

COURT FILE NO. 1803 20754

COURT COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH
OF ALBERTA

JUDICIAL CENTRE EDMONTON

PLAINTIFFS PEACE HILL TRUST COMPANY


DEFENDANTS 1436126 ALBERTA LTD., 1406618 ALBERTA LTD. and KAREN SICOLI

DOCUMENT BRIEF OF THE BOWRA GROUP INC. IN ITS CAPACITY AS RECEIVER AND MANAGER
OF 1436126 ALBERTA LTD. AND 1406618 ALBERTA LTD.

ADDRESS FOR
SERVICE AND
CONTACT
INFORMATION OF
PARTY FILING THIS
DOCUMENT

McLennan Ross LLP
#600 McLennan Ross
Building
12220 Stony Plain Road
Edmonton, AB T5N 3Y4

Lawyer: Ryan Trainer
Telephone: (780) 482-9153
Fax: (780) 733-9790
Email: ryan.trainer@mross.com
File No.: 20212717



Introduction

1. This Brief of Law is submitted on behalf of The Bowra Group Inc. in its capacity as Court-Appointed Receiver and Manager (the “**Receiver**”) of 1436126 Alberta Ltd. and 1406618 Alberta Ltd. (collectively the “**Debtors**”) in support of an Application for an Order approving the sale of and vesting title in all of the assets (the “**Assets**”) of the Debtors in 9307800 Canada Ltd. (“**930**”) pursuant to an Asset and Real Estate Purchase Agreement (“**APA**”) between the Receiver and 930, which is appended as Confidential Appendix “2” to the First Report of the Receiver dated March 7, 2022.
2. All capitalized terms not otherwise defined in this Brief have the meanings ascribed thereto in the Receiver’s First Report and the APA attached as Confidential Appendix “2” thereto.

Order Approving Sale and Vesting Title

3. The *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985, c B-3 permits the Court to appoint a receiver to do any of the following:
 - (a) take possession of all or substantially all of the property of an insolvent person used in relation to the business carried on by the insolvent person;
 - (b) exercise any control that the Court considers advisable over the property and over the insolvent corporation’s business; and
 - (c) take any other action that the Court considers advisable.

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, RSC 1985, c B-3 (“**BIA**”), s 243(1). **TAB 1**

4. Section 247(b) of the BIA provides that a receiver shall “act honestly and in good faith” and “deal with the property of the insolvent person or the bankrupt in a commercially reasonable manner.”

BIA, s 247. **TAB 1**

5. The Ontario Court of Appeal decision of *Royal Bank v Soundair Corp.*, sets out the criteria to be applied when considering the approval of a sale or the sales process of a receiver. When considering whether an offer accepted by a receiver should be approved and ratified by the Court, the Court is to consider and determine:
 - (a) Whether the receiver made sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently;

- (b) The interests of all the parties;
- (c) The efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers were obtained; and
- (d) Whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process.

Royal Bank v Soundair Corp., 1991 CarswellOnt 205 [*Soundair*] at para 16. **TAB 2**

6. The Soundair criteria have been thoroughly incorporated into Alberta insolvency law, and confirmed by the Alberta Court of Appeal in *Bank of Montreal v River Rentals Group Ltd.*, and *1905393 Alberta Ltd. v Servus Credit Union Ltd.*

Bank of Montreal v River Rentals Group Ltd., 2010 ABCA 16 [*River Rentals*] at para 12. **TAB 3**

Pricewaterhousecoopers Inc. v 1905393 Alberta Ltd., 2019 ABCA 433 [*Servus*] at para 10. **TAB 4**

7. If the Court is satisfied that the receiver has acted providently in its efforts to sell the debtor's assets, the case law instructs that the Court should approve the sale, as the Court provides deference to the Court-appointed receiver, assuming that the receiver's course of action and recommendation is appropriate and nothing to the contrary is shown. To order otherwise improperly calls into question the receiver's expertise and authority in the receivership process, thereby compromising both the integrity of the sales process, and undermining commercial certainty.

Soundair at para 14 and 43. **TAB 2**

River Rentals at paras 18 and 19. **TAB 3**

Servus at paras 10, and 12-14. **TAB 4**

8. The Court in *Soundair* also emphasized the importance of respecting a fair process as follows:

It is most important that the integrity of procedures followed by court-appointed receivers be protected in the interests of both commercial morality and the future confidence of business persons in their dealings with receivers. Consequently, in all cases, the court should carefully scrutinize the procedure followed by the receiver to determine whether it satisfies the [four-part test]

Soundair at para 72. **TAB 2**

Sealing Order

9. The Court's authority to grant sealing orders is contemplated under Rule 6.28 and Division 4 of Part 6 of the *Alberta Rules of Court*.

Alberta Rules of Court, AR 124/2010, Division
4 of Part 6 including
Rule 6.28. **TAB 5**

10. 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 decision of *Sierra Club of Canada v Canada (Minister of Finance)* provides the guiding principles in granting sealing orders and publication ban. Justice Iacobucci of the Supreme Court of Canada accepted that these types of orders could 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 that risk; and
- b) The salutary effects of the confidentiality order outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which includes public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

*Sierra Club of Canada v Canada (Minister of
Finance)*, 2002 SCC 41
at para 45. **TAB 6**

11. In the insolvency context, it is common when assets are being sold pursuant through a court process to seal various bids and other commercially sensitive material, such as valuations, and sale price, in case a further listing is required should the contemplated Current Offer falls through.

*Romspen Investment Corporation v Hargate
Properties Inc.*, 2012 ABQB 412 at paras 2, 11,
and 13. **TAB 7**

*Look Communications Inc. v Look Mobile
Corporation*, 2009 CarswellOnt 7952 at para 17. **TAB 8**

12. Sealing orders in this context are granted to maintain fair play so that competitors and potential purchasers do not obtain an unfair advantage by obtaining such information, while others have to rely on their own resources.

887574 Ontario Inc. v Pizza Ltd., 1994
CarswellOnt 1214 at para 6. **TAB 9**

13. In *Alberta Treasury Branches v Elaborate Homes Ltd.*, Justice K.G. Nielsen (as he then was) accepted the reasons and rationale of the Ontario Courts and acknowledged that it is common practice in the insolvency context that information relating to the sale of the

assets of an insolvent corporation be kept confidential until after the sale is completed pursuant to a court order.

Alberta Treasury Branches v Elaborate Homes Ltd., 2014 ABQB 350 at para 54. **TAB 10**

14. With respect to the approval of the Receiver's fees and that of its counsel, the Ontario Court of Appeal in *Bank of Nova Scotia v Diemer*, and followed by this Court in *Servus Credit Union Ltd. v Trimove Inc.*, held that in determining whether to approve the fees of a receiver and its counsel, the court should consider whether the remuneration and disbursements incurred in carrying out the receivership were fair and reasonable. The focus of the fair and reasonable assessment should be on what was accomplished, not on how much time it took. The following factors constitute a useful guideline but are not exhaustive:
- a) the nature, extent and value of the assets;
 - b) the complications and difficulties encountered; the degree of assistance provided by the debtor;
 - c) the time spent;
 - d) the receiver's knowledge, experience and skill;
 - e) the diligence and thoroughness displayed;
 - f) the responsibilities assumed;
 - g) the results of the receiver's efforts; and
 - h) the cost of comparable services when performed in a prudent and economical manner.

Bank of Nova Scotia v Diemer, 2014 ONCA 851, 2014 CarswellOnt at paras 33 and 45. **TAB 11**


Servus Credit Union Ltd. v Trimove Inc., 2015 ABQB 745, at para 6. **TAB 12**

15. Based upon the materials filed and foregoing submission, the Receiver respectfully requests an Order:
- i. Approving of the sale of the Assets and vesting title in 930;
 - ii. Sealing the Confidential Appendices to the Receiver's First Report to the Court until June 15, 2022;

- iii. Approving the activities and the accounts of the Receiver and it's legal counsel; and
- iv. Such other relief as this Honourable Court may deem just and appropriate.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED at the City of Edmonton, in the Province of Alberta, this 7th day of March, 2022.

MCLENNAN ROSS LLP



Per: _____

Ryan Trainer,
Solicitor for The Bowra Group Inc., Court-
Appointed Receiver and Manager of
1436126 Alberta Ltd. and 1406618 Alberta
Ltd.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<i>Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act</i> , RSC 1985, c B-3 (“BIA”), s 243(1).	TAB 1
<i>Royal Bank v Soundair Corp.</i> , 1991 CarswellOnt 205 at para 16.....	TAB 2
<i>Bank of Montreal v River Rentals Group Ltd.</i> , 2010 ABCA 16 at para 12.....	TAB 3
<i>Pricewaterhousecoopers Inc. v 1905393 Alberta Ltd.</i> , 2019 ABCA 433 at para 10.....	TAB 4
<i>Alberta Rules of Court</i> , AR 124/2010, Division 4 of Part 6 including Rule 6.28.....	TAB 5
<i>Sierra Club of Canada v Canada (Minister of Finance)</i> , 2002 SCC 41 at para 45.....	TAB 6
<i>Romspen Investment Corporation v Hargate Properties Inc.</i> , 2012 ABQB 412 at paras 2, 11, and 13	TAB 7
<i>Look Communications Inc. v Look Mobile Corporation</i> , 2009 CarswellOnt 7952 at para 17.....	TAB 8
<i>887574 Ontario Inc. v Pizza Ltd.</i> , 1994 CarswellOnt 1214 at para 6.	TAB 9
<i>Alberta Treasury Branches v Elaborate Homes Ltd.</i> , 2014 ABQB 350 at para 54.....	TAB 10
<i>Bank of Nova Scotia v Diemer</i> , 2014 ONCA 851, 2014 CarswellOnt at paras 33 and 45.....	TAB 11
<i>Servus Credit Union Ltd. v Trimove Inc.</i> , 2015 ABQB 745, at para 6.....	TAB 12

TAB 1

Canada Federal Statutes
Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act
Part XI — Secured Creditors and Receivers (ss. 243-252)

Most Recently Cited in: *Business Development Bank of Canada v. Astoria Organic Matters Ltd.*, 2019 ONSC 6557, 2019 CarswellOnt 18819 | (Ont. S.C.J., Nov 13, 2019)

R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, s. 243

s 243.

Currency

243.

243(1) Court may appoint receiver

Subject to subsection (1.1), on application by a secured creditor, a court may appoint a receiver to do any or all of the following if it considers it to be just or convenient to do so:

- (a) take possession of all or substantially all of the inventory, accounts receivable or other property of an insolvent person or bankrupt that was acquired for or used in relation to a business carried on by the insolvent person or bankrupt;
- (b) exercise any control that the court considers advisable over that property and over the insolvent person's or bankrupt's business; or
- (c) take any other action that the court considers advisable.

243(1.1) Restriction on appointment of receiver

In the case of an insolvent person in respect of whose property a notice is to be sent under subsection 244(1), the court may not appoint a receiver under subsection (1) before the expiry of 10 days after the day on which the secured creditor sends the notice unless

- (a) the insolvent person consents to an earlier enforcement under subsection 244(2); or
- (b) the court considers it appropriate to appoint a receiver before then.

243(2) Definition of "receiver"

Subject to subsections (3) and (4), in this Part, "receiver" means a person who

- (a) is appointed under subsection (1); or
- (b) is appointed to take or takes possession or control — of all or substantially all of the inventory, accounts receivable or other property of an insolvent person or bankrupt that was acquired for or used in relation to a business carried on by the insolvent person or bankrupt — under
 - (i) an agreement under which property becomes subject to a security (in this Part referred to as a "security agreement"), or
 - (ii) a court order made under another Act of Parliament, or an Act of a legislature of a province, that provides for or authorizes the appointment of a receiver or receiver-manager.

Canada Federal Statutes
Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act
Part XI — Secured Creditors and Receivers (ss. 243-252)

Most Recently Cited in: [Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce \(Re\)](#), 2018 NLSC 175, 2018 CarswellNfld 331, 296 A.C.W.S. (3d) 89, 64 C.B.R. (6th) 89 | (N.L. S.C., Aug 23, 2018)

R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, s. 247

s 247. Good faith, etc.

[Currency](#)

247. Good faith, etc.

A receiver shall

- (a) act honestly and in good faith; and
- (b) deal with the property of the insolvent person or the bankrupt in a commercially reasonable manner.

Amendment History

1992, c. 27, s. 89(1)

Currency

Federal English Statutes reflect amendments current to December 12, 2019

Federal English Regulations are current to Gazette Vol. 153:24 (November 27, 2019)

--

TAB 2

Most Negative Treatment: Distinguished

Most Recent Distinguished: [PCAS Patient Care Automation Services Inc., Re](#) | 2012 ONSC 3367, 2012 CarswellOnt 7248, 91 C.B.R. (5th) 285, 216 A.C.W.S. (3d) 551 | (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List], Jun 9, 2012)

1991 CarswellOnt 205
Ontario Court of Appeal

Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.

1991 CarswellOnt 205, [1991] O.J. No. 1137, 27 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1178,
46 O.A.C. 321, 4 O.R. (3d) 1, 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 83 D.L.R. (4th) 76

**ROYAL BANK OF CANADA (plaintiff/respondent) v. SOUNDAIR CORPORATION
(respondent), CANADIAN PENSION CAPITAL LIMITED (appellant)
and CANADIAN INSURERS' CAPITAL CORPORATION (appellant)**

Goodman, McKinlay and Galligan JJ.A.

Heard: June 11, 12, 13 and 14, 1991

Judgment: July 3, 1991

Docket: Doc. CA 318/91

Counsel: *J. B. Berkow* and *S. H. Goldman* , for appellants Canadian Pension Capital Limited and Canadian Insurers' Capital Corporation.

J. T. Morin, Q.C. , for Air Canada.

L.A.J. Barnes and *L.E. Ritchie* , for plaintiff/respondent Royal Bank of Canada.

S.F. Dunphy and *G.K. Ketcheson* , for Ernst & Young Inc., receiver of respondent Soundair Corporation.

W.G. Horton , for Ontario Express Limited.

N.J. Spies , for Frontier Air Limited.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Appeal from order approving sale of assets by receiver.

Galligan J.A. :

1 This is an appeal from the order of Rosenberg J. made on May 1, 1991. By that order, he approved the sale of Air Toronto to Ontario Express Limited and Frontier Air Limited, and he dismissed a motion to approve an offer to purchase Air Toronto by 922246 Ontario Limited.

2 It is necessary at the outset to give some background to the dispute. Soundair Corporation ("Soundair") is a corporation engaged in the air transport business. It has three divisions. One of them is Air Toronto. Air Toronto operates a scheduled airline from Toronto to a number of mid-sized cities in the United States of America. Its routes serve as feeders to several of Air Canada's routes. Pursuant to a connector agreement, Air Canada provides some services to Air Toronto and benefits from the feeder traffic provided by it. The operational relationship between Air Canada and Air Toronto is a close one.

3 In the latter part of 1989 and the early part of 1990, Soundair was in financial difficulty. Soundair has two secured creditors who have an interest in the assets of Air Toronto. The Royal Bank of Canada (the "Royal Bank") is owed at least \$65 million dollars. The appellants Canadian Pension Capital Limited and Canadian Insurers' Capital Corporation (collectively called "CCFL") are owed approximately \$9,500,000. Those creditors will have a deficiency expected to be in excess of \$50 million on the winding up of Soundair.

4 On April 26, 1990, upon the motion of the Royal Bank, O'Brien J. appointed Ernst & Young Inc. (the "receiver") as receiver of all of the assets, property and undertakings of Soundair. The order required the receiver to operate Air Toronto and sell it as a going concern. Because of the close relationship between Air Toronto and Air Canada, it was contemplated that the receiver would obtain the assistance of Air Canada to operate Air Toronto. The order authorized the receiver:

(b) to enter into contractual arrangements with Air Canada to retain a manager or operator, including Air Canada, to manage and operate Air Toronto under the supervision of Ernst & Young Inc. until the completion of the sale of Air Toronto to Air Canada or other person.

Also because of the close relationship, it was expected that Air Canada would purchase Air Toronto. To that end, the order of O'Brien J. authorized the Receiver:

(c) to negotiate and do all things necessary or desirable to complete a sale of Air Toronto to Air Canada and, if a sale to Air Canada cannot be completed, to negotiate and sell Air Toronto to another person, subject to terms and conditions approved by this Court.

5 Over a period of several weeks following that order, negotiations directed towards the sale of Air Toronto took place between the receiver and Air Canada. Air Canada had an agreement with the receiver that it would have exclusive negotiating rights during that period. I do not think it is necessary to review those negotiations, but I note that Air Canada had complete access to all of the operations of Air Toronto and conducted due diligence examinations. It became thoroughly acquainted with every aspect of Air Toronto's operations.

6 Those negotiations came to an end when an offer made by Air Canada on June 19, 1990, was considered unsatisfactory by the receiver. The offer was not accepted and lapsed. Having regard to the tenor of Air Canada's negotiating stance and a letter sent by its solicitors on July 20, 1990, I think that the receiver was eminently reasonable when it decided that there was no realistic possibility of selling Air Toronto to Air Canada.

7 The receiver then looked elsewhere. Air Toronto's feeder business is very attractive, but it only has value to a national airline. The receiver concluded reasonably, therefore, that it was commercially necessary for one of Canada's two national airlines to be involved in any sale of Air Toronto. Realistically, there were only two possible purchasers, whether direct or indirect. They were Air Canada and Canadian Airlines International.

8 It was well known in the air transport industry that Air Toronto was for sale. During the months following the collapse of the negotiations with Air Canada, the receiver tried unsuccessfully to find viable purchasers. In late 1990, the receiver turned to Canadian Airlines International, the only realistic alternative. Negotiations began between them. Those negotiations led to a letter of intent dated February 11, 1990. On March 6, 1991, the receiver received an offer from Ontario Express Limited and Frontier Airlines Limited, who are subsidiaries of Canadian Airlines International. This offer is called the OEL offer.

9 In the meantime, Air Canada and CCFL were having discussions about making an offer for the purchase of Air Toronto. They formed 922246 Ontario Limited ("922") for the purpose of purchasing Air Toronto. On March 1, 1991, CCFL wrote to the receiver saying that it proposed to make an offer. On March 7, 1991, Air Canada and CCFL presented an offer to the receiver in the name of 922. For convenience, its offers are called the "922 offers."

10 The first 922 offer contained a condition which was unacceptable to the receiver. I will refer to that condition in more detail later. The receiver declined the 922 offer and on March 8, 1991, accepted the OEL offer. Subsequently, 922 obtained an order allowing it to make a second offer. It then submitted an offer which was virtually identical to that of March 7, 1991, except that the unacceptable condition had been removed.

11 The proceedings before Rosenberg J. then followed. He approved the sale to OEL and dismissed a motion for the acceptance of the 922 offer. Before Rosenberg J., and in this court, both CCFL and the Royal Bank supported the acceptance of the second 922 offer.

12 There are only two issues which must be resolved in this appeal. They are:

- (1) Did the receiver act properly when it entered into an agreement to sell Air Toronto to OEL?
- (2) What effect does the support of the 922 offer by the secured creditors have on the result?

13 I will deal with the two issues separately.

1. Did the Receiver Act Properly in Agreeing to Sell to OEL?

14 Before dealing with that issue, there are three general observations which I think I should make. The first is that the sale of an airline as a going concern is a very complex process. The best method of selling an airline at the best price is something far removed from the expertise of a court. When a court appoints a receiver to use its commercial expertise to sell an airline, it is inescapable that it intends to rely upon the receiver's expertise and not upon its own. Therefore, the court must place a great deal of confidence in the actions taken and in the opinions formed by the receiver. It should also assume that the receiver is acting properly unless the contrary is clearly shown. The second observation is that the court should be reluctant to second-guess, with the benefit of hindsight, the considered business decisions made by its receiver. The third observation which I wish to make is that the conduct of the receiver should be reviewed in the light of the specific mandate given to him by the court.

15 The order of O'Brien J. provided that if the receiver could not complete the sale to Air Canada that it was "to negotiate and sell Air Toronto to another person." The court did not say how the receiver was to negotiate the sale. It did not say it was to call for bids or conduct an auction. It told the receiver to negotiate and sell. It obviously intended, because of the unusual nature of the asset being sold, to leave the method of sale substantially in the discretion of the receiver. I think, therefore, that the court should not review minutely the process of the sale when, broadly speaking, it appears to the court to be a just process.

16 As did Rosenberg J., I adopt as correct the statement made by Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg* (1986), 60 O.R. (2d) 87, 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 320n, 22 C.P.C. (2d) 131, 39 D.L.R. (4th) 526 (H.C.), at pp. 92-94 [O.R.], of the duties which a court must perform when deciding whether a receiver who has sold a property acted properly. When he set out the court's duties, he did not put them in any order of priority, nor do I. I summarize those duties as follows:

1. It should consider whether the receiver has made a sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently.
2. It should consider the interests of all parties.
3. It should consider the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers are obtained.
4. It should consider whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process.

17 I intend to discuss the performance of those duties separately.

1. Did the Receiver make a sufficient effort to get the best price and did it act providently?

18 Having regard to the fact that it was highly unlikely that a commercially viable sale could be made to anyone but the two national airlines, or to someone supported by either of them, it is my view that the receiver acted wisely and reasonably when it negotiated only with Air Canada and Canadian Airlines International. Furthermore, when Air Canada said that it would submit no further offers and gave the impression that it would not participate further in the receiver's efforts to sell, the only course reasonably open to the receiver was to negotiate with Canadian Airlines International. Realistically, there was nowhere else to go but to Canadian Airlines International. In doing so, it is my opinion that the receiver made sufficient efforts to sell the airline.

19 When the receiver got the OEL offer on March 6, 1991, it was over 10 months since it had been charged with the responsibility of selling Air Toronto. Until then, the receiver had not received one offer which it thought was acceptable. After substantial efforts to sell the airline over that period, I find it difficult to think that the receiver acted improvidently in accepting the only acceptable offer which it had.

39 It is well established that the primary interest is that of the creditors of the debtor: see *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, supra, and *Re Selkirk*, supra (Saunders J.). However, as Saunders J. pointed out in *Re Beauty Counsellors*, supra at p. 244 [C.B.R.], "it is not the only or overriding consideration."

40 In my opinion, there are other persons whose interests require consideration. In an appropriate case, the interests of the debtor must be taken into account. I think also, in a case such as this, where a purchaser has bargained at some length and doubtless at considerable expense with the receiver, the interests of the purchaser ought to be taken into account. While it is not explicitly stated in such cases as *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, supra, *Re Selkirk* (1986), supra, *Re Beauty Counsellors*, supra, *Re Selkirk* (1987), supra, and (*Cameron*), supra, I think they clearly imply that the interests of a person who has negotiated an agreement with a court-appointed receiver are very important.

41 In this case, the interests of all parties who would have an interest in the process were considered by the receiver and by Rosenberg J.

3. Consideration of the Efficacy and Integrity of the Process by which the Offer was Obtained

42 While it is accepted that the primary concern of a receiver is the protecting of the interests of the creditors, there is a secondary but very important consideration, and that is the integrity of the process by which the sale is effected. This is particularly so in the case of a sale of such a unique asset as an airline as a going concern.

43 The importance of a court protecting the integrity of the process has been stated in a number of cases. First, I refer to *Re Selkirk*, supra, where Saunders J. said at p. 246 [C.B.R.]:

In dealing with the request for approval, the court has to be concerned primarily with protecting the interest of the creditors of the former bankrupt. A secondary but important consideration is that the process under which the sale agreement is arrived at should be consistent with commercial efficacy and integrity.

In that connection I adopt the principles stated by Macdonald J.A. of the Nova Scotia Supreme Court (Appeal Division) in *Cameron v. Bank of N.S.* (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303, 86 A.P.R. 303 (C.A.), where he said at p. 11:

In my opinion if the decision of the receiver to enter into an agreement of sale, subject to court approval, with respect to certain assets is reasonable and sound under the circumstances at the time existing it should not be set aside simply because a later and higher bid is made. To do so would literally create chaos in the commercial world and receivers and purchasers would never be sure they had a binding agreement. On the contrary, they would know that other bids could be received and considered up until the application for court approval is heard — this would be an intolerable situation.

While those remarks may have been made in the context of a bidding situation rather than a private sale, I consider them to be equally applicable to a negotiation process leading to a private sale. Where the court is concerned with the disposition of property, the purpose of appointing a receiver is to have the receiver do the work that the court would otherwise have to do.

44 In *Salima Investments Ltd. v. Bank of Montreal* (1985), 59 C.B.R. (N.S.) 242, 41 Alta. L.R. (2d) 58, 65 A.R. 372, 21 D.L.R. (4th) 473 at p. 476 [D.L.R.], the Alberta Court of Appeal said that sale by tender is not necessarily the best way to sell a business as an ongoing concern. It went on to say that when some other method is used which is provident, the court should not undermine the process by refusing to confirm the sale.

45 Finally, I refer to the reasoning of Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, supra, at p. 124 [O.R.]:

While every proper effort must always be made to assure maximum recovery consistent with the limitations inherent in the process, no method has yet been devised to entirely eliminate those limitations or to avoid their consequences. *Certainly it is not to be found in loosening the entire foundation of the system. Thus to compare the results of the process in this case with what might have been recovered in some other set of circumstances is neither logical nor practical.*

[Emphasis added.]

46 It is my opinion that the court must exercise extreme caution before it interferes with the process adopted by a receiver to sell an unusual asset. It is important that prospective purchasers know that, if they are acting in good faith, bargain seriously with a receiver and enter into an agreement with it, a court will not lightly interfere with the commercial judgment of the receiver to sell the asset to them.

47 Before this court, counsel for those opposing the confirmation of the sale to OEL suggested many different ways in which the receiver could have conducted the process other than the way which he did. However, the evidence does not convince me that the receiver used an improper method of attempting to sell the airline. The answer to those submissions is found in the comment of Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, supra, at p. 109 [O.R.]:

The court ought not to sit as on appeal from the decision of the Receiver, reviewing in minute detail every element of the process by which the decision is reached. To do so would be a futile and duplicitous exercise.

48 It would be a futile and duplicitous exercise for this court to examine in minute detail all of circumstances leading up to the acceptance of the OEL offer. Having considered the process adopted by the receiver, it is my opinion that the process adopted was a reasonable and prudent one.

4. Was there unfairness in the process?

49 As a general rule, I do not think it appropriate for the court to go into the minutia of the process or of the selling strategy adopted by the receiver. However, the court has a responsibility to decide whether the process was fair. The only part of this process which I could find that might give even a superficial impression of unfairness is the failure of the receiver to give an offering memorandum to those who expressed an interest in the purchase of Air Toronto.

50 I will outline the circumstances which relate to the allegation that the receiver was unfair in failing to provide an offering memorandum. In the latter part of 1990, as part of its selling strategy, the receiver was in the process of preparing an offering memorandum to give to persons who expressed an interest in the purchase of Air Toronto. The offering memorandum got as far as draft form, but was never released to anyone, although a copy of the draft eventually got into the hands of CCFL before it submitted the first 922 offer on March 7, 1991. A copy of the offering memorandum forms part of the record, and it seems to me to be little more than puffery, without any hard information which a sophisticated purchaser would require in or der to make a serious bid.

51 The offering memorandum had not been completed by February 11, 1991. On that date, the receiver entered into the letter of intent to negotiate with OEL. The letter of intent contained a provision that during its currency the receiver would not negotiate with any other party. The letter of intent was renewed from time to time until the OEL offer was received on March 6, 1991.

52 The receiver did not proceed with the offering memorandum because to do so would violate the spirit, if not the letter, of its letter of intent with OEL.

53 I do not think that the conduct of the receiver shows any unfairness towards 922. When I speak of 922, I do so in the context that Air Canada and CCFL are identified with it. I start by saying that the receiver acted reasonably when it entered into exclusive negotiations with OEL. I find it strange that a company, with which Air Canada is closely and intimately involved, would say that it was unfair for the receiver to enter into a time-limited agreement to negotiate exclusively with OEL. That is precisely the arrangement which Air Canada insisted upon when it negotiated with the receiver in the spring and summer of 1990. If it was not unfair for Air Canada to have such an agreement, I do not understand why it was unfair for OEL to have a similar one. In fact, both Air Canada and OEL in its turn were acting reasonably when they required exclusive negotiating rights to prevent their negotiations from being used as a bargaining lever with other potential purchasers. The fact that Air Canada insisted upon an exclusive negotiating right while it was negotiating with the receiver demonstrates the commercial efficacy of

was given to this receiver to sell this airline if the support by these creditors of the 922 offer were permitted to carry the day. I give no weight to the support which they give to the 922 offer.

69 In its factum, the receiver pointed out that, because of greater liabilities imposed upon private receivers by various statutes such as the *Employment Standards Act*, R.S.O. 1980, c. 137, and the *Environmental Protection Act*, R.S.O. 1980, c. 141, it is likely that more and more the courts will be asked to appoint receivers in insolvencies. In those circumstances, I think that creditors who ask for court-appointed receivers and business people who choose to deal with those receivers should know that if those receivers act properly and providently, their decisions and judgments will be given great weight by the courts who appoint them. I have decided this appeal in the way I have in order to assure business people who deal with court-appointed receivers that they can have confidence that an agreement which they make with a court-appointed receiver will be far more than a platform upon which others may bargain at the court approval stage. I think that persons who enter into agreements with court-appointed receivers, following a disposition procedure that is appropriate given the nature of the assets involved, should expect that their bargain will be confirmed by the court.

70 The process is very important. It should be carefully protected so that the ability of court-appointed receivers to negotiate the best price possible is strengthened and supported. Because this receiver acted properly and providently in entering into the OEL agreement, I am of the opinion that Rosenberg J. was right when he approved the sale to OEL and dismissed the motion to approve the 922 offer.

71 I would, accordingly, dismiss the appeal. I would award the receiver, OEL and Frontier Airlines Limited their costs out of the Soundair estate, those of the receiver on a solicitor-client scale. I would make no order as to the costs of any of the other parties or intervenors.

McKinlay J.A. :

72 I agree with Galligan J.A. in result, but wish to emphasize that I do so on the basis that the undertaking being sold in this case was of a very special and unusual nature. It is most important that the integrity of procedures followed by court-appointed receivers be protected in the interests of both commercial morality and the future confidence of business persons in their dealings with receivers. Consequently, in all cases, the court should carefully scrutinize the procedure followed by the receiver to determine whether it satisfies the tests set out by Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg* (1986), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 320n, 60 O.R. (2d) 87, 22 C.P.C. (2d) 131, 39 D.L.R. (4th) 526 (H.C.). While the procedure carried out by the receiver in this case, as described by Galligan J.A., was appropriate, given the unfolding of events and the unique nature of the assets involved, it is not a procedure that is likely to be appropriate in many receivership sales.

73 I should like to add that where there is a small number of creditors who are the only parties with a real interest in the proceeds of the sale (i.e., where it is clear that the highest price attainable would result in recovery so low that no other creditors, shareholders, guarantors, etc., could possibly benefit therefore), the wishes of the interested creditors should be very seriously considered by the receiver. It is true, as Galligan J.A. points out, that in seeking the court appointment of a receiver, the moving parties also seek the protection of the court in carrying out the receiver's functions. However, it is also true that in utilizing the court process, the moving parties have opened the whole process to detailed scrutiny by all involved, and have probably added significantly to their costs and consequent shortfall as a result of so doing. The adoption of the court process should in no way diminish the rights of any party, and most certainly not the rights of the only parties with a real interest. Where a receiver asks for court approval of a sale which is opposed by the only parties in interest, the court should scrutinize with great care the procedure followed by the receiver. I agree with Galligan J.A. that in this case that was done. I am satisfied that the rights of all parties were properly considered by the receiver, by the learned motions court judge, and by Galligan J.A.

Goodman J.A. (dissenting):

74 I have had the opportunity of reading the reasons for judgment herein of Galligan and McKinlay J.A. Respectfully, I am unable to agree with their conclusion.

--

TAB 3

2010 ABCA 16
Alberta Court of Appeal

Bank of Montreal v. River Rentals Group Ltd.

2010 CarswellAlta 57, 2010 ABCA 16, [2010] A.J. No. 12, 184 A.C.W.S. (3d)
686, 18 Alta. L.R. (5th) 201, 469 A.R. 333, 470 W.A.C. 333, 63 C.B.R. (5th) 26

Bank of Montreal (Not a Party To the Appeal / Plaintiff) and River Rentals Group Ltd., Taves Contractors Ltd. and McTaves Inc. (Respondent / Defendant) and Hutterian Brethren Church of Codesa (Appellant / Other) and Bill McCulloch and Associates Inc. (Respondent / Other) and Don Warkentin (Respondent / Other)

Ronald Berger, Patricia Rowbotham JJ.A., R. Paul Belzil J. (ad hoc)

Heard: January 7, 2010

Judgment: January 18, 2010

Docket: Edmonton Appeal 0903-0191-AC, 0903-0236-AC

Counsel: D.R. Bieganek for Respondent, River Rentals Group, Taves Contractors Ltd., McTaves Inc., Bill McCulloch and Associates Inc.

G.D. Chrenek for Appellant, Hutterian Brethren Church of Codesa

T.M. Warner for Respondent, Don Warkentin

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

APPEAL by bidder from orders extending deadline to submit revised offers to purchase property and approving sale of property to another bidder.

Per curiam:

1 At the hearing of this appeal, we announced that the appeal is allowed with reasons to follow.

2 Bill McCulloch and Associates Inc. is the court-appointed Interim Receiver and/or Receiver Manager of the corporate Respondents ("the Taves Group") by order dated March 5, 2009. Prior to that date, the Receiver had become Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Taves Group.

3 The Receiver issued an information package and called for offers to purchase the assets of the Taves Group which included a property known as the Birch Hills Lands. The call for offers was dated April 17, 2009. The deadline for submission of offers was on or before May 7, 2009 (the tender closing date).

4 On June 2, 2009, the Receiver brought an application before Wachowich C.J.Q.B. to approve the sale of the Birch Hills Lands to the Appellant. The Appellant's offer was \$2,205,000. An appraisal concluded that the most probable sale price was \$1,560,000. Counsel for the Receiver explained that "the Receiver did effect wide advertizing in local and national newspapers. Sent out 160 tender packages and made the tender package available on the Receiver's website." (A.B. Record Digest, 3/30-33)

5 Fifteen offers were received on the Birch Hills Lands, six of which were for the entirety of the parcel.

6 In his submission to the Chief Justice, counsel for the Receiver stated:

Now, what we have advised the party that we're looking to accept is that we can't put them in possession yet until the Court approves the offer. That has caused some angst given the time of year and it is agricultural land, but we're not in

a position to put people on the land before we get court approval to do so. So — and that's fine, they're still — they're still at the table so we're good with that.

The offer that the Receiver is recommending acceptance of is — was from the Hutterite Church of Codesa. That offer was for \$2,205,000 ... the offer is very significant ... it was an excellent offer.

(A.B. Record Digest, 5/46 -6/19)

7 In considering other tenders with respect to other portions of the property of the Taves Group, the Chief Justice expressed his views regarding the importance of adhering to the integrity of the tender process:

You know, we ran a tender process, tender process is meant to be — there are certain rules. It is like, you do not change the rules of baseball or football during the middle of the game. This is the same thing except in this particular case the Court is prepared to exercise the — its inherent jurisdiction to extend the time in Mr. Taves' position. But I — you know, I could be the person who says no, Mr. Taves, you were late, I am sorry. Next time use Fed Ex.(Appeal Record Digest, 12/11-19)

And further:

We could be coming back right and left. I am inclined, you know, to grant the applications as submitted on these tenders because the tender process was followed properly. That was the market at the time, this is the people that — this is how they bid. You know, circumstances change and when circumstances change, somebody is the beneficiary of it, some — somebody is the loser on this. But the rules were adhered to and having the rules adhered to if, you know — if you want to — if you want to go to the Court of Appeal after the order is entered and say to the Court of Appeal, guess what, oil is now at \$90, we want this one resubmitted. And if those five people are wise enough to accept that argument, then good luck to you but — but you know, I am inclined to say we follow a process, the law has to be certain. The law has to be definite. This is what we did and we complied.(Appeal Record Digest, 12/40-13/8)

8 One of the persons who had tendered an offer to purchase the Birch Hills Lands was the Respondent Don Warkentin. Counsel for the guarantor, Mr. Orrin Toews, addressed the Court. He explained that Mr. Warkentin had submitted an offer of \$2.1 million "on the understanding that he would be receiving possession of the property sometime in the fall." Counsel further explained that "I believe it was the Receiver while during the initial auction, that it was brought to his attention on May 21st that he would in fact get possession of the property much earlier than he was anticipating. And on that basis he increased his bid by 200,000 which brings his offer to 2.3 million dollars cash." (A.B. Record Digest, 13/27-36) He submitted that Mr. Warkentin's offer be accepted.

9 In response, counsel for the Receiver advised the Court that he had been in written communication with counsel for Mr. Warkentin "and there was no indication in that correspondence that he thought he would get [possession of the lands] in the fall." (Appeal Record Digest, 14/18-20) He added: "I think the tender package is clear that the way it was supposed to close is after the appeal periods on any order has expired. ... So how anybody could reasonably conceive that possession wouldn't be granted until the fall based on that escapes me." (Appeal Record Digest, 14/20-25) He further added: "But the bottom line was at the time tenders closed, Mr. [Warkentin]'s offer was found wanting." (Appeal Record Digest, 14/36-38)

10 On the basis of that information, the Court ruled as follows:

Well, you know, rather than adjourning it to hear from Mr. Carter, what I am — what I am inclined to do with that piece of property, because of — is — because of an uncertainty as to occupation, dates of occupation or potential lease or whatever it may be, it is too late to put in the crop right now anyway so — ... Retender on this one and make it clear in the tender.

(Appeal Record Digest, 15/7-19)

11 Wachowich, C.J. then granted an order extending the deadline to submit revised offers to purchase the Birch Hills Lands; with submissions restricted to the Appellant and Warkentin. During this extension period, Warkentin submitted a bid higher

than the Appellant's. The Appellant did not increase its original offer. Subsequently, on June 17, 2009, Wachowich, C.J. granted an order directing that the Birch Hills Lands be sold to Warkentin. An application by the Appellant to reconsider the June 17, 2009 order was dismissed. The Court also granted a stay order for parts of the June 2 order and the entirety of its June 17 order, pending the determination of the appeal of the June 2 order. The Appellant appealed the June 2 order on July 22, 2009; and appealed the June 17 order on August 13, 2009 (the appeals were consolidated on August 20, 2009).

12 On applications by a Receiver for approval of a sale, the Court should consider whether the Receiver has acted properly. 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.

Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp. (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. C.A.) at para. 16

13 The Court should consider the following factors to determine if the Receiver has acted improvidently or failed to get 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.

Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia (1981), 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303 (N.S. C.A.)

Salima Investments Ltd. v. Bank of Montreal (1985), 65 A.R. 372 (Alta. C.A.) at para. 12.

14 The central issue in this appeal is whether the chambers judge, mindful of the record before him, should have permitted rebidding and whether he should have thereafter entertained and accepted the higher offer of \$2.51 million plus GST tendered by Mr. Warkentin during the extension period.

15 The relevance of higher offers after the close of process was considered by the Ontario Court of Appeal in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.*, *supra*. Upon review of the jurisprudence, the Court stated at para. 30:

What those cases show is that the prices in other offers have relevance only if they show that the price contained in the offer accepted by the receiver was so unreasonably low as to demonstrate that the receiver was improvident in accepting it. ...

16 The chambers judge made no such finding. Indeed, he made no assessment whatever of the conduct of the Receiver. The only evidence before the Court at the June 2, 2009 application was the Receiver's fifth report and the affidavit of Orrin Toews who proffered no evidence that the Receiver acted improvidently in accepting the offer of the Appellant.

17 Moreover, the June 2, 2009 order neither considers the interests of the Appellant as the highest bidder nor the interests of others who made compliant, but unsuccessful, bids to purchase the Birch Hills Lands pursuant to the call for offers.

18 This Court has consistently favoured an approach that preserves the integrity of the process. See *Salima Investments Ltd.*, *supra*, and *Royal Bank v. Fracmaster Ltd.*, 1999 ABCA 178, 244 A.R. 93 (Alta. C.A.).

19 That was also the view of the Nova Scotia Supreme Court (Appeal Division) in *Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia, supra*, at para. 35:

In my opinion if the decision of the receiver to enter into an agreement of sale, subject to court approval, with respect to certain assets is reasonable and sound under the circumstances at the time existing it should not be set aside simply because a later and a higher bid is made. To do so would literally create chaos in the commercial world and receivers and purchasers would never be sure they had a binding agreement. On the contrary, they would know that other bids could be received and considered up until the application for court approval is heard - this would be an intolerable situation. ...

20 In addition, there was no cogent evidence before the chambers judge of any unfairness to Warkentin. On the contrary, the impugned order of June 2 conferred an advantage upon Warkentin who then knew the price that had previously been offered by the Appellant when re-tendering his offer.

21 In cases involving the Court's consideration of the approval of the sale of assets by a court-appointed Receiver, decisions made by a chambers judge involve a measure of discretion and "are owed considerable deference". The Court will interfere only if it concludes that the chambers judge acted unreasonably, erred in principle, or made a manifest error.

22 In our opinion, the chambers judge erred in principle and on insufficient evidence ordered that the property in question be the subject of an extended re-tendering process. The appeal is allowed. An order will go setting aside paras. 26 through 32 of the June 2, 2009 and the June 17, 2009 orders, and approving the tender of the Appellant on the terms and conditions upon which the Receiver originally sought approval.

Appeal allowed.

TAB 4

2019 ABCA 433
Alberta Court of Appeal

Pricewaterhousecoopers Inc v. 1905393 Alberta Ltd

2019 CarswellAlta 2418, 2019 ABCA 433, [2019] A.W.L.D. 4519, 312 A.C.W.S. (3d) 237

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)

Thomas W. Wakeling, Dawn Pentelechuk, Jolaine Antonio JJ.A.

Heard: September 3, 2019
Judgment: November 14, 2019
Docket: Edmonton Appeal 1903-0134-AC

Counsel: D.M. Nowak, J.M. Lee, Q.C., for Respondent, Pricewaterhousecoopers Inc. in its capacity as receiver of 1905393 Alberta Ltd.

D.R. Peskett, C.M. Young, for Appellants

C.P. Russell, Q.C., R.T. Trainer, for Respondent, Servus Credit Union Ltd.

S.A. Wanke, for Respondent, Ducor Properties Ltd.

S.T. Fitzgerald, for Respondent, Northern Electric Ltd.

H.S. Kandola, for Respondent, Fancy Doors & Mouldings Ltd.

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency

APPEAL by appellants from Approval and Vesting Order which approved sale proposed in Asset Purchase Agreement between receiver, PWC, and respondent, D Ltd.

Per curiam:

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. Servus Credit Union Ltd*, [2019] A.J. No. 895, 2019 ABCA 269 (Alta. C.A.). 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. R.J.K. Power Systems Ltd.*, 2002 ABCA 201 (Alta. C.A.) at para 4, (2002), 317 A.R. 192 (Alta. C.A.).

10 As regards the first question, the parties agree that Court approval requires the Receiver to satisfy the well-known test in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.*, [1991] O.J. No. 1137 (Ont. C.A.) at para 16, (1991), 46 O.A.C. 321 (Ont. C.A.) ("*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 (Alta. C.A.) at para 13, (2010), 469 A.R. 333 (Alta. C.A.), 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 A.R. 372 (Alta. C.A.) 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: *Skyepharm PLC v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp.* (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 87 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para 4, [1999] O.J. No. 4300 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), aff'd on appeal (2000), 15 C.B.R. (4th) 298 (Ont. C.A.).

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 (Alta. C.A.) 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 2222 (B.C. S.C.) 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 dismissed.

--

TAB 5

Alberta Rules

Alta. Reg. 124/2010 — Alberta Rules of Court

Part 6 — Resolving Issues and Preserving Rights

Division 4 — Restriction on Media Reporting and Public Access to Court Proceedings

Most Recently Cited in: *R. v. Vader*, 2018 ABCA 389, 2018 CarswellAlta 2754, 151 W.C.B. (2d) 315, [2019] A.W.L.D. 80 | (Alta. C.A., Nov 22, 2018)

Alta. Reg. 124/2010, s. 6.28

s 6.28 Application of this Division

Currency

6.28 Application of this Division

Unless an enactment otherwise provides or the Court otherwise orders, this Division applies to an application for an order

- (a) to ban publication of court proceedings,
- (b) to seal or partially seal a court file,
- (c) permitting a person to give evidence in a way that prevents that person or another person from being identified,
- (d) for a hearing from which the public is excluded, or
- (e) for use of a pseudonym.

Currency

Alberta Current to Gazette Vol. 115:22 (November 30, 2019)

Alberta Rules

Alta. Reg. 124/2010 — Alberta Rules of Court

Part 6 — Resolving Issues and Preserving Rights

Division 4 — Restriction on Media Reporting and Public Access to Court Proceedings

Most Recently Cited in: *C. (L.) v. Alberta*, 2014 ABQB 557, 2014 CarswellAlta 1570, 6 Alta. L.R. (6th) 138, 61 C.P.C. (7th) 286, 596 A.R. 335, [2014] A.W.L.D. 4459, 245 A.C.W.S. (3d) 800 | (Alta. Q.B., Sep 9, 2014)

Alta. Reg. 124/2010, s. 6.29

s 6.29 Restricted court access applications and orders

Currency

6.29 Restricted court access applications and orders

An application under this Division is to be known as a restricted court access application and an order made under this Division is to be known as a restricted court access order.

Currency

Alberta Current to Gazette Vol. 115:22 (November 30, 2019)

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

Alberta Rules

Alta. Reg. 124/2010 — Alberta Rules of Court

Part 6 — Resolving Issues and Preserving Rights

Division 4 — Restriction on Media Reporting and Public Access to Court Proceedings

Most Recently Cited in: *C. (L.) v. Alberta*, 2014 ABQB 557, 2014 CarswellAlta 1570, 6 Alta. L.R. (6th) 138, 61 C.P.C. (7th) 286, 596 A.R. 335, [2014] A.W.L.D. 4459, 245 A.C.W.S. (3d) 800 | (Alta. Q.B., Sep 9, 2014)

Alta. Reg. 124/2010, s. 6.30

s 6.30 When restricted court access application may be filed

Currency

6.30 When restricted court access application may be filed

A person may file a restricted court access application only if a judge has authority to make a restricted court access order under an enactment or at common law.

Currency

Alberta Current to Gazette Vol. 115:22 (November 30, 2019)

Alberta Rules

Alta. Reg. 124/2010 — Alberta Rules of Court

Part 6 — Resolving Issues and Preserving Rights

Division 4 — Restriction on Media Reporting and Public Access to Court Proceedings

Most Recently Cited in: *C. (L.) v. Alberta*, 2014 ABQB 557, 2014 CarswellAlta 1570, 6 Alta. L.R. (6th) 138, 61 C.P.C. (7th) 286, 596 A.R. 335, [2014] A.W.L.D. 4459, 245 A.C.W.S. (3d) 800 | (Alta. Q.B., Sep 9, 2014)

Alta. Reg. 124/2010, s. 6.31

s 6.31 Timing of application and service

Currency

6.31 Timing of application and service

An applicant for a restricted court access order must, 5 days or more before the date scheduled for the hearing, trial or proceeding in respect of which the order is sought,

- (a) file the application in Form 32, and
- (b) unless the Court otherwise orders, serve every party and any other person named or described by the Court.

Currency

Alberta Current to Gazette Vol. 115:22 (November 30, 2019)

Alberta Rules

Alta. Reg. 124/2010 — Alberta Rules of Court

Part 6 — Resolving Issues and Preserving Rights

Division 4 — Restriction on Media Reporting and Public Access to Court Proceedings

Most Recently Cited in: *Sidhu v. Lieutenant-Governor of Alberta*, 2018 ABCA 284, 2018 CarswellAlta 1876, [2018] A.W.L.D. 3677, 296 A.C.W.S. (3d) 9 | (Alta. C.A., Sep 10, 2018)

Alta. Reg. 124/2010, s. 6.32

s 6.32 Notice to media

Currency

6.32 Notice to media

When a restricted court access application is filed, a copy of it must be served on the court clerk, who must, in accordance with the direction of the Chief Justice, give notice of the application to

- (a) the electronic and print media identified or described by the Chief Justice, and
- (b) any other person named by the Court.

Amendment History

Alta. Reg. 163/2010, s. 3

Currency

Alberta Current to Gazette Vol. 115:22 (November 30, 2019)

Alberta Rules

Alta. Reg. 124/2010 — Alberta Rules of Court

Part 6 — Resolving Issues and Preserving Rights

Division 4 — Restriction on Media Reporting and Public Access to Court Proceedings

Most Recently Cited in: *C. (L.) v. Alberta*, 2014 ABQB 557, 2014 CarswellAlta 1570, 6 Alta. L.R. (6th) 138, 61 C.P.C. (7th) 286, 596 A.R. 335, [2014] A.W.L.D. 4459, 245 A.C.W.S. (3d) 800 | (Alta. Q.B., Sep 9, 2014)

Alta. Reg. 124/2010, s. 6.33

s 6.33 Judge assigned to application

Currency

6.33 Judge assigned to application

A restricted court access application must be heard and decided by

- (a) the judge assigned to hear the application, trial or other proceeding in respect of which the restricted court access order is sought,
- (b) if the assigned judge is not available or no judge has been assigned, the case management judge for the action, or
- (c) if there is no judge available to hear the application as set out in clause (a) or (b), the Chief Justice or a judge designated for the purpose by the Chief Justice.

Currency

Alberta Current to Gazette Vol. 115:22 (November 30, 2019)

Alberta Rules

Alta. Reg. 124/2010 — Alberta Rules of Court

Part 6 — Resolving Issues and Preserving Rights

Division 4 — Restriction on Media Reporting and Public Access to Court Proceedings

Most Recently Cited in: [473440 Alberta Ltd v. Lenaco Homes Masterbuilder Inc](#), 2017 ABQB 538, 2017 CarswellAlta 1610, 13 C.P.C. (8th) 140, [2017] A.W.L.D. 5051, 284 A.C.W.S. (3d) 524 | (Alta. Q.B., Sep 6, 2017)

Alta. Reg. 124/2010, s. 6.34

s 6.34 Application to seal or unseal court files

Currency

6.34 Application to seal or unseal court files

6.34(1) An application to seal an entire court file or an application to set aside all or any part of an order to seal a court file must be filed.

6.34(2) The application must be made to

- (a) the Chief Justice, or
- (b) a judge designated to hear applications under subrule (1) by the Chief Justice.

6.34(3) The Court may direct

- (a) on whom the application must be served and when,
- (b) how the application is to be served, and
- (c) any other matter that the circumstances require.

Currency

Alberta Current to Gazette Vol. 115:22 (November 30, 2019)

Alberta Rules

Alta. Reg. 124/2010 — Alberta Rules of Court

Part 6 — Resolving Issues and Preserving Rights

Division 4 — Restriction on Media Reporting and Public Access to Court Proceedings

Most Recently Cited in: [Chemtrade Electrochem Inc v. Stikeman Elliott LLP](#), 2019 ABQB 562, 2019 CarswellAlta 1503, [2019] A.W.L.D. 3251, [2019] A.W.L.D. 3252, [2019] A.W.L.D. 3262, 38 C.P.C. (8th) 71, 308 A.C.W.S. (3d) 723 | (Alta. Q.B., Jul 24, 2019)

Alta. Reg. 124/2010, s. 6.35

s 6.35 Persons having standing at application

Currency

6.35 Persons having standing at application

The following persons have standing to be heard when a restricted court access application is considered

- (a) a person who was served or given notice of the application;
- (b) any other person recognized by the Court who claims to have an interest in the application, trial or proceeding and whom the Court permits to be heard.

Currency

Alberta Current to Gazette Vol. 115:22 (November 30, 2019)

Alberta Rules

Alta. Reg. 124/2010 — Alberta Rules of Court

Part 6 — Resolving Issues and Preserving Rights

Division 4 — Restriction on Media Reporting and Public Access to Court Proceedings

Most Recently Cited in: [Athwal v. Mather](#), 2019 ABQB 676, 2019 CarswellAlta 1837, [2019] A.W.L.D. 3491, 309 A.C.W.S. (3d) 749 | (Alta. Q.B., Aug 30, 2019)

Alta. Reg. 124/2010, s. 6.36

s 6.36 Confidentiality of information

Currency

6.36 Confidentiality of information

Information that is the subject of the initial restricted court access application must not be published without the Court's permission.

Currency

Alberta Current to Gazette Vol. 115:22 (November 30, 2019)

End of Document

Copyright © Thomson Reuters Canada Limited or its licensors (excluding individual court documents). All rights reserved.

TAB 6

Most Negative Treatment: Distinguished

Most Recent Distinguished: [Canada \(Procureur général\) c. Contrevenant No. 10](#) | 2015 CAF 155, 2015 FCA 155, 2015 CarswellNat 2920, 2015 CarswellNat 4847, 476 N.R. 142, 123 W.C.B. (2d) 413, 256 A.C.W.S. (3d) 759, [2015] A.C.F. No. 873 | (F.C.A., Jun 30, 2015)

2002 SCC 41, 2002 CSC 41
Supreme Court of Canada

Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)

2002 CarswellNat 822, 2002 CarswellNat 823, 2002 SCC 41, 2002 CSC 41, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522, [2002] S.C.J. No. 42, 113 A.C.W.S. (3d) 36, 18 C.P.R. (4th) 1, 20 C.P.C. (5th) 1, 211 D.L.R. (4th) 193, 223 F.T.R. 137 (note), 287 N.R. 203, 40 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, 44 C.E.L.R. (N.S.) 161, 93 C.R.R. (2d) 219, J.E. 2002-803, REJB 2002-30902

Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, Appellant v. Sierra Club of Canada, Respondent and The Minister of Finance of Canada, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada, the Minister of International Trade of Canada and the Attorney General of Canada, Respondents

McLachlin C.J.C., Gonthier, Iacobucci, Bastarache, Binnie, Arbour, LeBel JJ.

Heard: November 6, 2001

Judgment: April 26, 2002

Docket: 28020

Proceedings: reversing (2000), [2000 CarswellNat 970](#), (sub nom. [Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada](#)) 187 D.L.R. (4th) 231, 256 N.R. 1, 24 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, [2000] 4 F.C. 426, 182 F.T.R. 284 (note), [2000 CarswellNat 3271](#), [2000] F.C.J. No. 732 (Fed. C.A.); affirming (1999), [1999 CarswellNat 2187](#), [2000] 2 F.C. 400, [1999 CarswellNat 3038](#), 179 F.T.R. 283, [1999] F.C.J. No. 1633 (Fed. T.D.)

Counsel: *J. Brett Ledger* and *Peter Chapin*, for appellant

Timothy J. Howard and *Franklin S. Gertler*, for respondent Sierra Club of Canada

Graham Garton, Q.C., and *J. Sanderson Graham*, for respondents Minister of Finance of Canada, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada, Minister of International Trade of Canada, and Attorney General of Canada

Subject: Intellectual Property; Property; Civil Practice and Procedure; Evidence; Environmental

APPEAL from judgment reported at [2000 CarswellNat 970](#), [2000 CarswellNat 3271](#), [2000] F.C.J. No. 732, (sub nom. [Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada](#)) 187 D.L.R. (4th) 231, 256 N.R. 1, 24 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, [2000] 4 F.C. 426, 182 F.T.R. 284 (note) (Fed. C.A.), dismissing appeal from judgment reported at [1999 CarswellNat 2187](#), [2000] 2 F.C. 400, [1999 CarswellNat 3038](#), 179 F.T.R. 283 (Fed. T.D.), granting application in part.

POURVOI à l'encontre de l'arrêt publié à [2000 CarswellNat 970](#), [2000 CarswellNat 3271](#), [2000] F.C.J. No. 732, (sub nom. [Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. v. Sierra Club of Canada](#)) 187 D.L.R. (4th) 231, 256 N.R. 1, 24 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, [2000] 4 F.C. 426, 182 F.T.R. 284 (note) (C.A. Féd.), qui a rejeté le pourvoi à l'encontre du jugement publié à [1999 CarswellNat 2187](#), [2000] 2 F.C. 400, [1999 CarswellNat 3038](#), 179 F.T.R. 283 (C.F. (1^{re} inst.)), qui avait accueilli en partie la demande.

The judgment of the court was delivered by *Iacobucci J.*:

I. Introduction

1 In our country, courts are the institutions generally chosen to resolve legal disputes as best they can through the application of legal principles to the facts of the case involved. One of the underlying principles of the judicial process is public openness, both in the proceedings of the dispute, and in the material that is relevant to its resolution. However, some material can be made the subject of a confidentiality order. This appeal raises the important issues of when, and under what circumstances, a confidentiality order should be granted.

2 For the following reasons, I would issue the confidentiality order sought and, accordingly, would allow the appeal.

II. Facts

3 The appellant, Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. ("AECL"), is a Crown corporation that owns and markets CANDU nuclear technology, and is an intervener with the rights of a party in the application for judicial review by the respondent, the Sierra Club of Canada ("Sierra Club"). Sierra Club is an environmental organization seeking judicial review of the federal government's decision to provide financial assistance in the form of a \$1.5 billion guaranteed loan relating to the construction and sale of two CANDU nuclear reactors to China by the appellant. The reactors are currently under construction in China, where the appellant is the main contractor and project manager.

4 The respondent maintains that the authorization of financial assistance by the government triggered s. 5(1)(b) of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, S.C. 1992, c. 37 ("CEAA"), which requires that an environmental assessment be undertaken before a federal authority grants financial assistance to a project. Failure to undertake such an assessment compels cancellation of the financial arrangements.

5 The appellant and the respondent Ministers argue that the CEAA does not apply to the loan transaction, and that if it does, the statutory defences available under ss. 8 and 54 apply. Section 8 describes the circumstances where Crown corporations are required to conduct environmental assessments. Section 54(2)(b) recognizes the validity of an environmental assessment carried out by a foreign authority provided that it is consistent with the provisions of the CEAA.

6 In the course of the application by Sierra Club to set aside the funding arrangements, the appellant filed an affidavit of Dr. Simon Pang, a senior manager of the appellant. In the affidavit, Dr. Pang referred to and summarized certain documents (the "Confidential Documents"). The Confidential Documents are also referred to in an affidavit prepared by Dr. Feng, one of AECL's experts. Prior to cross-examining Dr. Pang on his affidavit, Sierra Club made an application for the production of the Confidential Documents, arguing that it could not test Dr. Pang's evidence without access to the underlying documents. The appellant resisted production on various grounds, including the fact that the documents were the property of the Chinese authorities and that it did not have authority to disclose them. After receiving authorization by the Chinese authorities to disclose the documents on the condition that they be protected by a confidentiality order, the appellant sought to introduce the Confidential Documents under R. 312 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*, SOR/98-106, and requested a confidentiality order in respect of the documents.

7 Under the terms of the order requested, the Confidential Documents would only be made available to the parties and the court; however, there would be no restriction on public access to the proceedings. In essence, what is being sought is an order preventing the dissemination of the Confidential Documents to the public.

8 The Confidential Documents comprise two Environmental Impact Reports on Siting and Construction Design (the "EIRs"), a Preliminary Safety Analysis Report (the "PSAR"), and the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang, which summarizes the contents of the EIRs and the PSAR. If admitted, the EIRs and the PSAR would be attached as exhibits to the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang. The EIRs were prepared by the Chinese authorities in the Chinese language, and the PSAR was prepared by the appellant with assistance from the Chinese participants in the project. The documents contain a mass of technical information and comprise thousands of pages. They describe the ongoing environmental assessment of the construction site by the Chinese authorities under Chinese law.

9 As noted, the appellant argues that it cannot introduce the Confidential Documents into evidence without a confidentiality order; otherwise, it would be in breach of its obligations to the Chinese authorities. The respondent's position is that its right to

cross-examine Dr. Pang and Dr. Feng on their affidavits would be effectively rendered nugatory in the absence of the supporting documents to which the affidavits referred. Sierra Club proposes to take the position that the affidavits should therefore be afforded very little weight by the judge hearing the application for judicial review.

10 The Federal Court of Canada, Trial Division, refused to grant the confidentiality order and the majority of the Federal Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. In his dissenting opinion, Robertson J.A. would have granted the confidentiality order.

III. Relevant Statutory Provisions

11 *Federal Court Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106*

151.(1) On motion, the Court may order that material to be filed shall be treated as confidential.

(2) Before making an order under subsection (1), the Court must be satisfied that the material should be treated as confidential, notwithstanding the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

IV. Judgments below

A. *Federal Court of Canada, Trial Division, [2000] 2 F.C. 400*

12 Pelletier J. first considered whether leave should be granted pursuant to R. 312 to introduce the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang to which the Confidential Documents were filed as exhibits. In his view, the underlying question was that of relevance, and he concluded that the documents were relevant to the issue of the appropriate remedy. Thus, in the absence of prejudice to the respondent, the affidavit should be permitted to be served and filed. He noted that the respondents would be prejudiced by delay, but since both parties had brought interlocutory motions which had contributed to the delay, the desirability of having the entire record before the court outweighed the prejudice arising from the delay associated with the introduction of the documents.

13 On the issue of confidentiality, Pelletier J. concluded that he must be satisfied that the need for confidentiality was greater than the public interest in open court proceedings, and observed that the argument for open proceedings in this case was significant given the public interest in Canada's role as a vendor of nuclear technology. As well, he noted that a confidentiality order was an exception to the rule of open access to the courts, and that such an order should be granted only where absolutely necessary.

14 Pelletier J. applied the same test as that used in patent litigation for the issue of a protective order, which is essentially a confidentiality order. The granting of such an order requires the appellant to show a subjective belief that the information is confidential and that its interests would be harmed by disclosure. In addition, if the order is challenged, then the person claiming the benefit of the order must demonstrate objectively that the order is required. This objective element requires the party to show that the information has been treated as confidential, and that it is reasonable to believe that its proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could be harmed by the disclosure of the information.

15 Concluding that both the subjective part and both elements of the objective part of the test had been satisfied, he nevertheless stated: "However, I am also of the view that in public law cases, the objective test has, or should have, a third component which is whether the public interest in disclosure exceeds the risk of harm to a party arising from disclosure" (para. 23).

16 A very significant factor, in his view, was the fact that mandatory production of documents was not in issue here. The fact that the application involved a voluntary tendering of documents to advance the appellant's own cause as opposed to mandatory production weighed against granting the confidentiality order.

17 In weighing the public interest in disclosure against the risk of harm to AECL arising from disclosure, Pelletier J. noted that the documents the appellant wished to put before the court were prepared by others for other purposes, and recognized that the appellant was bound to protect the confidentiality of the information. At this stage, he again considered the issue of materiality. If the documents were shown to be very material to a critical issue, "the requirements of justice militate in favour of a confidentiality order. If the documents are marginally relevant, then the voluntary nature of the production argues against

33 In applying these criteria to the circumstances of the case, Robertson J.A. concluded that the confidentiality order should be granted. In his view, the public interest in open court proceedings did not override the interests of AECL in maintaining the confidentiality of these highly technical documents.

34 Robertson J.A. also considered the public interest in the need to ensure that site-plans for nuclear installations were not, for example, posted on a web-site. He concluded that a confidentiality order would not undermine the two primary objectives underlying the principle of open justice: truth and the rule of law. As such, he would have allowed the appeal and dismissed the cross-appeal.

V. Issues

35

A. What is the proper analytical approach to be applied to the exercise of judicial discretion where a litigant seeks a confidentiality order under R. 151 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*?

B. Should the confidentiality order be granted in this case?

VI. Analysis

A. The Analytical Approach to the Granting of a Confidentiality Order

(1) *The General Framework: Herein the Dagenais Principles*

36 The link between openness in judicial proceedings and freedom of expression has been firmly established by this Court. In *Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480 (S.C.C.) [hereinafter *New Brunswick*], at para. 23, La Forest J. expressed the relationship as follows:

The principle of open courts is inextricably tied to the rights guaranteed by s. 2(b). Openness permits public access to information about the courts, which in turn permits the public to discuss and put forward opinions and criticisms of court practices and proceedings. While the freedom to express ideas and opinions about the operation of the courts is clearly within the ambit of the freedom guaranteed by s. 2(b), so too is the right of members of the public to obtain information about the courts in the first place.

Under the order sought, public access and public scrutiny of the Confidential Documents would be restricted; this would clearly infringe the public's freedom of expression guarantee.

37 A discussion of the general approach to be taken in the exercise of judicial discretion to grant a confidentiality order should begin with the principles set out by this Court in *Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835 (S.C.C.). Although that case dealt with the common law jurisdiction of the court to order a publication ban in the criminal law context, there are strong similarities between publication bans and confidentiality orders in the context of judicial proceedings. In both cases a restriction on freedom of expression is sought in order to preserve or promote an interest engaged by those proceedings. As such, the fundamental question for a court to consider in an application for a publication ban or a confidentiality order is whether, in the circumstances, the right to freedom of expression should be compromised.

38 Although in each case freedom of expression will be engaged in a different context, the *Dagenais* framework utilizes overarching *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* principles in order to balance freedom of expression with other rights and interests, and thus can be adapted and applied to various circumstances. As a result, the analytical approach to the exercise of discretion under R. 151 should echo the underlying principles laid out in *Dagenais, supra*, although it must be tailored to the specific rights and interests engaged in this case.

39 *Dagenais*, *supra*, dealt with an application by four accused persons under the court's common law jurisdiction requesting an order prohibiting the broadcast of a television programme dealing with the physical and sexual abuse of young boys at religious institutions. The applicants argued that because the factual circumstances of the programme were very similar to the facts at issue in their trials, the ban was necessary to preserve the accuseds' right to a fair trial.

40 Lamer C.J. found that the common law discretion to order a publication ban must be exercised within the boundaries set by the principles of the *Charter*. Since publication bans necessarily curtail the freedom of expression of third parties, he adapted the pre-*Charter* common law rule such that it balanced the right to freedom of expression with the right to a fair trial of the accused in a way which reflected the substance of the test from *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103 (S.C.C.). At p. 878 of *Dagenais*, Lamer C.J. set out his reformulated test:

A publication ban should only be ordered when:

- (a) Such a ban is *necessary* in order to prevent a real and substantial risk to the fairness of the trial, because reasonably available alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and
- (b) The salutary effects of the publication ban outweigh the deleterious effects to the free expression of those affected by the ban. [Emphasis in original.]

41 In *New Brunswick*, *supra*, this Court modified the *Dagenais* test in the context of the related issue of how the discretionary power under s. 486(1) of the *Criminal Code* to exclude the public from a trial should be exercised. That case dealt with an appeal from the trial judge's order excluding the public from the portion of a sentencing proceeding for sexual assault and sexual interference dealing with the specific acts committed by the accused on the basis that it would avoid "undue hardship" to both the victims and the accused.

42 La Forest J. found that s. 486(1) was a restriction on the s. 2(b) right to freedom of expression in that it provided a "discretionary bar on public and media access to the courts": *New Brunswick*, *supra*, at para. 33; however, he found this infringement to be justified under s. 1 provided that the discretion was exercised in accordance with the *Charter*. Thus, the approach taken by La Forest J. at para. 69 to the exercise of discretion under s. 486(1) of the *Criminal Code*, closely mirrors the *Dagenais* common law test:

- (a) the judge must consider the available options and consider whether there are any other reasonable and effective alternatives available;
- (b) the judge must consider whether the order is limited as much as possible; and
- (c) the judge must weigh the importance of the objectives of the particular order and its probable effects against the importance of openness and the particular expression that will be limited in order to ensure that the positive and negative effects of the order are proportionate.

In applying this test to the facts of the case, La Forest J. found that the evidence of the potential undue hardship consisted mainly in the Crown's submission that the evidence was of a "delicate nature" and that this was insufficient to override the infringement on freedom of expression.

43 This Court has recently revisited the granting of a publication ban under the court's common law jurisdiction in *R. v. Mentuck*, 2001 SCC 76 (S.C.C.), and its companion case *R. v. E. (O.N.)*, 2001 SCC 77 (S.C.C.). In *Mentuck*, the Crown moved for a publication ban to protect the identity of undercover police officers and operational methods employed by the officers in their investigation of the accused. The accused opposed the motion as an infringement of his right to a fair and public hearing under s. 11(d) of the *Charter*. The order was also opposed by two intervening newspapers as an infringement of their right to freedom of expression.

44 The Court noted that, while *Dagenais* dealt with the balancing of freedom of expression on the one hand, and the right to a fair trial of the accused on the other, in the case before it, both the right of the accused to a fair and public hearing, and freedom of expression weighed in favour of denying the publication ban. These rights were balanced against interests relating to the proper administration of justice, in particular, protecting the safety of police officers and preserving the efficacy of undercover police operations.

45 In spite of this distinction, the Court noted that underlying the approach taken in both *Dagenais* and *New Brunswick* was the goal of ensuring that the judicial discretion to order publication bans is subject to no lower a standard of compliance with the *Charter* than legislative enactment. This goal is furthered by incorporating the essence of s. 1 of the *Charter* and the *Oakes* test into the publication ban test. Since this same goal applied in the case before it, the Court adopted a similar approach to that taken in *Dagenais*, but broadened the *Dagenais* test (which dealt specifically with the right of an accused to a fair trial) such that it could guide the exercise of judicial discretion where a publication ban is requested in order to preserve *any* important aspect of the proper administration of justice. At para. 32, the Court reformulated the test as follows:

A publication ban should only be ordered when:

(a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to the proper administration of justice because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and

(b) the salutary effects of the publication ban outweigh the deleterious effects on the rights and interests of the parties and the public, including the effects on the right to free expression, the right of the accused to a fair and public trial, and the efficacy of the administration of justice.

46 The Court emphasized that under the first branch of the test, three important elements were subsumed under the "necessity" branch. First, the risk in question must be a serious risk well-grounded in the evidence. Second, the phrase "proper administration of justice" must be carefully interpreted so as not to allow the concealment of an excessive amount of information. Third, the test requires the judge ordering the ban to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives are available, but also to restrict the ban as far as possible without sacrificing the prevention of the risk.

47 At para. 31, the Court also made the important observation that the proper administration of justice will not necessarily involve *Charter* rights, and that the ability to invoke the *Charter* is not a necessary condition for a publication ban to be granted:

The [common law publication ban] rule can accommodate orders that must occasionally be made in the interests of the administration of justice, which encompass more than fair trial rights. As the test is intended to "reflect . . . the substance of the *Oakes* test", *we cannot require that Charter rights be the only legitimate objective of such orders any more than we require that government action or legislation in violation of the Charter be justified exclusively by the pursuit of another Charter right.* [Emphasis added.]

The Court also anticipated that, in appropriate circumstances, the *Dagenais* framework could be expanded even further in order to address requests for publication bans where interests other than the administration of justice were involved.

48 *Mentuck* is illustrative of the flexibility of the *Dagenais* approach. Since its basic purpose is to ensure that the judicial discretion to deny public access to the courts is exercised in accordance with *Charter* principles, in my view, the *Dagenais* model can and should be adapted to the situation in the case at bar where the central issue is whether judicial discretion should be exercised so as to exclude confidential information from a public proceeding. As in *Dagenais*, *New Brunswick* and *Mentuck*, granting the confidentiality order will have a negative effect on the *Charter* right to freedom of expression, as well as the principle of open and accessible court proceedings, and, as in those cases, courts must ensure that the discretion to grant the order is exercised in accordance with *Charter* principles. However, in order to adapt the test to the context of this case, it is first necessary to determine the particular rights and interests engaged by this application.

(2) *The Rights and Interests of the Parties*

TAB 7

2012 ABQB 412
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Romspen Investment Corp. v. Hargate Properties Inc.

2012 CarswellAlta 1101, 2012 ABQB 412, [2012] A.W.L.D. 3821, [2012]
A.W.L.D. 3824, [2012] A.J. No. 667, 218 A.C.W.S. (3d) 838, 99 C.B.R. (5th) 319

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

Donald Lee J.

Heard: June 14, 2012

Judgment: June 22, 2012

Docket: Edmonton 1103-17749

Counsel: Schuyler V. Wensel, Q.C. for Plaintiff
Lindsay Miller for Second Mortgagee, Allied Hospitalities Services Inc.
Scott Stevens for Receiver, D. Manning & Associates Inc.
Russel A. Rimer for BDO Canada Ltd.
Atul Omkar for Dr. Singh
Lyle Brookes for Victory Christian Centre Inc.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Evidence; Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency; Property

APPLICATION by receiver for sealing order with respect to its report about sale process for hotel and other relief.

Donald Lee J.:

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 its 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 its 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. No. 42, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.) 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.

Application granted in part.

TAB 8

2009 CarswellOnt 7952
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Look Communications Inc. v. Look Mobile Corp.

2009 CarswellOnt 7952, [2009] O.J. No. 5440, 183 A.C.W.S. (3d) 736

**IN THE MATTER OF LOOK COMMUNICATIONS INC. (Applicant) and LOOK
MOBILE CORPORATION AND LOOK COMMUNICATIONS L.P. (Respondent)**

AND IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION BY LOOK COMMUNICATIONS INC. UNDER
SECTION 192 OF THE BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C.44, AS AMENDED

Newbould J.

Heard: December 17, 2009
Judgment: December 18, 2009
Docket: 08-CL-7877

Counsel: John T. Porter for Look Communications Inc.
Aubrey E. Kauffman for Inukshuk Wireless Partnership

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Civil Practice and Procedure

MOTION by corporation for order extending sealing order made in court approved sale of assets.

Newbould J.:

1 Look Communications Inc.(Look) moves for an order extending a sealing order under which bids made in a court approved sales process were sealed. The order is opposed by Inukshuk Wireless Partnership which is a joint venture between Rogers Communications Inc. and Bell Canada.

Circumstances of Sealing Order

2 On December 1, 2008, Look was authorized by Pepall J. to conduct a special shareholder's meeting to pass resolutions (i) authorizing Look to establish a sales process for the sale of all or substantially all of its assets and to seek an order approving the sales process, and (ii) authorizing a plan of arrangement under section 192 of the CBCA which contemplated the sale of all or substantially all of Look's assets. The shareholders voted in favour of both a sales process and the arrangement.

3 On January 21, 2009, Look obtained an order approving the sales process and Grant Thornton Limited was appointed as Monitor to manage and conduct the sales process with Look. The sales process provided for bids from interested persons for five assets of Look, which were substantially all of its assets, being (i) Spectrum, being approximately 100MHz of License Spectrum in Ontario and Quebec; (ii) a CRTC Broadcast License; (iii) Subscribers; (iv) a Network consisting of two network operating centers and (v) approximately \$300 million in "tax attributes" or losses. Court approval was required for any sale.

4 Under the sales process, a bidder was entitled to bid for any or all of the assets that were being sold, or a combination thereof. Pursuant to the sales process, four bids were received and Look and the Monitor engaged in discussions with each bidder. Look eventually accepted an offer from Inukshuk for the Spectrum and Broadcast License. It is agreed that while not all of the assets of Look were sold, what was sold to Inukshuk were substantially all of the assets of Look.

5 The parties obtained a consent order on May 14, 2009 from Marrocco J. in which the sale of the Spectrum and Broadcast License to Inukshuk was approved. The order provided that the assets would vest in Inukshuk upon the Monitor filing a

certificate with the court certifying as to the completion of the transaction. The sale contemplated a staged closing, with the first taking place immediately following the order of Marrocco J., the second being December 31, 2009 and the final taking place as late as what the sale agreement defined as the Outside Date, being the third anniversary of the date of the final order approving the transaction, i.e., May 14, 2012. I am told that the reason for the staged dates was that it was anticipated that the necessary regulatory approvals for the sale of the Spectrum and License could take some time.

6 As it turned out, the final closing took place much earlier than the Outside Date within a few months of the order of Marrocco J. On September 11, 2009, the Monitor filed its certificate with the Court certifying that the purchase price had been paid in full and that the conditions of closing had been satisfied. Thus the sold assets vested in Inukshuk. Under the terms of the plan of arrangement that was approved by the order of Marrocco J., once the certificate of the Monitor as to the completion of the transaction was delivered, the articles of arrangement became effective.

7 In connection with the application to Marrocco J. to approve the arrangement and the sale to Inukshuk, the Monitor filed a redacted version of its First Report, as is usual in the Commercial List for sales carried out under a court process, redacting the information about the bids received in the sales process. The order of Marrocco J. provided that an unredacted version of the First Report was to be sealed and not form part of the public record until the Monitor's Certificate after the sale was completed was filed with the Court. That certificate, as I have said, was filed with the Court on September 11, 2009. Therefore under the order of Marrocco J. the unredacted First Report of the Monitor was no longer to be sealed.

8 Look is now attempting to sell its remaining assets, which include a corporation which had been approved by the CRTC to hold a license and has \$350 million of tax losses. Look is presently in discussions for the sale of its remaining assets with some of the same parties with whom discussions were held and bids were received under the previous sales process, including Rogers.

9 In early November 2009 Inukshuk asked the Monitor for the information contained in the Monitor's First Report that was sealed under the order of Marrocco J. Look immediately obtained an *ex parte* order from Campbell J. on November 4, 2009 extending the sealing of the Monitor's First Report pending a determination of this motion.

Analysis

10 Look seeks to extend the sealing order for six months while it completes the sale of its remaining assets. It has a concern that publication of the information could impede the sale process now underway and affect the amount received. Look is concerned that if the bids were disclosed, and with Rogers being one of the parties in discussions with Look for the purchase of Look's tax losses, other players in the telecommunications industry would not bid for the remaining assets.

11 Inukshuk has filed no affidavit material as to why it is interested in the sealed information in the Monitor's First Report dealing with all of the bids that were received for all assets. Inukshuk's position in a nutshell is that the sales process previously approved by the Court is over and that the public interest in seeing an open court process should prevent any further sealing of the Monitor's First Report. Mr. Kauffman said that his clients are here in this motion "in their own interest as two members of the public" seeking access to the documents that were filed in the court process.

12 It is understandable why Rogers would want the information. It has been negotiating with Look for the purchase of one or more of Look's remaining assets. Having access to prior bids in the prior sales process in which one or more of those remaining assets may have been the subject of a bid would obviously be of benefit to Rogers it in considering what price it is prepared to offer for the company with the tax loss benefits. While Mr. Kauffman pointed out that it is Inukshuk Wireless Partnership that is opposing the order sought, and that includes Bell as well as Rogers, the fact remains that the partnership does include Rogers which is in negotiations with Look. In any event, it is unrealistic to think that Bell, through its interest in Inukshuk, is funding at least in part the opposition to the extension of the sealing order out of altruistic or public purposes.

13 Section 137 of the *Courts of Justice Act* provides that a court may order any document filed in a civil proceeding to be treated as confidential, sealed and not form part of the public record. The fact that the plan of arrangement consummated under the court proceedings under s. 192 of the CBCA has now been finalized does not in itself mean that the court does not

have jurisdiction to continue with the sealing order if it is otherwise appropriate to do so. There is no limitation in section 137 limiting a sealing order to the time during which the litigation in question is ongoing.

14 In *MacIntyre v. Nova Scotia (Attorney General)*, [1982] 1 S.C.R. 175 (S.C.C.), it was held that sworn information to obtain a search warrant could not be made available to the public until the search warrant had been executed. In that case, Dixon J. (as he then was) for the majority noted that the case law did not distinguish between judicial proceedings which are part of a trial and those which are not, and that subject to a few well-recognized exceptions, all judicial proceedings should be in public. He held that the presumption was in favour of public access and the burden of contrary proof lay upon the person contending otherwise.

15 In *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 (S.C.C.), the court authorized a confidentiality order. It stated that an order should be granted in only two circumstances, being (i) when an order is needed to prevent serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk, and (ii) when the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right civil litigants to a fair trial, outweighs its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right of free expression, which includes public interest in open and accessible court proceedings. In dealing with the notion of an important commercial interest, Iacobucci J. stated:

In addition, the phrase "important commercial interest" is in need of some clarification. In order to qualify as an "important commercial interest", the interest in question cannot merely be specific to the party requesting the order; the interest must be one which can be expressed in terms of a public interest in confidentiality. For example, a private company could not argue simply that the existence of a particular contract should not be made public because to do so would cause the company to lose business, thus harming its commercial interests. However, if, as in this case, exposure of information would cause a breach of a confidentiality agreement, then the commercial interest affected can be characterized more broadly as the general commercial interest of preserving confidential information. Simply put, if there is no general principle at stake, there can be no "important commercial interest" for the purposes of this test. Or, in the words of Binnie J. in *Re N. (F.)* [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, 2000 SCC 35, at para. 10, the open court rule only yields "where the public interest in confidentiality outweighs the public interest in openness".

16 Look points out that it is not a private company. It is a public company with stakeholders, being public shareholders. It is not the kind of private corporation that Iacobucci J. was discussing in *Sierra*.

17 It is common when assets are being sold pursuant to a court process to seal the Monitor's report disclosing all of the various bids in case a further bidding process is required if the transaction being approved falls through. Invariably, no one comes back asking that the sealing order be set aside. That is because ordinarily all of the assets that were bid on during the court sale process end up being sold and approved by court order, and so long as the sale transaction or transactions closed, no one has any further interest in the information. In *887574 Ontario Inc. v. Pizza Pizza Ltd.* (1994), 23 B.L.R. (2d) 239 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), Farley J. discussed the fact that valuations submitted by a Receiver for the purpose of obtaining court approval are normally sealed. He pointed out that the purpose of that was 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. In that context, he stated that he thought the most appropriate sealing order in a court approval sale situation would be that the supporting valuation materials remain sealed until such time as the sale transaction had closed.

18 This case is a little different from the ordinary. Some of the assets that were bid on during the sales process were not sold. However, because the assets that were sold constituted substantially all of the assets of Look, the arrangement under section 192 of the CBCA was completed. Those assets that were not sold remained, however, to be sold and it is in the context of that process that Rogers has been discussing purchasing one or more of these assets from Look.

19 In this case, had the closing of the sale of the Spectrum and the License been drawn out to the maximum three year period provided for in the sale agreement, these remaining assets in all likelihood would have been sold before the maximum period ran out and during a period of time in which the Receiver's First Report remaining sealed. In those circumstances the effect of the sealing order would have been to protect the later sale process, a process which originally involved a sale of all of the

assets of Look. While the remaining sales will not take place under the original sale process that was conducted by Look and the Monitor, the commercial interest in seeing that the remaining assets are sold to the benefit of all stakeholders, including the public shareholders of Look, remains now as it did before.

20 The advantage to Rogers in seeing what other bidders may have bid on the assets that have remained unsold is obvious. Rogers is in negotiations with Look regarding the acquisition of one or more of those assets. If other bidders previously bid on one or more of those assets, that information would be beneficial to Rogers. If the other bidders did not bid on any of those remaining assets, that too would be of interest to Rogers. As well, Look's concern that the disclosure of the sealed information could impede other bidders from coming forward is not without some merit.

21 In *Sierra*, Iacobucci J said there were core values that should be considered in a motion such as this. *Sierra* involved an application by the Government of Canada for a confidentiality order protecting documents from public disclosure in litigation between the *Sierra* and the Government. Iacobucci J. stated that under the order sought, public access to the documents in question would be restricted, which would infringe the public's freedom of expression guarantees contained in section 2(b) of the *Charter*. He discussed the core values of freedom of expression and how they should be considered in a motion seeking confidentiality of documents. He stated:

Underlying freedom of expression are the core values of (1) seeking the truth and the common good; (2) promoting self-fulfilment of individuals by allowing them to develop thoughts and ideas as they see fit; and (3) ensuring that participation in the political process is open to all persons: *Irwin Toy Ltd. v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, [1989] 1 S.C.R. 927, [page551] at p. 976; *R. v. Keegstra*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697, at pp. 762-64, per Dickson C.J. Charter jurisprudence has established that the closer the speech in question lies to these core values, the harder it will be to justify a s. 2(b) infringement of that speech under s. 1 of the Charter: *Keegstra*, at pp. 760-61. Since the main goal in this case is to exercise judicial discretion in a way which conforms to Charter principles, a discussion of the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order on freedom of expression should include an assessment of the effects such an order would have on the three core values. The more detrimental the order would be to these values, the more difficult it will be to justify the confidentiality order. Similarly, minor effects of the order on the core values will make the confidentiality order easier to justify. (underlining added)

22 Rogers, or Inukshuk, cannot, in my view, claim that there will be a substantial detrimental effect on these core values by a continuation of the sealing order for a further six months. What Rogers will lose will be access to information that it could use against the interests of Look and its stakeholders. In my view, the salutary effects of extending the sealing order for six months to permit the sale of the remaining assets of Look outweighs the deleterious effects of such order in this case.

23 Inukshuk asks that if the extension order is made, there is no reason to seal the prior bids for the Spectrum that Inukshuk purchased and thus the order should permit that information to be made public. It is said by Mr. Kauffman that such information is of historical interest. I would not make this exception as requested by Inukshuk. Bidders under the prior sales process were entitled to bid on all of the assets either individually or together, and Mr. Porter points out that it may well be difficult to separate out the portion of any prior bid dealing with the Spectrum from a bid for other assets that are now sought to be sold. If the interest sought is only for historical purposes, a six month delay will not be of much or any consequence.

24 In the circumstances, the order sought by Look shall go. Look is entitled to its costs of the motion against Inukshuk. If costs cannot be agreed, short submissions may be made within ten days by Look and reply submissions may be made within a further ten days by Inukshuk.

Motion granted.

TAB 9

Most Negative Treatment: Check subsequent history and related treatments.

1994 CarswellOnt 1214
Ontario Court of Justice (General Division), Commercial List

887574 Ontario Inc. v. Pizza Pizza Ltd.

1994 CarswellOnt 1214, [1994] O.J. No. 3112, 23 B.L.R. (2d) 239, 35 C.P.C. (3d) 323, 52 A.C.W.S. (3d) 516

RE ARBITRATION BEFORE THE HONOURABLE R.E. HOLLAND, Q.C.

887574 ONTARIO INC., 863644 ONTARIO INC., 801409 ONTARIO INC., WESTBRIDGE FOODS LTD., 830542 ONTARIO INC., 779975 ONTARIO LIMITED, 783129 ONTARIO INC., 284055 ONTARIO INC., 946171 ONTARIO INC., 768027 ONTARIO INC., 841875 ONTARIO INC., 660840 ONTARIO LTD., BULE ENTERPRISES LIMITED, 900766 ONTARIO INC., 755950 ONTARIO LIMITED, 554135 ONTARIO INC., 769049 ONTARIO INC., 781380 ONTARIO INC., 892922 ONTARIO INC., 814591 ONTARIO INC., 925446 ONTARIO LTD., 876310 ONTARIO INC., 812138 ONTARIO INC., 880602 ONTARIO INC., 697339 ONTARIO INC., 863008 ONTARIO INC., 898201 ONTARIO INC., 989897 ONTARIO INC., 857387 ONTARIO INC., 828659 ONTARIO INC., 750242 ONTARIO LIMITED, 803767 ONTARIO INC., 910874 ONTARIO INC., 805837 ONTARIO INC., GOLD LION GROUP OF COMPANIES, 697246 ONTARIO LIMITED, 827532 ONTARIO INC., 914470 ONTARIO LIMITED, 804631 ONTARIO INC., 954270 ONTARIO INC., 686603 ONTARIO LIMITED, 741897 ONTARIO LIMITED, 675367 ONTARIO LIMITED, 809692 ONTARIO LIMITED, 681630 ONTARIO INC., 763012 ONTARIO LTD., 905933 ONTARIO INC., 945671 ONTARIO INC., 807352 ONTARIO INC. and 909206 ONTARIO INC. v. PIZZA PIZZA LIMITED

Farley J.

Oral reasons: December 14, 1994 *

Written reasons: December 27, 1994

Docket: Doc. 93-CQ-33541; Commercial Court File Doc. B85/93

Counsel: *Peter Griffin*, *Gavin MacKenzie* and *Daniel Vukovich*, for moving party (defendant).

Nancy Spies and *Timothy Mitchell*, for responding parties (plaintiffs) except 828659 Ontario Inc., 805837 Ontario Inc., 807353 Ontario Inc., and Drag Eleven Pizza Inc.

P. Waldmann, for other responding parties (plaintiffs).

B. Bruser, for Toronto Star.

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Corporate and Commercial

Motion for an order that material relating to appeal from commercial arbitration be sealed on grounds of confidentiality.

Editor's Note

This judgment, taken together with the arbitration award immediately preceding and the two reasons for judgment immediately following, forms an interesting quartet. It provides a basis for comment on several aspects of commercial arbitration in a general business setting. See the Case Comment at p. 277 post.

Farley J.:

1 At the hearing I dismissed the confidentiality/sealing motion, promising formal reasons at a later date. These are those reasons.

2 The defendant Pizza Pizza Limited ("P²") moved for an order:

(a) pursuant to Section 137(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C43 directing that the appeal materials upon the appeal to be heard on February 20, 1995 in this Honourable Court be sealed pending further order;

(b) continuing the order of the Honourable Mr. Justice Farley dated July 20, 1994.

P² submitted that the grounds for such a motion were:

1. The parties were originally before this Honourable Court by way of injunction proceedings (and extensive materials) in the spring of 1993;

2. The parties entered into Minutes of Settlement by which they submitted these issues to arbitration/mediation before the Honourable R.E. Holland;

3. Those proceedings were, by agreement and by order of the Honourable R.E. Holland, confidential;

4. The arbitration proceedings were conducted over many months involving at least 20 days of hearing time, during which a wide range of issues were canvassed;

5. The parties would not have entered into the arbitration process without the condition of confidentiality;

6. The parties have expended significant amounts of money upon the arbitration proceedings;

7. Only a handful of the myriad issues before the Honourable R.E. Holland are the subject of the appeal herein;

8. The disclosure of the arbitration proceedings to the public may affect the competitive position of the defendant and its franchisees in releasing the details of its operations to the public and competitors;

9. To fail to continue the order of the Honourable Mr. Justice Farley would discourage the attempts (and success) of the arbitration/mediation process which these parties underwent in confidence.

The aspect of item 8 was not in substance pursued. This is not in essence a situation involving trade secrets or confidential proprietary information. Further it was acknowledged that the proceedings resolved into an arbitration (versus other forms of alternative dispute resolution ("ADR")).

3 On Wednesday, June 22, 1994, the Honourable R.E. Holland, Q.C. ("Arbitrator") issued a confidentiality order. This was followed by a consent order issued by myself on July 20, 1994. Its terms provided (and clearly contemplated not only that there could be an adjustment or amendment to or cancellation of the sealing order, but also that the award would be made public when the matter was in court):

It is hereby ordered that:

1. The Interim Award of the Honourable R.E. Holland dated April 8, 1994 and the Cost Award dated May 19, 1994 (the "Awards") are, as all of the proceedings in this matter, confidential and may not be released to any party other than the parties to this proceeding and their professional advisors in this proceeding.

2. Until such time as it is filed in court, the Final Award arising from the Awards (the "Final Award") is also confidential and may only be released to those parties identified above.

4 The award has been appealed by P² and cross-appealed by the plaintiffs. Thus the matter is "re-entering" the court system after functionally having been in the private confidential sector before the Arbitrator. When the matter went out to the arbitration, it may have been that the parties contemplated some form of arbitration, but it was also conceivable that another form of ADR

could have been employed. I think it fair to observe that a binding arbitration is a non-court equivalent to a court trial. In either case a neutral third party hears the case and makes his decision which (subject to appeal) is binding upon the parties. This differs from other forms of ADR in which the parties themselves are part of the decision-making mechanism and the neutral third party's involvement is of a facilitative nature: e.g. mediation, conciliation, neutral evaluation, non-binding opinion, non-binding arbitration. Of course, the simplest method — often overlooked — is that of non-involvement by a neutral: a negotiation between the parties. It is not unusual that ADR resolutions are conducted privately; more to the point, I suspect it would be unusual to see a public ADR session especially where the focus is on coming to a consensual arrangement. The parties need to have the opportunity of discussion and natural give and take with brainstorming and conditional concession giving without the concern of being under a microscope. If the parties were under constant surveillance, one could well imagine that they would be severely inhibited in the frank and open discussions with the result that settlement ratios would tend to dry up. The litigation system depends on a couple of percent of new cases only going to trial. If this were doubled to several percent the system would collapse. Therefore in my view public policy supports the non-trial resolution of disputes. I note the observation of Oliver Tickell, "Shogun's Beginnings" *Oxford Today*, vol. 7, no. 1 Michaelmas Issue 1994 at p. 20 where he observed as to Professor Jeffrey Mass' view of the benefits of the first Shogunate in Japan:

... finding to [Professor Mass'] surprise that its rule was based far more on efficient administration than on military heroics. "Although a warrior government, it was devoted not to the battlefield but to maintaining the peace ... It developed laws, institutions of justice, and an adversarial legal system that even today seems extraordinarily ingenious and sophisticated. Written evidence always took precedence over oral testimony, and women enjoyed their full day in court. The vendetta was illegal, as the objective was to keep people ensnared in litigation".

I also note that perhaps the legal sector in Canada has progressed a little too far in the ensnarement direction.

5 Section 137(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43 (CJA) provides:

A court may order that any document filed in a civil proceeding before it be treated as confidential, sealed and not form part of the public record.

However when a matter comes to court the philosophy of the court system is openness: See *MDS Health Group Ltd. v. Canada (Attorney General)* (1993), 15 O.R. (3d) 630 (Gen. Div.) at p. 633. The present sealing application would not fit within any of the exceptions to the general rule of *public* justice as discussed in *A. (J.) v. Canada Life Assurance Co.* (1989), 70 O.R. (2d) 27 (H.C.) at p. 34: "... actions involving infants, or mentally disturbed people and actions involving matters of secrecy '... secret processes, inventions, documents or the like ...' " The broader principle of confidentiality possibly being "warranted where confidentiality is precisely what is at stake" was also discussed at the same page but would not appear applicable.

6 Mr. Griffin raised the question of reorganization material under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 or the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 or valuations submitted by a receiver for the purpose of obtaining court approval on a sale arrangement having been sealed. The purpose of that, of course, is to maintain fair play so that competitors or potential bidders do not obtain an unfair advantage by obtaining such information whilst others have to rely on their own resources. I would think the most appropriate sealing order in a court approval sale situation would be that the supporting valuation material remain sealed until such time as the sale transaction has closed.

7 I believe that it is obvious that if the ADR process entered into is along the mediation philosophy structure that it will be appreciated that the best and most productive results re dispute resolution will be achieved generally if such process involves a degree of confidentiality. This of course is subject to some exceptions such as when the parties agree that in a mediation of public policy issues there is a positive requirement for public exposure: see Brown and Marriott, *ADR Principles and Practice* (1993, London), Sweet & Maxwell, at p. 356. In other instances public exposure may induce a very negative reaction — e.g. if outsiders can be observers, then some (depending on their relationship to the parties involved) may become "cheerleaders", "advisors without the benefit of the facts" or "advisors without the discipline of having to live with the end result of the mediation" (which may be a non-resolution of the issues which may otherwise have been resolved). Unwanted pressure may thus be applied to one or more of the participants. Similarly a volunteer advisor-type may give "free" advice (e.g. "Don't settle; take him to court;

you've got an absolute winner!") when the hidden agenda of this officious intermeddler is to foment disruption, harass the other side or pursue his own self interests. Allow me to observe that it would be unusual for anyone to feel obliged to conduct all of his negotiations (including those to settle disputes) in a fishbowl: Consider for instance one having a mild disagreement with one's mother as to where the two of you should have lunch — or a debate between a customer and a supplier over whether an order was short-shipped and, if so, what adjustment should be made (all without resort to the *Sale of Goods Act* and/or the courts).

8 While it is true that it appears in this case that the parties went private in a dispute which they could have litigated openly in the courts with a trial rather than an arbitration, I do not see that this choice would oblige the parties to make their arbitration public in and of itself. As for the confidentiality order of July 20, 1994 referring to two types of awards, an interim and a final, I now understand from counsel that the thrust of the interim award was the legal principles and of the final the damage calculation or other results flowing as opposed to the interim being a draft for comment and possible adjustment. If the latter were the case then one would appreciate the practicality/necessity of maintaining confidentiality so as to avoid the types of unwarranted pressures aforesaid in achieving the end result. If of the other nature, I believe the same result prevails. Similarly if the process were something other than non-binding arbitration, one would also see the same type of necessity. In the instant case, the parties could have, if they had so chosen (i.e. either side), decided not to appeal the Arbitrator's award. In such case, the result would have been the same as the two sides entering into settlement negotiations to end their dispute and coming to an agreement. In effect that is what they did by entering the arbitration process except that in doing so, they at the start of the piece delegated the resolution determination function to the Arbitrator for him to do so by applying legal principles to the facts as he found them. If the parties had not made the detour from the main channel of court proceedings leading to trial by going to arbitration but had merely negotiated a settlement, then with a settlement achieved they would customarily merely proceed to put on the public court record that the claim had been dismissed on consent. Details of the settlement would remain with the parties; they would be free to disclose or agree not to disclose, subject to some legal obligation to make disclosure (e.g. timely disclosure requirements under securities legislation).

9 However in this case, it appears that both sides were dissatisfied to some degree by the decision of the Arbitrator for various reasons. Perhaps counsel would be of assistance to their clients if they were able to reflect upon what may have been attempted to be communicated by the other side at the hearing before me. I state the obvious: sometimes signals are obliquely broadcast; sometimes what might be perceived as a signal is nothing more than a false hope by the recipient. However if there is truly a signal intended, it would be very unfortunate if the recipient did not pick it up because it was too oblique or worse still because the mind was closed (possibly because the mouth was open so as to block the ear passage).

10 The onus is upon P² as moving party to demonstrate sound reason for departing from the openness rule: See *MDS*, supra, at p. 633. As the factum of P² put it:

There is an overriding public interest in the 1990's especially in fostering effective Alternative Dispute Resolution ("ADR") in such a way that parties will willingly submit to it in a manner which fosters its use and development and reduces the demands for scarce court resources.

The authority for this was given as *Brown and Marriott*, supra, at p. 356; *London & Leeds Estates Ltd. v. Paribas Ltd.*, unreported decision of Mance, J. (Q.B.) of July 28, 1994 and *Hassnah Insurance Co. of Israel v. Mew*, [1993] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 243 (Q.B. [Com. Ct.]). In citing *Hassnah*, Mance, J. at p. 8 of *London* merely stated:

There is no doubt that the parties to such a previous arbitration owed each other a duty of confidence and privacy in respect of the course of and evidence given during it.

He went on to say at p. 9:

None of those authorities deals with the need to consider the rights of a witness which could arise if duties of confidentiality or privacy were owed to him or her. Despite this I see some force in the submission that it is implicit in the nature of private consensual arbitration that witnesses who give evidence, even paid and professional experts, will within certain limits be accorded the benefits of the privacy which overall attaches to this type of arbitration. The privacy of arbitration is likely

to be a factor in persuading many witnesses to give evidence and a factor in encouraging them to speak, or in the case of experts, enabling them to obtain permission from other principals to speak, about matters within their experience about which otherwise they might be hesitant or unable to speak.

London of course involved a question of whether a subpoena to an expert witness should be set aside where the confidential or private documents of the expert were sought to be obtained by the subpoena. It is even clearer in *Hassnah* what the limits of confidentiality would be concerning an arbitration and the award issuing therefrom. In that case there was an arbitration between the defendant who was reinsured by the plaintiff under various reinsurance contracts which had been placed by brokers. The defendant pursued arbitration to recover under the policies; the arbitration went mainly against the defendant which now wished to proceed in court against the placing brokers for negligence in breach of duty. Coleman, J. found as stated in the headnote: "that if it was reasonably necessary for the establishment or protection of an arbitrating party's legal rights vis-a-vis a third party that the award should be disclosed to that third party in order to found a defence or as the basis for a cause of action, so to disclose it including its reasons would not be a breach of the duty of confidence (See p. 249, col. 2)".

11 However as discussed above the parties clearly contemplated the possibility of appeal pursuant to the *Arbitration Act, 1991*, S.O. 1991, c. 17. Both have availed themselves of that opportunity; the court files for whatever is filed pursuant to that appeal (and cross-appeal) will be open for inspection in the same way any other appeal of whatever nature or kind would be (assuming no valid sealing order obtained on the basis of the reasons set out above). This is not a case such as *Hassnah* where witness statements, documents and transcripts of a confidential arbitration were not to be made public for the purpose of a court action against a third person-*Hassnah* being a completely "separate" proceeding. In this case (the P² case) the court proceedings are merely the continuation of the fight between P² and the plaintiff franchisees (and not between one of them and a third person in separate proceedings), a fight which they took private but which they have now returned to the open arena of the court.

12 As Dickson, J. said at p. 186 (S.C.R.) of *MacIntyre v. Nova Scotia (Attorney General)*, [1982] 1 S.C.R. 175, 49 N.S.R. (2d) 609 (and cited in *MDS*, supra, at p. 635):

In my view, curtailment of public accessibility can only be justified where there is present the need to protect social values of superordinate importance. One of these is the protection of the innocent.

In my view "one of these" is not to keep secret the material involved in an arbitration appeal which of its necessity takes the parties back into the court system with its insistence on openness for court proceedings, an aspect which one must assume each side fully recognized before proceeding to appeal the award.

13 I believe it well expressed by Smith, J. in *S. (P.) v. C. (D.)* (1987), 22 C.P.C. (2d) 225 (Ont. H.C.) at p. 229 and p. 231:

It may be argued that private litigants resorting to our public justice system should have the right to do so away from the public glare. The answer, very simply put, is that secrecy can only attend a private system of justice, not a public one. Or put in a different way, publicity is a necessary consequence of the obvious benefits that are derived from a public system put in place to serve society in general, including private litigants (p. 229).

.....

There is no need to refer to the voluminous case law bearing upon the general principles of openness of Court proceedings. There is a dearth of authority on the interpretation of s. 147(2) of the *Courts of Justice Act*. Suffice it to say that it ought to be resorted to sparingly in the clearest of cases and on the clearest of material where as one instance the interests of justice would be subverted and/or the totally innocent would unduly suffer without any significant compensating public interest being served (p. 231).

14 P² has not adduced any evidence to support a sealing order pursuant to s. 137(2) CJA but rather it has relied on the court to fashion an order so as to extend the confidentiality which the parties had in their arbitration to the material in that arbitration which would otherwise be public pursuant to the appeal. I see no public policy grounds for doing so.

15 Mr. Griffin with his usual candour immediately agreed with Mr. Waldmann's proposition that if the sealing motion were dismissed then Mr. Waldmann's two clients outside the arbitration would be allowed access to the arbitration material.

16 The sealing order motion of P² is dismissed. P² is to pay \$1,000 in costs forthwith to the plaintiffs represented by Ms. Spies and Mr. Mitchell; no other costs awarded.

Motion dismissed.

Footnotes

- * Leave to appeal to the Ontario Court of Appeal was refused with costs on June 7, 1995, Doc. CA M15773, McKinlay, Griffiths and Doherty J.J.A. (Ont. C.A.).

..

TAB 10

2014 ABQB 350
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Alberta Treasury Branches v. Elaborate Homes Ltd.

2014 CarswellAlta 921, 2014 ABQB 350, [2014] A.W.L.D. 3322, [2014] A.W.L.D. 3353, 14 C.B.R. (6th) 199, 243 A.C.W.S. (3d) 80, 590 A.R. 156

In the Matter of the Insolvency of Elaborate Homes Ltd. and Elaborate Developments Inc.

Alberta Treasury Branches, Plaintiff and Elaborate Homes Ltd., Elaborate Developments Inc., Manjit (John) Nagra, Jaswinder Nagra, Defendants

K.G. Nielsen J.

Heard: May 14, 2014

Judgment: June 11, 2014 *

Docket: Edmonton 1103-02937

Counsel: Robert M. Curtis, Q.C. for Alco Industrial Inc.
Michael J. McCabe, Q.C. for PriceWaterhouseCoopers Inc.

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

MOTION by corporation for leave to file action against receiver, in bankruptcy matter.

K.G. Nielsen J.:

I. Introduction

1 PriceWaterhouseCoopers Inc. (PWC) was appointed as receiver of all current and future assets and property of Elaborate Homes Ltd. and Elaborate Developments Inc. (collectively referred to as Elaborate).

2 Alco Industrial Inc. (Alco) seeks leave to commence proceedings against PWC in relation to matters arising in the receivership.

II. Background

3 Alco held a second mortgage (the Mortgage) in the amount of \$1,075,000 on, *inter alia*, property (the Condo) owned by Elaborate Homes Ltd., legally described as:

Condominium Plan 0520263 Unit 4 and 905 undivided 1/10,000 shares in the common property Excepting thereout all mines and minerals.

4 Alberta Treasury Branches was a secured creditor of Elaborate. It held, *inter alia*, a first mortgage on the Condo.

5 PWC was appointed as the receiver of Elaborate Homes Ltd. pursuant to a Consent Receivership Order dated February 22, 2011 (the Receivership Order). Pursuant to a separate Receivership Order, also dated February 22, 2011, PWC was named as receiver of Elaborate Developments Inc., a company related to Elaborate Homes Ltd.

6 On March 3, 2011, PWC sent notice to Alco, pursuant to ss. 245 and 246 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC, 1985, c B-3 (*BIA*) of the receivership of Elaborate. This was sent by regular mail to the address indicated on the registration of

the Mortgage on the Certificate of Title to the Condo. In the Brief filed in this application on behalf of Alco, it is acknowledged that Alco was served with a copy of the Receivership Order.

7 On or about April 5, 2011, an assistant with legal counsel for PWC (not the counsel for PWC on this application) obtained certain contact information with respect to Alco. While the assistant could not recall with whom she spoke at Alco or the exact conversation, she deposed that she believed she followed her typical practice when speaking to creditors which was as follows:

- (a) she identified herself to the creditor and advised that she was calling from counsel for the receiver with respect to the receivership of the debtor company;
- (b) she advised the creditor that the receiver required certain information from the creditor with respect to the receivership; and
- (c) she requested contact information for the individual within the creditor's organization who would be best suited to receive correspondence with respect to the receivership.

8 In the discussions that ensued with the individual at Alco following this typical practice, she was advised that the owner of Alco was Bob Taubner and she was given his email address. This information is confirmed in a handwritten note made by the assistant. At all material times, Mr. Taubner was the President of Alco.

9 PWC took steps to market Elaborate's assets and property pursuant to the provisions of the Receivership Order. As a result of the marketing efforts, a number of offers were received for individual assets of Elaborate. PWC also received a number of "*en bloc* offers" to purchase all of Elaborate's assets. One of those *en bloc* offers was received from 1601812 Alberta Ltd. (the 160 Offer).

10 In accordance with its obligations, PWC reported to the Court with respect to the offers received in its Second Report, filed May 26, 2011. The Second Report contained a Bid Summary of all of the offers. PWC wished to keep the information in the Bid Summary confidential, and to release it to the public only after the Court had approved a sale. However, parties could obtain a copy of the Bid Summary on signing and sending to PWC a Confidentiality Letter, which provided that anyone signing it would be provided with the Bid Summary, but would be barred from acting as a purchaser in any way in respect of Elaborate's assets.

11 As outlined in the Second Report, PWC was of the opinion that the 160 Offer would lead to the highest net recovery for the creditors of Elaborate, as opposed to accepting other offers for specified or individual assets. PWC formed this view based on the combined value of the cash and assumption of liabilities components of the 160 Offer.

12 PWC accepted the 160 Offer subject to Court approval. PWC recommended to the Court that the 160 Offer be approved on the basis that it was higher than other offers and was preferable from the perspective of all of the creditors of Elaborate as a whole. Compared to all of the other *en bloc* offers, the 160 Offer would produce the highest net recovery on the Condo. Based on its analysis of the 160 Offer, PWC concluded that accepting the 160 Offer would allow for recovery of all of the indebtedness of Elaborate to Alberta Treasury Branches, but would not allow for the full recovery of the indebtedness of Elaborate to another secured creditor, Servus Credit Union. Following discussions with PWC, Servus Credit Union agreed with PWC's recommendation to accept the 160 Offer. PWC had no discussions with Alco with respect to the offers received.

13 The 160 Offer required Court approval by June 3, 2011. By an email dated May 26, 2011, counsel for PWC forwarded to Elaborate's creditors, including Alco, copies of the following:

- (a) the Application for an Order Approving Sale and Vesting Order returnable June 3, 2011 (the Application);
- (b) the Second Report;
- (c) a copy of a letter directed to the Court; and
- (d) a copy of the Confidentiality Letter.

14 On June 3, 2011, Belzil J. heard the application for approval of the sale of Elaborate's assets and property pursuant to the 160 Offer. Belzil J. granted a Sale Approval and Vesting Order approving the acceptance of the 160 Offer by PWC (the Sale Order). Belzil J. also granted a Sealing Order which sealed the Bid Summary until such time as the sale transaction had closed and a letter had been filed with the Clerk of the Court confirming that fact (the Sealing Order).

15 On June 3, 2011, counsel for PWC served the Sale Order and the Sealing Order by email on the listed creditors, including Alco.

16 Mr. Taubner, the President of Alco, has deposed that while he received the email of May 26, 2011 enclosing the Application, and 19 other emails with respect to this receivership, he did not use the email address which had been given to counsel for PWC or any other email address at the material time. He deposed that he was unfamiliar with computers and he did not anticipate that he might receive communications from PWC in such a fashion.

17 On cross-examination on his Affidavit, Mr. Taubner testified that he would occasionally request email communications, some of his employees would communicate with him by email, he would read such emails, and the group accountant for Alco had access to his emails. There is no evidence that any of the emails forwarded to Alco with respect to the Elaborate receivership at the address given, were rejected or returned as undeliverable.

18 The sale of Elaborate's assets and property proceeded pursuant to the 160 Offer, and Alco ultimately received the sum of \$90,553.09 net of costs in relation to the security which it held on the Condo. This recovery was insufficient to pay out the Mortgage.

19 PWC reported in its First Report, filed April 20, 2011, that an appraisal of the Condo had been conducted in August 2010, reflecting a market value of \$785,000. The Bid Summary indicated that the appraised value of the Condo on a forced liquidation was \$505,750. The value assigned to the Condo pursuant to the 160 Offer was \$432,000. This was the highest value assigned to the Condo in any of the *en bloc* offers. An offer had been received on the Condo only. This offer was in the amount of \$529,444.

20 The value assigned to the Condo in the 160 Offer represented 85% of the forced liquidation valuation. Only two other assets had higher returns compared to their valuations. The lowest allocation to an asset in the offers received was 24% of that asset's valuation.

21 Andrew Burnett, Vice President of PWC, was involved in this receivership. He filed an Affidavit in response to Alco's Application and was examined on it. With respect to the 160 Offer, Mr. Burnett deposed as follows:

Page 30, lines 17 to 22:

Q Was there ever any conversation with the offeror about modifying its offer in respect of the office condo [the Condo] because of the position of Alco?

A No, there was never discussion with them about changing their position on any of the other pieces of property other than the Althen One [unrelated to the Condo].

Page 33, lines 25 to 27 and Page 34, lines 1 to 11:

Q One of the bids that PWC did receive for the office condo alone was over \$500,000, correct?

A Correct.

Q When that bid came in, do I take it that the sole consideration was that it was a standalone bid whereas you wanted to have *en bloc* bids?

A No.

Q What consideration was given to possibly accepting that bid?

A We went back to all the purchasers that had more than one item on there and asked them whether we could carve out pieces, saying okay, you're the highest on this, but you're lower on this, can we just take that?

Page 36, lines 15 to 20:

Q What did Studio Homes [formerly 1601812 Alberta Ltd.] specifically advise with respect to their position on the office condo at the time, not in January of 2014, but at the time?

A At the time, and I won't say it's just on the office condo, we asked whether they would pull any of their other parcels out and they advised no.

III. Terms of the Orders

A. Receivership Order

22 The following provisions of the Receivership Order are relevant to this application:

...2. Pursuant to sections 243(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985, c. B-03 (the "BIA"), 13(2) of the *Judicature Act*, RSA 2000, c. J-2, 99(a) of the *Business Corporations Act*, RSA 2000, c. B-9 and 65(7) of the *Personal Property Security Act*, RSA 2000, c. P-7, PriceWaterhouseCoopers Inc. is hereby appointed Receiver (the "Receiver"), without security, of all of the Debtor current and future assets, undertakings and properties real and personal of every nature and kind whatsoever, and wherever situate, including all proceeds thereof ("the Property").

3. The Receiver is hereby empowered and authorized, but not obligated, to act at once in respect of the property and, without in any way limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Receiver is hereby expressly empowered and authorized to do any of the following where the Receiver considers it necessary or desirable:

...(k) to market any or all of the Property, including advertising and soliciting offers in respect of the Property or any part or parts thereof and negotiating such terms and conditions of sale as the Receiver in its discretion may deem appropriate.

(l) To sell, convey, transfer, lease or assign the Property (the "Disposition") or any part or parts thereof: ...

7. No proceeding or enforcement process in any court or tribunal (each, a "Proceeding") shall be commenced or continued against the Receiver except with the written consent of the Receiver or with leave of this Court.

...

16. The Receiver shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of its appointment or carrying out the provisions of this Order, save and except for any gross negligence or wilful misconduct on its part, or in respect of its obligations under sections 81.4(5) or 81.6(3) of the BIA or under the WEPPA. Nothing in this order shall derogate from the protection afforded to the Receiver by s. 14.06 of the BIA or any other applicable legislation.

B. Sale Order

23 The following provisions of the Sale Order are relevant to this application:

1. Service of the notice of this application and supporting materials is hereby declared to be good and sufficient, and no other person is required to have been served with notice of this application, and time for service is abridged to that actually given.

2. The Receiver's acceptance of the Purchaser's offer to purchase the Lands and Personal Property dated May 6th, 2011 as clarified and extended by the letter from the Receiver dated May 13, 2011, the e-mail from the Purchaser's legal counsel to the Receiver's legal counsel dated May 19, 2011, the letter from legal counsel for the Receiver to legal counsel for the Purchaser dated May 20, 2011, the letter from legal counsel for the Purchaser to legal counsel for the Receiver dated May 24, 2011, the letter from legal counsel for the Purchaser to legal counsel for the Receiver dated May 25, 2011, and the letter from the Receiver to the Purchaser dated May 26, 2011 (the "Offer"), which Offer is summarized at paragraphs 20 to 32 of the Receiver's Second Report, and [sic] is hereby approved and ratified.

...

15. Service of this Order may be effected upon those persons (directly or through legal counsel) on the Service List by facsimile or electronic mail, and such service shall constitute good and sufficient service. Service on any person other than as specified in the Service List is hereby dispensed with.

C. Sealing Order

24 The following provision of the Sealing Order is relevant to this application:

1. ... the Clerk of the Court is hereby directed to seal the Bid Summary (the "Confidential Documents") on the Court file until the sale of the Lands and Personal Property to 1601812 Alberta Ltd. has been closed in accordance with the Offer Terms and the filing of a letter with the Clerk of the Court from PriceWaterhouseCoopers Inc. confirming the sale of the Lands and Personal Property has been closed. ...

IV. Positions of the Parties

25 Alco argues that leave should be granted to file the Statement of Claim appended to its Application. Alco submits that it has a claim against PWC for gross negligence or wilful misconduct in serving the Application by email on May 26, 2011, and selling the Condo for less than its appraised value, thereby preferring the interests of other creditors to those of Alco.

26 PWC argues that there is no basis for a claim against it, as all documents were properly served on Alco by email, and all steps taken by it were in accordance with its obligations to act in the best interests of the creditors of Elaborate as a whole. Therefore, it was neither grossly negligent, nor did it wilfully misconduct itself.

V. Issue

27 The sole issue before the Court is whether Alco should be granted leave to file the Statement of Claim against PWC.

VI. Applicable Rules

A. Alberta Rules of Court, Alta Reg 124/2010

28 The following Rules of the *Alberta Rules of Court* are relevant to this application:

9.15(1) On application, the Court may set aside, vary or discharge a judgment or an order, whether final or interlocutory, that was made

(a) without notice to one or more affected persons, or

(b) following a trial or hearing at which an affected person did not appear because of an accident or mistake or because of insufficient notice of the trial or hearing.

(2) Unless the Court otherwise orders, the application must be made within 20 days after the earlier of

44 In contrast, *BIA* Rule 124 provides that a notice pursuant to s. 244(1) of the *BIA* by a secured creditor who intends to enforce a security on all or substantially all property of an insolvent may be "sent, *if agreed to by the parties*, by electronic transmission". Neither s. 245 regarding the initial notice of the receiver, nor general Rule 6(1) imposes a similar requirement.

45 The *Alberta Rules of Court* supplement the *BIA Rules* to the extent that they are not inconsistent with the *BIA* or the *BIA Rules*. Rule 11.21 requires that the recipient has specifically provided an address. Arguably, this is more onerous than Rule 6(1), and therefore inconsistent with it. However, even if Rule 11.21 of the *Alberta Rules of Court* applies, there is nothing in the material before the Court to suggest that the requirements of Rule 11.21 were not met in this case.

46 I also note that if Alco wished to pursue the position that the Sale Order had been obtained without notice to it, it could have availed itself of Rule 9.15 of the *Alberta Rules of Court* which provides a mechanism to seek to vary or discharge a judgment or order on that basis. Such an application must be made within 20 days after the earlier of service of the order on the applicant, or the date the order first came to the applicant's attention.

47 The Sale Order was, of course, also served by email on Alco. Therefore, Alco would argue that the Sale Order was not properly served upon it. However, on the record before me it is clear that Alco was aware of the Sale Order by January 11, 2012 at the latest, when it resisted the apportionment of receivership costs as against the proceeds from the sale of the Condo. Alco took no timely steps to set aside the Sale Order for lack of service upon becoming aware of it.

48 Further, the Sale Order makes it clear that service of the Application was declared to be good and sufficient and that service of the Sale Order could be effected upon all affected persons by way of facsimile or electronic mail, and such service was constituted to be good and sufficient. Therefore, it appears that Belzil J. considered the matter of both service of the Application and the Sale Order. Again, Alco could have either appealed the Sale Order, or sought to set it aside on the basis of a lack of notice. It took neither of these steps.

49 I would add that in today's world, electronic service is a reflection of practical realities. The *Alberta Rules of Court* and the *BIA Rules* recognize this reality. Perhaps there is no area of practice where electronic service of documents is more appropriate than the bankruptcy and insolvency area. I say this because of the volume of documents that are often produced in such matters, and the need for receivers, trustees, monitors and counsel to act expeditiously and often in the face of very short deadlines. Given the commercial and legal realities of bankruptcy and insolvency matters, there is an obvious need to exchange documents electronically. In my view, a party involved in such matters cannot ignore these realities by refusing to move effectively into the electronic age.

50 In summary, I find nothing in the material before the Court to suggest that PWC through its counsel did not properly effect service of both the Application and the Sale Order on Alco by emailing those documents to Mr. Taubner at Alco. There is no factual basis to suggest that PWC was either grossly negligent, or that it wilfully misconducted itself, in effecting service of the documents by email.

B. Sale Transaction

51 Alco also alleges that PWC breached its duties to Alco in the manner in which it conducted the sale of Elaborate's assets. Specifically, Alco alleges that PWC concealed the Bid Summary, and sold the Condo for an amount which was below its appraised value.

52 The Second Report indicated that PWC preferred that the Bid Summary remain confidential until such time as the sale transaction had closed. Upon signing the Confidentiality Letter, the Bid Summary would be disclosed to the signatory on the basis that the information disclosed in the Bid Summary would not later be used by the signatory as a potential purchaser of Elaborate assets.

53 Alco argues that PWC should not have required it to give up any right to make an offer on the Condo. Alco submits that its rights "ought not to have been extorted away under threat that otherwise the information necessary for it to respond to a court application would be kept hidden from view".

54 It is common practice in the insolvency context for information in relation to the sale of the assets of an insolvent corporation to be kept confidential until after the sale is completed pursuant to a Court order. In *Look Communications Inc. v. Look Mobile Corp.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 7952, [2009] O.J. No. 5440 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), Newbould J. explained the reasons for such confidentiality:

17 It is common when assets are being sold pursuant to a court process to seal the Monitor's report disclosing all of the various bids in case a further bidding process is required if the transaction being approved falls through. Invariably, no one comes back asking that the sealing order be set aside. That is because ordinarily all of the assets that were bid on during the court sale process end up being sold and approved by court order, and so long as the sale transaction or transactions closed, no one has any further interest in the information. In *8857574 Ontario Inc. v. Pizza Pizza Ltd.*, (1994), 23 B.L.R. (2nd) 239, Farley J. discussed the fact that valuations submitted by a Receiver for the purpose of obtaining court approval are normally sealed. He pointed out that the purpose of that was 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. In that context, he stated that he thought the most appropriate sealing order in a court approval sale situation would be that the supporting valuation materials remain sealed until such time as the sale transaction had closed.

55 Alco alleges that PWC and its counsel ignored Alco, hid the Bid Summary and cloaked their activities in the receivership with secrecy. However, there is nothing in the material before the Court to suggest that PWC's preference to keep the Bid Summary confidential until the sale transaction had been approved and closed was for any purpose other than to ensure the integrity of the marketing process, and to avoid misuse of the information in the Bid Summary by a subsequent bidder to obtain an unfair advantage in the event it was necessary to remarket Elaborate's assets. Further, there is nothing to suggest that Belzil J. granted the Sealing Order for any other reason.

56 Alco may have been in a unique position given that it held a second mortgage on the Condo. Given that unique position, it may very well have been entitled to receive information with respect to the offers received in relation to the Condo and, therefore, could have suggested revised terms to any required confidentiality agreement. However, Alco's position does not render PWC's actions inappropriate. There is nothing to suggest that PWC's actions in this regard were not in accordance with common, prudent and reasonable practice in receiverships, or that they reflect or resulted from gross negligence or wilful misconduct on the part of PWC.

57 With respect to the manner in which the sale of the Condo was conducted, Alco submits that PWC breached a "fundamental duty of Receivers" in that it failed to act with an even hand towards classes of creditors and in accordance with recognised lawful priorities. Again, the law and the material before the Court do not support this contention.

58 The obligations of a receiver in carrying out a sales transaction have been considered in numerous cases. In *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1, [1991] O.J. No. 1137 (Ont. C.A.) at paras 27-29, Galligan J.A. cited with approval case law for the proposition that if a receiver's decision to enter into an agreement of sale, subject to court approval, is reasonable and sound under the circumstances at the time, it should not be set aside simply because a later and higher bid is made. Otherwise, chaos would result in the commercial world, and receivers and purchasers would never be sure they had a binding agreement. Galligan J.A. concluded:

30 What those cases show is that the prices in other offers have relevance only if they show that the price contained in the offer accepted by the receiver was so unreasonably low as to demonstrate that the receiver was improvident in accepting it. I am of the opinion, therefore, that if they do not tend to show that the receiver was improvident, they should not be considered upon a motion to confirm a sale recommended by a court-appointed receiver. If they were, the process would be changed from a sale by a receiver, subject to court approval, into an auction conducted by the court at the time approval

is sought. In my opinion, the latter course is unfair to the person who has entered *bona fide* into an agreement with the receiver, can only lead to chaos, and must be discouraged.

59 Galligan J.A. recognized that in considering a sale by a receiver, a court must place a great deal of confidence in the actions taken and in the opinions formed by the receiver, and should assume that the receiver is acting properly unless the contrary is clearly shown. He summarized the duties of the court when deciding whether a receiver who has sold property acted properly as follows (at para 17):

1. It should consider whether the receiver has made a sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently;
2. It should consider the interests of all parties;
3. It should consider the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers are obtained;
4. It should consider whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process.

60 In *Skyepharm PLC v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp.* (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 87, [1999] O.J. No. 4300 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para 4, Farley J. cited *Soundair* with approval, holding that a receiver's conduct is to be reviewed in light of the objective information the receiver had and not with the benefit of hindsight. Other offers are irrelevant unless they demonstrate that the price in the proposed sale was so unreasonably low that it shows the receiver acted improvidently in accepting it.

61 In *Scanwood Canada Ltd., Re*, 2011 NSSC 189, 305 N.S.R. (2d) 34 (N.S. S.C.), the receiver was of the view that the best realization of the assets in question would come from a sale *en bloc*. Hood J. held that the receiver's duty to act in the interests of the general body of creditors does not necessarily mean that the majority rules. Rather, the receiver must consider the interests of all creditors and then act for the benefit of the general body.

62 PWC accepted the 160 Offer and recommended that the acceptance be approved by the Court on the basis that it was higher than other *en bloc* offers and was preferable from the overall perspective of Elaborate's creditors. The 160 Offer provided for the highest net recovery on the Condo of all of the *en bloc* offers and represented a recovery of 85% of the forced liquidation valuation of the Condo. Only one other offer in the marketing process undertaken by PWC assigned a purchase price for the Condo which was higher than the price assigned in the 160 Offer. This was an offer with respect to the Condo only.

63 The law is clear to the effect that the receiver must not consider the interests of only one creditor, but must act for the benefit of the general body of creditors. PWC was under a duty to act in the interests of the general body of creditors and to conduct a fair and efficient marketing process.

64 The excerpts from the cross-examination of Mr. Burnett on his Affidavit indicate that PWC did attempt to maximize the recovery on all of Elaborate's assets as it conducted negotiations with the various bidders in this regard.

65 There is nothing before the Court to suggest that PWC did not make sufficient efforts to obtain the best price for the assets, nor that it acted improvidently. Alco has not put forward any factual foundation to support an inference that PWC did not act for the benefit of the general body of creditors.

66 Alco submits that had it attended the hearing on June 3, 2011 before Belzil J., it would have been successful in arguing that Alco was deprived of a statutory right to recover its secured debt against the Condo. However, the contents of the Second Report undermine the argument that PWC's acceptance of the 160 Offer would not have been approved in the circumstances as known when the matter proceeded before Belzil J. Further, given my findings on the email service issue, PWC cannot be blamed for Alco's non-attendance at the hearing on June 3, 2011.

67 Therefore, I conclude that Alco has not established a factual basis for the claim that PWC was either grossly negligent or wilfully misconducted itself in the manner that it marketed Elaborate's assets or in its reporting to the Court.

IX. Conclusion

68 The threshold test for leave in this case is low. However, PWC would only be liable if it acted with gross negligence or wilful misconduct. I have found no factual basis to suggest that PWC was either grossly negligent or wilfully misconducted itself as alleged by Alco.

69 PWC is not entitled to protection against proper actions simply because it was court appointed. However, I am mindful of the bias against exposing a court appointed officer to unnecessary or unwarranted litigation. In my view, granting leave to Alco to proceed with the claim against PWC would expose it to a manifestly unmeritorious action.

70 Therefore, Alco's application for leave to file the Statement of Claim against PWC is dismissed.

X. Costs

71 If the parties cannot otherwise agree on costs, they may appear before me within 60 days of the filing of these Reasons for Judgment.

Motion dismissed.

Footnotes

* A corrigendum issued by the court on June 23, 2014 has been incorporated herein.

TAB 11

2014 ONCA 851
Ontario Court of Appeal

Bank of Nova Scotia v. Diemer

2014 CarswellOnt 16721, 2014 ONCA 851, 20 C.B.R. (6th) 292, 247 A.C.W.S. (3d) 584, 327 O.A.C. 376

**The Bank of Nova Scotia, Plaintiff (Respondent) and Daniel
A. Diemer o/a Cornacre Cattle Co., Defendant (Respondent)**

Alexandra Hoy A.C.J.O., E.A. Cronk, Sarah E. Pepall J.J.A.

Heard: June 10, 2014

Judgment: December 1, 2014

Docket: CA C58381

Proceedings: affirming *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Diemer* (2014), 2014 ONSC 365, 2014 CarswellOnt 666, A.J. Goodman J. (Ont. S.C.J.)

Counsel: Peter H. Griffin for Appellant, PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc.

James H. Cooke for Respondent, Daniel A. Diemer

No one for Respondent, The Bank of Nova Scotia

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Headnote

Debtors and creditors --- Receivers — Remuneration of receiver — Remuneration — Miscellaneous

Counsel fees — Bank held security over debtor's cattle farm operations, and was owed approximately \$2,000,000 — On application by bank, receiver was appointed — Receiver requested legal fees of \$255,955 on behalf of its counsel — Motion judge found legal fees were excessive, given size of receivership, and refused to approve them — Motion judge assessed fees at \$157,500, plus disbursements of \$4,434.92 — Receiver appealed — Appeal dismissed — Motion judge did not err in disallowing counsel's fees — Initial appointment order stating that counsel was to be compensated at "standard rates", and subsequent approval of receiver's reports, did not oust need for court to consider whether fees claimed were fair and reasonable — Motion judge made no palpable and overriding error in concluding that counsel's fees were not fair and reasonable — It was inappropriate for motion judge to simply apply rates of London counsel, but this was not fatal — Motion judge was informed by correct principles, which led him to conclude fees lacked proportionality and reasonableness — Certain comments made by motion judge were not justified, but different result should not ensue.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by Sarah E. Pepall J.A.:

Belyea v. Federal Business Development Bank (1983), 44 N.B.R. (2d) 248, 116 A.P.R. 248, 1983 CarswellNB 27, 46 C.B.R. (N.S.) 244 (N.B. C.A.) — followed

BT-PR Realty Holdings Inc. v. Coopers & Lybrand (1997), 29 O.T.C. 354, 1997 CarswellOnt 1246 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Confectionately Yours Inc., Re (2002), 2002 CarswellOnt 3002, 164 O.A.C. 84, 36 C.B.R. (4th) 200, 25 C.P.C. (5th) 207, 219 D.L.R. (4th) 72 (Ont. C.A.) — followed

Confectionately Yours Inc., Re (2003), 2003 CarswellOnt 1043, 2003 CarswellOnt 1044, 312 N.R. 195 (note), 41 C.B.R. (4th) 28, 181 O.A.C. 197 (note) (S.C.C.) — referred to

HSBC Bank Canada v. Lechier-Kimel (2014), 2014 CarswellOnt 14539, 2014 ONCA 721 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

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

s. 243(1) — pursuant to

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.

34 In Canada, very little has been written on professional fees in insolvency proceedings: see Stephanie Ben-Ishai and Virginia Torrie, "A 'Cost' Benefit Analysis: Examining Professional Fees in CCAA Proceedings" in Janis P. Sarra, ed., *Annual Review of Insolvency Law* (Toronto: Carswell, 2010) 141, at p.151.

35 Having said that, it is evident that the fairness and reasonableness of the fees of a receiver and its counsel are the stated lynchpins in the *Bakemates* analysis. However, in actual practice, time spent, that is, hours spent times hourly rate, has tended to be the predominant factor in determining the quantum of legal fees.

36 There is a certain irony associated with this dichotomy. A person requiring legal advice does not set out to buy time. Rather, the object of the exercise is to buy services. Moreover, there is something inherently troubling about a billing system that pits a lawyer's financial interest against that of its client and that has built-in incentives for inefficiency. The billable hour model has both of these undesirable features.

(c) The Rise and Dominance of the Billable Hour

37 For many decades now, the cornerstone of legal accounts and law firms has been the billable hour. It ostensibly provides an objective measure for both clients and law firms. For the most part, it determines the quantum of fees. From an internal law firm perspective, the billable hour also measures productivity and is an important tool in assessing the performance of associates and partners alike.

38 The billable hour traces its roots to the mid-20th century. In 1958, the American Bar Association ("ABA")'s Special Commission on the Economics of Law Practice published a study entitled "The 1958 Lawyer and his 1938 Dollar". The study noted that lawyers' incomes had not kept pace with those of other professionals and recommended improved recording of time spent and a target of 1,300 billable hours per year to boost lawyers' profits: see Stuart L. Pardau, "*Bill, Baby, Bill: How the Billable Hour Emerged as the Primary Method of Attorney Fee Generation and Why Early Reports of its Demise May be Greatly Exaggerated*" (2013) 50 Idaho L. Rev. 1, at pp. 4-5. By 2002, in its Commission on Billable Hours, the ABA revised its proposed expectation to 2,300 hours docketed annually of which 1,900 would represent billable work: see Pardau, at p. 2. And that was in 2002.

39 Typically, a lawyer's record of billable hours is accompanied by dockets that record and detail the time spent on a matter. In theory, this allows for considerable transparency. However, docketing may become more of an art than a science, and the objective of transparency is sometimes elusive.

40 This case illustrates the problem. Here, the lawyers provided dockets in blocks of time that provide little, if any, insight into the value provided by the time recorded. Moreover, each hour is divided into 10 six-minute segments, with six minutes being the minimum docket. So, for example, reading a one line e-mail could engender a 6 minute docket and associated fee. This segmenting of the hour to be docketed does not necessarily encourage accuracy or docketing parsimony.

(d) Fees in Context of Court Appointed Receiver

41 The cost of legal services is highlighted in the context of a court-supervised insolvency due to its public nature. In contrast, the cost of putting together many of the transactions that then become unravelled in court insolvency proceedings rarely attract the public scrutiny that professional fees in insolvencies do. While many of the principles described in these reasons may also be applicable to other areas of legal practice, the focus of this appeal is on legal fees in an insolvency.

42 Bilateral relationships are not the norm in an insolvency. In a traditional solicitor/client relationship, there are built-in checks and balances, incentives, and, frequently, prior agreements on fees. These sorts of arrangements are less common in an insolvency. For example, a receiver may not have the ability or incentive to reap the benefit of any pre-agreed client percentage fee discount of the sort that is incorporated from time to time into fee arrangements in bilateral relationships.

43 In a court-supervised insolvency, stakeholders with little or no influence on the fees may ultimately bear the burden of the largesse of legal expenditures. In the case under appeal, the recoveries were sufficient to discharge the debt owed to BNS. As such, it did not bear the cost of the receivership. In contrast, had the receivership costs far exceeded BNS's debt recovery such that in essence it was funding the professional fees, BNS would hold the economic interest and other stakeholders would be unaffected.

44 In a receivership, the duty to monitor legal fees and services in the first instance is on the receiver. Choice of counsel is also entirely within the purview of the receiver. In selecting its counsel, the receiver must consider expertise, complexity, location, and anticipated costs. The responsibility is on the receiver to choose counsel who best suits the circumstances of the receivership. However, subsequently, the court must pass on the fairness and reasonableness of the fees of the receiver and its counsel.

45 In my view, it is not for the court to tell lawyers and law firms how to bill. That said, in proceedings supervised by the court and particularly where the court is asked to give its *imprimatur* to the legal fees requested for counsel by its court officer, the court must ensure that the compensation sought is indeed fair and reasonable. In making this assessment, *all* the *Belyea* factors, including time spent, should be considered. However, value provided should pre-dominate over the mathematical calculation reflected in the hours times hourly rate equation. Ideally, the two should be synonymous, but that should not be the starting assumption. Thus, the factors identified in *Belyea* require a consideration of the overall value contributed by the receiver's counsel. The focus of the fair and reasonable assessment should be on what was accomplished, not on how much time it took. Of course, the measurement of accomplishment may include consideration of complications and difficulties encountered in the receivership.

TAB 12

2015 ABQB 745
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Servus Credit Union Ltd. v. Trimove Inc.

2015 CarswellAlta 2169, 2015 ABQB 745, [2015] A.J. No. 1275, [2016] A.W.L.D. 488, 260 A.C.W.S. (3d) 677

**Servus Credit Union Ltd, Applicant and
Trimove Inc. and Geeta Luthra, Respondents**

J.B. Veit J.

Heard: November 18, 2015
Judgment: November 24, 2015
Docket: Edmonton 1503-06388

Counsel: Kentigern A. Rowan, Q.C., for Receiver, MNP Ltd.
Thomas Gusa, for Applicant, Servus Credit Union Ltd.
Darren R. Bieganeck, Q.C., for AFSC (Agricultural Financial Service Corporation)
Vishal Luthra, Geeta Luthra, for themselves

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency; Public; Torts

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Receivers — Fees and expenses

Court-appointed receiver recovered total of approximately \$1.1 million of which approximately \$863,000 was available to distribute to creditors — Receiver brought application for approval of its fees and its lawyer's fees which together totalled approximately \$82,000 — Application granted — No basis was established for any substantive challenge to fees — Receiver provided detailed information about its activities and about individuals who undertook them and their rates — Amount of work undertaken by receiver was to be assessed in light of all circumstances of case including uncooperative attitude expressed by debtors at outset, difficulties of accounting for rolling stock, and ongoing failure of debtors to provide timely, accurate information — Debtors had contracted to pay receiver's lawyer's fees on full indemnity basis — Contract with respect to fees should be conclusive in absence of any argument that contract itself is invalid — There was no suggestion that legal fees exceeded those which could be said to be essential to and arising within four corners of litigation.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by J.B. Veit J.:

Alberta Treasury Branches v. Weatherlok Canada Ltd. (2011), 2011 ABCA 314, 2011 CarswellAlta 1883, 343 D.L.R. (4th) 304, (sub nom. *Trinier v. Shurnaik*) 515 A.R. 148, (sub nom. *Trinier v. Shurnaik*) 532 W.A.C. 148, 68 Alta. L.R. (5th) 400 (Alta. C.A.) — referred to
BT-PR Realty Holdings Inc. v. Coopers & Lybrand (1997), 1997 CarswellOnt 1246, 29 O.T.C. 354 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered
Bank of Nova Scotia v. Diemer (2014), 2014 ONCA 851, 2014 CarswellOnt 16721, 20 C.B.R. (6th) 292, 327 O.A.C. 376 (Ont. C.A.) — followed
Belyea v. Federal Business Development Bank (1983), 46 C.B.R. (N.S.) 244, 44 N.B.R. (2d) 248, 116 A.P.R. 248, 1983 CarswellNB 27 (N.B. C.A.) — followed
Confectionately Yours Inc., Re (2002), 2002 CarswellOnt 3002, 36 C.B.R. (4th) 200, 164 O.A.C. 84, 25 C.P.C. (5th) 207, 219 D.L.R. (4th) 72 (Ont. C.A.) — followed
Sidorsky v. CFCN Communications Ltd. (1995), 27 Alta. L.R. (3d) 296, 35 C.P.C. (3d) 239, [1995] 5 W.W.R. 190, 167 A.R. 181, 1995 CarswellAlta 86 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to
911502 Alberta Ltd. v. Elephant Enterprises Inc. (2014), 2014 ABCA 437, 2014 CarswellAlta 2293, 588 A.R. 296, 626 W.A.C. 296 (Alta. C.A.) — referred to

Tariffs considered:

Alberta Rules of Court, Alta. Reg. 124/2010

Sched. C — referred to

APPLICATION by receiver for approval of fees.

J.B. Veit J.:

Summary

- 1 The court-appointed receiver asks for approval of its, and its lawyer's, fees.
- 2 The debtors claim that both the receiver's fees and the receiver's lawyer's fees are excessive. They do not provide any evidence in support of their argument.
- 3 The court granted to Servus Credit Union Ltd. a without notice interim receivership, subsequently extended to a full receivership, of Trimove Inc. By the time of the granting of the full receivership, it was apparent that the debtors were insolvent: not only could they not pay Servus' demand claims, they could not pay their employees' salaries, etc. As of the date of the current application to distribute proceeds and award costs, the debtors owed Servus Credit Union approximately \$1.2 million. The instruments creating the secured debt include a contractual obligation on Trimove Inc. and the guarantor Luthra to pay all costs and expense of enforcing the security, including legal fees on "a solicitor-and-his-own-client full indemnity basis". The receiver recovered a total of approximately \$1.1 million, of which approximately \$863,000.00 was available to distribute to Trimove's secured creditors. The receiver proposes that Servus receive approximately \$298,000.00 of that fund. The fees claimed by the receiver and the receiver's lawyer total approximately \$82,000.00.
- 4 The debtors propose that the court appoint an independent expert in receiverships to assess the costs claimed and report to the court; they propose that the maximum fee payable for that work be \$3,000.00.
- 5 The debtors' application for the appointment of an expert to give an opinion on fees is denied. The applicant's request for approval of its, and its lawyers' fees, is granted.

6 Receivers and receivers' lawyers' fees are tested according to well-established legal principles as set out, for example, in *Belyea, Bakemates* and *Diemer*.

7 Here, the receiver has set out detailed dockets and an explanation of the multiplicand basis for its fee. Not only have the debtors not provided any evidence that the hourly fees charged were excessive, they have not established that the work undertaken was excessive. On the contrary, in light of the principal's early comment to the receiver, "We'll make sure you get nothing", the nature of the assets - rolling stock, and the documented failure of the debtors to provide reliable information on such crucial assets as accounts receivable, there is no evidence that the time spent by the receiver in tracking down assets was unreasonable.

8 While the claim for lawyer's fees was set out in only two lines of information and was not verified by affidavit as is recommended in *Bakemates*, the debtors contracted to pay all legal costs associated with recovery "on an indemnity basis"; that contract does not limit fees to what is reasonable. There is no suggestion of duress or equivalent in the negotiation of the lawyer's fee contract; as indicated by Farley J., in the absence of duress, an "agreement as to the fees should be conclusive." *BT-PR Realty Holdings*. In any event, however, neither of the two main secured creditors, who are the only parties whose recovery deficit would be ameliorated if the fees were reduced, nor the court, in the exercise of its oversight responsibility, discern any excess in the fees claimed by the receiver's lawyers.

9 If there were a basis for review of the receivers' fees, the court would not hire an outside expert; rather it would engage in the process outlined in *Bakemates*.

Cases and authority cited: