNSL W. ROBERTS: Thank you. We've agreed that the
            BMA lands --
      THE COURT: Okay. Good.
 8
       CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- which are described as "the
 9
            Gondola lands," are in.
10
       THE COURT:
                  Good.
11
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         So we are going to go hash out an
12
            order. And we --
      THE COURT: Does 2:00 o'clock give you enough time, or
13
14
      do you need a little bit longer than that?
CNSL W. ROBERTS: I think -- I think we should -- we
15
16
            should set for 2:00.
17
       THE COURT: All right.
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: And then we'll come let Madam
18
19
            Registrar know if we need longer. But then we --
20
            yeah.
21
      THE COURT:
                   All right.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Our view -- no, our view is if we
22
23
            haven't got this resolved largely by 2:00 then
24
            they'd better finish their submissions in 15
25
            minutes.
26
      THE COURT:
                   There's a problem. All right. All right.
27
            Good.
                   Okay.
28
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                         Fair.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Justice, just so you know, I think
29
30
            he's on the record, but Peter Rubin is present in
31
            the courtroom.
32
                   Right. And he's going to be acting for --
      THE COURT:
33
      CNSL K. JACKSON: And so he's now on the record --
34
                  -- A&M. Okay. Good.
      THE COURT:
      CNSL K. JACKSON: -- as counsel for A&M.
35
                   Good. All right. Well, that's good.
36
      THE COURT:
37
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Excellent.
                   And then you're going to be bringing the
38
      THE COURT:
            CPC order to -- I just heard?
39
40
                   That's right.
      THE CLERK:
                                  For 2:00 o'clock.
41
      THE COURT:
                   Okay. We'll deal with that right away
42
            then.
43
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Okay. Thank you, Justice.
      THE COURT: All right. Well, thank you very much.
44
45
            That's --
46
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Justice, I just want to be clear
47
            because I haven't been in all these
```

9 Submissions by Cnsl C. Ferris

```
conversations. So if -- are we -- we're standing
            down now --
      THE COURT:
                  Until 2:00.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Okay.
                                  And if there's no
 5
            agreement, my friends are going to finish their
 6
            submissions in 15 minutes and then I'm going to
 7
            be up?
 8
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        Yes.
 9
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Mr. Roberts said he was done, so --
10
      THE COURT: Mr. Ferris says yes.
11
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Yes.
      CNSL G. BRANDT: Yes, very good. Okay.
12
13
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Okay. Thank you.
14
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
15
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Yeah.
      THE COURT: And if it turns out there is an agreement
16
           and we're just going through the form of the
17
18
            order, then --
19
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Right.
      THE COURT: -- certain counsel can be excused, I would
20
21
            think.
22
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          Yes.
                                 That would be great.
23
            you.
24
      THE COURT:
                   Okay. All right.
                                      Thank you very much
25
           then.
                   Thank you.
26
      THE CLERK:
                  Order in chambers.
                                      We're adjourned --
27
      THE COURT:
                  And just make sure you work out that date
28
           later on in October too.
29
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          Thank you.
30
      CNSL K. JACKSON: The week we're looking for.
31
           you.
32
      THE COURT:
                  Yes, it's important. Okay.
                                                Thank you.
33
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Good.
                               Very good. Thank you.
34
      THE CLERK: Order in chambers. These chambers are
35
           adjourned until 2:00 PM.
36
37
                 (PROCEEDINGS RECESSED AT 12:08 PM)
38
                 (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED AT 2:08 PM)
39
40
      THE COURT:
                  We've just got to go on --
41
      THE CLERK:
                  We're now back on the record, Justice.
42
      THE COURT:
                  All right. Okay. Now, go ahead,
43
           Mr. Ferris.
44
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       So, Justice, I -- I understand -- I
45
           haven't had an update, so I understand that
46
           there's still work being done --
47
      THE COURT: Okay.
```

```
CNSL C. FERRIS: -- on an order. I don't know whether
            that -- it will be agreed or not --
       THE COURT: Okay.
 3
       CNSL C. FERRIS: -- but I understand they're ongoing.
 4
 5
            And in light of the timing and my --
 6
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
       CNSL C. FERRIS: -- friend's concerns, we thought we
 7
 8
            would just get going and proceed.
 9
                   Okay.
10
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        And if it pops up, it pops up.
11
       THE COURT: All right.
       CNSL C. FERRIS: So I'm here to -- to finish.
12
            I agreed, I have 15 minutes. Hopefully I won't
13
14
            take all of that time, because I'm really just
15
            going to address one final point which is the
16
            test and the jurisdiction under the corporate
17
            statute and why we think that that jurisdiction
18
            is available to you.
19
                 And so I'm going to jump through a number of
20
            smaller parts of the argument.
       THE COURT: So what should I have in front of me then?
21
       CNSL C. FERRIS: So you should only need the argument
22
23
            and perhaps the books of authority.
24
       THE COURT: Okay.
       CNSL C. FERRIS: But -- but maybe just -- lets just
25
26
            start on the argument.
27
       THE COURT: I've got the argument here.
       CNSL C. FERRIS: We'll see how we get -- how we get
28
29
            going.
30
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
31
       CNSL C. FERRIS: So I'm on page 47. I'm at
32
            paragraph 206.
33
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
34
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And just to remind you that, on what
            we call the funding application, 599 and Matthews
35
            has sought relief under 227(3) of the Business
36
37
            Corporation Act as well as the Law and Equity
                  And so I'm -- I'm focussing my submissions
38
            just on 227(3) of the Business Corporations Act.
39
40
                 And so from there I'm going to jump -- I'm
           going to jump over to page 51, paragraph 219. And essentially my friends and I are ad idem that
41
42
           the test under the Business Corporations Act is
43
44
           the -- is the RJR MacDonald injunction test.
           Whether it's two prongs or three prongs -- but
45
           there's a serious question to be tried, there is
46
           irreparable harm, and there is a balance of
47
```

 convenience and how that favours. There's -there's some question as to whether or not this
is a mandatory injunction and so there's a strong
prima facie case needed. We say not, and I'll
address that. But at the very least it -- it
engages the injunction test.

And so at paragraph 220, you know, what is our claim in the oppression proceeding? claim in the oppression proceeding is the standard oppression which is, here's our reasonable expectations, these expectations were breached, and that has unfairly prejudiced and oppressed us. And so at paragraph 220 we set out what Mr. Matthews says are -- are and were and which continue to be his reasonable expectations. And so that, you know, the Bear Mountain assets will be managed for the purpose of realizing on the bulk of lot sales their reflected market value, that he would be -- he would be in direction of EMD's overall operations, that Sanovest's main responsibility was to provide financing, and that repayment of the Sanovest loans from the proceeds of sale would be a priority. And that -- and as part of that they wouldn't -- Sanovest wouldn't sort of try to -try to abuse their position to profit unduly from their -- from their financing and that each would act in -- honestly in good faith and in the best interests of the business and the management.

And so Mr. Matthews has further deposed that as funds became available from sales or operations they would get together to determine the extent to which funds should be reinvested in amenities, for funds not required for operations to be payment of the Sanovest financing, and so this would be an ongoing iterative process between them. And so we say that there's ample evidence that following the appointment of Tian Kusumoto to replace his father Tom, that these expectations have been violated. And it certainly gets us to the -- the question to be tried that's required for an injunction application.

When you get to the balance of convenience analysis, we say it favours the appointment of a marketing agent because you don't need -- you don't need a receiver over all of the lands to

pay back the Sanovest loan. And so that is where the convenience is, is how do you get this loan repaid, and that that doesn't require anything more than the appointment of an agent to sell some of these lands.

At the present time Matthews and 599 are suffering irreparable harm because they've been stymied in any ability to raise funds. They've been stymied on land sales, alternate financing, and there's been a continuing drain on the equity. And so the balance of convenience, also, is that both sides have an interest in preserving the value of the partnership assets. You'll see Sanovest has said that. And we say that this is the best way in which to -- to do that and to maintain this value.

So the other point is that both sides agree that some form of interim relief is necessary. The only question is — is that it's the form. And we say that we — Sanovest can't say that damages are an adequate remedy because they themselves are seeking the appointment of a receiver which is an equitable form of relief beyond simply the sale of assets to fund their loan.

So just dealing with the jurisdiction point then, which I start at page 53. And I'm not going to take you through all of this -THE COURT: Okav.

THE COURT: Okay.

CNSL C. FERRIS: -- because I think it's relatively straightforward, our point. Sanovest takes the -- takes the position that because we're dealing with partnerships, that oppression is not available. And as a starting point, as a general proposition, it is true that oppression is not available to address issues arising in the context of partnerships. However, there is carveouts from that.

And at paragraph 230 we -- we set out -- and following we set out the case law. And so it's not in here, but the case at 230, the Landvis case is at tab 23 --

THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.

CNSL C. FERRIS: -- of what is entitled the Sanovest Interim Relief Book of Authorities. I'm not going to take you there because I've quoted it. THE COURT: Yeah.

Submissions by Cnsl C. Ferris

2.8

 CNSL C. FERRIS: I'm just giving you the cite.
THE COURT: Okay.
CNSL C. FERRIS: It's Volume I, tab 23.
THE COURT: Okay.
CNSL C. FERRIS: And so what the court wrote there was:

Relief from oppression pursuant to statutory jurisdiction is not available to address issues arising within a partnership, limited or otherwise. The statutory regime is intended to address oppressive (unfair) conduct in the legal context of a corporation, not conduct within what is regarded by the law simply as a relationship.

It goes on to say, though:

... even in the context of a partnership or relationship, to the extent that oppressive conduct may properly be considered as that of a corporate participant and prejudicial consequences of such conduct can be said to accrue to a 'complainant' as defined by the governing legislation, recourse to the statutory oppression jurisdiction may still be appropriate.

And that's where we say we find ourselves. So paragraph 232 is a -- is a case of -- of Mr. Justice Nathan Smith of this court. And that is found at tab 23(a) of one of our books of authorities. That was a cite -- 23(a)?

No. Zone 15 -- I'll --

THE COURT: All right.

CNSL C. FERRIS: We'll -- we'll identify the cite.

But I'll just -- in the interests of time, I'll

take you through this. And Mr. Justice Smith

writes:

In this case, the petitioners clearly have standing in relation to Holdings Ltd. — Cascadia is a shareholder, and Mr. Cote is the sole shareholder in Cascadia. They are also members of the limited partnership that holds one half of the shares in Boatyard

 Ltd., which in turn owns all of the shares in Moorage Ltd. In that sense, I find that they have an interest "not dissimilar" to that of shareholders.

[58] The BCA refers to oppression in the conduct of the "affairs" of a company. The "affairs" of [Holdings], in which Cascadia is a direct shareholder, include management of the limited partnership. While the BCA gives ... no direct rights against the limited partnership, the manner in which [Holdings] operates the limited partnership may affect the petitioners' rights as shareholders in Holdings Ltd. or as parties with "not dissimilar" rights in [Boatyard] and Moorage ...

Now -- though in that case Smith J. found the court lacked jurisdiction on an application under the BCA to order the respondents to purchase the petitioners' limited partnership units, he went on to say:

[61] Some of the relief available under section 227 ... might indirectly apply to a limited partnership through orders directed to a corporation that is a limited or general partner.

And we have the managing partner in this case.

For example section 227(3)(a) permits the court to make an order directing or prohibiting any act. Arguably, a corporation that is the general partner in a limited partnership may be directed to cause the limited partnership to do or not do certain things.

- CNSL G. BRANDT: It's in the -- our blue book of authorities, and it's 2(a).
- CNSL C. FERRIS: 2(a). Apologies.
- THE COURT: Okay. Let me just make note of that. Just bear with me. Okay.
- CNSL C. FERRIS: Okay. So just look down then to paragraph 234.

```
THE COURT:
                   M'mm-hmm.
 2
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        In this case 599 in fact is --
 3
            indirectly owns 50 percent shares of EMDB with
 4
            the balance owned by Sanovest. And that's the
            managing partner in the two limited partnerships.
 5
            Further, EMDB itself holds an interest in each of
 6
            the partnership and the resort partnership.
 7
            was incorporated to act as the managing partner
 8
 9
            for each partnership, and -- and, you know,
10
            Sanovest is saying, well, you know, to -- to use
11
            that as a lever to get in here would be sort
12
            of -- it's not enough to engage -- to engage --
13
            to engage corporate law. And they -- they make
            sort of the -- the -- sort of "the sky is falling" arguments, that this would be indirectly sort of taking up too much of -- too much of
14
15
16
17
            corporate law dealing with the partnerships.
18
                 And so there -- I just take you to the next
19
            page, 240 --
       THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
20
21
       CNSL C. FERRIS: -- where -- at paragraph 240 where
22
            you see the orders that we're seeking. And these
23
            are all orders that deal with the operation of
            the EDMB [sic]. You know, an order removing Tian
24
25
            Kusumoto as a director of that corporation, an
26
            order authorising it to obtain debt, an order
27
            directing it to purchase shares, a shotgun order.
28
       THE COURT:
                  How can I --
29
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                         That there be a --
       THE COURT: How can I grant all of that relief in view
30
31
            of the -- on this application, in view of the
32
            heavily contested ---
33
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        You can't grant any of that relief.
34
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah, okay.
35
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        But I have to show you that I have
36
            a prima facie case --
37
       THE COURT:
                   Oh I see.
38
      CNSL C. FERRIS: -- for those. Right.
39
                 And I'm showing you that the remedies we're
            seeking are corporate remedies relating to that
40
41
            corporation and its management role of the two
            partnerships. And -- and so continuing on here,
42
            there's further examples over on page 56. And --
43
44
            and -- and so we say that the relief we seek is
            corporate relief and we fall in with the
45
46
            exceptions in the case law that -- that carve
47
            back this general principle that oppression
```

```
proceedings are not to be used to deal with,
            generally, partnership issues.
 3
                  Just a minute. I just want to go back and
 4
            look at this for a minute.
 5
       CNSL C. FERRIS: Okay.
 6
       THE COURT: So you're not asking me, on your
 7
            application, to make the order set out in
 8
            paragraph -- paragraph 240?
 9
       CNSL C. FERRIS: No.
10
       THE COURT: You're just saying --
11
       CNSL C. FERRIS: I'm just -- I'm just showing you
12
            that --
13
      THE COURT: -- what you're seeking?
       CNSL C. FERRIS: Yes. That at the end of the day that
14
15
            that's the -- that's part of the relief that
16
            we're seeking in our corporate oppression
17
            proceeding. And that's why you can grant the
18
            relief on this application to cause that company
19
            to -- to cause the partnerships to sell this land
20
            to pay off the Sanovest loan.
21
      THE COURT:
                   I'm not -- I'm not sure that I've
22
            encountered this part before, but on a strong
23
           prima facie case component of an application, if
24
            the evidence -- if the conflicts in the evidence
25
            are so significant that it's impossible to make
26
            the determinations on a summary application, are
27
            there -- how do I -- how do I determine if the
28
            strong prima facie case has been made out?
29
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       Well, I think --
30
      THE COURT:
                  It requires me to weigh evidence; right?
31
      CNSL C. FERRIS: So I should say this -- is that we
32
            say it's not a strong prima facie case, that
33
            that's --
34
      THE COURT:
                   I -- yeah.
      CNSL C. FERRIS: -- that's not the test.
35
36
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah. It's a serious issue to be tried,
37
            and you've shown it.
38
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        Right.
39
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
40
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And we say that. And -- and it's
41
           addressed in the argument, but essentially we're
42
            simply saying that it's not causing the company
           to do anything. It's just -- it's not forcing
43
           the company to do anything. It's actually just
44
45
           putting somebody in to market the lands and the
           company just has to stand back and let them -- and let them. So we say that the -- we don't get
46
47
```

17 Submissions by Cnsl C. Ferris

```
to the mandatory injunction standard.
 2
      THE COURT: All right.
 3
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       But that being as it may, what do you
 4
            do?
 5
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
 6
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Well, you have to be able to get
 7
            yourself to a point that you can find that
 8
            there's a prima facie case. And if you look at
            the evidence and you say that it's too conflicted
 9
10
            for you to be able to do that, well, then I
            haven't met the standard.
11
12
      THE COURT: I see.
      CNSL C. FERRIS: But we say on -- you know, Mr. Brandt
13
14
            took you through the evidence --
      THE COURT: Right.
15
                          Yes.
                                 Yes.
      CNSL C. FERRIS: And we say that you certainly can get
16
17
            to that level based on what we've -- what we've
            shown you, especially if you get rid of
18
19
           Mr. Clark's evidence because it's completely
20
           unreliable, that there is a very strong -- it's
21
           an objective fact --
22
      THE COURT: Yeah.
      CNSL C. FERRIS: -- that there was these letters of
23
24
            intent for hundred of millions of dollars which
25
           have not been accepted.
26
      THE COURT: Yeah.
                         All right.
27
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       You know, does that get you to the
28
           prima facie case?
29
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
30
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        I would say yes. But if you can't
31
           get there then I -- I would concede that I have
32
           not succeeded here.
33
      THE COURT:
                   All right.
34
                And then in terms of the use of the -- of
35
           the nomenclature, "marketing agent," it doesn't
36
           require me to consider the receivership
37
           provisions of the BIA, simply deal with it under
38
           the terms of a -- the injunction application
39
           under the --
40
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Correct.
41
      THE COURT:
                  -- corporate business -- BC Business
42
           Corporations Act.
43
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Yes. So --
44
      THE COURT:
                  But --
45
      CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       -- Justice, I've used up my
46
           15 minutes.
47
      THE COURT: All right.
```

```
CNSL C. FERRIS: I'm just going to tell you that the
            rest of the argument deals with a couple of
 3
 4
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
 5
       CNSL C. FERRIS: Entitlement to a redemption period,
 6
            my friend was correct that Mr. Matthews and 599
 7
            don't have a personal right --
 8
       THE COURT: Right.
       CNSL C. FERRIS: -- to a redemption period, but
 9
10
            they're asserting that on behalf of the
11
            partnership as partners.
12
       THE COURT: Yeah. Yeah.
13
       CNSL C. FERRIS: And in our view they're entitled to
14
            do that, that the partner should have a right of
15
            redemption period.
16
       THE COURT: Okay.
17
       CNSL C. FERRIS: And then there's some other
18
            miscellaneous points about the Gondola lands
19
            et cetera, such that we say that we'll just leave
20
            those provisions with you.
21
       THE COURT: Okay.
22
       CNSL C. FERRIS: And -- and I'll just -- I'll just end
23
            with paragraph 264, just to reiterate this point.
24
       THE COURT: All right.
25
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                       That Sanovest and Tian Kusumoto
26
           propose the appointment of a receiver over all of
            the partnership and resort partnership assets
27
28
           which are worth many times what they're owed --
29
       THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
30
      CNSL C. FERRIS: -- at the same time seeking to
31
           entrench their position as a lender, which we say
           to continue to dilute my -- my client, seen for
32
33
           what it really is, Sanovest and Tian Kusumoto
           don't actually want the loan repaid and retired.
34
           Rather, they want to draw out the partnership's
35
36
           indebtedness, accumulating interest, chipping
           away at Mr. Matthews' and 599's equity in a
37
38
           concerted effort to push them out of Bear
           Mountain in a distress situation. And that's
39
40
           what we say our case is.
41
                  If I make a finding -- a determination
      THE COURT:
           that there's a strong prima facie case, am I in
42
43
           any way entrenching upon issues to be determined
44
           at the trial in January 2026?
45
      CNSL C. FERRIS: Well, I think you have to be
46
           careful --
47
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
```

```
CNSL C. FERRIS: -- in how -- how you write it.
       THE COURT: Yeah.
 3
       CNSL C. FERRIS: But -- but that couldn't be the test
            if -- if you weren't able to do it. That is the
            test on -- on an interlocutory application. And
 5
            so there must be a way that you can come to that
            finding on an interlocutory basis without
            impeding upon the trial -- trial -- ultimate
 9
            trial, because otherwise it couldn't be the test
10
            on an interlocutory application.
11
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah. Okay.
12
       CNSL C. FERRIS: Okay?
13
       THE COURT:
                   Thank you.
       CNSL C. FERRIS: Thank you, Justice.
14
15
       THE COURT: Mr. Nathanson?
16
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Thank you, Justice.
                                                 Justice, just
17
            one moment while I give away a few things.
18
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
19
       CNSL K. JACKSON: So --
20
       THE COURT: Mr. Jackson?
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Thank you, Justice. Very quickly,
21
22
            we advise you -- sorry.
23
       THE COURT: That's fine.
24
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Great.
                                 We advised you at the end of
25
            the hearing this morning that there was an
26
            agreement -
27
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
28
       CNSL K. JACKSON: -- between the parties.
                                                  We laid out
29
            for you the terms of that deal in no small amount
30
            of detail.
31
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
32
      CNSL K. JACKSON: We went back to the office to settle
33
            terms of an order. Our office delivered to
34
           counsel for 599 a revised form of order. We also
35
            copied counsel for the --
36
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: -- proposed receiver. That was done
37
38
            at 12:53.
      THE COURT:
39
                   Yeah.
40
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         Quickly. We received comments very
41
           quickly, minor comments, from counsel for the
42
           proposed receiver and nothing from counsel for
           599, no response at all. And Mr. Roberts
43
           attended here today. I've asked him what's going
44
           on, and it appears as if, despite the fact that
45
46
           we have an agreement, his clients have decided to not proceed with that agreement which is an
47
```

```
interesting situation because we spoke to an
           agreement to the court.
                I will need instructions. I'd like to
           discuss with my co-counsel as to what we do about
 5
           it, but there is the part of me which says we
 6
           should be sitting here settling the terms of an
 7
           order -
 8
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
 9
      10
           court.
11
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah. Why don't I hear from Mr. Roberts
12
           then.
13
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Yes, of course.
                                         Please.
      THE COURT: I thought there was -- I was told this
14
15
           morning there was an agreement.
16
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                       The devil's in the details.
17
      THE COURT:
                 Yeah.
18
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        He sent us a draft order. It's, as
19
           you would expect, 14-pages long.
20
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
21
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                        And in that period of time we
22
           haven't got through it.
23
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
24
      CNSL W. ROBERTS:
                       I'm -- I'm certainly not saying
25
           there is no agreement, but as of right now --
                 Are you telling me, though, there's an
26
27
           agreement on the terms that I was told this
28
           morning before the break?
29
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: We told you what we told you, which
30
           is we had an agreement on terms.
      THE COURT: All right.
31
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Yes. There was an agreement on
32
33
           those terms.
      THE COURT: Okay. Well, do you have -- look, do you
34
35
           have any sense of how long it will take for
36
           your -- your side to respond to Mr. Jackson?
37
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: In terms --
38
      THE COURT:
                 In terms of the order?
39
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: It's hard. So if -- if we didn't
40
           have this hearing booked this afternoon, we'd be
41
           back at the office doing it right now.
42
      THE COURT:
                 Right.
43
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: But we had to come back for this.
44
                So I will certainly, at the first
45
           opportunity, be outside with our clients talking
46
           to them about the terms and trying to get through
47
           it, but not while this is going on. I need
```

```
Mr. Ferris out there with me.
      THE COURT: Oh, I see. Oh. All right. CNSL K. JACKSON: Well, Justice, we have --
      THE COURT:
                  Just a minute, Mr. Jackson.
 5
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Oh, sorry. Yes, of course.
 6
            course.
 7
      THE COURT: Okay. I guess I had thought, perhaps
 8
            naively so, that given the multiple sets of
            counsel that -- in terms of the insolvency side,
 9
            [indiscernible] dealing with it and in terms of
10
11
            the oppression side --
12
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: Agreed. But there are substantive
13
            underlying commercial issues --
14
      THE COURT: All right.
15
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: -- that come into play.
16
                 I'm not sure I should say any more than
17
            that.
18
      THE COURT:
                   All right. Okay.
      CNSL W. ROBERTS: And so that's all I can tell you
19
20
            right now. Right now there's no agreement on a
21
            form of order.
22
      THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Jackson?
23
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Right. So, Justice, we've been --
24
            we left someone behind to do this.
25
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
26
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                         There's no reason they couldn't have
27
            done the same. And now that Mr. Ferris is done
28
           his submissions and before he has to leave at
29
            2:45, as I understand it --
30
      THE COURT:
                  Just a minute.
31
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Oh, apologies. I should have
32
            approached the [indiscernible].
33
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Of course. Apologies. Mr. Ferris I
34
           think has until 2:45. If I could suggest that
35
36
           Mr. Ferris and Mr. Roberts and myself step out
37
           with his clients if they need to -- I don't have
38
           to speak to them, but to try and -- and talk
39
           about what it is that I'm missing on this.
40
      THE COURT:
                   Okay.
41
      CNSL K. JACKSON:
                        I think it's --
42
      THE COURT:
                   Because unfortunately I can't be here
43
           tomorrow to deal with this.
44
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Correct. Exactly. I don't -- I
45
           think there's no time like the present.
46
      THE COURT:
                  Thank you.
47
      CNSL K. JACKSON: We shouldn't -- we should be in
```

```
the -- we should be -- some of us --
       THE COURT: Yeah.
 2
       CNSL K. JACKSON: -- should be out there doing this
 3
 4
            right now.
 5
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
 6
       CNSL K. JACKSON: And so I'm going to invite my
 7
            friends to do that.
 8
       THE COURT:
                  Does that work?
 9
       CNSL C. FERRIS: Yeah. That's fine.
       THE COURT: Mr. Nathanson, I know --
10
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Justice, I mean -- look, we could
11
12
            take the --
13
       THE COURT: I can -- I can sit part of next Wednesday
14
            too, but ...
15
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: We could take the break early.
16
       THE COURT: Yeah. And if the --
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: I -- I -- but, I mean, if this is
17
18
            not resolved by 3:00 o'clock, I should be making
19
            my submissions.
20
       THE COURT:
                  I know.
                            I know.
21
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: We're running out of time.
22
       THE COURT: Let's --
       CNSL C. FERRIS: No. No, just -- I'm fine to leave
23
24
            Mr. Brandt here, if -- if Mr. Nathanson wishes to
25
            start right now. And I can go outside and --
26
       THE COURT: Okay.
27
       CNSL C. FERRIS:
                        -- speak to Mr. Jackson and
28
            Mr. Roberts.
29
       THE COURT:
                  Does that work, Mr. Nathanson?
30
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: That's fine.
      THE COURT: All right. If you're -- look, I'll just
31
32
            say this to counsel and the parties who are here.
33
            If you're -- I'm told there's a deal. I was --
34
            the terms were conveyed to me this morning.
35
            It's -- now it's a matter of drafting an order
            that reflects that. I take it that you're going
36
            to be taking quite a bit from the model order but
37
38
            also crafting some parts that deal with any
           unique aspect of it. But the terms were relayed
39
            to me on the record, so I would think with all of
40
            the -- the experience in this room, you'd be able
to come up with an order and -- and one that I
41
42
43
            could look at and --
44
      CNSL K. JACKSON: Agreed, Justice.
      THE COURT: And -- and then it stops the erosion of --
45
46
           no offence to counsel -- ongoing legal expense
47
            that erodes the value of the assets of the
```

```
partnership because of the -- what I view to be
            the enormous costs of this --
 3
       CNSL K. JACKSON:
                          These are expensive minutes.
       THE COURT: Yeah.
 5
       CNSL K. JACKSON: Agreed. Justice I --
       THE COURT: So if you can work something out, I would
 6
 7
            encourage you to do it. I -- I was quite taken
            with the -- what I was told this morning was the agreement. I think it's a way that protects everyone at least for now. Okay.
 8
 9
10
11
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Can I have one moment, Justice?
       THE COURT: Of course. And, Mr. Nathanson, I was going to tell you, look, I know Mr. Ferris isn't
12
13
14
            available Wednesday, but I -- I moved a personal
15
            matter from Thursday to Wednesday, but I can
16
            work -- I have to attend that, but I can work
17
            around that to give more time on Wednesday.
18
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: You've -- you've been very
19
            gracious.
                        I can -- I can finish --
20
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
21
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- in time -- on the schedule that
22
            we've discussed.
23
       THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.
24
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: So we don't, in my view, require
25
            more --
       THE COURT: All right.
26
                                 If you need it, you got it.
27
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                             Thank you.
28
       THE COURT:
                    If you need more, you've got it.
29
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            I appreciate that. So, Justice,
30
            what you should have for me to begin --
31
       THE COURT:
                    Yeah.
32
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            You -- you have, I know, my
            cerloxed book of submissions --
33
34
       THE COURT:
                    Yeah.
35
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- that have the table of actions
36
            that you've been referred to several times.
37
       THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. Let me just get it. There's
38
            a lot up here. Just a minute.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Yeah. I appreciate that. THE COURT: I'm just going to have to stand up here
39
40
41
            and figure out where it all is. Let's put this
42
                    That's the receivership [indiscernible].
            away.
43
            Okay.
                    Here it is. Here we are. No. Right.
44
            Right.
45
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            So --
46
      THE COURT: Okay. I've got it.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Okay. So that -- that's part of
47
```

```
the battle.
 2
       THE COURT: I've got it.
 3
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: And then what you should have been
            handed by Madam Registrar, unfortunately, are a
 5
            two-volume book of authorities --
 6
       THE COURT: Right.
 7
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          -- with the kind of yellow-ish
 8
            tabs -- or yellow-ish cover and then a two-volume
 9
            condensed book to save us going into --
10
      THE COURT: Thank you.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- the application record.
11
12
            I'll be making reference to that as I go.
13
                 So I'm going to start briefly in my written
14
            submissions, but then I'm going to try and
            diverge to engage directly with how matters have
15
16
            evolved --
17
      THE COURT: Right.
18
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- and where we are.
                                                 And I know
19
            that you've read this, so I'm not going to read
20
      it to you. I'm going to highlight some --
THE COURT: I -- I can't tell you that I read it -- I
21
            didn't read all of it in depth.
22
23
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          It's very long. I appreciate
24
            that. But --
25
      THE COURT: Yeah, no, and I was -- I was -- all right.
26
            I was -- go ahead.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: I will tell you the important
27
28
            points, but I will not read it to you.
29
      THE COURT: Okay.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: All right. As -- as you would
30
31
            expect. So -- so, Justice, at page 1,
32
            paragraph 1, introduction.
33
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
34
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: As you --
35
      THE COURT: Well -- I'm sorry.
36
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Yes.
                  Would it help -- do you say the test is
37
      THE COURT:
38
           serious question to be tried, or do you say
39
            it's --
40
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Strong prima facie case.
41
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
42
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Yes. It's in all the -- and I'm
43
           going to come to this in my introduction but,
44
           sorry, let's just take this on right away.
45
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
46
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: So I agree with parts of what
47
           Mr. Ferris said and parts I don't agree with.
```

```
the -- let me start with the parts I do agree
            with. I do agree with him that you need to view
 3
            the evidence and the findings you're being asked
            to make through the filter of an injunction test,
            number 1. Number 2, I agree with what he said to
            you just a few minutes ago, that it's a proper
 7
            concern to not want to prejudice the trial of
 8
            these complicated proceedings but at the same
            time you have to be able to act.
10
      THE COURT: Right.
11
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           And I don't say that you're not
12
            able to act.
                          Where we part company is that I say
13
            it's clear that what the Supreme Court of Canada
14
            tells you is that you view whether it's a
15
           mandatory or prohibitory injunction, so positive
16
            or negative conduct, by looking at the question
17
            of substance.
                          And I'll develop this later.
18
      THE COURT: Okay.
19
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          So -- but the essential question
20
            is as a matter of substance, not how the relief
21
            is framed, is the party being asked to -- not do
22
            something. So you can't enter into that
23
            contract, you can't terminate that contract, you
24
            can't terminate someone's employment --
25
      THE COURT:
                   Right.
26
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- you can't violate your -- you
27
           know, go onto your neighbour's property, those
28
            are all negative injunctions; right?
29
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
30
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: A positive injunction -- a
31
           mandatory injunction requires a positive course
32
           of action. It requires, for example, here, the
33
           regulation --
34
                   M'mm-hmm.
      THE COURT:
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- of the conduct of this
35
36
           enterprise, which in my submission in substance
           clearly my friend's order does. They want to take $100 million plus of development lands and
37
38
           put it in the hands of a third party now to be
39
40
                  The appointment of a receiver or sales
41
           agent or whatever you want to call it is clearly
42
           not prohibiting action.
43
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: It's requiring action.
44
45
                 So ---
      THE COURT: The only prohibitory part would be --
46
47
           well, no, even -- even having Mr. Kusumoto
```

```
removed as a director is a mandatory act --
 2
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Yes, it would be. It would be.
 3
            But you're not as, Mr. Ferris said, just to be
 4
            clear --
 5
       THE COURT:
                   Right.
 6
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            -- he was right. He's saying, I'm
 7
            trying to persuade you -- I'm -- he was showing
 8
            you in that paragraph a few minutes ago,
 9
            Justice --
10
       THE COURT:
                    Right.
11
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- he's saying this is what will
            happen at the trial in 14 months. I'm not asking
12
13
            you to do it today, but he recognizes properly
14
            that he needs to satisfy you that there's a high degree of assurance that the trial judge in that
15
            case will do that. That's what the strong prima
16
            facie case standard is. You're probably going to win. There's a strong likelihood, and so we're
17
18
19
            basically saying if you're going to win anyways
20
            then the risk on an interim basis --
21
       THE COURT: Yeah.
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- of being wrong is small.
22
       THE COURT: Yeah, and the risk of -- the prejudice
23
24
            is --
25
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Exactly.
26
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
27
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            Exactly. You have the point.
28
            So -- so in a nutshell, what I say -- sorry to
29
            wave my glasses at you.
30
       THE COURT: That's all right.
31
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           In a nutshell, what I say is -- is
32
            this is a mandatory injunction --
33
       THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
34
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- the strong prima facie case
            standard applies. And then I'm going to
35
            endeavour to show you that you haven't been told
36
37
            the whole picture, that the evidence is very
            substantially different from what you've been
38
                  And I agree -- like, I thought your -- I
39
            accept that the -- the first impression comments
40
            that you gave us on the first morning of the
41
42
            hearing, in my respectful submission, are
43
            correct, that there are substantial conflicts in
            the evidence, that you are not in a position to
44
            say with a high degree of assurance that this has
45
46
            been a calculated course of oppression to dilute
            Mr. Matthews and 599 into nothing. And if you
47
```

```
can't conclude that that is likely to be so at
 2
            the conclusion of the trial to a high degree of
 3
            confidence then the injunctions fails.
 4
       THE COURT:
                   M'mm-hmm.
 5
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: But, Justice, here's the point
            that's getting a little lost. There are two
 7
            competing applications. And so let me be very clear about what I say. I say the injunction
 8
 9
            must fail. It is radical. It is not something
            that could be supported in any way, shape, or
10
11
            form. But I do accept that when you look at the
12
            question of what you should do on our
13
            application, what Mr. Jackson spoke to --
14
            it's you have an equitable discretion, and
            there's a question about what the terms should
15
16
            be. And so my friends can get to essentially
17
            where they want to get to but only under the
18
            rubric of the BIA and the Law and Equity Act.
19
       THE COURT: Right.
                            Right.
20
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            So their positive course of action
21
            cannot, in my respectful submission, succeed.
22
            But you can do what you think is equitable in all
23
            of the circumstances by attaching terms to the
24
            order that we ask you to make.
25
       THE COURT:
                   Under the BIA or --
26
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: Under the BIA --
27
       THE COURT: Yeah, right.
28
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- and -- or the Law and Equity
29
            Act.
30
       THE COURT:
                    Right.
31
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            So I'm not here being Dr. No to
32
            what the right commercial and equitable answer
33
            is. I'm here to persuade you that if you're
34
            being presented with two analytic boxes, one box
35
            is radically wrong, oppression, the other box is
36
            available to you and you can do what you need to
37
            do to adjust the parties' rights in that box --
38
       THE COURT:
                   Well, that's where --
39
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- in that paragraph.
40
                   That's where I was getting to when I put
       THE COURT:
41
            that question to Mr. Ferris. If at the end of
42
            the day the evidence is in such conflict, sure,
            you can -- you can -- there's a serious question to be tried every -- all sides have raised serious questions to be tried. But I'm being
43
44
45
46
            asked to do something more than -- that's more
47
            than prohibitory. I'm being asked to take
```

```
active -- issue orders that require people to do
            things.
 3
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: And -- and not just that, if I
            could say this.
 5
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
 6
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           But if I could kind of have a
 7
            three-part --
 8
       THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
 9
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- point here. So the courts have
10
            said repeatedly that injunctions are
11
            extraordinary remedies; right?
12
       THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: They're -- they're relief before
13
14
            trial --
15
       THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
16
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- before the court's been able to
17
            adjust on the merits what the party --
18
       THE COURT: Yeah.
19
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          -- the right answer for the
           parties is. Then you add on if the injunction is
20
21
           mandatory, it adds to the -- the costs and the
22
            risks and the significance. Like, that
23
            extraordinary nature goes up.
24
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
25
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          Right? Which is why we require
            the high degree of assurance. And then we have
26
            on top of that -- is an action where there's a --
27
28
            a fundamental difference of what I say is
29
            corporate policy -- and I'm going show you some
30
            law --
31
      THE COURT: Okay.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- where the courts say there
32
           aren't right and wrong answers when it comes to
33
34
           questions of corporate policy, investment,
35
           strategy, risk taking, and the courts don
            involve themselves in those questions and those
36
37
           questions, only in the most rare circumstances
38
           where there's a disagreement -- and that this is
39
           what it is, Justice -- between two partners about
           the right investment strategy for their
40
41
           partnership, for the court to come down and say
           you're right, you're wrong, I'm going to make the
42
           decision for you, and the person that doesn't
43
44
           agree is acting oppressively.
45
      THE COURT:
                  M'mm-hmm.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: The courts don't do that.
46
47
           the business judgment rule.
```

```
THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
       CNSL A. NATHANSON: That's that kind of margin of
 2
 3
            appreciation.
                           Courts are not well suited to make
            those calls and they don't like to and they
            shouldn't, which is another reason why that
            oppression paradigm in my submission is wrong.
 7
                 So when you pile -- and, sorry, in the last
 8
            piling --
       THE COURT: Yeah, no.
 9
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- of extraordinary is the court's
10
11
            going to make what amounts to a final decision --
12
            if you did what my friends are -- and I'm going
            to make this point again in a second -- my
13
14
            friends are saying two slightly -- more than
15
            slightly contradictory things.
                 On the one hand they're saying, we're not
16
            abandoning our marketing agent motion, but at the
17
18
            same time you heard Mr. Roberts say it's far from
19
            perfect and we were just aiming to achieve some
20
            principles and Sanovest can tell us what's wrong
21
            and we could work it out.
22
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: And in fact you have, as happens
23
24
            in dynamic commercial cases, this convergence;
25
            right?
26
      THE COURT:
                   M'mm-hmm.
27
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: This is what you're reacting to,
28
           which is you -- the parties, what they told you
29
            this morning, are extremely close.
30
      THE COURT: Well, they have a deal. CNSL A. NATHANSON: Yeah. Sure. C
31
                                 Sure. Okay. I'll go
32
            further.
                     I'll agree with you. Ī --
      THE COURT: I was told and Mr. Roberts just confirmed
33
34
            they have a deal.
35
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          Right. But I'm making my
36
            submissions on the basis that there isn't.
37
      THE COURT: Right.
38
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           We'll see. We may be saying there
39
           is a binding deal --
40
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
41
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- and you just have to affirm it.
42
      THE COURT:
                  But you say they're close in approach.
43
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Assume -- assume they're not,
44
           Justice.
45
      THE COURT: All right.
46
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           The reality is, if I can be plain,
47
           one -- put it this way: One course of action
```

```
that is available to you, even if you conclude
 1
            there isn't a deal, is to say I'm just going to
 3
            choose between one of those two positions.
 4
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
 5
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: Because even if there's not a
 6
            binding agreement --
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
 7
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
 8
                          -- there were concessions made
 9
           before me --
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
10
11
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          -- that narrow the issues to this
12
           practical question.
                                And to retreat -- I mean, I
13
           can only imagine -- I've never been where you
           are, but I can only imagine the difficulty of
14
15
           being confronted with something that looks so
16
           close to having a sensible practical resolution
17
            and then being asked to retreat to, I might have
18
            to write a very difficult judgment on masses of
19
           material in commercially urgent circumstances
20
            that affects, Justice, $100 million of assets --
21
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
22
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- in a summary motion in chambers
23
           where I've only been taken to a very thin film of
24
            the entire record.
                               That's a difficult thing to
25
      ask -- I mean, courts sometimes have to do it. THE COURT: Yeah.
26
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: But in my respectful submission,
27
28
           you don't. And the path that's available to you
29
            is, I say, the insolvency path --
30
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah.
31
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- and it's, even if there's no
32
           binding agreement, to choose between the two
33
           converging positions you heard this morning.
34
           that would certainly make -- be a benefit of
35
            simplicity --
36
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
37
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- expediency --
38
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
39
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- speed, cost as opposed to
40
           retreating to, are we going to write a deal or
41
            treatise on corporate law.
42
      THE COURT:
                  Yeah. Yeah.
43
                Well, look, in -- we do see this in -- in
44
           high -- high conflict insolvency cases from time
45
           to time, where there is the -- there are
           allegations of oppressive conduct and in
46
47
           management and self-interested dealing and the
```

like, and we turn to the court's officer, whether it's a monitor, a trustee, or a receiver 3 appointed by the court, to provide independent 4 views and recommendations. 5 And so that's why I said, I think to Mr. Brandt, well, why did -- even based on their 6 analysis of the evidence, why is it that Mr. Tian 7 8 Kusumoto has taken the steps that he has? Is it 9 because he stepped in and realized the gravity of what his father's done? I don't know if that's 10 11 the case. 12 CNSL A. NATHANSON: Well, why don't I -- can I deal 13 with that right now --14 THE COURT: Sure. 15 CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- since you raised it? 16 So this is my submission. You -- you asked 17 a number of times what was the change of 18 direction. 19 THE COURT: Right. 20 CNSL A. NATHANSON: So I'm going to give you -- I 21 think I've got four or five points. 22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 CNSL A. NATHANSON: So first, it wasn't such a change 24 of direction as my friends have told you. 25 THE COURT: Right. 26 CNSL A. NATHANSON: In other words, when I show you 27 the evidence of what this partnership did over 28 the years prior to the disputes emerging, it was far more nuanced than the consistent practice my 29 30 friends say of it's just lot sales. That's 31 number 1. 32 Number 2 is it was exactly what you supposed 33 in one of your questions to my friends, which is 34 Tian Kusumoto came in, discovered problems that 35 raised serious concerns. Those have yet to be 36 ventilated. 37 THE COURT: Right. 38 CNSL A. NATHANSON: But -- but that's not just -- and can I just make this point, Justice? I think -- I don't want this to escape our common sense. 39 40 41 How extraordinary a thing for a son -- he didn't 42 just sue Mr. Matthews -- cause Sanovest to sue Mr. Matthews. And that claim is seeking relief 43 under the disclosable interest provisions of the 44 BCA, so the conflict provisions, which would be

for the benefit of the partnership as a whole.

But he didn't just sue Mr. Matthews.

45

46 47

```
THE COURT:
                   Right.
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            He said, Mr. Matthews and my dad
            both did these things.
       THE COURT: Yeah.
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            That's a pretty tough thing for a
            son to have to do.
 7
       THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
 8
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            But, Justice, he's a director.
            has an fiduciary obligation. If he discovers
10
            transactions of the kind you saw this morning,
11
            you were shown the reservoir agreement -- do you
12
            recall that?
13
       THE COURT:
                   I do.
14
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            The assignment agreement?
15
       THE COURT:
                  Right.
16
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            Where Mr. Matthews and Mr. Tom
17
            Kusumoto sign on both sides of the deal to push
18
            $3 million -- 3.3, Mr. Brandt told you, into an
19
            entirely different entity that they control
20
            outside of the partnership.
                                          And, Justice, here's
21
            the point:
                        Outside the reach of Sanovest
22
            Security.
                       That's a grave concern. Now, my
23
            friends have explanations that they want to give
24
            about that, but the -- why the voltus -- so
25
            the next proposition is the self-interested
26
            transactions are a problem.
                                          If that 14 or 10 or
27
            whatever million dollars of cash were back --
28
            Justice, just so you have it, the loan that --
29
            remember Mr. Brandt took you through them and one
30
            was, like, a million dollar loan?
31
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
                           Right.
32
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                            That was money loaned by a
33
            third-party lender that was subject to
34
            restrictions on the purpose for the money.
35
            wasn't allowed to be given to Mr. Matthews.
            that's part of the reason for the term. And then
36
37
            the next reason for the term comes right to the
            question you asked me two minutes ago, about why
38
39
            can't we just have the court officer have a --
            have, you know, neutral commercial recommendation, look -- unhindered to look at what the right thing to do is? That's what
40
41
42
43
            normally happens. That's the point you've been
44
            making repeatedly over the last three days.
45
                 Well, as you'll see in the evidence I take
46
            you to, that was what Tian Kusumoto said. He
47
            said, I don't want to do lot sales before we've
```

evaluated the alternatives. And we need an expert to help us. And I'm not going to throw in on this strategy worth tens or hundred of millions of dollars until we've decided that it's the best strategy with the benefit of proper advice, and I want to see a business plan. And guess what? Mr. Matthews wouldn't do that. And that's -- you're going to see that repeatedly in the evidence.

And then the third -- the last reason for the shift is because this partnership doesn't have financial statements. It doesn't have a budget. It doesn't have an overall business plan. And, Justice, these are all things that, I'll show you, were required under the terms of the agreements between the parties.

So Mr. Matthews wants to invoke oral discussions he'd had with Tom Kusumoto in practice back in 2013. I'm invoking agreements. And I'm invoking the law, that I'll show you, that says the most important source of the parties' reasonable expectations are their agreements and would have to be a strong equity, I submit, indeed to override the parties' written agreements.

So those are the reasons for the change. And so just to come back to your point, that's -- our point is the same as yours. One of the reasons why we want a receiver with full powers is to do the very sensible things that haven't been done: Investigate alternatives, look at all of the options, take expert advice, look at the tax questions, assess whether based on the true financial position of these partnerships A is the right call or B is the right call. But that hasn't been done. So when you hear complaints about the taps been -- I'm going to go through this --

THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.

CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- the tap's been turned off, the lot sales have been blocked, you're not being told why.

THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.

CNSL A. NATHANSON: You're not being told the whole story. Mr. Kusumoto is saying we need to do our duty as directors, we need to investigate alternatives, we need to take advice, we need to

```
do all the things that would happen if a
            receiver's appointed and the receiver comes and
 3
            makes the recommendation that you keep saying is
            is the normal course, which I accept.
                   Yeah. Because what -- the way -- to boil
      THE COURT:
            it all down, the way it was put to me is it's a
 7
           mala fides play or attempt by Mr. Tian Kusumoto
 8
            to parlay his position as a secured creditor and
 9
            wipe out Mr. Matthews' --
10
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          Right.
11
      THE COURT: -- part of the partnership.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: But -- but, Justice, can I make
12
            one other -- can I make one other point about
13
14
            that, please? So you've heard a lot about what
15
            vendor doesn't want to be repaid and --
16
      THE COURT: Right.
17
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- they're just deluding -- so can
18
           I just make a couple points? So one -- what
19
            you're going to see is that Sanovest as lender
20
           actually was quite patient. It took years for it
            to get to this point. The loan's been in default
21
22
           for years. Two, Sanovest has no longer got a
           position as lender. It's a secured creditor that
23
24
           wants the property sold. But that's the very
25
           thing that Mr. Matthews says he wants too. You
26
            recall --
27
      THE COURT:
                   I know. I know.
28
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          -- Mr. Ferris showed you the
29
            letter --
30
      THE COURT:
                   I know --
31
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          And he went through all of his
32
           options, the buyout and the partition and the
33
           unblocked sale and, we just want to do something
           here. But that's -- that's the commercial effect of our application. I mean, we're -- we're
34
35
36
           accepting that if the receiver's appointed and
37
           says they're plan is a better plan --
38
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
39
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          -- and -- and has good reasoning
           and backup, then -- then you'll order it,
40
41
           Justice, and that will be okay. But if that's
42
           not what the receiver recommends, and if they do
           what we expect they're going to do, which is this
43
44
           has to be dealt with finally and the most
45
           sensible commercial course is unblock. Because
46
           part of the problem, as you're going to hear in
47
           the evidence, selling these things is going to
```

```
flood the market.
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: And it's going take a long time to
 3
            subdivide. It's going to take a long time to
 5
            list and expose them to the market. It's going
 6
            to take a long time to close, and it's going to
            really soak -- because remember you were told --
 7
            I was quite struck by this evidence, this -- what
 8
 9
            Mr. Brandt told you, the projection is to be
10
            8,000 more residents.
11
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
12
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          Like, we're creating a
13
            non-insignificant sized town --
14
      THE COURT: Right.
15
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- right -- in the projected
            development of -- of Bear Mountain.
16
17
                 So the -- one of the concerns -- and it may
18
            be true, maybe not. We had an expert come in --
19
            I'll show you -- says there are all these
20
            problems with their plan. But if that turns out
21
            not to be true, that's fine.
22
                 But my only point is this whole trope, to
23
           use Mr. Brandt's word, of Tian Kusumoto trying to
24
            oppressively orchestrate the dilution and
25
            insolvency fails because there is no more lender.
26
            Right? This is -- under our plan, this is all
27
           going to end. So they're not seeking to continue
28
            to be lender.
                           And the other point that's -- my
29
            friends seem to overlook, Mr. Ferris told you 13
30
            and a half thousand dollars a day is a very
31
            important number. That might be an important
32
            number, but that's not the dilution of
33
           Mr. Matthews.
34
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
35
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           That's the interest per day that
36
            the partnership pays. So that dilution is
37
            accruing to both partners, number 1, and
38
            number 2, it accrues actually more aggressively
39
           to Sanovest because they're not -- in the waterfall I'll show you, they're not equal.
40
41
           Sanovest has a 30 million preference after the
42
            first 15 million that's distributed.
43
      THE COURT:
                  Mm.
44
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: So in my respectful submission,
45
           you haven't, regrettably, been given the whole
46
           sorry.
47
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
```

```
CNSL A. NATHANSON: And where you're going to come to
 2
            is that, in my submission, strong prima facie
            case fails. And even if it didn't, you'll recall this part of the injunction test -- the merits
 3
 4
 5
            don't go away. They come back in the balance of
 6
            convenience. They're a factor to be
 7
            considered --
 8
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm. M'mm-hmm.
 9
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- in the holistic approach --
10
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- that you have to take. And
11
12
            when you compare the running away that -- you
13
            know, the alternative that my friends have put in
            their motion but are now running away from --
14
15
            from what is proposed or what might be adjusted
16
            by you in the exercise of your discretion,
17
            there's not any close contest in my respectful
18
            submission.
19
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
20
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          And that's why Mr. Roberts is
21
            running away from the relief. Like, imagine --
22
            and imagine a mandatory injunction for -- to
23
            sell -- appoint a sales agent, and sell
24
            $100 million, and then in the middle of the
25
            motion, the party says, actually that's not the
26
            relief that I'm seeking at all.
27
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
28
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          Extraordinary.
                                            Doesn't happen.
29
                 So maybe if I could press on for five
30
            minutes --
31
      THE COURT:
                   Sure.
32
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- and then take the break?
      THE COURT:
33
                   Sure.
34
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Okay.
                                   So I jumped all around my
35
            introduction.
36
      THE COURT:
                   No, but that's because I asked you a
37
            number of questions.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: But let's -- let's go here. So --
38
39
                 No. So I'm just going to hold up what my
40
            friends say, which I've sort of been doing --
41
      THE COURT:
                   Okay.
42
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- and I'll be faster and then
            I'll show you why I think it fails.
43
44
                 So my friends say you should see this for
            what it is, that Tian Kusumoto has manufactured
45
46
            this default and insolvency --
47
      THE COURT: Right.
```

```
CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- to enhance Sanovest's position,
            dilute 599, and circumvent the ongoing litigation
 3
           between the partners. And I'll come back to that
            last point. We say there's no circumvention at
 5
            all. And in fact Mr. Ferris was quite strong in
           his submissions -- you'll recall this yesterday
 7
           morning -- called it fabricated insolvency.
 8
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
 9
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          Getting quite -- it was getting --
10
            the temperature was rising.
11
      THE COURT:
                  Right.
12
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           And my friends described the three
13
           pillars of this -- or prongs, I think
           Mr. Brandt's word was -- for oppression, Sanovest
14
15
           refused to advance financing under the loan, it
           blocked sales, and they refused to permit
16
17
           refinancing. So in other words, I've painted you a picture of a choking off --
18
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
19
20
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- right, to get power --
21
      THE COURT: Right.
22
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           -- to get control, to amass a
23
           greater share of their equity. So in my
24
           submission that is a selective, incomplete,
25
           curated, unfair view of the evidence.
26
                 And so let me give you a summary on each of
27
           those three pillars, and I'm going to show you
28
           more of this later. So the first point is
29
           Sanovest did advance financing under the loan.
30
           It advanced 5.5 million of it after this dispute.
31
      THE COURT:
                  Sorry. 5.5 million, you say?
32
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          5.5 million.
33
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
34
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          It agreed to renew the loan in
35
           2022 when it was in default. It took no steps in
36
           default of the loan to call the loan for three
37
           years, from '21 to '24. And, Justice, this is an
38
           important point. This was subtle. It's actually
39
           in -- you'll see it, I'll show you the
40
           agreement --
41
      THE COURT:
                   Yeah.
42
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- but it was in part of
43
           Mr. Brandt's argument. So you'll recall he
44
           showed you just the purpose of the loan and the
45
           provision about "it will be made in advances."
46
           But at the bottom of that -- and I don't
47
           criticize him for this at all, but -- but at the
```

bottom of that paragraph, which wasn't -- didn't get any prominent mention, the advances are 3 subject to conditions. And you haven't heard 4 anything about those conditions. 5 THE COURT: No. CNSL A. NATHANSON: And you haven't heard anything 7 about whether those conditions were complied 8 with. And so I'm going to show you both the 9 conditions and how they weren't complied with. This is not an ATM. Mr. Matthews doesn't get to 10 go to Sanovest and say, on two day's notice, give 11 12 me money for whatever you want. It's as you would expect, like any -- I mean, they're not --13 they're an arm's length commercial lender, that's 14 15 true. But it doesn't mean that they're not 16 entitled to the normal commercial protections 17 that are in their loan agreement as security. 18 we're going to see that. And so Sanovest cooperated by subordinating 19 20 its financing to other third-party financing that 21 was obtained, construction and other financing. 22 THE COURT: M'mm-hmm. Okay. I don't think I was told 23 about that, was I? 24 CNSL A. NATHANSON: No. It's -- it's not necessarily 25 material. But, again, the point being they're 26 being painted as this is, you know, some puppet 27 master of oppression. That's not the case. 28 But, Justice, this is a really important 29 point. I'm going to show you a letter from 30 Mr. Ferris. When this dispute really got going 31 in 2021, Mr. Ferris wrote what I would 32 characterize as a pretty extraordinary letter, pretty ferocious letter, if I can say so. And do 33 34 you know what Mr. Ferris said, Justice? He 35 said -- he made essentially the same arguments 36 that you've heard in the last three days three years ago. He said, if this doesn't stop, we're 37 38 pulling the pin. The partnership is deadlocked, 39 we'll dissolve the partnership, it'll be over. That's all that's happening now. 40 41 And the further point is if this course of oppressive -- this choking off of Mr. Matthews' 42 43 and 599's equity, if this was so terrible, they could have put it -- an end to it at any time 44 over the preceding three years. They had a case 45 46 for deadlock in 2021. THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.

```
1
       CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           There's a case for deadlock now.
                 And, Justice, if I could -- we haven't put
 3
            this authority before you, but my friends are
            saying this is all so extraordinary. You
 5
            observed any sensible person would have looked at
            this record and say these partners are hopelessly
 6
 7
            deadlocked. Under the Partnership Act, that
 8
            gives rise to a right of dissolution, just and
 9
            equitable or otherwise.
10
      THE COURT:
                  M'mm-hmm.
11
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          What's the default remedy when
12
            there's a partnership that's dissolved?
13
            appointment of a receiver, Justice --
14
      THE COURT: M'mm-hmm. M'mm-hmm.
      CNSL A. NATHANSON: -- to wind up the affairs of the
15
16
            partnership, to settle the accounts, and to
17
           liquidate the property, pay the creditors, distribute the balance to the partners. T
18
19
           not some extraordinary thing that's happening.
20
           And either partner could have done that three
21
            years ago, and either partner could do that
22
            tomorrow.
23
      THE COURT: That's under the Partnership Act; right?
24
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           That's right.
                                          Section 38. And --
25
            and so the -- and the last point, again -- this
26
            is on the didn't advance financing --
27
      THE COURT:
                  M'mm-hmm.
28
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          -- the didn't advance financing is
29
            connected to these policy disagreements, these
30
            strategy disagreements that I'm going to show you
31
            in the evidence.
32
      THE COURT:
                  Okay.
33
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           These are just my summary --
34
      THE COURT: No. No.
                             Thank you. That's --
35
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                          Yeah. I just don't want you to be
36
           waiting --
37
      THE COURT: No, that's why I've been asking.
38
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Yeah, I didn't want you to wait
39
            in -- in suspense.
40
      THE COURT: No.
41
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           So, sorry, would you like to take
42
            the break?
43
      THE COURT:
                   Sure.
44
      CNSL A. NATHANSON:
                           Thank you.
45
                   Because I've been asking where is -- is
46
           there evidence of why the present position in
47
           Mr. Tian Kusumoto --
```

 CNSL A. NATHANSON: And -- and this is my preview, and I'm going to actually show you the evidence.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.

THE CLERK: Order in chambers. These chambers are adjourned for the afternoon recess.

(END OF EXCERPT AT 3:01 PM)

(END OF EXCERPT AT 3:01 PM) (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 4:05 PM)

REPORTER CERTIFICATION

I, Lisa Ciurysek, Official Reporter in the Province of British Columbia, Canada, do hereby certify:

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name on this day, the 15th of September, 2024.

Lisa Ciurysek

Authorized Reporter.

\$	3	abuse [۱] - 11:26	aggressively[1] -	1:29, 4:33, 31:3,
		accept [3] - 26:40,	35:38	34:2, 34:36
\$100 _[3] - 25:38,	3 [1] - 32:18	27:11, 34:4	ago [5] - 25:6, 26:8,	appointment [7] -
30:20, 36:24	3.3 [1] - 32:18	accepted [1] - 17:25	32:38, 38:37, 39:21	11:38, 11:45, 12:4,
1	30 [2] - 2:31, 35:41	accepting [1] - 34:36	agree [12] - 7:23, 7:24,	12:22, 18:26, 25:40,
'	38 [1] - 39:24	accounts [1] - 39:16	7:33, 12:17, 24:46,	39:13
104 07.07	3:00[1] - 22:18	accrue [1] - 13:25	24:47, 25:1, 25:2,	appreciate (3) - 23:29,
'21(1) - 37:37	3:01(1) - 40:7	accrues (1) - 35:38	25:5, 26:39, 28:44,	23:39, 24:23
'24 (1) - 37:37		accruing (1) - 35:37	29:32	appreciation (1) - 29:3
4	4	accumulating [1] -	agreed [9] - 1:13, 8:5,	approach [2] - 29:42,
1		18:36	10:2, 10:13, 20:9,	36:9
1 [5] - 24:31, 24:32,	47[1] - 10:31	achleve [1] - 29:19	21:12, 22:44, 23:5,	approached [1] -
25:5, 31:31, 35:37	4:00[1] - 4:28	act [6] - 11:28, 14:35,	37:34	21:32
10 [1] - 32:26	4:05[1] - 40:8	15:8, 25:9, 25:12,	agreement(20) - 1;21,	appropriate [1] -
10:02[1] - 1:6	4:30[1] - 4:26	26:1	9:5, 9:16, 19:26,	13:28
11:48(1) - 1:7		Act(9) - 10:37, 10:38,	19:46, 19:47, 20:2,	approval [2] - 5:23,
11:56[1] - 7:46	5	10:39, 10:43, 17:42,	20:15, 20:25, 20:27,	7:11
12(1) - 1:1	5,5(3) - 37:30, 37:31,	27:18, 27:29, 39:7,	20:30, 20:32, 21:20,	arbitration [2] - 6:23,
12:06 [1] - 7:47	37:32	39:23	23:9, 30:6, 30:32,	6:24
12:08[1] - 9:37	50 (1) - 15:3	acting [2] - 8:32,	32:11, 32:14, 37:40, 38:17	Arguably (1) - 14:35
12:53[1] - 19:38	51 _[1] - 10:41	28:44	agreements(4) -	argument[7] - 10:20,
13 111 - 35:29	53 [1] - 12:27	action [6] - 25:32,	33:16, 33:19, 33:23,	10:22, 10:26, 10:27,
14 (2) - 26:12, 32:26	56 [1] - 15:43	25:42, 25:44, 27:20, 28:27, 29:47	33:25	16:41, 18:2, 37:43
14-pages [1] - 20:19	58[1] - 14:6	actions [1] - 23:35	ahead [2] - 9:42, 24:26	arguments (2) - 15:15, 38:35
15 (6) - 8:24, 9:6,	599 [8] - 10:35, 12:6,	active(1) - 28:1	alming (1) - 29:19	arise (1) - 4:23
10:13, 13:35, 17:46,	15:2, 18:6, 19:34,	ad [1] - 10:42	allay [1] - 7:5	arises (1) - 4:24
35:42	19:43, 26:47, 37:2	add [2] - 6:21, 28:20	allegations (1) - 30:46	arising (3) - 2:10.
15th [1] - 40:24	599's [2] - 18:37,	address [5] - 10:15,	allowed [1] - 32:35	12:36, 13:10
	38:43	11:5, 12:36, 13:9,	alternate(i) - 12:9	arm's (1) - 38:14
2		13:12	alternative[1] - 36:13	aside (1) - 5:33
	6	addressed(1) - 16:41	alternatives [3] - 33:1,	aspect[1] - 22:39
2[3] - 25:5, 31:32,		adds [1] - 28:21	33:31, 33:47	asserting[1] - 18:10
35:38	60 [1] - 2:25	adequate [1] - 12:21	AM(2) - 1:6, 7:46	assess (1) - 33:33
2(a) [2] - 14:42, 14:43	61 [1] - 14:25	adjourned [3] - 9:26,	amass [1] - 37:22	assets [10] - 1:41,
2013[1] - 33:19		9:35, 40:5	amenities (1) - 11:34	4:32, 4:34, 4:35,
2021[2] - 38:31, 38:46	7	ADJOURNED(1) -	amount [1] - 19:29	11:16, 12:13, 12:24,
2022[1] - 37:35	7th [1] - 3:10	40:8	amounts [1] - 29:11	18:27, 22:47, 30:20
2024 [2] - 1:1, 40:25	tar(i) - 2:10	adjust [2] - 27:37,	ample [1] - 11:37	assignment(i) -
2026 [1] - 18:44	8	28:17	analysis [2] - 11:45,	32:14
206[1] - 10:32	8	adjusted [1] - 36:15	31:7	assume (2) - 29:43
219 _[1] - 10:41 220 _[2] - 11:7, 11:13	8,000[1] - 35:10	advance [4] - 37:15,	analytic (1) - 27:34	assurance [3] - 26:15,
227(1) - 14:26	,(,	37:29, 39:26, 39:28	answer [2] - 27:32,	26:45, 28:26
227(3 (2) - 10:36,	9	advanced (1) - 37:30	28:19	AT [8] - 1:6, 1:7, 7:46,
10:39	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	advances (5) - 5:40,	answers [1] - 28:33	7:47, 9:37, 9:38,
227(3)(a[i] - 14:33	9:00 [1] - 4:26	5:43, 5:46, 37:45,	anyways[1] - 26:19	40:7, 40:8
23 (2) - 12:42, 13:3		38:2	apologies (3) - 14:43,	ATM[1] - 38:10
23(a [2] - 13:33, 13:34	Α	advice [3] - 33:6,	21:31, 21:34	attaching [1] - 27:23
230 [2] - 12:39, 12:41	4011	33:32, 33:47	application [14] -	attempt[1] - 34:7
232[1] - 13:31	A&M [4] - 1:26, 1:30,	advise [1] - 19:22	10:35, 11:43, 14:20,	attend (1) - 23:16
234(1) - 14:47	8:34, 8:35	advised [1] - 19:24	15:31, 16:7, 16:18, 16:23, 16:26, 17:38,	attended [1] - 19:44
240 [3] - 15:19, 15:21,	abandoning [1] -	affairs (1) - 39:15 affect (1) - 14:14	19:5, 19:10, 24:11,	audio [1] - 40:18
16:8	29:17	affects [1] - 30:20	27:13, 34:35	authorising (1) -
264[1] - 18:23	ability [2] - 12:8, 40:21	affirm(1) - 29:41	applications (2) - 4:3,	15:26
2:00[7] - 1:19, 8:13,	able [9] - 3:12, 3:26,	afternoon (2) - 20:40,	27:7	Authorities (1) - 12:45
8:16, 8:23, 8:40, 9:3,	17:6, 17:10, 19:4, 22:41, 25:9, 25:12,	40:5	applies [1] - 26:35	authorities [3] - 13:34, 14:42, 24:5
9:35	28:16	agent [6] - 11:46,	apply (i) - 14:26	authority [3] - 7:3,
2:08 (1) - 9:38	absolutely [1] - 4:4	12:4, 17:35, 25:41,	appoint[1] - 36:23	10:23, 39:3
2:45[2] - 21:29, 21:35	and orinitally [1] * 4.4	29:17, 36:23	appointed (6) - 1:26,	authorize[1] - 5:26
		30.11, 30,40	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	

authorized [1] - 40:31 available [10] - 10:18, 11:31, 12:34, 12:36, 13:9, 14:25, 23:14, 27:36, 30:1, 30:28 avoids [1] - 7:39

В

backup [1] - 34:40 baked (1) - 4:30 balance [6] - 10:47, 11:44, 12:11, 15:4, 36:5, 39:18 based [3] - 17:17, 31:6, 33:33 basis [3] - 19:7, 26:20, 29:36 battle(i) - 24:1 BC [2] - 1:2, 17:41 BCA[4] - 14:6, 14:10, 14:21, 31:45 bear [2] - 3:9, 14:45 Bear(4) - 4:39, 11:16, 18:38, 35:16 became [1] - 11:31 begin (1) - 23:30 BEGINS [1] - 1:7 behalf[1] - 18:10 behind [1] - 21:24 benefit [3] - 30:34, 31:46, 33:5 best[4] - 11:28, 12:15, 33:5, 40:20 better[2] - 8:24, 34:37 botween (8) - 1:18, 11:37, 19:28, 28:39, 30:3, 30:32, 33:16. 37:3 boyond [1] - 12:24 BIA(4) - 17:37, 27:18, 27:25, 27:26 blnd [s] - 2:36 binding [3] - 29:39, 30:6, 30:32 bit [5] - 2:44, 5:19, 5:30, 8:14, 22:37 blocked [2] - 33:41, 37:16 blue [1] - 14:41 BMA[3] - 6:31, 7:22, Boatyard [2] - 13:47, 14:16 boll(1) - 34:5 Book [1] - 12:45 book [4] - 14:41, 23:33, 24:5, 24:9 booked [1] - 20:40 books [2] - 10:23,

13:33 borrow [1] - 1:46 borrowings (5) - 4:41, 4:45, 5:8, 5:15, 5:26 bottom [2] - 37:46, box [3] - 27:34, 27:35, 27:37 boxes [1] - 27:34 Brandt [7] - 6:22, 17:13, 22:24, 31:6, 32:18, 32:29, 35:9 BRANDT (3) - 9:9, 9:12, 14:41 Brandt's [3] - 35:23, 37:14, 37:43 breached (1) - 11:12 break [5] - 2:23, 20:28, 22:15, 36:32, 39:42 breaks [1] - 3:24 briefly (1) - 24:13 bringing (1) - 8:38 British (1) - 40:14 brought [1] - 6:9 browbeat (1) - 1:11 budget[i] - 33:13 bulk(1) - 11:18 business [14] - 4:35, 5:2, 5:9, 5:16, 5:28, 5:32, 5:47, 6:1, 6:9, 11:29, 17:41, 28:47, 33:6, 33:13 Business (4) - 10:36, 10:39, 10:43, 17:41 buyout[i] - 34:32

C

calculated [1] - 26:46 Canada (2) - 25:13, 40:14 cannot [1] - 27:21 careful[i] - 18:46 carve[5] - 3:12, 3:46, 4:19, 6:23, 15:46 carved[1] - 6:38 carveout[1] - 1:30 carveouts [1] - 12:38 Cascadia [3] - 13:44, 13:45, 14:8 case [27] - 11:4, 12:40. 12:41, 12:42, 13:31, 13:42, 14:19, 14:31, 15:2, 15:36, 15:46, 16:23, 16:28, 16:32, 17:8, 17:28, 18:40, 18:42, 24:40, 26:16. 26:17, 26:34, 31:11, 36:3, 38:27, 38:45,

30:44 cash [1] - 32:27 causing [1] - 16:42 CCAAs[i] - 5:39 cerloxed[1] - 23:33 certain [2] - 9:20, 14:39 certainly (5) - 11:41, 17:16, 20:24, 20:44, 30:34 CERTIFICATION[1] -40:11 certify [1] - 40:15 cetera [1] - 18:19 chambers [8] - 7:43, 9:26, 9:34, 30:22, 40:4 change [3] - 31:17, 31:23, 33:26 characterize[1] -38:32 charge [2] ~ 2:4, 6:1 chipping (1) - 18:36 choking (2) - 37:18 38:42 choose [2] - 30:3, 30:32 circumstances [3] -27:23, 28:37, 30:19 circumvent(i) - 37:2 circumvention[1] -37:4 cite (3) - 13:1, 13:34, 13:37 Ciurysek [2] - 40:13, 40:30 claim [3] - 11:8, 11:9, 31:43 Clark's [1] - 17:19 clear [8] - 4:31, 4:43, 6:6, 6:31, 8:46, 25:13, 26:4, 27:8 clearly [3] - 13:42, 25:37, 25:41 CLERK[8] - 1:10, 7:43, 8:3, 8:40, 9:26, 9:34, 9:41, 40:4 client(2) - 5:12, 18:32 clients [3] - 19:46. 20:45, 21:37 close [5] - 29:29, 29:42, 30:16, 35:6, 36:17 CNSL [340] - 1:9, 1:11, 1:15, 1:18, 1:21, 1:25, 1:40, 1:42, 1:44, 1:46, 2:1, 2:8, 2:12, 2:16, 2:20,

39.1

cases [2] - 29:24,

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

22:23, 22:27, 22:30, 22:44, 23:3, 23:5, 23:11, 23:18, 23:21, 23:24, 23:27, 23:29, 23:32, 23:35, 23:39, 23:45, 23:47, 24:3, 24:7, 24:11, 24:18, 24:23, 24:27, 24:30, 24:34, 24:36, 24:40, 24:42, 24:46, 25:11, 25:19, 25:26, 25:30, 25:35, 25:44, 26:2, 26:6, 26:11, 26:22, 26:25, 26:27, 26:31, 26:34, 27:5, 27:20, 27:26, 27:28, 27:31, 27:39, 28:3, 28:6, 28:9, 28:13, 28:16, 28:19, 28:25, 28:32, 28:46, 29:2, 29:10, 29:23, 29:27, 29:31, 29:35, 29:38, 29:41, 29:43, 29:46, 30:5, 30:8, 30:11, 30:22, 30:27, 30:31, 30:37, 30:39, 31:12, 31:15, 31:20, 31:23, 31:26, 31:38, 32:2, 32:5, 32:8, 32:14, 32:16, 32:32, 33:40, 33:44, 34:10, 34:12, 34:17, 34:28, 34:31, 34:39, 35:3, 35:12, 35:15, 35:35, 35:44, 36:1, 36:9, 36:11, 36:20, 36:28, 36:32, 36:34, 36:38, 36:42, 37:1, 37:9, 37:12, 37:20, 37:22, 37:32, 37:34. 37:42, 38:6, 38:24, 39:1, 39:11, 39:15, 39:24, 39:28, 39:33, 39:35, 39:38, 39:41, 39:44, 40:1 co [1] - 20:4 co-counsel[1] - 20:4 Columbia [1] - 40:14 comfortable [1] - 3:4 COMMENCEDIII -1.6 comments [3] - 19:40, 19:41, 26:40 commercial[9] - 2:19, 21:13, 27:32, 29:24, 32:40, 34:34, 34:45, 38:14, 38:16 commercially [1] -30:19 common m - 31:40 company [7] - 5:41,

14:7, 16:18, 16:42, 16:44, 16:46, 25:12 compare [1] - 36:12 compel[1] - 2:5 competing [1] - 27:7 complaints (1) - 33:36 complete [1] - 40:19 completely [1] - 17:19 complicated (1) - 25:8 complied [2] - 38:7, 38:9 component(i) - 16:23 concede (1) - 17:31 concept[2] - 2:32, 6:16 concepts [1] - 4:30 concern [2] - 25:7, 32:22 concerns [4] - 7:5, 10:7, 31:35, 35:17 concerted [1] - 18:38 concessions (1) -30:8 conclude [2] - 27:1, 30:1 conclusion [1] - 27:2 condensed [1] - 24:9 conditions (4) - 38:3, 38:4, 38:7, 38:9 conduct[8] - 13:13, 13:14, 13:22, 13:24, 14:7, 25:16, 25:35, 30:46 confidence (1) - 27:3 confirmed [1] - 29:33 conflict [3] - 27:42, 30:44, 31:45 conflicted [1] - 17:9 conflicts [2] - 16:24, confronted (1) - 30:15 connected [1] - 39:29 consequences (1) -13:24 consider[i] - 17:36 considered [2] -13:22, 36:7 consistent (1) - 31:29 construction [1] -38:21 content[1] - 2:47 contest(1) - 36:17 contested (1) - 15:32 context [3] - 12:37, 13:13, 13:20 continue [4] - 4:40, 11:15, 18:32, 35:27 continuing (2) - 12:10. 15:42 contract (2) - 25:23

contradictory [1] -29:15 control [2] - 32:19, 37:22 convenience [5] -11:1, 11:44, 12:2, 12:11, 36:6 convergence[i] -29:24 converging [1] - 30:33 conversations (1) conveyed [1] - 22:34 cooperated [1] - 38:19 copied (1) - 19:35 corporate[11] - 10:16, 13:23, 15:13, 15:17, 15:40, 15:45, 16:16, 17:41, 28:29, 28:34, 30:41 corporation [5] -13:14, 14:28, 14:36, 15:25, 15:41 Corporation [1] -10:37 Corporations [3] -10:39, 10:43, 17:42 correct[7] - 1:40, 1:42, 17:40, 18:6. 21:44, 26:43, 40:19 cost[1] - 30:39 costs [2] - 23:2, 28:21 Cote [1] - 13:44 counsel[12] - 2:23, 4:16, 8:35, 9:20, 19:34, 19:35, 19:41, 19:42, 20:4, 21:9, 22:32, 22:46 couple [3] - 4:3, 18:2. 34:18 course (17) - 4:5, 4:9, 4:27, 6:24, 20:13. 21:5, 21:6, 21:34, 23:12, 25:31, 26:46, 27:20, 29:47, 34:4, 34:45, 38:41 COURT (329) - 1:14, 1:17, 1:20, 1:24, 1:38, 1:41, 1:43, 1:45, 1:47, 2:7, 2:11, 2:13, 2:17, 2:21, 2:24, 2:30, 2:33, 2:37, 2:40, 2:43, 2:46, 3:3, 3:7, 3:9, 3:12, 3:14, 3:19, 3:24, 3:29, 3:33, 3:37, 3:40, 3:44, 3:46, 4:2, 4:7, 4:12, 4:14, 4:18, 4:21, 4:25, 4:28, 4:37,

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

25:25, 25:29, 25:34,

25:43, 25:46, 26:5, 26:10, 26:21, 26:23, 26:26, 26:30, 26:33, 27:4, 27:19, 27:25, 27:27, 27:30, 27:38. 27:40, 28:5, 28:8, 28:12, 28:15, 28:18, 28:24, 28:31, 28:45, 29:1, 29:9, 29:22, 29:26, 29:30, 29:33, 29:37, 29:40, 29:42, 29:45, 30:4, 30:7, 30:10, 30:21, 30:26, 30:30, 30:36, 30:38, 30:42, 31:14, 31:19, 31:22, 31:25, 31:37, 32:1, 32:4, 32:7, 32:13, 32:15, 32:31, 33:39, 33:43, 34:5, 34:11, 34:16, 34:27, 34:30, 34:38, 35:2, 35:11, 35:14, 35:34, 35:43, 35:47, 36:8, 36:10, 36:19, 36:27, 36:31, 36:33, 36:36, 36:41, 36:47, 37:8, 37:11, 37:19, 37:21, 37:31, 37:33, 37:41, 38:5, 38:22, 38:47, 39:10, 39:14, 39:23, 39:27, 39:32, 39:34, 39:37, 39:40, 39:43, 39:45, 40:3 court (13) - 3:4, 5:23, 7:11, 7:32, 13:5, 13:32, 14:20, 14:34, 20:2, 20:10, 28:41, 31:3, 32:39 Court[1] - 25:13 court's [4] - 2:35, 28:16, 29:10, 31:1 courtroom [1] - 8:31 courts [6] - 28:9, 28:32, 28:35, 28:46, 29:3, 30:25 cover[1] - 24:8 CPC (1) - 8:39 crafting [1] - 22:38 creates [1] - 5:4 creating (1) - 35:12 creditor[2] - 34:8, 34:23 creditors [1] - 39:17 criticize(1) - 37:47 curated [1] - 37:25 D

dad [1] - 32:2 damages [1] - 12:21

date [4] - 3:31, 4:10, 4:19, 9:27 dates [1] - 4:15 day's [1] - 38:11 days [5] - 2:25, 2:31, 3:14, 32:44, 38:36 deadline [1] - 3:5 deadlock [2] - 38:46, 39:1 deadlocked[2] -38:38, 39:7 deal [17] - 2:9, 7:27, 8:41, 15:23, 16:1, 17:37, 19:29, 21:43, 22:33, 22:38, 29:30, 29:34, 29:39, 30:2, 30:40, 31:12, 32:17 dealing [6] - 7:30, 12:26, 12:33, 15:17, 21:10, 30:47 deals (1) - 18:2 dealt[1] - 34:44 debt(1) - 15:26 decided [2] - 19:46, 33:4 decision (2) - 28:43, 29:11 default [6] - 34:21, 36:46, 37:35, 37:36, 39:11 defined [1] - 13:25 degree [4] - 26:15, 26:45, 27:2, 28:26 delivered [1] - 19:33 deluding [1] - 34:17 deposed (1) - 11:30 depth (1) - 24:22 describe[1] - 4:33 described [2] - 8:8, 37:12 despite (1) ~ 19:45 detail(1) - 19:30 details (1) - 20:16 determination [1] -18:41 determinations [1] -16:26 determine [2] - 11:32, 16:27 determined [1] - 18:43 develop [1] - 25:17 development(3) -1:27, 25:38, 35:16 developments [1] -2.3 devil's (1) - 20:16 difference [1] - 28:28

different (3) - 2:26,

difficult [2] - 30:18,

26:38, 32:19

30:24 difficulty [1] - 30:14 dilute [3] - 18:32, 26:46, 37:2 dilution [3] - 35:24, 35:32, 35:36 direct(2) - 14:9, 14:11 directed (2) - 14:27, 14:37 directing [2] - 14:34. 15.27 direction [3] - 11:20, 31:18, 31:24 directly [1] - 24:15 director[3] - 15:25, 26:1, 32:8 directors [1] - 33:46 disagreement[1] -28:38 disagreements [2] -39:29, 39:30 disclosable [1] -31:44 discovered[i] - 31:34 discovers [1] - 32:9 discretion (9) - 2:1, 2:4, 3:1, 4:47, 5:1. 5:13, 5:29, 27:14, 36:16 discuss [1] - 20:4 discussed [1] - 23:22 discussions (1) -33:18 dispute [2] - 37:30, 38:30 disputes (1) - 31:28 dissimilar" [2] - 14:3, dissolution [1] - 39:8 dissolve [1] - 38:39 dissolved (1) - 39:12 distinction [2] - 1:28, 5:5 distress (1) - 18:39 distribute [1] - 39:18 distributed (1) - 35:42 distrust[1] - 7:27 diverge [1] - 24:15 dollar[1] - 32:30 dollars [4] - 17:24, 32:27, 33:4, 35:30 done (9) - 9:9, 9:46, 19:37, 21:27, 31:10, 33:31, 33:36, 39:20 down [6] - 6:47, 7:44, 9:2, 14:46, 28:41, 34:6 Dr [1] - 27:31 draft[1] - 20:18 drafting [1] - 22:35

drain [1] - 12:10 draw [2] - 1:28, 18:35 during [1] - 5:40 duty [1] - 33:46 dynamic [1] - 29:24

E

early [1] - 22:15 easier[1] - 4:32 EBMD [i] - 4:39 Ecoasis (1) - 4:39 EDMB [1] - 15:24 effect[i] - 34:34 effectively[1] - 5:27 effort[1] - 18:38 elther[5] - 1:21, 2:2, 7:5, 39:20, 39:21 EMD's (1) - 11:20 EMDB [3] - 15:3, 16:6, 15:7 emerging [1] - 31:28 employment[1] -25:24 encountered [1] -16:22 encourage [1] - 23:7 END(1) - 40:7 end [9] - 4:13, 4:21, 6:9, 16:14, 18:22, 19:24, 27:41, 35:27, 38:44 endeavour(1) - 26:36 engage [5] - 7:17, 15:12, 15:13, 24:15 engages [1] - 11:6 enhance [1] - 37:1 enormous [1] - 23:2 enter(1) - 25:22 enterprise [1] - 25:36 entire [1] - 30:24 entirely [1] - 32:19 entitled (3) - 12:44, 18:13, 38:16 entitlement(i) - 18:5 entity (1) - 32:19 entrench [1] - 18:31 entrenching (1) -18:43 equal (1) - 35:40 equitable [5] - 12:23. 27:14, 27:22, 27:32, 39:9 Equity [3] - 10:37, 27:18, 27:28 equity [5] - 12:11, 18:37, 33:23, 37:23, 38:43 erodes [1] - 22:47 erosion (1) - 22:45

escape[i] - 31:40 especially [1] - 17:18 essential[1] - 25:19 essentially [4] - 10:42, 16:41, 27:16, 38:35 estate [4] - 5:28, 5:36, 5:46, 6:14 et [1] - 18:19 evaluated (1) - 33:1 evidence(21) - 11:38, 16:24, 16:30, 17:9, 17:14, 17:19, 25:3, 26:37, 26:44, 27:42, 31:7, 31:27, 32:45, 33:9, 34:47, 35:8, 37:25, 39:31, 39:46, 40:2 evolved[1] - 24:16 exactly (5) - 3:45, 21:44, 26:25, 26:27, 31:32 example (2) - 14:33, 25:32 examples [1] - 15:43 excellent(1) - 8:37 exceptions [1] - 15:46 EXCERPT[3] - 1:4, 1:7, 40:7 excused [1] - 9;20 exercise (n - 36:16 expect [4] - 20:19, 24:31, 34:43, 38:13 expectation [1] - 3:34 expectations [5] -11:11, 11:15, 11:40, 33:22 expediency[i] - 30:37 expense [1] - 22:46 expensive[i] - 23:3 experience [1] - 22:41 expert [3] - 33:2, 33:32, 35:18 explanations [1] -32:23 expose[1] - 35:5 extent[2] - 11:33, 13:21 extraordinary (8) -28:11, 28:23, 29:10. 31:41, 36:28, 38:32,

F

filter[1] - 25:4

33:34

final (2) - 10:15, 29:11

financial [2] - 33:12,

finally [1] - 34:44

extremely[1] - 29:29

39:4, 39:19

fabricated (1) - 37:7 facle (12) - 11:4, 15:36, 16:23, 16:28, 16:32, 17:8, 17:28, 18:42, 24:40, 26:17,

26:34, 36:2 fact[5] - 15:2, 17:21, 19:45, 29:23, 37:5 factor[1] - 36:6 fall [1] - 27:9 fails [4] - 27:3, 35:25, 36:3, 36:43 fair [1] - 8:28 faith [1] - 11:28 fall (1) - 15:45 falling [1] - 15:15 far [2] - 29:18, 31:29 faster[1] - 36:42 father[1] - 11:39 father's (1) - 31:10 favour[3] - 5:13, 5:36, 5:41 favours [2] - 11:1, 11:45 terocious (1) - 38:33 FERRIS [63] - 9:8, 9:11, 9:15, 9:44, 10:1, 10:4, 10:7, 10:10, 10:12, 10:22, 10:25, 10:28, 10:31, 10:34, 12:30, 12:44, 13:1, 13:3, 13:5, 13:37, 14:43, 14:46, 15:2, 15:21, 15:29, 15:33, 15:35, 15:38, 16:5, 16:9, 16:11, 16:14, 16:29, 16:31, 16:35, 16:38, 16:40, 17:3, 17:6, 17:13, 17:16, 17:23, 17:27, 17:30, 17:40, 17:43, 17:45, 18:1, 18:5, 18:9, 18:13, 18:17, 18:22, 18:25, 18:30, 18:45, 19:1, 19:3, 19:12, 19:14, 22:9, 22:23, 22:27 Ferris [16] - 9:10, 9:43, 21:1, 21:27, 21:34, 21:36, 23:13, 24:47, 26:3, 27:41, 34:28, 35:29, 37:5, 38:30, 38:31, 38:34 few [4] - 7:44, 19:17, 25:6, 26:8 fides (1) - 34:7 flduciary(1) - 32:9 fight [1] - 6:2 figure [1] - 23:41 film [1] - 30:23

financing [11] - 11:22, 11:27, 11:35, 12:9, 37:15, 37:29, 38:20, 38:21, 39:26, 39:28 findings (1) - 25:3 fine [5] - 19:23, 22:9, 22:23, 22:30, 35:21 finish [4] - 8:24, 9:5, 10:12, 23:19 first [9] - 4:11, 5:30. 6:1, 20:44, 26:40, 26:41, 31:23, 35:42, 37:28 fit [1] - 2:9 five [4] - 6:46, 6:47, 31:21, 36:29 flood [1] - 35:1 focussing [1] - 10:38 fold [2] - 5:10, 6:39 following [2] - 11:38, 12:40 forcing [1] - 16:43 form [9] - 1:13, 1:25, 9:17, 12:18, 12:19. 12:23, 19:34, 21:21, 27:11 four[2] - 2:15, 31:21 frame [1] - 2:13 framed (1) - 25:21 friend [5] - 4:41, 4:44, 5:46, 6:34, 18:6 friend's [3] - 5:12, 10:7, 25:37 friends [16] - 9:5, 10:42, 22:7, 27:16, 29:12, 29:14, 31:24, 31:30, 31:33, 32:23, 35:29, 36:13, 36:40, 36:44, 37:12, 39:3 FROM (1) - 1:4 front[1] - 10:21 full [1] - 33:29 fund [2] - 5:9, 12:24 fundamental [1] -28:28 funding [1] - 10:35 funds (5) - 5:1, 11:31, 11:33, 11:34, 12:8

G

general [4] - 12:34, 14:29, 14:36, 15:47 generally [1] - 16:2 given [5] - 5:31, 7:26, 21:8, 32:35, 35:45 glasses [1] - 26:29 Gondola [2] - 8:9, 18:18 governing [1] - 13:26 gracious [1] - 23:19 grant[3] - 15:30, 15:33, 16:17 grave [1] - 32:22 gravity [1] - 31:9 great[3] - 7:26, 9:22, 19:24 greater[1] - 37:23 guess [2] - 21:7, 33:7

Н

half [2] - 13:47, 35:30 hand (1) - 29:16 handed [1] - 24:4 hands [1] - 25:39 hard [2] - 6:41, 20:39 hardly [1] - 6:28 harm (2) - 10:47, 12:7 hash [1] - 8:11 hear [5] - 4:2, 4:26, 20:11, 33:36, 34:46 heard [7] - 8:39, 29:18, 30:33, 34:14, 38:3, 38:6, 38:36 hearing (4) - 4:21, 19:25, 20:40, 26:42 heavily [1] - 15:32 help [2] - 24:37, 33:2 helpful (1) - 4:8 helps [1] - 7:2 hereby [1] - 40:14 hereunto [i] - 40:23 high [6] - 26:14, 26:45, 27:2, 28:26, 30:44 highlight [1] - 24:20 hmm [39] - 1:20, 3:13, 5:3, 7:28, 12:43, 15:1, 15:20, 25:34, 25:43, 26:33, 27:4, 28:12, 28:24, 28:45, 29:1, 29:22, 29:26, 30:4, 30:7, 30:10, 33:39, 33:43, 34:38, 35:2, 35:11, 35:34, 35:47, 36:8, 36:10, 36:19, 36:27, 37:19, 38:22, 38:47, 39:10, 39:14, 39:27 hold [1] - 36:39 Holdings [4] - 13:43, 14:8, 14:13, 14:15 holds [2] - 13:47, 15:6 holistic [1] - 36:9 honestly [1] - 11:28 hope [1] - 4:5 hopefully [1] - 10:13 hopelessly [1] - 39:6 hour(1) - 3:36

hundred [2] - 17:24, 33:3

idem (1) - 10:42

Identify [1] - 13:37

imagine (4) - 30:13,

impeding (1) - 19:8

Important[7] - 9:32.

37:38, 38:28

IN [1] - 40:23

30:14, 36:21, 36:22

24:27, 33:21, 35:31,

impossible (1) - 16:25

Impression[i] - 26:40

inappropriate (2) -7:21, 7:34 Include [1] - 14:9 Includes (1) - 6:31 including [2] - 2:2, 7:31 incomplete [1] - 37:24 incorporated [1] -15:8 Indebtedness [1] -18:36 Indeed (1) - 33:24 Independent [2] -7:30, 31:3 indirectly [3] - 14:26, 15:3, 15:15 indiscernible [2] - 3:8, 21:10 indiscernible] [3] -6:26, 21:32, 23:42 Information [1] - 2:6 injunction [15] -10:44, 11:3, 11:6, 11:42, 17:1, 17:38, 25:4, 25:15, 25:30, 25:31, 26:32, 27:8, 28:20, 36:4, 36:22 injunctions [3] -25:28, 27:3, 28:10 insignificant(i) -35:13 Insisted [1] - 5:13 insolvency [6] - 21:9, 30:29, 30:44, 35:25, 36:46, 37:7 instructions [2] -6:42, 20:3 Intended (1) - 13:12 Intent [1] - 17:24 Intention [1] - 5:25 intercompany [1] -5:40 interest [6] - 12:12, 14:3, 15:6, 18:36,

31:44, 35:35 Interested (2) - 30:47, 32:25 interesting (4) - 5:5, 5:20, 5:21, 20:1

Interests [2] - 11:29, 13:38 Interim (1) - 12:45 interim [3] - 2:9, 12:18, 26:20 interlocutory (3) -19:5, 19:7, 19:10 Introduction (3) -

24:32, 24:43, 36:35 investigate[3] - 1:31, 33:31, 33:46 investment(2) -

28:34, 28:40 Invite (1) - 22:6 invoke[1] - 33:17 Invoking [2] - 33:19,

33:20 involve [1] - 28:36 irreparable [2] - 10:47,

12:7 Ish [2] - 24:7, 24:8 Issue [3] - 2:29, 16:36. 28:1

issues [7] - 2:9, 12:36,

13:10, 16:2, 18:43. 21:13, 30:11 it'll [1] - 38:39

iterative (1) - 11:36 itself[1] - 15:6

JACKSON[89] - 2:27, 2:31, 2:34, 2:38, 2:41, 2:44, 2:47, 3:4, 3:8, 3:11, 3:17, 3:21, 3:23, 3:27, 3:32, 3:35, 3:39, 3:43, 3:45, 4:1, 4:4, 4:8,

4:13, 4:15, 4:20, 4:23, 4:27, 4:29, 4:38, 4:43, 5:4, 5:7, 5:12, 5:17, 5:19, 5:21, 5:25, 5:36,

5:39, 5:43, 6:4, 6:6, 6:8, 6:12, 6:16, 6:19, 6:28, 6:33, 6:38, 6:44, 7:9, 7:12, 7:14,

7:16, 7:19, 7:23, 7:28, 7:35, 7:38, 7:41, 8:22, 8:29, 8:33, 8:35, 9:30,

9:33, 19:19, 19:21, 19:24, 19:28, 19:32, 19:37, 19:40, 20:9,

20:13, 21:3, 21:5, 21:23, 21:26, 21:31, 21:34, 21:41, 21:44,

21:47, 22:3, 22:6, 22:44, 23:3, 23:5 Jackson [6] - 19:20,

20:36, 21:4, 21:22, 22:27, 27:13

January [1] - 18:44 Judge (1) - 26:15 judgment[2] - 28:47, 30:18

Jump [3] - 10:19, 10:40, 10:41 jumped [1] - 36:34

jurisdiction (6) -10:16, 10:17, 12:26, 13:9, 13:27, 14:20 Justice [46] - 1:10,

1:11, 2:28, 4:5, 4:29, 7:1, 7:23, 7:41, 8:3.

8:29, 8:43, 8:46, 9:41, 9:44, 13:32, 13:39, 17:45, 19:14,

19:16, 19:21, 21:3, 21:23, 22:11, 22:44,

23:5, 23:11, 23:29,

24:31, 26:9, 27:5, 28:39, 29:44, 30:20,

31:39, 32:8, 32:20,

32:28, 33:14, 34:12, 34:41, 37:37, 38:28,

38:34, 39:2, 39:13

K

keep [2] - 3:9, 34:3 kind [4] - 24:7, 28:6. 29:2, 32:10 Kusumoto [15] -11:39, 15:25, 18:25, 18:33, 25:47, 31:8, 31:34, 32:17, 32:46, 33:18, 33:45, 34:7, 35:23, 36:45, 39:47

lacked [1] - 14:20 laid [1] - 19:28 land [3] - 7:22, 12:9, 16:19 lands [18] - 1:29, 1:32, 1:38, 1:39, 4:34, 6:29, 6:30, 6:31, 7:4, 7:10, 7:30, 8:6, 8:9, 11:47, 12:5, 16:45, 18:18, 25:38 Landvis [1] - 12:41 largely (1) - 8:23

last[6] - 29:7, 32:44. 33:10, 37:4, 38:36, 39:25 late [1] - 4:21

Law [3] - 10:37, 27:18, 27:28

law [8] - 12:40, 13:15, 15:13, 15:17, 15:46, 28:30, 30:41, 33:20 lawsult [1] - 7:39

least [3] - 4:2, 11:5, 23:10 leave [5] - 3:1, 7:40.

18:19, 21:28, 22:23 leaving [1] - 5:33

left[1] - 21:24 legal [2] - 13:13, 22:46

legislation (i) - 13:26 lend [1] - 5:1

lender[7] - 18:31, 32:33, 34:19, 34:23,

35:25, 35:28, 38:14 length (1) - 38:14

letter (4) - 34:29. 38:29, 38:32, 38:33

letters [1] - 17:23

letting (i) - 7:3

level[1] - 17:17

lever(1) - 15:11 light[1] - 10:5

likelihood [1] - 26:18 likely [1] - 27:1

limited [11] - 13:10, 13:46, 14:10, 14:12,

14:13, 14:22, 14:27, 14:28, 14:37, 14:38,

15:5

line m - 3:36 Ilquidate [1] - 39:17

liquidity [1] - 5:32 lis [1] - 7:17

Llsa [2] - 40:13, 40:30 list (1) - 35:5 litigation (1) - 37:2

loan [15] - 5:26, 12:1, 12:2, 12:25, 16:20.

18:34, 32:28, 32:30, 37:15, 37:29, 37:34, 37:36, 37:44, 38:17

loan's [1] - 34:21

loaned [1] - 32:32 loans (1) - 11:23

look [16] - 2:14, 3:26, 14:46, 16:4, 17:8, 20:34, 22:11, 22:31,

22:43, 23:13, 27:11, 30:43, 32:41, 33:31, 33:32

looked [1] - 39:5 looking [3] - 4:38, 9:30, 25:16 looks [1] - 30:15 lost [2] - 4:44, 27:6 Ltd [4] - 13:43, 14:1, 14:2, 14:15 lunch [1] - 3:36

M

m'mm [39] - 1:20, 3:13, 5:3, 7:28, 12:43, 15:1, 15:20, 25:34, 25:43, 26:33, 27:4, 28:12, 28:24, 28:45, 29:1, 29:22, 29:26, 30:4, 30:7, 30:10, 33:39, 33:43, 34:38, 35:2, 35:11, 35:34, 35:47, 36:8, 36:10, 36:19, 36:27, 37:19, 38:22, 38:47, 39:10, 39:14, 39:27 m'mm-hmm [39] -1:20, 3:13, 5:3, 7:28, 12:43, 15:1, 15:20, 25:34, 25:43, 26:33, 27:4, 28:12, 28:24, 28:45, 29:1, 29:22, 29:26, 30:4, 30:7, 30:10, 33:39, 33:43, 34:38, 35:2, 35:11, 35:34, 35:47, 36:8, 36:10, 36:19, 36:27, 37:19, 38:22, 38:47, 39:10, 39:14, 39:27 MacDonald (1) - 10:44 Madam (2) - 8:18, 24:4 main (1) - 11:21 maintain (1) - 12:16 mala [1] - 34:7 manage [1] - 4:40 managed (n - 11:17 management(5) -2:29, 11:29, 14:9, 15:41, 30:47 managing [3] - 14:31, 15:5, 15:8 mandatory [8] - 11:3, 17:1, 25:15, 25:31, 26:1, 26:32, 28:21, 36:22 manner (1) - 14:12 manufactured (1) -36:45 margin (1) - 29:2 market[4] - 11:18, 16:45, 35.1, 35.5 marketing [3] - 11:46, 17:35, 29:17 masses [1] - 30:18

master[1] - 38:27 material [2] - 30:19, 38:25 matter[3] - 22:35, 23:15, 25:20 matters [1] - 24:15 matthews | 11 - 35:33 Matthews [16] - 10:35, 11:14, 11:30, 12:6, 18:6, 26:47, 31:42, 31:43, 31:47, 32:2, 32:16, 32:35, 33:7, 33:17, 34:25, 38:10 Matthews' [3] - 18:37. 34:9, 38:42 mean [11] - 2:17, 4:31, 4:33, 6:35, 22:11, 22:17, 30:12, 30:25,

4:33, 6:35, 22:11, 22:17, 30:12, 30:25, 34:35, 38:13, 38:15 meantline [1] - 7:37 members [1] - 13:46 mention [1] - 3:18 mentioning [1] - 6:29 merits [2] - 28:17,

36:4 met[i] - 17:11 middle [i] - 36:24 might[i] - 3:6, 4:23, 7:24, 14:26, 30:17, 35:31, 36:15

million (11) - 25:38, 30:20, 32:18, 32:27, 32:30, 35:41, 35:42, 36:24, 37:30, 37:31, 37:32

millions [2] - 17:24, 33:4 mind [2] - 2:25, 3:9 minor [1] - 19:41 minute [5] - 16:3, 16:4, 21:4, 21:30,

16:4, 21:4, 21:30, 23:38 minutes [12] - 6:46, 6:47, 7:44, 8:25, 9:6, 10:13, 17:46, 23:3, 25:6, 26:8, 32:38,

36:30 miscellaneous (1) -18:18

missing (1) - 21:39 model (1) - 22:37 moment (3) - 5:33

moment [3] - 5:33, 19:17, 23:11 money [3] - 32:32,

32:34, 38:12 monitor(i) - 31:2 month [i] - 4:11

months [3] - 2:15, 26:12 Moorage [2] - 14:2, 14:17 moot[i] - 6:8 morning [10] - 19:25, 20:15, 20:28, 22:34, 23:8, 26:41, 29:29, 30:33, 32:10, 37:7 most[3] - 28:37, 33:21, 34:44 motion [4] - 29:17, 30:22, 36:14, 36:25 Mountain [4] - 4:40, 11:16, 18:39, 35:16 moved[i] - 23:14

N

multiple (1) - 21:8

must [2] - 19:6, 27:9

nalvely [1] - 21:8 name [1] - 40:24 narrow[i] - 30:11 Nathan [1] - 13:32 NATHANSON[137] -8:46, 9:4, 9:13, 9:19, 9:22, 9:29, 19:16, 22:11, 22:15, 22:17, 22:21, 22:30, 23:11, 23:18, 23:21, 23:24, 23:27, 23:29, 23:32, 23:35, 23:39, 23:45, 23:47, 24:3, 24:7, 24:11, 24:18, 24:23, 24:27, 24:30, 24:34, 24:36, 24:40, 24:42, 24:46, 25:11, 25:19, 25:26, 25:30, 25:35, 25:44, 26:2, 26:6, 26:11, 26:22, 26:25, 26:27, 26:31, 26:34, 27:5, 27:20, 27:26, 27:28, 27:31, 27:39, 28:3, 28:6, 28:9, 28:13, 28:16, 28:19, 28:25, 28:32, 28:46, 29:2, 29:10, 29:23, 29:27, 29:31, 29:35, 29:38, 29:41, 29:43, 29:46, 30:5, 30:8, 30:11, 30:22, 30:27, 30:31, 30:37, 30:39, 31:12, 31:15, 31:20, 31:23, 31:26, 31:38, 32:2, 32:5, 32:8, 32:14, 32:16, 32:32, 33:40, 33:44, 34:10, 34:12, 34:17, 34:28, 34:31, 34:39, 35:3. 35:12, 35:15, 35:35, 35:44, 36:1, 36:9,

36:11, 36:20, 36:28, 36:32, 36:34, 36:38, 36:42, 37:1, 37:9, 37:12, 37:20, 37:32, 37:34, 37:42, 38:6, 38:24, 39:1, 39:14, 39:28, 39:33, 39:35, 39:38, 39:41, 39:44, 40:1

Nathanson [5] - 19:15, 22:10, 22:24,

19:15, 22:10, 22:24, 22:29, 23:12 nature [2] - 6:3, 28:23 necessarily [1] - 38:24 necessary [2] - 2:5, 12:18

need [19] - 5:34, 6:44, 8:14, 8:19, 10:22, 11:46, 11:47, 20:3, 20:47, 21:37, 23:26, 23:28, 25:2, 27:36, 33:1, 33:45, 33:46, 33:47

needed [1] - 11:4 needs [2] - 2:17, 26:14 negative [2] - 25:16, 25:28 neighbour's [1] -25:27

neutral[i] - 32:40 never[i] - 30:13 next[i] - 1:34, 4:3, 15:18, 22:13, 32:25, 32:37

nine (1) - 3:20 nine-week (1) - 3:20 nomenclature (1) -17:35

non (1) - 35:13 non-insignificant (1) -35:13 normal (2) - 34:4,

normally [2] - 4:6, 32:43 note [1] - 14:44 nothing [2] - 19:42, 26:47

38:16

notice [1] - 38:11 noting (1] - 3:2 November [1] - 3:25 nuanced [2] - 1:44, 31:29

number[11] - 10:19, 25:5, 31:17, 31:31, 31:32, 35:31, 35:32, 35:37, 35:38, 36:37 nutshell [2] - 26:28,

26:31

0 o'clock [4] - 4:28, 8:13, 8:40, 22:18 objective[i] - 17:21 obligation [2] - 6:13, 32:9 observed (1) - 39:5 obtain (2) - 5:15, 15:26 obtained [1] - 38:21 October (5) - 3:10, 3:41, 4:13, 4:22, 9:28 OF [1] - 40:7 offence [1] - 22:46 office [3] - 19:32, 19:33, 20:41 officer[4] - 2:35, 7:30, 31:1, 32:39

Official [1] - 40:13 one [27] - 3:17, 4:29, 4:30, 5:29, 6:28, 6:33, 6:38, 7:31, 7:33, 10:15, 13:33, 13:47, 19:17, 22:42, 23:11, 27:34, 29:16, 29:47, 30:3, 31:33, 32:29, 33:28, 34:13,

34:18, 35:17 ongoing [4] - 10:4, 11:36, 22:46, 37:2 operates [1] - 14:13 operation [2] - 5:9,

15:23 operations [8] - 1:30, 1:32, 1:36, 2:29, 4:36, 11:20, 11:32,

11:34 opportunity [1] -20:45

opposed [i] - 30:39 oppressed [i] - 11:13 oppression [ie] -11:8, 11:9, 11:10,

12:33, 12:35, 13:8, 13:27, 14:6, 15:47, 16:16, 21:11, 26:46, 27:35, 29:6, 37:14, 38:27

oppressive [4] -13:12, 13:21, 30:46, 38:42 oppressively [2] -28:44, 35:24

options [2] - 33:32, 34:32 oral [1] - 33:17

orchestrate [1] - 35:24 order [30] - 1:13, 5:26,

5:43, 7:43, 8:12, 8:39, 9:18, 9:26, 9:34, 10:1, 14:21, 14:34, 15:24, 15:26, 15:27, 16:7, 19:33, 19:34, 20:7, 20:18, 20:38, 21:21, 22:35, 22:37, 22:42, 25:37, 27:24, 34:40, 40:4 orders [4] - 14:27, 15:22, 15:23, 28:1 ordinary (1) - 4:5 otherwise [4] - 4:25, 13:11, 19:9, 39:9 ouch [1] - 3:22 ourselves [1] - 13:30 outline (1) - 1:16 outside [8] - 5:10, 5:47, 6:12, 7:42, 20:45, 22:25, 32:20, 32:21 overali(2) - 11:20, 33:13 overlook [1] - 35:29 override[i] - 33:24 owed [1] - 18:28 owned [1] - 15:4 owns [2] - 14:1, 15:3

Р

page [6] - 10:31, 10:41, 12:27, 15:19, 15:43, 24:31 painted (2) - 37:17, 38:26 paradigm(1) - 29:6 paragraph [15] -10:32, 10:41, 11:7, 11:13, 12:39, 13:31, 14:47, 15:21, 16:8, 18:23, 24:32, 26:8, 27:39, 38:1 parlay[1] - 34:8 part [14] - 11:24, 16:15, 16:22, 20:5, 22:13, 23:47, 25:12, 25:46, 28:7, 32:36, 34:11, 34:46, 36:4, 37:42 participant (ij - 13:23 parties (9) - 2:18. 3:29, 7:31, 14:15, 19:28, 22:32, 28:20, 29:28, 33:16 parties' [3] - 27:37, 33:22, 33:24 partition (1) - 34:32 partner (8) - 14:29. 14:31, 14:36, 15:5,

13:46, 14:10, 14:12, 14:13, 14:22, 14:27, 14:37, 14:38, 15:7, 15:9, 16:2, 18:11, 18:27, 23:1, 28:41. 31:27, 31:46, 32:20, 33:11, 34:11, 35:36, 38:38, 38:39, 39:12, 39:16 Partnership [2] - 39:7, 39:23 partnership's [1] -18:35 partnerships [7] -12:33, 12:37, 15:5, 15:17, 15:42, 16:19, 33:34 parts (5) - 10:20, 22:38, 24:46, 24:47, 25:1 party [7] - 7:5, 25:21, 25:39, 28:17, 32:33, 36:25, 38:20 path [2] - 30:28, 30:29 patient [1] - 34:20 pay [3] - 12:1, 16:20, 39:17 payables (1) - 2:2 paying [1] - 2:2 payment[1] - 11:35 pays [1] - 35:36 people [1] - 28:1 per(1) - 35:35 percent[1] - 15:3 perfect[i] - 29:19 perhaps [2] - 10:23, 21:7 period [4] - 18:5, 18:9, 18:15, 20:21 permit(1) - 37:16 permits (i) - 14:33 person [2] - 28:43, 39:5 personal [2] - 18:7, 23:14 persuade [2] - 26:7, 27:33 Peter[1] - 8:30 petitioners (1) - 13:42 petitioners' [1] - 14:22 petitioners' [1] - 14:14 picture [2] - 26:37, 37:18

15:8, 18:14, 39:20,

partners (6) - 18:11.

39:6, 39:18

partnership (30) -

28:39, 35:37, 37:3,

12:13, 13:10, 13:20,

39.21

plece [1] - 7:36 pile [1] - 29:7 piling [1] - 29:8 pillars (2) - 37:13, 37:27 pin (1) - 38:38 plain [1] - 29:46 plan [7] - 2:22, 33:6, 33:14, 34:37, 35:20, 35:26 play [2] - 21:15, 34:7 plus (1) - 25:38 PM [8] - 1:7, 1:19, 7:47, 9:35, 9:37, 9:38, 40:7, 40:8 point [27] - 10:15, 12:17, 12:26, 12:31, 12:34, 17:7, 18:23, 26:27, 27:5, 28:9, 29:13, 31:39, 32:21, 32:43, 33:27, 33:28, 34:13, 34:21, 35:22, 35:28, 37:4, 37:28, 37:38, 38:25, 38:29, 38:41, 39:25 pointed [2] - 2:18, 4:44 points (6) - 18:3, 18:18, 24:28, 31:21, 34:18 policy [3] - 28:29. 28:34, 39:29 pops [2] - 10:10 position [9] - 11:26. 12:32, 18:31, 26:44, 33:34, 34:8, 34:23, 37:1, 39:46 positions [2] - 30:3, 30:33 positive [4] - 25:15, 25:30, 25:31, 27:20 power[6] - 1:31, 1:46, 2:5, 4:41, 4:45, 37:20 powers [1] - 33:29 practical [2] - 30:12, 30:16 practice [2] - 31:29, 33:19 preceding [1] - 38:45 preference[1] - 35:41 prejudice (2) - 25:7, 26:23 prejudiced (1) - 11:12 prejudicial (1) - 13:23 present(4) - 8:30, 12:6, 21:45, 39:46 presented [1] - 27:34 preserving (1) - 12:12 press [1] - 36:29

pretty [4] - 3:35, 32:5, 38:32, 38:33 preview (1) - 40:1 prima [12] - 11:4, 15:36, 16:23, 16:28, 16:32, 17:8, 17:28, 18:42, 24:40, 26:16, 26:34, 36:2 principle (1) - 15:47 principles [1] - 29:20 priority [2] - 2:4, 11:24 problem [3] - 8:26, 32:26, 34:46 problems [2] - 31:34, 35:20 proceed[2] - 10:8, 19:47 proceeding [3] - 11:8, 11:9, 16:17 proceedings [6] -6:25, 16:1, 25:8, 40:17, 40:18, 40:20 PROCEEDINGS 171 -1:4, 1:6, 7:46, 7:47, 9:37, 9:38, 40:8 proceeds [1] - 11;23 process(6) - 1:32, 1:34, 2:42, 4:6, 5:41, 11:36 profit[1] - 11:26 prohibiting (2) -14:35, 25:42 prohibitory [3] -25:15, 25:46, 27:47 projected (1) - 35:15 projection (1) - 35:9 prominent [1] - 38:2 prongs [3] - 10:45, 37:13 proper [2] - 25:6, 33:5 properly [2] - 13:22, 26:13 property (4) - 7:36, 25:27, 34:24, 39:17 proposal(1) - 1:18 propose [2] - 5:44, 18:26 proposed [3] - 19:37, 19:42, 36:15 proposition [2] -12:35, 32:25 protections (1) -38 16 protects (2) - 7:20, 23:9 provide [2] - 11:21, 31:3 provided [1] - 40:18 Province[1] - 40:14 provision [1] - 37:45

provisions (4) - 17:37. 18:20, 31:44, 31:45 pulling [1] - 38:38 puppet[1] - 38:26 purchase [2] - 14:21, 15:27 purpose [3] - 11:17, 32:34, 37:44 pursuant[1] - 13:8 push [2] - 18:38, 32:17 put (10] - 2:13, 3:5, 23:41, 25:39, 27:40, 29:47, 34:6, 36:13, 38:44, 39:2 putting [2] - 2:35, 16:45

Q

questions [7] - 27:45, 28:34, 28:36, 28:37, 31:33, 33:33, 36:37 quickly [3] - 19:21, 19:40, 19:41 quite [6] - 22:37, 23:7, 34:20, 35:8, 37:5, 37:9 quoted [1] - 12:46

R

radical[1] - 27:9 radically [1] - 27:35 rail [1] - 6:42 raise[1] - 12:8 raised (4) - 6:34, 27:44, 31:15, 31:35 rare[1] - 28:37 rather(1) - 18:35 reach [1] - 32:21 reacting (1) - 29:27 read [5] - 24:19, 24:21, 24:22, 24:28 real[1] - 4:34 reality (1) - 29:46 realized [1] - 31:9 realizing [1] - 11:17 really (6) - 4:38, 10:14, 18:33, 35:7, 38:28, 38:30 reason [5] - 21:26, 29:5, 32:36, 32:37, 33:10 reasonable [3] ~ 11:11, 11:15, 33:22 reasoning (1) - 34:39 reasons [2] - 33:26, 33:29 received [1] - 19:40

receiver[29] - 1:26, 1:29, 1:30, 1:35, 2:8, 2:23, 2:26, 3:2, 3:8, 3:34, 3:41, 4:46, 5:14, 5:15, 5:17, 5:27, 7:3, 7:6, 11:47, 12:23, 18:26, 19:37, 19:42, 25:40, 31:2. 33:29, 34:2, 34:42, 39:13 recelver's [8] - 2:1, 2:3, 2:14, 2:23, 4:16, 5:29, 34:2, 34:36 receivership (8) - 5:2. 5:8, 5:10, 5:28, 5:47, 6:10, 17:36, 23:42 receiverships(1) - 5:8 recess (1) - 40:5 RECESSED[2] - 7:46, 9:37 recognizes [1] - 26:13 recommendation [3] -1:36, 32:41, 34:3 recommendations [1] - 31:4 recommends [1] -34:42 RECONVENED [2] -7:47, 9:38 record [9] - 1:10, 8:3, 8:30, 8:33, 9:41, 22:40, 24:11, 30:24, 39:6 recorded [1] - 40:18 recourse[1] - 13:26 redemption [3] - 18:5, 18:9, 18:15 refer(1) - 1:39 reference[1] - 24:12 referred (1) - 23:36 refers (1) - 14:6 refinancing (1) - 37:17 reflected [1] - 11:18 reflects [1] - 22:36 refused [2] - 37:15, 37:16 regarded (1) - 13:15 regime (1) - 13:11 Registrar(2) - 8:19, regrettably[1] - 35:45 regulation (1) - 25:33 reinvested [1] - 11:33 reiterate (1) - 18:23 relating [2] - 7:36, 15:40 relation [1] - 13:43 relationship [2] -13:16, 13:21 relatively[1] - 12:30

relayed [1] - 22:39 Relief [2] - 12:45, 13:8 relief[15] - 10:36, 12:18, 12:23, 14:25, 15:30, 15:33, 15:44, 15:45, 16:15, 16:18, 25:20, 28:13, 31:43, 36:21, 36:26 remain (i) - 4:39 remains [1] - 6:12 remedies (3) - 15:39. 15:40, 28:11 remedy [2] - 12:21, 39:11 remember[3] - 1:27, 32:29, 35:7 remind [1] - 10:34 reminded [1] - 6:22 removed (1) - 26:1 removing (1) - 15:24 renew [i] - 37:34 repaid [3] - 12:3, 18:34, 34:15 repayment[i] - 11:22 repeatedly [3] - 28:10, 32:44, 33:8 replace[1] - 11:39 report[5] - 1:33, 2:6, 2:28, 4:10, 4:11 REPORTERM -40:11 Reporter [2] - 40:13, 40:31 require [6] - 5:23, 12:3, 17:36, 23:24, 28:1, 28:25 required [3] - 11:34, 11:42, 33:15 requires (3) - 16:30. 25:31, 25:32 requiring (1) - 25:44 reservoir[1] - 32:11 residents [1] - 35:10 resolution [1] - 30:16 resolved [2] - 8:23, 22:18 resort[3] - 1:27, 15:7, 18:27 resorts[1] - 2:3 respectful [6] - 26:42, 27:21, 30:27, 35:44, 36:17 respond [1] - 20:36 respondents[1] -14:21 response (1) - 19:43 responsibility [1] -11:21

rest[1] - 18:2

restrictions (1) - 32:34

retain [1] - 7:31 retired (1) - 18:34 retreat [2] - 30:12, 30:17 retreating [1] - 30:40 revised[1] - 19:34 rld [1] - 17:18 rightly [1] - 2:18 rights [6] - 7:32, 14:11, 14:14, 14:16, 27:37 rise[1] - 39:8 rising (1) - 37:10 risk [3] - 26:20, 26:23, 28:35 risks [1] - 28:22 RJR m - 10:44 ROBERTS [48] - 1:9. 1:11, 1:15, 1:18, 1:21, 1:25, 1:40, 1:42, 1:44, 1:46, 2:1, 2:8, 2:12, 2:16, 2:20, 2:22, 2:25, 3:13, 3:16, 3:22, 3:28, 6:21, 6:25, 6:41, 6:46, 7:1, 7:8, 7:24, 8:5, 8:8, 8:11, 8:15, 8:18, 8:28, 8:37, 8:43, 20:16, 20:18, 20:21, 20:24, 20:29, 20:32, 20:37, 20:39, 20:43, 21:12, 21:15, 21:19 Roberts (9) - 8:4, 9:9, 19:43, 20:11, 21:36, 22:28, 29:18, 29:33, 36:20 role [1] - 15:41 room[1] - 22:41 Rubin (2) - 3:38, 8:30 rubric[1] - 27:18 rule (1) - 28:47 running (4) - 22:21, 36:12, 36:14, 36:21

S

sale [4] - 2:42, 11:23, 12:24, 34:33
sales [11] - 1:32, 1:34, 11:18, 11:31, 12:9, 25:40, 31:30, 32:47, 33:41, 36:23, 37:16
Sanovest [24] - 11:22, 11:25, 11:35, 12:1, 12:14, 12:20, 12:31, 12:44, 15:4, 15:10, 16:20, 18:25, 18:33, 29:20, 31:42, 32:21, 34:19, 34:22, 35:39,

35:41, 37:14, 37:29, 38:11, 38:19 Sanovest's (2) -11:21, 37:1 satisfy[1] - 26:14 save [1] - 24:9 saw [1] - 32:10 schedule (1) - 23:21 second [1] - 29:13 section [3] - 14:26, 14:33, 39:24 secured [6] - 2:4, 5:34, 5:41, 6:1, 34:8, 34:23 Security [1] - 32:22 security |2| - 6:3, 38:17 see [19] - 5:7, 5:37. 6:35, 7:4, 10:28, 12:13, 15:22, 15:37, 17:12, 21:2, 29:38, 30:43, 32:45, 33:6, 33:8, 34:19, 36:44, 37:39, 38:18 seek (1) - 15:44 seeking [9] - 12:22, 15:22, 15:40, 16:13. 16:16, 18:30, 31:43, 35:27, 36:26 seem (1) - 35:29 sees [2] - 2:9, 2:10 seized [1] - 4:6 selective[1] - 37:24 self [2] - 30:47, 32:25 self-interested [2] -30:47, 32:25 sell [6] - 7:10, 7:14, 12:4, 16:19, 36:23 selling [1] - 34:47 sense[4] - 7:4, 14:2, 20:35, 31:40 sensible [4] - 30:16, 33:30, 34:45, 39:5 sent [1] - 20:18 soparate(1) - 2:41 September[2] - 1:1, 40:25 serious [6] - 10:46, 16:36, 24:38, 27:43, 27:45, 31:35 set[7] - 3:14, 3:40, 8:16, 11:13, 12:39, 12:40, 16:7 sets [1] - 21:8 settle [2] - 19:32, 39:16 settling [1] - 20:6 several[i] - 23:36

shape (1) - 27:10

share [1] - 37:23

shareholder[3] -13:44, 13:45, 14:9 shareholders (2) -14:4, 14:15 shares [4] - 13:47, 14:1, 15:3, 15:27 shift(1) - 33:11 shotgun [1] - 15:27 show [15] - 15:35, 26:36, 28:29, 31:26, 33:15, 33:20, 35:19, 35:40, 36:43, 37:27, 37:39, 38:8, 38:29, 39:30, 40:2 showed [2] - 34:28, 37:44 showing [3] - 15:39, 16:11, 26:7 shown [3] - 16:37. 17:18, 32:11 sic] [1] - 15:24 side [4] - 7:21, 20:36, 21:9, 21:11 sides [4] - 12:12, 12:17, 27:44, 32:17 sight [1] - 3:36 sign [1] - 32:17 significance [1] -28:22 significant[1] - 16:25 simplicity [1] - 30:35 simply [5] - 6:13, 12:24, 13:15, 16:42. 17:37 sit [1] - 22:13 sitting [2] - 3:30, 20:6 situation [2] - 18:39 20:1 sized [1] - 35:13 skill (n - 40:21 sky [1] - 15:14 slightly (2) - 29:14, 29:15 small [3] - 6:28, 19:29, 26:22 smaller[1] - 10:20 Smith [3] - 13:32, 13:39, 14:19 soak[1] - 35:7 sold [2] - 25:40, 34:24 sole [1] - 13:45 someone [1] - 21:24 sometime (1) - 3:41 sometimes (1) - 30:25 son (2) - 31:41, 32:6 sorry [11] - 3:21, 6:21, 19:22, 21:5, 24:35, 24:44, 26:28, 29:7, 35:46, 37:31, 39:41

sort (6) - 11:25, 15:11,

15:14, 15:16, 36:40 sought(1) - 10:36 source (1) - 33:21 specific[1] - 3:14 speed [1] - 30:39 stand [4] - 6:47, 7:42, 16:46, 23:40 standard [5] - 11:10, 17:1, 17:11, 26:17, 26:35 standing [2] - 9:1, 13:43 start [6] - 3:10, 10:26, 12:27, 22:25, 24:13, starting [1] - 12:34 statements [1] - 33:12 statute [1] - 10:17 statutory [3] - 13:8. 13:11, 13:27 step [1] - 21:36 stepped [1] - 31:9 steps (2) - 31:8, 37:35 still [2] - 9:46, 13:27 stood [1] - 7:44 stop [1] - 38:37 stops [1] - 22:45 story [1] - 33:45 straightforward [1] -12:31 strange (1) - 6:36 strategy [5] - 28:35, 28:40, 33:3, 33:5, 39:30 strong [13] - 11:3, 16:22, 16:28, 16:32, 17:20, 18:42, 24:40, 26:16, 26:18, 26:34, 33:23, 36:2, 37:5 struck[1] - 35:8 stymled (2) - 12:8, 12:9 subdivide [1] - 35:4 subject[2] - 32:33, 38:3 submission [11] -1:12, 25:36, 26:42, 27:21, 29:6, 30:27, 31:16, 35:44, 36:2, 36:18, 37:24 submissions [10] -5:31, 8:24, 9:6, 10:38, 21:28, 22:19, 23:33, 24:14, 29:36. 37:6 submit [1] - 33:24 subordinating [1] -38:19 subscribed [1] - 40:24 substance (3) - 25:17,

25:20, 25:36 substantial [1] - 26:43 substantially [1] substantive[i] -21:12 subtle (1) - 37;38 succeed [1] - 27:21 succeeded (1) - 17:32 sue [3] - 31:42, 31:47 suffering [1] - 12:7 sufficient[2] - 1:31, 2.5 suggest [2] - 2:47, 21:35 Buggestion[1] - 4:17 suited [1] - 29:3 summary [4] - 16:26, 30:22, 37:26, 39:33 supported [1] - 27:10 supposed [2] - 3:19, 31:32 supposedly [1] - 3:10 Supreme [1] - 25:13 suspense (1) - 39:39

Т

tab [3] - 12:42, 13:3.

13:33 table (1) - 23:35 tabs (1) - 24:8 tap's [1] - 33:40 taps [1] - 33:37 tax [1] - 33:33 temperature [1] -37:10 tens (i) - 33:3 term [2] - 32:36, 32:37 terminate (2) - 25:23, 25:24 terms [19] - 1:34. 17:34, 17:38, 19:29, 19:33, 20:6, 20:27, 20:30, 20:33, 20:37, 20:38, 20:46, 21:9, 21:10, 22:34, 22:39, 27:15, 27:23, 33:15 terrible [1] - 38:43 test (11) - 10:16, 10:43, 10:44, 11:6, 16:35, 19:3, 19:5, 19:9, 24:37, 25:4, 36:4 themselves [2] -12:22, 28:36 they've [2] - 12:7, 12:8 thin [1] - 30:23 third [4] - 25:39, 32:33, 33:10, 38:20

throw[1] - 33:2 Thursday [1] - 23:15 Tian [11] - 11:38, 15:24, 18:25, 18:33, 31:7, 31:34, 32:46, 34:7, 35:23, 36:45, 39:47 timing (1) - 10:5 today [2] - 19:44, 26:13 together(i) - 11:32 Tom [3] - 11:39, 32:16, 33:18 tomorrow[2] - 21:43, 39:22 took (4) - 17:14, 32:29, 34:20, 37:35 top[1] - 28:27 tough [1] - 32:5 town (i) - 35:13 transactions (2) -32:10, 32:26 transcribed [1] - 40:17 transcript[1] - 40:20 treatise [1] - 30:41 trial [12] - 3:10, 3:20, 3:29, 18:44, 19:8, 19:9, 25:7, 26:12, 26:15, 27:2, 28:14 tried [6] - 10:46, 11:42, 16:36, 24:38, 27:44, 27:45 trope [1] - 35:22 true [6] - 12:35, 33:33, 35:18, 35:21, 38:15. 40:19 trustee [1] - 31:2 try [5] - 7:14, 11:25, 11:26, 21:38, 24:14 trying [3] - 20:46, 26:7, 35:23 turn [2] - 14:1, 31:1 turned (1) - 33:40 turns [2] - 9:16, 35:20 two [15] - 2:27, 10:45, 15:5, 15:41, 24:5, 24:8, 27:6, 27:34, 28:39, 29:14, 30:3 30:32, 32:38, 34:22,

38:11

24:8

two-volume (2) - 24:5,

third-party [2] - 32:33,

thousand [1] - 35:30

10:45, 28:7, 32:44,

37:12, 37:27, 37:36,

38:36, 38:45, 39:20

three-part(1) - 28:7

three[11] - 2:15,

38:20

U

ultimate (1) - 19:8 unblock (1) - 34:45 unblocked [1] - 34:33 under [17] - 10:16, 10:36, 10:43, 14:20, 14:25, 17:37, 17:39, 27:17, 27:25, 27:26. 31:44, 33:15, 35:26. 37:15, 37:29, 39:7, 39:23 underlying (1) - 21:13 understood (1) - 7:38 unduly (1) - 11:26 unexpected (i) - 5:31 unfair [2] - 13:12, 37:25 unfairly [1] - 11:12 unfortunately [2] -21:42, 24:4 unhindered (1) -32:41 unique [1] - 22:39 units (1) - 14:22 unreliable [1] - 17:20 untoward [1] - 7:34 unusual [1] - 5;19 up [12] - 4:10, 9:7, 10:10, 15:16, 17:45, 22:42, 23:38, 23:40, 28:23, 36:39, 39:15 update [1] - 9:45 urgency (1) - 2:19 urgent [2] - 4:26, 30:19

V

value [4] - 11:19, 12:13, 12:16, 22:47 Vancouver[1] - 1:2 vendor[1] - 34:15 ventilated [1] - 31:36 view (10] - 8:22, 15:30, 15:31, 18:13, 23:1, 23:24, 25:2, 25:14, 37:25 views [1] - 31:4 violate (1) - 25:26 violated [1] - 11:40 voltus (1) - 32:24 Volume (n - 13:3 volume [2] - 24:5, 24:8

W

wait [1] - 39:38 waiting [2] - 7:42,

39:36 wants [3] - 33:17, 34:24, 34:25 waterfall [1] - 35:40 wave [1] - 26:29 Wednesday [4] -22:13, 23:14, 23:15, 23:17 week [2] - 3:20, 9:30 weigh [1] - 16:30 WHEREOF (1) - 40:23 whole [6] - 6:39, 26:37, 31:46, 33:44, 35:22, 35:45 win [2] - 26:18, 26:19 wind (1) - 39:15 wipe [1] - 34:9 wishos [1] - 22:24 WITNESS [1] - 40:23 word [2] - 35:23, 37:14 words [2] ~ 31:26, 37:17 worth (3) - 6:28, 18:28, 33:3 write [3] - 19:1, 30:18, 30:40 writes (1) - 13:40 written [2] - 24:13, 33:24 wrote [2] - 13:5, 38:31

....

years [7] - 31:28, 34:20, 34:22, 37:37, 38:37, 38:45, 39:21 yellow [2] - 24:7, 24:8 yellow-ish [2] - 24:7, 24:8 yesterday [1] - 37:6 yourself [1] - 17:7

Z,

zone (1) - 13:35

13:25

'complainant' [1] -

**

"affairs" [2] - 14:7, 14:8 "not [2] - 14:3, 14:16 —(1) - 13:43