

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

**IN THE MATTER OF THE NOTICES OF INTENTION TO  
MAKE A PROPOSAL OF ORBCARE INC., AND  
PARISCRIBE INC., CORPORATIONS INCORPORATED  
UNDER THE *CANADA BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT*,  
AND ORBCARE US, INC. A CORPORATION  
INCORPORATED UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF  
DELAWARE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**BRIEF OF AUTHORITIES  
(returnable August 14, 2019)  
(Approval of Sale Process)**

**DATE: August 12, 2019**

**GOLDMAN SLOAN NASH & HABER LLP**

Suite 1600, 480 University Avenue

Toronto (ON) M5G 1V2

Fax: 416-597-3370

**R. Brendan Bissell (LSO# 40354V)**

Tel: 416-597-6489

Email: [bissell@gsnh.com](mailto:bissell@gsnh.com)

Lawyers for OrbCare Inc., Pariscribe Inc. and  
OrbCare US, Inc.

**TO: THE SERVICE LIST**

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

**IN THE MATTER OF THE NOTICES OF INTENTION TO  
MAKE A PROPOSAL OF ORBCARE INC., AND  
PARISCRIBE INC., CORPORATIONS INCORPORATED  
UNDER THE CANADA BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT,  
AND ORBCARE US, INC. A CORPORATION  
INCORPORATED UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF  
DELAWARE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**INDEX**

1. *Nortel Networks Corporation (Re)*, [2009] O.J. No. 3169 (ON SC), [2009 CanLII 39492](#)
2. *Colossus Minerals Inc. (Re)*, [2014 ONSC 514](#)
3. *Mustang GP Ltd. (Re)*, [2015 ONSC 6562](#)
4. *Danier Leather Inc. (Re)*, [2016 ONSC 1044](#)
5. *CCM Master Qualified Fund v blutip Power Technologies*, [2012 ONSC 1750](#)

# **Tab 1**

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

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

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

**APPLICANTS**

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

**BEFORE:           MORAWETZ J.**

**COUNSEL:        Derrick Tay and Jennifer Stam, for Nortel Networks Corporation, et al**

**Lyndon Barnes and Adam Hirsh, for the Board of Directors of Nortel  
Networks Corporation and Nortel Networks Limited**

**J. Carfagnini and J. Pasquariello, for Ernst & Young Inc., Monitor**

**M. Starnino, for the Superintendent of Financial Services and  
Administrator of PBGF**

**S. Philpott, for the Former Employees**

**K. Zych, for Noteholders**

**Pamela Huff and Craig Thorburn, for MatlinPatterson Global Advisors  
LLC, MatlinPatterson Global Opportunities Partners III L.P. and Matlin  
Patterson Opportunities Partners (Cayman) III L.P.**

**David Ward, for UK Pension Protection Fund**

**Leanne Williams, for Flextronics Inc.**

**Alex MacFarlane, for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors**

**Arthur O. Jacques and Tom McRae, for Felske & Sylvain (de facto Continuing Employees' Committee)**

**Robin B. Schwill and Matthew P. Gottlieb, for Nortel Networks UK Limited**

**A. Kauffman, for Export Development Canada**

**D. Ullman, for Verizon Communications Inc.**

**G. Benchetrit, for IBM**

**HEARD &  
DECIDED:**

**JUNE 29, 2009**

## **ENDORSEMENT**

### **INTRODUCTION**

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

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

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

[4] The following are my reasons for granting these orders.

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

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

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

## **BACKGROUND**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (a) the Business operates in a highly competitive environment;
- (b) full value cannot be realized by continuing to operate the Business through a restructuring; and
- (c) in the absence of continued investment, the long-term viability of the Business would be put into jeopardy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## ISSUES AND DISCUSSION

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

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

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

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

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

[29] The CCAA has been described as “skeletal in nature”. It has also been described as a “sketch, an outline, a supporting framework for the resolution of corporate insolvencies in the public interest”. *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 45 C.B.R. (5<sup>th</sup>) 163 (Ont. C.A.) at paras. 44, 61, leave to appeal refused [2008] SCCA 337. (“ATB Financial”).

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

- (a) the power of the court to impose terms and conditions on the granting of a stay under s. 11(4) of the CCAA;
- (b) the specific provision of s. 11(4) of the CCAA which provides that the court may make an order “on such terms as it may impose”; and



- (c) the inherent jurisdiction of the court to “fill in the gaps” of the CCAA in order to give effect to its objects. *Re Canadian Red Cross Society* (1998), 5 C.B.R. (4<sup>th</sup>) 299 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at para. 43; *Re PSINet Ltd.* (2001), 28 C.B.R. (4<sup>th</sup>) 95 (Ont. S.C.J.) at para. 5, *ATB Financial, supra*, at paras. 43-52.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[35] Counsel to the Applicants makes reference to a number of cases where courts in Ontario, in appropriate cases, have exercised their jurisdiction to approve a sale of assets, even in the absence of a plan of arrangement being tendered to stakeholders for a vote. In doing so, counsel to the Applicants submits that the courts have repeatedly recognized that they have jurisdiction under the CCAA to approve asset sales in the absence of a plan of arrangement, where such sale is in the best interests of stakeholders generally. *Re Canadian Red Cross Society, supra, Re PSINet, supra, Re Consumers Packaging, supra, Re Stelco Inc.* (2004), 6 C.B.R. (5<sup>th</sup>) 316 (Ont. S.C.J.) at para. 1, *Re Tiger Brand Knitting Co.* (2005) 9 C.B.R. (5<sup>th</sup>) 315, *Re Caterpillar*

*Financial Services Ltd. v. Hardrock Paving Co.* (2008), 45 C.B.R. (5<sup>th</sup>) 87 and *Re Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3<sup>rd</sup>) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div.).

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

The sale of Consumers' Canadian glass operations as a going concern pursuant to the Owens-Illinois bid allows the preservation of Consumers' business (albeit under new ownership), and is therefore consistent with the purposes of the CCAA.

...we cannot refrain from commenting that Farley J.'s decision to approve the Owens-Illinois bid is consistent with previous decisions in Ontario and elsewhere that have emphasized the broad remedial purpose of flexibility of the CCAA and have approved the sale and disposition of assets during CCAA proceedings prior to a formal plan being tendered. *Re Consumers Packaging, supra, at paras. 5, 9.*

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

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

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

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

I would observe that usually it is the creditor side which wishes to terminate CCAA proceedings and that when the creditors threaten to take action, there is a realization that a liquidation scenario will not only have a negative effect upon a CCAA applicant, but also upon its workforce. Hence, the CCAA may be employed to provide stability during a period of necessary financial and operational restructuring – and if a restructuring of the “old company” is not

feasible, then there is the exploration of the feasibility of the sale of the operations/enterprise as a going concern (with continued employment) in whole or in part. *Re Stelco Inc, supra*, at para. 1.

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

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

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

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

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

[45] The *Cliffs Over Maple Bay* decision has recently been the subject of further comment by the British Columbia Court of Appeal in *Asset Engineering L.P. v. Forest and Marine Financial Limited Partnership* (2009) B.C.C.A. 319.

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

24. In *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*, the debtor company was a real estate developer whose one project had failed. The company had been dormant for some time. It applied for CCAA protection but described its proposal for restructuring in vague terms that amounted essentially to a plan to "secure sufficient funds" to complete the stalled project (Para. 34). This court, per Tysoe J.A., ruled that although the

Act can apply to single-project companies, its purposes are unlikely to be engaged in such instances, since mortgage priorities are fully straight forward and there will be little incentive for senior secured creditors to compromise their interests (Para. 36). Further, the Court stated, the granting of a stay under s. 11 is “not a free standing remedy that the court may grant whenever an insolvent company wishes to undertake a “restructuring”...Rather, s. 11 is ancillary to the fundamental purpose of the CCAA, and a stay of proceedings freezing the rights of creditors should only be granted in furtherance of the CCAA’s fundamental purpose”. That purpose has been described in *Meridian Developments Inc. v. Toronto Dominion Bank* (1984) 11 D.L.R. (4<sup>th</sup>) 576 (Alta. Q.B.):

The legislation is intended to have wide scope and allow a judge to make orders which will effectively maintain the status quo for a period while the insolvent company attempts to gain the approval of its creditors for a proposed arrangement which will enable the company to remain in operation for what is, hopefully, the future benefit of both the company and its creditors. [at 580]

25. The Court was not satisfied in *Cliffs Over Maple Bay* that the “restructuring” contemplated by the debtor would do anything other than distribute the net proceeds from the sale, winding up or liquidation of its business. The debtor had no intention of proposing a plan of arrangement, and its business would not continue following the execution of its proposal – thus it could not be said the purposes of the statute would be engaged...

26. In my view, however, the case at bar is quite different from *Cliffs Over Maple Bay*. Here, the main debtor, the Partnership, is at the centre of a complicated corporate group and carries on an active financing business that it hopes to save notwithstanding the current economic cycle. (The business itself which fills a “niche” in the market, has been carried on in one form or another since 1983.) The CCAA is appropriate for situations such as this where it is unknown whether the “restructuring” will ultimately take the form of a refinancing or will involve a reorganization of the corporate entity or entities and a true compromise of the rights of one or more parties. The “fundamental purpose” of the Act – to preserve the *status quo* while the debtor prepares a plan that will enable it to remain in business to the benefit of all concerned – will be furthered by granting a stay so that the means contemplated by the Act – a compromise or arrangement – can be developed, negotiated and voted on if necessary...

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

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

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

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

I accept this submission.

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

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

- (a) Nortel has been working diligently for many months on a plan to reorganize its business;
- (b) in the exercise of its business judgment, Nortel has concluded that it cannot continue to operate the Business successfully within the CCAA framework;
- (c) unless a sale is undertaken at this time, the long-term viability of the Business will be in jeopardy;
- (d) the Sale Agreement continues the Business as a going concern, will save at least 2,500 jobs and constitutes the best and most valuable proposal for the Business;
- (e) the auction process will serve to ensure Nortel receives the highest possible value for the Business;
- (f) the sale of the Business at this time is in the best interests of Nortel and its stakeholders; and
- (g) the value of the Business is likely to decline over time.

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

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

## **DISPOSITION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**MORAWETZ J.**

**Heard and Decided: June 29, 2009**

**Reasons Released: July 23, 2009**

# **Tab 2**



**CITATION:** Colossus Minerals Inc. (Re), 2014 ONSC 514  
**COURT FILE NO.:** CV-14-10401-00CL  
**DATE:** 20140207

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO**

**RE:** IN THE MATTER OF THE *BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, As Amended

AND IN THE MATTER OF THE NOTICE OF INTENTION OF COLOSSUS MINERALS INC., OF THE CITY OF TORONTO IN THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

**BEFORE:** Mr. Justice H.J. Wilton-Siegel

**COUNSEL:** S. Brotman and D. Chochla, for the Applicant Colossus Minerals Inc.

L. Rogers and A. Shalviri, for the DIP Agent, Sandstorm Gold Inc.

H. Chaiton, for the Proposal Trustee

S. Zweig, for the Ad Hoc Group of Noteholders and Certain Lenders

**HEARD:** January 16, 2014

**ENDORSEMENT**

[1] The applicant, Colossus Minerals Inc. (the “applicant” or “Colossus”), seeks an order granting various relief under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (the “BIA”). The principal secured creditors of Colossus were served and no objections were received regarding the relief sought. In view of the liquidity position of Colossus, the applicant was heard on an urgent basis and an order was issued on January 16, 2014 granting the relief sought. This endorsement sets out the Court’s reasons for granting the order.

**Background**

[2] The applicant filed a notice of intention to make a proposal under s. 50.4(1) of the BIA on January 13, 2014. Duff & Phelps Canada Restructuring Inc. (the “Proposal Trustee”) has been named the Proposal Trustee in these proceedings. The Proposal Trustee has filed its first report dated January 14, 2014 addressing this application, among other things. The main asset of Colossus is a 75% interest in a gold and platinum project in Brazil (the “Project”), which is held by a subsidiary. The Project is nearly complete. However, there is a serious water control issue that urgently requires additional de-watering facilities to preserve the applicant’s interest in the Project. As none of the applicant’s mining interests, including the Project, are producing, it has

no revenue and has been accumulating losses. To date, the applicant has been unable to obtain the financing necessary to fund its cash flow requirements through to the commencement of production and it has exhausted its liquidity.

### **DIP Loan and DIP Charge**

[3] The applicant seeks approval of a Debtor-in-Possession Loan (the “DIP Loan”) and DIP Charge dated January 13, 2014 with Sandstorm Gold Inc. (“Sandstorm”) and certain holders of the applicant’s outstanding gold-linked notes (the “Notes”) in an amount up to \$4 million, subject to a first-ranking charge on the property of Colossus, being the DIP Charge. The Court has the authority under section 50.6(1) of the BIA to authorize the DIP Loan and DIP Charge, subject to a consideration of the factors under section 50.6(5). In this regard, the following matters are relevant.

[4] First, the DIP Loan is to last during the currency of the sale and investor solicitation process (“SISP”) discussed below and the applicant has sought an extension of the stay of proceedings under the BIA until March 7, 2014. The applicant’s cash flow statements show that the DIP Loan is necessary and sufficient to fund the applicant’s cash requirements until that time.

[5] Second, current management will continue to operate Colossus during the stay period to assist in the SISP. Because Sandstorm has significant rights under a product purchase agreement pertaining to the Project and the Notes represent the applicant’s largest debt obligation, the DIP Loan reflects the confidence of significant creditors in the applicant and its management.

[6] Third, the terms of the DIP Loan are consistent with the terms of DIP financing facilities in similar proceedings.

[7] Fourth, Colossus is facing an imminent liquidity crisis. It will need to cease operations if it does not receive funding. In such circumstances, there will be little likelihood of a viable proposal.

[8] Fifth, the DIP Loan is required to permit the SISP to proceed, which is necessary for any assessment of the options of a sale and a proposal under the BIA. It will also fund the care and maintenance of the Project without which the asset will deteriorate thereby seriously jeopardizing the applicant’s ability to make a proposal. This latter consideration also justifies the necessary adverse effect on creditors’ positions. The DIP Charge will, however, be subordinate to the secured interests of Dell Financial Services Canada Limited Partnership (“Dell”) and GE VFS Canada Limited Partnership (“GE”) who have received notice of this application and have not objected.

[9] Lastly, the Proposal Trustee has recommended that the Court approve the relief sought and supports the DIP Loan and DIP Charge.

[10] For the foregoing reasons, I am satisfied that the Court should authorize the DIP Loan and the DIP Charge pursuant to s. 50.6(1) of the BIA.

### **Administration Charge**

[11] Colossus seeks approval of a first-priority administration charge in the maximum amount of \$300,000 to secure the fees and disbursements of the Proposal Trustee, the counsel to the Proposal Trustee, and the counsel to the applicant in respect of these BIA proceedings.

[12] Section 64.2 of the BIA provides jurisdiction to grant a super-priority for such purposes. The Court is satisfied that such a charge is appropriate for the following reasons.

[13] First, the proposed services are essential both to a successful proceeding under the BIA as well as for the conduct of the SISP.

[14] Second, the quantum of the proposed charge is appropriate given the complexity of the applicant's business and of the SISP, both of which will require the supervision of the Proposal Trustee.

[15] Third, the proposed charge will be subordinate to the secured interests of GE and Dell.

### **Directors' and Officers' Charge**

[16] Colossus seeks approval of an indemnity and priority charge to indemnify its directors and officers for obligations and liabilities they may incur in such capacities from and after the filing of the Notice of Intention (the "D&O Charge"). It is proposed that the D&O Charge be in the amount of \$200,000 and rank after the Administration Charge and prior to the DIP Charge.

[17] The Court has authority to grant such a charge under s. 64.1 of the BIA. I am satisfied that it is appropriate to grant such relief in the present circumstances for the following reasons.

[18] First, the Court has been advised that the existing directors' and officers' insurance policies contain certain limits and exclusions that create uncertainty as to coverage of all potential claims. The order sought provides that the benefit of the D&O Charge will be available only to the extent that the directors and officers do not have coverage under such insurance or such coverage is insufficient to pay the amounts indemnified.

[19] Second, the applicant's remaining directors and officers have advised that they are unwilling to continue their services and involvement with the applicant without the protection of the D&O Charge.

[20] Third, the continued involvement of the remaining directors and officers is critical to a successful SISP or any proposal under the BIA.

[21] Fourth, the Proposal Trustee has stated that the D&O Charge is reasonable and supports the D&O Charge.

### **The SISP**

[22] The Court has the authority to approve any proposed sale under s. 65.13(1) of the BIA subject to consideration of the factors in s. 65.13(4). At this time, Colossus seeks approval of its proposed sales process, being the SISP. In this regard, the following considerations are relevant.

[23] First, the SISP is necessary to permit the applicant to determine whether a sale transaction is available that would be more advantageous to the applicant and its stakeholders than a proposal under the BIA. It is also a condition of the DIP Loan. In these circumstances, a sales process is not only reasonable but also necessary.

[24] Second, it is not possible at this time to assess whether a sale under the SISP would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale under a bankruptcy. However, the conduct of the SISP will allow that assessment without any obligation on the part of the applicant to accept any offer under the SISP.

[25] Third, the Court retains the authority to approve any sale under s. 65.13 of the BIA.

[26] Lastly, the Proposal Trustee supports the proposed SISP.

[27] Accordingly, I am satisfied that the SISP should be approved at this time.

### **Engagement Letter with the Financial Advisor**

[28] The applicant seeks approval of an engagement letter dated November 27, 2013 with Dundee Securities Limited (“Dundee”) (the “Engagement Letter”). Dundee was engaged at that time by the special committee of the board of directors of the applicant as its financial advisor for the purpose of identifying financing and/or merger and acquisition opportunities available to the applicant. It is proposed that Dundee will continue to be engaged pursuant to the Engagement Letter to run the SISP together with the applicant under the supervision of the Proposal Trustee.

[29] Under the Engagement Letter, Dundee will receive certain compensation including a success fee. The Engagement Letter also provides that amounts payable thereunder are claims that cannot be compromised in any proposal under the BIA or any plan of arrangement under the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the “CCAA”).

[30] Courts have approved success fees in the context of restructurings under the CCAA. The reasoning in such cases is equally applicable in respect of restructurings conducted by means of proposal proceedings under the BIA. As the applicant notes, a success fee is both appropriate and necessary where the debtor lacks the financial resources to pay advisory fees on any other basis.

[31] For the following reasons, I am satisfied that the Engagement Letter, including the success fee arrangement, should be approved by the Court and that the applicant should be authorized to continue to engage Dundee as its financial advisor in respect of the SISP.

[32] Dundee has considerable industry experience as well as familiarity with Colossus, based on its involvement with the company prior to the filing of the Notice of Intention.

[33] As mentioned, the SISP is necessary to permit an assessment of the best option for stakeholders.

[34] In addition, the success fee is necessary to incentivize Dundee but is reasonable in the circumstances and consistent with success fees in similar circumstances.

[35] Importantly, the success fee is only payable in the event of a successful outcome of the SISP.

[36] Lastly, the Proposal Trustee supports the Engagement Letter, including the success fee arrangement.

### **Extension of the Stay**

[37] The applicant seeks an extension for the time to file a proposal under the BIA from the thirty-day period provided for in s. 50.4(8). The applicant seeks an extension to March 7, 2014 to permit it to pursue the SISP and assess whether a sale or a proposal under the BIA would be most beneficial to the applicant's stakeholders.

[38] The Court has authority to grant such relief under section 50.4(9) of the BIA. I am satisfied that such relief is appropriate in the present circumstances for the following reasons.

[39] First, the applicant is acting in good faith and with due diligence, with a view to maximizing value for the stakeholders, in seeking authorization for the SISP.

[40] Second, the applicant requires additional time to determine whether it could make a viable proposal to stakeholders. The extension of the stay will increase the likelihood of a feasible sale transaction or a proposal.

[41] Third, there is no material prejudice likely to result to creditors from the extension of the stay itself. Any adverse effect flowing from the DIP Loan and DIP Charge has been addressed above.

[42] Fourth, the applicant's cash flows indicate that it will be able to meet its financial obligations, including care and maintenance of the Project, during the extended period with the inclusion of the proceeds of the DIP Loan.

[43] Lastly, the Proposal Trustee supports the requested relief.

---

Wilton-Siegel J.

**Released:** February 7, 2014

# **Tab 3**

**CITATION:** Mustang GP Ltd. (Re), 2015 ONSC 6562  
**COURT FILE NOs.:** 35-2041153, 35-2041155, 35-2041157  
**DATE:** 2015/10/28

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO – IN BANKRUPTCY

**RE:** IN THE MATTER OF THE NOTICE OF INTENTION TO MAKE A PROPOSAL OF MUSTANG GP LTD.

IN THE MATTER OF THE NOTICE OF INTENTION TO MAKE A PROPOSAL OF HARVEST ONTARIO PARTNERS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

IN THE MATTER OF THE NOTICE OF INTENTION TO MAKE A PROPOSAL OF HARVEST POWER MUSTANG GENERATION LTD.

**BEFORE:** Justice H. A. Rady

**COUNSEL:** Harvey Chaiton, for Mustang GP Ltd., Harvest Ontario Partners Limited Partnership and Harvest Power Mustang Generation Ltd.

Joseph Latham for Harvest Power Inc.

Jeremy Forrest for Proposal Trustee, Deloitte Restructuring Inc.

Robert Choi for Badger Daylighting Limited Partnership

Curtis Cleaver for StormFisher Ltd.

No one else appearing.

**HEARD:** October 19, 2015

## **ENDORSEMENT**

### **Introduction**

[1] This matter came before me as a time sensitive motion for the following relief:

- (a) abridging the time for service of the debtors' motion record so that the motion was properly returnable on October 19, 2015;



- (b) administratively consolidating the debtors' proposal proceeding;
- (c) authorizing the debtors to enter into an interim financing term sheet (the DIP term sheet) with StormFisher Environmental Ltd. (in this capacity, the DIP lender), approving the DIP term sheet and granting the DIP lender a super priority charge to secure all of the debtors' obligations to the DIP lender under the DIP term sheet;
- (d) granting a charge in an amount not to exceed \$150,000 in favour of the debtors' legal counsel, the proposal trustee and its legal counsel to secure payment of their reasonable fees and disbursements;
- (e) granting a charge in an amount not to exceed \$2,000,000 in favour of the debtors' directors and officers;
- (f) approving the process described herein for the sale and marketing of the debtors' business and assets;
- (g) approving the agreement of purchase and sale between StormFisher Environmental Ltd. and the debtors; and
- (h) granting the debtors an extension of time to make a proposal to their creditors.

### **Preliminary Matter**

[2] As a preliminary matter, Mr. Choi, who acts for a creditor of the debtors, Badger Daylighting Limited Partnership, requested an adjournment to permit him an opportunity to review and consider the material, which was late served on October 15, 2015. He sought only a brief adjournment and I was initially inclined to grant one. However, having heard counsel's submissions and considered the material, I was concerned that even a brief adjournment had the potential to cause mischief as

the debtors attempt to come to terms with their debt. Any delay might ultimately cause prejudice to the debtors and their stakeholders. Both Mr. Chaiton and Mr. Latham expressed concern about adverse environmental consequences if the case were delayed. No other stakeholders appeared to voice any objection. As a result, the request was denied and the motion proceeded.

- [3] Following submissions, I reserved my decision. On October 20, 2015, I released an endorsement granting the relief with reasons to follow.

### **Background**

- [4] The evidence is contained in the affidavit of Wayne Davis, the chief executive officer of Harvest Mustang GP Ltd. dated October 13, 2015. He sets out in considerable detail the background to the motion and what has led the debtors to seek the above described relief. The following is a summary of his evidence.

- [5] On September 29, 2015, the moving parties, which are referred to collectively as the debtors, each filed a Notice of Intention to Make a Proposal pursuant to s. 50.4 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 as amended. Deloitte Restructuring Inc. was named proposal trustee.

- [6] The debtors are indirect subsidiaries of Harvest Power Inc., a privately owned Delaware corporation that develops, builds, owns and operates facilities that generate renewable energy, as well as soil and mulch products from waste organic materials.

- [7] Harvest Power Mustang Generation Ltd. was established in July 2010 in order to acquire assets related to a development opportunity in London. In October 2010, it purchased a property located at 1087 Green Valley Road from London Biogas Generation Inc., a subsidiary of StormFisher Ltd. The intent was to design, build, own and operate a biogas electricity production facility.

- [8] In November 2011, a limited partnership was formed between Harvest Power Canada Ltd., Harvest Power Mustang GP Ltd. and Waste Management of Canada Corporation, referred to as Harvest Ontario Partners Limited Partnership or Harvest Ontario Partners. It was formed to permit the plant to accept organic waste to be used to generate renewable electricity. After the partnership was formed, Harvest Power Mustang Generation Ltd. became a 100 percent owned subsidiary of the partnership. In June 2012, its personal property was transferred to the partnership. It remains the registered owner of 1087 Green Valley Road.
- [9] The plant employs twelve part and full time employees.
- [10] The debtors began operating the biogas electrical facility in London in April 2013. Unfortunately, the plant has never met its production expectations, had negative EBITDA from the outset and could not reach profitability without new investment. The debtors had experienced significant “launch challenges” due to construction delays, lower than expected feedstock acquisition, higher than anticipated labour costs, and delays in securing a necessary approval from the Canadian Food Inspection Agency for the marketing and sale of fertilizer produced at the facility.
- [11] Its difficulties were compounded by litigation with its general contractor, arising from the earlier construction of the facility. The lawsuit was ultimately resolved with the debtors paying \$1 million from a holdback held by Harvest Ontario Partners as well as a 24 percent limited partnership interest in the partnership. The litigation was costly and “caused a substantial drain on the debtors’ working capital resources”.
- [12] The debtors’ working capital and operating losses had been funded by its parent company, Harvest Power Inc. However, in early 2015 Harvest Power Inc. advised the debtors that it would not continue to do so. By the year ended September 2015, the debtors had an operating loss of approximately \$4.8 million.

- [13] In January 2015, the debtors defaulted on their obligations to Farm Credit Canada, its senior secured creditor, which had extended a demand credit facility to secure up to \$11 million in construction financing for the plant. The credit facility was converted to a twelve year term loan, secured by a mortgage, a first security interest and various guarantees. In February 2015, FCC began a process to locate a party to acquire its debt and security, with the cooperation of the debtors. FCC also advised the debtors that it would not fund any restructuring process or provide further financing. The marketing process failed to garner any offers from third parties that FCC found acceptable.
- [14] On July 9, 2015, FCC demanded payment of its term loan from Harvest Ontario Partners and served a Notice of Intention to Enforce Security pursuant to s. 244(1) of the *BIA*. In August 2015, an indirect subsidiary of Harvest Power Inc. – 2478223 Ontario Limited – purchased and took an assignment of FCC’s debt and security at a substantial discount.
- [15] Shortly thereafter, StormFisher Ltd., which is a competitor of Harvest Power Inc., advised 2478223 that it was interested in purchasing the FCC debt and security in the hopes of acquiring the debtors’ business. It was prepared to participate in the sale process as a stalking horse bidder and a DIP lender.
- [16] On September 25, 2015, 2478223 assigned the debt and security to StormFisher Environmental Ltd., a subsidiary of StormFisher Ltd., incorporated for the purpose of purchasing the debtors’ assets. The debt and security were purchased at a substantial discount from what 2478223 had paid and included cash, a promissory note and a minority equity interest. StormFisher Ltd. is described as having remained close to the Harvest Power group of companies in the time following its subsidiary’s sale of the property to Harvest Power Generation Ltd. Some of its employees worked under contract for Harvest Power Inc. It was aware of the

debtors' financial difficulties and had participated in FCC's earlier attempted sale process.

[17] On September 29, 2015, the debtors commenced these proceedings under the *BIA*, in order to carry out the sale of the debtors' business as a going concern to StormFisher Environmental Ltd. as a stalking horse bidder or another purchaser. Given the lack of success in the sale process earlier initiated by FCC, and concerns respecting the difficulties facing the renewable energy industry in general and for the debtors specifically, the debtors believe that a stalking horse process is appropriate and necessary.

[18] In consultation with the proposal trustee, the debtors developed a process for the marketing and sale of their business and assets. The following summary of the process is described by Mr. Davis in his affidavit:

- i. the sale process will be commenced immediately following the date of the order approving it;
- ii. starting immediately after the sale process approval date, the debtors and the proposal trustee will contact prospective purchasers and will provide a teaser summary of the debtors' business in order to solicit interest. The proposal trustee will obtain a non-disclosure agreement from interested parties who wish to receive a confidential information memorandum and undertake due diligence. Following the execution of a non-disclosure agreement, the proposal trustee will provide access to an electronic data room to prospective purchasers;
- iii. at the request of interested parties, the proposal trustee will facilitate plant tours and management meetings;

- iv. shortly following the sale process approval date, the proposal trustee will advertise the opportunity in the national edition of the Globe and Mail;
- v. the bid deadline for prospective purchasers will be 35 days following the sale process approval date. Any qualified bid must be accompanied by a cash deposit of 10% of the purchase price;
- vi. the debtors and the proposal trustee will review all superior bids received to determine which bid it considers to be the most favourable and will then notify the successful party that its bid has been selected as the winning bid. Upon the selection of the winning bidder, there shall be a binding agreement of purchase and sale between the winning bidder and the debtors;
- vii. if one or more superior bids is received, the debtors shall bring a motion to the Court within seven business days following the selection of the winning bidder for an order approving the agreement of purchase and sale between the winning bidder and the debtors and to vest the assets in the winning bidder;
- viii. the closing of the sale transaction will take place within one business day from the sale approval date;
- ix. in the event that a superior bid is not received by the bid deadline, the debtors will bring a motion as soon as possible following the bid deadline for an order approving the stalking horse agreement of purchase and sale.

[19] StormFisher Environmental Ltd. is prepared to purchase the business and assets of the debtors on a going-concern basis on the following terms:

A partial credit bid for a purchase price equal to: (i) \$250,000 of the debtors' total secured obligations to StormFisher Environmental Ltd. (plus the DIP loan described below); (ii) any amounts ranking in priority to StormFisher Environmental Ltd.'s security, including the amounts secured by: (a) the administration charge; (b) the D&O charge (both described below); and (c) the amount estimated by the proposal trustee to be the aggregate fees, disbursements and expenses for the period from and after closing of the transaction for the sale the debtors' business to the completion of the *BIA* proceedings and the discharge of Deloitte Restructuring Inc. as trustee in bankruptcy of estate of the debtors.

- [20] The debtors and the proposal trustee prepared a cash flow forecast for September 25, 2015 to December 25, 2015. It shows that the debtors will require additional funds in order to see them through this process, while still carrying on business.
- [21] StormFisher Environmental Ltd. has offered to make a DIP loan of up to \$1 million to fund the projected shortfall in cash flow. In return, the DIP lender requires a charge that ranks in priority to all other claims and encumbrances, except the administration and D&O charges. The administration charge protects the reasonable fees and expenses of the debtors' professional advisors. The D&O charge is to indemnify the debtors for possible liabilities such as wages, vacation pay, source deductions and environmental remedy issues. The latter may arise in the event of a wind-down or shut down of the plant and for which existing insurance policies may be inadequate. According to Mr. Davis, the risk if such a charge is not granted is that the debtors' directors and officers might resign, thereby jeopardizing the proceedings.
- [22] The debtors have other creditors. Harvest Power Partners had arranged for an irrevocable standby letter of credit, issued by the Bank of Montreal to fund the payment that might be required to the Ministry of Environment arising from any environment clean up that might become necessary.
- [23] Searches of the *PPSA* registry disclosed the following registrations:

- (a) Harvest Ontario Partners:
  - (i) FCC in respect of all collateral classifications other than consumer goods. On August 12, 2015, change statement filed to reflect the assignment of FCC's Debt and Security to 2478223;
  - (ii) BMO in respect of accounts.
- (b) Harvest Power Mustang Generation Ltd.
  - (i) FCC in respect of all collateral classifications other than consumer goods. On August 12, 2015, change statement filed to reflect the assignment of FCC's Debt and Security to 2478223;
  - (ii) BMO in respect of accounts; and
  - (iii) Roynat Inc. in respect of certain equipment.

[24] There are two registrations on title to 1087 Green Valley Road. The first is for \$11 million in favour of FCC dated February 28, 2012 and transferred to 2478223 on October 8, 2015. The second is a construction lien registered by Badger Daylighting Limited Partnership on July 2, 2015 for \$239,191. The validity and priority of the lien claim is disputed by the debtors and 2478223.

## **Analysis**

### **a) the administrative consolidation**

[25] The administration order, consolidating the debtors' notice of intention proceedings is appropriate for a variety of reasons. First, it avoids a multiplicity of proceedings, the associated costs and the need to file three sets of motion



materials. There is no substantive merger of the bankruptcy estates but rather it provides a mechanism to achieve the just, most expeditious and least expensive determination mandated by the *BIA General Rules*. The three debtors are closely aligned and share accounting, administration, human resources and financial functions. The sale process contemplates that the debtors' assets will be marketed together and form a single purchase and sale transaction. Harvest Ontario Partners and Harvest Power Mustang Generation Ltd. have substantially the same secured creditors and obligations. Finally, no prejudice is apparent. A similar order was granted in *Re Electro Sonic Inc.*, 2014 ONSC 942 (S.C.J.).

**b) the DIP agreement and charge**

[26] S. 50.6 of the *BIA* gives the court jurisdiction to grant a DIP financing charge and to grant it a super priority. It provides as follows:

**50.6(1) *Interim Financing:*** On application by a debtor in respect of whom a notice of intention was filed under section 50.4 or a proposal was filed under subsection 62(1) 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 debtor'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 debtor an amount approved by the court as being required by the debtor, having regard to the debtor's cash-flow statement referred to in paragraph 50(b)(a) or 50.4(2)(a), as the case may be. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

**50.6(3) *Priority:*** The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the debtor.

[27] S. 50.6(5) enumerates a list of factors to guide the court's decision whether to grant DIP financing:

**50.6(5) *Factors to be considered:*** In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

(a) the period during which the debtor is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;

(b) how the debtor's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;

- (c) whether the debtor's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
- (d) whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable proposal being made in respect of the debtor;
- (e) the nature and value of the debtor's property
- (f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
- (g) the trustee's report referred to in paragraph 50(6)(b) or 50.4(2)(b), as the case may be.

[28] This case bears some similarity to *Re P.J. Wallbank Manufacturing*, 2011 ONSC 7641 (S.C.J.). The court granted the DIP charge and approved the agreement where, as here, the evidence was that the debtors would cease operations if the relief were not granted. And, as here, the DIP facility is supported by the proposal trustee. The evidence is that the DIP lender will not participate otherwise.

[29] The Court in *Wallbank* also considered any prejudice to existing creditors. While it is true that the DIP loan and charge may affect creditors to a degree, it seems to me that any prejudice is outweighed by the benefit to all stakeholders in a sale of the business as a going concern. I would have thought that the potential for creditor recovery would be enhanced rather than diminished.

[30] In *Re Comstock Canada Ltd.*, 2013 ONSC 4756 (S.C.J.), Justice Morawetz was asked to grant a super priority DIP charge in the context of a *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* proceeding. He referred to the moving party's factum, which quoted from *Sun Indalex Finance, LLC v. United Steelworkers*, 2013 SCC 6 as follows:

[I]t is important to remember that the purpose of CCAA proceedings is not to disadvantage creditors but rather to try to provide a constructive solution for all stakeholders when a company has become insolvent. As my colleague, Deschamps J. observed in *Century Services*, at para. 15:

...the purpose of the CCAA... is to permit the debtor to continue to carry on business and, where possible, avoid the social and economic costs of liquidating its assets.

In the same decision, at para. 59, Deschamps J. also quoted with approval the following passage from the reasons of Doherty J.A. in *Elan Corp. v. Comiskey* (1990), 41 O.A.C. 282, at para. 57 (dissenting):

The legislation is remedial in the purest sense in that it provides 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.

...

Given that there was no alternative for a going-concern solution, it is difficult to accept the Court of Appeal's sweeping intimation that the DIP lenders would have accepted that their claim ranked below claims resulting from the deemed trust. There is no evidence in the record that gives credence to this suggestion. Not only is it contradicted by the CCAA judge's findings of fact, but case after case has shown that "the priming of the DIP facility is a key aspect of the debtor's ability to attempt a workout" (J. P. Sarra, *Rescue! The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (2007), at p. 97). The harsh reality is that lending is governed by the commercial imperatives of the lenders, not by the interests of the plan members or the policy considerations that lead provincial governments to legislate in favour of pension fund beneficiaries. The reasons given by Morawetz J. in response to the first attempt of the Executive Plan's members to reserve their rights on June 12, 2009 are instructive. He indicated that any uncertainty as to whether the lenders would withhold advances or whether they would have priority if advances were made did "not represent a positive development". He found that, in the absence of any alternative, the relief sought was "necessary and appropriate".

[Emphasis in original]

[31] I recognize that in the *Comstock* decision, the court was dealing with a CCAA proceeding. However, the comments quoted above seem quite apposite to this case. After all, the CCAA is an analogous restructuring statute to the proposal provisions of the *BIA*.

**c) administration charge**

[32] The authority to grant this relief is found in s. 64.2 of the *BIA*.

**64.2 (1) *Court may order security or charge to cover certain costs:*** On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a person in respect of whom a notice of intention is filed under section 50.4 or a proposal is filed under subsection 62(1) is subject to a security or charge, in an amount that the court considers appropriate, in respect of the fees and expenses of

(a) the trustee, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the trustee in the performance of the trustee's duties;

(b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the person for the purpose of proceedings under this Division; and

(c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for the effective participation of that person in proceedings under this Division.

**64.2 (2) *Priority:*** The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the person.

[33] In this case, notice was given although it may have been short. There can be no question that the involvement of professional advisors is critical to a successful restructuring. This process is reasonably complex and their assistance is self evidently necessary to navigate to completion. The debtors have limited means to obtain this professional assistance. See also *Re Colossus Minerals Inc.*, 2014 ONSC 514 (S.C.J.) and the discussion in it.

**d) the D & O charge**

[34] The *BIA* confers the jurisdiction to grant such a charge at s. 64.1, which provides as follows:

**64.1 (1)** On application by a person in respect of whom a notice of intention is filed under section 50.4 or a proposal is filed under subsection 62(1) 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 property of the person is subject to a security or charge – in an amount that the court considers appropriate in favour of any director or officer of the person to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer after the filing of the notice of intention or the proposal, as the case may be.

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

(3) The court may not make the order if in its opinion the person could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.

(4) The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional default.

[35] I am satisfied that such an order is warranted in this case for the following reasons:

- the D & O charge is available only to the extent that the directors and officers do not have coverage under existing policies or to the extent that those policies are insufficient;
- it is required only in the event that a sale is not concluded and a wind down of the facility is required;
- there is a possibility that the directors and officers whose participation in the process is critical, may not continue their involvement if the relief were not granted;
- the proposal trustee and the proposed DIP lender are supportive;

**e) the sale process and the stalking horse agreement of purchaser sale**

[36] The court's power to approve a sale of assets in the context of a proposal is set out in s. 65.13 of the *BIA*. However, the section does not speak to the approval of a sale process.

[37] In *Re Brainhunter* (2009), 62 C.B.R. (5<sup>th</sup>) 41, Justice Morawetz considered the criteria to be applied on a motion to approve a stalking horse sale process in a restructuring application under the *CCAA* and in particular s. 36, which parallels s. 65.13 of the *BIA*. He observed:

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

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

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

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

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

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

[38] It occurs to me that the Nortel Criteria are of assistance in circumstances such as this – namely on a motion to approve a sale process in proposal proceedings under the *BIA*.

[39] In *CCM Master Qualified Fund Ltd. v. blutip Power Technologies* 2012 ONSC 175 (S.C.J.) the Court was asked to approve a sales process and bidding procedures, which included the use of a stalking horse credit bid. The court reasoned as follows:

6. Although the decision to approve a particular form of sales process is distinct from the approval of a proposed sale, the reasonableness and adequacy of any sales process proposed by a court-appointed receiver must be assessed in light of the factors which a court will take into account when considering the approval of a proposed sale. Those factors were identified by the Court of Appeal in its decision in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.*: (i) whether the receiver has made a sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently; (ii) the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers are obtained; (iii) whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process; and, (iv) the interests of all parties. Accordingly, when reviewing a sales and marketing process proposed by a receiver a court should assess:

(i) the fairness, transparency and integrity of the proposed process;

(ii) the commercial efficacy of the proposed process in light of the specific circumstances facing the receiver; and,

(iii) whether the sales process will optimize the chances, in the particular circumstances, of securing the best possible price for the assets up for sale.

7. The use of stalking horse bids to set a baseline for the bidding process, including credit bid stalking horses, has been recognized by Canadian courts as a reasonable and useful element of a sales process. Stalking horse bids have been approved for use in other receivership proceedings, BIA proposals, and CCAA proceedings.

[40] I am satisfied that the sale process and stalking horse agreement should be approved. It permits the sale of the debtors' business as a going concern, with obvious benefit to them and it also maintains jobs, contracts and business relationships. The stalking horse bid establishes a floor price for the debtors' assets. It does not contain any compensation to StormFisher Environmental Ltd. in the event a superior bid is received, and as a result, a superior bid necessarily benefits the debtors' stakeholders rather than the stalking horse bidder. The process seems fair and transparent and there seems no viable alternative, particularly in light of FCC's earlier lack of success. Finally, the proposal trustee supports the process and agreement.

#### **f) Extension of time to file a proposal**

[41] It is desirable that an extension be granted under s. 50.4 (9) of the *BIA*. It appears the debtors are acting in good faith and with due diligence. Such an extension is

necessary so the sale process can be carried out. Otherwise, the debtors would be unable to formulate a proposal to their creditors and bankruptcy would follow.

[42] For these reasons, the relief sought is granted.

*“Justice H.A. Rady”*  
Justice H.A. Rady

**Date:** October 28, 2015



# **Tab 4**

**CITATION:** Danier Leather Inc. (Re), 2016 ONSC 1044  
**COURT FILE NO.:** 31-CL-2084381  
**DATE:** 20160210

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO**

**IN THE MATTER OF INTENTION TO MAKE A PROPOSAL OF DANIER LEATHER INC.**

**BEFORE:** Penny J.

**COUNSEL:** *Jay Swartz and Natalie Renner* for Danier

*Sean Zweig* for the Proposal Trustee

*Harvey Chaiton* for the Directors and Officers

*Jeffrey Levine* for GA Retail Canada

*David Bish* for Cadillac Fairview

*Linda Galessiere* for Morguard Investment, 20 ULC Management, SmartReit and Ivanhoe Cambridge

*Clifton Prophet* for CIBC

**HEARD:** February 8, 2016

**ENDORSEMENT**

**The Motion**

[1] On February 8, 2016 I granted an order approving a SISP in respect of Danier Leather Inc., with reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

[2] Danier filed a Notice of Intention to make a proposal under the BIA on February 4, 2016. This is a motion to :

- (a) approve a stalking horse agreement and SISP;
- (b) approve the payment of a break fee, expense reimbursement and signage costs obligations in connection with the stalking horse agreement;
- (c) authorize Danier to perform its obligations under engagement letters with its financial advisors and a charge to secure success fees;

- (d) approve an Administration Charge;
- (e) approve a D&O Charge;
- (f) approve a KERP and KERP Charge; and
- (g) grant a sealing order in respect of the KERP and a stalking horse offer summary.

### **Background**

[3] Danier is an integrated designer, manufacturer and retailer of leather and suede apparel and accessories. Danier primarily operates its retail business from 84 stores located throughout Canada. It does not own any real property. Danier employs approximately 1,293 employees. There is no union or pension plan.

[4] Danier has suffered declining revenues and profitability over the last two years resulting primarily from problems implementing its strategic plan. The accelerated pace of change in both personnel and systems resulting from the strategic plan contributed to fashion and inventory miscues which have been further exacerbated by unusual extremes in the weather and increased competition from U.S. and international retailers in the Canadian retail space and the depreciation of the Canadian dollar relative to the American dollar.

[5] In late 2014, Danier implemented a series of operational and cost reduction initiatives in an attempt to return Danier to profitability. These initiatives included reductions to headcount, marketing costs, procurement costs and capital expenditures, renegotiating supply terms, rationalizing Danier's operations, improving branding, growing online sales and improving price management and inventory mark downs. In addition, Danier engaged a financial advisor and formed a special committee comprised of independent members of its board of directors to explore strategic alternatives to improve Danier's financial circumstances, including soliciting an acquisition transaction for Danier.

[6] As part of its mandate, the financial advisor conducted a seven month marketing process to solicit offers from interested parties to acquire Danier. The financial advisor contacted approximately 189 parties and provided 33 parties with a confidential information memorandum describing Danier and its business. Over the course of this process, the financial advisor had meaningful conversations with several interested parties but did not receive any formal offers to provide capital and/or to acquire the shares of Danier. One of the principal reasons that this process was unsuccessful is that it focused on soliciting an acquisition transaction, which ultimately proved unappealing to interested parties as Danier's risk profile was too great. An acquisition transaction did not afford prospective purchasers the ability to restructure Danier's affairs without incurring significant costs.

[7] Despite Danier's efforts to restructure its financial affairs and turn around its operations, Danier has experienced significant net losses in each of its most recently completed fiscal years and in each of the two most recently completed fiscal quarters in the 2016 fiscal year. Danier currently has approximately \$9.6 million in cash on hand but is projected to be cash flow

negative every month until at least September 2016. Danier anticipated that it would need to borrow under its loan facility with CIBC by July 2016. CIBC has served a notice of default and indicate no funds will be advanced under its loan facility. In addition, for the 12 months ending December 31, 2015, 30 of Danier's 84 store locations were unprofitable. If Danier elects to close those store locations, it will be required to terminate the corresponding leases and will face substantial landlord claims which it will not be able to satisfy in the normal course.

[8] Danier would not have had the financial resources to implement a restructuring of its affairs if it had delayed a filing under the BIA until it had entirely used up its cash resources. Accordingly, on February 4, 2016, Danier commenced these proceedings for the purpose of entering into a stalking horse agreement and implementing the second phase of the SISP.

### **The Stalking Horse Agreement**

[9] The SISP is comprised of two phases. In the first phase, Danier engaged the services of its financial advisor to find a stalking horse bidder. The financial advisor corresponded with 22 parties, 19 of whom had participated in the 2015 solicitation process and were therefore familiar with Danier. In response, Danier received three offers and, with the assistance of the financial advisor and the Proposal Trustee, selected GA Retail Canada or an affiliate (the "Agent") as the successful bid. The Agent is an affiliate of Great American Group, which has extensive experience in conducting retail store liquidations.

[10] On February 4, 2016, Danier and the Agent entered into the stalking horse agreement, subject to Court approval. Pursuant to the stalking horse agreement, the Agent will serve as the stalking horse bid in the SISP and the exclusive liquidator for the purpose of disposing of Danier's inventory. The Agent will dispose of the merchandise by conducting a "store closing" or similar sale at the stores.

[11] The stalking horse agreement provides that Danier will receive a net minimum amount equal to 94.6% of the aggregate value of the merchandise, provided that the value of the merchandise is no less than \$22 million and no more than \$25 million. After payment of this amount and the expenses of the sale, the Agent is entitled to retain a 5% commission. Any additional proceeds of the sale after payment of the commission are divided equally between the Agent and Danier.

[12] The stalking horse agreement also provides that the Agent is entitled to (a) a break fee in the amount of \$250,000; (b) an expense reimbursement for its reasonable and documented out-of-pocket expenses in an amount not to exceed \$100,000; and (c) the reasonable costs, fees and expenses actually incurred and paid by the Agent in acquiring signage or other advertising and promotional material in connection with the sale in an amount not to exceed \$175,000, each payable if another bid is selected and the transaction contemplated by the other bid is completed. Collectively, the break fee, the maximum amount payable under the expense reimbursement and the signage costs obligations represent approximately 2.5% of the minimum consideration payable under the stalking horse agreement. Another liquidator submitting a successful bid in the course of the SISP will be required to purchaser the signage from the Agent at its cost.

[13] The stalking horse agreement is structured to allow Danier to proceed with the second phase of the SISP and that process is designed to test the market to ascertain whether a higher or better offer can be obtained from other parties. While the stalking horse agreement contemplates liquidating Danier's inventory, it also establishes a floor price that is intended to encourage bidders to participate in the SISP who may be interested in going concern acquisitions as well.

### **The SISP**

[14] Danier, in consultation with the Proposal Trustee and financial advisor, have established the procedures which are to be followed in conducting the second phase of the SISP.

[15] Under the SISP, interested parties may make a binding proposal to acquire the business or all or any part of Danier's assets, to make an investment in Danier or to liquidate Danier's inventory and furniture, fixtures and equipment.

[16] Danier, in consultation with the Proposal Trustee and its financial advisors, will evaluate the bids and may (a) accept, subject to Court approval, one or more bids, (b) conditionally accept, subject to Court approval, one or more backup bids (conditional upon the failure of the transactions contemplated by the successful bid to close, or (c) pursue an auction in accordance with the procedures set out in the SISP.

[17] The key dates of the second phase of the SISP are as follows:

- (1) The second phase of the SISP will commence upon approval by the Court
- (2) Bid deadline: February 22, 2016
- (3) Advising interested parties whether bids constitute "qualified bids":  
No later than two business days after bid deadline
- (4) Determining successful bid and back-up bid (if there is no auction):  
No later than five business days after bid deadline
- (5) Advising qualified bidders of auction date and location (if applicable):  
No later than five business days after bid deadline
- (6) Auction (if applicable): No later than seven business days after bid deadline
- (7) Bringing motion for approval: Within five business days following determination by Danier of the successful bid (at auction or otherwise)
- (8) Back-Up bid expiration date: No later than 15 business days after the bid deadline, unless otherwise agreed
- (9) Outside date: No later than 15 business days after the bid deadline

[18] The timelines in the SISP have been designed with regard to the seasonal nature of the business and the fact that inventory values will depreciate significantly as the spring season approaches. The timelines also ensure that any purchaser of the business as a going concern has the opportunity to make business decisions well in advance of Danier's busiest season, being fall/winter. These timelines are necessary to generate maximum value for Danier's stakeholders and are sufficient to permit prospective bidders to conduct their due diligence, particularly in light of the fact that is expected that many of the parties who will participate in the SISP also participated in the 2015 solicitation process and were given access to a data room containing non-public information about Danier at that time.

[19] Danier does not believe that there is a better viable alternative to the proposed SISP and stalking horse agreement.

[20] The use of a sale process that includes a stalking horse agreement maximizes value of a business for the benefit of its stakeholders and enhances the fairness of the sale process. Stalking horse agreements are commonly used in insolvency proceedings to facilitate sales of businesses and assets and are intended to establish a baseline price and transactional structure for any superior bids from interested parties, *CCM Master Qualified Fund Ltd. v. blutip Power Technologies*, 2012 ONSC 1750 at para. 7 [Commercial List].

[21] The Court's power to approve a sale of assets in a proposal proceeding is codified in section 65.13 of the BIA, which sets out a list of non-exhaustive factors for the Court to consider in determining whether to approve a sale of the debtor's assets outside the ordinary course of business. This Court has considered section 65.13 of the BIA when approving a stalking horse sale process under the BIA, *Re Colossus Minerals Inc.*, 2014 CarswellOnt 1517 at paras. 22-26 (S.C.J.).

[22] A distinction has been drawn, however, between the approval of a sale process and the approval of an actual sale. Section 65.13 is engaged when the Court determines whether to approve a sale transaction arising as a result of a sale process, it does not necessarily address the factors a court should consider when deciding whether to approve the sale process itself.

[23] In *Re Brainhunter*, the Court considered the criteria to be applied on a motion to approve a stalking horse sale process in a restructuring proceeding under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. Citing his decision in *Nortel*, Justice Morawetz (as he then was) confirmed that the following four factors should be considered by the Court in the exercise of its discretion to determine if the proposed sale process should be approved:

- (1) Is a sale transaction warranted at this time?
- (2) Will the sale benefit the whole "economic community"?
- (3) Do any of the debtors' creditors have a bona fide reason to object to a sale of the business?
- (4) Is there a better viable alternative?

*Re Brainhunter*, 2009 CarswellOnt 8207 at paras. 13-17 (S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Re Nortel Networks Corp.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 4467 at para. 49 (S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

[24] While *Brainhunter* and *Nortel* both dealt with a sale process under the CCAA, the Court has recognized that the CCAA is an analogous restructuring statute to the proposal provisions of the BIA, *Re Ted Leroy Trucking [Century Services] Ltd.*, 2010 SCC 60 at para 24; *Re Indalex Ltd.*, [2013] 1 S.C.R. 271 at paras. 50-51.

[25] Furthermore, in *Mustang*, this Court applied the *Nortel* criteria on a motion to approve a sale process backstopped by a stalking horse bid in a proposal proceeding under the BIA, *Re Mustang GP Ltd.*, 2015 CarswellOnt 16398 at paras. 37-38 (S.C.J.).

[26] These proceedings are premised on the implementation of a sale process using the stalking horse agreement as the minimum bid intended to maximize value and act as a baseline for offers received in the SISP. In the present case, Danier is seeking approval of the stalking horse agreement for purposes of conducting the SISP only.

[27] The SISP is warranted at this time for a number of reasons.

[28] First, Danier has made reasonable efforts in search of alternate financing or an acquisition transaction and has attempted to restructure its operations and financial affairs since 2014, all of which has been unsuccessful. At this juncture, Danier has exhausted all of the remedies available to it outside of a Court-supervised sale process. The SISP will result in the most viable alternative for Danier, whether it be a sale of assets or the business (through an auction or otherwise) or an investment in Danier.

[29] Second, Danier projects that it will be cash flow negative for the next six months and it is clear that Danier will be unable to borrow under the CIBC loan facility to finance its operations (CIBC gave notice of default upon Danier's filing of the NOI). If the SISP is not implemented in the immediate future, Danier's revenues will continue to decline, it will incur significant costs and the value of the business will erode, thereby decreasing recoveries for Danier's stakeholders.

[30] Third, the market for Danier's assets as a going concern will be significantly reduced if the SISP is not implemented at this time because the business is seasonal in nature. Any purchaser of the business as a going concern will need to make decisions about the raw materials it wishes to acquire and the product lines it wishes to carry by March 2016 in order to be sufficiently prepared for the fall/winter season, which has historically been Danier's busiest.

[31] Danier and the Proposal Trustee concur that the SISP and the stalking horse agreement will benefit the whole of the economic community. In particular:

- (a) the stalking horse agreement will establish the floor price for Danier's inventory, thereby maximizing recoveries;
- (b) the SISP will subject the assets to a public marketing process and permit higher and better offers to replace the Stalking horse agreement; and

- (c) should the SISP result in a sale transaction for all or substantially all of Danier's assets, this may result in the continuation of employment, the assumption of lease and other obligations and the sale of raw materials and inventory owned by Danier.

[32] There have been no expressed creditor concerns with the SISP as such. The SISP is an open and transparent process. Absent the stalking horse agreement, the SISP could potentially result in substantially less consideration for Danier's business and/or assets.

[33] Given the indications of value obtained through the 2015 solicitation process, the stalking horse agreement represents the highest and best value to be obtained for Danier's assets at this time, subject to a higher offer being identified through the SISP.

[34] Section 65.13 of the BIA is also indirectly relevant to approval of the SISP. In deciding whether to grant authorization for a sale, the court is to consider, among other things:

- (a) whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances;
- (b) whether the trustee approved the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition;
- (c) whether the trustee filed with the court a report stating that in their opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;
- (d) the extent to which the creditors were consulted;
- (e) the effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties; and
- (f) whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.

[35] In the present case, in addition to satisfying the *Nortel* criteria, the SISP will result in a transaction that is at least capable of satisfying the 65.13 criteria. I say this for the following reasons.

[36] The SISP is reasonable in the circumstances as it is designed to be flexible and allows parties to submit an offer for some or all of Danier's assets, make an investment in Danier or acquire the business as a going concern. This is all with the goal of improving upon the terms of the stalking horse agreement. The SISP also gives Danier and the Proposal Trustee the right to extend or amend the SISP to better promote a robust sale process.

[37] The Proposal Trustee and the financial advisor support the SISP and view it as reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances.



[38] The duration of the SISP is reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances having regard to Danier's financial situation, the seasonal nature of its business and the fact that many potentially interested parties are familiar with Danier and its business given their participation in the 2015 solicitation process and/or the stalking horse process.

[39] A sale process which allows Danier to be sold as a going concern would likely be more beneficial than a sale under a bankruptcy, which does not allow for the going concern option.

[40] Finally, the consideration to be received for the assets under the stalking horse agreement appears at this point, to be *prima facie* fair and reasonable and represents a fair and reasonable benchmark for all other bids in the SISP.

### **The Break Fee**

[41] Break fees and expense and costs reimbursements in favour of a stalking horse bidder are frequently approved in insolvency proceedings. Break fees do not merely reflect the cost to the purchaser of putting together the stalking horse bid. A break fee may be the price of stability, and thus some premium over simply providing for out of pocket expenses may be expected, Daniel R. Dowdall & Jane O. Dietrich, "Do Stalking Horses Have a Place in Intra-Canadian Insolvencies", 2005 ANNREVINSOLV 1 at 4.

[42] Break fees in the range of 3% and expense reimbursements in the range of 2% have recently been approved by this Court, *Re Nortel Networks Corp.*, [2009] O.J. No. 4293 at paras. 12 and 26 (S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Re W.C. Wood Corp. Ltd.*, [2009] O.J. No. 4808 at para. 3 (S.C.J. [Commercial List], where a 4% break fee was approved.

[43] The break fee, the expense reimbursement and the signage costs obligations in the stalking horse agreement fall within the range of reasonableness. Collectively, these charges represent approximately 2.5% of the minimum consideration payable under the stalking horse agreement. In addition, if a liquidation proposal (other than the stalking horse agreement) is the successful bid, Danier is not required to pay the signage costs obligations to the Agent. Instead, the successful bidder will be required to buy the signage and advertising material from the Agent at cost.

[44] In the exercise of its business judgment, the Board unanimously approved the break fee, the expense reimbursement and the signage costs obligations. The Proposal Trustee and the financial advisor have both reviewed the break fee, the expense reimbursement and the signage costs obligations and concluded that each is appropriate and reasonable in the circumstances. In reaching this conclusion, the Proposal Trustee noted, among other things, that:

- (i) the maximum amount of the break fee, expense reimbursement and signage costs obligations represent, in the aggregate 2.5% of the imputed value of the consideration under the stalking horse agreement, which is within the normal range for transactions of this nature;

- (ii) each stalking horse bidder required a break fee and expense reimbursement as part of their proposal in the stalking horse process;
- (iii) without these protections, a party would have little incentive to act as the stalking horse bidder; and
- (iv) the quantum of the break fee, expense reimbursement and signage costs obligations are unlikely to discourage a third party from submitting an offer in the SISP.

[45] I find the break fee to be reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances.

### **Financial Advisor Success Fee and Charge**

[46] Danier is seeking a charge in the amount of US\$500,000 to cover its principal financial advisor's (Concensus) maximum success fees payable under its engagement letter. The Consensus Charge would rank behind the existing security, *pari passu* with the Administration Charge and ahead of the D&O Charge and KERP Charge.

[47] Orders approving agreements with financial advisors have frequently been made in insolvency proceedings, including CCAA proceedings and proposal proceedings under the BIA. In determining whether to approve such agreements and the fees payable thereunder, courts have considered the following factors, among others:

- (a) whether the debtor and the court officer overseeing the proceedings believe that the quantum and nature of the remuneration are fair and reasonable;
- (b) whether the financial advisor has industry experience and/or familiarity with the business of the debtor; and
- (c) whether the success fee is necessary to incentivize the financial advisor.

*Re Sino-Forest Corp.*, 2012 ONSC 2063 at paras. 46-47 [Commercial List]; *Re Colossus Minerals Inc.*, *supra*.

[48] The SISP contemplates that the financial advisor will continue to be intimately involved in administering the SISP.

[49] The financial advisor has considerable experience working with distressed companies in the retail sector that are in the process of restructuring, including seeking strategic partners and/or selling their assets. In the present case, the financial advisor has assisted Danier in its restructuring efforts to date and has gained a thorough and intimate understanding of the business. The continued involvement of the financial advisor is essential to the completion of a successful transaction under the SISP and to ensuring a wide-ranging canvass of prospective bidders and investors.

[50] In light of the foregoing, Danier and the Proposal Trustee are in support of incentivizing the financial advisor to carry out the SISP and are of the view that the quantum and nature of the remuneration provided for in the financial advisor's engagement letter are reasonable in the circumstances and will incentivize the Financial advisor.

[51] Danier has also engaged OCI to help implement the SISP in certain international markets in the belief that OCI has expertise that warrants this engagement. OCI may be able to identify a purchaser or strategic investor in overseas markets which would result in a more competitive sales process. OCI will only be compensated if a transaction is originated by OCI or OCI introduces the ultimate purchaser and/or investor to Danier.

[52] Danier and the Proposal Trustee believe that the quantum and nature of the success fee payable under the OCI engagement letter is reasonable in the circumstances. Specifically, because the fees payable to OCI are dependent on the success of transaction or purchaser or investor originated by OCI, the approval of this fee is necessary to incentivize OCI.

[53] Accordingly, an order approving the financial advisor and OCI engagement letters is appropriate.

[54] A charge ensuring payment of the success fee is also appropriate in the circumstances, as noted below.

#### **Administration Charge**

[55] In order to protect the fees and expenses of each of the Proposal Trustee, its counsel, counsel to Danier, the directors of Danier and their counsel, Danier seeks a charge on its property and assets in the amount of \$600,000. The Administration Charge would rank behind the existing security, *pari passu* with the Consensus Charge and ahead of the D&O Charge and KERP Charge. It is supported by the Proposal Trustee.

[56] Section 64.2 of the BIA confers on the Court the authority to grant a charge in favour of financial, legal or other professionals involved in proposal proceedings under the BIA.

[57] Administration and financial advisor charges have been previously approved in insolvency proposal proceedings, where, as in the present case, the participation of the parties whose fees are secured by the charge is necessary to ensure a successful proceeding under the BIA and for the conduct of a sale process, *Re Colossus Minerals Inc.*, 2014 CarswellOnt 1517 at paras. 11-15 (S.C.J.).

[58] This is an appropriate circumstance for the Court to grant the Administration Charge. The quantum of the proposed Administration Charge is fair and reasonable given the nature of the SISP. Each of the parties whose fees are to be secured by the Administration Charge has played (and will continue to play) a critical role in these proposal proceedings and in the SI. The Administration Charge is necessary to secure the full and complete payment of these fees. Finally, the Administration Charge will be subordinate to the existing security and does not prejudice any known secured creditor of Danier.

### **D&O Charge**

[59] The directors and officers have been actively involved in the attempts to address Danier's financial circumstances, including through exploring strategic alternatives, implementing a turnaround plan, devising the SISP and the commencement of these proceedings. The directors and officers are not prepared to remain in office without certainty with respect to coverage for potential personal liability if they continue in their current capacities.

[60] Danier maintains directors and officers insurance with various insurers. There are exclusions in the event there is a change in risk and there is potential for there to be insufficient funds to cover the scope of obligations for which the directors and officers may be found personally liable (especially given the significant size of the Danier workforce).

[61] Danier has agreed, subject to certain exceptions, to indemnify the directors and officers to the extent that the insurance coverage is insufficient. Danier does not anticipate it will have sufficient funds to satisfy those indemnities if they were ever called upon.

[62] Danier seeks approval of a priority charge to indemnify its directors and officers for obligations and liabilities they may incur in such capacities from and after the filing of the NOI. It is proposed that the D&O Charge be in an amount not to exceed \$4.9 million and rank behind the existing security, the Administration Charge and the Consensus Charge but ahead of the KERP Charge.

[63] The amount of the D&O Charge is based on payroll obligations, vacation pay obligations, employee source deduction obligations and sales tax obligations that may arise during these proposal proceedings. It is expected that all of these amounts will be paid in the normal course as Danier expects to have sufficient funds to pay these amounts. Accordingly, it is unlikely that the D&O charge will be called upon.

[64] The Court has the authority to grant a directors' and officers' charge under section 64.1 of the BIA.

[65] In *Colossus Minerals* and *Mustang*, *supra*, this Court approved a directors' and officers' charge in circumstances similar to the present case where there was uncertainty that the existing insurance was sufficient to cover all potential claims, the directors and officers would not continue to provide their services without the protection of the charge and the continued involvement of the directors and officers was critical to a successful sales process under the BIA.

[66] I approve the D&O Charge for the following reasons.

[67] The D&O Charge will only apply to the extent that the directors and officers do not have coverage under the existing policy or Danier is unable to satisfy its indemnity obligations.

[68] The directors and officers of Danier have indicated they will not continue their involvement with Danier without the protection of the D&O Charge yet their continued involvement is critical to the successful implementation of the SISP.

[69] The D&O Charge applies only to claims or liabilities that the directors and officers may incur after the date of the NOI and does not cover misconduct or gross negligence.

[70] The Proposal Trustee supports the D&O Charge, indicating that the D&O Charge is reasonable in the circumstances.

[71] Finally, the amount of the D&O Charge takes into account a number of statutory obligations for which directors and officers are liable if Danier fails to meet these obligations. However, it is expected that all of these amounts will be paid in the normal course. Danier expects to have sufficient funds to pay these amounts. Accordingly, it is unlikely that the D&O charge will be called upon.

### **Key Employee Retention Plan and Charge**

[72] Danier developed a key employee retention plan (the "KERP") that applies to 11 of Danier's employees, an executive of Danier and Danier's consultant, all of whom have been determined to be critical to ensuring a successful sale or investment transaction. The KERP was reviewed and approved by the Board.

[73] Under the KERP, the key employees will be eligible to receive a retention payment if these employees remain actively employed with Danier until the earlier of the completion of the SISP, the date upon which the liquidation of Danier's inventory is complete, the date upon which Danier ceases to carry on business, or the effective date that Danier terminates the services of these employees.

[74] Danier is requesting approval of the KERP and a charge for up to \$524,000 (the "KERP Charge") to secure the amounts payable thereunder. The KERP Charge will rank in priority to all claims and encumbrances other than the existing security, the Administration Charge, the Consensus Charge and the D&O Charge.

[75] Key employee retention plans are approved in insolvency proceedings where the continued employment of key employees is deemed critical to restructuring efforts, *Re Nortel Networks Corp. supra*.

[76] In *Re Grant Forest Products Inc.*, Newbould J. set out a non-exhaustive list of factors that the court should consider in determining whether to approve a key employee retention plan, including the following:

- (a) whether the court appointed officer supports the retention plan;
- (b) whether the key employees who are the subject of the retention plan are likely to pursue other employment opportunities absent the approval of the retention plan;
- (c) whether the employees who are the subject of the retention plan are truly "key employees" whose continued employment is critical to the successful restructuring of Danier;

- (d) whether the quantum of the proposed retention payments is reasonable; and
- (e) the business judgment of the board of directors regarding the necessity of the retention payments.

*Re Grant Forest Products Inc.*, [2009] O.J. No. 3344 at paras. 8-22 (S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

[77] While *Re Grant Forest Products Inc.* involved a proceeding under the CCAA, key employee retention plans have frequently been approved in proposal proceedings under the BIA, see, for example, *In the Matter of the Notice of Intention of Starfield Resources Inc.*, Court File No. CV-13-10034-00CL, Order dated March 15, 2013 at para. 10.

[78] The KERP and the KERP Charge are approved for the following reasons:

- (i) the Proposal Trustee supports the granting of the KERP and the KERP Charge;
- (ii) absent approval of the KERP and the KERP Charge, the key employees who are the subject of the KERP will have no incentive to remain with Danier throughout the SISF and are therefore likely to pursue other employment opportunities;
- (iii) Danier has determined that the employees who are the subject of the KERP are critical to the implementation of the SISF and a completion of a successful sale or investment transaction in respect of Danier;
- (iv) the Proposal Trustee is of the view that the KERP and the quantum of the proposed retention payments is reasonable and that the KERP Charge will provide security for the individuals entitled to the KERP, which will add stability to the business during these proceedings and will assist in maximizing realizations; and
- (v) the KERP was reviewed and approved by the Board.

### **Sealing Order**

[79] There are two documents which are sought to be sealed: 1) the details about the KERP; and 2) the stalking horse offer summary.

[80] Section 137(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act* provides the court with discretion to order that any document filed in a civil proceeding can be treated as confidential, sealed, and not form part of the public record.

[81] In *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, the Supreme Court of Canada held that courts should exercise their discretion to grant sealing orders where:

- (1) the order is necessary to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and

- (2) the salutary effects of the order outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right of free expression, which includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

[2002] S.C.J. No. 42 at para. 53 (S.C.C.).

[82] In the insolvency context, courts have applied this test and authorized sealing orders over confidential or commercially sensitive documents to protect the interests of debtors and other stakeholders, *Re Stelco Inc.*, [2006] O.J. No. 275 at paras. 2-5 (S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Re Nortel Networks Corp.*, *supra*.

[83] It would be detrimental to the operations of Danier to disclose the identity of the individuals who will be receiving the KERP payments as this may result in other employees requesting such payments or feeling underappreciated. Further, the KERP evidence involves matters of a private, personal nature.

[84] The offer summary contains highly sensitive commercial information about Danier, the business and what some parties, confidentially, were willing to bid for Danier's assets. Disclosure of this information could undermine the integrity of the SISP. The disclosure of the offer summary prior to the completion of a final transaction under the SISP would pose a serious risk to the SISP in the event that the transaction does not close. Disclosure prior to the completion of a SISP would jeopardize value-maximizing dealings with any future prospective purchasers or liquidators of Danier's assets. There is a public interest in maximizing recovery in an insolvency that goes beyond each individual case.

[85] The sealing order is necessary to protect the important commercial interests of Danier and other stakeholders. This salutary effect greatly outweighs the deleterious effects of not sealing the KERPs and the offer summary, namely the lack of immediate public access to a limited number of documents filed in these proceedings.

[86] As a result, the *Sierra Club* test for a sealing order has been met. The material about the KERP and the offer summary shall not form part of the public record pending completion of these proposal proceedings.

---

Penny J.

**Date:** February 10, 2016

# Tab 5



**CITATION:** CCM Master Qualified Fund v. blutip Power Technologies, 2012 ONSC 1750  
**COURT FILE NO.:** CV-12-9622-00CL  
**DATE:** 20120315

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO**

**COMMERCIAL LIST**

**RE:** CCM Master Qualified Fund, Ltd., Applicant

**AND:**

blutip Power Technologies Ltd., Respondent

**BEFORE:** D. M. Brown J.

**COUNSEL:** L. Rogers and C. Burr, for the Receiver, Duff & Phelps Canada Restructuring Inc.

A. Cobb and A. Lockhart, for the Applicant

**HEARD:** March 15, 2012

**REASONS FOR DECISION**

**I. Receiver’s motion for directions: sales/auction process & priority of receiver’s charges**

[1] By Appointment Order made February 28, 2012, Duff & Phelps Canada Restructuring Inc. (“D&P”) was appointed receiver of blutip Power Technologies Ltd. (“Blutip”), a publicly listed technology company based in Mississauga which engages in the research, development and sale of hydrogen generating systems and combustion controls. Blutip employs 10 people and, as the Receiver stressed several times in its materials, the company does not maintain any pension plans.

[2] D&P moves for orders approving (i) a sales process and bidding procedures, including the use of a stalking horse credit bid, (ii) the priority of a Receiver’s Charge and Receiver’s Borrowings Charge, and (iii) the activities reported in its First Report. Notice of this motion was given to affected persons. No one appeared to oppose the order sought. At the hearing today I granted the requested Bidding Procedures Order; these are my Reasons for so doing.

**II. Background to this motion**

[3] The Applicant, CCM Master Qualified Fund, Ltd. (“CCM”), is the senior secured lender to Blutip. At present Blutip owes CCM approximately \$3.7 million consisting of (i) two

convertible senior secured promissory notes (October 21, 2011: \$2.6 million and December 29, 2011: \$800,000), (ii) \$65,000 advanced last month pursuant to a Receiver's Certificate, and (iii) \$47,500 on account of costs of appointing the Receiver (as per para. 30 of the Appointment Order). Receiver's counsel has opined that the security granted by Blutip in favour of CCM creates a valid and perfected security interest in the company's business and assets.

[4] At the time of the appointment of the Receiver Blutip was in a development phase with no significant sources of revenue and was dependant on external sources of equity and debt funding to operate. As noted by Morawetz J. in his February 28, 2012 endorsement:

In making this determination [to appoint a receiver] I have taken into account that there is no liquidity in the debtor and that it is unable to make payroll and it currently has no board. Stability in the circumstances is required and this can be accomplished by the appointment of a receiver.

[5] As the Receiver reported, it does not have access to sufficient funding to support the company's operations during a lengthy sales process.

### **III. Sales process/bidding procedures**

#### **A. General principles**

[6] Although the decision to approve a particular form of sales process is distinct from the approval of a proposed sale, the reasonableness and adequacy of any sales process proposed by a court-appointed receiver must be assessed in light of the factors which a court will take into account when considering the approval of a proposed sale. Those factors were identified by the Court of Appeal in its decision in *Royal Bank v. Soundair*: (i) whether the receiver has made a sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently; (ii) the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers are obtained; (iii) whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process; and, (iv) the interests of all parties.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, when reviewing a sales and marketing process proposed by a receiver a court should assess:

- (i) the fairness, transparency and integrity of the proposed process;
- (ii) the commercial efficacy of the proposed process in light of the specific circumstances facing the receiver; and,
- (iii) whether the sales process will optimize the chances, in the particular circumstances, of securing the best possible price for the assets up for sale.

---

<sup>1</sup> (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (C.A.).

[7] The use of stalking horse bids to set a baseline for the bidding process, including credit bid stalking horses, has been recognized by Canadian courts as a reasonable and useful element of a sales process. Stalking horse bids have been approved for use in other receivership proceedings,<sup>2</sup> BIA proposals,<sup>3</sup> and CCAA proceedings.<sup>4</sup>

[8] Perhaps the most well-known recent example of the use of a stalking horse credit bid was that employed in the Canwest Publishing Corp. CCAA proceedings where, as part of a sale and investor solicitation process, Canwest's senior lenders put forward a stalking horse credit bid. Ultimately a superior offer was approved by the court. I accept, as an apt description of the considerations which a court should take into account when deciding whether to approve the use of a stalking horse credit bid, the following observations made by one set of commentators on the Canwest CCAA process:

To be effective for such stakeholders, the credit bid had to be put forward in a process that would allow a sufficient opportunity for interested parties to come forward with a superior offer, recognizing that a timetable for the sale of a business in distress is a fast track ride that requires interested parties to move quickly or miss the opportunity. The court has to balance the need to move quickly, to address the real or perceived deterioration of value of the business during a sale process or the limited availability of restructuring financing, with a realistic timetable that encourages and does not chill the auction process.<sup>5</sup>

## **B. The proposed bidding process**

### **B.1 The bid solicitation/auction process**

[9] The bidding process proposed by the Receiver would use a Stalking Horse Offer submitted by CCM to the Receiver, and subsequently amended pursuant to negotiations, as a baseline offer and a qualified bid in an auction process. D&P intends to distribute to prospective purchasers an interest solicitation letter, make available a confidential information memorandum to those who sign a confidentiality agreement, allow due diligence, and provide interested parties with a copy of the Stalking Horse Offer.

[10] Bids filed by the April 16, 2012 deadline which meet certain qualifications stipulated by the Receiver may participate in an auction scheduled for April 20, 2012. One qualification is that the minimum consideration in a bid must be an overbid of \$100,000 as compared to the

---

<sup>2</sup> *Re Graceway Canada Co.*, 2011 ONSC 6403, para. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Re Parlay Entertainment Inc.*, 2011 ONSC 3492, para. 15.

<sup>4</sup> *Re Brainhunter* (2009), 62 C.B.R. (5<sup>th</sup>) 41 (Ont. S.C.J.), para. 13; *Re White Birch Paper Holding Co.*, 2010 QCCS 4382, para. 3; *Re Nortel Networks Corp.* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5<sup>th</sup>) 229 (Ont. S.C.J.), para. 2, and (2009), 56 C.B.R. (5<sup>th</sup>) 74 (Ont. S.C.J.); *Re Indalex Ltd.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 4262 (S.C.J.).

<sup>5</sup> Pamela Huff, Linc Rogers, Douglas Bartner and Craig Culbert, "Credit Bidding – Recent Canadian and U.S. Themes", in Janis P. Sarra (ed.), *2010 Annual Review of Insolvency Law* (Toronto: Carswell, 2011), p. 16.

Stalking Horse Offer. The proposed auction process is a standard, multi-round one designed to result in a Successful Bid and a Back-Up Bid. The rounds will be conducted using minimum incremental overbids of \$100,000, subject to reduction at the discretion of the Receiver.

## **B.2 Stalking horse credit bid**

[11] The CCM Stalking Horse Offer, or Agreement, negotiated with the Receiver contemplates the acquisition of substantially all the company's business and assets on an "as is where is" basis. The purchase price is equal to: (i) Assumed Liabilities, as defined in the Stalking Horse Offer, plus (ii) a credit bid of CCM's secured debt outstanding under the two Notes, the Appointment Costs and the advance under the Receiver's Certificate. The purchase price is estimated to be approximately \$3.744 million before the value of Assumed Liabilities which will include the continuation of the employment of employees, if the offer is accepted.

[12] The Receiver reviewed at length, in its Report and in counsel's factum, the calculation of the value of the credit bid. Interest under both Notes was fixed at 15% per annum and was prepaid in full. The Receiver reported that if both Notes were repaid on May 3, 2012, the anticipated closing date, the effective annual rate of interest (taking into account all costs which could be categorized as "interest") would be significantly higher than 15% per annum - 57.6% on the October Note and 97.4% on the December Note. In order that the interest on the Notes considered for purposes of calculating the value of the credit bid complied with the interest rate provisions of the *Criminal Code*, the Receiver informed CCM that the amount of the secured indebtedness under the Notes eligible for the credit bid would have to be \$103,500 less than the face value of the Notes. As explained in detail in paragraphs 32 through to 39 of its factum, the Receiver is of the view that such a reduction would result in a permissible effective annual interest rate under the December Note. The resulting Stalking Horse Agreement reflected such a reduction.

[13] The Stalking Horse Offer does not contain a break-fee, but it does contain a term that in the event the credit bid is not the Successful Bid, then CCM will be entitled to reimbursement of its expenses up to a maximum of \$75,000, or approximately 2% of the value of the estimated purchase price. Such an amount, according to the Receiver, would fall within the range of reasonable break fees and expense reimbursements approved in other cases, which have ranged from 1.8% to 5% of the value of the bid.<sup>6</sup>

## **C. Analysis**

[14] Given the financial circumstances of Blutip and the lack of funding available to the Receiver to support the company's operations during a lengthy sales process, I accept the Receiver's recommendation that a quick sales process is required in order to optimize the

---

<sup>6</sup> *Re Parlay Entertainment*, 2011 ONSC 3492, para. 12; *Re White Birch Paper Holding Co.*, 2010 QCCS 4915, paras. 4 to 7; *Re Nortel Networks Corp.* (2009), 56 C.B.R. (5<sup>th</sup>) 74 (Ont. S.C.J.), para. 12.

prospects of securing the best price for the assets. Accordingly, the timeframe proposed by the Receiver for the submission of qualifying bids and the conduct of the auction is reasonable. The marketing, bid solicitation and bidding procedures proposed by the Receiver are likely to result in a fair, transparent and commercially efficacious process in the circumstances.

[15] In light of the reduction in the face value of the Notes required by the Receiver for the purposes of calculating the value of the credit bid and the reasonable amount of the Expense Reimbursement, I approved the Stalking Horse Agreement for the purposes requested by the Receiver. I accept the Receiver's assessment that in the circumstances the terms of the Stalking Horse Offer, including the Expense Reimbursement, will not discourage a third party from submitting an offer superior to the Stalking Horse Offer.

[16] Also, as made clear in paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Bidding Procedures Order, the Stalking Horse Agreement is deemed to be a Qualified Bid and is accepted solely for the purposes of CCM's right to participate in the auction. My order did not approve the sale of Blutip's assets on the terms set out in the Stalking Horse Agreement. As the Receiver indicated, the approval of the sale of Blutip's assets, whether to CCM or some other successful bidder, will be the subject of a future motion to this Court. Such an approach is consistent with the practice of this Court.<sup>7</sup>

[17] For those reasons I approved the bidding procedures recommended by the Receiver.

#### **IV. Priority of receiver's charges**

[18] Paragraphs 17 and 20 of the Appointment Order granted some priority for the Receiver's Charge and Receiver's Borrowings Charge. However, as noted by the Receiver in section 3.1 of its First Report, because that hearing was brought on an urgent, *ex parte* basis, priority over existing perfected security interests and statutory encumbrances was not sought at that time. The Receiver now seeks such priority.

[19] As previously noted, the Receiver reported that Blutip does not maintain any pension plans. In section 3.1 of its Report the Receiver identified the persons served with notice of this motion: (i) parties with registered security interests pursuant to the *PPSA*; (ii) those who have commenced legal proceedings against the Company; (iii) those who have asserted claims in respect of intellectual property against the Company; (iv) the Company's landlord, and (v) standard government agencies. Proof of such service was filed with the motion record. No person appeared on the return of the motion to oppose the priority sought by the Receiver for its charges.

[20] Although the Receiver gave notice to affected parties six days in advance of this motion, not seven days as specified in paragraph 31 of the Appointment Order, I was satisfied that

---

<sup>7</sup> *Re Indalex Ltd.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 4262 (S.C.J.), para. 7; *Re Graceway Canada Co.*, 2011 ONSC 6403, para. 5; *Re Parlay Entertainment Inc.*, 2011 ONSC 3492, para. 58.

secured creditors who would be materially affected by the order had been given reasonable notice and an opportunity to make representations, as required by section 243(6) of the *BIA*, that abridging the notice period by one day, as permitted by paragraph 31 of the Appointment Order, was appropriate and fair in the circumstances, and I granted the priority charges sought by the Receiver.

[21] I should note that the Appointment Order contains a standard “come-back clause” (para. 31). Recently, in *First Leaside Wealth Management Inc. (Re)*, a proceeding under the *CCAA*, I wrote:

[49] In his recent decision in *Timminco Limited (Re)* (“Timminco I”) Morawetz J. described the commercial reality underpinning requests for Administration and D&O Charges in *CCAA* proceedings:

In my view, in the absence of the court granting the requested super priority and protection, the objectives of the *CCAA* would be frustrated. It is not reasonable to expect that professionals will take the risk of not being paid for their services, and that directors and officers will remain if placed in a compromised position should the Timminco Entities continue *CCAA* proceedings without the requested protection. The outcome of the failure to provide these respective groups with the requested protection would, in my view, result in the overwhelming likelihood that the *CCAA* proceedings would come to an abrupt halt, followed, in all likelihood, by bankruptcy proceedings.

...

[51] In my view, absent an express order to the contrary by the initial order applications judge, the issue of the priorities enjoyed by administration, D&O and DIP lending charges should be finalized at the commencement of a *CCAA* proceeding. Professional services are provided, and DIP funding is advanced, in reliance on super-priorities contained in initial orders. To ensure the integrity, predictability and fairness of the *CCAA* process, certainty must accompany the granting of such super-priority charges. When those important objectives of the *CCAA* process are coupled with the Court of Appeal’s holding that parties affected by such priority orders be given an opportunity to raise any paramountcy issue, it strikes me that a judge hearing an initial order application should directly raise with the parties the issue of the priority of the charges sought, including any possible issue of paramountcy<sup>8</sup> in respect of competing claims on the debtor’s property based on provincial legislation.

[22] In my view those comments regarding the need for certainty about the priority of charges for professional fees or borrowings apply, with equal force, to priority charges sought by a

---

<sup>8</sup> 2012 ONSC 1299 (CanLII).

receiver pursuant to section 243(6) of the *BIA*. Certainty regarding the priority of administrative and borrowing charges is required as much in a receivership as in proceedings under the *CCAA* or the proposal provisions of the *BIA*.

[23] In the present case the issues of the priority of the Receiver's Charge and Receiver's Borrowings Charge were deferred from the return of the initial application until notice could be given to affected parties. I have noted that Blutip did not maintain pension plans. I have found that reasonable notice now has been given and no affected person appeared to oppose the granting of the priority charges. Consequently, it is my intention that the Bidding Procedures Order constitutes a final disposition of the issue of the priority of those charges (subject, of course, to any rights to appeal the Bidding Procedures Order). I do not regard the presence of a "come-back clause" in the Appointment Order as leaving the door open a crack for some subsequent challenge to the priorities granted by this order.

**V. Approval of the Receiver's activities**

[24] The activities described by the Receiver in its First Report were reasonable and fell within its mandate, so I approved them.

[25] May I conclude by thanking Receiver's counsel for a most helpful factum.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(original signed by)

D. M. Brown J.

**Date:** March 15, 2012

**IN THE MATTER OF THE NOTICES OF INTENTION TO MAKE A PROPOSAL  
OF ORBCARE INC. AND PARISCRIBE INC., CORPORATIONS  
INCORPORATED UNDER THE CANADA BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT, AND  
ORBCARE US, INC. A CORPORATION INCORPORATED UNDER THE LAWS  
OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

Estate File No. 31-2516167

---

**ONTARIO  
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE  
COMMERCIAL LIST  
Proceeding commenced in TORONTO**

---

**BRIEF OF AUTHORITIES  
(returnable August 14, 2019)  
(Approval of Sale Process)**

---

**GOLDMAN SLOAN NASH & HABER LLP**  
480 University Avenue, Suite 1600  
Toronto (ON) M5G 1V2

**R. Brendan Bissell** (LSO# 40354V)  
Tel: 416-597-6489  
Email: [bissell@gsnh.com](mailto:bissell@gsnh.com)

Lawyers for OrbCare Inc., Pariscribe Inc. and  
OrbCare US, Inc.