



ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

ENDORSEMENT

COURT FILE NO.: CV-25-00738613-00CL

READ: MARCH 16, 2026

NO. ON LIST: 1

TITLE OF PROCEEDING:

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

AND

**IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF 1242939
B.C. UNLIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, 1241423 B.C. LTD., 1330096 B.C. LTD.,
1330094 B.C. LTD., 1330092 B.C. UNLIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, 1329608 B.C.
UNLIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, 2745263 ONTARIO INC., 2745270 ONTARIO
INC., SNOSPMIS LIMITED, 2472596 ONTARIO INC., AND 2472598 ONTARIO INC.,
Applicants**

BEFORE: JUSTICE KIMMEL

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

For Plaintiff, Applicant, Moving Party:

| Name of Person Appearing | Name of Party | Contact Info |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Ashley Taylor | The Applicants | ataylor@stikeman.com |
| | | |

For Defendant, Respondent, Responding Party:

| Name of Person Appearing | Name of Party | Contact Info |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Sean Zweig Michael Shakra | Counsel to HBC CCAA Monitor | szweig@bennettjones.com shakram@bennettjones.com |

For Other, Self-Represented:

| Name of Person Appearing | Name of Party | Contact Info |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| Robrt Rene Turpin | Self-Represented | rturpin15@gmail.com |
| | | |

ENDORSEMENT OF JUSTICE KIMMEL:

- [1] Since I assumed responsibility for case managing this proceeding earlier this year, Mr. Robert Rene Turpin has asserted various rights and entitlements in email correspondence directed to the Monitor and its counsel and to counsel for the Applicant companies, some of which has been sent directly to the court and to the email service list for this proceeding.
- [2] Mr. Turpin has sought various accommodations from the court which have been referenced in two formal endorsements, dated January 27, 2026 and February 13, 2026. This endorsement summarizes Mr. Turpin’s most recent requests for accommodations from the court and the court’s prior rulings and directions regarding his requests for accommodations. This endorsement also provides some preliminary directions regarding next steps.
- [3] In an email from the court dated February 6, 2026 regarding his communications to the court, Mr. Turpin was advised, among other things, that:

The accommodations that you will be afforded for upcoming hearings will be those that you were afforded for the last hearing: you are on the service list and will receive all written materials from other parties by email when they are served. You will be provided with a zoom link for all hearings and the zoom closed captioning and audio transcript functions will be activated during the hearing should you wish to turn on those functions on your screen.

- [4] In the court’s February 13, 2026 endorsement the court confirmed (at paragraphs 52-54) that:

[52] Mr. Turpin’s demand for all matters in this complex CCAA proceeding to be heard entirely in writing is not reasonable and cannot be accommodated.

[53] In exercising that supervisory function, the court is satisfied that reasonable steps were taken to provide accommodations to Mr. Turpin, and that he had received the court material in a timely manner and had reasonable written notice of other parties’ positions in respect of his assertions. He had a reasonable and fair amount of time to analyze the contents of the material for this hearing having regard to his stated disabilities (which to date have not been medically documented), but also considering the broader context of the real time litigation that this court manages in a large and complex restructuring proceeding such as this one. In all of the circumstances, it was determined that it was

appropriate to proceed with the ERC motion for approval of the Term Sheet and ancillary relief on February 11, 2026, as scheduled.

[54] As this court has said previously in *Niang v. Lakeshore Gardens Co-operative Homes Inc.*, 2024 ONSC 3246, at para. 9: “The court cannot simply address the needs of one party alone where doing so may prejudice the other parties. Accommodations sought in legal proceedings must take into account that there are other people whose rights might be affected”. This concern is exacerbated in large insolvency and restructuring proceedings involving numerous stakeholders in which there are multiple motions to address settlements, sales transactions and distributions of proceeds, to name a few. This “real time litigation” involves a balancing act of competing interests, under the supervision of the Commercial Court. Certainty is one of the important hallmarks of large restructuring proceedings such as these, with each issue raised and decided in the progression towards a final resolution.

- [5] After the February 13, 2026 hearing, on February 17, 2026 Mr. Turpin served the following materials
- (a) The February 14, 2026 Evidence Filing: Said to contain the foundational archival data and initial notice he sent over the weekend.
 - (b) The February 16, 2026 Master Evidence Package: Said to be the 6-Part definitive "Chain of Title" and Archival Instruction set.
 - (c) The February 17, 2026 Counter-Notice: Said to address the 14-day window for a February 27th hearing.
- [6] Mr. Turpin also refers to a four-part “Sovereign Proposal: The Source of Peace” said to have been served on January 12, 2026 that he says he resubmitted by email on February 19, 2026.
- [7] All of the above-referenced materials appear to be directed to a challenge to the sale of the Hudson’s Bay Charter that was approved by the Court on December 11, 2025. The sale transaction closed on December 19, 2025. Mr. Turpin was under the erroneous impression that there was a hearing scheduled for February 27, 2026, which was not the case.
- [8] Following various emails from Mr. Turpin, the court provided Mr. Turpin with a further procedural direction by email on February 20, 2026, including that:

If a request is being made for an exceptional direction for a case conference (or any other hearing in this matter) to proceed entirely in writing that would need to be submitted as a formal request (motion) for a direction from the court and that request would need to be supported by evidence, including medical documentation, of the limitations or need for accommodation resulting from a disability and how this impacts your ability to participate in a zoom, in-person or hybrid hearing. In these particular circumstances, any such request (motion) for an exceptional direction may include a request that it be considered on the basis of written submissions. The court would consider your request and any responding written submissions from

the Monitor and the Company and any other interested stakeholders, all of whom would have the right to respond to your request should they wish to do so.

[9] On February 25, 2026, Mr. Turpin again wrote by email to the court after various emails attaching portions of medical records, with a request that: “All future communication and hearings must remain in **written format**”. That day a request for an in-writing case conference was submitted by Mr. Turpin seeking: “The determination on the "Chain of Title" and formalizing a request for Mandatory Accommodations (Written Proceedings) under AODA/Human Rights Code due to documented disabilities”.

[10] On February 26, 2026, Mr. Turpin was advised by the court that:

The court invites the monitor to provide its position and recommendations regarding the timing, forum and process for the court's consideration of your claims, after which a further direction will be provided. The court has not approved the request for your claims to be determined entirely in writing and will await the submissions from the monitor on this and any other aspects of your request. A further direction will be provided in due course.

[11] The court received additional email submissions about the process to be followed, in particular with respect to Mr. Turpin’s request for an in-writing case conference:

(a) On March 5, 2026, counsel for the Applicants advised as follows:

Leaving aside the fact that the relief sought by Mr. Turpin is not properly a matter to be decided at a case conference, it seems to the Applicants that the first step is for there to be a determination made whether Mr. Turpin is entitled to the requested accommodation. People who request accommodation bear the burden of establishing that they have disabilities that need specific accommodation. The accommodation question must be determined by the Court on a motion with a proper evidentiary record, including an assessment from a qualified doctor. The “doctors notice” provided by Mr. Turpin is not on letter head, is not signed by a doctor, and does not indicate which doctor conducted the assessment. Further, the notice improperly purports to instruct the Court on what accommodations should be made.

In addition to the Monitor and the Applicants, there are a number of other stakeholders who would be interested in these motions (i.e. a motion seeking accommodations and a subsequent motion regarding the "Chain of Title") and may wish to make submissions, including HBC’s secured creditors, the purchasers of the Charter, and the Government of Canada, among others. A proper process is required to permit interested parties to participate in both motions, with the motion for accommodations to be heard first. [with reference to paragraph 54 of the court’s February 13, 2026 endorsement].

(b) Mr. Turpin wrote on March 5, 2026 to provide what he described as “the formal evidentiary record requested in Mr. Taylor’s email”, and provided some additional medial records with his emails of that date.

(c) On March 9, 2026, counsel for the Monitor advised that:

In terms of next steps and process, we agree with Mr. Taylor's email on behalf of the Applicants that the next step ought to be a motion brought by Mr. Turpin to determine whether he is entitled to the accommodations he is seeking. That motion – like all motions in the CCAA proceeding – should be on notice to the Service List. We acknowledge that Mr. Turpin has now provided certain additional documentation in connection with his accommodation request.

(d) Mr. Turpin confirmed by email later on March 9, 2026 as follows:

As directed by the Monitor’s counsel and in accordance with the rules of this proceeding, I am providing formal notification that I have served my **Notice of Motion for Mandatory Accommodation** on the full Service List today, March 9, 2026.

I am attaching the following evidentiary records to this email for the Court’s file:

1. **Clinical Documentation:** Psychological Assessment (Sullivan + Associates) and Medical Notice (NP Grace Fox).
2. **Evidence of Claim:** Documents regarding the **Mary Ann Turpin** ancestral records and my **\$30,000,000 Restitution Claim**

[bold type here and elsewhere in this endorsement is reproduced from the original emails from Mr. Turpin]

[12] Now that Mr. Turpin has provided a document titled Notice of Motion seeking accommodation that all proceedings in this matter involving Mr. Turpin be conducted in plain text/writing (the “Accommodation Request”), and he has identified and attached to his emails the material that he says provides the evidentiary support for this Accommodation Request, in this limited and particular circumstance and as was contemplated by the court’s February 20, 2026 email, the court is prepared to consider this Accommodation Request on the basis of written submissions. This does not mean that all other hearings will be in writing, that is part of what the court’s decision in respect of the Accommodation Request will decide.

[13] The court’s consideration of the Accommodation Request will proceed on the basis of the following timetable:

- (a) Counsel for the Monitor shall ensure that a copy of this endorsement and the materials delivered thus far by Mr. Turpin in support of his Accommodation Request are served on all stakeholders on the service list and posted on the Monitor’s website.
- (b) The Monitor, the Applicants and any other interested stakeholders who wish to respond shall do so in writing in an Aide Memoire not to exceed five pages double spaced (each) to be submitted by March 23, 2026.

- (c) If Mr. Turpin wishes to reply to any responding submissions provided on or before March 23, 2026, he may do so in-writing in an Aide Memoire not to exceed 5 pages double spaced to be delivered by no later than March 30, 2026.
- (d) A hearing bundle will be created in Case Center for an in writing hearing that will have a designated date of March 30, 2026 (the last date for filing submissions). Counsel for the Monitor is asked to assist Mr. Turpin by uploading his materials (Notice Of Motion and supporting materials and reply submissions, if any) in respect of the Request for Accommodation into that hearing bundle in Case Center for Mr. Turpin (Moving Party) for the court's ready access. The Monitor, the Applicants and any other responding stakeholder(s) who have delivered responding submissions shall ensure that their respective responding materials have also been uploaded into this hearing bundle in Case Center for the court's ready access.
- (e) The court will, sometime after March 30, 2026, read the submissions provided and decide Mr. Turpin's Accommodation Request and will provide a written endorsement in due course.

[14] The next scheduled hearing in this CCAA Proceeding is on March 19, 2026. That is a stay extension motion. Counsel for the Monitor provided the court with a copy of Mr. Turpin's March 13, 2026 email objecting to this motion proceeding by zoom and requesting that "the Court provide a written direction regarding how this motion will be conducted to accommodate my documented disabilities before any Zoom links are circulated".

[15] The court directs that the March 19, 2026 hearing for the stay extension motion will proceed by zoom in the same manner as the last two motions that have proceeded in this matter. Mr. Turpin was on the service list and received the Monitor's motion materials for the stay extension, will receive any other written materials delivered in connection with this motion since he is on the service list, and has been afforded the opportunity to respond in writing to the motion if he has an objection. The same accommodations will be afforded to Mr. Turpin for this motion as were afforded to him on the prior two motions (see paragraphs 3 and 4 above that outline those accommodations).

[16] This endorsement and the orders and directions contained in it shall have the immediate effect of a court order.



Date: March 16, 2026