

COURT FILE NUMBER 2103-02132
COURT COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA
JUDICIAL CENTRE EDMONTON



In the Matter of the Receivership of P7 CONSTRUCTION LTD. et al

APPLICANT BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT BANK OF CANADA

RESPONDERS P7 CONSTRUCTION LTD., 1619904 ALBERTA LTD., HYOUNG JOON YOON aka JASON YOON, SUNG SOO CHOI aka RICHARD CHOI AND EUNG CHANG KIM

MOVING PARTY BDO CANADA LIMITED in its capacity as the Court-appointed Receiver and Manager of P7 CONSTRUCTION LTD. and 1619904 ALBERTA LTD

DOCUMENT BENCH BRIEF of the RECEIVER-MANAGER

(for an Application on December 9, 2021 at 10:00 AM before the Honourable Justice K. Feth, Commercial List)

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT
Caron & Partners LLP
2120, 237 – 4th Avenue SW
Calgary, AB T2P 4K3
Tel: (403) 262-3000
Fax: (403) 237-0111

Attention: R.J. Daniel Gilborn / Lucinda A. Wong
Solicitors for BDO Canada Limited
Email: dgilborn@caronpartners.com / lwong@caronpartners.com
File No. 60899-000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	2
II.	FACTS.....	2
III.	APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL AND VESTING ORDER	3
IV.	RESTRICTED COURT ACCESS ORDER	4
V.	APPROVAL OF ACTIVITIES OF THE RECEIVER.....	5
VI.	CONCLUSION AND RELIEF SOUGHT	6

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This Bench Brief is filed on behalf of the Applicant BDO Canada Limited (the “**Receiver**”), in its capacity as the Court-appointed receiver and manager of P7 Construction Ltd. and 1619904 Alberta Ltd. (collectively, the “**Companies**”) in support of an Application for an Approval and Vesting Order (hereinafter an “**Approval Order**”) and such other relief as is more particularly set out in the three draft Orders scheduled to the Applicant’s Notice of Application, filed December 1, 2021 (the “**Approval Application**”).

2. The Applicant’s application for an Approval Order and consequential relief will be supported by, among other things, the Receiver’s First Report, filed December 1, 2021 (the “**Receiver’s First Report**”) and the Confidential Supplement to the Receiver’s First Report, filed December 1, 2021 (the “**Confidential Supplement**”). Capitalized terms not defined herein have the meanings given to them in the Approval Application.

3. This Bench Brief is filed to provide a succinct overview of the relevant authorities governing the relief sought in the Approval Application.

II. FACTS

4. The fulsome facts may be found in the Receiver’s First Report and the Confidential Supplement. No attempt will be made here to detail the facts herein. The Applicant’s counsel will instead address the facts, to the extent required, at the hearing of the Application.

III. APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL AND VESTING ORDER

5. This Court has the authority to grant an Approval and Vesting Order under the common law. Specifically, the Court should consider the following:

- (a) whether the Receiver has made a sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently;
- (b) the interests of all parties;
- (c) the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers are obtained; and
- (d) whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process.

Pricewaterhousecoopers Inc v 1905393 Alberta Ltd, 2019 ABCA 433, at para 10 [TAB 1] [“PWC”],
citing *Royal Bank of Canada v Soundair Corp*, 1991 CanLII 2727 (ON CA)

6. This Court should also consider the following factors to determine if the Receiver has acted improvidently or failed to obtain the best price:

- (a) whether the offer accepted is so low in relation to the appraised value as to be unrealistic;
- (b) whether the circumstances indicate that insufficient time was allowed for the making of bids;
- (c) whether inadequate notice of sale by bid was given; or
- (d) whether it can be said that the proposed sale is not in the best interest of either the creditors or the owner.

PWC at para 11 [TAB 1],
citing *River Rentals Group Ltd v Hutterian Brethren Church of Codesa*, 2010 ABCA 16

7. The decision of a chambers judge in approving the sale of assets by a court-appointed receiver is considered discretionary and therefore is circumstantial in nature.

PWC at para 9 [TAB 1]

8. In the case at bar, it is submitted the Receiver’s actions to market and sell the Lands will satisfy the well-known test outlined in PWC. The Receiver issued a request for proposal to four

licensed commercial realtors on June 8, 2021. As a result of this, the Receiver entered into an exclusive listing Agreement with Colliers Macaulay Nicolls Inc. (“**Colliers**”) dated July 15, 2021. The Colliers marketing process commenced on August 5, 2021 and included the efforts described at paragraph 25 of the Receiver’s First Report, culminating in a call for bids ending on November 4, 2021. The Confidential Supplement contains more detailed information.

9. . In respect of the sales process and final value of the assets, it is submitted the Court should take into account the restrictions imposed within Canada due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The deleterious effects of COVID-19 on the travel and hospitality industry are well known and it is uncertain if or when the industry will recover. The Receiver listed the property in accordance with the advice of its consultant and received the offers detailed in the Confidential Supplement. The Receiver submits it obtained the best possible value for the Property in the circumstances.

10. Having regard to the unique nature of the property and the location of the hotel outside of a major urban center in the midst of an economic downturn and pandemic, it is submitted that the Receiver has acted in a commercially reasonable manner and obtained the best price possible in the circumstances. Moreover, the most affected secured creditor does not object to the transaction at the proposed price.

IV. RESTRICTED COURT ACCESS ORDER

11. This Court has the jurisdiction to order that certain materials filed with the Court be sealed on the Court file. The Supreme Court of Canada has authorized such orders where:

- (a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and
- (b) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

Sierra Club of Canada v Canada (Minister of Finance), 2002 SCC 41 (not reproduced)

12. It is common when assets are being sold pursuant to a court process to seal the portion of the Receiver's report disclosing the sale price in case the transaction being approved falls through. The purpose of this is to maintain fair play so that competitors or potential bidders do not obtain an unfair advantage by obtaining such information while others have to rely on their own resources.

Romspen Investment Corporation v Hargate Properties Inc., 2012 ABQB 412 at paras 2, 11, and 13 [TAB 2]

13. Given the commercially sensitive nature of this information and the potential harm to the Companies' commercial interests (and the interests of the stakeholders hoping to maximize the value of those interests) and the privacy interests of the purchasers, the materials sought to be sealed fit squarely within the *Sierra Club* test and the insolvency authorities that apply it.

V. APPROVAL OF ACTIVITIES OF THE RECEIVER

14. This Court possesses the jurisdiction under common law to issue an interim approval of a receiver's activities.

15. In *Target Canada Co. (Re)*, (citation below), Justice Morawetz discussed the process for approval of the reports of a court officer. In that case, the court dealt with a Monitor under the CCAA. However, the same principles have been held to apply to a receivership.

Hanfeng Evergreen Inc., (Re), 2017 ONSC 7161 at para 15 [*"Hanfeng"*] [TAB 3]

16. In *Target Canada Co. (Re)*, the Court recognized that the effect of the approval of the reports of a court officer varies with the context. Where a report is delivered for a specific purpose, such as a sale transaction, express findings of fact may be required to support the relief being sought. The task of the court is to address squarely specific facts and to make specific findings that will be binding in future.

Target Canada Co (Re), 2015 ONSC 7574 at para 18 [*"Target"*] [TAB 4]

17. Court approval serves a number of important purposes for the receiver:

- (a) allows the receiver to move forward with the next steps in the proceedings;
- (b) brings the receiver's activities before the Court;
- (c) allows an opportunity for the concerns of the stakeholders to be addressed, and any problems to be rectified;
- (d) enables the Court to satisfy itself that the receiver's activities have been conducted in prudent and diligent manners;
- (e) provides protection for the receiver not otherwise provided by the *BIA*; and
- (f) protects creditors from the delay and distribution that would be caused by:
 - i. re-litigation of steps taken to date, and
 - ii. potential indemnity claims by the receiver.

Target at para 23 [TAB 4], and cited in *Hangfeng* at para 17 [TAB 3]

VI. CONCLUSION AND RELIEF SOUGHT

18. The Applicants seek an Approval Order, approval of its activities and a restricted court access order, substantially in the forms as attached as appendices to the Approval Application.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED THIS 1st Day of December, 2021

CARON & PARTNERS, LLP



R.J. Daniel Gilborn
of counsel for the Applicant,
BDO Canada Limited

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

1. *Pricewaterhousecoopers Inc v 1905393 Alberta Ltd*, 2019 ABCA 433
2. *Romspen Investment Corporation v Hargate Properties Inc.*, 2012 ABQB 412
3. *Hanfeng Evergreen Inc., (Re)*, 2017 ONSC 7161
4. *Target Canada Co (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 7574

In the Court of Appeal of Alberta

Citation: Pricewaterhousecoopers Inc v 1905393 Alberta Ltd, 2019 ABCA 433

Date: 20191114

Docket: 1903-0134-AC

Registry: Edmonton

Between:

**Pricewaterhousecoopers Inc. in its capacity as
Receiver of 1905393 Alberta Ltd.**

Respondent/Cross-Appellants
(Applicant)

- and -

1905393 Alberta Ltd., David Podollan and Steller One Holdings Ltd.

Appellants/Cross-Respondents
(Respondents)

- and -

**Servus Credit Union Ltd., Ducor Properties Ltd., Northern Electric Ltd.
and Fancy Doors & Mouldings Ltd.**

Respondents
(Interested Parties)

The Court:

**The Honourable Mr. Justice Thomas W. Wakeling
The Honourable Madam Justice Dawn Pentelchuk
The Honourable Madam Justice Jolaine Antonio**

Memorandum of Judgment

Appeal from the Order by
The Honourable Madam Justice J.E. Topolniski
Dated the 21st day of May, 2019
Filed on the 22nd day of May, 2019
(Docket: 1803 13229)

Memorandum of Judgment

The Court:

[1] The appellants appeal an Approval and Vesting Order granted on May 21, 2019 which approved a sale proposed in the May 3, 2019 Asset Purchase Agreement between the Receiver, PriceWaterhouseCoopers, and the respondent, Ducor Properties Ltd (“Ducor”). The assets consist primarily of lands and buildings in Grande Prairie, Alberta described as a partially constructed 169 room full service hotel not currently open for business (the “Development Hotel”) and a 63 room extended stay hotel (“Extended Stay Hotel”) currently operating on the same parcel of land (collectively the “Hotels”). The Hotels are owned by the appellant, 1905393 Alberta Ltd. (“190”) whose shareholder is the appellant, Stellar One Holdings Ltd, and whose president and sole director is the appellant, David Podollan.

[2] The respondent, Servus Credit Union Ltd (“Servus”), is 190’s largest secured creditor. Servus provided financing to 190 for construction of the Hotels. On May 16, 2018, Servus issued a demand for payment of its outstanding debt. As of June 29, 2018, 190 owed Servus approximately \$23.9 million. That debt remains outstanding and, in fact, continues to increase because of interest, property taxes and ongoing carrying costs for the Hotels incurred by the Receiver.

[3] On July 20, 2018, the Receiver was appointed over all of 190’s current and future assets, undertakings and properties. The appellants opposed the Receiver’s appointment primarily on the basis that 190 was seeking to re-finance the Hotels. That re-financing has never materialized.

[4] As a result, the Receiver sought in October 2018 to liquidate the Hotels. In typical fashion, the Receiver obtained an appraisal of the Hotels, as did the respondents. After consulting with three national real estate brokers, the Receiver engaged the services of Colliers International (“Colliers”), which recommended a structured sales process with no listing price and a fixed bid submission date. While the sales process contemplated an exposure period of approximately six weeks between market launch and offer submission deadline, Colliers had contacted over 1,290 prospective purchasers and agents using a variety of mediums in the months prior to market launch, exposing the Hotels to national hotel groups and individuals in the industry, and conducted site visits and answered inquiries posed by prospective buyers. Prospective purchasers provided feedback to Colliers but that included concerns about the quality of construction on the Development Hotel.

[5] The Receiver also engaged the services of an independent construction consultant, Entuitive Corporation, to provide an estimate of the cost to complete construction on the Development Hotel and to assist in decision-making on whether to complete the Development Hotel. In addition, the Receiver contacted a major international hotel franchise brand to obtain input on prospective franchisees’ views of the design and fixturing of the Development Hotel. The ability to brand the Hotels is a significant factor affecting their marketability. Moreover, some of

the feedback confirmed that energy exploration and development in Grande Prairie is down, resulting in downward pressure on hotel-room demand.

[6] Parties that requested further information in response to the listing were asked to execute a confidentiality agreement whereupon they were granted access to a “data-room” containing information on the Hotels and offering related documents and photos. Colliers provided confidential information regarding 190’s assets to 27 interested parties.

[7] The deadline for offer submission yielded only four offers, each of which was far below the appraised value of the Hotels. Three of the four offers were extremely close in respect of their stated price; the fourth offer was significantly lower than the others. As a result, the Receiver went back to the three prospective purchasers that had similar offers and asked them to re-submit better offers. None, however, varied their respective purchase prices in a meaningful manner when invited to do so. The Receiver ultimately accepted and obtained approval for Ducor’s offer to purchase which, as the appellants correctly point out, is substantially less than the appraised value of the Hotels.

[8] The primary thrust of the appellants’ argument is that an abbreviated sale process resulted in an offer which is unreasonably low having regard to the appraisals. They argue that the Receiver was improvident in accepting such an offer and the chambers judge erred by approving it. Approving the sale, they argue, would eliminate the substantial equity in the property evidenced by the appraised value and that the “massive prejudice” caused to them as a result materially outweighs any further time and cost associated with requiring the Receiver to re-market the Hotels with a longer exposure time. Mr. Podollan joins in this argument as he is potentially liable for any shortfall under personal guarantees to Servus for all amounts owed to Servus by 190. The other respondents, Fancy Doors & Mouldings Ltd and Northern Electric Ltd, similarly echo the appellants’ arguments as the shortfall may deprive them both from collecting on their builders’ liens which, collectively, total approximately \$340,000.

[9] The appellants obtained both a stay of the Approval and Vesting Order and leave to appeal pursuant to s 193 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985, c B-3: **1905393 Alberta Ltd v 1905393 Alberta Ltd (Receiver of)**, [2019] AJ No 895, 2019 ABCA 269. The issues around which leave was granted generally coalesce around two questions. First, whether the chambers judge applied the correct test in deciding whether to approve of the Receiver recommended sale; and second, whether the chambers judge erred in her application of the legal test to the facts in deciding whether to approve the sale and, in particular, erred in her exercise of discretion by failing to consider or provide sufficient weight to a relevant factor. The standard of review is correctness on the first question and palpable and overriding error on the second: **Northstone Power Corp v RJK Power Systems Ltd**, 2002 ABCA 201 at para 4, 317 AR 192.

[10] As regards the first question, the parties agree that Court approval requires the Receiver to satisfy the well-known test in *Royal Bank of Canada v Soundair Corporation*, [1991] OJ No 1137 at para 16, 46 OAC 321 (“*Soundair*”). That test requires the Court to consider four factors: (i) whether the receiver has made a sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently; (ii) whether the interests of all parties have been considered, not just the interests of the creditors of the debtor; (iii) the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers are obtained; and (iv) whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process.

[11] The appellants suggest that *Soundair* has been modified by our Court in *Bank of Montreal v River Rentals Group Ltd*, 2010 ABCA 16 at para 13, 469 AR 333, to require an additional four factors in assessing whether a receiver has complied with its duties: (a) whether the offer accepted is so low in relation to the appraised value as to be unrealistic; (b) whether the circumstances indicate that insufficient time was allowed for the making of bids; (c) whether inadequate notice of sale by bid was given; and (d) whether it can be said that the proposed sale is not in the best interests of either the creditor or the owner. The appellants argue that, although the chambers judge considered the *Soundair* factors, she erred by failing to consider the additional *River Rentals* factors and, in so doing, in effect applied the “wrong law”.

[12] We disagree. The chambers judge expressly referred to the *River Rentals* case. *River Rentals*, it must be recalled, simply identified a subset of factors that a Court might also consider when considering the first prong of the *Soundair* test as to whether a receiver failed to get the best price and has not acted providently. Moreover, the type of factors that might be considered is by no means a closed category and there may be other relevant factors that might lead a court to refuse to approve a sale: *Salima Investments Ltd v Bank of Montreal* (1985), 65 AR 372 at paras 12-13. At its core, *River Rentals* highlights the need for a Court to balance several factors in determining whether a receiver complied with its duties and to confirm a sale. It did not purport to modify the *Soundair* test, establish a hierarchy of factors, nor limit the types of things that a Court might consider. The chambers judge applied the correct test. This ground of appeal is dismissed.

[13] At its core, then, the appellants challenge how the chambers judge applied and weighed the relevant factors in this case. The appellants suggest that the failure to obtain a price at or close to the appraised value of the Hotels is an overriding factor that trumps all the others in assessing whether the Receiver acted improvidently. That is not the test. A reviewing Court’s function is not to consider whether a Receiver has failed to get the best price. Rather, a Receiver’s duty is to act in a commercially reasonable manner in the circumstances with a view to obtaining the best price having regard to the competing interests of the interested parties: *Skyepharma PLC v Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp* (1999), 12 CBR (4th) 84 at para 4, [1999] OJ No 4300, aff’d on appeal 15 CBR (4th) 298 (ONCA).

[14] Nor is it the Court’s function to substitute its view of how a marketing process should proceed. The appellants suggest that if the Hotels were re-marketed with an exposure period closer to that which the appraisals were based on, then a better offer might be obtained. Again, that is not

the test. The Receiver's decision to enter into an agreement for sale must be assessed under the circumstances then existing. The chambers judge was aware that the Receiver considered the risk of not accepting the approved offer to be significant. There was no assurance that a longer marketing period would generate a better offer and, in the interim, the Receiver was incurring significant carrying costs. To ignore these circumstances would improperly call into question a receiver's expertise and authority in the receivership process and thereby compromise the integrity of a sales process and would undermine the commercial certainty upon which court-supervised insolvency sales are based: *Soundair* at para 43. In such a case, chaos in the commercial world would result and "receivers and purchasers would never be sure they had a binding agreement": *Soundair* at para 22.

[15] The fact that three of the four offers came in so close together in terms of amount, with the fourth one being even lower, is significant. Absent evidence of impropriety or collusion in the preparation of those confidential offers – of which there is absolutely none – the fact that those offers were all substantially lower than the appraised value speaks loudly to the existing hotel market in Grande Prairie. Moreover, the appellants have not brought any fresh evidence application to admit cogent evidence that a better offer might materialize if the Hotels were re-marketed. Indeed, the appellants have indicated that they do not rely on what the leave judge described as a "fairly continuous flow of material", the scent of which was to suggest that there were better offers waiting in the wings but were prevented from bidding because of the Receiver's abbreviated marketing process. Clearly the impression meant to be created by that late flow of material was an important factor in the leave judge's decision to grant a stay and leave to appeal: 2019 ABCA 269 at para 13.

[16] Nor, as stated previously, have the appellants been able to re-finance the Hotels notwithstanding their assessment that there is still substantial equity in the Hotels based on the appraisals. At a certain point, however, it is the market that sets the value of property and appraisals simply become "relegated to not much more than well-meant but inaccurate predictions": *Romspen Mortgage Corp v Lantzville Foothills Estates Inc*, 2013 BCSC 222 at para 20.

[17] The chambers judge was keenly alive to the abbreviated marketing period and the appraised values of the Hotels. Nevertheless, having regard to the unique nature of the property, the incomplete construction of the Development Hotel, the difficulties with prospective purchasers in branding the Hotels in an area outside of a major centre and an area which is in the midst of an economic downturn, she concluded that the Receiver acted in a commercially reasonable manner and obtained the best price possible in the circumstances. Even with an abbreviated period for submission of offers, the chambers judge reasonably concluded that the Receiver undertook an extensive marketing campaign, engaged a commercial realtor and construction consultant, and consulted and dialogued with the owner throughout the process, which process the appellants took no issue with, until the offers were received.

[18] We see no reviewable error. This ground of appeal is also dismissed.

[19] Finally, leave to appeal was also granted on whether s 193 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, and specifically s 193(a) or (c) of the Act, creates a leave to appeal as of right in these circumstances or whether leave to appeal is required pursuant to s 193(e). As the appeal was also authorized under s 193(e), we find it unnecessary to address whether this case meets the criteria for leave as of right in s 193(a)-(d) of the Act.

Appeal heard on September 3, 2019

Memorandum filed at Edmonton, Alberta
this 14th day of November, 2019

Wakeling J.A.

Pentelechuk J.A.

Authorized to sign for

Antonio J.A.

Appearances:

D.M. Nowak/J.M. Lee, Q.C.

for the Respondent, Pricewaterhousecoopers Inc. in its capacity as receiver of 1905393 Alberta Ltd.

D.R. Peskett/C.M. Young

for the Appellants

C.P. Russell, Q.C./R.T. Trainer

for the Respondent, Servus Credit Union Ltd.

S.A. Wanke

for the Respondent, Ducor Properties Ltd.

S.T. Fitzgerald (no appearance)

for the Respondent, Northern Electric Ltd.

H.S. Kandola

for the Respondent, Fancy Doors & Mouldings Ltd.

Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta

Citation: Romspen Investment Corporation v. Hargate Properties Inc., 2012 ABQB 412

Date: 20120625
Docket: 1103 17749
Registry: Edmonton

Romspen Investment Corporation

Plaintiff

- and -

**Hargate Properties Inc., 1410973 Alberta Ltd., Voipus Canada Ltd.,
1333183 Alberta Ltd., Bellavera Green Condominium Corp. and
Kevyn Ronald Frederick Also Known As Kevyn Frederick, Kevin Frederic,
Kevyn Sheldon Frederick or Kevin Frederick and
Chateau Lacombe Capital Partners Ltd.**

Defendants

Reasons for Judgment of the Honourable Mr. Justice Donald Lee

I. Background

[1] This is an application by the Receiver, D. Manning & Associates Inc. for a sealing order with respect to the Receiver's report dated June 4, 2012; as well as for directions with respect to the disbursement of certain funds recovered by the Receiver from the accounts of Chateau Lacombe Capital Partners Ltd. ["CLCPL"]. There is also an application by the primary creditor for a one day redemption order in a related foreclosure application.

[2] The Receiver's report dated June 4, 2012 provides details with respect to the ongoing sale process of the Chateau Lacombe Hotel in downtown Edmonton, including the realtors marketing reports and appraisal of the hotel. The Receiver submits that the protection of the commercial interest herein forms a proper basis for the issuance of a sealing order as there is an ongoing sales process. In the absence of the sealing order with respect to the appraisal and

marketing reports, it is submitted that there is a serious risk that the integrity of the sales process will be adversely affected and that all parties involved in this matter will suffer financially.

[3] The primary creditor in this matter, Romspen Investment Corporation (“Romspen”), supports the Receiver’s application for a sealing order. Romspen is owed approximately 35 million dollars presently, and submits that the sealing order is required to protect the confidentiality of the sales process. The second mortgagee, Allied Hospitality Services Inc., [“Allied”] also supports the sealing order application.

[4] Opposing the sealing order, however, are counsel for Dr. Singh who has claimed a first mortgage on properties known as the “Church lands.” The priority of Dr. Singh’s claim as first mortgagee on the Church lands is in dispute as Romspen received an apparent postponement in it’s favor from Dr. Singh when it financed the hotel purchase in 2010. These lands consist of 20 acres on Ellerslie Road located in a rapidly developing residential suburban area of Edmonton which the principal of CLCPL, Kevin Frederick, had purchased from the Victory Christian Church in August 2008, for 18 million dollars.

[5] Counsel for the Victory Christian Church also opposes the sealing order request, arguing that concept of “Marshalling” could be applicable with respect to the Church lands given that the Church has now received an assignment of the 12 million dollar vendor take-back mortgage given by Kevin Frederick in it’s favor at the time of the 2008 purchase by his numbered company. The Victory Christian Church advises that at the present time as a result of the current developments in the case, the 20 acres of prime Edmonton real estate sold for 18 million dollars has resulted in no realisable funds to the Church. The Church is now also the subject of a potential removal proceeding from the lands that it uses for its worship services because of Romspen’s present foreclosure application.

[6] Counsel for Dr. Singh, a retired dentist, and the Church submit that they must have access to the marketing and appraisal reports that the Receiver, Romspen, and Allied Properties already have with respect to the Chateau Lacombe Hotel site. Counsel for Dr. Singh and the Church submit that it is only through their receipt of these marketing reports and appraisal that they will be able to determine that the best price is being obtained for the Chateau Lacombe Hotel site.

[7] The present appraisal comes in at a price well below that which is owed to the creditors, so all counsel supporting the granting of the sealing order argue that no useful purpose would be served in disclosing this information any further. They further submit that it is inevitable, and in fact, they wish the Court to direct as part of another application presently before me that a redemption order for the Church property be issued setting the redemption period at one day.

[8] Counsel for Dr. Singh, the first mortgagee on the Church lands, points out that the City of Edmonton’s current valuation of the Chateau Lacombe Hotel for municipal tax purposes is approximately 32 million dollars, and at the time the hotel was purchased in 2010 it was 38 million dollars. Based on three appraisals done in 2010, the Chateau Lacombe Hotel property

was worth between 57 to 70 million dollars. The property was purchased in October 2010 for 47.8 million dollars by Mr. Frederick's company, Hargate Properties Inc. ["Hargate"], with Romspen advancing 32 million dollars, a take-back second mortgage by Allied of 11+ million dollars, and Kevin Frederick's 6 million dollar contribution. The 6 million dollars appears to have come from Dr. Singh's first mortgage loan secured on the Church lands. The Church's 12 million dollar vendor take-back mortgage on its lands from Mr. Frederick has been defaulted on and it has been assigned back to the Church, although curiously, the purchase price for the Church lands was listed at Land Titles as 10 million dollars. The Marshalling concept as I understand it involves certain other Leduc properties owned by Kevin Frederick that are also under foreclosure currently.

[9] The argument then of counsel for Dr. Singh and for the Church is that the Chateau Lacombe Hotel property could or should have a value far greater than intimated by the Receiver presently, and if there are proper marketing efforts, all creditors and primarily Romspen would benefit. However, in order to ascertain the validity of the present appraisal and marketing efforts, counsel for Dr. Singh and for the Church need access to the most current reports, which to date has been refused by the Receiver

II. Conclusion

[10] All parties agree that the relevant case law is found in the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [2002] S.C.J 42; [2002] 2 S.C.R 522 at paragraph 53 which reads as follows:

A confidentiality order under Rule 151 should only be granted when:

- (a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and
- (b) the salutary effect of the confidentiality order, including the effect on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

[11] The commercial interest as stated in *Sierra Club* is presumed in the present case, but as the Supreme Court of Canada also stated at paragraph 57 "reasonably alternative measures" requires the judge to consider whether reasonable alternatives to the confidentiality order are available as well as to restrict the order as much as reasonably possible while preserving the commercial interest in question. Counsel for the Receiver is not prepared to release the marketing and appraisals even to counsel for Dr. Singh and for the church on any basis.

[12] I conclude that the Receiver has already released the marketing reports and the appraisal to counsel for Rompsen, the primary creditor, and to counsel for the second mortgagee, Allied, with no adverse consequences, to the sales process as they are entitled to receive that information on a confidential basis. I conclude that counsel for Dr. Singh and for the Church should also be allowed to see those reports on the same confidential basis, and I am satisfied that there will be no adverse consequences as a result notwithstanding the objections of counsel for the Receiver, Rompsen and Allied Properties. It is in everyone's financial interest amongst this group including Dr. Singh and the Church to see that the Chateau Lacombe Hotel property is sold for the most monies. The release of the requested sales process and appraisal reports is no reflection that there is anything deficient in the present sales efforts which appear to have been conducted quite efficiently. It is only a recognition of the legitimate financial interest in this process of Dr. Singh and the Church.

[13] The application to Seal is granted with the exception that the documents sealed, and future related documents, will be released to counsel for Dr. Singh and for the Church confidentially, in addition to them being released to Rompsen and Allied. Pending the receipt of these reports and appraisal, including the results of the current final June 22 bidding round, the application for a one day redemption period on the Church lands pursuant to the foreclosure application presently before me, will be adjourned to July 5, 2012, at which point it will be considered.

III. The CLCPL Application

[14] With respect to counsel for BDO Canada's issues regarding the Receiver's request to distribute all of the remaining funds in that company, I understand BDO's objection to be that the Canada Revenue Agency ["CRA"] has a secured priority claims under the Wage Earning Protection Program ("WEPP"), and with respect to certain unremitted employee source deductions.

[15] Hargate Properties Inc. purchased the hotel from the previous owner, Chateau Lacombe Limited Partnership in October 2010, financing the purchase in part by a 32 million dollar loan from Rompsen. The assets purchased by Hargate formed a substantial part of the security taken by Rompsen for the loan. Additional security came from the allegedly improper/fraudulent postponement of the first mortgage on the Church lands that Dr. Singh had advanced to a numbered company controlled by Kevin Frederick. Concurrent with Hargate's acquisition of the assets of the Chateau Lacombe Hotel, unbeknownst to Rompsen even at the time I granted the original receivership order to Rompsen, in apparent contradiction in the terms of Rompsen's security documentation, CLCPL began operating the Chateau Lacombe Hotel.

[16] There were no formal agreements between Hargate and CLCPL with respect to the buyers use of Hargate's assets. CLCPL did not render any payments to Hargate for the use of the assets. CLCPL did not appear to have had any assets of its own, yet it received and retained all the revenues generated through the operation of the hotel (with the exception of some of the

revenues generated under a lease between Hargate and ImPark in relationship to the hotel's parkade.) Kevin Frederick was the principal and operating mind of both Hargate and CLCPL at all material times, and it is alleged that Mr. Frederick converted at least some of the revenues generated by the hotel to his own use.

[17] I have considered the concerns of the bankruptcy trustee of CLCPL BDO Canada Ltd. and I am satisfied that the CRA has properly been notified with respect to any priorities it may have in this matter. From the funds held by the Receiver of \$632,110.26, there will be a \$120,000 hold-back with respect to any potential WEPP claim made by the employees of CLCPL, although non-union employees were terminated by the Receiver upon his appointment. The Receiver has paid all outstanding wages since the date of their appointment, and has continued to pay vacation pay as it becomes due, payable to non-union and union employees. The hold back will also cover any costs of the Receiver-Manager prior to discharge. The Receiver shall pay \$5,985.57 to the CRA in satisfaction of its secured claim for unremitted source deductions.

[18] Additionally, the CRA shall provide the Receiver with notice of any opposition to the payout described above within 14 days of service of these directions.

[19] If the CRA does not provide notice to the Receiver within 14 days of service of these directions, then it shall be deemed forever barred from making or enforcing any claim, interest or right of any nature or kind whatsoever, whether arising by statute, at law or in equity (a "Claim") to the Funds, as well as any Claim(s) arising out of or relating to the Funds or the source of the Funds, and all such Claim(s) shall be forever extinguished, barred and released.

Heard on the 14th day of June, 2012.

Dated at the City of Edmonton, Alberta this 22nd day of June, 2012.

Donald Lee
J.C.Q.B.A.

Appearances:

Schuyler V. Wensel, Q.C.
Witten LLP
for the Plaintiff

Lindsay Miller
Field LLP
for the Second Mortgagee, Allied Hospitalities Services Inc.

Scott Stevens
Owen Bird Law Corporation
for the Receiver, D. Manning & Associates Inc.

Russel A. Rimer
Duncan & Craig LLP
for BDO Canada Ltd.

Atul Omkar
Reynolds Mirth Richards & Farmer LLP
for Dr. Singh

Lyle Brookes
Fraser Milner Casgrain LLP
for the Victory Christian Centre Inc.

CITATION: Hanfeng Evergreen Inc., (Re), 2017 ONSC 7161
COURT FILE NO.: CV-14-10667-00CL
DATE: 20171130

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

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 101 OF THE *COURTS
OF JUSTICE ACT*, R.S.O. c.C.43 (as amended)

AND IN THE MATTER OF HANFENG EVERGREEN INC.

Applicant

BEFORE: F.L. Myers J.

COUNSEL: *Daniel S. Murdoch and Haddon Murray*, counsel for Ernst & Young Inc., receiver
David C. Moore and Karen M. Mitchell, counsel for the Lei Lo and Xinduo Yu

HEARD: November 20, 2017

ENDORSEMENT

[1] Ernst & Young Inc. moves for approval of its activities as receiver and manager of Hanfeng Evergreen Inc. as described in the Supplement to its First Report, its Fourth Report, and its Fifth Report. It also seeks approval of its fees and disbursements including the fees and disbursements of its counsel here and abroad.

[2] Xinduo Yu, the founder and former CEO of Henfeng Evergreen Inc. and his spouse Lei Li oppose the approval of the receiver's reports at this time. They seek, at minimum, the imposition of conditions to protect their positions in separate litigation that the receiver has brought against them. They also argue that the receiver has failed or refused to deliver sufficient evidence to support its claim for approval of its fees and disbursements. They invite the court to require the receiver to engage in a document disclosure process so as to create a sufficient factual record on which they can make submissions and the court can meaningfully assess the fees and disbursements of the receiver and its counsel.

[3] For the reasons that follow the receiver's motion is granted on the terms set out below.

Brief Background

[4] Hanfeng Evergreen Inc. is an Ontario public corporation. Henfeng was a financing vehicle to raise money from investors who were interested in investing in the fertilizer business operated by a subsidiary in the People's Republic of China. By 2014, Henfeng's sole operations were limited to the fertilizer business.

[5] When this proceeding began, Mr. Yu was a member of the board of directors of Henfeng. He was a principal contact for the receiver. He controlled Chinese management of the business.

[6] The receiver advises that in 2011, Henfeng's biggest customer was a company run by the state in China. It sought to buy 30% of the fertilizer business to ensure its control over its supply. By February, 2013, an agreement had been prepared whereby Henfeng would sell its shares in the fertilizer subsidiary to a company controlled by Mr. Yu. Mr. Yu agreed to sell 30% of that company's shares to the state actor. The transactions were expected to close in April, 2013.

[7] The deal did not close as expected. Eventually Henfeng established a special committee representing shareholders independent of management. Acrimony developed between the special committee and Mr. Yu. In December, 2013, the purchaser terminated the transaction. The board of directors proceeded to fire Mr. Yu.

[8] A proxy battle ensued. During the proxy battle, Henfeng's auditor KPMG resigned. Thereupon, the rest of the board of directors resigned. Ultimately, Mr. Yu regained control of the public corporation.

[9] In April, 2014, Mr. Yu brought forward a transaction to sell the operating subsidiary to an established third party business in China for a price of approximately \$40 million. The transaction would have provided meaningful recovery to shareholders. The transaction required shareholder approval. However, without an auditor, Henfeng could not produce the material required to call a shareholders' meeting under Ontario securities laws. Therefore, this receivership was proposed as a way to convey title in a solvent transaction.

[10] Negotiations with the buyer proved difficult. The receiver retained the Mayer Brown law firm to help it obtain a deposit of approximately \$2.4 million required by the agreement and to deal with some Chinese regulatory matters that arose. The purchaser was also supposed to put funds in escrow. With Mayer Brown's assistance some funds were escrowed. But then they were released back to the purchaser by the escrow agent ostensibly with Mr. Yu's cooperation. In addition, the receiver says that the buyer's name seems to have changed subtly in the documents over time. While initially Mr. Yu represented that the buyer was an established third party, the ultimate buyer may have been a company with a similar name that is actually a shell controlled by Mr. Yu. Further, the receiver alleges that while the transaction was playing out, Mr. Yu obtained very substantial loans in China on the credit of the subsidiary so that they he has effectively taken the value of the business leaving the other shareholders with nothing.

[11] The receiver has sued Mr. Yu and Ms. Li for damages exceeding \$100 million.

[12] In addition, the ostensible purchaser has sued the receiver in China for the return of the \$2.4 million deposit. Mr. Yu is a defendant in that case as he is a guarantor under the terms of the relevant agreement. Whether he is also behind the plaintiff/purchaser remains to be proven.

[13] The purchaser succeeded against the receiver at first instance in China. But an appellate court overruled the first decision. As of this moment therefore, the deposit has been forfeited and

is properly counted among the funds realized by the receiver. The purchaser has appealed from that decision however and the further appeal is pending.

[14] In this receivership proceeding, Mr. Yu is concerned to ensure that the receiver does not consume the deposit on its own fees and disbursements in case it is required to return the deposit to the purchaser by the ultimate appeal court in China. If the purchaser succeeds in China, there may be a priorities dispute between the purchaser and the receiver over which has a better claim to the deposit funds in the receiver's hands. In any event, Mr. Yu argues that as guarantor of the return of the deposit, he has an interest in protecting the deposit in the receiver's hands and in minimizing or delaying the receiver's use of the deposit to pay its fees and disbursements until the Chinese litigation ends.

Approval of the Receiver's Activities

[15] In *Target Canada Co. (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 7574 (CanLII), Morawetz RSJ discussed the process for approval of the reports of a court officer. In that case the court dealt with a Monitor under the CCAA. The same principles apply in a receivership in my view.

[16] In *Target*, Morawetz RSJ recognized that the effect of the approval of the reports of a court officer varies with the context. Where a report is delivered for a specific purpose, such as a sale transaction, express findings of fact may be required to support the relief being sought. An affidavit may be delivered to support the findings or not. In either case, the court is called up to address squarely specific facts and to make specific findings that will be binding in future.

[17] However, the context of a general approval of activities, such as the motion that is currently before me, is different. As discussed by Morawetz RSJ:

[20] The Monitor has in its various reports provided commentary, some based on its own observations and work product and some based on information provided to it by the Applicant or other stakeholders. Certain aspects of the information provided by the Monitor has not been scrutinized or challenged in any formal sense. In addition, for the most part, no fact-finding process has been undertaken by the court.

[21] In circumstances where the Monitor is requesting approval of its reports and activities in a general sense, it seems to me that caution should be exercised so as to avoid a broad application of res judicata and related doctrines. The benefit of any such approval of the Monitor's reports and its activities should be limited to the Monitor itself. To the extent that approvals are provided, the effect of such approvals should not extend to the Applicant or other third parties.

[22] I recognized there are good policy and practical reasons for the court to approve of Monitor's activities and providing a level of protection for Monitors during the CCAA process. These reasons are set out in paragraph [12] above. However, in my view, the protection should be limited to the Monitor in the manner suggested by counsel to Rio Can and KingSett.

[23] By proceeding in this manner, Court approval serves the purposes set out by the Monitor above. Specifically, Court approval:

- (a) allows the Monitor to move forward with the next steps in the CCAA proceedings;
- (b) brings the Monitor's activities before the Court;
- (c) allows an opportunity for the concerns of the stakeholders to be addressed, and any problems to be rectified,
- (d) enables the Court to satisfy itself that the Monitor's activities have been conducted in prudent and diligent manners;
- (e) provides protection for the Monitor not otherwise provided by the CCAA; and
- (f) protects the creditors from the delay and distribution that would be caused by:
 - (i) re-litigation of steps taken to date, and
 - (ii) potential indemnity claims by the Monitor.

[24] By limiting the effect of the approval, the concerns of the objecting parties are addressed as the approval of Monitor's activities do not constitute approval of the activities of parties other than the Monitor.

[18] In this case, Mr. Yu and Ms. Li do not want the approval of the receiver's activities to impact on their litigation with the receiver including their desire to counterclaim against the receiver in that litigation. Apparently they have sought directions regarding a possible counterclaim although no motion for leave to proceed has been heard as yet. Regional Senior Justice Morawetz held that the general approval of a court officer's activities should not affect third party dealings generally. He accepted however that the approval of the receiver's activities does affect the court officer's own status. For example, there is case law suggesting that a stronger showing on the merits is required to obtain leave to sue a receiver in respect of activities that have been approved than for unapproved activities.¹

¹ Compare and contrast for example, *Bank of America Canada v Wilann Investments Ltd.* (1993), 23 CBR (3d) 98 (Ont. Gen. Div) with *GMAC Commercial Credit Corporation - Canada v.*

[19] Mr. Yu and Ms. Li argue that if they are prejudiced by the approval of the receiver's activities, then they would be required to contest in this motion the substance of their concerns in order to protect themselves in their other litigation. I agree that it is not the purpose of this summary proceeding to engage in fact finding that might prejudice or affect the fact finding process in other litigation. As such, there is no need to delve deeply into the concerns raised by the objectors with the receiver's characterization of their behaviour or the other details of specific issues of fact that may become the subject matter of proceedings later. There will be no findings of contested facts that might bind Mr. Yu or Ms. Li elsewhere.

[20] The receiver argues that it seeks broad, general approval for its decisions to bring litigation against Mr. Yu and Ms. Li and to defend the litigation in China. It notes that its prior activities have already been approved in relation to the approval of its earlier reports.

[21] Under the terms of its appointment order, the receiver is already authorized to litigate on behalf of the debtor generally. As such, Mr. Yu and Ms. Li argue that it does not need any further approval of its litigation activities. But, I agree with Morawetz RSJ that there are additional proposes to a court officer's reporting and the court's approval functions such as those listed in para. 23 of *Target* above. In this case for example, concerns of stakeholders can be considered and addressed in real time rather than waiting until matters are concluded some years hence. Moreover, stakeholders are given an opportunity to bring to the fore any concerns with the receiver's prudence and diligence in the issues under consideration. Here, for example, no one – not even Mr. Yu or Ms. Li - contest the prudence of the receiver's decisions to defend the deposit in China or to commence the litigation here against Mr. Yu and Ms. Li.

[22] The receiver also argues that it wants its activities approved so as to protect it from personal liability for costs in the event that it is later determined that the deposit must be returned to the purchaser with the result that the receiver may not have any assets left in the estate to fund any costs liability that it may incur. The receiver refers to the decision of Pattillo J. in *Essery Estate (Trustee of) v Essery*, 2016 ONSC 321. At para. 72 of that decision, Pattillo J. wrote:

[72] In receiverships, the general rule is that costs are awarded against a receiver personally in rare cases. Where a receiver engages in litigation in its capacity as receiver in the normal course of the receivership, it is subject to the costs in accordance with s. 131 of the CJA and Rule 57.01. To the extent that costs are awarded against a receiver they are normally covered by receivership funds or by an indemnity agreement with a

T.C.T. Logistics Inc., 2006 SCC 35 (CanLII). See also: Houlden, Morawetz & Sarra, *The 2007 Annotated Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, (Thomson Reuters, Toronto) at L§26. Whether *Wilann* remains good law after *TCT* is an issue that is not before the court today.

secured creditor. It is only when the receiver embarks on a course of action extraneous to the credit-driven relationship which effectively undermines its neutral position as an officer of the court and turn itself into a “real litigant” [*sic*] that a receiver exposes itself to costs personally: see *Akagi v Synergy Group (2000)*, 2015 ONCA 771 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 18.

[23] In my view, the receiver reads too much into this quotation. I do not read *Essery* as altering the receiver’s risk of personal liability for costs. Rather, Pattillo J. explains the court’s historic hesitation to award costs against receivers because they can bear personal liability for costs. In my view *Essery* does not create any special protection for receivers’ costs liability. Neither does the approval of a receiver’s activities provide it with any special protection in relation to costs awards in subsequent litigation. That is the reason that Pattillo J. noted that before undertaking litigation, receivers typically will consider the sufficiency of the assets under their charge to meet a costs award or obtain an indemnity from a creditor to protect themselves from the risk of adverse costs.

[24] It is clear therefore that in approving the receiver’s general activities broadly and summarily in this motion, I am not finding any facts beyond expressing satisfaction with the general scope and direction of the receiver’s activities as set out in the three reports that are before me. However, if the law post-*TCT* still provides that the approval of a receiver’s conduct raises the bar for those who seek to sue a receiver, as referenced in the footnote above, that is indeed a consequence of approval and nothing I say or do not say should affect that outcome. The fact that approval may have some effect is not a basis to withhold or deny approval. Rather it reflects the intention of the law as it applies in circumstances where the court is satisfied with the activities undertaken by its officer and with the protections that the law affords court officers in such circumstances as discussed by Morawetz RSJ above.

[25] I also do not see the existence of an outstanding appeal in China as a basis to defer or withhold approval of the receiver’s activities, especially its activities in defending and participating fully in that case. Approval does not affect the ongoing litigation in China. Neither does it affect the priorities in the deposit or authorize or embolden the receiver to distribute to itself or to its counsel funds that it currently holds. If the court in China rules that the funds are a deposit that are to be returned to the purchaser, legal results flow. As noted above, if that creates a priority issue here, that issue may have to be determined.

[26] As argument of this aspect of the motion was drawing to a close, it appeared that counsel might be able to agree upon language to resolve the issues in dispute. I invited them to advise me within 48 hours if they reached agreement. On November 22, 2017, counsel advised that while they had not agreed to resolve the objections of Mr Yu and Ms. Li, they had agreed upon some language to limit the relief granted should I determine to approve the receiver’s activities.

[27] The term agreed upon by counsel reflects the limitations that I have discussed above as follows:

THIS COURT ORDERS that the approval of the Fourth Report and the Fifth Report shall be without prejudice to any of the procedural or substantive rights of the Receiver, Xinduo Lu and Lei Li in respect of Action No. CV-16-11325-00CL, and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, shall be deemed not to constitute any finding or determination of any kind whatsoever in respect of any allegations, issues or defences in said Action.

[28] While this term does not satisfy all of the concerns of Mr. Yu and Ms. Li, it does satisfy mine. Accordingly, it is appropriate to approve the activities of the receiver as set out in the three reports that are before the court on the term set out in the immediately preceding paragraph.

Receiver's Fees

[29] In accordance with the principles set out in *Confectionately Yours Inc. (Re)*, 2002 CanLII 45059 (ON CA), the receiver delivered affidavits supporting its fees and disbursements including those of its counsel. Cross-examinations ensued. Mr. Yu and Ms. Li argue that there is insufficient disclosure of information to enable the court to determine the reasonableness of the receiver's fees and disbursements. They say they have delivered letter after letter for months seeking production of documents relating to matters set out in the receiver's invoices so as to be able to understand the work performed by the receiver and to make proper submissions on the fees and disbursements sought in relation to the work. In addition, the receiver delivered dockets (belatedly in some cases) that are heavily redacted to prevent disclosure of the subject matter of much of the work that is the subject of the docket entries.

[30] The receiver argues that the scope of its discussions with its counsel and the work being performed by its counsel on its behalf are privileged – both under lawyer client privilege and litigation privilege. I agree. Disclosing the subject matter of a meeting is essentially disclosing the communication from client to lawyer (or vice versa) concerning the topic on which advice was being sought or given. That does not mean however that the receiver is entitled to approval of its fees or disbursements without providing proper supporting evidence. If the claims of privilege prevent the court from making the assessment required, then the motion will not succeed until sufficient evidence is duly adduced to meet the required standard.

[31] In *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Diemer*, 2014 ONCA 851 (CanLII), the Court of Appeal discussed the test for assessment of a receiver's fees as follows:

[32] In *Bakemates*, this court described the purpose of the passing of a receiver's accounts and also discussed the applicable procedure. Borins J.A. stated, at para. 31, that there is an onus on the receiver to prove that the compensation for which it seeks approval is fair and reasonable. This includes the compensation claimed on behalf of its counsel. At para. 37, he observed that the accounts must disclose the total charges for each of the categories of services rendered. In addition:

The accounts should be in a form that can be easily understood by those affected by the receivership (or by the judicial officer required to assess the accounts) so that such

person can determine the amount of time spent by the receiver's employees (and others that the receiver may have hired) in respect to the various discrete aspects of the receivership.

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

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

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

[32] The Court of Appeal also noted in *Diemers* that while the calculation of billable hours times hourly rates is not the most desirable metric for conducting this review, it is the predominant methodology in the case law. Moreover, while counsel for Mr. Yu and Ms. Li submitted that this is not to be a mathematical exercise, the bulk of their complaints are essentially directed to the question of whether there has been duplication in the dockets or, more specifically, whether the claims of privilege prevent them and the court from determining with any degree of precision whether there is duplication in the dockets that ought to be excluded from the value calculus. While I certainly do not dismiss the risk of duplication in an assessment of the reasonableness of the fees, it is but one factor and not an especially important one in my view. Duplication might suggest a lack of value-added but not necessarily so in a holistic review. If an issue takes time to resolve, there may be several docket entries that look similar. That does not make them duplicative. More than one person may be involved providing different services and docket to the same issue – either at different levels of seniority or different subject matters. Reading brief docket descriptions years after complex work is performed is a poor method to learn precisely what was accomplished by any single person on any given day. A full assessment of the file accompanied by oral narrative is required to assess professional accounts. That is what

assessment officers routinely do in formal cost assessment hearings. But that is not what is anticipated or even desirable in fee approval hearings of this type.

[33] It is not lost on me that what was also at play on Mr. Yu's side of the table is possibly a desire for discovery in the other litigation or at least opening up a threat to the receiver's remuneration as a strategy to provide bargaining leverage. Thus, rather than responding to the receiver's request for the specifics of documents required or bringing their own motion (or 9:30 appointment) seeking production of documents that they actually need, Mr. Yu and Ms. Li were content to make request after request and then graciously offer to allow the receiver an adjournment to give it time to make yet further production. I have little doubt that were any further documents produced, Mr. Yu and Ms. Li would just ask for more. After all, if you want to assess what every person acting for counsel and the receiver have done every day, then every draft of every document and communication is ostensibly relevant. The eight, non-exhaustive *Belyea* factors do not require or anticipate a full fee assessment process. Mr. Yu and Ms. Li's digging for more and ever more documents ostensibly to allow them to review in minute detail the receiver's fees was misdirected from the outset.

[34] Mr. Yu and Ms. Li make much of the fact that the receiver's Ontario counsel had 27 billers on the file over a period of three years. Counsel for the receiver took me through each biller's name and role. Apart from a few students, there was one partner and an associate in each relevant area at each time. The associate generally performed the bulk of the work. As the project evolved from a consensual corporate transaction to contested litigation, the identities and focus of the partners involved changed. There is nothing untoward or even suspicious in the identification of the lawyers engaged despite the effort to evoke an emotional reaction to the overall number of billers. I am perfectly satisfied that given the complexity and evolution of the matter over time, staffing raises no significant concerns. Given the limited numbers of people involved in each specialty area, and the swing from corporate to contested litigation, duplication is not a significant issue in my view.

[35] The receiver has not provided docket level evidence of activities from its litigation counsel in China. However that lawyer was retained on a fixed fee of \$100,000. The litigation involved securing the receiver's right to keep the deposit of approximately \$2.4 million. A fee of 4% of the fund whose preservation is in issue strikes me as quite reasonable. Dockets would not assist the understanding of the flat fee account in this circumstance.

[36] Other counsel were retained for other specific purposes. Each had to be briefed so, once again, it is not surprising to see docket entries where people discuss similar things. They are instructing or reporting back to each other. Mr. Yu and Ms. Li pointed to docket entries in which telephone inter-firm communications are set out but only by one firm. The unstated implication is that unless both sides docketed the call, then the docket that was recorded is suspect and may be fraudulent. I do not know a more innocent word to characterize a docket of a call that did not happen. But Mr. Yu and Ms. Li forgot to account for the International Date Line. When one looks to see if telephone calls from this side of the globe were docketed in China on the next day, many of the calls were indeed recorded. I cannot draw an inference of fraud, or even suspicion from noting that a firm did not record every single telephone call it ostensibly received or made.

Docketing practices can differ. I did not look to see if the calls that were not recorded by both sides were recorded as being short or long duration for example. In any event, I do not see how a few calls has much impact on the assessment of the *Belyea* factors.

[37] The receiver's counsel has provided a lengthy assessment of the *Belyea* factors in para. 60 of its factum. Again, without making findings of fact on the level of cooperation or the lack thereof by Mr. Yu and Ms. Li, in my view in para. 60 the receiver provided a very fair analysis of the relevant factors and I adopt it in full.

[38] In all, I am satisfied that the fees and disbursement of the receiver, including those of its counsel, are fair, reasonable and ought to be approved as sought.

[39] Costs should be agreed upon. Barring exceptional circumstances, I would expect them to follow the event on a partial indemnity basis. If counsel cannot agree on costs then they should exchange Costs Outlines and schedule a telephone case conference through my Assistant for oral argument of costs.

F.L. Myers J.

Date: November 30, 2017

CITATION: Target Canada Co. (Re), 2015 ONSC 7574
COURT FILE NO.: CV-15-10832-00CL
DATE: 2015-12-11

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO

RE: **IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF TARGET CANADA CO., TARGET CANADA HEALTH CO., TARGET CANADA MOBILE GP CO., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY (BC) CORP., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY (ONTARIO) CORP., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY CORP., TARGET CANADA PHARMACY (SK) CORP. AND TARGET CANADA PROPERTY LLC.**

BEFORE: Regional Senior Justice Morawetz

COUNSEL: *J. Swartz and Dina Milivojevic*, for the Target Corporation

Jeremy Dacks, for the Target Canada Entities

Susan Philpott, for the Employees

Richard Swan and S. Richard Orzy, for Rio Can Management Inc. and KingSett Capital Inc.

Jay Carfagnini and Alan Mark, for Alvarez & Marsal, Monitor

Jeff Carhart, for Ginsey Industries

Lauren Epstein, for the Trustee of the Employee Trust

Lou Brzezinski and Alexandra Teodescu, for Nintendo of Canada Limited, Universal Studios, Thyssenkrupp Elevator (Canada) Limited, United Cleaning Services, RPJ Consulting Inc., Blue Vista, Farmer Brothers, East End Project, Trans Source, E One Entertainment, Foxy Originals

Linda Galessiere, for Various Landlords

ENDORSEMENT

[1] Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc., in its capacity as Monitor of the Applicants (the “Monitor”) seeks approval of Monitor’s Reports 3-18, together with the Monitor’s activities set out in each of those Reports.

[2] Such a request is not unusual. A practice has developed in proceedings under the Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act (“CCAA”) whereby the Monitor will routinely bring a

motion for such approval. In most cases, there is no opposition to such requests, and the relief is routinely granted.

[3] Such is not the case in this matter.

[4] The requested relief is opposed by Rio Can Management Inc. (“Rio Can”) and KingSett Capital Inc. (“KingSett”), two landlords of the Applicants (the “Target Canada Estates”). The position of these landlords was supported by Mr. Brzezinski on behalf of his client group and as agent for Mr. Solmon, who acts for ISSI Inc., as well as Ms. Galessiere, acting on behalf of another group of landlords.

[5] The essence of the opposition is that the request of the Monitor to obtain approval of its activities – particularly in these liquidation proceedings – is both premature and unnecessary and that providing such approval, in the absence of full and complete disclosure of all of the underlying facts, would be unfair to the creditors, especially if doing so might in future be asserted and relied upon by the Applicants, or any other party, seeking to limit or prejudice the rights of creditors or any steps they may wish to take.

[6] Further, the objecting parties submit that the requested relief is unnecessary, as the Monitor has the full protections provided to it in the Initial Order and subsequent orders, and under the CCAA.

[7] Alternatively, the objecting parties submit that if such approval is to be granted, it should be specifically limited by the following words:

“provided, however, that only the Monitor, in its personal capacity and only with respect to its own personal liability, shall be entitled to rely upon or utilize in any way such approval.”

[8] The CCAA mandates the appointment of a monitor to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company (section 11.7).

[9] The duties and functions of the monitor are set forth in Section 23(1). Section 23(2) provides a degree of protection to the monitor. The section reads as follows:

(2) Monitor not liable – if the monitor acts in good faith and takes reasonable care in preparing the report referred to in any of paragraphs (1)(b) to (d.1), the monitor is not liable for loss or damage to any person resulting from that person’s reliance on the report.

[10] Paragraphs 1(b) to (d.1) primarily relate to review and reporting issues on specific business and financial affairs of the debtor.

[11] In addition, paragraph 51 of the Amended and Restated Order provides that:

... in addition to the rights, and protections afforded the Monitor under the CCAA or as an officer of the Court, the Monitor shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of its appointment or the carrying out of the provisions of this Order, including for great certainty in the Monitor's capacity as Administrator of the Employee Trust, save and except for any gross negligence or wilful misconduct on its part.

[12] The Monitor sets out a number of reasons why it believes that the requested relief is appropriate in these circumstances. Such approval

- (a) allows the monitor and stakeholders to move forward confidently with the next step in the proceeding by fostering the orderly building-block nature of CCAA proceedings;
- (b) brings the monitor's activities in issue before the court, allowing an opportunity for the concerns of the court or stakeholders to be addressed, and any problems to be rectified in a timely way;
- (c) provides certainty and finality to processes in the CCAA proceedings and activities undertaken (eg., asset sales), all parties having been given an opportunity to raise specific objections and concerns;
- (d) enables the court, tasked with supervising the CCAA process, to satisfy itself that the monitor's court-mandated activities have been conducted in a prudent and diligent manner;
- (e) provides protection for the monitor, not otherwise provided by the CCAA; and
- (f) protects creditors from the delay in distribution that would be caused by:
 - a. re-litigation of steps taken to date; and
 - b. potential indemnity claims by the monitor.

[13] Counsel to the Monitor also submits that the doctrine of issue estoppel applies (as do related doctrines of collateral attack and abuse of process) in respect of approval of the Monitor's activities as described in its reports. Counsel submits that given the functions that court approval serves, the availability of the doctrine (and related doctrines) is important to the CCAA process. Counsel submits that actions mandated and authorized by the court, and the activities taken by the Monitor to carry them out, are not interim measure that ought to remain open for second guessing or re-litigating down the road and there is a need for finality in a CCAA process for the benefit of all stakeholders.

[14] Prior to consideration of these arguments, it is helpful to review certain aspects of the doctrine of *res judicata* and its relationship to both issue estoppel and cause of action estoppel.

The issue was recently considered in *Forrest v. Vriend*, 2015 Carswell BC 2979, where Ehrcke J. stated:

25. “TD and Vriend point out that the doctrine of *res judicata* is not limited to issue estoppel, but includes cause of action estoppel as well. The distinction between these two related components of *res judicata* was concisely explained by Cromwell J.A., as he then was, in *Hoque v. Montreal Trust Co. of Canada* (1997), 162 N.S.R. (2d) 321 (C.A.) at para. 21:

21 *Res judicata* is mainly concerned with two principles. First, there is a principle that “... prevents the contradiction of that which was determined in the previous litigation, by prohibiting the relitigation of issues already actually addressed.”: see Sopinka, Lederman and Bryant, *The Law of Evidence in Canada* (1991) at p. 997. The second principle is that parties must bring forward all of the claims and defences with respect to the cause of action at issue in the first proceeding and that, if they fail to do so, they will be barred from asserting them in a subsequent action. This “... prevents fragmentation of litigation by prohibiting the litigation of matters that were never actually addressed in the previous litigation, but which properly belonged to it.”: *ibid* at 998. Cause of action estoppel is usually concerned with the application of this second principle because its operation bars all of the issues properly belonging to the earlier litigation.

...

30. It is salutary to keep in mind Mr. Justice Cromwell’s caution against an overly broad application of cause of action estoppel. In *Hoque* at paras. 25, 30 and 37, he wrote:

25. The appellants submit, relying on these and similar statements, that cause of action estoppel is broad in scope and inflexible in application. With respect, I think this overstates the true position. In my view, this very broad language which suggests an inflexible application of cause of action estoppel to all matters that “could” have been raised does not fully reflect the present law.

....

30. The submission that all claims that could have been dealt with in the main action are barred is not borne out by the Canadian cases. With respect to matter not actually raised and decided, the

test appears to me to be that the party should have raised the matter and, in deciding whether the party should have done so, a number of factors are considered.

...

37. Although many of these authorities cite with approval the broad language of *Henderson v. Henderson, supra*, to the effect that any matter which the parties had the opportunity to raise will be barred, I think, however, that this language is somewhat too wide. The better principle is that those issues which the parties had the opportunity to raise and, in all the circumstances, should have raised, will be barred. In determining whether the matter should have been raised, a court will consider whether proceeding constitutes a collateral attack on the earlier findings, whether it simply asserts a new legal conception of facts previously litigated, whether it relies on “new” evidence that could have been discovered in the earlier proceeding with reasonable diligence, whether the two proceedings relate to separate and distinct causes of action and whether, in all the circumstances, the second proceeding constitutes an abuse of process.

[15] In this case, I accept the submission of counsel to the Monitor to the effect that the Monitor plays an integral part in balancing and protecting the various interests in the CCAA environment.

[16] Further, in this particular case, the court has specifically mandated the Monitor to undertake a number of activities, including in connection with the sale of the debtors assets. The Monitor has also, in its various Reports, provided helpful commentary to the court and to Stakeholders on the progress of the CCAA proceedings.

[17] Turning to the issue as to whether these Reports should be approved, it is important to consider how Monitor’s Reports are in fact relied upon and used by the court in arriving at certain determinations.

[18] For example, if the issue before the court is to approve a sales process or to approve a sale of assets, certain findings of fact must be made before making a determination that the sale process or the sale of assets should be approved. Evidence is generally provided by way of affidavit from a representative of the applicant and supported by commentary from the monitor in its report. The approval issue is put squarely before the court and the court must, among other things conclude that the sales process or the sale of assets is, among other things, fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

[19] On motions of the type, where the evidence is considered and findings of fact are made, the resulting decision affects the rights of all stakeholders. This is recognized in the jurisprudence with the acknowledgment that *res judicata* and related doctrines apply to approval

of a Monitor's report in these circumstances. (See: *Toronto Dominion Bank v. Preston Spring Gardens Inc.*, [2006] O.J. No. 1834 (SCJ Comm. List); *Toronto Dominion Bank v. Preston Spring Gardens Inc.*, 2007 ONCA 145 and *Bank of America Canada v. Willann Investments Limited*, [1993] O.J. No. 3039 (SCJ Gen. Div.)).

[20] The foregoing must be contrasted with the current scenario, where the Monitor seeks a general approval of its Reports. The Monitor has in its various reports provided commentary, some based on its own observations and work product and some based on information provided to it by the Applicant or other stakeholders. Certain aspects of the information provided by the Monitor has not been scrutinized or challenged in any formal sense. In addition, for the most part, no fact-finding process has been undertaken by the court.

[21] In circumstances where the Monitor is requesting approval of its reports and activities in a general sense, it seems to me that caution should be exercised so as to avoid a broad application of *res judicata* and related doctrines. The benefit of any such approval of the Monitor's reports and its activities should be limited to the Monitor itself. To the extent that approvals are provided, the effect of such approvals should not extend to the Applicant or other third parties.

[22] I recognized there are good policy and practical reasons for the court to approve of Monitor's activities and providing a level of protection for Monitors during the CCAA process. These reasons are set out in paragraph [12] above. However, in my view, the protection should be limited to the Monitor in the manner suggested by counsel to Rio Can and KingSett.

[23] By proceeding in this manner, Court approval serves the purposes set out by the Monitor above. Specifically, Court approval:

- (a) allows the Monitor to move forward with the next steps in the CCAA proceedings;
- (b) brings the Monitor's activities before the Court;
- (c) allows an opportunity for the concerns of the stakeholders to be addressed, and any problems to be rectified,
- (d) enables the Court to satisfy itself that the Monitor's activities have been conducted in prudent and diligent manners;
- (e) provides protection for the Monitor not otherwise provided by the CCAA; and
- (f) protects the creditors from the delay and distribution that would be caused by:
 - (i) re-litigation of steps taken to date, and
 - (ii) potential indemnity claims by the Monitor.

[24] By limiting the effect of the approval, the concerns of the objecting parties are addressed as the approval of Monitor's activities do not constitute approval of the activities of parties other than the Monitor.

[25] Further, limiting the effect of the approval does not impact on prior court orders which have approved other aspects of these CCAA proceedings, including the sales process and asset sales.

[26] The Monitor's Reports 3-18 are approved, but the approval the limited by the inclusion of the wording provided by counsel to Rio Can and KingSett, referenced at paragraph [7].

Regional Senior Justice G.B. Morawetz

Date: December 11, 2015