

COURT FILE NUMBER

QB No. 1884 of 2019

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH FOR SASKATCHEWAN

JUDICIAL CENTRE

SASKATOON

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF 101098672
SASKATCHEWAN LTD., MORRIS INDUSTRIES LTD., MORRIS SALES AND SERVICE LTD.,
CONTOUR REALTY INC., and MORRIS INDUSTRIES (USA) INC.

BRIEF OF LAW OF THE MONITOR, ALVAREZ & MARSAL CANADA INC.

Hearing Date: August 18, 2020

MLT AIKINS

1500, 410 22nd Street East
Saskatoon SK S7K 5T6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Facts and Background	1
III.	Issues	1
IV.	Argument.....	2
	A. Circumstances Exist Which Make The Extension Appropriate.....	2
	B. Good Faith and Due Diligence	3
V.	Conclusion	5
VI.	List of Authorities.....	6

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This Brief of Law is filed in support of the application by Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc. (the “**Monitor**”), Court-appointed Monitor of 101098672 Saskatchewan Ltd., Morris Industries Ltd., Morris Sales and Service Ltd., Contour Realty Inc., and Morris Industries (USA) Inc. (collectively, the “**Morris Group**”), for an Order:
 - (a) extending the term of the Amended and Restated Initial Order of the Honourable Mr. Justice R.S. Smith granted in these proceedings on January 16, 2020 (the “**ARI Order**”), and the stay of proceedings provided for therein, from 11:59 p.m. Saskatchewan time on Monday, August 31, 2020 to 11:59 p.m. Saskatchewan time on Friday, September 18, 2020;
 - (b) approving the actions, activities and conduct of the Monitor from July 24 to August 14, 2020;
 - (c) approving the fees and disbursements of the Monitor and its legal counsel from July 1 to July 31, 2020; and
 - (d) granting such further and other relief as counsel may request and this Honourable Court may allow.

II. FACTS AND BACKGROUND

2. Pursuant to the Order (Enhancement of Monitor’s Powers) of the Honourable Mr. Justice R.W. Elson granted on February 18, 2020 (the “**EMP Order**”), the Monitor is empowered, *inter alia*, to take any steps reasonably incidental to certain enumerated powers described therein and to exercise statutory rights and remedies on behalf of Morris Group (paragraph 3(d)). This is the authority relied upon by the Monitor to bring applications in these proceedings on behalf of the Morris Group, including the within application.
3. The facts relied upon by the Monitor in support of this application are set out in the Ninth Report of the Monitor dated August 14, 2020 (the “**Ninth Report**”), as well as the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Reports previously filed by the Monitor in relation to these proceedings.

III. ISSUES

4. This Brief addresses the issue of whether the statutory requirements for extending the stay of proceedings provided by the Initial Order have been met.

IV. ARGUMENT

5. The Court's jurisdiction to extend the stay of proceedings granted pursuant to an initial order, and the prerequisites that must be met before the Court may grant such an extension, are set out in subsections 11.02(2) and (3) of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36 (the "**CCAA**"), which provide as follows:

Stays, etc. — other than initial application

(2) A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

Burden of proof on application

(3) The court shall not make the order unless

(a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

Restriction

(4) Orders doing anything referred to in subsection (1) or (2) may only be made under this section.

A. Circumstances Exist Which Make The Extension Appropriate

6. In considering whether circumstances exist that make the extension order sought appropriate, the Courts have looked to, among others, the following, non-exhaustive list of factors:
- (a) whether the extension sought furthers the underlying purposes of the CCAA; namely: to avoid the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company, by facilitating a plan of arrangement or compromise between the debtor company and the creditors;¹

¹ *Clothing for Modern Times Ltd., Re*, 2011 ONSC 7522 at paras 11-12, 88 CBR (5th) 239.

- (b) the debtor company's progress during the previous stay period toward a restructuring;
 - (c) whether creditors will be prejudiced if the court grants the extension; and
 - (d) the comparative prejudice to the debtor company, creditors, and other stakeholders, if the stay extension were not granted.²
7. In the circumstances of this application, the Monitor is continuing its efforts to close transactions for the sale of the business assets of the Morris Group with a view to maximizing value for all stakeholders. The first ranking secured creditor, Bank of Montreal ("**BMO**"), has expressed its support for the requested extension, and continues to fund the CCAA proceedings as interim financing lender. Farm Credit Canada, which holds loan obligations which are joint with those of BMO, and Avrio Subordinated Debt, the other senior secured creditors, are not expected to oppose the requested extension.
 8. As described in the Ninth Report, the Monitor and the prospective purchaser have executed Asset Purchase Agreements. This proposed transaction represents the best chance at this time to maximize the value of the assets of Morris Group.
 9. To the knowledge of the Monitor, no party is opposing the stay extension sought and no viable alternative to an extension of the stay of proceedings has been identified or brought forward by any party. No party has applied for a receivership order directed against the Morris Group. The Monitor has been operating the business of Morris Industries Ltd. since the resignation or retirement of the last remaining directors and officers in February, and is best positioned to "keep the lights on" within the Morris Group pending a sale. Any change in course at this point would be expected to jeopardize the Monitor's extensive efforts to conclude a sale of the assets of Morris Group and to result in a significant increase in professional fees.
 10. For all of these reasons, the Monitor respectfully submits that circumstances exist which make an Order extending the stay of proceedings appropriate.

B. Good Faith and Due Diligence

11. The requirements of good faith and due diligence were the subject of recent comment by the Supreme Court of Canada in *9354-9186 Québec Inc. v Callidus Capital Corp.*, as follows:

49 The discretionary authority conferred by the CCAA, while broad in nature, is not boundless. This authority must be exercised in furtherance of the remedial objectives of the CCAA, which we have explained above. Additionally, the court must keep in mind three "baseline considerations" (at para. 70), which the

² *Federal Gypsum Co., Re*, 2007 NSSC 347 at paras 24-29, 40 CBR (5th) 80.

applicant bears the burden of demonstrating: (1) that the order sought is appropriate in the circumstances, and (2) that the applicant has been acting in good faith and (3) with due diligence (para. 69).

50 The first two considerations of appropriateness and good faith are widely understood in the CCAA context. Appropriateness “is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the CCAA”. Further, the well-established requirement that parties must act in good faith in insolvency proceedings has recently been made express in s. 18.6 of the CCAA, which provides:

Good faith

18.6 (1) Any interested person in any proceedings under this Act shall act in good faith with respect to those proceedings.

Good faith — powers of court

(2) If the court is satisfied that an interested person fails to act in good faith, on application by an interested person, the court may make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

51 The third consideration of due diligence requires some elaboration. Consistent with the CCAA regime generally, the due diligence consideration discourages parties from sitting on their rights and ensures that creditors do not strategically manoeuvre or position themselves to gain an advantage. The procedures set out in the CCAA rely on negotiations and compromise between the debtor and its stakeholders, as overseen by the supervising judge and the monitor. This necessarily requires that, to the extent possible, those involved in the proceedings be on equal footing and have a clear understanding of their respective rights. A party’s failure to participate in CCAA proceedings in a diligent and timely fashion can undermine these procedures and, more generally, the effective functioning of the CCAA regime.

52 We pause to note that supervising judges are assisted in their oversight role by a court appointed monitor whose qualifications and duties are set out in the CCAA. The monitor is an independent and impartial expert, acting as “the eyes and the ears of the court” throughout the proceedings. The core of the monitor’s role includes providing an advisory opinion to the court as to the fairness of any proposed plan of arrangement and on orders sought by parties, including the sale of assets and requests for interim financing.³

[citations omitted]

12. In this case, the Monitor, an officer of this Honourable Court, is overseeing management of the debtor companies pursuant to the EMP Order. All of the Monitor’s actions have been directed at maximizing value for stakeholders. There is no suggestion of which the Monitor is aware that the Monitor’s conduct has not been in good faith. Further, there has been no breakdown of communication of treatment of stakeholders on unequal terms that would support a finding of a lack of due diligence as described by the Supreme Court above. To the contrary, the Monitor has

³ 2020 SCC 10, 2020 CarswellQue 3772.

fulfilled the role described by the Supreme Court of Canada – an independent party safeguarding the process and (pursuant to the EMP Order) the business of the debtor companies.

13. For all of these reasons, the available evidence establishes that the Morris Group has acted and continues to act in good faith and with due diligence.

V. CONCLUSION

14. Based upon the foregoing, the Monitor respectfully requests that this Honourable Court grant an Order extending the ARI Order and the stay of proceedings thereunder to and including Friday, September 18, 2020, in the form of the Draft Order (Fifth Extension of Stay of Proceedings) filed.

ALL OF WHICH is respectfully submitted at Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, this 13th day of August, 2020.

MLT AIKINS LLP

Per: 

Jeffrey M. Lee, Q.C. and Paul Olfert

Solicitors for the Monitor, Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc.

CONTACT INFORMATION AND ADDRESS FOR SERVICE:

Name of firm:	MLT Aikins LLP
Lawyer in charge of file:	Jeffrey M. Lee, Q.C. and Paul Olfert
Address of firm:	1500, 410 22nd Street E, Saskatoon SK S7K 5T6
Telephone number:	306.975.7100
Email address:	JMLee@mltaikins.com / POlfert@mltaikins.com
File No:	35572.3

VI. LIST OF AUTHORITIES

TAB AUTHORITY

1. *9354-9186 Québec Inc. v Callidus Capital Corp.*, 2020 SCC 10, 2020 CarswellQue 3772.
2. *Clothing for Modern Times Ltd., Re*, 2011 ONSC 7522, 88 CBR (5th) 239.
3. *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36 (excerpt).
4. *Federal Gypsum Co., Re*, 2007 NSSC 347, 40 CBR (5th) 80.

2020 SCC 10, 2020 CSC 10
Supreme Court of Canada

9354-9186 Québec inc. v. Callidus Capital Corp.

2020 CarswellQue 3772, 2020 CarswellQue 3773, 2020 SCC 10, 2020 CSC 10

9354-9186 Québec inc. and 9354-9178 Québec inc. (Appellants) and Callidus Capital Corporation, International Game Technology, Deloitte LLP, Luc Carignan, François Vigneault, Philippe Millette, Francis Proulx and François Pelletier (Respondents) and Ernst & Young Inc., IMF Bentham Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Limited), Bentham IMF Capital Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Capital (Canada) Limited), Insolvency Institute of Canada and Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals (Intervenors)

IMF Bentham Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Limited) and Bentham IMF Capital Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Capital (Canada) Limited (Appellants) and Callidus Capital Corporation, International Game Technology, Deloitte LLP, Luc Carignan, François Vigneault, Philippe Millette, Francis Proulx and François Pelletier Respondents and Ernst & Young Inc., 9354-9186 Québec inc., 9354-9178 Québec inc., Insolvency Institute of Canada and Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals (Intervenors)

Wagner C.J.C., Abella J., Moldaver J., Karakatsanis J., Côté J., Rowe J., Kasirer J.

Heard: January 23, 2020
Judgment: May 8, 2020
Docket: 38594

Proceedings: Reasons in Full, [2020 CarswellQue 236](#), [2020 CarswellQue 237](#), [313 A.C.W.S. \(3d\) 686 \(S.C.C.\)](#) [Reversed](#), [2019 CarswellQue 94](#), [303 A.C.W.S. \(3d\) 693](#), [2019 QCCA 171](#), [EYB 2019-306890](#) (C.A. Que.)

Counsel: Jean-Philippe Groleau, Christian Lachance, Gabriel Lavery Lepage, Hannah Toledano, for Appellants / Intervenors, 9354-9186 Québec inc. and 9354-9178 Québec inc.

Neil A. Peden, for Appellants / Intervenors IMF Bentham Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Limited) and Bentham IMF Capital Limited (now known as Omni Bridgeway Capital (Canada) Limited)

Geneviève Cloutier, Clifton P. Prophet, for Respondent, Callidus Capital Corporation

Jocelyn Perreault, Noah Zucker, François Alexandre Toupin, for Respondents, International Game Technology, Deloitte LLP, Luc Carignan, François Vigneault, Philippe Millette, Francis Proulx and François Pelletier

Joseph Reynaud, Nathalie Nouvet, for Intervener, Ernst & Young Inc.

Sylvain Rigaud, Arad Mojtahedi, Saam Pousht-Mashhad, for Intervenors, Insolvency Institute of Canada and the Canadian Association of Insolvency and Restructuring Professionals

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by Wagner C.J.C., Moldaver J.:

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

ATCO Gas & Pipelines Ltd. v. Alberta (Energy & Utilities Board) (2006), 2006 SCC 4, 2006 CarswellAlta 139, 2006 CarswellAlta 140, 344 N.R. 293, 54 Alta. L.R. (4th) 1, [2006] 5 W.W.R. 1, 263 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 39 Admin. L.R. (4th) 159, 380 A.R. 1, 363 W.A.C. 1, [2006] 1 S.C.R. 140 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Arrangement relatif à 9354-9186 Québec inc. (Bluberi Gaming Technologies Inc.) (2018), 2018 QCCS 1040, 2018 CarswellQue 1923 (C.S. Que.) — referred to

BA Energy Inc., Re (2010), 2010 ABQB 507, 2010 CarswellAlta 1598, 70 C.B.R. (5th) 24 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Blackburn Developments Ltd., Re (2011), 2011 BCSC 1671, 2011 CarswellBC 3291, 27 B.C.L.R. (5th) 199 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

Boutiques San Francisco inc., Re (2003), 2003 CarswellQue 13882 (C.S. Que.) — referred to

Bridging Finance Inc. v. Béton Brunet 2001 inc. (2017), 2017 CarswellQue 328, 2017 QCCA 138, 44 C.B.R. (6th) 175 (C.A. Que.) — referred to

Canada Trustco Mortgage Co. v. R. (2005), 2005 SCC 54, 2005 CarswellNat 3212, 2005 CarswellNat 3213, (sub nom. *Canada Trustco Mortgage Co. v. Canada*) 2005 D.T.C. 5523 (Eng.), (sub nom. *Hypothèques Trustco Canada v. Canada*) 2005 D.T.C. 5547 (Fr.), [2005] 5 C.T.C. 215, (sub nom. *Minister of National Revenue v. Canada Trustco Mortgage Co.*) 340 N.R. 1, 259 D.L.R. (4th) 193, [2005] 2 S.C.R. 601 (S.C.C.) — referred to

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

Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. v. 360networks Corp. (2007), 2007 BCCA 14, 2007 CarswellBC 29, 28 E.T.R. (3d) 186, 27 C.B.R. (5th) 115, 61 B.C.L.R. (4th) 334, 10 P.P.S.A.C. (3d) 311, 235 B.C.A.C. 95, 388 W.A.C. 95, 279 D.L.R. (4th) 701 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

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

Crystallex International Corp., Re (2012), 2012 ONSC 2125, 2012 CarswellOnt 4577, 91 C.B.R. (5th) 169 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Crystallex International Corp., Re (2012), 2012 ONCA 404, 2012 CarswellOnt 7329, 91 C.B.R. (5th) 207, 293 O.A.C. 102, 4 B.L.R. (5th) 1 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Dugal v. Manulife Financial Corp. (2011), 2011 ONSC 1785, 2011 CarswellOnt 1889, 105 O.R. (3d) 364, 18 C.P.C. (7th) 105 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Edgewater Casino Inc., Re (2009), 2009 BCCA 40, 2009 CarswellBC 213, 51 C.B.R. (5th) 1, 265 B.C.A.C. 274, 446 W.A.C. 274, (sub nom. *Canadian Metropolitan Properties Corp. v. Libin Holdings Ltd.*) 308 D.L.R. (4th) 339 (B.C. C.A.) — followed

Ernst & Young Inc. v. Essar Global Fund Limited (2017), 2017 ONCA 1014, 2017 CarswellOnt 20162, 54 C.B.R. (6th) 173, 139 O.R. (3d) 1, 420 D.L.R. (4th) 23, 76 B.L.R. (5th) 171 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Fracmaster Ltd., Re (1999), 1999 CarswellAlta 461, 245 A.R. 102, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 204, 1999 ABQB 379 (Alta. Q.B.)

— referred to

Grant Forest Products Inc. v. Toronto-Dominion Bank (2015), 2015 ONCA 570, 2015 CarswellOnt 11970, 26 C.B.R. (6th) 218, 20 C.C.P.B. (2nd) 161, 387 D.L.R. (4th) 426, 9 E.T.R. (4th) 205, 2015 C.E.B. & P.G.R. 8139 (headnote only), 337 O.A.C. 237, 26 C.C.E.L. (4th) 176, 4 P.P.S.A.C. (4th) 358 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

HSBC Bank Canada v. Bear Mountain Master Partnership (2010), 2010 BCSC 1563, 2010 CarswellBC 2962, 72 C.B.R. (4th) 276 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) — referred to

Hayes v. Saint John (City) (2016), 2016 NBBR 125, 2016 NBQB 125, 2016 CarswellNB 253, 2016 CarswellNB 254 (N.B. Q.B.) — referred to

Houle v. St. Jude Medical Inc. (2017), 2017 ONSC 5129, 2017 CarswellOnt 13215, 9 C.P.C. (8th) 321 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Houle v. St. Jude Medical Inc. (2018), 2018 ONSC 6352, 2018 CarswellOnt 17713, 429 D.L.R. (4th) 739, 29 C.P.C. (8th) 409 (Ont. Div. Ct.) — referred to

Indalex Ltd., Re (2013), 2013 SCC 6, 2013 CarswellOnt 733, 2013 CarswellOnt 734, D.T.E. 2013T-97, 96 C.B.R. (5th) 171, 354 D.L.R. (4th) 581, 20 P.P.S.A.C. (3d) 1, 439 N.R. 235, 301 O.A.C. 1, 8 B.L.R. (5th) 1, (sub nom. *Sun Indalex Finance LLC v. United Steelworkers*) [2013] 1 S.C.R. 271, 2 C.C.P.B. (2nd) 1 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Kitchener Frame Ltd., Re (2012), 2012 ONSC 234, 2012 CarswellOnt 1347, 86 C.B.R. (5th) 274 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Langtry v. Dumoulin (1885), 7 O.R. 644 (Ont. Div. Ct.) — referred to

Laserworks Computer Services Inc., Re (1998), 1998 CarswellNS 38, (sub nom. *Laserworks Computer Services Inc. (Bankrupt), Re*) 165 N.S.R. (2d) 297, (sub nom. *Laserworks Computer Services Inc. (Bankrupt), Re*) 495 A.P.R. 297, 6 C.B.R. (4th) 69, 37 B.L.R. (2d) 226, 1998 NSCA 42, 165 N.S.R. (2d) 296 (N.S. C.A.) — considered

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

Marcotte c. Banque de Montréal (2015), 2015 QCCS 1915, 2015 CarswellQue 4055 (C.S. Que.) — referred to

McIntyre Estate v. Ontario (Attorney General) (2002), 2002 CarswellOnt 2880, 23 C.P.C. (5th) 59, 218 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 61 O.R. (3d) 257, 164 O.A.C. 37 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Musicians' Pension Fund of Canada (Trustee of) v. Kinross Gold Corp. (2013), 2013 ONSC 4974, 2013 CarswellOnt 11197, 117 O.R. (3d) 150, 55 C.P.C. (7th) 437, 6 C.C.P.B. (2nd) 82 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

New Skeena Forest Products Inc., Re (2005), 2005 BCCA 192, 2005 CarswellBC 705, 7 M.P.L.R. (4th) 153, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 278, 39 B.C.L.R. (4th) 338, [2005] 8 W.W.R. 224, (sub nom. *New Skeena Forest Products Inc. v. Kitwanga Lumber Co.*) 210 B.C.A.C. 247, (sub nom. *New Skeena Forest Products Inc. v. Kitwanga Lumber Co.*) 348 W.A.C. 247 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Nortel Networks Corp., Re (2015), 2015 ONCA 681, 2015 CarswellOnt 15461, 391 D.L.R. (4th) 283, 127 O.R. (3d) 641, 340 O.A.C. 234, 32 C.B.R. (6th) 21 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

North American Tungsten Corp. v. Global Tungsten and Powders Corp. (2015), 2015 BCCA 390, 2015 CarswellBC 2629, 76 C.P.C. (7th) 1, 377 B.C.A.C. 6, 648 W.A.C. 6, 32 C.B.R. (6th) 175 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Orphan Well Association v. Grant Thornton Ltd. (2019), 2019 SCC 5, 2019 CSC 5, 2019 CarswellAlta 141, 2019 CarswellAlta 142, 66 C.B.R. (6th) 1, 81 Alta. L.R. (6th) 1, [2019] 3 W.W.R. 1, 430 D.L.R. (4th) 1, 22 C.E.L.R. (4th) 121, 9 P.P.S.A.C. (4th) 293, [2019] 1 S.C.R. 150 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Pole Lite Ltée c. Banque Nationale du Canada (2006), 2006 CarswellQue 3438, 2006 QCCA 557, [2006] R.J.Q. 1009 (C.A. Que.) — referred to

Royal Bank v. Fracmaster Ltd. (1999), 1999 CarswellAlta 539, (sub nom. *UTI Energy Corp. v. Fracmaster Ltd.*) 244 A.R. 93, (sub nom. *UTI Energy Corp. v. Fracmaster Ltd.*) 209 W.A.C. 93, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 230, 1999 ABCA 178 (Alta. C.A.) — referred to

Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re (1999), 1999 CarswellOnt 625, 6 C.B.R. (4th) 314, 96 O.T.C. 272 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Schenk v. Valeant Pharmaceuticals International Inc. (2015), 2015 ONSC 3215, 2015 CarswellOnt 8651, 74 C.P.C. (7th) 332 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Stanway v. Wyeth Canada Inc. (2013), 2013 BCSC 1585, 2013 CarswellBC 2630, 41 C.P.C. (7th) 209, [2014] 3 W.W.R. 808, 56 B.C.L.R. (5th) 192 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

Stelco Inc., Re (2005), 2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 196 O.A.C. 142, 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Target Canada Co., Re (2015), 2015 ONSC 303, 2015 CarswellOnt 620, 22 C.B.R. (6th) 323 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re (2010), 2010 SCC 60, 2010 CarswellBC 3419, 2010 CarswellBC 3420, 12 B.C.L.R. (5th) 1, (sub nom. *Century Services Inc. v. A.G. of Canada*) 2011 D.T.C. 5006 (Eng.), (sub nom. *Century Services Inc. v. A.G. of Canada*) 2011 G.T.C. 2006 (Eng.), [2011] 2 W.W.R. 383, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 170, 409 N.R. 201, (sub nom. *Ted LeRoy Trucking Ltd., Re*) 326 D.L.R. (4th) 577, (sub nom. *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (A.G.)*) [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, [2010] G.S.T.C. 186, (sub nom. *Leroy (Ted) Trucking Ltd., Re*) 296 B.C.A.C. 1, (sub nom. *Leroy (Ted) Trucking Ltd., Re*) 503 W.A.C. 1 (S.C.C.) — followed

Third Eye Capital Corporation v. Ressources Dianor Inc./Dianor Resources Inc. (2019), 2019 ONCA 508, 2019 CarswellOnt 9683, 70 C.B.R. (6th) 181, 3 R.P.R. (6th) 175, 435 D.L.R. (4th) 416, 11 P.P.S.A.C. (4th) 11 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

1078385 Ontario Ltd., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 8034, 16 C.B.R. (5th) 152, (sub nom. *1078385 Ontario Ltd. (Receivership), Re*) 206 O.A.C. 17 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

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

Generally — referred to

s. 4.2 [en. 2019, c. 29, s. 133] — referred to

s. 43(7) — referred to

s. 50(1) — referred to

s. 54(3) — considered

s. 108(3) — referred to

s. 187(9) — considered

Champerty, Act respecting, R.S.O. 1897, c. 327

Generally — referred to

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

Generally — referred to

- s. 2(1) “debtor company” — referred to
- s. 3(1) — referred to
- s. 4 — referred to
- s. 5 — referred to
- s. 6 — referred to
- s. 6(1) — considered
- s. 11 — considered
- s. 11.2 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered
- s. 11.2(1) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered
- s. 11.2(2) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered
- s. 11.2(4) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered
- s. 11.2(4)(a) [en. 2007, c. 36, s. 65] — considered
- s. 11.2(4)(b) [en. 2007, c. 36, s. 65] — considered
- s. 11.2(4)(c) [en. 2007, c. 36, s. 65] — considered
- s. 11.2(4)(d) [en. 2007, c. 36, s. 65] — considered
- s. 11.2(4)(e) [en. 2007, c. 36, s. 65] — considered
- s. 11.2(4)(f) [en. 2007, c. 36, s. 65] — considered
- s. 11.2(4)(g) [en. 2007, c. 36, s. 65] — considered
- s. 11.2(5) [en. 2019, c. 29, s. 138] — considered
- s. 11.7 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to
- s. 11.8 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — referred to
- s. 18.6 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered
- s. 22(1) — referred to
- s. 22(2) — referred to
- s. 22(3) — considered
- s. 23(1)(d) — referred to
- s. 23(1)(i) — referred to
- ss. 23-25 — referred to
- s. 36 — considered

Winding-up and Restructuring Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11

Generally — referred to

s. 6(1) — referred to

APPEALS from a judgment of the Quebec Court of Appeal (Dutil, Schrager and Dumas J.J.A.), 2019 QCCA 171, [2019] AZ-51566416, [2019] Q.J. No. 670 (QL), 2019 CarswellQue 94 (WL Can.), setting aside a decision of Michaud J., 2018 QCCS 1040, [2018] AZ-51477967, [2018] Q.J. No. 1986 (QL), 2018 CarswellQue 1923 (WL Can.). Appeals allowed; POURVOIS contre un arrêt de la Cour d'appel du Québec (les juges Dutil, Schrager et Dumas), 2019 QCCA 171, [2019] AZ-51566416, [2019] Q.J. No. 670 (QL), 2019 CarswellQue 94 (WL Can.), qui a infirmé une décision du juge Michaud, 2018 QCCS 1040, [2018] AZ-51477967, [2018] Q.J. No. 1986 (QL), 2018 CarswellQue 1923 (WL Can.). Pourvois accueillis.

Wagner C.J. and Moldaver J. (Abella, Karakatsanis, Côté, Rowe and Kasirer JJ. concurring):

I. Overview

1 These appeals arise in the context of an ongoing proceeding instituted under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 ("CCAA"), in which substantially all of the assets of the debtor companies have been liquidated. The proceeding was commenced well over four years ago. Since then, a single supervising judge has been responsible for its oversight. In this capacity, he has made numerous discretionary decisions.

2 Two of the supervising judge's decisions are in issue before us. Each raises a question requiring this Court to clarify the nature and scope of judicial discretion in CCAA proceedings. The first is whether a supervising judge has the discretion to bar a creditor from voting on a plan of arrangement where they determine that the creditor is acting for an improper purpose. The second is whether a supervising judge can approve third party litigation funding as interim financing, pursuant to s. 11.2 of the CCAA.

3 For the reasons that follow, we would answer both questions in the affirmative, as did the supervising judge. To the extent the Court of Appeal disagreed and went on to interfere with the supervising judge's discretionary decisions, we conclude that it was not justified in doing so. In our respectful view, the Court of Appeal failed to treat the supervising judge's decisions with the appropriate degree of deference. In the result, as we ordered at the conclusion of the hearing, these appeals are allowed and the supervising judge's order reinstated.

II. Facts

4 In 1994, Mr. Gérald Duhamel founded Bluberi Gaming Technologies Inc., which is now one of the appellants, 9354-9186 Québec inc. The corporation manufactured, distributed, installed, and serviced electronic casino gaming machines. It also provided management systems for gambling operations. Its sole shareholder has at all material times been Bluberi Group Inc., which is now another of the appellants, 9354-9178 Québec inc. Through a family trust, Mr. Duhamel controls Bluberi Group Inc. and, as a result, Bluberi Gaming (collectively, "Bluberi").

5 In 2012, Bluberi sought financing from the respondent, Callidus Capital Corporation ("Callidus"), which describes itself as an "asset-based or distressed lender" (R.F., at para. 26). Callidus extended a credit facility of approximately \$24 million to Bluberi. This debt was secured in part by a share pledge agreement.

6 Over the next three years, Bluberi lost significant amounts of money, and Callidus continued to extend credit. By 2015, Bluberi owed approximately \$86 million to Callidus — close to half of which Bluberi asserts is comprised of interest and fees.

A. Bluberi's Institution of CCAA Proceedings and Initial Sale of Assets

7 On November 11, 2015, Bluberi filed a petition for the issuance of an initial order under the CCAA. In its petition, Bluberi alleged that its liquidity issues were the result of Callidus taking *de facto* control of the corporation and dictating a number of purposefully detrimental business decisions. Bluberi alleged that Callidus engaged in this conduct in order to deplete the corporation's equity value with a view to owning Bluberi and, ultimately, selling it.

8 Over Callidus's objection, Bluberi's petition succeeded. The supervising judge, Michaud J., issued an initial order under the CCAA. Among other things, the initial order confirmed that Bluberi was a "debtor company" within the meaning of s. 2(1) of the Act; stayed any proceedings against Bluberi or any director or officer of Bluberi; and appointed Ernst & Young Inc. as monitor ("Monitor").

9 Working with the Monitor, Bluberi determined that a sale of its assets was necessary. On January 28, 2016, it proposed a sale solicitation process, which the supervising judge approved. That process led to Bluberi entering into an asset purchase agreement with Callidus. The agreement contemplated that Callidus would obtain all of Bluberi's assets in exchange for extinguishing almost the entirety of its secured claim against Bluberi, which had ballooned to approximately \$135.7 million. Callidus would maintain an undischarged secured claim of \$3 million against Bluberi. The agreement would also permit Bluberi to retain claims for damages against Callidus arising from its alleged involvement in Bluberi's financial difficulties ("Retained Claims").¹ Throughout these proceedings, Bluberi has asserted that the Retained Claims should amount to over \$200 million in damages.

10 The supervising judge approved the asset purchase agreement, and the sale of Bluberi's assets to Callidus closed in February 2017. As a result, Callidus effectively acquired Bluberi's business, and has continued to operate it as a going concern.

11 Since the sale, the Retained Claims have been Bluberi's sole remaining asset and thus the sole security for Callidus's \$3 million claim.

B. The Initial Competing Plans of Arrangement

12 On September 11, 2017, Bluberi filed an application seeking the approval of a \$2 million interim financing credit facility to fund the litigation of the Retained Claims and other related relief. The lender was a joint venture numbered company incorporated as 9364-9739 Québec inc. This interim financing application was set to be heard on September 19, 2017.

13 However, one day before the hearing, Callidus proposed a plan of arrangement ("First Plan") and applied for an order convening a creditors' meeting to vote on that plan. The First Plan proposed that Callidus would fund a \$2.5 million (later increased to \$2.63 million) distribution to Bluberi's creditors, except itself, in exchange for a release from the Retained Claims. This would have fully satisfied the claims of Bluberi's former employees and those creditors with claims worth less than \$3000; creditors with larger claims were to receive, on average, 31 percent of their respective claims.

14 The supervising judge adjourned the hearing of both applications to October 5, 2017. In the meantime, Bluberi filed its own plan of arrangement. Among other things, the plan proposed that half of any proceeds resulting from the Retained Claims, after payment of expenses and Bluberi's creditors' claims, would be distributed to the unsecured creditors, as long as the net proceeds exceeded \$20 million.

15 On October 5, 2017, the supervising judge ordered that the parties' plans of arrangement could be put to a creditors' vote. He ordered that both parties share the fees and expenses related to the presentation of the plans of arrangement at a creditors' meeting, and that a party's failure to deposit those funds with the Monitor would bar the presentation of that party's plan of arrangement. Bluberi elected not to deposit the necessary funds, and, as a result, only Callidus's First Plan was put to the creditors.

C. Creditors' Vote on Callidus's First Plan

16 On December 15, 2017, Callidus submitted its First Plan to a creditors' vote. The plan failed to receive sufficient support. Section 6(1) of the CCAA provides that, to be approved, a plan must receive a "double majority" vote in each class of creditors — that is, a majority in *number* of class members, which also represents two-thirds in *value* of the class members' claims. All of Bluberi's creditors, besides Callidus, formed a single voting class of unsecured creditors. Of the 100 voting unsecured creditors, 92 creditors (representing \$3,450,882 of debt) voted in favour, and 8 voted against (representing \$2,375,913 of debt). The First Plan failed because the creditors voting in favour only held 59.22 percent of the total value being voted, which did not meet the s. 6(1) threshold. Most notably, SMT Hautes Technologies ("SMT"), which held 36.7 percent of Bluberi's debt, voted against the plan.

17 Callidus did not vote on the First Plan — despite the Monitor explicitly stating that Callidus could have "vote[d] ... the portion of its claim, assessed by Callidus, to be an unsecured claim" (Joint R.R., vol. III, at p.188).

D. Bluberi's Interim Financing Application and Callidus's New Plan

18 On February 6, 2018, Bluberi filed one of the applications underlying these appeals, seeking authorization of a proposed third party litigation funding agreement ("LFA") with a publicly traded litigation funder, IMF Bentham Limited or its Canadian subsidiary, Bentham IMF Capital Limited (collectively, "Bentham"). Bluberi's application also sought the placement of a \$20 million super-priority charge in favour of Bentham on Bluberi's assets ("Litigation Financing Charge").

19 The LFA contemplated that Bentham would fund Bluberi's litigation of the Retained Claims in exchange for receiving a portion of any settlement or award after trial. However, were Bluberi's litigation to fail, Bentham would lose all of its invested funds. The LFA also provided that Bentham could terminate the litigation of the Retained Claims if, acting reasonably, it were no longer satisfied of the merits or commercial viability of the litigation.

20 Callidus and certain unsecured creditors who voted in favour of its plan (who are now respondents and style themselves the "Creditors' Group") contested Bluberi's application on the ground that the LFA was a plan of arrangement and, as such, had to be submitted to a creditors' vote.²

21 On February 12, 2018, Callidus filed the other application underlying these appeals, seeking to put another plan of arrangement to a creditors' vote ("New Plan"). The New Plan was essentially identical to the First Plan, except that Callidus increased the proposed distribution by \$250,000 (from \$2.63 million to \$2.88 million). Further, Callidus filed an amended proof of claim, which purported to value the security attached to its \$3 million claim at *nil*. Callidus was of the view that this valuation was proper because Bluberi had no assets other than the Retained Claims. On this basis, Callidus asserted that it stood in the position of an unsecured creditor, and sought the supervising judge's permission to vote on the New Plan with the other unsecured creditors. Given the size of its claim, if Callidus were permitted to vote on the New Plan, the plan would necessarily pass a creditors' vote. Bluberi opposed Callidus's application.

22 The supervising judge heard Bluberi's interim financing application and Callidus's application regarding its New Plan together. Notably, the Monitor supported Bluberi's position.

III. Decisions Below

A. Quebec Superior Court (2018 QCCS 1040 (C.S. Que.)) (Michaud J.)

23 The supervising judge dismissed Callidus's application, declining to submit the New Plan to a creditors' vote. He granted Bluberi's application, authorizing Bluberi to enter into a litigation funding agreement with Bentham on the terms set forth in the LFA and imposing the Litigation Financing Charge on Bluberi's assets.

24 With respect to Callidus's application, the supervising judge determined Callidus should not be permitted to vote on the New Plan because it was acting with an "improper purpose" (para. 48). He acknowledged that creditors are generally entitled to vote in their own self-interest. However, given that the First Plan — which was almost identical to the New Plan — had been defeated by a creditors' vote, the supervising judge concluded that Callidus's attempt to vote on the New Plan was an attempt to override the result of the first vote. In particular, he wrote:

Taking into consideration the creditors' interest, the Court accepted, in the fall of 2017, that Callidus' Plan be submitted to their vote with the understanding that, as a secured creditor, Callidus would not cast a vote. However, under the present circumstances, it would serve an improper purpose if Callidus was allowed to vote on its own plan, especially when its vote would very likely result in the New Plan meeting the two thirds threshold for approval under the CCAA.

As pointed out by SMT, the main unsecured creditor, Callidus' attempt to vote aims only at cancelling SMT's vote which prevented Callidus' Plan from being approved at the creditors' meeting.

It is one thing to let the creditors vote on a plan submitted by a secured creditor, it is another to allow this secured creditor to vote on its own plan in order to exert control over the vote for the sole purpose of obtaining releases. [paras. 45-47]

25 The supervising judge concluded that, in these circumstances, allowing Callidus to vote would be both "unfair and unreasonable" (para. 47). He also observed that Callidus's conduct throughout the CCAA proceedings "lacked transparency" (at para. 41) and that Callidus was "solely motivated by the [pending] litigation" (para. 44). In sum, he found that Callidus's conduct was contrary to the "requirements of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence", and ordered that Callidus would not be permitted to vote on the New Plan (para. 48, citing *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re*, 2010 SCC 60, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379 (S.C.C.) [hereinafter *Century Services*], at para. 70).

26 Because Callidus was not permitted to vote on the New Plan and SMT had unequivocally stated its intention to vote against it, the supervising judge concluded that the plan had no reasonable prospect of success. He therefore declined to submit it to a creditors' vote.

27 With respect to Bluberi's application, the supervising judge considered three issues relevant to these appeals: (1) whether the LFA should be submitted to a creditors' vote; (2) if not, whether the LFA ought to be approved by the court; and (3) if so, whether the \$20 million Litigation Financing Charge should be imposed on Bluberi's assets.

28 The supervising judge determined that the LFA did not need to be submitted to a creditors' vote because it was not a plan of arrangement. He considered a plan of arrangement to involve "an arrangement or compromise between a debtor and its creditors" (para. 71, citing *Crystalex International Corp., Re*, 2012 ONCA 404, 293 O.A.C. 102 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 92 ("*Crystalex*"). In his view, the LFA lacked this essential feature. He also concluded that the LFA did not need to be accompanied by a plan, as Bluberi had stated its intention to file a plan in the future.

29 After reviewing the terms of the LFA, the supervising judge found it met the criteria for approval of third party litigation funding set out in *Musicians' Pension Fund of Canada (Trustee of) v. Kinross Gold Corp.*, 2013 ONSC 4974, 117 O.R. (3d) 150 (Ont. S.C.J.), at para. 41, and *Hayes v. Saint John (City)*, 2016 NBQB 125 (N.B. Q.B.), at para. 4 (CanLII). In particular, he considered Bentham's percentage of return to be reasonable in light of its level of investment and risk. Further, the supervising judge rejected Callidus and the Creditors' Group's argument that the LFA gave too much discretion to Bentham. He found that the LFA did not allow Bentham to exert undue influence on the litigation of the Retained Claims, noting similarly broad clauses had been approved in the CCAA context (para. 82, citing *Schenk v. Valeant Pharmaceuticals International Inc.*, 2015 ONSC 3215, 74 C.P.C. (7th) 332 (Ont. S.C.J.), at para. 23).

30 Finally, the supervising judge imposed the Litigation Financing Charge on Bluberi's assets. While significant, the supervising judge considered the amount to be reasonable given: the amount of damages that would be claimed from Callidus; Bentham's financial commitment to the litigation; and the fact that Bentham was not charging any interim fees or interest (i.e., it would only profit in the event of successful litigation or settlement). Put simply, Bentham was taking substantial risks, and it was reasonable that it obtain certain guarantees in exchange.

31 Callidus, again supported by the Creditors' Group, appealed the supervising judge's order, impleading Bentham in the process.

B. Quebec Court of Appeal (2019 OCCA 171 (C.A. Que.)) (Dutil and Schrager J.J.A. and Dumas J. (ad hoc))

32 The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal, finding that “[t]he exercise of the judge’s discretion [was] not founded in law nor on a proper treatment of the facts so that irrespective of the standard of review applied, appellate intervention [was] justified” (para. 48 CanLII)). In particular, the court identified two errors of relevance to these appeals.

33 First, the court was of the view that the supervising judge erred in finding that Callidus had an improper purpose in seeking to vote on its New Plan. In its view, Callidus should have been permitted to vote. The court relied heavily on the notion that creditors have a right to vote in their own self-interest. It held that any judicial discretion to preclude voting due to improper purpose should be reserved for the “clearest of cases” (para. 62, referring to *Blackburn Developments Ltd., Re*, 2011 BCSC 1671, 27 B.C.L.R. (5th) 199 (B.C. S.C.), at para. 45). The court was of the view that Callidus’s transparent attempt to obtain a release from Bluberi’s claims against it did not amount to an improper purpose. The court also considered Callidus’s conduct prior to and during the CCAA proceedings to be incapable of justifying a finding of improper purpose.

34 Second, the court concluded that the supervising judge erred in approving the LFA as interim financing because, in its view, the LFA was not connected to Bluberi’s commercial operations. The court concluded that the supervising judge had both “misconstrued in law the notion of interim financing and misapplied that notion to the factual circumstances of the case” (para. 78).

35 In light of this perceived error, the court substituted its view that the LFA was a plan of arrangement and, as a result, should have been submitted to a creditors’ vote. It held that “[a]n arrangement or proposal can encompass both a compromise of creditors’ claims as well as the process undertaken to satisfy them” (para. 85). The court considered the LFA to be a plan of arrangement because it affected the creditors’ share in any eventual litigation proceeds, would cause them to wait for the outcome of any litigation, and could potentially leave them with nothing at all. Moreover, the court held that Bluberi’s scheme “as a whole”, being the prosecution of the Retained Claims and the LFA, should be submitted as a plan to the creditors for their approval (para. 89).

36 Bluberi and Bentham (collectively, “appellants”), again supported by the Monitor, now appeal to this Court.

IV. Issues

37 These appeals raise two issues:

- (1) Did the supervising judge err in barring Callidus from voting on its New Plan on the basis that it was acting for an improper purpose?
- (2) Did the supervising judge err in approving the LFA as interim financing, pursuant to s. 11.2 of the CCAA?

V. Analysis

A. Preliminary Considerations

38 Addressing the above issues requires situating them within the contemporary Canadian insolvency landscape and, more specifically, the CCAA regime. Accordingly, before turning to those issues, we review (1) the evolving nature of CCAA proceedings; (2) the role of the supervising judge in those proceedings; and (3) the proper scope of appellate review of a supervising judge’s exercise of discretion.

(1) The Evolving Nature of CCAA Proceedings

39 The CCAA is one of three principal insolvency statutes in Canada. The others are the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (“BIA”), which covers insolvencies of both individuals and companies, and the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. W-11 (“WURA”), which covers insolvencies of financial institutions and certain other corporations, such as insurance companies (WURA, s. 6(1)). While both the CCAA and the BIA enable reorganizations of

insolvent companies, access to the CCAA is restricted to debtor companies facing total claims in excess of \$5 million (CCAA, s. 3(1)).

40 Together, Canada's insolvency statutes pursue an array of overarching remedial objectives that reflect the wide ranging and potentially "catastrophic" impacts insolvency can have (*Indalex Ltd., Re*, 2013 SCC 6, [2013] 1 S.C.R. 271 (S.C.C.), at para. 1). These objectives include: providing for timely, efficient and impartial resolution of a debtor's insolvency; preserving and maximizing the value of a debtor's assets; ensuring fair and equitable treatment of the claims against a debtor; protecting the public interest; and, in the context of a commercial insolvency, balancing the costs and benefits of restructuring or liquidating the company (J. P. Sarra, "The Oscillating Pendulum: Canada's Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law", in J. P. Sarra and B. Romaine, eds., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2016* (2017), 9, at pp. 9-10; J. P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* 2nd ed. (2013), at pp. 4-5 and 14; Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, *Debtors and Creditors Sharing the Burden: A Review of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (2003), at pp. 9-10; R. J. Wood, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law* (2nd ed. 2015), at pp. 4-5).

41 Among these objectives, the CCAA generally prioritizes "avoiding the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company" (*Century Services*, at para. 70). As a result, the typical CCAA case has historically involved an attempt to facilitate the reorganization and survival of the pre-filing debtor company in an operational state — that is, as a going concern. Where such a reorganization was not possible, the alternative course of action was seen as a liquidation through either a receivership or under the BIA regime. This is precisely the outcome that was sought in *Century Services* (see para. 14).

42 That said, the CCAA is fundamentally insolvency legislation, and thus it also "has the simultaneous objectives of maximizing creditor recovery, preservation of going-concern value where possible, preservation of jobs and communities affected by the firm's financial distress ... and enhancement of the credit system generally" (Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, at p. 14; see also *Ernst & Young Inc. v. Essar Global Fund Limited*, 2017 ONCA 1014, 139 O.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 103). In pursuit of those objectives, CCAA proceedings have evolved to permit outcomes that do not result in the emergence of the pre-filing debtor company in a restructured state, but rather involve some form of liquidation of the debtor's assets under the auspices of the Act itself (Sarra, "The Oscillating Pendulum: Canada's Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law", at pp. 19-21). Such scenarios are referred to as "liquidating CCAAs", and they are now commonplace in the CCAA landscape (see *Third Eye Capital Corporation v. Ressources Dianor Inc./Dianor Resources Inc.*, 2019 ONCA 508, 435 D.L.R. (4th) 416 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 70).

43 Liquidating CCAAs take diverse forms and may involve, among other things: the sale of the debtor company as a going concern; an "en bloc" sale of assets that are capable of being operationalized by a buyer; a partial liquidation or downsizing of business operations; or a piecemeal sale of assets (B. Kaplan, "Liquidating CCAAs: Discretion Gone Awry?", in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law* (2008), 79, at pp. 87-89). The ultimate commercial outcomes facilitated by liquidating CCAAs are similarly diverse. Some may result in the continued operation of the business of the debtor under a different going concern entity (e.g., the liquidations in *Indalex* and *Canadian Red Cross Society / Société Canadienne de la Croix-Rouge*, *Re* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4th) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), while others may result in a sale of assets and inventory with no such entity emerging (e.g., the proceedings in *Target Canada Co., Re*, 2015 ONSC 303, 22 C.B.R. (6th) 323 (Ont. S.C.J.), at paras. 7 and 31). Others still, like the case at bar, may involve a going concern sale of most of the assets of the debtor, leaving residual assets to be dealt with by the debtor and its stakeholders.

44 CCAA courts first began approving these forms of liquidation pursuant to the broad discretion conferred by the Act. The emergence of this practice was not without criticism, largely on the basis that it appeared to be inconsistent with the CCAA being a "restructuring statute" (see, e.g., *Royal Bank v. Fracmaster Ltd.*, 1999 ABCA 178, 244 A.R. 93 (Alta. C.A.), at paras. 15-16, aff'd 1999 ABQB 379, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 204 (Alta. Q.B.), at paras. 40-43; A. Nocilla, "The History of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Future of Re-Structuring Law in Canada" (2014), 56 *Can. Bus. L.J.* 73, at pp. 88-92).

45 However, since s. 36 of the CCAA came into force in 2009, courts have been using it to effect liquidating CCAAs. Section 36 empowers courts to authorize the sale or disposition of a debtor company's assets outside the ordinary course of business.³ Significantly, when the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce recommended the adoption

of s. 36, it observed that liquidation is not necessarily inconsistent with the remedial objectives of the CCAA, and that it may be a means to “raise capital [to facilitate a restructuring], eliminate further loss for creditors or focus on the solvent operations of the business” (p. 147). Other commentators have observed that liquidation can be a “vehicle to restructure a business” by allowing the business to survive, albeit under a different corporate form or ownership (Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, at p. 169; see also K. P. McElcheran, *Commercial Insolvency in Canada* (4th ed. 2019), at p. 311). Indeed, in *Indalex*, the company sold its assets under the CCAA in order to preserve the jobs of its employees, despite being unable to survive as their employer (see para. 51).

46 Ultimately, the relative weight that the different objectives of the CCAA take on in a particular case may vary based on the factual circumstances, the stage of the proceedings, or the proposed solutions that are presented to the court for approval. Here, a parallel may be drawn with the BIA context. In *Orphan Well Association v. Grant Thornton Ltd.*, 2019 SCC 5, [2019] 1 S.C.R. 150 (S.C.C.), at para. 67, this Court explained that, as a general matter, the BIA serves two purposes: (1) the bankrupt’s financial rehabilitation and (2) the equitable distribution of the bankrupt’s assets among creditors. However, in circumstances where a debtor corporation will never emerge from bankruptcy, only the latter purpose is relevant (see para. 67). Similarly, under the CCAA, when a reorganization of the pre-filing debtor company is not a possibility, a liquidation that preserves going-concern value and the ongoing business operations of the pre-filing company may become the predominant remedial focus. Moreover, where a reorganization or liquidation is complete and the court is dealing with residual assets, the objective of maximizing creditor recovery from those assets may take centre stage. As we will explain, the architecture of the CCAA leaves the case-specific assessment and balancing of these remedial objectives to the supervising judge.

(2) The Role of a Supervising Judge in CCAA Proceedings

47 One of the principal means through which the CCAA achieves its objectives is by carving out a unique supervisory role for judges (see Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, at pp. 18-19). From beginning to end, each CCAA proceeding is overseen by a single supervising judge. The supervising judge acquires extensive knowledge and insight into the stakeholder dynamics and the business realities of the proceedings from their ongoing dealings with the parties.

48 The CCAA capitalizes on this positional advantage by supplying supervising judges with broad discretion to make a variety of orders that respond to the circumstances of each case and “meet contemporary business and social needs” (*Century Services*, at para. 58) in “real-time” (para. 58, citing R. B. Jones, “The Evolution of Canadian Restructuring: Challenges for the Rule of Law”, in J. P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2005* (2006), 481, at p. 484). The anchor of this discretionary authority is s. 11, which empowers a judge “to make any order that [the judge] considers appropriate in the circumstances”. This section has been described as “the engine” driving the statutory scheme (*Stelco Inc., Re* (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 36).

49 The discretionary authority conferred by the CCAA, while broad in nature, is not boundless. This authority must be exercised in furtherance of the remedial objectives of the CCAA, which we have explained above (see *Century Services*, at para. 59). Additionally, the court must keep in mind three “baseline considerations” (at para. 70), which the applicant bears the burden of demonstrating: (1) that the order sought is appropriate in the circumstances, and (2) that the applicant has been acting in good faith and (3) with due diligence (para. 69).

50 The first two considerations of appropriateness and good faith are widely understood in the CCAA context. Appropriateness “is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the policy objectives underlying the CCAA” (para. 70). Further, the well-established requirement that parties must act in good faith in insolvency proceedings has recently been made express in s. 18.6 of the CCAA, which provides:

Good faith

18.6 (1) Any interested person in any proceedings under this Act shall act in good faith with respect to those proceedings.

Good faith — powers of court

(2) If the court is satisfied that an interested person fails to act in good faith, on application by an interested person, the

court may make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

(See also *BIA*, s. 4.2; *Budget Implementation Act, 2019, No. 1*, S.C. 2019, c. 29, ss. 133 and 140.)

51 The third consideration of due diligence requires some elaboration. Consistent with the CCAA regime generally, the due diligence consideration discourages parties from sitting on their rights and ensures that creditors do not strategically manoeuvre or position themselves to gain an advantage (*Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), at p. 31). The procedures set out in the CCAA rely on negotiations and compromise between the debtor and its stakeholders, as overseen by the supervising judge and the monitor. This necessarily requires that, to the extent possible, those involved in the proceedings be on equal footing and have a clear understanding of their respective rights (see McElcheran, at p. 262). A party's failure to participate in CCAA proceedings in a diligent and timely fashion can undermine these procedures and, more generally, the effective functioning of the CCAA regime (see, e.g., *North American Tungsten Corp. v. Global Tungsten and Powders Corp.*, 2015 BCCA 390, 377 B.C.A.C. 6 (B.C. C.A.), at paras. 21-23; *BA Energy Inc., Re*, 2010 ABQB 507, 70 C.B.R. (5th) 24 (Alta. Q.B.); *HSBC Bank Canada v. Bear Mountain Master Partnership*, 2010 BCSC 1563, 72 C.B.R. (4th) 276 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]), at para. 11; *Caterpillar Financial Services Ltd. v. 360networks Corp.*, 2007 BCCA 14, 279 D.L.R. (4th) 701 (B.C. C.A.), at paras. 51-52, in which the courts seized on a party's failure to act diligently).

52 We pause to note that supervising judges are assisted in their oversight role by a court appointed monitor whose qualifications and duties are set out in the CCAA (see ss. 11.7, 11.8 and 23 to 25). The monitor is an independent and impartial expert, acting as "the eyes and the ears of the court" throughout the proceedings (*Essar*, at para. 109). The core of the monitor's role includes providing an advisory opinion to the court as to the fairness of any proposed plan of arrangement and on orders sought by parties, including the sale of assets and requests for interim financing (see CCAA, s. 23(1)(d) and (i); *Sarra, Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, at pp-566 and 569).

(3) Appellate Review of Exercises of Discretion by a Supervising Judge

53 A high degree of deference is owed to discretionary decisions made by judges supervising CCAA proceedings. As such, appellate intervention will only be justified if the supervising judge erred in principle or exercised their discretion unreasonably (see *Grant Forest Products Inc. v. Toronto-Dominion Bank*, 2015 ONCA 570, 387 D.L.R. (4th) 426 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 98; *Bridging Finance Inc. v. Béton Brunet 2001 inc.*, 2017 QCCA 138, 44 C.B.R. (6th) 175 (C.A. Que.), at para. 23). Appellate courts must be careful not to substitute their own discretion in place of the supervising judge's (*New Skeena Forest Products Inc., Re*, 2005 BCCA 192, 39 B.C.L.R. (4th) 338 (B.C. C.A.), at para. 20).

54 This deferential standard of review accounts for the fact that supervising judges are steeped in the intricacies of the CCAA proceedings they oversee. In this respect, the comments of Tysoe J.A. in *Edgewater Casino Inc., Re*, 2009 BCCA 40, 305 D.L.R. (4th) 339 (B.C. C.A.) ("*Re Edgewater Casino Inc.*"), at para. 20, are apt:

... one of the principal functions of the judge supervising the CCAA proceeding is to attempt to balance the interests of the various stakeholders during the reorganization process, and it will often be inappropriate to consider an exercise of discretion by the supervising judge in isolation of other exercises of discretion by the judge in endeavoring to balance the various interests. ... CCAA proceedings are dynamic in nature and the supervising judge has intimate knowledge of the reorganization process. The nature of the proceedings often requires the supervising judge to make quick decisions in complicated circumstances.

55 With the foregoing in mind, we turn to the issues on appeal.

B. Callidus Should Not Be Permitted to Vote on Its New Plan

56 A creditor can generally vote on a plan of arrangement or compromise that affects its rights, subject to any specific provisions of the CCAA that may restrict its voting rights (e.g., s. 22(3)), or a proper exercise of discretion by the supervising

judge to constrain or bar the creditor's right to vote. We conclude that one such constraint arises from s. 11 of the CCAA, which provides supervising judges with the discretion to bar a creditor from voting where the creditor is acting for an improper purpose. Supervising judges are best-placed to determine whether this discretion should be exercised in a particular case. In our view, the supervising judge here made no error in exercising his discretion to bar Callidus from voting on the New Plan.

(1) Parameters of Creditors' Right to Vote on Plans of Arrangement

57 Creditor approval of any plan of arrangement or compromise is a key feature of the CCAA, as is the supervising judge's oversight of that process. Where a plan is proposed, an application may be made to the supervising judge to order a creditors' meeting to vote on the proposed plan (CCAA, ss. 4 and 5). The supervising judge has the discretion to determine whether to order the meeting. For the purposes of voting at a creditors' meeting, the debtor company may divide the creditors into classes, subject to court approval (CCAA, s. 22(1)). Creditors may be included in the same class if "their interests or rights are sufficiently similar to give them a commonality of interest" (CCAA, s. 22(2); see also L. W. Houlden, G. B. Morawetz and J. P. Sarra, *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada* (4th ed. (loose-leaf)), vol. 4, at N§149). If the requisite "double majority" in each class of creditors — again, a majority in *number* of class members, which also represents two-thirds in *value* of the class members' claims — vote in favour of the plan, the supervising judge may sanction the plan (*ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.*, 2008 ONCA 587, 296 D.L.R. (4th) 135 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 34; see CCAA, s. 6). The supervising judge will conduct what is commonly referred to as a "fairness hearing" to determine, among other things, whether the plan is fair and reasonable (Wood, at pp. 490-92; see also Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, at p. 529; Houlden, Morawetz and Sarra at N§45). Once sanctioned by the supervising judge, the plan is binding on each class of creditors that participated in the vote (CCAA, s. 6(1)).

58 Creditors with a provable claim against the debtor whose interests are affected by a proposed plan are usually entitled to vote on plans of arrangement (Wood, at p. 470). Indeed, there is no express provision in the CCAA barring such a creditor from voting on a plan of arrangement, including a plan it sponsors.

59 Notwithstanding the foregoing, the appellants submit that a purposive interpretation of s. 22(3) of the CCAA reveals that, as a general matter, a creditor should be precluded from voting on its own plan. Section 22(3) provides:

Related creditors

(3) A creditor who is related to the company may vote against, but not for, a compromise or arrangement relating to the company.

The appellants note that s. 22(3) was meant to harmonize the CCAA scheme with s. 54(3) of the BIA, which provides that "[a] creditor who is related to the debtor may vote against but not for the acceptance of the proposal." The appellants point out that, under s. 50(1) of the BIA, only debtors can sponsor plans; as a result, the reference to "debtor" in s. 54(3) captures *all* plan sponsors. They submit that if s. 54(3) captures all plan sponsors, s. 22(3) of the CCAA must do the same. On this basis, the appellants ask us to extend the voting restriction in s. 22(3) to apply not only to creditors who are "related to the company", as the provision states, but to any creditor who sponsors a plan. They submit that this interpretation gives effect to the underlying intention of both provisions, which they say is to ensure that a creditor who has a conflict of interest cannot "dilute" or overtake the votes of other creditors.

60 We would not accept this strained interpretation of s. 22(3). Section 22(3) makes no mention of conflicts of interest between creditors and plan sponsors generally. The wording of s. 22(3) only places voting restrictions on creditors who are "related to the [debtor] company". These words are "precise and unequivocal" and, as such, must "play a dominant role in the interpretive process" (*Canada Trustco Mortgage Co. v. R.*, 2005 SCC 54, [2005] 2 S.C.R. 601 (S.C.C.), at para. 10). In our view, the appellants' analogy to the BIA is not sufficient to overcome the plain wording of this provision.

61 While the appellants are correct that s. 22(3) was enacted to harmonize the treatment of related parties in the CCAA and BIA, its history demonstrates that it is not a general conflict of interest provision. Prior to the amendments incorporating s. 22(3) into the CCAA, the CCAA clearly allowed creditors to put forward a plan of arrangement (see Houlden, Morawetz and Sarra, at N§33, *Red Cross; 1078385 Ontario Ltd., Re* (2004), 206 O.A.C. 17 (Ont. C.A.)). In contrast, under the BIA,

only debtors could make proposals. Parliament is presumed to have been aware of this obvious difference between the two statutes (see *ATCO Gas & Pipelines Ltd. v. Alberta (Energy & Utilities Board)*, 2006 SCC 4, [2006] 1 S.C.R. 140 (S.C.C.), at para. 59; see also *Third Eye Capital Corporation*, at para. 57). Despite this difference, Parliament imported, with necessary modification, the wording of the *BIA* related creditor provision into the *CCAA*. Going beyond this language entails accepting that Parliament failed to choose the right words to give effect to its intention, which we do not.

62 Indeed, Parliament did not mindlessly reproduce s. 54(3) of the *BIA* in s. 22(3) of the *CCAA*. Rather, it made two modifications to the language of s. 54(3) to bring it into conformity with the language of the *CCAA*. First, it changed “proposal” (a defined term in the *BIA*) to “compromise or arrangement” (a term used throughout the *CCAA*). Second, it changed “debtor” to “company”, recognizing that companies are the only kind of debtor that exists in the *CCAA* context.

63 Our view is further supported by Industry Canada’s explanation of the rationale for s. 22(3) as being to “reduce the ability of *debtor companies* to organize a restructuring plan that confers additional benefits to *related parties*” (Office of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy Canada, *Bill C-12: Clause by Clause Analysis*, developed by Industry Canada, last updated March 24, 2015 (online), cl. 71, s. 22 (emphasis added); see also Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, at p. 151).

64 Finally, we note that the *CCAA* contains other mechanisms that attenuate the concern that a creditor with conflicting legal interests with respect to a plan it proposes may distort the creditors’ vote. Although we reject the appellants’ interpretation of s. 22(3), that section still bars creditors who are related to the debtor company from voting in favour of *any* plan. Additionally, creditors who do not share a sufficient commonality of interest may be forced to vote in separate classes (s. 22(1) and (2)), and, as we will explain, a supervising judge may bar a creditor from voting where the creditor is acting for an improper purpose.

(2) Discretion to Bar a Creditor From Voting in Furtherance of an Improper Purpose

65 There is no dispute that the *CCAA* is silent on when a creditor who is otherwise entitled to vote on a plan can be barred from voting. However, *CCAA* supervising judges are often called upon “to sanction measures for which there is no explicit authority in the *CCAA*” (*Century Services*, at para. 61; see also para. 62). In *Century Services*, this Court endorsed a “hierarchical” approach to determining whether jurisdiction exists to sanction a proposed measure: “courts [must] rely first on an interpretation of the provisions of the *CCAA* text before turning to inherent or equitable jurisdiction to anchor measures taken in a *CCAA* proceeding” (para. 65). In most circumstances, a purposive and liberal interpretation of the provisions of the *CCAA* will be sufficient “to ground measures necessary to achieve its objectives” (para. 65).

66 Applying this approach, we conclude that jurisdiction exists under s. 11 of the *CCAA* to bar a creditor from voting on a plan of arrangement or compromise where the creditor is acting for an improper purpose.

67 Courts have long recognized that s. 11 of the *CCAA* signals legislative endorsement of the “broad reading of *CCAA* authority developed by the jurisprudence” (*Century Services*, at para. 68). Section 11 states:

General power of court

11 Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

On the plain wording of the provision, the jurisdiction granted by s. 11 is constrained only by restrictions set out in the *CCAA* itself, and the requirement that the order made be “appropriate in the circumstances”.

68 Where a party seeks an order relating to a matter that falls within the supervising judge’s purview, and for which there is no *CCAA* provision conferring more specific jurisdiction, s. 11 necessarily is the provision of first resort in anchoring jurisdiction. As Blair J.A. put it in *Stelco*, s. 11 “for the most part supplants the need to resort to inherent jurisdiction” in the *CCAA* context (para. 36).

69 Oversight of the plan negotiation, voting, and approval process falls squarely within the supervising judge's purview. As indicated, there are no specific provisions in the CCAA which govern when a creditor who is otherwise eligible to vote on a plan may nonetheless be barred from voting. Nor is there any provision in the CCAA which suggests that a creditor has an absolute right to vote on a plan that cannot be displaced by a proper exercise of judicial discretion. However, given that the CCAA regime contemplates creditor participation in decision-making as an integral facet of the workout regime, creditors should only be barred from voting where the circumstances demand such an outcome. In other words, it is necessarily a discretionary, circumstance-specific inquiry.

70 Thus, it is apparent that s. 11 serves as the source of the supervising judge's jurisdiction to issue a discretionary order barring a creditor from voting on a plan of arrangement. The exercise of this discretion must further the remedial objectives of the CCAA and be guided by the baseline considerations of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence. This means that, where a creditor is seeking to exercise its voting rights in a manner that frustrates, undermines, or runs counter to those objectives — that is, acting for an “improper purpose” — the supervising judge has the discretion to bar that creditor from voting.

71 The discretion to bar a creditor from voting in furtherance of an improper purpose under the CCAA parallels the similar discretion that exists under the BIA, which was recognized in *Laserworks Computer Services Inc., Re*, 1998 NSCA 42, 165 N.S.R. (2d) 296 (N.S. C.A.). In *Laserworks Computer Services Inc.*, the Nova Scotia Court of Appeal concluded that the discretion to bar a creditor from voting in this way stemmed from the court's power, inherent in the scheme of the BIA, to supervise “[e]ach step in the bankruptcy process” (at para. 41), as reflected in ss. 43(7), 108(3), and 187(9) of the Act. The court explained that s. 187(9) specifically grants the power to remedy a “substantial injustice”, which arises “when the BIA is used for an improper purpose” (para. 54). The court held that “[a]n improper purpose is any purpose collateral to the purpose for which the bankruptcy and insolvency legislation was enacted by Parliament” (para. 54).

72 While not determinative, the existence of this discretion under the BIA lends support to the existence of similar discretion under the CCAA for two reasons.

73 First, this conclusion would be consistent with this Court's recognition that the CCAA “offers a more flexible mechanism with *greater* judicial discretion” than the BIA (*Century Services*, at para. 14 (emphasis added)).

74 Second, this Court has recognized the benefits of harmonizing the two statutes to the extent possible. For example, in *Indalex*, the Court observed that “in order to avoid a race to liquidation under the BIA, courts will favour an interpretation of the CCAA that affords creditors analogous entitlements” to those received under the BIA (para. 51; see also *Century Services*, at para. 24; *Nortel Networks Corp., Re*, 2015 ONCA 681, 391 D.L.R. (4th) 283 (Ont. C.A.), at paras. 34-46). Thus, where the statutes are capable of bearing a harmonious interpretation, that interpretation ought to be preferred “to avoid the ills that can arise from [insolvency] ‘statute-shopping’” (*Kitchener Frame Ltd., Re*, 2012 ONSC 234, 86 C.B.R. (5th) 274, at para. 78; see also para. 73). In our view, the articulation of “improper purpose” set out in *Laserworks Computer Services Inc.* — that is, any purpose collateral to the purpose of insolvency legislation — is entirely harmonious with the nature and scope of judicial discretion afforded by the CCAA. Indeed, as we have explained, this discretion is to be exercised in accordance with the CCAA's objectives as an insolvency statute.

75 We also observe that the recognition of this discretion under the CCAA advances the basic fairness that “permeates Canadian insolvency law and practice” (Sarra, “The Oscillating Pendulum: Canada's Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law”, at p. 27; see also *Century Services*, at paras. 70 and 77). As Professor Sarra observes, fairness demands that supervising judges be in a position to recognize and meaningfully address circumstances in which parties are working against the goals of the statute:

The Canadian insolvency regime is based on the assumption that creditors and the debtor share a common goal of maximizing recoveries. The substantive aspect of fairness in the insolvency regime is based on the assumption that all involved parties face real economic risks. Unfairness resides where only some face these risks, while others actually benefit from the situation If the CCAA is to be interpreted in a purposive way, the courts must be able to recognize when people have conflicting interests and are working actively against the goals of the statute.

(“The Oscillating Pendulum: Canada's Sesquicentennial and Finding the Equilibrium for Insolvency Law”, at p. 30

(emphasis added))

In this vein, the supervising judge's oversight of the CCAA voting regime must not only ensure strict compliance with the Act, but should further its goals as well. We are of the view that the policy objectives of the CCAA necessitate the recognition of the discretion to bar a creditor from voting where the creditor is acting for an improper purpose.

76 Whether this discretion ought to be exercised in a particular case is a circumstance-specific inquiry that must balance the various objectives of the CCAA. As this case demonstrates, the supervising judge is best-positioned to undertake this inquiry.

(3) The Supervising Judge Did Not Err in Prohibiting Callidus From Voting

77 In our view, the supervising judge's decision to bar Callidus from voting on the New Plan discloses no error justifying appellate intervention. As we have explained, discretionary decisions like this one must be approached from the appropriate posture of deference. It bears mentioning that, when he made this decision, the supervising judge was intimately familiar with Bluberi's CCAA proceedings. He had presided over them for over 2 years, received 15 reports from the Monitor, and issued approximately 25 orders.

78 The supervising judge considered the whole of the circumstances and concluded that Callidus's vote would serve an improper purpose (paras. 45 and 48). We agree with his determination. He was aware that, prior to the vote on the First Plan, Callidus had chosen not to value *any* of its claim as unsecured and later declined to vote at all — despite the Monitor explicitly inviting it to do so⁴. The supervising judge was also aware that Callidus's First Plan had failed to receive the other creditors' approval at the creditors' meeting of December 15, 2017, and that Callidus had chosen not to take the opportunity to amend or increase the value of its plan at that time, which it was entitled to do (see CCAA, ss. 6 and 7; Monitor, I.F., at para. 17). Between the failure of the First Plan and the proposal of the New Plan — which was identical to the First Plan, save for a modest increase of \$250,000 — none of the factual circumstances relating to Bluberi's financial or business affairs had materially changed. However, Callidus sought to value the *entirety* of its security at *nil* and, on that basis, sought leave to vote on the New Plan as an unsecured creditor. If Callidus were permitted to vote in this way, the New Plan would certainly have met the s. 6(1) threshold for approval. In these circumstances, the inescapable inference was that Callidus was attempting to strategically value its security to acquire control over the outcome of the vote and thereby circumvent the creditor democracy the CCAA protects. Put simply, Callidus was seeking to take a "second kick at the can" and manipulate the vote on the New Plan. The supervising judge made no error in exercising his discretion to prevent Callidus from doing so.

79 Indeed, as the Monitor observes, "Once a plan of arrangement or proposal has been submitted to the creditors of a debtor for voting purposes, to order a second creditors' meeting to vote on a substantially similar plan would not advance the policy objectives of the CCAA, nor would it serve and enhance the public's confidence in the process or otherwise serve the ends of justice" (I.F., at para. 18). This is particularly the case given that the cost of having another meeting to vote on the New Plan would have been upwards of \$200,000 (see supervising judge's reasons, at para. 72).

80 We add that Callidus's course of action was plainly contrary to the expectation that parties act with due diligence in an insolvency proceeding — which, in our view, includes acting with due diligence in valuing their claims and security. At all material times, Bluberi's Retained Claims have been the sole asset securing Callidus's claim. Callidus has pointed to nothing in the record that indicates that the value of the Retained Claims has changed. Had Callidus been of the view that the Retained Claims had no value, one would have expected Callidus to have valued its security accordingly prior to the vote on the First Plan, if not earlier. Parenthetically, we note that, irrespective of the timing, an attempt at such a valuation may well have failed. This would have prevented Callidus from voting as an unsecured creditor, even in the absence of Callidus's improper purpose.

81 As we have indicated, discretionary decisions attract a highly deferential standard of review. Deference demands that review of a discretionary decision begin with a proper characterization of the basis for the decision. Respectfully, the Court of Appeal failed in this regard. The Court of Appeal seized on the supervising judge's somewhat critical comments relating to Callidus's goal of being released from the Retained Claims and its conduct throughout the proceedings as being incapable of grounding a finding of improper purpose. However, as we have explained, these considerations did not drive the supervising judge's conclusion. His conclusion was squarely based on Callidus' attempt to manipulate the creditors' vote to ensure that

its New Plan would succeed where its First Plan had failed (see supervising judge's reasons, at paras. 45-48). We see nothing in the Court of Appeal's reasons that grapples with this decisive impropriety, which goes far beyond a creditor merely acting in its own self-interest.

82 In sum, we see nothing in the supervising judge's reasons on this point that would justify appellate intervention. Callidus was properly barred from voting on the New Plan.

83 Before moving on, we note that the Court of Appeal addressed two further issues: whether Callidus is "related" to Bluberi within the meaning of s. 22(3) of the CCAA; and whether, if permitted to vote, Callidus should be ordered to vote in a separate class from Bluberi's other creditors (see CCAA, s. 22(1) and (2)). Given our conclusion that the supervising judge did not err in barring Callidus from voting on the New Plan on the basis that Callidus was acting for an improper purpose, it is unnecessary to address either of these issues. However, nothing in our reasons should be read as endorsing the Court of Appeal's analysis of them.

C. Bluberi's LFA Should Be Approved as Interim Financing

84 In our view, the supervising judge made no error in approving the LFA as interim financing pursuant to s. 11.2 of the CCAA. Interim financing is a flexible tool that may take on a range of forms. As we will explain, third party litigation funding may be one such form. Whether third party litigation funding should be approved as interim financing is a case-specific inquiry that should have regard to the text of s. 11.2 and the remedial objectives of the CCAA more generally.

(1) Interim Financing and Section 11.2 of the CCAA

85 Interim financing, despite being expressly provided for in s. 11.2 of the CCAA, is not defined in the Act. Professor Sarra has described it as "refer[ring] primarily to the working capital that the debtor corporation requires in order to keep operating during restructuring proceedings, as well as to the financing to pay the costs of the workout process" (*Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, at p. 197). Interim financing used in this way — sometimes referred to as "debtor-in-possession" financing — protects the going-concern value of the debtor company while it develops a workable solution to its insolvency issues (p. 197; *Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re* (1999), 6 C.B.R. (4th) 314 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), at paras. 7, 9 and 24; *Boutiques San Francisco inc., Re* [2003 CarswellQue 13882 (C.S. Que.)], 2003 CanLII 36955, at para. 32). That said, interim financing is not limited to providing debtor companies with immediate operating capital. Consistent with the remedial objectives of the CCAA, interim financing at its core enables the preservation and realization of the value of a debtor's assets.

86 Since 2009, s. 11.2(1) of the CCAA has codified a supervising judge's discretion to approve interim financing, and to grant a corresponding security or charge in favour of the lender in the amount the judge considers appropriate:

Interim financing

11.2 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

87 The breadth of a supervising judge's discretion to approve interim financing is apparent from the wording of s. 11.2(1). Aside from the protections regarding notice and pre-filing security, s. 11.2(1) does not mandate any standard form or terms.⁵ It simply provides that the financing must be in an amount that is "appropriate" and "required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement".

88 The supervising judge may also grant the lender a "super-priority charge" that will rank in priority over the claims of any secured creditors, pursuant to s. 11.2(2):

Priority — secured creditors

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

89 Such charges, also known as “priming liens”, reduce lenders’ risks, thereby incentivizing them to assist insolvent companies (Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, *Archived — Bill C-55: clause by clause analysis*, last updated December 29, 2016 (online), cl. 128, s. 11.2; Wood, at p. 387). As a practical matter, these charges are often the only way to encourage this lending. Normally, a lender protects itself against lending risk by taking a security interest in the borrower’s assets. However, debtor companies under CCAA protection will often have pledged all or substantially all of their assets to other creditors. Accordingly, without the benefit of a super-priority charge, an interim financing lender would rank behind those other creditors (McElcheran, at pp. 298-99). Although super-priority charges do subordinate secured creditors’ security positions to the interim financing lender’s — a result that was controversial at common law — Parliament has indicated its general acceptance of the trade-offs associated with these charges by enacting s. 11.2(2) (see M. B. Rotsztein and A. Dostal, “Debtor-In-Possession Financing”, in S. Ben-Ishai and A. Duggan, eds., *Canadian Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law: Bill C-55, Statute c. 47 and Beyond* (2007), 227, at pp. 228-229 and 240-50). Indeed, this balance was expressly considered by the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce that recommended codifying interim financing in the CCAA (pp. 100-4).

90 Ultimately, whether proposed interim financing should be approved is a question that the supervising judge is best-placed to answer. The CCAA sets out a number of factors that help guide the exercise of this discretion. The inclusion of these factors in s. 11.2 was informed by the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce’s view that they would help meet the “fundamental principles” that have guided the development of Canadian insolvency law, including “fairness, predictability and efficiency” (p. 103; see also Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, cl. 128, s. 11.2). In deciding whether to grant interim financing, the supervising judge is to consider the following non-exhaustive list of factors:

Factors to be considered

(4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a) the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
- (b) how the company’s business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
- (c) whether the company’s management has the confidence of its major creditors;
- (d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;
- (e) the nature and value of the company’s property;
- (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
- (g) the monitor’s report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

(CCAA, s. 11.2(4))

91 Prior to the coming into force of the above provisions in 2009, courts had been using the general discretion conferred by s. 11 to authorize interim financing and associated super-priority charges (*Century Services*, at para. 62). Section 11.2 largely codifies the approaches those courts have taken (Wood, at p. 388; McElcheran, at p. 301). As a result, where appropriate, guidance may be drawn from the pre-codification interim financing jurisprudence.

92 As with other measures available under the CCAA, interim financing is a flexible tool that may take different forms or attract different considerations in each case. Below, we explain that third party litigation funding may, in appropriate cases, be one such form.

(2) *Supervising Judges May Approve Third Party Litigation Funding as Interim Financing*

93 Third party litigation funding generally involves “a third party, otherwise unconnected to the litigation, agree[ing] to pay some or all of a party’s litigation costs, in exchange for a portion of that party’s recovery in damages or costs” (R. K. Agarwal and D. Fenton, “Beyond Access to Justice: Litigation Funding Agreements Outside the Class Actions Context” (2017), 59 *Can. Bus. L. J.* 65, at p. 65). Third party litigation funding can take various forms. A common model involves the litigation funder agreeing to pay a plaintiff’s disbursements and indemnify the plaintiff in the event of an adverse cost award in exchange for a share of the proceeds of any successful litigation or settlement (see *Dugal v. Manulife Financial Corp.*, 2011 ONSC 1785, 105 O.R. (3d) 364 (Ont. S.C.J.); *Musicians’ Pension Fund of Canada (Trustee of)*).

94 Outside of the CCAA context, the approval of third party litigation funding agreements has been somewhat controversial. Part of that controversy arises from the potential of these agreements to offend the common law doctrines of champerty and maintenance.⁶ The tort of maintenance prohibits “officious intermeddling with a lawsuit which in no way belongs to one” (L. N. Klar et al., *Remedies in Tort* (loose-leaf), vol. 1, by L. Berry, ed., at p. 14-11, citing *Langtry v. Dumoulin* (1885), 7 O.R. 644 (Ont. Div. Ct.), at p. 661). Champerty is a species of maintenance that involves an agreement to share in the proceeds or otherwise profit from a successful suit (*McIntyre Estate v. Ontario (Attorney General)* (2002), 218 D.L.R. (4th) 193 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 26).

95 Building on jurisprudence holding that *contingency fee* arrangements are not champertous where they are not motivated by an improper purpose (e.g., *McIntyre Estate*), lower courts have increasingly come to recognize that *litigation funding* agreements are also not *per se* champertous. This development has been focussed within class action proceedings, where it arose as a response to barriers like adverse cost awards, which were stymieing litigants’ access to justice (see *Dugal*, at para. 33; *Marcotte c. Banque de Montréal*, 2015 QCCS 1915 (C.S. Que.), at paras. 43-44 (CanLII); *Houle v. St. Jude Medical Inc.*, 2017 ONSC 5129, 9 C.P.C. (8th) 321 (Ont. S.C.J.), at para. 52, aff’d 2018 ONSC 6352, 429 D.L.R. (4th) 739 (Ont. Div. Ct.); see also *Stanway v. Wyeth Canada Inc.*, 2013 BCSC 1585, 56 B.C.L.R. (5th) 192 (B.C. S.C.), at para. 13). The jurisprudence on the approval of third party litigation funding agreements in the class action context — and indeed, the parameters of their legality generally — is still evolving, and no party before this Court has invited us to evaluate it.

96 That said, insofar as third party litigation funding agreements are not *per se* illegal, there is no principled basis upon which to restrict supervising judges from approving such agreements as interim financing in appropriate cases. We acknowledge that this funding differs from more common forms of interim financing that are simply designed to help the debtor “keep the lights on” (see *Royal Oak*, at paras. 7 and 24). However, in circumstances like the case at bar, where there is a single litigation asset that could be monetized for the benefit of creditors, the objective of maximizing creditor recovery has taken centre stage. In those circumstances, litigation funding furthers the basic purpose of interim financing: allowing the debtor to realize on the value of its assets.

97 We conclude that third party litigation funding agreements may be approved as interim financing in CCAA proceedings when the supervising judge determines that doing so would be fair and appropriate, having regard to all the circumstances and the objectives of the Act. This requires consideration of the specific factors set out in s. 11.2(4) of the CCAA. That said, these factors need not be mechanically applied or individually reviewed by the supervising judge. Indeed, not all of them will be significant in every case, nor are they exhaustive. Further guidance may be drawn from other areas in which third party litigation funding agreements have been approved.

98 The foregoing is consistent with the practice that is already occurring in lower courts. Most notably, in *Crystallex*, the Ontario Court of Appeal approved a third party litigation funding agreement in circumstances substantially similar to the case at bar. *Crystallex* involved a mining company that had the right to develop a large gold deposit in Venezuela. Crystallex eventually became insolvent and (similar to Bluberi) was left with only a single significant asset: a US\$3.4 billion arbitration claim against Venezuela. After entering CCAA protection, Crystallex sought the approval of a third party litigation funding agreement. The agreement contemplated that the lender would advance substantial funds to finance the arbitration in exchange for, among other things, a percentage of the net proceeds of any award or settlement. The supervising judge

approved the agreement as interim financing pursuant to s. 11.2. The Court of Appeal unanimously found no error in the supervising judge's exercise of discretion. It concluded that s. 11.2 "does not restrict the ability of the supervising judge, where appropriate, to approve the grant of a charge securing financing before a plan is approved that may continue after the company emerges from CCAA protection" (para. 68).

99 A key argument raised by the creditors in *Crystallex* — and one that Callidus and the Creditors' Group have put before us now — was that the litigation funding agreement at issue was a plan of arrangement and not interim financing. This was significant because, if the agreement was in fact a plan, it would have had to be put to a creditors' vote pursuant to ss. 4 and 5 of the CCAA prior to receiving court approval. The court in *Crystallex* rejected this argument, as do we.

100 There is no definition of plan of arrangement in the CCAA. In fact, the CCAA does not refer to plans at all — it only refers to an "arrangement" or "compromise" (see ss. 4 and 5). The authors of *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Law of Canada* offer the following general definition of these terms, relying on early English case law:

A "compromise" presupposes some dispute about the rights compromised and a settling of that dispute on terms that are satisfactory to the debtor and the creditor. An agreement to accept less than 100¢ on the dollar would be a compromise where the debtor disputes the debt or lacks the means to pay it. "Arrangement" is a broader word than "compromise" and is not limited to something analogous to a compromise. It would include any scheme for reorganizing the affairs of the debtor: *Re Guardian Assur. Co.*, [1917] 1 Ch. 431, 61 Sol. Jo 232, [1917] H.B.R. 113 (C.A.); *Re Refund of Dues under Timber Regulations*, [1935] A.C. 185 (P.C.).

(Houlden, Morawetz and Sarra, at N§33)

101 The apparent breadth of these terms notwithstanding, they do have some limits. More recent jurisprudence suggests that they require, at minimum, some compromise of creditors' rights. For example, in *Crystallex* the litigation funding agreement at issue (known as the Tenor DIP facility) was held not to be a plan of arrangement because it did not "compromise the terms of [the creditors'] indebtedness or take away ... their legal rights" (para. 93). The Court of Appeal adopted the following reasoning from the lower court's decision, with which we substantially agree:

A "plan of arrangement" or a "compromise" is not defined in the CCAA. It is, however, to be an arrangement or compromise between a debtor and its creditors. The Tenor DIP facility is not on its face such an arrangement or compromise between *Crystallex* and its creditors. Importantly the rights of the noteholders are not taken away from them by the Tenor DIP facility. The noteholders are unsecured creditors. Their rights are to sue to judgment and enforce the judgment. If not paid, they have a right to apply for a bankruptcy order under the BIA. Under the CCAA, they have the right to vote on a plan of arrangement or compromise. None of these rights are taken away by the Tenor DIP.

(*Crystallex International Corp.*, *Re*, 2012 ONSC 2125, 91 C.B.R. (5th) 169 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), at para. 50)

102 Setting out an exhaustive definition of plan of arrangement or compromise is unnecessary to resolve these appeals. For our purposes, it is sufficient to conclude that plans of arrangement require at least some compromise of creditors' rights. It follows that a third party litigation funding agreement aimed at extending financing to a debtor company to realize on the value of a litigation asset does not necessarily constitute a plan of arrangement. We would leave it to supervising judges to determine whether, in the particular circumstances of the case before them, a particular third party litigation funding agreement contains terms that effectively convert it into a plan of arrangement. So long as the agreement does not contain such terms, it may be approved as interim financing pursuant to s. 11.2 of the CCAA.

103 We add that there may be circumstances in which a third party litigation funding agreement may contain or incorporate a plan of arrangement (e.g., if it contemplates a plan for distribution of litigation proceeds among creditors). Alternatively, a supervising judge may determine that, despite an agreement itself not being a plan of arrangement, it should be packaged with a plan and submitted to a creditors' vote. That said, we repeat that third party litigation funding agreements are not necessarily, or even generally, plans of arrangement.

104 None of the foregoing is seriously contested before us. The parties essentially agree that third party litigation funding

agreements *can* be approved as interim financing. The dispute between them focusses on whether the supervising judge erred in exercising his discretion to approve the LFA in the absence of a vote of the creditors, either because it was a plan of arrangement or because it should have been accompanied by a plan of arrangement. We turn to these issues now.

(3) *The Supervising Judge Did Not Err in Approving the LFA*

105 In our view, there is no basis upon which to interfere with the supervising judge’s exercise of his discretion to approve the LFA as interim financing. The supervising judge considered the LFA to be fair and reasonable, drawing guidance from the principles relevant to approving similar agreements in the class action context (para. 74, citing *Musicians’ Pension Fund of Canada (Trustee of)*, at para. 41; *Hayes*, at para. 4). In particular, he canvassed the terms upon which Bentham and Bluberi’s lawyers would be paid in the event the litigation was successful, the risks they were taking by investing in the litigation, and the extent of Bentham’s control over the litigation going forward (paras. 79 and 81). The supervising judge also considered the unique objectives of CCAA proceedings in distinguishing the LFA from ostensibly similar agreements that had not received approval in the class action context (paras. 81-82, distinguishing *Houle*). His consideration of those objectives is also apparent from his reliance on *Crystallex*, which, as we have explained, involved the approval of interim financing in circumstances substantially similar to the case at bar (see paras. 67 and 71). We see no error in principle or unreasonableness to this approach.

106 While the supervising judge did not canvass each of the factors set out in s. 11.2(4) of the CCAA individually before reaching his conclusion, this was not itself an error. A review of the supervising judge’s reasons as a whole, combined with a recognition of his manifest experience with Bluberi’s CCAA proceedings, leads us to conclude that the factors listed in s. 11.2(4) concern matters that could not have escaped his attention and due consideration. It bears repeating that, at the time of his decision, the supervising judge had been seized of these proceedings for well over two years and had the benefit of the Monitor’s assistance. With respect to each of the s. 11.2(4) factors, we note that:

- the judge’s supervisory role would have made him aware of the potential length of Bluberi’s CCAA proceedings and the extent of creditor support for Bluberi’s management (s. 11.2(4)(a) and (c)), though we observe that these factors appear to be less significant than the others in the context of this particular case (see para. 96);
- the LFA itself explains “how the company’s business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings” (s. 11.2(4)(b));
- the supervising judge was of the view that the LFA would enhance the prospect of a viable plan, as he accepted (1) that Bluberi intended to submit a plan and (2) Bluberi’s submission that approval of the LFA would assist it in finalizing a plan “with a view towards achieving maximum realization” of its assets (at para. 68, citing 9354-9186 Québec inc. and 9354-9178 Québec inc.’s application, at para. 99; s. 11.2(4)(d));
- the supervising judge was apprised of the “nature and value” of Bluberi’s property, which was clearly limited to the Retained Claims (s. 11.2(4)(e));
- the supervising judge implicitly concluded that the creditors would not be materially prejudiced by the Litigation Financing Charge, as he stated that “[c]onsidering the results of the vote [on the First Plan], and given the particular circumstances of this matter, *the only potential recovery* lies with the lawsuit that the Debtors will launch” (at para. 91 (emphasis added); s. 11.2(4)(f)); and
- the supervising judge was also well aware of the Monitor’s reports, and drew from the most recent report at various points in his reasons (see, e.g., paras. 64-65 and fn. 1; s. 11.2(4)(g)). It is worth noting that the Monitor supported approving the LFA as interim financing.

107 In our view, it is apparent that the supervising judge was focussed on the fairness at stake to all parties, the specific objectives of the CCAA, and the particular circumstances of this case when he approved the LFA as interim financing. We cannot say that he erred in the exercise of his discretion. Although we are unsure whether the LFA was as favourable to Bluberi’s creditors as it might have been — to some extent, it does prioritize Bentham’s recovery over theirs — we nonetheless defer to the supervising judge’s exercise of discretion.

108 To the extent the Court of Appeal held otherwise, we respectfully do not agree. Generally speaking, our view is that the Court of Appeal again failed to afford the supervising judge the necessary deference. More specifically, we wish to comment on three of the purported errors in the supervising judge's decision that the Court of Appeal identified.

109 First, it follows from our conclusion that LFAs can constitute interim financing that the Court of Appeal was incorrect to hold that approving the LFA as interim financing “transcended the nature of such financing” (para. 78).

110 Second, in our view, the Court of Appeal was wrong to conclude that the LFA was a plan of arrangement, and that *Crystallex* was distinguishable on its facts. The Court of Appeal held that the LFA and associated super-priority Litigation Financing Charge formed a plan because they subordinated the rights of Bluberi's creditors to those of Bentham.

111 We agree with the supervising judge that the LFA is not a plan of arrangement because it does not propose any compromise of the creditors' rights. To borrow from the Court of Appeal in *Crystallex*, Bluberi's litigation claim is akin to a “pot of gold” (para. 4). Plans of arrangement determine how to distribute that pot. They do not generally determine what a debtor company should do to fill it. The fact that the creditors may walk away with more or less money at the end of the day does not change the nature or existence of their rights to access the pot once it is filled, nor can it be said to “compromise” those rights. When the “pot of gold” is secure — that is, in the event of any litigation or settlement — the net funds will be distributed to the creditors. Here, if the Retained Claims generate funds in excess of Bluberi's total liabilities, the creditors will be paid in full; if there is a shortfall, a plan of arrangement or compromise will determine how the funds are distributed. Bluberi has committed to proposing such a plan (see supervising judge's reasons, at para. 68, distinguishing *Cliffs Over Maple Bay Investments Ltd. v. Fisgard Capital Corp.*, 2008 BCCA 327, 296 D.L.R. (4th) 577 (B.C. C.A.)).

112 This is the very same conclusion that was reached in *Crystallex* in similar circumstances:

The facts of this case are unusual: there is a single “pot of gold” asset which, if realized, will provide significantly more than required to repay the creditors. The supervising judge was in the best position to balance the interests of all stakeholders. I am of the view that the supervising judge's exercise of discretion in approving the Tenor DIP Loan was reasonable and appropriate, despite having the effect of constraining the negotiating position of the creditors.

.....

... While the approval of the Tenor DIP Loan affected the Noteholders' leverage in negotiating a plan, and has made the negotiation of a plan more complex, it did not compromise the terms of their indebtedness or take away any of their legal rights. It is accordingly not an arrangement, and a creditor vote was not required. [paras. 82 and 93]

113 We disagree with the Court of Appeal that *Crystallex* should be distinguished on the basis that it involved a single option for creditor recovery (i.e., the arbitration) while this case involves two (i.e., litigation of the Retained Claims and Callidus's New Plan). Given the supervising judge's conclusion that Callidus could not vote on the New Plan, that plan was not a viable alternative to the LFA. This left the LFA and litigation of the Retained Claims as the “only potential recovery” for Bluberi's creditors (supervising judge's reasons, at para. 91). Perhaps more significantly, even if there were multiple options for creditor recovery in either *Crystallex* or this case, the mere presence of those options would not necessarily have changed the character of the third party litigation funding agreements at issue or converted them into plans of arrangement. The question for the supervising judge in each case is whether the agreement before them ought to be approved as interim financing. While other options for creditor recovery may be relevant to that discretionary decision, they are not determinative.

114 We add that the Litigation Financing Charge does not convert the LFA into a plan of arrangement by “subordinat[ing]” creditors' rights (C.A. reasons, at para. 90). We accept that this charge would have the effect of placing secured creditors like Callidus behind in priority to Bentham. However, this result is expressly provided for in s. 11.2 of the CCAA. This “subordination” does not convert statutorily authorized interim financing into a plan of arrangement. Accepting this interpretation would effectively extinguish the supervising judge's authority to approve these charges without a creditors' vote pursuant to s. 11.2(2).

115 Third, we are of the view that the Court of Appeal was wrong to decide that the supervising judge should have submitted the LFA together with a plan to the creditors for their approval (para. 89). As we have indicated, whether to insist

that a debtor package their third party litigation funding agreement with a plan is a discretionary decision for the supervising judge to make.

116 Finally, at the appellants' insistence, we point out that the Court of Appeal's suggestion that the LFA is somehow "akin to an equity investment" was unhelpful and potentially confusing (para. 90). That said, this characterization was clearly *obiter dictum*. To the extent that the Court of Appeal relied on it as support for the conclusion that the LFA was a plan of arrangement, we have already explained why we believe the Court of Appeal was mistaken on this point.

VI. Conclusion

117 For these reasons, at the conclusion of the hearing we allowed these appeals and reinstated the supervising judge's order. Costs were awarded to the appellants in this Court and the Court of Appeal.

Footnotes

- ¹ Bluberi does not appear to have filed this claim yet (see 2018 QCCS 1040 (C.S. Que.), at para. 10 (CanLII)).
- ² Notably, the Creditors' Group advised Callidus that it would lend its support to the New Plan. It also asked Callidus to reimburse any legal fees incurred in association with that support. At the same time, the Creditors' Group did not undertake to vote in any particular way, and confirmed that each of its members would assess all available alternatives individually.
- ³ We note that while s. 36 now codifies the jurisdiction of a supervising court to grant a sale and vesting order, and enumerates factors to guide the court's discretion to grant such an order, it is silent on when courts ought to approve a liquidation under the CCAA as opposed to requiring the parties to proceed to liquidation under a receivership or the BIA regime (see Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, at pp. 167-68; A. Nocilla, "Asset Sales Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Failure of Section 36" (2012) 52 *Can. Bus. L.J.* 226, at pp. 243-44 and 247). This issue remains an open question and was not put to this Court in either *Indalex* or these appeals.
- ⁴ It bears noting that the Monitor's statement in this regard did not decide whether Callidus would ultimately have been entitled to vote on the First Plan. Because Callidus did not even attempt to vote on the First Plan, this question was never put to the supervising judge.
- ⁵ A further exception has been codified in the 2019 amendments to the CCAA, which create s. 11.2(5) (see *Budget Implementation Act, 2019, No. 1*, s. 138). This section provides that at the time an initial order is sought, "no order shall be made under subsection [11.2](1) unless the court is also satisfied that the terms of the loan are limited to what is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period". This provision does not apply in this case, and the parties have not relied on it. However, it may be that it restricts the ability of supervising judges to approve LFAs as interim financing at the time of granting an Initial Order.
- ⁶ The extent of this controversy varies by province. In Ontario, champertous agreements are forbidden by statute (see *An Act respecting Champerty*, R.S.O. 1897, c. 327). In Quebec, concerns associated with champerty and maintenance do not arise as acutely because champerty and maintenance are not part of the law as such (see *Pole Lite ltée c. Banque Nationale du Canada*, 2006 QCCA 557, [2006] R.J.Q. 1009 (C.A. Que.); G. Michaud, "New Frontier: The Emergence of Litigation Funding in the Canadian Insolvency Landscape" in J. P. Sarra et al., eds., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law 2018* (2019), 221, at p. 231).

Most Negative Treatment: Check subsequent history and related treatments.

2011 ONSC 7522

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Clothing for Modern Times Ltd., Re

2011 CarswellOnt 14402, 2011 ONSC 7522, 210 A.C.W.S. (3d) 575, 88 C.B.R. (5th) 329

In the Matter of the Notice of Intention to make a Proposal of Clothing for Modern Times Ltd.

D.M. Brown J.

Heard: December 16, 2011

Judgment: December 16, 2011

Docket: 31-1513595

Counsel: M. Poliak, H. Chaiton for Applicant

M. Forte for A. Farber & Partners Inc., the Proposal Trustee and Proposed Monitor

I. Aversa for Roynat Asset Finance

D. Bish for Cadillac Fairview

L. Galessiere for Ivanhoe Cambridge Inc., Oxford Properties Group Inc., Primaris Retail Estate Investment Trust, Morguard Investment Limited, 20 VIC Management Inc.

M. Weinczuk for 7951388 Canada Inc.

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

XIX.5 Miscellaneous

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Miscellaneous

Continuation of Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA) proposal proceedings under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) — Debtor company filed notice of intention to make proposal pursuant to s. 50.4 of BIA — Time to file proposal was running out and no further extensions of time to file proposal were available to debtor under BIA — Debtor brought motion to continue BIA proposal proceedings under CCAA — Motion granted — Debtor had not filed proposal — Continuation to enable going-concern sale of part of debtor's business would be consistent with purposes of CCAA — Debtor filed cash flow statements which showed net positive cash flow for period and that debtor had sufficient resources to continue operating in CCAA proceeding, as well as to conduct sale process without need for additional financing — Proposal Trustee regarded cash flow statements as reasonable — Previous extension orders made under s. 50.4(9) of BIA indicated that debtor established it had been acting in good faith and with due diligence.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by D.M. Brown J.:

Brainhunter Inc., Re (2009), 62 C.B.R. (5th) 41, 2009 CarswellOnt 8207 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

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

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

Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance) (2002), 287 N.R. 203, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 18 C.P.R. (4th) 1, 44 C.E.L.R. (N.S.) 161, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 211 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 223 F.T.R. 137 (note), 20 C.P.C. (5th) 1, 40 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, 2002 SCC 41, 2002 CarswellNat 822, 2002 CarswellNat 823, (sub nom. *Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada*) 93 C.R.R. (2d) 219, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.) — followed

Stelco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 4084, 6 C.B.R. (5th) 316 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re (2010), (sub nom. *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (A.G.)*) [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, [2010] G.S.T.C. 186, 12 B.C.L.R. (5th) 1, (sub nom. *Century Services Inc. v. A.G. of Canada*) 2011 G.T.C. 2006 (Eng.), (sub nom. *Century Services Inc. v. A.G. of Canada*) 2011 D.T.C. 5006 (Eng.), (sub nom. *Leroy (Ted) Trucking Ltd., Re*) 503 W.A.C. 1, (sub nom. *Leroy (Ted) Trucking Ltd., Re*) 296 B.C.A.C. 1, 2010 SCC 60, 2010 CarswellBC 3419, 2010 CarswellBC 3420, 409 N.R. 201, (sub nom. *Ted LeRoy Trucking Ltd., Re*) 326 D.L.R. (4th) 577, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 170, [2011] 2 W.W.R. 383 (S.C.C.) — followed

Statutes considered:

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

Generally — referred to

Pt. III — referred to

s. 50.4 [en. 1992, c. 27, s. 19] — pursuant to

s. 50.4(9) [en. 1992, c. 27, s. 19] — considered

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

Generally — referred to

s. 10(2) — considered

s. 11.52 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — referred to

s. 11.6 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.6(a) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — pursuant to

MOTION by debtor company to continue *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* proposal proceedings under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

D.M. Brown J.:

I. Motion to continue BIA Part III proposal proceedings under the CCAA

1 Clothing for Modern Times Ltd. ("CMT"), a retailer of fashion apparel, filed a Notice of Intention to Make a Proposal pursuant to section 50.4 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, on June 27, 2011. A. Farber & Partners Inc. was appointed CMT's proposal trustee. At the time of the filing of the NOI CMT operated 116 retail stores from leased

locations across Canada. CMT sold fashion apparel under the trade names Urban Behavior, Costa Blanca and Costa Blanca X.

2 CMT has obtained from this Court several extensions of time to file a proposal. That time will expire on December 22, 2011. Under section 50.4(9) of the *BIA*, no further extensions are possible.

3 Accordingly, CMT moves under section 11.6(a) of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 for an order, effective December 22, 2011, continuing CMT's restructuring proceeding under the *CCAA* and granting an Initial Order, as well as approving a sale process as a going concern for part of CMT's business.

II. Key background events

4 Following the filing of the NOI, pursuant to orders of this Court, CMT conducted a self-liquidation of underperforming stores across Canada and, as well, a going-concern sale of its Urban Behavior business. The latter transaction is scheduled to close on January 16, 2012.

5 At the time of the filing of the NOI there were three major secured creditors of CMT: Roynat Asset Finance, CIC Asset Management Inc., and CMT Sourcing. The company's indebtedness to those creditors totaled approximately \$28.3 million. CMT anticipates that the proceeds from the Urban Behavior transaction and the liquidation of under-performing stores will prove sufficient to repay its loan obligations to Roynat in full before the expiration of a forbearance period on January 16, 2012.

6 When CMT was last in court on November 7, 2011 it stated it intended to make a proposal to its unsecured creditors, an intention supported by the two remaining secured creditors, CIC and CMT Sourcing. Subsequently CMT met with representatives of certain landlords and commenced discussions about its proposed restructuring plan. As a result of those discussions CMT lacks the confidence that its proposal would be approved by the requisite majority of its unsecured creditors, and it does not believe that it can make a viable proposal to its creditors. Instead, CMT thinks that a going-concern sale of its Costa Blanca business would be in the best interests of stakeholders and would preserve employment for about 500 remaining employees, both full-time and hourly retail staff.

7 In its Sixth Report dated December 14, 2011 Farber agrees that a going concern sale of the Costa Blanca business would be in the best interests of CMT's stakeholders, maximize recoveries to the two secured creditors, CIC and CMT Sourcing, and preserve employment for CMT's remaining employees. Farber supports CMT's request to continue its restructuring under the *CCAA*. Farber consents to act as the Monitor under *CCAA* proceedings and to administer the proposed sale process.

III. Continuation under the CCAA

A. Principles governing motions to continue *BIA* Part III proposal proceedings under the *CCAA*

8 Continuations of *BIA* Part III proposal proceedings under the *CCAA* are governed by section 11.6(a) of that Act which provides:

11.6 Notwithstanding the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*,

(a) proceedings commenced under Part III of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* may be taken up and continued under this Act only if a proposal within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* has not been filed under that Part.

9 It strikes me that on a motion to continue under the *CCAA* an applicant company should place before the court evidence dealing with three issues:

- (i) The company has satisfied the sole statutory condition set out in section 11.6(a) of the CCAA that it has not filed a proposal under the BIA;
- (ii) The proposed continuation would be consistent with the purposes of the CCAA; and,
- (iii) Evidence which serves as a reasonable surrogate for the information which section 10(2) of the CCAA requires accompany any initial application under the Act.

Let me deal with each in turn

B. The applicant has not filed a proposal under the BIA

10 The evidence shows that CMT has satisfied this statutory condition.

C. The continuation would be consistent with the purposes of the CCAA

11 In *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re*,¹ the Supreme Court of Canada articulated the purpose of the CCAA in several ways:

- (i) To permit the debtor to continue to carry on business and, where possible, avoid the social and economic costs of liquidating its assets;²
- (ii) To provide a means whereby the devastating social and economic effects of bankruptcy or creditor initiated termination of ongoing business operations can be avoided while a court-supervised attempt to reorganize the financial affairs of the debtor company is made;³
- (iii) To avoid the social and economic losses resulting from liquidation of an insolvent company;⁴
- (iv) To create conditions for preserving the *status quo* while attempts are made to find common ground amongst stakeholders for a reorganization that is fair to all.⁵

As the Supreme Court noted in *Century Services*, proposals to creditors under the BIA serve the same remedial purpose, though this is achieved “through a rules-based mechanism that offers less flexibility.”⁶ In the present case CMT bumped up against one of those less flexible rules — the inability of a court to extend the time to file a proposal beyond six months after the filing of the NOI.

12 The jurisprudence under the CCAA accepts that in appropriate circumstances the purposes of the CCAA will be met even though the re-organization involves the sale of the company as a going concern, with the consequence that the debtor no longer would continue to carry on the business, as is contemplated in the present case. In *Stelco Inc., Re* Farley J. observed that if a restructuring of a company is not feasible, “then there is the exploration of the feasibility of the sale of the operations/enterprise as a going concern (with continued employment) in whole or in part”.⁷ It also is well-established in the jurisprudence that a court may approve a sale of assets in the course of a CCAA proceeding before a plan of arrangement has been approved by creditors.⁸ In *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* Morawetz J. set out the rationale for this judicial approach:

The value of equity in an insolvent debtor is dubious, at best, and, in my view, it follows that the determining factor should not be whether the business continues under the debtor’s stewardship or under a structure that recognizes a new equity structure. An equally important factor to consider is whether the case can be made to continue the business as a going concern.⁹

13 The evidence filed by CMT and Farber supports a finding that a continuation under the CCAA to enable a going-concern sale of the Costa Blanca business and assets would be consistent with the purposes of the CCAA. Such a sale likely would maximize the recovery for the two remaining secured creditors, CIC and CMT Sourcing, preserve employment for many of the 500 remaining employees, and provide a tenant to the landlords of the 35 remaining Costa Blanca stores. Avoidance of the social and economic losses which would result from a liquidation and the maximization of value would best be achieved outside of a bankruptcy.

D. Evidence which serves as a reasonable surrogate for CCAA s. 10(2) information

14 As the Supreme Court of Canada observed in *Century Services*, “the requirements of appropriateness, good faith, and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising CCAA authority.”¹⁰ On an initial application under the CCAA a court will have before it the information specified in section 10(2) which assists it in considering the appropriateness, good faith and due diligence of the application. Section 10(2) of the CCAA provides:

10. (2) An initial application must be accompanied by

- (a) a statement indicating, on a weekly basis, the projected cash flow of the debtor company;
- (b) a report containing the prescribed representations of the debtor company regarding the preparation of the cash-flow statement; and
- (c) copies of all financial statements, audited or unaudited, prepared during the year before the application or, if no such statements were prepared in that year, a copy of the most recent such statement.

15 Section 11.6 of the CCAA does not stipulate the information which must be filed in support of a continuation motion, but a court should have before it sufficient financial and operating information to assess the viability of a continuation under the CCAA. In the present case CMT has filed, on a confidential basis,¹¹ cash flows for the period ending January 31, 2012, which show a net positive cash flow for the period and that CMT has sufficient resources to continue operating in the CCAA proceeding, as well as to conduct a sale process without the need for additional financing.

16 In addition, the Proposal Trustee filed on this motion its Sixth Report in which it reported on its review of the cash flow statements. Although its opinion was expressed in the language of a double negative, I take from its report that it regards the cash flow statements as reasonable.

17 Finally, the previous extension orders made by this Court under section 50.4(9) of the BIA indicate that CMT satisfied the Court that it has been acting in good faith and with due diligence.

E. Conclusion

18 No interested person opposes CMT’s motion to continue under the CCAA. Its two remaining secured creditors, CIC and CMT Sourcing, support the motion. From the evidence filed I am satisfied that CMT has satisfied the statutory condition contained in section 16(a) of the CCAA and that a continuation of its re-structuring under the CCAA would be consistent with the purposes of that Act.

IV. Sale Process

19 In *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* Morawetz J. identified the factors which a court should consider when reviewing a proposed sale process under the CCAA in the absence of a plan:

- (a) is a sale transaction warranted at this time?
- (b) will the sale benefit the whole “economic community”?
- (c) do any of the debtors’ creditors have a *bona fide* reason to object to a sale of the business?
- (d) is there a better viable alternative?¹²

20 No objection has been taken to CMT’s proposed sale of its Costa Blanca business or the proposed sale process under the direction of Farber as Monitor. Chris Johnson, CMT’s CFO, deposed that CMT is not in a position to make a viable

proposal to its creditors and has concluded that a going-concern sale of the Costa Blanca business would be the most appropriate course of action. The Proposal Trustee concurs with that assessment. In light of those opinions, an immediate sale of the Costa Blanca business would be warranted in order to attract the best bids for that business on a going-concern basis. Such a sale, according to the evidence, stands the best chance of maximizing recovery by the remaining secured creditors and preserving the employment of a large number of people. No better viable alternative has been put forward.

21 Accordingly, I approve the proposed sale process as described in paragraph 37 of the affidavit of Chris Johnson.

V. Administration Charges

22 CMT seeks approval under section 11.52 of the CCAA of an Administration Charge over the assets of CMT to secure the professional fees and disbursements of Farber as Monitor and its counsel, as well as the fees of Ernst & Young Orenda Corporate Finance Inc. ("E&Y"), who has been acting as CMT's financial advisor, together with its counsel. The order sought reflects, in large part, the priorities of various charges approved during the *BIA* Part III proposal process. CMT proposes that the Professionals Charge approved under the *BIA* orders and the CCAA Administration Charge rank *pari passu*, and that whereas the *BIA* orders treated as ranking fourth "the balance of any indebtedness under the Professionals Charge", the CCAA order would place a cap of \$250,000 on such portions of the Professionals and CCAA Administration Charges.

23 No interested person opposes the charges sought.

24 I am satisfied that the charge requested is appropriate given the importance of the professional advice to the completion of the Urban Behavior transaction and the sale process for the Costa Blanca business.

VI. Order granted

25 I have reviewed the draft Initial Order submitted by CMT and am satisfied that an order should issue in that form.

26 CMT also seeks a variation of paragraph 3 of the Approval and Vesting Order of Morawetz J. made November 7, 2011 in respect of the Urban Behavior transaction to include, in the released claims, the Professionals Charge and the CCAA Administration Charge. None of the secured creditors objects to the variation sought and it is consistent with the intent of the existing language of that order. I therefore grant the variation sought and I have signed the order.

Motion granted.

Footnotes

¹ 2010 SCC 60 (S.C.C.).

² *Century Services*, para. 15.

³ *Ibid.*, para. 59.

⁴ *Ibid.*, para. 70.

⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 77.

⁶ *Ibid.*, para. 15.

⁷ (2004), 6 C.B.R. (5th) 316 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), para. 1. In *Consumers Packaging Inc.*, Re, 2001 CarswellOnt 3482

(Ont. C.A.) the Court of Appeal held that a sale of a business as a going concern during a CCAA proceeding is consistent with the purposes of that Act.

⁸ See the cases collected by Morawetz J. in *Nortel Networks Corp., Re* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 229 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), paras. 35 to 39. See also section 36 of the CCAA.

⁹ *Ibid.*, para. 40.

¹⁰ *Century Services*, para. 70.

¹¹ CMT has filed evidence explaining that disclosure of the cash flows prior to the closing of the Urban Behavior transaction would make public the proceeds expected from that transaction. I agree that such information should not be made public until the deal has closed. CMT has satisfied the principles set out in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.) and a sealing order should issue.

¹² *Nortel Networks, supra.*, para. 49. See also *Brainhunter Inc., Re* (2009), 62 C.B.R. (5th) 41 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), para. 13.

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (R.S.C. (Revised Statutes of Canada), 1985, c. C-36)

Act current to 2020-05-04 and last amended on 2019-11-01.

PART I**Compromises and Arrangements (continued)**

Court may give directions

7 Where an alteration or a modification of any compromise or arrangement is proposed at any time after the court has directed a meeting or meetings to be summoned, the meeting or meetings may be adjourned on such term as to notice and otherwise as the court may direct, and those directions may be given after as well as before adjournment of any meeting or meetings, and the court may in its discretion direct that it is not necessary to adjourn any meeting or to convene any further meeting of any class of creditors or shareholders that in the opinion of the court is not adversely affected by the alteration or modification proposed, and any compromise or arrangement so altered or modified may be sanctioned by the court and have effect under section 6.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 7.

Scope of Act

8 This Act extends and does not limit the provisions of any instrument now or hereafter existing that governs the rights of creditors or any class of them and has full force and effect notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in that instrument.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 8.

PART II**Jurisdiction of Courts****Jurisdiction of court to receive applications**

9 (1) Any application under this Act may be made to the court that has jurisdiction in the province within which the head office or chief place of business of the company in Canada is situated, or, if the company has no place of business in Canada, in any province within which any assets of the company are situated.

Single judge may exercise powers, subject to appeal

(2) The powers conferred by this Act on a court may, subject to appeal as provided for in this Act, be exercised by a single judge thereof, and those powers may be exercised in chambers during term or in vacation.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 9.

Form of applications

10 (1) Applications under this Act shall be made by petition or by way of originating summons or notice of motion in accordance with the practice of the court in which the application is made.

Documents that must accompany initial application

(2) An initial application must be accompanied by

- (a)** a statement indicating, on a weekly basis, the projected cash flow of the debtor company;
- (b)** a report containing the prescribed representations of the debtor company regarding the preparation of the cash-flow statement; and
- (c)** copies of all financial statements, audited or unaudited, prepared during the year before the application or, if no such statements were prepared in that year, a copy of the most recent such statement.

Publication ban

(3) The court may make an order prohibiting the release to the public of any cash-flow statement, or any part of a cash-flow statement, if it is satisfied that the release would unduly prejudice the debtor company and the making of the order would not unduly prejudice the company's creditors, but the court may, in the order, direct that the cash-flow statement or any part of it be made available to any person specified in the order on any terms or conditions that the court considers appropriate.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 10; 2005, c. 47, s. 127.

General power of court

11 Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 11; 1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Relief reasonably necessary

11.001 An order made under section 11 at the same time as an order made under subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection with respect to an initial application shall be limited to relief that is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

2019, c. 29, s. 136.

Rights of suppliers

11.01 No order made under section 11 or 11.02 has the effect of

- (a) prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration provided after the order is made; or
- (b) requiring the further advance of money or credit.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Stays, etc. — initial application

11.02 (1) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 10 days,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

Stays, etc. — other than initial application

(2) A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

Burden of proof on application

(3) The court shall not make the order unless

- (a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and
- (b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

Restriction

(4) Orders doing anything referred to in subsection (1) or (2) may only be made under this section.

2005, c. 47, s. 128, 2007, c. 36, s. 62(F); 2019, c. 29, s. 137.

Stays — directors

11.03 (1) An order made under section 11.02 may provide that no person may commence or continue any action against a director of the company on any claim against directors that arose before the commencement of proceedings under this Act and that relates to obligations of the company if directors are under any law liable in their capacity as directors for the payment of those obligations, until a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company, if one is filed, is sanctioned by the court or is refused by the creditors or the court.

Exception

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of an action against a director on a guarantee given by the director relating to the company's obligations or an action seeking injunctive relief against a director in relation to the company.

Persons deemed to be directors

(3) If all of the directors have resigned or have been removed by the shareholders without replacement, any person who manages or supervises the management of the business and affairs of the company is deemed to be a director for the purposes of this section.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Persons obligated under letter of credit or guarantee

11.04 No order made under section 11.02 has affect on any action, suit or proceeding against a person, other than the company in respect of whom the order is made, who is obligated under a letter of credit or guarantee in relation to the company.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

11.05 [Repealed, 2007, c. 29, s. 105]

Member of the Canadian Payments Association

11.06 No order may be made under this Act that has the effect of preventing a member of the Canadian Payments Association from ceasing to act as a clearing agent or group clearer for a company in accordance with the *Canadian Payments Act* or the by-laws or rules of that Association.

2005, c. 47, s. 128, 2007, c. 36, s. 64.

Date modified:

2020-05-14

2007 NSSC 347
Nova Scotia Supreme Court

Federal Gypsum Co., Re

2007 CarswellNS 629, 2007 NSSC 347, 163 A.C.W.S. (3d) 689, 261 N.S.R. (2d) 299, 40 C.B.R. (5th) 80, 835 A.P.R.
299

**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 the Applicant, Federal Gypsum Company

A.D. MacAdam J.

Heard: November 5, 2007
Oral reasons: November 5, 2007
Written reasons: January 29, 2008
Docket: S.H. 285667

Counsel: Maurice P. Chaisson, Graham Lindfield for Federal Gypsum Company

Carl Holm, Q.C. for BDO Dunwoody Goodman Rosen Inc.

Thomas Boyne, Q.C. for Royal Bank of Canada

Robert Sampson, Robert Risk for Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, Cape Breton Growth Fund Corporation

Michael Pugsley for Her Majesty in Right of the Province of Nova Scotia (Nova Scotia Economic Development), Nova Scotia Business Incorporated

Michael Ryan, Q.C., Michael Schweiger for Black & McDonald Limited

Subject: Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency

XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

XIX.2 Initial application

XIX.2.b Grant of stay

XIX.2.b.vii Extension of order

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Proposal — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Miscellaneous issues

Debtor was granted stay of proceedings for 30 days pursuant to s. 11 of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA") — Debtor wished to arrange debtor in possession ("DIP") financing, which was essentially new financing that required existing secured creditors to subordinate their interests — Bank was sole secured creditor that objected to DIP financing — Debtor was granted approval to arrange DIP financing to extent of \$350,000 — Debtor was subsequently granted extension of time for filing plan of arrangement along with extension of stay termination date — Debtor wished to increase DIP financing with view to paying off bank — Debtor brought application for permission to increase DIP financing to \$1,500,000 and for further extension of stay termination date — Application granted in part — Stay termination date was extended but increase in DIP financing was to be limited to \$475,000 with no priority to be given to paying off bank — While debtor's net sales had declined, debtor had also incurred lower expenses and used less of authorized DIP financing than had been projected — Debtor's failure to meet projected sales was concern but information and evidence on file offered positive

indications — Debtor was not shown to be in its death throes — Prejudice to creditors was evident but perhaps not so fatal as certain demise of company in absence of further DIP financing and extension of time — Bank's secured position had apparently not deteriorated substantially thus far — Extension of time and additional DIP financing would enable debtor to continue in operation while plan of arrangement was considered and voted on by creditors — Favouring bank was not justified as success of restructuring was not dependent on permitting repayment of this single creditor.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by A.D. MacAdam J.:

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

Cansugar Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellNB 9, 2004 NBQB 7 (N.B. Q.B.) — considered

Dylex Ltd., Re (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106, 1995 CarswellOnt 54 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered

Hunters Trailer & Marine Ltd., Re (2000), 2000 ABQB 952, 2000 CarswellAlta 1776, 5 C.B.R. (5th) 64 (Alta. Q.B.) — considered

Hunters Trailer & Marine Ltd., Re (2001), 2001 CarswellAlta 964, 94 Alta. L.R. (3d) 389, 27 C.B.R. (4th) 236, [2001] 9 W.W.R. 299, 2001 ABQB 546, 295 A.R. 113 (Alta. Q.B.) — considered

Inducon Development Corp., Re (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306, 1991 CarswellOnt 219 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

Juniper Lumber Co., Re (2000), 2000 CarswellNB 130, 226 N.B.R. (2d) 115, 579 A.P.R. 115 (N.B. C.A.) — considered

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

Manderley Corp., Re (2005), 2005 CarswellOnt 1082, 10 C.B.R. (5th) 48 (Ont. S.C.J.) — considered

San Francisco Gifts Ltd., Re (2005), 2005 ABQB 91, 2005 CarswellAlta 174, 10 C.B.R. (5th) 275, 42 Alta. L.R. (4th) 377, 378 A.R. 361 (Alta. Q.B.) — considered

Simpson's Island Salmon Ltd., Re (2006), 2006 CarswellNB 420, 2006 NBQB 244, 24 C.B.R. (5th) 13, 300 N.B.R. (2d) 165, 782 A.P.R. 165 (N.B. Q.B.) — considered

Simpson's Island Salmon Ltd., Re (2006), 302 N.B.R. (2d) 10, 784 A.P.R. 10, 24 C.B.R. (5th) 17, 2006 CarswellNB 453, 2006 NBQB 279 (N.B. Q.B.) — considered

Statutes considered:

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

Generally — referred to

s. 11 — considered

s. 11(3) — considered

s. 11(4) — considered

s. 11(6) — considered

s. 11(6)(a) — considered

APPLICATION by debtor for permission to increase debtor in possession financing to \$1.5 million and for extension of stay termination date.

A.D. MacAdam J.:

1 Federal Gypsum Company, (herein “the Company” or “the Applicant”), having been granted a stay of proceedings pursuant to S. 11 of the *Companies Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-25 (herein “CCAA”), and, subsequently approval of arrangements for debtor in possession (herein “DIP”) financing and an Order providing for extension of the Stay Termination Date set out in the initial Order, now applies for approval of arrangements for additional DIP financing.

2 The initial Stay Order provided for a 30-day Stay of Proceedings pursuant to s. 11(3) of the CCAA. The initial DIP financing application authorized DIP financing in the principal sum of \$350,000.00. The time for filing the Plan of Arrangement under the CCAA and the Stay Termination Date were extended to November 29, 2007 at 4:00 p.m. by Order dated October 23, 2007. The Order also provided that “the Company shall file an Application before this Honourable Court relating to the consideration of further debtor in possession financing for a hearing on November 5, 2007 at 9:30 a.m.” The Order also stipulated that the extension of the Stay Termination Date to November 29, 2007 was “subject to the right of the creditors of the Company to request a review and reconsideration” of the October 23 Order on the application for further DIP financing.

3 The Company now seeks an increase in the DIP financing from the original authorized \$350,000.00 to \$1,500,000.00.

4 Appearing on the Company’s application were a number of secured creditors, including the Royal Bank of Canada, (herein “Royal Bank”), Cape Breton Growth Corporation, (herein “CBGC”), and Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, (herein “ECBC”), (herein collectively referred to as the “Federal Crown Corporations”); Nova Scotia Business Inc. (herein “NSBI”) and Nova Scotia — Office of Economic Development (herein “NSOED”) (herein collectively referred to as the “Nova Scotia Crown Corporations”), each of whom hold, or purport to hold, first secured charges on some of the assets of the Company, as do the Federal Crown Corporations; and Black & McDonald Limited, (herein “BML”) who purport to hold a subordinate secured charge on assets of the Company.

The CCAA

5 The relevant provisions of Section 11 of the CCAA are as follows:

11. (1) **Powers of court** — Notwithstanding anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up Act*, where an application is made under this Act in respect of a company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make an order under this section.

(2) **Initial Application** — An application made for the first time under this section in respect of a company, in this section referred to as an ‘initial application’ shall be accompanied by a statement indicating the projected cash flow of the company and copies of all financial statements, audited or unaudited, prepared during the year prior to the application, or where no such statements were prepared in the prior year, a copy of the most recent such statement.

(3) **Initial application court orders** — A court may, on an initial application in respect of a company, make an order on such terms as it may impose, effective for such period as the court deems necessary not exceeding thirty days,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection (1);

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company.

(4) **Other than initial application court orders** — A court may, on an application in respect of a company other than an initial application, make an order on such terms as it may impose,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for such period as the court deems necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in subsection (1);

(b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of or proceeding with any other action, suit or proceeding against the company.

(5) **Notice of orders** — Except as otherwise ordered by the court, the monitor appointed under section 11.7 shall send a copy of any order made under subsection (3), within ten days after the order is made, to every known creditor who has a claim against the company of more than two hundred and fifty dollars.

(6) **Burden of proof on application** — The court shall not make an order under subsection (3) or (4) unless

(a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make such an order appropriate; and

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (4), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

The Law

6 The purpose of the CCAA was commented on by Justice Turnbull of the New Brunswick Court of Appeal in *Juniper Lumber Co., Re.*, [2000] N.B.J. No. 144 (N.B. C.A.), at para. 1:

The principal purpose of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the 'CCAA'), 'is to facilitate the making of a compromise or arrangement between an insolvent debtor company and its creditors to the end that the company is able to continue in business ... When a company has recourse to the C.C.A.A. the court is called upon to play a kind of supervisory role to preserve the status quo and to move the process along to the point where a compromise or arrangement is approved or it is evident that the attempt is doomed to failure.' See Arrangements Under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act by Goldman, Baird and Weinszok (1991), 1 C.B.R. (3d) 135 at p. 201 where the authors cite Thackray; J. approvingly quoting Gibbs, J.A. from the cases cited on that page. In New Brunswick, the Court of Queen's Bench is defined by the CCAA as the Court to play the 'kind of supervisory role.' The CCAA has a remedial purpose and, therefore, must be interpreted in a broad and liberal fashion. See pages 137-138 in the article previously cited. More often than not time is critical. And, in order to maintain a status quo while attempts are made to determine if a successful compromise or arrangement can be reached, the courts are granted certain powers in s. 11 to hold creditors at bay.

7 Justice Glennie of the New Brunswick Court of Queen's Bench in *Simpson's Island Salmon Ltd., Re.*, 2006 NBQB 279 (N.B. Q.B.), at para. 20, after referencing *Juniper Lumber Co.*, referred to *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re.*, [1993] O.J. No. 14 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), at paras. 5 and 6, where Farley, J. said:

The CCAA is intended to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors as an alternative to bankruptcy and, as such, is remedial legislation entitled to a liberal interpretation. It seems to me that the

purpose of the statute is to enable insolvent companies to carry on business in the ordinary course or otherwise deal with their assets so as to enable a plan of compromise or arrangement to be prepared, filed and considered by their creditors and the court. In the interim, a judge has a great discretion under the CCAA to make order so as to effectively maintain the status quo in respect of an insolvent company while it attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for the proposed compromise or arrangement which will be to the benefit of both the company and its creditors. ...

The CCAA is intended to provide a structured environment for the negotiation of compromises between a debtor company and its creditors for the benefit of both. Where a debtor company realistically plans to continue operating or to otherwise deal with its assets but it requires the protection of the court in order to do so and it is otherwise too early for the court to determine whether the debtor company will succeed, relief should be granted under the CCAA. ...

Background

(A) *The Initial Application*

8 On the initial application, the Court having been satisfied the company met the requirements for the filing under the CCAA, in that it was, on the evidence tendered, “insolvent” and had total claims exceeding \$5,000,000.00, and being further satisfied that the burden stipulated in s. 11(6) had been met, an Order providing for a Stay of Proceedings was issued.

(B) *The Initial DIP Financing*

9 Shortly after the Stay Order was issued, the Company filed the application for the initial DIP financing in the sum of \$350,000.00. Counsel for the company acknowledged the omission in the CCAA of any specific authorization sanctioning DIP financing and granting “super-priority” over existing secured, as well as unsecured, debt. Counsel referenced the legal principles cited by Justice C. Campbell in *Manderley Corp., Re* (2005), 10 C.B.R. (5th) 48 (Ont. S.C.J.), at para 18 where he observes:

The operative legal principles are set out in the following quotations from Houlden & Morawetz’ *Bankruptcy & Insolvency Analysis* (Carswell, 2004), section N16 — Stay of Proceedings[sic] — CCAA — at para 18:

Although the C.C.A.A. makes no provision for DIP financing, it seems to be well established that, under its inherent powers, the court may give a priority for such financing and for professional fees incurred in connection with the working out of a C.C.A.A. plan.

For the court to authorize DIP financing, there must be cogent evidence that the benefit of the financing clearly outweighs the prejudice to the lenders whose security is being subordinated to the financing: ...

The court can create a priority for the fees and expenses of a court-appointed monitor ranking ahead of secured creditors so long as they are reasonably incurred in connection with the restructuring of the debtor corporation and there is a reasonable prospect of a successful restructuring: ...

10 At para 19 Justice Campbell continues:

In *Skydome Corp., Re*, 1998 CarswellOnt 5922, 16 C.B.R. (4th) 118 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), Blair J. (as he then was) dealt with the issue of ‘super-priority’ financing in the context of the specific use to be made of the funds where he was satisfied that the priority accorded the DIP financing would not prejudice the secured creditors. At paragraph 13 he said:

I am satisfied that the Court has the authority either under s. 8 of the CCAA or under its broad discretionary powers in such proceedings, to make such an order. This is not a situation where someone is being compelled to advance further credit. What is happening is that the creditor’s security is being weakened to the extent of its reduction in

value. It is not the first time in restructuring proceedings where secured creditors — in the exercise of balancing the prejudices between the parties which is inherent in these situations — have been asked to make such a sacrifice. Cases such as Re Westar Mining Ltd. (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 88 (B.C.S.C.) are examples of the flexibility which courts bring to situations such as this. ...

11 To similar effect Wachowich J. in *Hunters Trailer & Marine Ltd., Re* (2001), 295 A.R. 113 (Alta. Q.B.), noted, at para. 32, the necessity to balance the benefit of such financing with the potential prejudice to the existing secured creditors. Justice Glennie in *Simpson's Island Salmon Ltd., Re, supra*, at paras. 16-19 held:

In order for DIP financing with super-priority status to be authorized pursuant to CCAA, there must be cogent evidence that the benefit of such financing clearly outweighs the potential prejudice to secured creditors whose security is being eroded. See United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re, [1999] B.C.J. No. 2754(B.C.S.C. [In Chambers]), affirmed [2000] B.C.J. No. 409 (B.C. C.A.)

DIP financing ought to be restricted to what is reasonably necessary to meet the debtors urgent needs while a plan of arrangement or compromise is being developed.

I am satisfied on the evidence before me that Simpson's Island and Tidal Run have a viable basis for restructuring. The amount of the DIP facility has been restricted to what is necessary to meet short-term needs until harvest.

A Court should not authorize DIP financing pursuant to the CCAA unless there is a reasonable prospect that the debtor will be able to make an arrangement with its creditors and rehabilitate itself. In this case the Monitor has advised the Court that there is a reasonable prospect that Simpson's Island and Tidal Run will be able to make such arrangements with their creditors.

12 In his written submission counsel for the company, in reference to the three issues for review outlined by Justice Glennie, commented that “[e]ssentially, the court must engage in the balancing act that is the hallmark of DIP financing, as declared by C. Campbell, J. in *Manderley* at para. 27, weighing the benefit and prejudice referred to by Glennie, J.”

13 The secured creditors, with the exception of the Royal Bank, neither consented nor strenuously objected to the initial DIP financing sought by the Company. The Royal Bank, on the other hand, objected, on the basis that the funding of the ongoing operations of the company could very well be at the expense of its security on the receivables and inventory. Nevertheless, having balanced prejudice to the secured creditors, in this instance particularly to the Royal Bank, and the benefit of providing financing to enable the Company to pursue a Plan of Arrangement, and on being satisfied the sought-for DIP financing and resulting super-priority were reasonably necessary to meet the Company's immediate needs and there was a reasonable prospect the Company would be able to make arrangements with its creditors and thereby rehabilitate itself, this Court allowed the application.

(C) The First Extension

14 At the expiration of the initial Stay Termination date, the Company applied for an extension, which application was generally opposed by the secured creditors. The Application included a further Affidavit by one of the Directors and Officers of the Company, as well as a further report from the Monitor. In para. 4.7, the Monitor reported:

Having met with Federal and its legal counsel, and having had preliminary discussions with them as to the general principles and format of a Plan of Arrangement, and having considered the progress made in financing and sales opportunities, and having had initial discussions with senior secured creditors, the Monitor concludes that Federal has acted, and continues to act, in good faith and with due diligence and, if given sufficient time by This Honorable (sic)Court, should be able to file a Plan of Arrangement under CCAA that will have a significant chance of being successful.

15 Included among the Monitor's recommendations was the observation that the Company “... must make an application

for an increase in the DIP financing level and such other matters as may relate thereto”.

16 In *Cansugar Inc., Re*, 2004 NBQB 7 (N.B. Q.B.), at paras 8 and 9, Justice Glennie in respect to applications for extension of stay termination dates, after referencing ss. 11(4) and (6) of the CCAA, stated:

In *The 2004 Annotated Bankruptcy & Insolvency Act*, Houlden & Morawetz state at page 1126:

To obtain an extension, the application must establish three preconditions:

- (a) the circumstances exist that make the order appropriate;
- (b) that the applicant has acted and continues to act in good faith; and
- (c) that the applicant has acted and continues to act with due diligence.

In my opinion, the requirements of section 11(6) of the C.C.A.A. have been satisfied in this case. The continuation of the stay is supported by the overriding purpose of the C.C.A.A., which is to allow an insolvent company a reasonable period of time to reorganize and propose a plan of arrangement to its creditors and the Court, and to prevent maneuvers for positioning among creditors in the interim.

17 In support of the application for the extension, counsel referenced para. 17 of the Affidavit of Mr. Simpson, where he states that:

An extension of the Stay of Termination Date would allow the Company to accomplish the following:

- (a) continue with its recent efforts to improve sales, which are expected to yield positive results;
- (b) provide for additional debtor-in-possession financing to service the Company’s cash flow needs in the short and medium term until the Plan is presented to the Company’s stakeholders;
- (c) complete the appraisal of the assets of the Company;
- (d) complete cash flow forecasts and income statement and balance sheet projections for the 2008, 2009 and 2010 years; and
- (e) finalize the elements of the Plan.

18 At para 18 Mr. Simpson continues:

I believe that if the Stay Termination Date is not extended, some of the creditors of the Company will commence proceedings against the Company in relation to the enforcement of their security. Such proceedings would be highly prejudicial to the interests of the Company and would significantly impair the Company’s ability to complete a successful restructuring.

19 Mr. Simpson’s Affidavit, in outlining the present circumstances and the efforts of the company since the date of the initial order, also states that the Company “... is presently formulating a plan to present to its various stakeholders- including its creditors”. Counsel notes the Company is arranging for an appraisal of its assets and negotiating with a lender to provide additional financing during the “near and medium term”. Counsel suggests these factors demonstrate that:

... the Company has been proceeding diligently and in good faith since the Initial Order to assemble the elements of a plan to be presented to its stakeholders. There will be several elements to this plan and the Company requires additional time to bring these elements together. The Company's majority shareholder is motivated by the single goal of putting together a plan which will ensure the survival of the Company and, in so doing, protect, to the fullest extent possible, the interests of the stakeholders as a whole.

20 Counsel references *San Francisco Gifts Ltd., Re*, 2005 ABQB 91 (Alta. Q.B.), where, at para. 28, Topolniski. J. comments on the supervisory role of the Court on such an application:

The court's role during the stay period has been described as a supervisory one, meant to: '*... preserve the status quo and to move the process along to the point where an arrangement or compromise is approved or it is evident that the attempt is doomed to failure.*' That is not to say that the supervising judge is limited to a myopic view of balance sheets, scheduling of creditors' meetings and the like. On the contrary, this role requires attention to changing circumstances and vigilance in ensuring that a delicate balance of interests is maintained.

21 The application for an extension of the Stay Termination Date was opposed on the basis that the performance by the Company did not generate confidence it had turned the corner and was likely to survive. The objecting creditors viewed the performance of the Company as further prejudicing their position in respect to the secured positions they held on the various assets of the company. They took this view, notwithstanding the Monitor's assessment that the Company, by its actions, appeared to be acting in good faith and with due diligence and moving forward towards the preparation of a Plan of Arrangement, and that the actual net cashflow of the Company was not adverse to the cashflow plan as presented on the initial Order. On the Application for the Stay Extension, counsel for the Nova Scotia Crown Corporations did not object to the extended Stay, but expressed a concern about the proposed increase in the DIP financing.

22 Considering the position of the creditors and the representations on behalf of the Company, the Stay Termination Date was extended to November 29, 2007 with the proviso that on the Application for further DIP financing the creditors could request a review and reconsideration of the extension.

Issue

23 At issue is whether the Company's application for approval of Arrangements for additional DIP financing should be approved, including the proposed payout of the Royal Bank operating loan, and whether the Court should reconsider the extension of the Stay Termination Date to November 29, 2007.

The Present Applications

Reconsidering the Extension of the Stay Termination Date

24 In respect to the Company's application to extend the Stay Termination Date, counsel on behalf of the Royal Bank had indicated the Bank's opposition both in writing and in oral submission. Counsel noted the burden of proof was on the Applicant. Counsel for the Company suggested circumstances existed that made it appropriate to extend the initial Order, in that the Applicant had acted, and continued to act in good faith and with due diligence. In this respect counsel refers to *Inducon Development Corp., Re* (1991), 8 C.B.R. (3d) 306 (Ont. Gen. Div.), where Farley, J. observed :

The good faith and due diligence of the Applicant are not questioned.

25 On the reconsideration application, counsel for the Royal Bank acknowledged that neither the good faith nor due diligence of the Applicant were questioned, but said the Company had failed to show circumstances that made it appropriate to extend the initial Order. Counsel suggested that to cover the losses for the first seven months of 2007 the Company would have to increase its net sales by over 65%, and if one were to include all expenses and only the repayment of \$1,000,000.00

per year on the total liabilities of more than \$32,000,000.00, the Applicant would have to increase its net sales by 92%. Counsel noted the difficulties the Company has had in marketing its products and that in fact there has been a “decrease in sales from expected levels with a resulting decrease in accounts receivables”. Counsel added that in the Monitor’s second report he indicated sales were over \$150,000.00 less than budget and expressed concern about the trend in sales. Counsel submitted that there is no evidence of a plan, referring again to reasons of Justice Farley in *Inducon Development Corp.*, *supra*, where he stated:

[W]hile it is desirable to have a formalized plan when applying, it must be recognized as a practical matter that there may be many instances where only an outline is possible. I think it inappropriate, absent most unusual and rare circumstances, not to have a plan outline at a minimum, in which case then I would think that there would be a requisite for the germ of a plan.

26 Counsel for the Royal Bank suggested it is inappropriate to continue CCAA protection where the Company does not have, “at the least, a minimum outline of a plan”.

27 In response to the Company’s suggestion that the creditors “will not be materially prejudiced as the company continues to operate”, Counsel said there is real prejudice, including:

(a) interference with the rights of secured creditors to deal with their security and to maximize their recovery;

(b) changing market conditions and the loss of potential purchasers of the assets;

(c) deterioration in the value of assets through on-going use;

(d) in the case of Royal Bank of Canada, the eroding of and loss of its security interest through the collection and use of accounts receivable [sic] to fund the operations of the Applicant during the Stay;

(e) costs of professionals in maintaining these proceedings, which in the case of the Applicant are recognized to be as great as \$300,000;

(f) professionals costs to the creditors; and

(g) delay with regard to unsecured creditors in recognizing losses and the decisions that they must make in dealing with their own creditors on a go forward basis.

28 Counsel notes as unique the reality that the Company has never been profitable, whereas in many of the cases where CCAA orders are granted, the Companies have been in business for some period of time and, through circumstances, have suffered adversity which may be overcome through forgiveness and restructuring of debt obligations and the injection of equity to enable them to return to a state of profitability. The Company, counsel suggests, has never generated enough sales to even meet its operating expenses. Counsel adds that no evidence has been presented to the Court to indicate such a level of sales can be reached. As a result, counsel concludes, the Company has no reasonable expectation of reaching the required level of sales.

29 Notwithstanding the forceful submission of counsel for the Royal Bank, it is clear that although net sales have declined, the Company has also incurred lower expenses and has used less of the authorized DIP financing than had been projected in the cashflow projections filed on the initial DIP financing application. Like with the Monitor, I am concerned with the failure of the Company to meet the projected sales. There are, however, some positive indications from the information filed in the Monitor’s report and outlined in the Affidavit of Rhyne Simpson, Jr., President and a Director of the Applicant. I am not satisfied the Company has reached the stage of “the last gasp of a dying company” or is in its “death throes”, although clearly any Plan of Arrangement will require compromise and cooperation between the Company and its stakeholders. During the course of submissions, counsel for the Company acknowledged that if additional DIP financing was not obtained the inevitable consequence would be the demise of the Company. The effect on the Company of terminating the extension of the Termination Date, as it relates to the opportunity for the preparation and presentation of a Plan of

Arrangement, is evident. The prejudice to the creditors, although evident, is perhaps not so fatal. Although not necessarily indicative of the position of the Royal Bank, should, in due course, the Company fail, nevertheless on the financial information filed by the Monitor from information obtained from the Company's officers, it would not appear that there has been a substantial deterioration in the Royal Bank's secured position to date.

30 As a consequence I am prepared to grant the Order continuing the Stay Termination Date until November 29th, 2007, provided the Company is successful on the application for additional DIP financing.

The Additional DIP Financing

31 On the Application to extend the Stay Termination Date and to set the date for filing the Plan of Arrangement, counsel for the Company acknowledged that if the Company was unsuccessful in obtaining approval of arrangements for additional DIP financing, notwithstanding the extension, the Company would not be able to continue in operation while preparing and presenting to its creditors its proposed Plan of Arrangement. On the Application for the \$1,500,000.00 DIP financing, the Monitor appointed on the initial application, in his third report to the Court, indicated the purpose was to replace the previous DIP lender, pay out the Royal Bank working capital loan, and provide additional DIP funds to allow the Company to continue operations and provide time to finalize and file a Plan of Arrangement for consideration by the creditors. The Monitor reported that its weekly cashflow projections, as prepared by the Company, indicated the requirement for DIP financing for the week of November 26, 2007 would be approximately \$83,000.00 in excess of the present DIP financing approval limit. The report further indicated that beyond the Stay Termination Date of November 29, 2007 the requirement for DIP financing would increase significantly in the month of December 2007.

32 With the sole exception of the Royal Bank, the secured creditors oppose the application for additional DIP financing. The Royal Bank, in view of the stipulated intention to use the additional DIP financing to pay down its working capital loan, leaving only a second loan secured on certain leases, does not oppose the additional DIP financing. Absent the provision for repayment of its working capital loan, it is clear from the representations of counsel, both on this and earlier applications, that the Royal Bank would not consent to nor support the request for additional DIP financing.

33 On the application, counsel for the Company advised that the proposed DIP lender had stipulated certain changes in the terms of the proposed financing to require the first DIP lender to advance the remainder of the amounts authorized under the initial DIP Order and that the full amount of \$350,000.00 be subordinated to its charge. There were changes relating to the "borrowing base" for the loans and a requirement that the priority of the "Administration Charge", which priority was provided for in the initial Order, was not to exceed the sum of \$75,000.00. During the course of the application counsel also advised that other changes had been approved by the DIP lender, including verification of the amount upon which the lender was entitled to charge fees over and above the interest provided for in the offer of financing.

34 Counsel for the applicant, referencing the comment by C. Campbell, J. in *Manderley Corp., Re, supra*, at para 27, acknowledged the Court must engage in "the balancing act that is the hallmark of DIP financing". He notes Justice Glennie applied this balancing in considering the approval of super-priority funds, beyond those initially requested, when, in *Simpson's Island Salmon Ltd., Re, 2006 NBQB 244* (N.B. Q.B.), at para 9, he declared:

As stated by MacKenzie J.A. in *United Used Auto & Truck Parts Ltd., Re* (2000), 16 C.B.R. (4th) 141 (B.C. C.A.):

[12] ... the CCAA's effectiveness in achieving its objectives is dependent on a broad and flexible exercise of jurisdiction to facilitate a restructuring and continue the debtor as a going concern in the interim.

[28] The object of the CCAA is more than the preservation and realization of assets for the benefits of creditors, as several courts have underlined. In *Chef Ready Foods*, Giggs J.A. said that the primary purpose is to facilitate an arrangement to permit the debtor company to continue in business and to hold off creditors long enough for a restructuring plan to be prepared and submitted for approval. The court has a supervisory role and the monitor is appointed 'to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company' for the court.

35 Justice Glennie was concerned with an application for an increase in the “Administrative Charge”, for which priority was granted, to the advisors retained to formulate and present the restructuring plan. He determined that failure to grant the increase would result in the applicants no longer being able to continue their attempts at restructuring. He referred to the decision of Justice Wachowich, also in respect to an administrative charge, in *Hunters Trailer & Marine Ltd.*, *supra*, denying an increase in the amount of DIP financing. He found the applicant had not met the onus under s. 11(6) (a) of the CCAA to establish that a stay would be appropriate in the circumstances. At para 10 he observed:

In my view, the evidence provided by Hunters does not show that the benefits of DIP financing will clearly outweigh potential prejudice to the Objecting Creditors. While DIP financing is the only means for Hunters to continue operating, it is impossible to conclude that this short-term benefit will culminate in Hunters’ financial recovery, due to a number of deficiencies in the evidence.

36 Justice Wachowich continued by identifying particular deficiencies such as the absence of appraisals, the absence of current financial information on the Company, the absence of verification of the Company’s cashflow projections by the Monitor and uncertainty as to the value of one of the major assets. Counsel suggests that in the present instance these deficiencies do not exist, in that an appraisal has been obtained, the current financial information is available on an ongoing basis, and the Monitor is being provided with continuing opportunities to verify the Company’s cashflow projections and has done so. Counsel also suggests the other deficiency noted by Justice Wachowich, the uncertainty as to the value of a major asset, is not an issue in the current circumstance.

37 Counsel for the Company, suggesting that DIP financing “is merely prolonging the inevitable”, cites para. 13 of *Hunters Trailer & Marine Ltd., Re, 2000 ABQB 952* (Alta. Q.B.):

Another consideration in assessing the benefit of DIP financing is that even if Hunters’ projected cashflows are accurate, they show a continuing net deficit, suggesting that the benefit of DIP financing is merely prolonging the inevitable. Even as of September 2001, following the months when the volume of Recreational Vehicle (‘RV’) sales is highest, Hunters expects a cash flow deficit. After September, the RV sales will slow down significantly as Hunters enters the low season, so cash flow is not likely to increase after September. Hunters can expect continuing difficulties in meeting operating expenses well into the foreseeable future. The sources of Hunters’ cash flow problems, as identified by Blair Bondar, the company president, will likely continue to exist. Mr. Bondar states that RV sales have decreased as a result of, in part, increasing gas prices, a weak Canadian dollar, and increased competition. Hunters has no control over these systemic problems, and there is no evidence or reason to believe that they will be resolved in the foreseeable future. As a result, I am not convinced that the cash flow projections themselves are accurate. The Monitor does not verify the accuracy or reasonableness of the projections. Therefore, it is impossible to conclude that the DIP financing will benefit Hunters and its creditors in the long run.

38 Counsel says the current circumstance can be distinguished for a number of reasons, including that the projected cashflow statements “do not disclose uninterrupted deficits, and those deficits that exist for the most part are minimal.” Counsel’s submission continues:

... The sources of the Company’s cash flow problems are not expected to continue to exist, or at least to have as severe an effect as they did during the month of October, as noted at paragraph 25 of the Additional DIP Affidavit. Finally, as noted above, the Monitor has verified the reasonableness of the Company’s cash flow projections. All of the above circumstances suggest, contrary to those facing Wachowich J. in *Hunters* (2000) (*supra*), that additional DIP financing will benefit the Company and its creditors in the long run, as those funds will allow the Company to take advantage of the opportunities presented, and thereby ultimately bolster its efforts to finalize and present a viable restructuring plan. It is submitted that none of the myriad reasons by Wachowich J. for denying further DIP financing are present in the current situation.

39 Counsel suggests the additional DIP financing is a necessary cost of ensuring there can be a meaningful discussion between the stakeholders about the restructuring plan. Counsel recognizes that any protection afforded by the CCAA, with its attended super-priority, will necessarily have a prejudicial effect on the Company’s creditors. As counsel suggests, what must

be examined is whether such prejudice is more than outweighed by the prejudice to the Company and its stakeholders should the requested DIP financing be denied, given that, as counsel suggests, “it would most likely have to cease operations in that instance.” Counsel suggests the Affidavit filed in support of the Application “provides clear evidence of improving prospects for the Company, as well as considerable effort on its part to build a sustainable business, the ultimate goal of the CCAA restructuring process”. Having considered the Monitor’s reports and filed documents, including affidavits, together with the representations of Counsel, I am satisfied it is appropriate to continue CCAA protection to enable the Company to finalize preparation of the Plan and its presentation to the creditors. In view of the need for additional DIP financing to enable the Company to continue in operation, while the Plan is considered and voted upon by the creditors, the Company is granted approval for additional DIP financing.

Payout of the Royal Bank

40 Counsel for the Company’s submission recognized the possibility that some of the secured creditors would object to the application and, in particular, to the proposed buy-out of the Royal Bank’s operating line of credit. Counsel referenced the comments of Farley, J. in *Dylex Ltd., Re* (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), to the effect that the mere fact a significant secured creditor objects to such financing should in no way preclude the Court’s ability to approve DIP financing. Counsel then references *Hunters Trailer & Marine Ltd., Re* (2001), 295 A.R. 113 (Alta. Q.B.), at para 32, where the Court stated that “if super-priority cannot be granted without the consent of secured creditors, the protection of the CCAA effectively would be denied a debtor company in many cases.”

41 Counsel’s submission continues:

... the specific issue of the Court’s ability to approve an agreement between a CCAA debtor and one or more, though less than all, of its creditors was recently reviewed by the Alberta Court of Appeal in *Re. Calpine Canada Energy Ltd.* 2007 ABCA 266. As C. O’Brien J.A. noted,

The power to approve such transactions during the stay is not spelled out in the CCAA. As has often been observed, the statute is skeletal. The approval power in such instances is usually said to be found either in the broad powers under section 11(4) to make orders other than on an initial application to effectuate the stay, or in the court’s inherent jurisdiction to fill in gaps in legislation so as to give effect to the objects of the CCAA, including the survival program of the debtor until it can present a plan: *Re Dylex Ltd., (1995), 31 C.B.R. (3d) 106 at para 8 (Ont. Gen. Div.)*

In the result the Court of Appeal upheld the ruling of B.E. Romaine J. at the Court of Queen’s Bench: 2007 ABQB 504 (Alta. Q.B.). As Justice Romaine set out,

... Settling with one or two claimants will invariably have an effect on the size of the estate available for other claimants. The test of whether such an adjustment results in fair and reasonable requires the Court to look to the benefits of the settlement to the creditors as a whole, to consider the prejudice, if any, to the objecting creditors specifically and to ensure that rights are not unilaterally terminated or unjustly confiscated without the agreement or approval of the affected creditor.

.....

... It is clear from the case law that Court approval of settlements and major transactions can and often is given over the objections of one or more parties. The Court’s ability to do this is a recognition of its authority to act in the greater good consistent with the purpose and spirit and with the confines of the legislation.

42 In his Affidavit filed on this application, Mr. Simpson, at para. 16, deposes:

The Company is pursuing this repayment so as to afford the best chance of success for its restructuring plan (the ‘Plan’) when it is presented to creditors, and thereby the best chance of a reasonable resolution. Throughout the Company’s proceedings under the CCAA to this point, the Royal Bank has been consistently vocal in its opposition to the restructuring process. It is most likely that the Royal Bank’s continued participation in the process will only hinder it, necessitating the use of further time and the expenditure of additional costs in order to ultimately achieve a fair

restructuring, a result that will be most beneficial to the Company, and given the limited alternatives, most beneficial to the creditors as a whole. It is for these reasons that the Company considers repayment of the operating facility to be in the best interests of all stakeholders.

43 After referencing para 16 of Mr. Simpson's Affidavit, Counsel suggests that in view of the Royal Bank's opposition to the process, and in view of the serious discussions and negotiations that will occur between the Company and its creditors:

... For the attainable and beneficial goal of a successful restructuring to be achieved, it is the Company's position that the Royal Bank should likely be removed from active participation through the retirement of its operating line, and that this Court is empowered to do so either under s. 11(4) of the CCAA or by way of its inherent jurisdiction.

44 On being examined, Mr. Simpson indicated, in response to the question why provide for the payout of the Royal Bank operating line, that it would "make life easier, but is not necessary". To similar effect, counsel for the Company in his oral submission acknowledged that the rejection of the proposal to pay out the Royal Bank operating line would not appear to be fatal to the proposed restructuring. In the circumstances, it is clear that the success of the restructuring and the Plan is not dependent on permitting the repayment of this single creditor. As such, there is really no justification for favouring the Royal Bank by authorizing the repayment of its operating line from the DIP financing. The request to pay out the Royal Bank operating line is therefore denied.

Conclusion

45 The extension of the Stay to November 29, 2007 is confirmed and the Company is authorized to drawn down DIP financing in the sum of \$475,00.00. The request to pay out the Royal Bank from the DIP financing is denied.

Application granted in part.