

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

BETWEEN:

BANK OF MONTREAL

Applicant

- and -

**THANE INTERNATIONAL, INC., THANE DIRECT, INC., THANE DIRECT
COMPANY, THANE DIRECT MARKETING INC. WEST COAST DIRECT
MARKETING, INC., THANE DIRECT CANADA INC. AND TDG, INC.**

Respondents

**Application under Section 243 of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3,
as amended, and under Section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C-43**

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE APPLICANT

Returnable October 23, 2015

GOWLING LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP

Barristers and Solicitors
1 First Canadian Place
100 King Street West, Suite 1600
Toronto, Ontario M5X 1G5

Clifton Prophet (LSUC #34845K)

Tel: (416) 862-3509
Fax: (416) 862-7661
Email: clifton.prophet@gowlings.com

C. Haddon Murray (LSUC #61640P)

Tel: (416) 862-3604
Fax: (416) 862-7661
Email: haddon.murray@gowlings.com

Solicitors for Bank of Montreal.

INDEX

TAB AUTHORITY

1. *Montrose Mortgage Corp. V Kingsway Arms Ottawa Inc.*, 2013 ONSC 6905.
2. *Bank of Nova Scotia v Freure Village on Clair Creek*, [1996] OJ No. 5088, 1996 CarswellOnt 2328 (OCJ – Gen. Div [Commercial List])
3. *Re Bilrite Rubber (1984) Inc.*, 2009 CarswellOnt 9475 (SCJ [Commercial List])
4. *Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp.*, [1991] O.J. No. 1137 (C.A.)
5. *Re Eddie Bauer of Canada Inc.*, [2009] O.J. No. 3784 (SCJ [Commercial List])
6. *Sierra Club of Canada v Canada (Minister of Finance)*, 2002 SCC 41.
7. *Ron Handelman Investments Ltd. v Mass Properties Inc.* (2009), 55 CBR (5th) 271 (Ont SCJ [Commercial List]).

TAB 1

2013 ONSC 6905
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Montrose Mortgage Corp. v. Kingsway Arms Ottawa Inc.

2013 CarswellOnt 15278, 2013 ONSC 6905, 17 C.B.R. (6th) 169, 233 A.C.W.S. (3d) 638

**Montrose Mortgage Corporation Ltd., Applicant and Kingsway Arms
Ottawa Inc., 1168614 Ontario Limited, Kingsway Arms (Walden
Village) Inc., Kingsway Arms (Carleton Place) Inc., Respondents**

D.M. Brown J.

Heard: November 5, 2013
Judgment: November 6, 2013
Docket: CV-13-10298-00CL

Counsel: J. Dietrich for Applicant
R. Jaipargas for proposed Receiver, Grant Thornton Limited

Subject: Insolvency; Estates and Trusts; Corporate and Commercial; Property

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by D.M. Brown J.:

Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek (1996), 1996 CarswellOnt 2328, 40 C.B.R. (3d) 274 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — followed

Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp. (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 83 D.L.R. (4th) 76, 46 O.A.C. 321, 4 O.R. (3d) 1, 1991 CarswellOnt 205 (Ont. C.A.) — followed

Tool-Plas Systems Inc., Re (2008), 48 C.B.R. (5th) 91, 2008 CarswellOnt 6258 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

9-Ball Interests Inc. v. Traditional Life Sciences Inc. (2012), 89 C.B.R. (5th) 78, 2012 CarswellOnt 5829, 2012 ONSC 2788, 19 P.P.S.A.C. (3d) 211 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3
s. 244 — considered

Mortgages Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. M.40
Generally — referred to

Personal Property Security Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.10
Generally — referred to

APPLICATION by creditor for appointment of receiver and manager, and order approving sale of assets.

D.M. Brown J.:

I. Application for approval of a "pre-pack" credit bid sale in a proposed receivership

1 Montrose Mortgage Corporation Ltd. applied for (i) an order appointing Grant Thornton Limited ("GTL") as receiver and manager of all assets, undertakings and properties of Kingsway Arms Ottawa Inc., 1168614 Ontario Limited, Kingsway Arms (Walden Village) Inc. and Kingsway Arms (Carleton Place) Inc. (collectively the "Debtors"), as well as (ii) an order approving a purchase and sale agreement between the Receiver and 2391766 Ontario Inc. dated October 16, 2013, together with a related vesting order. The proposed sale essentially involved an indirect credit bid by the debtors' main secured creditor, Montrose, which was acting on the loans to the Debtors as agent for GMF Nominee Inc. ("Greystone").

2 On November 5, 2013, I granted and signed the orders sought. These are my reasons for so doing.

II. Material facts

3 The Debtors operated four retirement residences which werer home to about 351 residents and employed 220 employees. The Debtors were beneficially owned by several limited partnerships. Service of the application was made on those beneficial owners. Counsel for a number of the beneficial owners sent an email to applicant's counsel on November 4, 2013, advising that he had no instructions to appear at the hearing to oppose the relief requested; no other beneficial owner appeared.

4 The Debtors were operated by three related management companies: Kingsway Arms Management (Villa Orleans/St. Joseph) Inc., Kingsway Arms Management (at Walden Village) Inc. and Kingsway Arms Management (at Carleton Place) Inc. In its November 1, 2013 Supplemental Report Grant Thorton stated that the Property Managers had executed an agreement which contemplated the termination of the property management agreements upon the issuance of the Approval and Vesting Order.

5 As of August 31, 2013, the Debtors owed Montrose close to \$36 million. Montrose had made demands for payment and had given *BIA* s. 244 notices back in March and December, 2012. As well, Montrose delivered notices of sale under the *PPSA* and *Mortgages Act*. The evidence disclosed that the Debtors were unable to repay or service that debt and were in default of the terms of the loans. Independent counsel to GTL delivered opinions that Montrose's security was valid and enforceable subject to the customary qualifications and assumptions.

6 In February, 2012, Montrose appointed GTL as monitor to review and report on the financial and operational condition of the Debtors. With Montrose's support, in March, 2012 one of the Debtors retained John A. Jenson Realty Inc. as listing agent to market, ultimately, each of the four retirement residences.

7 The application materials described in detail the efforts Jenson undertook to market the properties, which included advertisements, direct contact with potential purchasers, the preparation of a confidential information memorandum and granting access to data to those who made serious expressions of interest. Few offers resulted. Most offers, if accepted, would have resulted in a significant shortfall on the debt. In the first half of this year a more substantial offer emerged which resulted in the execution of a letter of intent, but the transaction did not proceed because the purchaser was unable to secure adequate financing.

8 Montrose obtained appraisals of the retirement residences from a professional appraiser, Altus Group Limited, and, in the case of the Carleton Place Retirement Residence, an additional appraisal from CBRE Limited. The Altus Group appraisals gave two valuation opinions for each property: one on an "as is" basis, and the other on a "stabilized" occupancy basis. I have reviewed those appraisals. Given that the occupancy rates for three of the residences were below the 80% level, with one at 57%, and Carleton Place was 88% occupied, I agreed with the submissions of the applicant that the "as is" basis valuations presented a more accurate picture of fair market value at this juncture.

9 In light of the failure of the marketing process to elicit satisfactory offers for the properties, Montrose applied for the appointment of a receiver over the properties in order to effect a credit bid sale for them. Greystone incorporated the Purchaser who proposed to acquire each Debtor's assets charged by Montrose's security for an amount equivalent to the total amount of all indebtedness owing to Montrose and to assume the prior ranking Desjardins Prior Charge of the Villa Orleans Retirement Residence. In addition, the Purchaser would assume the leasehold interest of the land on which the St. Joseph Retirement Residence is located; the landlord is the National Capital Commission. At the time of the hearing neither Desjardins nor the NCC had provided their formal consents to the proposed assumptions, but both indicated that they were processing Montrose's request. Under the terms of the proposed sale, the Purchaser assumed the risk of securing those consents.

III. Analysis

10 "Quick flip" or "pre-pack" transactions are becoming more common in the Ontario distress marketplace. In certain circumstances, a "quick flip" involving the appointment of a receiver and then immediately seeking court approval of a "pre-packaged" sale transaction may well represent the best, or only, commercial alternative to a liquidation.¹ In such situations the court still will assess the need for a receiver and the reasonableness of the proposed sale against the standard criteria set out in decisions such as *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek*² and *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.*,³ respectively. However, courts will scrutinize with especial care the adequacy and the fairness of the sales and marketing process in "quick flip" transactions:

Part of the duty of a receiver is to place before the court sufficient evidence to enable the court to understand the implications for all parties of any proposed sale and, in the case of a sale to a related party, the overall fairness of the proposed related-party transaction. As stated by Morawetz J. in the *Tool-Plas Systems Inc.* case:

[T]he Court should consider the impact on various parties and assess whether their respective positions and the proposed treatment that they will receive in the quick flip transaction would realistically be any different if an extended sales process were followed.⁴

The need for such a robust and transparent record is heightened even more where the proposed purchase involves a credit bid by one of the debtor's secured creditors, the practical effect of which usually is to foreclose on all subordinate creditors.

11 In the present case, I was satisfied from the evidence filed by Montrose that the appointment of a receiver was necessary to preserve the opportunity to continue to operate the retirement residences as going concerns, thereby ensuring a place to live for the residents and maintaining current levels of employment. The record revealed a professional and prolonged effort to elicit interest in the properties from third party purchasers, but it appeared that market conditions were such that interest could not be generated at a level which would cover the senior secured indebtedness. As to the reasonableness of the credit bid, the appraisals provided the independent evidence necessary to conclude that the proposed sale price was reasonable in the circumstances. Finally, the proposed sale agreement gave proper treatment to claims in priority to that enjoyed by Montrose.

12 Given those circumstances, I concluded that it was just and convenient to appoint GTL as receiver of the Debtors and to approve the proposed sale.

13 Montrose asked for an order sealing large portions of the applicant's main affidavit and the confidential appendices to the GTL report on the basis of commercial sensitivity. I granted a sealing order which would remain in place until the earlier of the closing of the proposed sale or the further order of this court.

14 Finally, Montrose filed a USB key containing an electronic copy of its application materials, for which I thank it. I would observe that although I was able to read the materials on the USB key, I was not able to edit them because they were in "imaged" form. I would remind counsel that the Commercial List's *Guidelines for Preparing and Delivering Electronic Documents requested by Judges* require parties to perform Optical Character Recognition (OCR) within PDF to enable text

searching. "Imaged", rather than "OCR'd" documents are of much less use to judges. I would encourage the Commercial List Bar to continue their efforts to train their administrative staffs to follow the scanning directions contained in the *Guidelines*.

Application granted.

Footnotes

- 1 *Tool-Plas Systems Inc., Re* (2008), 48 C.B.R. (5th) 91 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])
- 2 (1996), 40 C.B.R. (3d) 274 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List])
- 3 (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. C.A.)
- 4 *9-Ball Interests Inc. v. Traditional Life Sciences Inc.* (2012), 89 C.B.R. (5th) 78 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), para. 30.

End of Document

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

TAB 2

1996 CarswellOnt 2328
Ontario Court of Justice (General Division — Commercial List)

Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek

1996 CarswellOnt 2328, [1996] O.J. No. 5088, 40 C.B.R. (3d) 274

Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek et al

Blair J.

Judgment: May 31, 1996

Docket: none given

Counsel: *John J. Chapman* and *John R. Varley*, for Bank of Nova Scotia.

J. Gregory Murdoch, for Freure Group (all defendants).

John Lancaster, for Boehmers, a Division of St. Lawrence Cement.

Robb English, for Toronto-Dominion Bank.

William T. Houston, for Canada Trust

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Table of Authorities

Cases considered:

Confederation Trust Co. v. Dentbram Developments Ltd. (1992), 9 C.P.C. (3d) 399 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

Irving Ungerman Ltd. v. Galanis (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 545, 20 R.P.R. (2d) 49 (note), 83 D.L.R. (4th) 734, 1 C.P.C. (3d) 248, (sub nom. *Ungerman (Irving) Ltd. v. Galanis*) 50 O.A.C. 176 (C.A.) — referred to

Pizza Pizza Ltd. v. Gillespie (1990), 75 O.R. (2d) 225, 45 C.P.C. (2d) 168, 33 C.P.R. (3d) 515 (Gen. Div.) — referred to

Royal Trust Corp. of Canada v. DQ Plaza Holdings Ltd. (1984), 54 C.B.R. (N.S.) 18, 36 Sask. R. 84 (Q.B.) — referred to

Swiss Bank Corp. (Canada) v. Odyssey Industries Inc. (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 49 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Third Generation Realty Ltd. v. Twigg Holdings Ltd. (1991), 6 C.P.C. (3d) 366 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43

s. 101 referred to

Rules considered:

Ontario, Rules of Civil Procedure

r. 20.01referred to

r. 20.04referred to

MOTION for summary judgment on covenant on mortgages; MOTION for appointment of receiver-manager.

Blair J.:

1 There are two companion motions here, namely:

(i) the within motion by the Bank for summary judgment on the covenants on mortgages granted by "Freure Management" and "Freure Village" to the Bank, which mortgages have been guaranteed by Freure Investments; and

(ii) the motion for appointment by the Court of a receiver-manager over five different properties which are the subject matter of the mortgages (four of which properties are apartment/townhouse complexes totalling 286 units and one of which is an as yet undeveloped property).

2 This endorsement pertains to both motions.

The Motion for Summary Judgment

3 Three of the mortgages have matured and have not been repaid. The fourth has not yet matured but, along with the first three, is in default as a result of the failure to pay tax arrears. The total tax arrears outstanding are in excess of \$850,000. The Bank is owed in excess of \$13,200,000. There is no question that the mortgages are in default. Nor is it contested that the monies are presently due and owing. The Defendants argue, however, that the Bank had agreed to forebear or to stand-still for six months to a year in May, 1995 and therefore submit the monies were not due and owing at the time demand was made and proceedings commenced.

4 There is simply no merit to this defence on the evidence and there is no issue with respect to it which survives the "good hard look at the evidence" which the authorities require the Court to take and which requires a trial for its disposition: see Rule 20.01 and Rule 20.04, *Pizza Pizza Ltd. v. Gillespie* (1990), 75 O.R. (2d) 225 (Gen. Div.); *Irving Ungerman Ltd. v. Galanis* (1993) 4 O.R. (3d) 545 (C.A.).

5 On his cross-examination, Mr. Freure admitted:

(i) that he knew the Bank had not entered into any agreement whereby it had waived its rights under its security or to enforce its security; and

(ii) that he realized the Bank was entitled to make demand, that the individual debtors in the Freure Group owed the money, that they did not have the money to pay and the \$13,200,000 indebtedness was "due and owing" (see cross-examination questions 46-54, 88-96, 233-243).

6 As to the guarantees of Freure Investments, an argument was put forward that the Bank changed its position with regard to the accumulation of tax arrears without notice to the guarantor, and accordingly that a triable issue exists in that regard.

7 No such triable issue exists. The guarantee provisions of the mortgage itself permit the Bank to negotiate changes in the security with the principal debtor. Moreover, the principal of the principal debtor and the principal of the guarantor - Mr. Freure - are the same. Finally, the evidence which is relied upon for the change in the Bank's position - an internal Bank memo from the local branch to the credit committee of the Bank in Toronto - is not proof of any such agreement with the debtor or change; it is merely a recitation of various position proposals and a recommendation to the credit committee, which was not followed.

8 Accordingly, summary judgment is granted as sought in accordance with the draft judgment filed today and on which I have placed my fiat. The cost portion of the judgment will bear interest at the *Courts of Justice Act* rate.

Receiver/Manager

9 The more difficult issue for determination is whether or not the Court should appoint a receiver/manager.

10 It is conceded, in effect, that if the loans are in default and not saved from immediate payment by the alleged forbearance agreement - which they are, and are not, respectively - the Bank is entitled to move under its security and appoint a receiver-manager privately. Indeed this is the route which the Defendants - supported by the subsequent creditor on one of the properties (Boehmers, on the Glencairn property) - urge must be taken. The other major creditors, TD Bank and Canada Trust, who are owed approximately \$20,000,000 between them, take no position on the motion.

11 The Court has the power to appoint a receiver or receiver and manager where it is "just or convenient" to do so: the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. 43, s. 101. In deciding whether or not to do so, it must have regard to all of the circumstances but in particular the nature of the property and the rights and interests of all parties in relation thereto. The fact that the moving party has a right under its security to appoint a receiver is an important factor to be considered but so, in such circumstances, is the question of whether or not an appointment by the Court is necessary to enable the receiver-manager to carry out its work and duties more efficiently; see generally *Third Generation Realty Ltd. v. Twigg* (1991) 6 C.P.C. (3d) 366 (Ont. Gen. Div.) at pages 372-374; *Confederation Trust Co. v. Dentbram Developments Ltd.* (1992), 9 C.P.C. (3d) 399 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Royal Trust Corp. of Canada v. D.Q. Plaza Holdings Ltd.* (1984), 54 C.B.R. (N.S.) 18 (Sask. Q.B.) at page 21. It is not essential that the moving party, a secured creditor, establish that it will suffer irreparable harm if a receiver-manager is not appointed: *Swiss Bank Corp. (Canada) v. Odyssey Industries Inc.* (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 49 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

12 The Defendants and the opposing creditor argue that the Bank can perfectly effectively exercise its private remedies and that the Court should not intervene by giving the extraordinary remedy of appointing a receiver when it has not yet done so and there is no evidence its interest will not be well protected if it did. They also argue that a Court appointed receiver will be more costly than a privately appointed one, eroding their interests in the property.

13 While I accept the general notion that the appointment of a receiver is an extraordinary remedy, it seems to me that where the security instrument permits the appointment of a private receiver - and even contemplates, as this one does, the secured creditor seeking a court appointed receiver - and where the circumstances of default justify the appointment of a private receiver, the "extraordinary" nature of the remedy sought is less essential to the inquiry. Rather, the "just or convenient" question becomes one of the Court determining, in the exercise of its discretion, whether it is more in the interests of all concerned to have the receiver appointed by the Court or not. This, of course, involves an examination of all the circumstances which I have outlined earlier in this endorsement, including the potential costs, the relationship between the debtor and the creditors, the likelihood of maximizing the return on and preserving the subject property and the best way of facilitating the work and duties of the receiver-manager.

14 Here I am satisfied on balance it is just and convenient for the order sought to be made. The Defendants have been attempting to refinance the properties for 1 1/2 years without success, although a letter from Mutual Trust dated yesterday suggests (again) the possibility of a refinancing in the near future. The Bank and the debtors are deadlocked and I infer from the history and evidence that the Bank's attempts to enforce its security privately will only lead to more litigation. Indeed, the debtor's solicitors themselves refer to the prospect of "costly, protracted and unproductive" litigation in a letter dated March 21st of this year, should the Bank seek to pursue its remedies. More significantly, the parties cannot agree on the proper approach to be taken to marketing the properties which everyone agrees must be sold. Should it be on a unit by unit conversion condominium basis (as the debtor proposes) or on an en bloc basis as the Bank would prefer? A Court appointed receiver with a mandate to develop a marketing plan can resolve that impasse, subject to the Court's approval, whereas a privately appointed receiver in all likelihood could not, at least without further litigious skirmishing. In the end, I am satisfied the interests of the debtors

themselves, along with those of the creditors (and the tenants, who will be caught in the middle) and the orderly disposition of the property are all better served by the appointment of the receiver-manager as requested.

15 I am prepared, in the circumstances, however, to render the debtors one last chance to rescue the situation, if they can bring the potential Mutual Trust refinancing to fruition. I postpone the effectiveness of the order appointing Doane Raymond as receiver-manager for a period of three weeks from this date. If a refinancing arrangement which is satisfactory to the Bank and which is firm and concrete can be arranged by that time, I may be spoken to at a 9:30 appointment on Monday, June 24, 1996 with regard to a further postponement. The order will relate back to today's date, if taken out.

16 Should the Bank be advised to appoint Doane Raymond as a private receiver/manager under its mortgages in the interim, it may do so.

17 Counsel may attend at an earlier 9:30 appointment if necessary to speak to the form of the order.

Motions granted.

End of Document

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

TAB 3

2009 CarswellOnt 9475
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Bilrite Rubber (1984) Inc., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 9475

**In the Matter of the Interim Receivership of Bilrite
Rubber (1984) Inc. and Bilrite Rubber, Inc.**

In the Matter of an Application under Section 47(1) of the
Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, as amended

Morawetz J.

Judgment: September 16, 2009
Docket: Toronto CV-09-8359-00CL

Counsel: Mario Forte, for Applicants

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial

Table of Authorities

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3
s. 14.06 [en. 1992, c. 27, s. 9(1)] — referred to

s. 47(1) — pursuant to

Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. 1982
Chapter 15 — referred to

Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999, S.C. 1999, c. 33
Generally — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36
Generally — referred to

s. 17 — considered

Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43
s. 101 — pursuant to

Environmental Protection Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. E.19
Generally — referred to

Occupational Health and Safety Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.1
Generally — referred to

Ontario Water Resources Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.40
Generally — referred to

Morawetz J.:

This motion was not opposed.

The record support the requested relief.

Order to issue in the form submitted.

Morawetz J.:

Order

THIS MOTION, made by the Applicant for an Order pursuant to section 47(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, as amended (the "*BIA*") and section 101 of the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c. C.43, as amended (the "*CJA*") appointing RSM Richter Inc. as interim receiver and receiver (in such capacities, the "*Receiver*") without security, of all of the assets, undertakings and properties of Bilrite Rubber (1984) Inc. and Bilrite Rubber Inc. (together, the "*Debtor*") was heard this day at 393 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.

ON READING the affidavit of Linda Vanderbürgt sworn September 10, 2009 and the Exhibits thereto and on reading the Fifth report of RSM Richter Inc. in its capacity as Monitor in the respondents' *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* proceedings (the "*CCAA Proceedings*") and on hearing the submissions of counsel for the Applicant, the Receiver, the Debtor and with other counsel that were present and wished to be heard, no one else appearing although duly served as appears from the affidavit of service of Devka Sakhrani sworn September 14, 2009 and on reading the consent of RSM Richter Inc. to act as the Receiver.

Service

1 THIS COURT ORDERS that the time for service of the Notice of Motion and the Motion Record is hereby abridged so that this motion is properly returnable today and hereby dispenses with further service thereof.

Appointment

2 THIS COURT ORDERS that pursuant to section 47(1) of the *BIA* and section 101 of the *CJA*, RSM Richter Inc. is hereby appointed Receiver, without security, of all of the Debtor's current and future assets, undertakings and properties of every nature and kind whatsoever, and wherever situate including all proceeds thereof including without limitation all such property constituting the proceeds of realization of the assets, property and undertaking of the respondents realized in the course of the *CCAA Proceedings* and proceedings under Chapter 15 of the *US Bankruptcy Code* (the "*Property*").

2.A THIS COURT ORDERS that the Receiver is hereby authorized and directed to continue distribution in accordance with the terms of paragraph 7 of the Order Mr. Justice Wilton-Siegel made on July 27, 2009 as amended by the Order of Mr. Justice Morawetz made September 16, 2009 in the respondents *CCAA proceedings*, until further order of this Court (the "*Distribution Order*").

2.B THIS COURT ORDERS that the Receiver be and is hereby authorized to make, and shall make, such payments to such persons entitled to the benefit of the Administrative Charge in the *CCAA Proceedings* in respect of their reasonable and proper fees, costs and expenses incurred up to and including the date of this Order, and subsequent hereto for matters relating to the completion of the administration of the Debtor's estates in the *CCAA Proceeding* and the Chapter 15 Proceeding.

Receiver's Powers

3 THIS COURT ORDERS that 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:

(a) to take possession and control of the Property and any and all proceeds, receipts and disbursements arising out of or from the Property and to take such steps as the Receiver may deem necessary for the administration of all matters arising from the CCAA Proceeding and these proceedings;

(b) to receive, preserve, protect and maintain control of the Property, or any part or parts thereof;

(c) to act as foreign representative in the Chapter 15 proceedings currently instituted in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Ohio — Western Division, for the purposes of completing such activities as may be necessary to facilitate the proper administration of such proceedings to their conclusion;

(d) to engage consultants, appraisers, agents, experts, auditors, accountants, managers, counsel and such other persons from time to time and on whatever basis, including on a temporary basis, to assist with the exercise of the powers and duties conferred by this Order;

(e) to receive and collect all monies and accounts now owed or hereafter owing to the Debtor and to exercise all remedies of the Debtor in collecting such monies, including, without limitation, to enforce any security held by the Debtor;

(f) to settle, extend or compromise any indebtedness owing to the Debtor;

(g) to execute, assign, issue and endorse documents of whatever nature in respect of any of the Property, whether in the Receiver's name or in the name and on behalf of the Debtor, for any purpose pursuant to this Order;

(h) to initiate, prosecute and continue the prosecution of any and all proceedings and to defend all proceedings now pending or hereafter instituted with respect to the Debtor, the Property or the Receiver, and to settle or compromise any such proceedings. The authority hereby conveyed shall extend to such appeals or applications for judicial review in respect of any order or judgment pronounced in any such proceeding;

(i) to report to, meet with and discuss with such affected Persons (as defined below) as the Receiver deems appropriate on all matters relating to the Property and the receivership, and to share information, subject to such terms as to confidentiality as the Receiver deems advisable;

(j) to apply for any permits, licences, approvals or permissions as may be required by any governmental authority and any renewals thereof for and on behalf of and, if thought desirable by the Receiver, in the name of the Debtor;

(k) to enter into agreements with any trustee in bankruptcy appointed in respect of the Debtor, including, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the ability to enter into occupation agreements for any property owned or leased by the Debtor;

(l) to make or cause to be made an assignment in bankruptcy of the respondents, and to act as trustee in bankruptcy thereof in the case of the Canadian Debtors;

(m) to exercise any shareholder, partnership, joint venture or other rights which the Debtor may have; and

(n) to take any steps reasonably incidental to the exercise of these powers,

and in each case where the Receiver takes any such actions or steps, it shall be exclusively authorized and empowered to do so, to the exclusion of all other Persons (as defined below), including the Debtor, and without interference from any other Person.

Duty to Provide Access and Co-Operation to the Receiver

4 THIS COURT ORDERS that (i) the Debtor, (ii) all of its current and former directors, officers, employees, agents, accountants, legal counsel and shareholders, and all other persons acting on its instructions or behalf, and (iii) all other individuals, firms, corporations, governmental bodies or agencies, or other entities having notice of this Order (all of the foregoing, collectively, being "*Persons*" and each being a "*Person*") shall forthwith advise the Receiver of the existence of any Property in such Person's possession or control, shall grant immediate and continued access to the Property to the Receiver, and shall deliver all such Property to the Receiver upon the Receiver's request.

5 THIS COURT ORDERS that all Persons shall forthwith advise the Receiver of the existence of any books, documents, securities, contracts, orders, corporate and accounting records, and any other papers, records and information of any kind related to the business or affairs of the Debtor, and any computer programs, computer tapes, computer disks, or other data storage media containing any such information (the foregoing, collectively, the "*Records*") in that Person's possession or control, and shall provide to the Receiver or permit the Receiver to make, retain and take away copies thereof and grant to the Receiver unfettered access to and use of accounting, computer, software and physical facilities relating thereto, provided however that nothing in this paragraph 5 or in paragraph 6 of this Order shall require the delivery of Records, or the granting of access to Records, which may not be disclosed or provided to the Receiver due to the privilege attaching to solicitor-client communication or due to statutory provisions prohibiting such disclosure.

6 THIS COURT ORDERS that if any Records are stored or otherwise contained on a computer or other electronic system of information storage, whether by independent service provider or otherwise, all Persons in possession or control of such Records shall forthwith give unfettered access to the Receiver for the purpose of allowing the Receiver to recover and fully copy all of the information contained therein whether by way of printing the information onto paper or making copies of computer disks or such other manner of retrieving and copying the information as the Receiver in its discretion deems expedient, and shall not alter, erase or destroy any Records without the prior written consent of the Receiver. Further, for the purposes of this paragraph, all Persons shall provide the Receiver with all such assistance in gaining immediate access to the information in the Records as the Receiver may in its discretion require including providing the Receiver with instructions on the use of any computer or other system and providing the Receiver with any and all access codes, account names and account numbers that may be required to gain access to the information.

No Proceedings Against the Receiver

7 THIS COURT ORDERS that 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.

No Proceedings Against the Debtor or the Property

8 THIS COURT ORDERS that no Proceeding against or in respect of the Debtor or the Property shall be commenced or continued except with the written consent of the Receiver or with leave of this Court and any and all Proceedings currently under way against or in respect of the Debtor or the Property are hereby stayed and suspended pending further Order of this Court.

No Exercise of Rights or Remedies

9 THIS COURT ORDERS that all rights and remedies against the Debtor, the Receiver, or affecting the Property, are hereby stayed and suspended except with the written consent of the Receiver or leave of this Court, provided however that nothing in this paragraph shall (i) empower the Receiver or the Debtor to carry on any business which the Debtor is not lawfully entitled to carry on, (ii) exempt the Receiver or the Debtor from compliance with statutory or regulatory provisions relating to health, safety or the environment, (iii) prevent the filing of any registration to preserve or perfect a security interest, or (iv) prevent the registration of a claim for lien.

No Interference with the Receiver

10 THIS COURT ORDERS that no Person shall discontinue, fail to honour, alter, interfere with, repudiate, terminate or cease to perform any right, renewal right, contract, agreement, licence or permit in favour of or held by the Debtor, without written consent of the Receiver or leave of this Court.

Receiver to Hold Funds

11 THIS COURT ORDERS that all funds, monies, cheques, instruments, and other forms of payments received or collected by the Receiver from and after the making of this Order from any source whatsoever, including without limitation the sale of all or any of the Property and the collection of any accounts receivable in whole or in part, whether in existence on the date of this Order or hereafter coming into existence, shall be deposited into one or more new accounts to be opened by the Receiver (the "*Post Receivership Accounts*") and the monies standing to the credit of such Post Receivership Accounts from time to time, net of any disbursements provided for herein including any distribution made pursuant to the Distribution Order, shall be held by the Receiver to be paid in accordance with the terms of this Order or any further Order of this Court.

Limitation on Environmental Liabilities

12 THIS COURT ORDERS that nothing herein contained shall require the Receiver to occupy or to take control, care, charge, possession or management (separately and/or collectively, "*Possession*") of any of the Property that might be environmentally contaminated, might be a pollutant or a contaminant, or might cause or contribute to a spill, discharge, release or deposit of a substance contrary to any federal, provincial or other law respecting the protection, conservation, enhancement, remediation or rehabilitation of the environment or relating to the disposal of waste or other contamination including, without limitation, the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act*, the *Ontario Environmental Protection Act*, the *Ontario Water Resources Act*, or the *Ontario Occupational Health and Safety Act* and regulations thereunder (the "*Environmental Legislation*"), provided however that nothing herein shall exempt the Receiver from any duty to report or make disclosure imposed by applicable Environmental Legislation. The Receiver shall not, as a result of this Order or anything done in pursuance of the Receiver's duties and powers under this Order, be deemed to be in Possession of any of the Property within the meaning of any Environmental Legislation, unless it is actually in possession.

Limitation on the Receiver's Liability

13 THIS COURT ORDERS that the Receiver shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of its appointment or the carrying out the provisions of this Order, save and except for any gross negligence or wilful misconduct on its part. Nothing in this Order shall derogate from the protections afforded the Receiver by section 14.06 of the BIA or by any other applicable legislation.

Receiver's Accounts

14 THIS COURT ORDERS that any expenditure or liability which shall properly be made or incurred by the Receiver, including the fees of the Receiver and the fees and disbursements of its legal counsel, incurred at the standard rates and charges of the Receiver and its counsel, shall be allowed to it in passing its accounts and shall form a first charge on the Property in priority to all security interests, trusts, liens, charges and encumbrances, statutory or otherwise, in favour of any Person (the "*Receiver's Charge*").

15 THIS COURT ORDERS the Receiver and its legal counsel shall pass its accounts from time to time, and for this purpose the accounts of the Receiver and its legal counsel are hereby referred to a judge of the Commercial List of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice.

16 THIS COURT ORDERS that prior to the passing of its accounts, the Receiver shall be at liberty from time to time to apply reasonable amounts, out of the monies in its hands, against its fees and disbursements, including legal fees and disbursements, incurred at the normal rates and charges of the Receiver or its counsel, and such amounts shall constitute advances against its remuneration and disbursements when and as approved by this Court.

Funding of the Receivership

17 THIS COURT ORDERS that the Receiver be at liberty and it is hereby empowered to utilize from the proceeds coming into its hands such monies from time to time as it may consider necessary or desirable, provided that the outstanding amount does not exceed \$100,000.00 (or such greater amount as the lender and this Court may by further Order may authorize) at any time, for the purpose of funding the exercise of the powers and duties conferred upon the Receiver by this Order, including interim expenditures.

Effect, Recognition and Assistance

18 THIS COURT REQUESTS the aid, recognition and assistance of other courts in Canada in accordance with Section 17 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended, and requests that the Federal Court of Canada and the courts and judicial, regulatory and administrative bodies of or constituted by the provinces and territories of Canada, the Parliament of Canada, the United States of America, the states and other subdivisions of the United States of America, including, without limitation, the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Ohio — Western Division, and other nations and states act in aid, recognition and assistance of, and be complementary to, this Court in carrying out the terms of this Order. The Applicant and the Receiver shall be at liberty, and are hereby authorized and empowered, to make such further applications, motions or proceedings to or before such other courts and judicial, regulatory and administrative bodies, and take such other steps, in Canada or the United States of America, as may be necessary or advisable to give effect to this order.

General

19 THIS COURT ORDERS that the Receiver may from time to time apply to this Court for advice and directions in the discharge of its powers and duties hereunder.

20 THIS COURT ORDERS that nothing in this Order shall prevent the Receiver from acting as a trustee in bankruptcy of the Debtor.

21 THIS COURT ORDERS that the Receiver be at liberty and is hereby authorized and empowered to apply to any court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body, wherever located, for the recognition of this Order and for assistance in carrying out the terms of this Order.

22 THIS COURT ORDERS that the Plaintiff shall have its costs of this motion, up to and including entry and service of this Order, provided for by the terms of the Plaintiff's security or, if not so provided by the Plaintiff's security, then on a substantial indemnity basis to be paid by the Receiver from the Debtor's estate with such priority and at such time as this Court may determine.

23 THIS COURT ORDERS that any interested party may apply to this Court to vary or amend this Order on not less than seven (7) days' notice to the Receiver and to any other party likely to be affected by the order sought or upon such other notice, if any, as this Court may order.

TAB 4

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

Table of Authorities

Cases considered:

Beauty Counsellors of Canada Ltd., Re (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 (Ont. S.C.) — referred to

British Columbia Development Corp. v. Spun Cast Industries Ltd. (1977), 26 C.B.R. (N.S.) 28, 5 B.C.L.R. 94 (S.C.)
— referred to

Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303, 86 A.P.R. 303 (C.A.) — referred to

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.) — applied

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) (C.A.) — referred to

Selkirk, Re (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 245 (Ont. S.C.) — referred to

Selkirk, Re (1987), 64 C.B.R. (N.S.) 140 (Ont. S.C.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Employment Standards Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 137.

Environmental Protection Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 141.

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.

20 On March 8, 1991, the date when the receiver accepted the OEL offer, it had only two offers, the OEL offer, which was acceptable, and the 922 offer, which contained an unacceptable condition. I cannot see how the receiver, assuming for the moment that the price was reasonable, could have done anything but accept the OEL offer.

21 When deciding whether a receiver had acted providently, the court should examine the conduct of the receiver in light of the information the receiver had when it agreed to accept an offer. In this case, the court should look at the receiver's conduct in the light of the information it had when it made its decision on March 8, 1991. The court should be very cautious before deciding that the receiver's conduct was improvident based upon information which has come to light after it made its decision. To do so, in my view, would derogate from the mandate to sell given to the receiver by the order of O'Brien J. I agree with and adopt what was said by Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, supra, at p. 112 [O.R.]:

Its decision was made as a matter of business judgment *on the elements then available to it*. It is of the very essence of a receiver's function to make such judgments and in the making of them to act seriously and responsibly so as to be prepared to stand behind them.

If the court were to reject the recommendation of the Receiver in any but the most exceptional circumstances, it would materially diminish and weaken the role and function of the Receiver both in the perception of receivers and in the perception of any others who might have occasion to deal with them. It would lead to the conclusion that the decision of the Receiver was of little weight and that the real decision was always made upon the motion for approval. That would be a consequence susceptible of immensely damaging results to the disposition of assets by court-appointed receivers.

[Emphasis added.]

22 I also agree with and adopt what was said by Macdonald J.A. in *Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303, 86 A.P.R. 303 (C.A.), at p. 11 [C.B.R.]:

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.

[Emphasis added.]

23 On March 8, 1991, the receiver had two offers. One was the OEL offer, which it considered satisfactory but which could be withdrawn by OEL at any time before it was accepted. The receiver also had the 922 offer, which contained a condition that was totally unacceptable. It had no other offers. It was faced with the dilemma of whether it should decline to accept the OEL offer and run the risk of it being withdrawn, in the hope that an acceptable offer would be forthcoming from 922. An affidavit filed by the president of the receiver describes the dilemma which the receiver faced, and the judgment made in the light of that dilemma:

24. An asset purchase agreement was received by Ernst & Young on March 7, 1991 which was dated March 6, 1991. This agreement was received from CCFL in respect of their offer to purchase the assets and undertaking of Air Toronto. Apart from financial considerations, which will be considered in a subsequent affidavit, the *Receiver determined that it would not be prudent to delay acceptance of the OEL agreement to negotiate a highly uncertain arrangement with Air Canada and CCFL*. Air Canada had the benefit of an 'exclusive' in negotiations for Air Toronto and had clearly indicated its intention take itself out of the running while ensuring that no other party could seek to purchase Air Toronto and maintain the Air Canada connector arrangement vital to its survival. The CCFL offer represented a radical reversal of this position by Air Canada at the eleventh hour. However, it contained a significant number of conditions to closing which were entirely beyond the control of the Receiver. As well, the CCFL offer came less than 24 hours before signing of the agreement with OEL which had been negotiated over a period of months, at great time and expense.

[Emphasis added.] I am convinced that the decision made was a sound one in the circumstances faced by the receiver on March 8, 1991.

24 I now turn to consider whether the price contained in the OEL offer was one which it was provident to accept. At the outset, I think that the fact that the OEL offer was the only acceptable one available to the receiver on March 8, 1991, after 10 months of trying to sell the airline, is strong evidence that the price in it was reasonable. In a deteriorating economy, I doubt that it would have been wise to wait any longer.

25 I mentioned earlier that, pursuant to an order, 922 was permitted to present a second offer. During the hearing of the appeal, counsel compared at great length the price contained in the second 922 offer with the price contained in the OEL offer. Counsel put forth various hypotheses supporting their contentions that one offer was better than the other.

26 It is my opinion that the price contained in the 922 offer is relevant only if it shows that the price obtained by the receiver in the OEL offer was not a reasonable one. In *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, supra, Anderson J., at p. 113 [O.R.], discussed the comparison of offers in the following way:

No doubt, as the cases have indicated, situations might arise where the disparity was so great as to call in question the adequacy of the mechanism which had produced the offers. It is not so here, and in my view that is substantially an end of the matter.

27 In two judgments, Saunders J. considered the circumstances in which an offer submitted after the receiver had agreed to a sale should be considered by the court. The first is *Re Selkirk* (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 245 (Ont. S.C.), at p. 247:

If, for example, in this case there had been a second offer of a substantially higher amount, then the court would have to take that offer into consideration in assessing whether the receiver had properly carried out his function of endeavouring to obtain the best price for the property.

28 The second is *Re Beauty Counsellors of Canada Ltd.* (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 (Ont. S.C.), at p. 243:

If a substantially higher bid turns up at the approval stage, the court should consider it. Such a bid may indicate, for example, that the trustee has not properly carried out its duty to endeavour to obtain the best price for the estate.

29 In *Re Selkirk* (1987), 64 C.B.R. (N.S.) 140 (Ont. S.C.), at p. 142, McRae J. expressed a similar view:

The court will not lightly withhold approval of a sale by the receiver, particularly in a case such as this where the receiver is given rather wide discretionary authority as per the order of Mr. Justice Trainor and, of course, where the receiver is an officer of this court. Only in a case where there seems to be some unfairness in the process of the sale or *where there are substantially higher offers which would tend to show that the sale was improvident* will the court withhold approval. It is important that the court recognize the commercial exigencies that would flow if prospective purchasers are allowed to wait until the sale is in court for approval before submitting their final offer. This is something that must be discouraged.

[Emphasis added.]

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.

31 If, however, the subsequent offer is so substantially higher than the sale recommended by the receiver, then it may be that the receiver has not conducted the sale properly. In such circumstances, the court would be justified itself in entering into the sale process by considering competitive bids. However, I think that that process should be entered into only if the court is satisfied that the receiver has not properly conducted the sale which it has recommended to the court.

32 It is necessary to consider the two offers. Rosenberg J. held that the 922 offer was slightly better or marginally better than the OEL offer. He concluded that the difference in the two offers did not show that the sale process adopted by the receiver was inadequate or improvident.

33 Counsel for the appellants complained about the manner in which Rosenberg J. conducted the hearing of the motion to confirm the OEL sale. The complaint was that when they began to discuss a comparison of the two offers, Rosenberg J. said that he considered the 922 offer to be better than the OEL offer. Counsel said that when that comment was made, they did not think it necessary to argue further the question of the difference in value between the two offers. They complain that the finding that the 922 offer was only marginally better or slightly better than the OEL offer was made without them having had the opportunity to argue that the 922 offer was substantially better or significantly better than the OEL offer. I cannot understand how counsel could have thought that by expressing the opinion that the 922 offer was better, Rosenberg J. was saying that it was a significantly or substantially better one. Nor can I comprehend how counsel took the comment to mean that they were foreclosed from arguing that the offer was significantly or substantially better. If there was some misunderstanding on the part of counsel, it should have been raised before Rosenberg J. at the time. I am sure that if it had been, the misunderstanding would have been cleared up quickly. Nevertheless, this court permitted extensive argument dealing with the comparison of the two offers.

34 The 922 offer provided for \$6 million cash to be paid on closing with a royalty based upon a percentage of Air Toronto profits over a period of 5 years up to a maximum of \$3 million. The OEL offer provided for a payment of \$2 million on closing with a royalty paid on gross revenues over a 5-year period. In the short term, the 922 offer is obviously better because there is substantially more cash up front. The chances of future returns are substantially greater in the OEL offer because royalties are paid on gross revenues, while the royalties under the 922 offer are paid only on profits. There is an element of risk involved in each offer.

35 The receiver studied the two offers. It compared them and took into account the risks, the advantages and the disadvantages of each. It considered the appropriate contingencies. It is not necessary to outline the factors which were taken into account by the receiver because the manager of its insolvency practice filed an affidavit outlining the considerations which were weighed in its evaluation of the two offers. They seem to me to be reasonable ones. That affidavit concluded with the following paragraph:

24. On the basis of these considerations the Receiver has approved the OEL offer and has concluded that it represents the achievement of the highest possible value at this time for the Air Toronto division of SoundAir.

36 The court appointed the receiver to conduct the sale of Air Toronto, and entrusted it with the responsibility of deciding what is the best offer. I put great weight upon the opinion of the receiver. It swore to the court which appointed it that the OEL offer represents the achievement of the highest possible value at this time for Air Toronto. I have not been convinced that the receiver was wrong when he made that assessment. I am, therefore, of the opinion that the 922 offer does not demonstrate any failure upon the part of the receiver to act properly and providently.

37 It follows that if Rosenberg J. was correct when he found that the 922 offer was in fact better, I agree with him that it could only have been slightly or marginally better. The 922 offer does not lead to an inference that the disposition strategy of the receiver was inadequate, unsuccessful or improvident, nor that the price was unreasonable.

38 I am, therefore, of the opinion the the receiver made a sufficient effort to get the best price, and has not acted improvidently.

2. Consideration of the Interests of all Parties

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 order 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 OEL being given the same right during its negotiations with the receiver. I see no unfairness on the part of the receiver when it honoured its letter of intent with OEL by not releasing the offering memorandum during the negotiations with OEL.

54 Moreover, I am not prepared to find that 922 was in any way prejudiced by the fact that it did not have an offering memorandum. It made an offer on March 7, 1991, which it contends to this day was a better offer than that of OEL. 922 has not convinced me that if it had an offering memorandum, its offer would have been any different or any better than it actually was. The fatal problem with the first 922 offer was that it contained a condition which was completely unacceptable to the receiver. The receiver, properly, in my opinion, rejected the offer out of hand because of that condition. That condition did not relate to any information which could have conceivably been in an offering memorandum prepared by the receiver. It was about the resolution of a dispute between CCFL and the Royal Bank, something the receiver knew nothing about.

55 Further evidence of the lack of prejudice which the absence of an offering memorandum has caused 922 is found in CCFL's stance before this court. During argument, its counsel suggested as a possible resolution of this appeal that this court should call for new bids, evaluate them and then order a sale to the party who put in the better bid. In such a case, counsel for CCFL said that 922 would be prepared to bid within 7 days of the court's decision. I would have thought that, if there were anything to CCFL's suggestion that the failure to provide an offering memorandum was unfair to 922, that it would have told the court that it needed more information before it would be able to make a bid.

56 I am satisfied that Air Canada and CCFL have, and at all times had, all of the information which they would have needed to make what to them would be a commercially viable offer to the receiver. I think that an offering memorandum was of no commercial consequence to them, but the absence of one has since become a valuable tactical weapon.

57 It is my opinion that there is no convincing proof that if an offering memorandum had been widely distributed among persons qualified to have purchased Air Toronto, a viable offer would have come forth from a party other than 922 or OEL. Therefore, the failure to provide an offering memorandum was neither unfair, nor did it prejudice the obtaining of a better price on March 8, 1991, than that contained in the OEL offer. I would not give effect to the contention that the process adopted by the receiver was an unfair one.

58 There are two statements by Anderson J. contained in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, supra, which I adopt as my own. The first is at p. 109 [O.R.]:

The court should not proceed against the recommendations of its Receiver except in special circumstances and where the necessity and propriety of doing so are plain. Any other rule or approach would emasculate the role of the Receiver and make it almost inevitable that the final negotiation of every sale would take place on the motion for approval.

The second is at p. 111 [O.R.]:

It is equally clear, in my view, though perhaps not so clearly enunciated, that it is only in an exceptional case that the court will intervene and proceed contrary to the Receiver's recommendations if satisfied, as I am, that the Receiver has acted reasonably, prudently and fairly and not arbitrarily.

In this case the receiver acted reasonably, prudently, fairly and not arbitrarily. I am of the opinion, therefore, that the process adopted by the receiver in reaching an agreement was a just one.

59 In his reasons for judgment, after discussing the circumstances leading to the 922 offer, Rosenberg J. said this:

They created a situation as of March 8th, where the Receiver was faced with two offers, one of which was in acceptable form and one of which could not possibly be accepted in its present form. The Receiver acted appropriately in accepting the OEL offer.

I agree.

60 The receiver made proper and sufficient efforts to get the best price that it could for the assets of Air Toronto. It adopted a reasonable and effective process to sell the airline which was fair to all persons who might be interested in purchasing it. It is my opinion, therefore, that the receiver properly carried out the mandate which was given to it by the order of O'Brien J. It follows that Rosenberg J. was correct when he confirmed the sale to OEL.

II. The effect of the support of the 922 offer by the two secured creditors.

61 As I noted earlier, the 922 offer was supported before Rosenberg J., and in this court, by CCFL and by the Royal Bank, the two secured creditors. It was argued that, because the interests of the creditors are primary, the court ought to give effect to their wish that the 922 offer be accepted. I would not accede to that suggestion for two reasons.

62 The first reason is related to the fact that the creditors chose to have a receiver appointed by the court. It was open to them to appoint a private receiver pursuant to the authority of their security documents. Had they done so, then they would have had control of the process and could have sold Air Toronto to whom they wished. However, acting privately and controlling the process involves some risks. The appointment of a receiver by the court insulates the creditors from those risks. But, insulation from those risks carries with it the loss of control over the process of disposition of the assets. As I have attempted to explain in these reasons, when a receiver's sale is before the court for confirmation, the only issues are the propriety of the conduct of the receiver and whether it acted providently. The function of the court at that stage is not to step in and do the receiver's work, or change the sale strategy adopted by the receiver. Creditors who asked the court to appoint a receiver to dispose of assets should not be allowed to take over control of the process by the simple expedient of supporting another purchaser if they do not agree with the sale made by the receiver. That would take away all respect for the process of sale by a court-appointed receiver.

63 There can be no doubt that the interests of the creditor are an important consideration in determining whether the receiver has properly conducted a sale. The opinion of the creditors as to which offer ought to be accepted is something to be taken into account. But if the court decides that the receiver has acted properly and providently, those views are not necessarily determinative. Because, in this case, the receiver acted properly and providently, I do not think that the views of the creditors should override the considered judgment of the receiver.

64 The second reason is that, in the particular circumstances of this case, I do not think the support of CCFL and the Royal Bank of the 922 offer is entitled to any weight. The support given by CCFL can be dealt with summarily. It is a co-owner of 922. It is hardly surprising and not very impressive to hear that it supports the offer which it is making for the debtor's assets.

65 The support by the Royal Bank requires more consideration and involves some reference to the circumstances. On March 6, 1991, when the first 922 offer was made, there was in existence an inter-lender agreement between the Royal Bank and CCFL. That agreement dealt with the share of the proceeds of the sale of Air Toronto which each creditor would receive. At the time, a dispute between the Royal Bank and CCFL about the interpretation of that agreement was pending in the courts. The unacceptable condition in the first 922 offer related to the settlement of the inter-lender dispute. The condition required that the dispute be resolved in a way which would substantially favour CCFL. It required that CCFL receive \$3,375,000 of the \$6 million cash payment and the balance, including the royalties, if any, be paid to the Royal Bank. The Royal Bank did not agree with that split of the sale proceeds.

66 On April 5, 1991, the Royal Bank and CCFL agreed to settle the inter-lender dispute. The settlement was that if the 922 offer was accepted by the court, CCFL would receive only \$1 million, and the Royal Bank would receive \$5 million plus any royalties which might be paid. It was only in consideration of that settlement that the Royal Bank agreed to support the 922 offer.

67 The Royal Bank's support of the 922 offer is so affected by the very substantial benefit which it wanted to obtain from the settlement of the inter-lender dispute that, in my opinion, its support is devoid of any objectivity. I think it has no weight.

68 While there may be circumstances where the unanimous support by the creditors of a particular offer could conceivably override the proper and provident conduct of a sale by a receiver, I do not think that this is such a case. This is a case where the receiver has acted properly and in a provident way. It would make a mockery out of the judicial process, under which a mandate 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.

75 The case at bar is an exceptional one in the sense that upon the application made for approval of the sale of the assets of Air Toronto, two competing offers were placed before Rosenberg J. Those two offers were that of OEL and that of 922, a company incorporated for the purpose of acquiring Air Toronto. Its shares were owned equally by CCFL and Air Canada. It was conceded by all parties to these proceedings that the only persons who had any interest in the proceeds of the sale were two secured creditors, viz., CCFL and the Royal Bank of Canada. Those two creditors were unanimous in their position that they desired the court to approve the sale to 922. We were not referred to, nor am I aware of, any case where a court has refused to abide by the unanimous wishes of the only interested creditors for the approval of a specific offer made in receivership proceedings.

76 In *British Columbia Developments Corp. v. Spun Cast Industries Ltd.* (1977), 26 C.B.R. (N.S.) 28, 5 B.C.L.R. 94 (S.C.), Berger J. said at p. 30 [C.B.R.]:

Here all of those with a financial stake in the plant have joined in seeking the court's approval of the sale to Fincas. This court does not have a roving commission to decide what is best for investors and businessmen when they have agreed among themselves what course of action they should follow. It is their money.

77 I agree with that statement. It is particularly apt to this case. The two secured creditors will suffer a shortfall of approximately \$50 million. They have a tremendous interest in the sale of assets which form part of their security. I agree with the finding of Rosenberg J. that the offer of 922 is superior to that of OEL. He concluded that the 922 offer is marginally superior. If by that he meant that mathematically it was likely to provide slightly more in the way of proceeds, it is difficult to take issue with that finding. If, on the other hand, he meant that having regard to all considerations it was only marginally superior, I cannot agree. He said in his reasons:

I have come to the conclusion that knowledgeable creditors such as the Royal Bank would prefer the 922 offer even if the other factors influencing their decision were not present. No matter what adjustments had to be made, the 922 offer results in more cash immediately. Creditors facing the type of loss the Royal Bank is taking in this case would not be anxious to rely on contingencies especially in the present circumstances surrounding the airline industry.

78 I agree with that statement completely. It is apparent that the difference between the two offers insofar as cash on closing is concerned amounts to approximately \$3 million to \$4 million. The bank submitted that it did not wish to gamble any further with respect to its investment, and that the acceptance and court approval of the OEL offer in effect supplanted its position as a secured creditor with respect to the amount owing over and above the down payment and placed it in the position of a joint

entrepreneur, but one with no control. This results from the fact that the OEL offer did not provide for any security for any funds which might be forthcoming over and above the initial down payment on closing.

79 In *Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303, 86 A.P.R. 303 (C.A.), Hart J.A., speaking for the majority of the court, said at p. 10 [C.B.R.]:

Here we are dealing with a receiver appointed at the instance of one major creditor, who chose to insert in the contract of sale a provision making it subject to the approval of the court. This, in my opinion, shows an intention on behalf of the parties to invoke the normal equitable doctrines which place the court in the position of looking to the interests of all persons concerned before giving its blessing to a particular transaction submitted for approval. In these circumstances the court would not consider itself bound by the contract entered into in good faith by the receiver but would have to look to the broader picture to see that that contract was for the benefit of the creditors as a whole. When there was evidence that a higher price was readily available for the property the chambers judge was, in my opinion, justified in exercising his discretion as he did. Otherwise he could have deprived the creditors of a substantial sum of money.

80 This statement is apposite to the circumstances of the case at bar. I hasten to add that in my opinion it is not only price which is to be considered in the exercise of the judge's discretion. It may very well be, as I believe to be so in this case, that the amount of cash is the most important element in determining which of the two offers is for the benefit and in the best interest of the creditors.

81 It is my view, and the statement of Hart J.A. is consistent therewith, that the fact that a creditor has requested an order of the court appointing a receiver does not in any way diminish or derogate from his right to obtain the maximum benefit to be derived from any disposition of the debtor's assets. I agree completely with the views expressed by McKinlay J.A. in that regard in her reasons.

82 It is my further view that any negotiations which took place between the only two interested creditors in deciding to support the approval of the 922 offer were not relevant to the determination by the presiding judge of the issues involved in the motion for approval of either one of the two offers, nor are they relevant in determining the outcome of this appeal. It is sufficient that the two creditors have decided unanimously what is in their best interest, and the appeal must be considered in the light of that decision. It so happens, however, that there is ample evidence to support their conclusion that the approval of the 922 offer is in their best interests.

83 I am satisfied that the interests of the creditors are the prime consideration for both the receiver and the court. In *Re Beauty Counsellors of Canada Ltd.* (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 (Ont. S.C.), Saunders J. said at p. 243:

This does not mean that a court should ignore a new and higher bid made after acceptance where there has been no unfairness in the process. The interests of the creditors, while not the only consideration, are the prime consideration.

84 I agree with that statement of the law. In *Re Selkirk* (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 245 (Ont. S.C.), Saunders J. heard an application for court approval of the sale by the sheriff of real property in bankruptcy proceedings. The sheriff had been previously ordered to list the property for sale subject to approval of the court. Saunders J. said at p. 246:

In dealing with the request for approval, the court has to be concerned primarily with protecting the interests 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.

85 I am in agreement with that statement as a matter of general principle. Saunders J. further stated that he adopted the principles stated by Macdonald J.A. in *Cameron*, supra, quoted by Galligan J.A. in his reasons. In *Cameron*, the remarks of Macdonald J.A. related to situations involving the calling of bids and fixing a time limit for the making of such bids. In those circumstances the process is so clear as a matter of commercial practice that an interference by the court in such process might have a deleterious effect on the efficacy of receivership proceedings in other cases. But Macdonald J.A. recognized that even

in bid or tender cases where the offeror for whose bid approval is sought has complied with all requirements, a court might not approve the agreement of purchase and sale entered into by the receiver. He said at pp. 11-12 [C.B.R.]:

There are, of course, many reasons why a court might not approve an agreement of purchase and sale, viz., where the offer accepted is so low in relation to the appraised value as to be unrealistic; or, where the circumstances indicate that insufficient time was allowed for the making of bids or that inadequate notice of sale by bid was given (where the receiver sells property by the bid method); or, where it can be said that the proposed sale is not in the best interest of either the creditors or the owner. Court approval must involve the delicate balancing of competing interests and not simply a consideration of the interests of the creditors.

86 The deficiency in the present case is so large that there has been no suggestion of a competing interest between the owner and the creditors.

87 I agree that the same reasoning may apply to a negotiation process leading to a private sale, but the procedure and process applicable to private sales of a wide variety of businesses and undertakings with the multiplicity of individual considerations applicable and perhaps peculiar to the particular business is not so clearly established that a departure by the court from the process adopted by the receiver in a particular case will result in commercial chaos to the detriment of future receivership proceedings. Each case must be decided on its own merits, and it is necessary to consider the process used by the receiver in the present proceedings and to determine whether it was unfair, improvident or inadequate.

88 It is important to note at the outset that Rosenberg J. made the following statement in his reasons:

On March 8, 1991 the trustee accepted the OEL offer subject to court approval. The Receiver at that time had no other offer before it that was in final form or could possibly be accepted. The Receiver had at the time the knowledge that Air Canada with CCFL had not bargained in good faith and had not fulfilled the promise of its letter of March 1st. The Receiver was justified in assuming that Air Canada and CCFL's offer was a long way from being in an acceptable form and that Air Canada and CCFL's objective was to interrupt the finalizing of the OEL agreement and to retain as long as possible the Air Toronto connector traffic flowing into Terminal 2 for the benefit of Air Canada.

89 In my opinion there was no evidence before him or before this court to indicate that Air Canada, with CCFL, had not bargained in good faith, and that the receiver had knowledge of such lack of good faith. Indeed, on his appeal, counsel for the receiver stated that he was not alleging Air Canada and CCFL had not bargained in good faith. Air Canada had frankly stated at the time that it had made its offer to purchase, which was eventually refused by the receiver, that it would not become involved in an "auction" to purchase the undertaking of Air Canada and that, although it would fulfil its contractual obligations to provide connecting services to Air Toronto, it would do no more than it was legally required to do insofar as facilitating the purchase of Air Toronto by any other person. In so doing, Air Canada may have been playing "hardball," as its behaviour was characterized by some of the counsel for opposing parties. It was nevertheless merely openly asserting its legal position, as it was entitled to do.

90 Furthermore, there was no evidence before Rosenberg J. or this court that the receiver had assumed that Air Canada and CCFL's objective in making an offer was to interrupt the finalizing of the OEL agreement and to retain as long as possible the Air Toronto connector traffic flowing into Terminal 2 for the benefit of Air Canada. Indeed, there was no evidence to support such an assumption in any event, although it is clear that 922, and through it CCFL and Air Canada, were endeavouring to present an offer to purchase which would be accepted and/or approved by the court in preference to the offer made by OEL.

91 To the extent that approval of the OEL agreement by Rosenberg J. was based on the alleged lack of good faith in bargaining and improper motivation with respect to connector traffic on the part of Air Canada and CCFL, it cannot be supported.

92 I would also point out that rather than saying there was no other offer before it that was final in form, it would have been more accurate to have said that there was *no unconditional* offer before it.

93 In considering the material and evidence placed before the court, I am satisfied that the receiver was at all times acting in good faith. I have reached the conclusion, however, that the process which he used was unfair insofar as 922 is concerned, and improvident insofar as the two secured creditors are concerned.

94 Air Canada had been negotiating with Soundair Corporation for the purchase from it of Air Toronto for a considerable period of time prior to the appointment of a receiver by the court. It had given a letter of intent indicating a prospective sale price of \$18 million. After the appointment of the receiver, by agreement dated April 30, 1990, Air Canada continued its negotiations for the purchase of Air Toronto with the receiver. Although this agreement contained a clause which provided that the receiver "shall not negotiate for the sale ... of Air Toronto with any person except Air Canada," it further provided that the receiver would not be in breach of that provision merely by receiving unsolicited offers for all or any of the assets of Air Toronto. In addition, the agreement, which had a term commencing on April 30, 1990, could be terminated on the fifth business day following the delivery of a written notice of termination by one party to the other. I point out this provision merely to indicate that the exclusivity privilege extended by the receiver to Air Canada was of short duration at the receiver's option.

95 As a result of due diligence investigations carried out by Air Canada during the months of April, May and June of 1990, Air Canada reduced its offer to \$8.1 million conditional upon there being \$4 million in tangible assets. The offer was made on June 14, 1990, and was open for acceptance until June 29, 1990.

96 By amending agreement dated June 19, 1990, the receiver was released from its covenant to refrain from negotiating for the sale of the Air Toronto business and assets to any person other than Air Canada. By virtue of this amending agreement, the receiver had put itself in the position of having a firm offer in hand, with the right to negotiate and accept offers from other persons. Air Canada, in these circumstances, was in the subservient position. The receiver, in the exercise of its judgment and discretion, allowed the Air Canada offer to lapse. On July 20, 1990, Air Canada served a notice of termination of the April 30, 1990 agreement.

97 Apparently as a result of advice received from the receiver to the effect that the receiver intended to conduct an auction for the sale of the assets and business of the Air Toronto division of Soundair Corporation, the solicitors for Air Canada advised the receiver by letter dated July 20, 1990, in part as follows:

Air Canada has instructed us to advise you that it does not intend to submit a further offer in the auction process.

98 This statement, together with other statements set forth in the letter, was sufficient to indicate that Air Canada was not interested in purchasing Air Toronto in the process apparently contemplated by the receiver at that time. It did not form a proper foundation for the receiver to conclude that there was no realistic possibility of selling Air Toronto [to] Air Canada, either alone or in conjunction with some other person, in different circumstances. In June 1990, the receiver was of the opinion that the fair value of Air Toronto was between \$10 million and \$12 million.

99 In August 1990, the receiver contacted a number of interested parties. A number of offers were received which were not deemed to be satisfactory. One such offer, received on August 20, 1990, came as a joint offer from OEL and Air Ontario (an Air Canada connector). It was for the sum of \$3 million for the good will relating to certain Air Toronto routes, but did not include the purchase of any tangible assets or leasehold interests.

100 In December 1990, the receiver was approached by the management of Canadian Partner (operated by OEL) for the purpose of evaluating the benefits of an amalgamated Air Toronto/Air Partner operation. The negotiations continued from December of 1990 to February of 1991, culminating in the OEL agreement dated March 8, 1991.

101 On or before December 1990, CCFL advised the receiver that it intended to make a bid for the Air Toronto assets. The receiver, in August of 1990, for the purpose of facilitating the sale of Air Toronto assets, commenced the preparation of an operating memorandum. He prepared no less than six draft operating memoranda with dates from October 1990 through March 1, 1991. None of these were distributed to any prospective bidder despite requests having been received therefor, with the exception of an early draft provided to CCFL without the receiver's knowledge.

102 During the period December 1990 to the end of January 1991, the receiver advised CCFL that the offering memorandum was in the process of being prepared and would be ready soon for distribution. He further advised CCFL that it should await the receipt of the memorandum before submitting a formal offer to purchase the Air Toronto assets.

103 By late January, CCFL had become aware that the receiver was negotiating with OEL for the sale of Air Toronto. In fact, on February 11, 1991, the receiver signed a letter of intent with OEL wherein it had specifically agreed not to negotiate with any other potential bidders or solicit any offers from others.

104 By letter dated February 25, 1991, the solicitors for CCFL made a written request to the receiver for the offering memorandum. The receiver did not reply to the letter because he felt he was precluded from so doing by the provisions of the letter of intent dated February 11, 1991. Other prospective purchasers were also unsuccessful in obtaining the promised memorandum to assist them in preparing their bids. It should be noted that, exclusivity provision of the letter of intent expired on February 20, 1991. This provision was extended on three occasions, viz., February 19, 22 and March 5, 1991. It is clear that from a legal standpoint the receiver, by refusing to extend the time, could have dealt with other prospective purchasers, and specifically with 922.

105 It was not until March 1, 1991, that CCFL had obtained sufficient information to enable it to make a bid through 922. It succeeded in so doing through its own efforts through sources other than the receiver. By that time the receiver had already entered into the letter of intent with OEL. Notwithstanding the fact that the receiver knew since December of 1990 that CCFL wished to make a bid for the assets of Air Toronto (and there is no evidence to suggest that at that time such a bid would be in conjunction with Air Canada or that Air Canada was in any way connected with CCFL), it took no steps to provide CCFL with information necessary to enable it to make an intelligent bid, and indeed suggested delaying the making of the bid until an offering memorandum had been prepared and provided. In the meantime, by entering into the letter of intent with OEL, it put itself in a position where it could not negotiate with CCFL or provide the information requested.

106 On February 28, 1991, the solicitors for CCFL telephoned the receiver and were advised for the first time that the receiver had made a business decision to negotiate solely with OEL and would not negotiate with anyone else in the interim.

107 By letter dated March 1, 1991, CCFL advised the receiver that it intended to submit a bid. It set forth the essential terms of the bid and stated that it would be subject to customary commercial provisions. On March 7, 1991 CCFL and Air Canada, jointly through 922, submitted an offer to purchase Air Toronto upon the terms set forth in the letter dated March 1, 1991. It included a provision that the offer was conditional upon the interpretation of an inter-lender agreement which set out the relative distribution of proceeds as between CCFL and the Royal Bank. It is common ground that it was a condition over which the receiver had no control, and accordingly would not have been acceptable on that ground alone. The receiver did not, however, contact CCFL in order to negotiate or request the removal of the condition, although it appears that its agreement with OEL not to negotiate with any person other than OEL expired on March 6, 1991.

108 The fact of the matter is that by March 7, 1991, the receiver had received the offer from OEL which was subsequently approved by Rosenberg J. That offer was accepted by the receiver on March 8, 1991. Notwithstanding the fact that OEL had been negotiating the purchase for a period of approximately 3 months, the offer contained a provision for the sole benefit of the purchaser that it was subject to the purchaser obtaining "a financing commitment within 45 days of the date hereof in an amount not less than the Purchase Price from the Royal Bank of Canada or other financial institution upon terms and conditions acceptable to them. In the event that such a financing commitment is not obtained within such 45 day period, the purchaser or OEL shall have the right to terminate this agreement upon giving written notice of termination to the vendor on the first Business Day following the expiry of the said period." The purchaser was also given the right to waive the condition.

109 In effect, the agreement was tantamount to a 45-day option to purchase, excluding the right of any other person to purchase Air Toronto during that period of time and thereafter if the condition was fulfilled or waived. The agreement was, of course, stated to be subject to court approval.

110 In my opinion, the process and procedure adopted by the receiver was unfair to CCFL. Although it was aware from December 1990 that CCFL was interested in making an offer, it effectively delayed the making of such offer by continually referring to the preparation of the offering memorandum. It did not endeavour during the period December 1990 to March 7, 1991, to negotiate with CCFL in any way the possible terms of purchase and sale agreement. In the result, no offer was sought from CCFL by the receiver prior to February 11, 1991, and thereafter it put itself in the position of being unable to negotiate with anyone other than OEL. The receiver then, on March 8, 1991, chose to accept an offer which was conditional in nature without prior consultation with CCFL (922) to see whether it was prepared to remove the condition in its offer.

111 I do not doubt that the receiver felt that it was more likely that the condition in the OEL offer would be fulfilled than the condition in the 922 offer. It may be that the receiver, having negotiated for a period of 3 months with OEL, was fearful that it might lose the offer if OEL discovered that it was negotiating with another person. Nevertheless, it seems to me that it was imprudent and unfair on the part of the receiver to ignore an offer from an interested party which offered approximately triple the cash down payment without giving a chance to the offeror to remove the conditions or other terms which made the offer unacceptable to it. The potential loss was that of an agreement which amounted to little more than an option in favour of the offeror.

112 In my opinion the procedure adopted by the receiver was unfair to CCFL in that, in effect, it gave OEL the opportunity of engaging in exclusive negotiations for a period of 3 months, notwithstanding the fact that it knew CCFL was interested in making an offer. The receiver did not indicate a deadline by which offers were to be submitted, and it did not at any time indicate the structure or nature of an offer which might be acceptable to it.

113 In his reasons, Rosenberg J. stated that as of March 1, CCFL and Air Canada had all the information that they needed, and any allegations of unfairness in the negotiating process by the receiver had disappeared. He said:

They created a situation as of March 8, where the receiver was faced with two offers, one of which was acceptable in form and one of which could not possibly be accepted in its present form. The Receiver acted appropriately in accepting the OEL offer.

If he meant by "acceptable in form" that it was acceptable to the receiver, then obviously OEL had the unfair advantage of its lengthy negotiations with the receiver to ascertain what kind of an offer would be acceptable to the receiver. If, on the other hand, he meant that the 922 offer was unacceptable in its form because it was conditional, it can hardly be said that the OEL offer was more acceptable in this regard, as it contained a condition with respect to financing terms and conditions "*acceptable to them*."

114 It should be noted that on March 13, 1991, the representatives of 922 first met with the receiver to review its offer of March 7, 1991, and at the request of the receiver, withdrew the inter-lender condition from its offer. On March 14, 1991, OEL removed the financing condition from its offer. By order of Rosenberg J. dated March 26, 1991, CCFL was given until April 5, 1991, to submit a bid, and on April 5, 1991, 922 submitted its offer with the inter-lender condition removed.

115 In my opinion, the offer accepted by the receiver is improvident and unfair insofar as the two creditors are concerned. It is not improvident in the sense that the price offered by 922 greatly exceeded that offered by OEL. In the final analysis it may not be greater at all. The salient fact is that the cash down payment in the 922 offer constitutes approximately two thirds of the contemplated sale price, whereas the cash down payment in the OEL transaction constitutes approximately 20 to 25 per cent of the contemplated sale price. In terms of absolute dollars, the down payment in the 922 offer would likely exceed that provided for in the OEL agreement by approximately \$3 million to \$4 million.

116 In *Re Beauty Counsellors of Canada Ltd.*, supra, Saunders J. said at p. 243 [C.B.R.]:

If a substantially higher bid turns up at the approval stage, the court should consider it. Such a bid may indicate, for example, that the trustee has not properly carried out its duty to endeavour to obtain the best price for the estate. In such a case the proper course might be to refuse approval and to ask the trustee to recommence the process.

117 I accept that statement as being an accurate statement of the law. I would add, however, as previously indicated, that in determining what is the best price for the estate, the receiver or court should not limit its consideration to which offer provides for the greater sale price. The amount of down payment and the provision or lack thereof to secure payment of the balance of the purchase price over and above the down payment may be the most important factor to be considered, and I am of the view that is so in the present case. It is clear that that was the view of the only creditors who can benefit from the sale of Air Toronto.

118 I note that in the case at bar the 922 offer in conditional form was presented to the receiver before it accepted the OEL offer. The receiver, in good faith, although I believe mistakenly, decided that the OEL offer was the better offer. At that time the receiver did not have the benefit of the views of the two secured creditors in that regard. At the time of the application for approval before Rosenberg J., the stated preference of the two interested creditors was made quite clear. He found as fact that knowledgeable creditors would not be anxious to rely on contingencies in the present circumstances surrounding the airline industry. It is reasonable to expect that a receiver would be no less knowledgeable in that regard, and it is his primary duty to protect the interests of the creditors. In my view, it was an improvident act on the part of the receiver to have accepted the conditional offer made by OEL, and Rosenberg J. erred in failing to dismiss the application of the receiver for approval of the OEL offer. It would be most inequitable to foist upon the two creditors, who have already been seriously hurt, more unnecessary contingencies.

119 Although in other circumstances it might be appropriate to ask the receiver to recommence the process, in my opinion, it would not be appropriate to do so in this case. The only two interested creditors support the acceptance of the 922 offer, and the court should so order.

120 Although I would be prepared to dispose of the case on the grounds stated above, some comment should be addressed to the question of interference by the court with the process and procedure adopted by the receiver.

121 I am in agreement with the view expressed by McKinlay J.A. in her reasons that the undertaking being sold in this case was of a very special and unusual nature. As a result, the procedure adopted by the receiver was somewhat unusual. At the outset, in accordance with the terms of the receiving order, it dealt solely with Air Canada. It then appears that the receiver contemplated a sale of the assets by way of auction, and still later contemplated the preparation and distribution of an offering memorandum inviting bids. At some point, without advice to CCFL, it abandoned that idea and reverted to exclusive negotiations with one interested party. This entire process is not one which is customary or widely accepted as a general practice in the commercial world. It was somewhat unique, having regard to the circumstances of this case. In my opinion, the refusal of the court to approve the offer accepted by the receiver would not reflect on the integrity of procedures followed by court-appointed receivers, and is not the type of refusal which will have a tendency to undermine the future confidence of business persons in dealing with receivers.

122 Rosenberg J. stated that the Royal Bank was aware of the process used and tacitly approved it. He said it knew the terms of the letter of intent in February 1991, and made no comment. The Royal Bank did, however, indicate to the receiver that it was not satisfied with the contemplated price, nor the amount of the down payment. It did not, however, tell the receiver to adopt a different process in endeavouring to sell the Air Toronto assets. It is not clear from the material filed that at the time it became aware of the letter of intent that it knew that CCFI was interested in purchasing Air Toronto.

123 I am further of the opinion that a prospective purchaser who has been given an opportunity to engage in exclusive negotiations with a receiver for relatively short periods of time which are extended from time to time by the receiver, and who then makes a conditional offer, the condition of which is for his sole benefit and must be fulfilled to his satisfaction unless waived by him, and which he knows is to be subject to court approval, cannot legitimately claim to have been unfairly dealt with if the court refuses to approve the offer and approves a substantially better one.

124 In conclusion, I feel that I must comment on the statement made by Galligan J.A. in his reasons to the effect that the suggestion made by counsel for 922 constitutes evidence of lack of prejudice resulting from the absence of an offering memorandum. It should be pointed out that the court invited counsel to indicate the manner in which the problem should be

resolved in the event that the court concluded that the order approving the OEL offer should be set aside. There was no evidence before the court with respect to what additional information may have been acquired by CCFL since March 8, 1991, and no inquiry was made in that regard. Accordingly, I am of the view that no adverse inference should be drawn from the proposal made as a result of the court's invitation.

125 For the above reasons I would allow the appeal one set of costs to CCFL-922, set aside the order of Rosenberg J., dismiss the receiver's motion with one set of costs to CCFL-922 and order that the assets of Air Toronto be sold to numbered corporation 922246 on the terms set forth in its offer with appropriate adjustments to provide for the delay in its execution. Costs awarded shall be payable out of the estate of Soundair Corporation. The costs incurred by the receiver in making the application and responding to the appeal shall be paid to him out of the assets of the estate of Soundair Corporation on a solicitor-client basis. I would make no order as to costs of any of the other parties or intervenors.

Appeal dismissed.

TAB 5

2009 CarswellOnt 5450
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Eddie Bauer of Canada Inc., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 5450, 57 C.B.R. (5th) 241

**IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT
ACT, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED AND IN THE MATTER OF A
PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF EDDIE BAUER OF
CANADA, INC. AND EDDIE BAUER CUSTOMER SERVICES INC. (Applicants)**

C. Campbell J.

Heard: July 22, 2009

Judgment: July 30, 2009

Docket: CV-09-8240-00CL

Counsel: Fred Myers, L. Joseph Latham, Christopher G. Armstrong for Applicants

Jay Swartz for RSM Richter

Linda Galessiere for Landlords

Maria Konyukhova for Everest Holdings

Alexander Cobb for Bank of America

Subject: Insolvency

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by C. Campbell J.:

Bakemates International Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 2339 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg (1986), 60 O.R. (2d) 87, 1986 CarswellOnt 235, 22 C.P.C. (2d) 131, 39 D.L.R. (4th) 526, 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 320 (note) (Ont. H.C.) — considered

Eddie Bauer of Canada Inc., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 3657, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 33 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Ivaco Inc., Re (2004), 2004 CarswellOnt 3563 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp. (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 83 D.L.R. (4th) 76, 46 O.A.C. 321, 4 O.R. (3d) 1, 1991 CarswellOnt 205 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Tiger Brand Knitting Co., Re (2005), 2005 CarswellOnt 1240, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 315 (Ont. S.C.J.) — considered

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C.

Chapter 11 — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36
Generally — referred to

APPLICATION for approval of sale and vesting order.

C. Campbell J.:

1 A joint hearing between this Court and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware was held on July 22, 2009 for Sale Approval and a Vesting Order in respect of an Asset Purchase Agreement dated as of July 17, 2009 among Everest Holdings LLC as buyer and Eddie Bauer Holdings Inc. ("EB Holdings") and each of its subsidiaries.

2 These are the reasons for approval of the Order granted.

3 On June 17, 2009, Eddie Bauer Canada Inc. and Eddie Bauer Customer Services Inc. (together, "EB Canada"), two of the EB Holdings subsidiaries, were granted protection under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-36, as amended ("CCAA") in an Initial Order of this Court, with RSM Richter Inc. appointed as Monitor.

4 On the same day, EB Holdings commenced reorganization under Chapter 11 of the United States Code in bankruptcy. A cross-border protocol was approved by this Court [2009 CarswellOnt 3657 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])] and the U.S. Court on June 25, 2009.

5 The purpose of what is described in the Orders as "Restructuring Proceedings" was a process to enable the Eddie Bauer Group to have an opportunity to maximize the value of its business and assets in a unified, Court-approved sale process.

6 EB Holdings is a publicly traded company with shares trade on the NASDAQ Global Market. Eddie Bauer branded products are sold at over 300 retail outlets in the United States and 36 retail stores and one warehouse store throughout Canada, together with online and catalogue sales employing 933 individuals in Canada.

7 The joint hearing conducted on June 29, 2009 before the U.S. Court and this Court approved a Stalking Horse process and certain prescribed bidding procedures. Rainer Holdings LLC, an affiliate of CCMP Capital Advisors and indirectly of the buyer, became the Stalking Horse bidder.

8 The Stalking Horse offer of US\$202.3 million was for substantially all of the assets, property and undertaking of the Eddie Bauer Group.

9 The Bidding Procedure Order provided that the Stalking Horse offeror would be entitled to a break fee and to have its expenses of approximately \$250,000 reimbursed and would offer employment to substantially all of the Company's employees, assume at least 250 U.S. retail locations and all Canadian locations and pay all of the Group's post-filing supplier claims.

10 The bidding was completed in the early hours of July 17, 2009. The three stage basis of the auction process included (1) the best inventory offer from Inventory Bidders; (2) the best intellectual property offer of the IP bidders; and (3) the best going-concern offer from Going-Concern Bidders. The best inventory and intellectual offers were to be compared against the best going-concern offer.

11 The US\$286 million bid by Everest (a company unrelated to Rainer) was deemed the best offer, yielding the highest net recovery for creditors (including creditors in consultation.) A US\$250 million back-up bid was also identified.

12 The Canadian real property leases are to be assigned, assuming consent of landlords, and offers of employment to all Canadian employees to be made and ordinary course liabilities assumed.

13 The value allocated to the Canadian Purchased Assets of US\$11 million exceeds in the analysis and opinion of the Monitor the net value on a liquidation basis, particularly as the only two material assets are inventory and equity (if any) in realty leases.

14 All parties represented at the joint hearing, including counsel for the landlords, either supported or did not oppose the Order sought.

15 The process that has been undertaken in a very short time is an example of a concerted and dedicated effort of a variety of stakeholders to achieve a restructuring without impairing the going-concern nature of the Eddie Bauer business.

16 The sale and purchase of assets assures a compromise of debt accepted by those debtholders (with a process of certain leases not taken up in the US), which to the extent possible preserves the value of the name and reputation of the business as a going concern.

17 Had it not been for the cooperative effort of counsel for the parties on both sides of the border and a joint hearing process to approve on an efficient and timely basis, the restructuring regime would undoubtedly have been more time-consuming and more costly.

18 I am satisfied that the statement of law that set out the duties of a Court in reviewing the propriety of the actions of a Court officer (Monitor) are applicable and have been met here.

19 The duties were set out by Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg* (1986), 60 O.R. (2d) 87 (Ont. H.C.) at pp 92-94 and are as follows:

1. It should consider the interests of all parties.
2. It should consider the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers are obtained.
3. It should consider whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process.

20 Galligan J.A. for the majority in the Court of Appeal in Ontario in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. C.A.) at p. 8 further accepted and adopted the further statement of Anderson J. in *Crown Trust* at p. 551 that "its decision was made as a matter of business judgement on the elements then available to it. It is the very essence of a receiver's function to make such judgments and in the making of them, to act seriously and responsibly, so as to be prepared to stand behind them."

21 What have come to be known as the *Soundair* principles have been accepted in a number of Ontario cases, including *Bakemates International Inc., Re* [2004 CarswellOnt 2339 (Ont. C.A.)], 2004 CanLII 59994. The same principles have been accepted to approval of Asset Purchase Agreements and Vesting Orders. See *Ivaco Inc., Re* [2004 CarswellOnt 3563 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])] 2004 CanLII 21547. In *Tiger Brand Knitting Co., Re* [2005 CarswellOnt 1240 (Ont. S.C.J.)] 2005 CanLII 9680, I declined to extend the time for a bid and directed the Monitor not to accept a bid it had received and to negotiate with another party.

22 The concern in *Tiger Brand*, as in this case, is that once a sales process is put forward, the Court should to the extent possible uphold the business judgment of the Court officer and the parties supporting it. Absent a violation of the *Soundair* principles, the result of that process should as well be upheld.

23 A Stalking Horse bid has become an important feature of the CCAA process. In this case, the fact that the Stalking Horse bidder promoted other bids and put in the highest bid satisfies me that the process was fair and reasonable and produced a fair and reasonable result.

24 One can readily understand that the goodwill attached to a recognized name such as Eddie Bauer will likely only retain its value if there is a seamless and orderly transfer.

25 For the foregoing reasons the draft Orders of Approval and Vesting will issue as approved and signed.

Application granted.

TAB 6

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

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by Iacobucci J.:

AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health & Welfare), 1998 CarswellNat 2520, 83 C.P.R. (3d) 428, 161 F.T.R. 15 (Fed. T.D.) — considered

AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health & Welfare), 2000 CarswellNat 356, 5 C.P.R. (4th) 149, 253 N.R. 284, [2000] 3 F.C. 360, 2000 CarswellNat 3254 (Fed. C.A.) — considered

Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General), 2 C.R. (5th) 1, 110 C.C.C. (3d) 193, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480, 139 D.L.R. (4th) 385, 182 N.B.R. (2d) 81, 463 A.P.R. 81, 39 C.R.R. (2d) 189, 203 N.R. 169, 1996 CarswellNB 462, 1996 CarswellNB 463, 2 B.H.R.C. 210 (S.C.C.) — followed

Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp., 34 C.R. (4th) 269, 20 O.R. (3d) 816 (note), [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835, 120 D.L.R. (4th) 12, 175 N.R. 1, 94 C.C.C. (3d) 289, 76 O.A.C. 81, 25 C.R.R. (2d) 1, 1994 CarswellOnt 112, 1994 CarswellOnt 1168 (S.C.C.) — followed

Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General) (1989), [1990] 1 W.W.R. 577, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326, 64 D.L.R. (4th) 577, 102 N.R. 321, 71 Alta. L.R. (2d) 273, 103 A.R. 321, 41 C.P.C. (2d) 109, 45 C.R.R. 1, 1989 CarswellAlta 198, 1989 CarswellAlta 623 (S.C.C.) — followed

Eli Lilly & Co. v. Novopharm Ltd., 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437, 82 F.T.R. 147, 1994 CarswellNat 537 (Fed. T.D.) — referred to

Ethyl Canada Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General), 1998 CarswellOnt 380, 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

Irwin Toy Ltd. c. Québec (Procureur général), 94 N.R. 167, (sub nom. *Irwin Toy Ltd. v. Québec (Attorney General)*) [1989] 1 S.C.R. 927, 58 D.L.R. (4th) 577, 24 Q.A.C. 2, 25 C.P.R. (3d) 417, 39 C.R.R. 193, 1989 CarswellQue 115F, 1989 CarswellQue 115 (S.C.C.) — followed

M. (A.) v. Ryan, 143 D.L.R. (4th) 1, 207 N.R. 81, 4 C.R. (5th) 220, 29 B.C.L.R. (3d) 133, [1997] 4 W.W.R. 1, 85 B.C.A.C. 81, 138 W.A.C. 81, 34 C.C.L.T. (2d) 1, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, 42 C.R.R. (2d) 37, 8 C.P.C. (4th) 1, 1997 CarswellBC 99, 1997 CarswellBC 100 (S.C.C.) — considered

N. (F.), Re, 2000 SCC 35, 2000 CarswellNfld 213, 2000 CarswellNfld 214, 146 C.C.C. (3d) 1, 188 D.L.R. (4th) 1, 35 C.R. (5th) 1, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, 191 Nfld. & P.E.I.R. 181, 577 A.P.R. 181 (S.C.C.) — considered

R. v. E. (O.N.), 2001 SCC 77, 2001 CarswellBC 2479, 2001 CarswellBC 2480, 158 C.C.C. (3d) 478, 205 D.L.R. (4th) 542, 47 C.R. (5th) 89, 279 N.R. 187, 97 B.C.L.R. (3d) 1, [2002] 3 W.W.R. 205, 160 B.C.A.C. 161, 261 W.A.C. 161 (S.C.C.) — referred to

R. v. Keegstra, 1 C.R. (4th) 129, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697, 77 Alta. L.R. (2d) 193, 117 N.R. 1, [1991] 2 W.W.R. 1, 114 A.R. 81, 61 C.C.C. (3d) 1, 3 C.R.R. (2d) 193, 1990 CarswellAlta 192, 1990 CarswellAlta 661 (S.C.C.) — followed

R. v. Mentuck, 2001 SCC 76, 2001 CarswellMan 535, 2001 CarswellMan 536, 158 C.C.C. (3d) 449, 205 D.L.R. (4th) 512, 47 C.R. (5th) 63, 277 N.R. 160, [2002] 2 W.W.R. 409 (S.C.C.) — followed

R. v. Oakes, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103, 26 D.L.R. (4th) 200, 65 N.R. 87, 14 O.A.C. 335, 24 C.C.C. (3d) 321, 50 C.R. (3d) 1, 19 C.R.R. 308, 53 O.R. (2d) 719, 1986 CarswellOnt 95, 1986 CarswellOnt 1001 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Part I of the Constitution Act, 1982, being Schedule B to the Canada Act 1982 (U.K.), 1982, c. 11

Generally — referred to

s. 1 — referred to

s. 2(b) — referred to

s. 11(d) — referred to

Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, S.C. 1992, c. 37

Generally — considered

s. 5(1)(b) — referred to

s. 8 — referred to

s. 54 — referred to

s. 54(2)(b) — referred to

Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46

s. 486(1) — referred to

Rules considered:

Federal Court Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106

R. 151 — considered

R. 312 — referred to

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 a confidentiality order" (para. 29). He then decided that the documents were material to a question of the appropriate remedy, a significant issue in the event that the appellant failed on the main issue.

18 Pelletier J. also considered the context of the case and held that since the issue of Canada's role as a vendor of nuclear technology was one of significant public interest, the burden of justifying a confidentiality order was very onerous. He found that AECL could expunge the sensitive material from the documents, or put the evidence before the court in some other form, and thus maintain its full right of defence while preserving the open access to court proceedings.

19 Pelletier J. observed that his order was being made without having perused the Confidential Documents because they had not been put before him. Although he noted the line of cases which holds that a judge ought not to deal with the issue of a confidentiality order without reviewing the documents themselves, in his view, given their voluminous nature and technical content as well as his lack of information as to what information was already in the public domain, he found that an examination of these documents would not have been useful.

20 Pelletier J. ordered that the appellant could file the documents in current form, or in an edited version if it chose to do so. He also granted leave to file material dealing with the Chinese regulatory process in general and as applied to this project, provided it did so within 60 days.

B. Federal Court of Appeal, [2000] 4 F.C. 426

(1) *Evans J.A. (Sharlow J.A. concurring)*

21 At the Federal Court of Appeal, AECL appealed the ruling under R. 151 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*, and Sierra Club cross-appealed the ruling under R. 312.

22 With respect to R. 312, Evans J.A. held that the documents were clearly relevant to a defence under s. 54(2)(b), which the appellant proposed to raise if s. 5(1)(b) of the CEAA was held to apply, and were also potentially relevant to the exercise of the court's discretion to refuse a remedy even if the Ministers were in breach of the CEAA. Evans J.A. agreed with Pelletier J. that the benefit to the appellant and the court of being granted leave to file the documents outweighed any prejudice to the respondent owing to delay and thus concluded that the motions judge was correct in granting leave under R. 312.

23 On the issue of the confidentiality order, Evans J.A. considered R. 151, and all the factors that the motions judge had weighed, including the commercial sensitivity of the documents, the fact that the appellant had received them in confidence from the Chinese authorities, and the appellant's argument that without the documents it could not mount a full answer and defence to the application. These factors had to be weighed against the principle of open access to court documents. Evans J.A. agreed with Pelletier J. that the weight to be attached to the public interest in open proceedings varied with context and held that, where a case raises issues of public significance, the principle of openness of judicial process carries greater weight as a factor in the balancing process. Evans J.A. noted the public interest in the subject matter of the litigation, as well as the considerable media attention it had attracted.

24 In support of his conclusion that the weight assigned to the principle of openness may vary with context, Evans J.A. relied upon the decisions in *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health & Welfare)*, [2000] 3 F.C. 360 (Fed. C.A.), where the court took into consideration the relatively small public interest at stake, and *Ethyl Canada Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)* (1998), 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278 (Ont. Gen. Div.), at p. 283, where the court ordered disclosure after determining that the case was a significant constitutional case where it was important for the public to understand the issues at stake. Evans J.A. observed that openness and public participation in the assessment process are fundamental to the CEAA, and concluded that the motions judge could not be said to have given the principle of openness undue weight even though confidentiality was claimed for a relatively small number of highly technical documents.

25 Evans J.A. held that the motions judge had placed undue emphasis on the fact that the introduction of the documents was voluntary; however, it did not follow that his decision on the confidentiality order must therefore be set aside. Evans J.A. was of the view that this error did not affect the ultimate conclusion for three reasons. First, like the motions judge, he attached great weight to the principle of openness. Secondly, he held that the inclusion in the affidavits of a summary of the reports could go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals, should the appellant choose not to put them in without a confidentiality order. Finally, if AECL submitted the documents in an expunged fashion, the claim for confidentiality would rest upon a relatively unimportant factor, i.e., the appellant's claim that it would suffer a loss of business if it breached its undertaking with the Chinese authorities.

26 Evans J.A. rejected the argument that the motions judge had erred in deciding the motion without reference to the actual documents, stating that it was not necessary for him to inspect them, given that summaries were available and that the documents were highly technical and incompletely translated. Thus, the appeal and cross-appeal were both dismissed.

(2) *Robertson J.A. (dissenting)*

27 Robertson J.A. disagreed with the majority for three reasons. First, in his view, the level of public interest in the case, the degree of media coverage, and the identities of the parties should not be taken into consideration in assessing an application for a confidentiality order. Instead, he held that it was the nature of the evidence for which the order is sought that must be examined.

28 In addition, he found that without a confidentiality order, the appellant had to choose between two unacceptable options: either suffering irreparable financial harm if the confidential information was introduced into evidence or being denied the right to a fair trial because it could not mount a full defence if the evidence was not introduced.

29 Finally, he stated that the analytical framework employed by the majority in reaching its decision was fundamentally flawed as it was based largely on the subjective views of the motions judge. He rejected the contextual approach to the question of whether a confidentiality order should issue, emphasizing the need for an objective framework to combat the perception that justice is a relative concept, and to promote consistency and certainty in the law.

30 To establish this more objective framework for regulating the issuance of confidentiality orders pertaining to commercial and scientific information, he turned to the legal rationale underlying the commitment to the principle of open justice, referring to *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326 (S.C.C.). There, the Supreme Court of Canada held that open proceedings foster the search for the truth, and reflect the importance of public scrutiny of the courts.

31 Robertson J.A. stated that, although the principle of open justice is a reflection of the basic democratic value of accountability in the exercise of judicial power, in his view, the principle that justice itself must be secured is paramount. He concluded that justice as an overarching principle means that exceptions occasionally must be made to rules or principles.

32 He observed that, in the area of commercial law, when the information sought to be protected concerns "trade secrets," this information will not be disclosed during a trial if to do so would destroy the owner's proprietary rights and expose him or her to irreparable harm in the form of financial loss. Although the case before him did not involve a trade secret, he nevertheless held that the same treatment could be extended to commercial or scientific information which was acquired on a confidential basis and attached the following criteria as conditions precedent to the issuance of a confidentiality order (at para. 13):

(1) the information is of a confidential nature as opposed to facts which one would like to keep confidential; (2) the information for which confidentiality is sought is not already in the public domain; (3) on a balance of probabilities the party seeking the confidentiality order would suffer irreparable harm if the information were made public; (4) the information is relevant to the legal issues raised in the case; (5) correlatively, the information is "necessary" to the resolution of those issues; (6) the granting of a confidentiality order does not unduly prejudice the opposing party; and (7) the public interest in open court proceedings does not override the private interests of the party seeking the confidentiality order. The onus in establishing that criteria one to six are met is on the party seeking the confidentiality order. Under the seventh criterion, it is for the opposing party to show that a *prima facie* right to a protective order has been overtaken by the need to preserve the openness of the court proceedings. In addressing these criteria one must bear in mind two of the threads woven into the fabric of the principle of open justice: the search for truth and the preservation of the rule of law. As stated at the outset, I do not believe that the perceived degree of public importance of a case is a relevant consideration.

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*

49 The immediate purpose for AECL's confidentiality request relates to its commercial interests. The information in question is the property of the Chinese authorities. If the appellant were to disclose the Confidential Documents, it would be in breach of its contractual obligations and suffer a risk of harm to its competitive position. This is clear from the findings of fact of the motions judge that AECL was bound by its commercial interests and its customer's property rights not to disclose the information (para. 27), and that such disclosure could harm the appellant's commercial interests (para. 23).

50 Aside from this direct commercial interest, if the confidentiality order is denied, then in order to protect its commercial interests, the appellant will have to withhold the documents. This raises the important matter of the litigation context in which the order is sought. As both the motions judge and the Federal Court of Appeal found that the information contained in the Confidential Documents was relevant to defences available under the CEEA, the inability to present this information hinders the appellant's capacity to make full answer and defence or, expressed more generally, the appellant's right, as a civil litigant, to present its case. In that sense, preventing the appellant from disclosing these documents on a confidential basis infringes its right to a fair trial. Although in the context of a civil proceeding this does not engage a *Charter* right, the right to a fair trial generally can be viewed as a fundamental principle of justice: *M. (A.) v. Ryan*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157 (S.C.C.), at para. 84, *per* L'Heureux-Dubé J. (dissenting, but not on that point). Although this fair trial right is directly relevant to the appellant, there is also a general public interest in protecting the right to a fair trial. Indeed, as a general proposition, all disputes in the courts should be decided under a fair trial standard. The legitimacy of the judicial process alone demands as much. Similarly, courts have an interest in having all relevant evidence before them in order to ensure that justice is done.

51 Thus, the interests which would be promoted by a confidentiality order are the preservation of commercial and contractual relations, as well as the right of civil litigants to a fair trial. Related to the latter are the public and judicial interests in seeking the truth and achieving a just result in civil proceedings.

52 In opposition to the confidentiality order lies the fundamental principle of open and accessible court proceedings. This principle is inextricably tied to freedom of expression enshrined in s. 2(b) of the *Charter*: *New Brunswick, supra*, at para. 23. The importance of public and media access to the courts cannot be understated, as this access is the method by which the judicial process is scrutinized and criticized. Because it is essential to the administration of justice that justice is done and is *seen* to be done, such public scrutiny is fundamental. The open court principle has been described as "the very soul of justice," guaranteeing that justice is administered in a non-arbitrary manner: *New Brunswick, supra*, at para. 22.

(3) Adapting the Dagenais Test to the Rights and Interests of the Parties

53 Applying the rights and interests engaged in this case to the analytical framework of *Dagenais* and subsequent cases discussed above, the test for whether a confidentiality order ought to be granted in a case such as this one should be framed as follows:

A confidentiality order under R. 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 effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

54 As in *Mentuck, supra*, I would add that three important elements are subsumed under the first branch of this test. First, the risk in question must be real and substantial, in that the risk is well-grounded in the evidence and poses a serious threat to the commercial interest in question.

55 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 (S.C.C.), at para. 10, the open court rule only yields "where the *public* interest in confidentiality outweighs the public interest in openness" (emphasis added).

56 In addition to the above requirement, courts must be cautious in determining what constitutes an "important commercial interest." It must be remembered that a confidentiality order involves an infringement on freedom of expression. Although the balancing of the commercial interest with freedom of expression takes place under the second branch of the test, courts must be alive to the fundamental importance of the open court rule. See generally Muldoon J. in *Eli Lilly & Co. v. Novopharm Ltd.* (1994), 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437 (Fed. T.D.), at p. 439.

57 Finally, the phrase "reasonably alternative measures" requires the judge to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives to a confidentiality order are available, but also to restrict the order as much as is reasonably possible while preserving the commercial interest in question.

B. Application of the Test to this Appeal

(1) Necessity

58 At this stage, it must be determined whether disclosure of the Confidential Documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of the appellant, and whether there are reasonable alternatives, either to the order itself or to its terms.

59 The commercial interest at stake here relates to the objective of preserving contractual obligations of confidentiality. The appellant argues that it will suffer irreparable harm to its commercial interests if the confidential documents are disclosed. In my view, the preservation of confidential information constitutes a sufficiently important commercial interest to pass the first branch of the test as long as certain criteria relating to the information are met.

60 Pelletier J. noted that the order sought in this case was similar in nature to an application for a protective order which arises in the context of patent litigation. Such an order requires the applicant to demonstrate that the information in question has been treated at all relevant times as confidential and that on a balance of probabilities its proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could reasonably be harmed by the disclosure of the information: *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health & Welfare)* (1998), 83 C.P.R. (3d) 428 (Fed. T.D.), at p. 434. To this I would add the requirement proposed by Robertson J.A. that the information in question must be of a "confidential nature" in that it has been "accumulated with a reasonable expectation of it being kept confidential" (para. 14) as opposed to "facts which a litigant would like to keep confidential by having the courtroom doors closed" (para. 14).

61 Pelletier J. found as a fact that the *AB Hassle* test had been satisfied in that the information had clearly been treated as confidential both by the appellant and by the Chinese authorities, and that, on a balance of probabilities, disclosure of the information could harm the appellant's commercial interests (para. 23). As well, Robertson J.A. found that the information in question was clearly of a confidential nature as it was commercial information, consistently treated and regarded as confidential, that would be of interest to AECL's competitors (para. 16). Thus, the order is sought to prevent a serious risk to an important commercial interest.

62 The first branch of the test also requires the consideration of alternative measures to the confidentiality order, as well as an examination of the scope of the order to ensure that it is not overly broad. Both courts below found that the information contained in the Confidential Documents was relevant to potential defences available to the appellant under the CEAA and this finding was not appealed at this Court. Further, I agree with the Court of Appeal's assertion (para. 99) that, given the importance of the documents to the right to make full answer and defence, the appellant is, practically speaking, compelled to produce the documents. Given that the information is necessary to the appellant's case, it remains only to determine whether there are reasonably alternative means by which the necessary information can be adduced without disclosing the confidential information.

63 Two alternatives to the confidentiality order were put forward by the courts below. The motions judge suggested that the Confidential Documents could be expunged of their commercially sensitive contents, and edited versions of the documents could be filed. As well, the majority of the Court of Appeal, in addition to accepting the possibility of expungement, was of the opinion that the summaries of the Confidential Documents included in the affidavits could go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals. If either of these options is a reasonable alternative to submitting the Confidential Documents under a confidentiality order, then the order is not necessary, and the application does not pass the first branch of the test.

64 There are two possible options with respect to expungement, and, in my view, there are problems with both of these. The first option would be for AECL to expunge the confidential information without disclosing the expunged material to the parties and the court. However, in this situation the filed material would still differ from the material used by the affiants. It must not be forgotten that this motion arose as a result of Sierra Club's position that the summaries contained in the affidavits should be accorded little or no weight without the presence of the underlying documents. Even if the relevant information and the confidential information were mutually exclusive, which would allow for the disclosure of all the information relied on in the affidavits, this relevancy determination could not be tested on cross-examination because the expunged material would not be available. Thus, even in the best case scenario, where only irrelevant information needed to be expunged, the parties would

be put in essentially the same position as that which initially generated this appeal in the sense that at least some of the material relied on to prepare the affidavits in question would not be available to Sierra Club.

65 Further, I agree with Robertson J.A. that this best case scenario, where the relevant and the confidential information do not overlap, is an untested assumption (para. 28). Although the documents themselves were not put before the courts on this motion, given that they comprise thousands of pages of detailed information, this assumption is at best optimistic. The expungement alternative would be further complicated by the fact that the Chinese authorities require prior approval for any request by AECL to disclose information.

66 The second option is that the expunged material be made available to the Court and the parties under a more narrowly drawn confidentiality order. Although this option would allow for slightly broader public access than the current confidentiality request, in my view, this minor restriction to the current confidentiality request is not a viable alternative given the difficulties associated with expungement in these circumstances. The test asks whether there are *reasonably* alternative measures; it does not require the adoption of the absolutely least restrictive option. With respect, in my view, expungement of the Confidential Documents would be a virtually unworkable and ineffective solution that is not reasonable in the circumstances.

67 A second alternative to a confidentiality order was Evans J.A.'s suggestion that the summaries of the Confidential Documents included in the affidavits "may well go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals" (para. 103). However, he appeared to take this fact into account merely as a factor to be considered when balancing the various interests at stake. I would agree that at this threshold stage to rely on the summaries alone, in light of the intention of Sierra Club to argue that they should be accorded little or no weight, does not appear to be a "reasonably alternative measure" to having the underlying documents available to the parties.

68 With the above considerations in mind, I find the confidentiality order necessary in that disclosure of the Confidential Documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of the appellant, and that there are no reasonably alternative measures to granting the order.

(2) The Proportionality Stage

69 As stated above, at this stage, the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial, must be weighed against the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right to free expression, which, in turn, is connected to the principle of open and accessible court proceedings. This balancing will ultimately determine whether the confidentiality order ought to be granted.

(a) Salutary Effects of the Confidentiality Order

70 As discussed above, the primary interest that would be promoted by the confidentiality order is the public interest in the right of a civil litigant to present its case or, more generally, the fair trial right. Because the fair trial right is being invoked in this case in order to protect commercial, not liberty, interests of the appellant, the right to a fair trial in this context is not a *Charter* right; however, a fair trial for all litigants has been recognized as a fundamental principle of justice: *Ryan, supra*, at para. 84. It bears repeating that there are circumstances where, in the absence of an affected *Charter* right, the proper administration of justice calls for a confidentiality order: *Mentuck, supra*, at para. 31. In this case, the salutary effects that such an order would have on the administration of justice relate to the ability of the appellant to present its case, as encompassed by the broader fair trial right.

71 The Confidential Documents have been found to be relevant to defences that will be available to the appellant in the event that the CEEA is found to apply to the impugned transaction and, as discussed above, the appellant cannot disclose the documents without putting its commercial interests at serious risk of harm. As such, there is a very real risk that, without the confidentiality order, the ability of the appellant to mount a successful defence will be seriously curtailed. I conclude, therefore, that the confidentiality order would have significant salutary effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial.

72 Aside from the salutary effects on the fair trial interest, the confidentiality order would also have a beneficial impact on other important rights and interests. First, as I discuss in more detail below, the confidentiality order would allow all parties and the court access to the Confidential Documents, and permit cross-examination based on their contents. By facilitating access to relevant documents in a judicial proceeding, the order sought would assist in the search for truth, a core value underlying freedom of expression.

73 Second, I agree with the observation of Robertson J.A. that, as the Confidential Documents contain detailed technical information pertaining to the construction and design of a nuclear installation, it may be in keeping with the public interest to prevent this information from entering the public domain (para. 44). Although the exact contents of the documents remain a mystery, it is apparent that they contain technical details of a nuclear installation, and there may well be a substantial public security interest in maintaining the confidentiality of such information.

(b) Deleterious Effects of the Confidentiality Order

74 Granting the confidentiality order would have a negative effect on the open court principle, as the public would be denied access to the contents of the Confidential Documents. As stated above, the principle of open courts is inextricably tied to the s. 2(b) *Charter* right to freedom of expression, and public scrutiny of the courts is a fundamental aspect of the administration of justice: *New Brunswick, supra*, at paras. 22-23. Although as a *general* principle, the importance of open courts cannot be overstated, it is necessary to examine, in the context of this case, the *particular* deleterious effects on freedom of expression that the confidentiality order would have.

75 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. c. Québec (Procureur général)*, [1989] 1 S.C.R. 927 (S.C.C.), at p. 976, *R. v. Keegstra*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697 (S.C.C.), *per* Dickson C.J., at pp. 762-764. *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, supra*, at pp. 760-761. 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.

76 Seeking the truth is not only at the core of freedom of expression, but it has also been recognized as a fundamental purpose behind the open court rule, as the open examination of witnesses promotes an effective evidentiary process: *Edmonton Journal, supra, per* Wilson J., at pp. 1357-1358. Clearly, the confidentiality order, by denying public and media access to documents relied on in the proceedings, would impede the search for truth to some extent. Although the order would not exclude the public from the courtroom, the public and the media would be denied access to documents relevant to the evidentiary process.

77 However, as mentioned above, to some extent the search for truth may actually be *promoted* by the confidentiality order. This motion arises as a result of Sierra Club's argument that it must have access to the Confidential Documents in order to test the accuracy of Dr. Pang's evidence. If the order is denied, then the most likely scenario is that the appellant will not submit the documents, with the unfortunate result that evidence which may be relevant to the proceedings will not be available to Sierra Club or the court. As a result, Sierra Club will not be able to fully test the accuracy of Dr. Pang's evidence on cross-examination. In addition, the court will not have the benefit of this cross-examination or documentary evidence, and will be required to draw conclusions based on an incomplete evidentiary record. This would clearly impede the search for truth in this case.

78 As well, it is important to remember that the confidentiality order would restrict access to a relatively small number of highly technical documents. The nature of these documents is such that the general public would be unlikely to understand their contents, and thus they would contribute little to the public interest in the search for truth in this case. However, in the hands of the parties and their respective experts, the documents may be of great assistance in probing the truth of the Chinese

environmental assessment process, which would, in turn, assist the court in reaching accurate factual conclusions. Given the nature of the documents, in my view, the important value of the search for truth which underlies both freedom of expression and open justice would be promoted to a greater extent by submitting the Confidential Documents under the order sought than it would by denying the order, and thereby preventing the parties and the court from relying on the documents in the course of the litigation.

79 In addition, under the terms of the order sought, the only restrictions on these documents relate to their public distribution. The Confidential Documents would be available to the court and the parties, and public access to the proceedings would not be impeded. As such, the order represents a fairly minimal intrusion into the open court rule, and thus would not have significant deleterious effects on this principle.

80 The second core value underlying freedom of speech, namely, the promotion of individual self-fulfilment by allowing open development of thoughts and ideas, focuses on individual expression, and thus does not closely relate to the open court principle which involves institutional expression. Although the confidentiality order would restrict individual access to certain information which may be of interest to that individual, I find that this value would not be significantly affected by the confidentiality order.

81 The third core value, open participation in the political process, figures prominently in this appeal, as open justice is a fundamental aspect of a democratic society. This connection was pointed out by Cory J. in *Edmonton Journal, supra*, at p. 1339:

It can be seen that freedom of expression is of fundamental importance to a democratic society. It is also essential to a democracy and crucial to the rule of law that the courts are seen to function openly. The press must be free to comment upon court proceedings to ensure that the courts are, in fact, seen by all to operate openly in the penetrating light of public scrutiny.

Although there is no doubt as to the importance of open judicial proceedings to a democratic society, there was disagreement in the courts below as to whether the weight to be assigned to the open court principle should vary depending on the nature of the proceeding.

82 On this issue, Robertson J.A. was of the view that the nature of the case and the level of media interest were irrelevant considerations. On the other hand, Evans J.A. held that the motions judge was correct in taking into account that this judicial review application was one of significant public and media interest. In my view, although the public nature of the case may be a factor which strengthens the importance of open justice in a particular case, the level of media interest should not be taken into account as an independent consideration.

83 Since cases involving public institutions will generally relate more closely to the core value of public participation in the political process, the public nature of a proceeding should be taken into consideration when assessing the merits of a confidentiality order. It is important to note that this core value will *always* be engaged where the open court principle is engaged owing to the importance of open justice to a democratic society. However, where the political process is also engaged by the *substance* of the proceedings, the connection between open proceedings and public participation in the political process will increase. As such, I agree with Evans J.A. in the court below, where he stated, at para. 87:

While all litigation is important to the parties, and there is a public interest in ensuring the fair and appropriate adjudication of all litigation that comes before the courts, some cases raise issues that transcend the immediate interests of the parties and the general public interest in the due administration of justice, and have a much wider public interest significance.

84 This motion relates to an application for judicial review of a decision by the government to fund a nuclear energy project. Such an application is clearly of a public nature, as it relates to the distribution of public funds in relation to an issue of demonstrated public interest. Moreover, as pointed out by Evans J.A., openness and public participation are of fundamental importance under the CEAA. Indeed, by their very nature, environmental matters carry significant public import, and openness in judicial proceedings involving environmental issues will generally attract a high degree of protection. In this regard, I agree

with Evans J.A. that the public interest is engaged here more than it would be if this were an action between private parties relating to purely private interests.

85 However, with respect, to the extent that Evans J.A. relied on media interest as an indicium of public interest, this was an error. In my view, it is important to distinguish *public* interest from *media* interest, and I agree with Robertson J.A. that media exposure cannot be viewed as an impartial measure of public interest. It is the public *nature* of the proceedings which increases the need for openness, and this public nature is not necessarily reflected by the media desire to probe the facts of the case. I reiterate the caution given by Dickson C.J. in *Keegstra*, *supra*, at p. 760, where he stated that, while the speech in question must be examined in light of its relation to the core values, "we must guard carefully against judging expression according to its popularity."

86 Although the public interest in open access to the judicial review application *as a whole* is substantial, in my view, it is also important to bear in mind the nature and scope of the information for which the order is sought in assigning weight to the public interest. With respect, the motions judge erred in failing to consider the narrow scope of the order when he considered the public interest in disclosure, and consequently attached excessive weight to this factor. In this connection, I respectfully disagree with the following conclusion of Evans J.A., at para. 97:

Thus, having considered the nature of this litigation, and having assessed the extent of public interest in the openness of the proceedings in the case before him, the Motions Judge cannot be said in all the circumstances to have given this factor undue weight, even though confidentiality is claimed for only three documents among the small mountain of paper filed in this case, and their content is likely to be beyond the comprehension of all but those equipped with the necessary technical expertise.

Open justice is a fundamentally important principle, particularly when the substance of the proceedings is public in nature. However, this does not detract from the duty to attach weight to this principle in accordance with the specific limitations on openness that the confidentiality order would have. As Wilson J. observed in *Edmonton Journal*, *supra*, at pp. 1353-1354:

One thing seems clear and that is that one should not balance one value at large and the conflicting value in its context. To do so could well be to pre-judge the issue by placing more weight on the value developed at large than is appropriate in the context of the case.

87 In my view, it is important that, although there is significant public interest in these proceedings, open access to the judicial review application would be only slightly impeded by the order sought. The narrow scope of the order coupled with the highly technical nature of the Confidential Documents significantly temper the deleterious effects the confidentiality order would have on the public interest in open courts.

88 In addressing the effects that the confidentiality order would have on freedom of expression, it should also be borne in mind that the appellant may not have to raise defences under the CEAA, in which case the Confidential Documents would be irrelevant to the proceedings, with the result that freedom of expression would be unaffected by the order. However, since the necessity of the Confidential Documents will not be determined for some time, in the absence of a confidentiality order, the appellant would be left with the choice of either submitting the documents in breach of its obligations or withholding the documents in the hopes that either it will not have to present a defence under the CEAA or that it will be able to mount a successful defence in the absence of these relevant documents. If it chooses the former option, and the defences under the CEAA are later found not to apply, then the appellant will have suffered the prejudice of having its confidential and sensitive information released into the public domain with no corresponding benefit to the public. Although this scenario is far from certain, the possibility of such an occurrence also weighs in favour of granting the order sought.

89 In coming to this conclusion, I note that if the appellant is not required to invoke the relevant defences under the CEAA, it is also true that the appellant's fair trial right will not be impeded, even if the confidentiality order is not granted. However, I do not take this into account as a factor which weighs in favour of denying the order because, if the order is granted and the Confidential Documents are not required, there will be no deleterious effects on *either* the public interest in freedom of

expression *or* the appellant's commercial interests or fair trial right. This neutral result is in contrast with the scenario discussed above where the order is denied and the possibility arises that the appellant's commercial interests will be prejudiced with no corresponding public benefit. As a result, the fact that the Confidential Documents may not be required is a factor which weighs in favour of granting the confidentiality order.

90 In summary, the core freedom of expression values of seeking the truth and promoting an open political process are most closely linked to the principle of open courts, and most affected by an order restricting that openness. However, in the context of this case, the confidentiality order would only marginally impede, and in some respects would even promote, the pursuit of these values. As such, the order would not have significant deleterious effects on freedom of expression.

VII. Conclusion

91 In balancing the various rights and interests engaged, I note that the confidentiality order would have substantial salutary effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial, and freedom of expression. On the other hand, the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order on the principle of open courts and freedom of expression would be minimal. In addition, if the order is not granted and in the course of the judicial review application the appellant is not required to mount a defence under the CEAA, there is a possibility that the appellant will have suffered the harm of having disclosed confidential information in breach of its obligations with no corresponding benefit to the right of the public to freedom of expression. As a result, I find that the salutary effects of the order outweigh its deleterious effects, and the order should be granted.

92 Consequently, I would allow the appeal with costs throughout, set aside the judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal, and grant the confidentiality order on the terms requested by the appellant under R. 151 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*.

Appeal allowed.

Pourvoi accueilli.

TAB 7

2009 CarswellOnt 4257
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Ron Handelman Investments Ltd. v. Mass Properties Inc.

2009 CarswellOnt 4257, 179 A.C.W.S. (3d) 114, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 271

**B&M HANDELMAN INVESTMENTS LIMITED et al v. MASS
PROPERTIES INC. AND MASS BANQUET HALLS INC.**

Pepall J.

Judgment: July 14, 2009

Docket: 09-CL-7995

Counsel: David Preger for Receiver, Harris and Partners Inc.
Allan V. Mills for Mass Properties Inc., Mass Banquet Halls Inc.
James S.G. Macdonald for Samra Singh
Satwant Merwar for 2205884 Ontario limited
S. Sood for Castimis Inc., Manjit Kaur Sidhu
S. Schneiderman for Tara Singh

Subject: Property; Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency; Contracts

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by Pepall J.:

Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303, 86 A.P.R. 303, 1981 CarswellNS 47 (N.S. C.A.) — considered

Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp. (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 83 D.L.R. (4th) 76, 46 O.A.C. 321, 4 O.R. (3d) 1, 1991 CarswellOnt 205 (Ont. C.A.) — followed

Skyepharma PLC v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp. (2000), 47 O.R. (3d) 234, 2000 CarswellOnt 466, 130 O.A.C. 273, 15 C.B.R. (4th) 298 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Winick v. 1305067 Ontario Ltd. (2008), 41 C.B.R. (5th) 81, 2008 CarswellOnt 900 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3
s. 47(1) — referred to

Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43
s. 101 — referred to

Excise Tax Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. E-15
Generally — referred to

Mortgages Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. M.40

s. 31 — referred to

Personal Property Security Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.10

s. 63(4) — referred to

APPLICATION by receiver for approval of sale of mortgagors' property and for vesting order.

Pepall J.:

Relief Requested

1 Harris and Partners Inc., the Receiver of the debtor respondent companies, Mass Properties Inc. ("MPI") and Mass Banquet Halls Inc. ("MBHI") (the "Receiver"), seeks an order approving a sale transaction contemplated by an agreement of purchase and sale between the Receiver and Balbir Bharwalia dated May 8, 2009. It also seeks a vesting order. The Receiver's motion is supported by the Applicant mortgagees and the purchaser, Mr. Bharwalia.

2 There is opposition to the motion. There are two cross-motions. Tara Singh is a 50% owner of the subject real estate. She seeks a discharge of the Applicants' mortgage and a discharge of the Receiver. The debtors, Mass Properties Inc. and Mass Banquet Halls Inc., seek declaratory relief, an order withholding approval of Mr. Bharwalia's agreement of purchase and sale and directing the Receiver to accept any counter-offer proposed by the Respondents. Others opposing the motion consist of Daljit Samra and Sukhvinder Singh, plaintiffs in an action against the debtors commenced in September, 2007 in which they claim a 50% interest in the subject real estate, and Castimis Inc., a lien claimant owed approximately \$16,271 and the principal of whom, Manjit Kaur Sidhu, also wishes to purchase the property.

Facts

3 The relevant facts are as follows. On March 31, 2009, Hoy J. appointed Harris and Partners Inc. as Receiver of all of the assets of the debtor Respondent companies. The appointment order was made after four adjournments of the application to appoint the Receiver were granted by Hoy J. According to the Receiver, these were at the request of the debtor Respondent companies and the premise of the adjournments was imminent refinancing that did not materialize.

4 The assets under the Receiver's administration consist of real property known as 75 Hedgedale Road, Brampton and personal property (the "Property"). The former is a 2.478 acre parcel of land with a one storey, 12,603 sq foot building which is used as a banquet hall. The latter consists of chattels in connection with the banquet hall, the liquidation value of which was appraised as being \$17,900.

5 The Applicants hold a first mortgage over the real property that was registered on September 26, 2005. As at June 24, 2009 the Applicants state that \$2,259,498.31 is due and owing to them by the debtors pursuant to the mortgage. There is a second mortgage in the amount of \$184,882.00 that is registered against the real property but the Receiver has been unable to locate the second mortgagee, Kishor Kamal. The City of Brampton is owed \$265,076.68 on account of realty taxes as of January 22, 2009 and there are construction liens of approximately \$100,000 registered against the real property along with a tax lien registered in the amount of \$94,538.67 pursuant to the *Excise Tax Act*.

6 The registered owner of the real property is the debtor Respondent, MPI. Manjit Singh Saini ("Manjit") is the principal of MPI. He is also the principal of the other debtor Respondent, MBHI, which owns the personal property.

7 On January 13, 2009, Klowak J. granted a judgment in favour of Tara Singh in an action she brought against Manjit, the debtor Respondent companies and certain others. On consent of Manjit and the debtor Respondent companies, Klowak J. granted Ms. Singh a 50% interest in the real property subject to encumbrances registered between August 2, 2002 and October

4, 2005. Her interest was therefore subject to the Applicants' mortgage. Klowak J. ordered that the real property immediately be listed for sale at a price to be determined by Ms. Singh and MPI. According to the Receiver, Ms. Singh through her counsel has had notice of each Court appearance in this proceeding and did not oppose the appointment of the Receiver.

8 Upon the granting of the appointment order, the Receiver negotiated an arrangement with Manjit to permit him to remain in occupation and continue to operate the banquet hall business. In return, he agreed to pay ongoing expenses and occupation rent. The Receiver was of the view that a better realization would result if the banquet hall business continued to operate.

9 The Receiver also engaged Chris Kelos of Coldwell Banker Case Realty, an agent with significant experience selling commercial real estate on behalf of secured lenders and secured creditors. The Receiver set May 7, 2009 as a deadline for submission of offers. The Property was listed for \$3,690,000 pursuant to a listing agreement dated April 8, 2009. The listing price was higher than the appraised value of the Property. The Property was listed on MLS and 1,573 hits were received on the MLS listing. In addition, advertisements for the Property were placed in the Globe and Mail on April 23 and 28, 2009. The Receiver sent 49 detailed information packages to prospective purchasers, select real estate agents and persons who responded to the advertisements. 97 showings of the Property were conducted and the Receiver received 9 offers to purchase the Property ranging from a high of \$3,750,000 to a low of \$2,400,000.

10 On May 8, 2009, the Receiver accepted an unconditional offer of \$3,735,000 from Mr. Bharwalia who paid a deposit of \$500,000. The purchase agreement imposed an obligation on the Receiver to apply for court approval of the purchase agreement and a vesting order. The allocation of the purchase price as between the real and personal property was to be determined at a later date and on June 4, 2009, the purchaser and the Receiver agreed to allocate \$18,000 towards the personal property and \$3,717,000 towards the real property. Mr. Bharwalia secured private financing for the purchase. He has had to pay both lenders' fees and legal fees in that regard. The price offered was the second highest offer received by the Receiver prior to the May 7, 2009 deadline. The highest offer received was for \$3,750,000 but it was conditional on obtaining financing. Due to market volatility, uncertain market conditions, the difficult credit environment, and the \$15,000 price differential, the Receiver was of the view that acceptance of the higher offer presented significant downside risk and for those reasons, did not accept it. The Receiver was and remains of the view that Mr. Bharwalia's terms including the price represent the best offer in the circumstances. Acceptance of his offer avoided the downside risk of accepting a slightly higher conditional offer and/or engaging in a longer sales process. The price proposed is both higher than the appraised value and the listing price and the offer is unconditional. The Receiver entered into an agreement of purchase and sale with Mr. Bharwalia that is subject to Court approval. The Receiver now recommends that the Court approve that purchase agreement and grant a vesting order.

11 Turning to those opposing the order requested, on June, 9, 2009, the Receiver received an agreement of purchase and sale dated May 29, 2009 between Manjit Kaur Sidhu as purchaser and MPI as vendor. Manjit purported to bind MPI even though only the Receiver had power to do so and the listing agent was described as Homelife/Miracle Realty Ltd. even though the property had been listed with Coldwell Banker. The purchase price was \$4,200,000 which is \$465,000 more than the price offered by Mr. Bharwalia. No deposit was paid but the agreement stated that a deposit of \$600,000 would be payable upon acceptance. There are various purchaser's conditions contained in the offer. Ultimately Manjit Kaur Sidhu provided the Receiver with an unconditional offer to purchase the real and personal property for \$4,300,000 however, the closing date is 50 days following court approval in contrast with the 10 days provided for in Mr. Bharwalia's offer. The Receiver has asked but received no explanation as to why the offer of Manjit Kaur Sidhu was outside the May 7, 2009 deadline; why 50 days are required for closing; why Manjit purported to bind MPI and why Homelife Miracle Realty Ltd. was described as the agent; and why, according to the Receiver, there is an apparent proximity of relationship between Manjit and Manjit Kaur Sidhu. In addition, although requested by the Receiver, no information on Manjit Kaur Sidhu's creditworthiness has been forthcoming.

12 MPI and MBHI bring a cross motion for a declaration that the mode of advertising was inadequate as the Receiver failed to advertise in any national paper or any Indian or South Indian paper thereby limiting the prospects of yielding maximum returns. They ask that approval of Mr. Bharwalia's offer be refused and that I grant an order directing the Receiver to accept a counter offer proposed by them. They also seek a declaration that they are entitled to a sale process that would yield maximum returns to creditors and that would guarantee a viable continuation of the debtors' business activities. Manjit states that it would have been far more productive to have enlisted the aid of a real estate agent of his ethnic background and experience who might

better understand the intrinsic value of the hall, the facilities and the nature of the events that take place at the premises. He does not take exception with the listing agent but does take exception to the mode of advertising chosen. The facility was not advertised in any Indian or South Asian paper or in any national publication that might be specifically seen and reviewed by persons of an Indian or South Asian background. The advertisement, according to Manjit, did not include the correct size of the real property and the parking lot, understated the value of the chattels and failed to indicate that bookings were available as was the cooperation of the existing operators (being the debtors). He provided no particulars with respect to these complaints about the advertisement. He also notes that the equipment appraisers have the same address as Mr. Bharwalia. He says that he is familiar with the other offeror, Manjit Kaur Sidhu, and his group.

13 Daljit Samra and Sukhvinder Singh commenced their action in September, 2007 but have not obtained a judgment against the debtors. They state that they advanced funds to Manjit and MPI that were used to buy the 75 Hedgedale property. They learnt of the Receivership on March 31, 2009. They complain, amongst other things, that the Receiver's plan of action was to list the Property for sale but there was no mention of any sale of the on going banquet hall business. They state that the total claims amount to over \$5,000,000 and question whether the Receiver's lack of knowledge of the quantum of debts caused it to assume that a sale of \$3,500,000 would satisfy all of the creditors. They also complain that the marketing and sale process was without any consultation with creditors other than the Applicants. In addition, the Receiver should have retained a business valuator. They also complain that the one month listing was too short a time period. They say that the Sidhu offer indicates that the Receiver's sales and marketing process did not attract the attention of at least one serious buyer. They ask the Court to refuse the approval of the Bharwalia agreement of purchase and sale and accept submissions from other interested parties. They state that the Court should be concerned as to how the Receiver came to determine a list price, the listing period and the deadline for submission of offers. The failure of the Receiver to consider the value of the business was a glaring omission. They further state that there was a lack of consideration of the interests of all parties.

14 In response, the Receiver states that it did not disregard their interests and the Property was appraised on the basis of its continued use as a banquet hall which the appraiser considered to be the highest and best used for the real property. The appraiser used a direct sales approach to value in part because although requested by the Receiver, no income and expense statements were forthcoming from Manjit and it appeared likely that none existed. The appraiser did prepare a reconstructed income and expenses statement based on industry norms but the income approach yielded a considerably lower value.

15 As to the one month time period, no prospective purchasers or agents suggested that they would have submitted an offer have they had more time.

16 Turning to Tara Singh, she states that she advanced \$946,000 for the purchase of the Property of which she has been repaid \$427,000. She wishes to discharge the mortgage of the Applicants. Her position is that there is no binding agreement of purchase and sale in that Mr. Bharwalia's has been terminated and she therefore retains the right to redeem. As mentioned, she had commenced an action against the debtors and Manjit. The parties to that action signed minutes of settlement in which the defendants were to pay Tara Singh \$600,000 within 120 days during which time she was not to act upon a consent judgment given to her as part of the settlement and she also was not to have any dealings with mortgagees of the Property. The 120 days expired on May 13, 2009. Meanwhile, on May 8, 2009, the Receiver had entered into an agreement to sell the Property. Section 6 of Mr. Bharwalia's purchase agreement states that there is no agreement of purchase and sale until the offer has been accepted by the vendor and approved by the Court. As such, Ms. Singh maintains that she is still entitled to redeem. Alternatively, she states that if Court approval has not been granted within 21 days of waiver of the purchaser's conditions, the agreement automatically terminates. Ms. Singh submits that 21 days had elapsed and therefore there is no agreement. Ms. Singh wishes to discharge the mortgage or failing same, she is prepared to purchase the Property for \$4,220,000, closing to occur within 14 days of June 29, 2009 with no conditions for financing. This is \$485,000 higher than Mr. Bharwalia's offer and \$20,000 higher than that of Manjit Kaur Sidhu but with an early closing date. There is no evidence of any deposit having been paid.

17 The Receiver states that before the Receivership proceeding was launched, the option of obtaining an assignment of the Applicants' security was canvassed with Ms. Singh's counsel on January 22, 2009. On February 5, 2009, the option of purchasing the Property was also canvassed with her counsel. The Receiver states that the sale process would be undermined if stakeholders were permitted to wait by the sidelines until an offer is accepted before acting to protect their equity.

Issues

18 The issues to consider are:

(i) Does Manjit Kaur Sandu have standing?

(ii) May Tara Singh redeem the Applicants' mortgage?

(iii) Should the agreement of purchase and sale between the Receiver and Mr. Bharwalia be approved as recommended by the Receiver?

Discussion

(a) Standing

19 Manjit Kaur Sandu does not have standing in his capacity as a prospective purchaser. In contrast to a successful purchaser, an unsuccessful prospective purchaser has no standing on a sale approval motion: *Skyepharm PLC v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp.*¹ and *Winick v. 1305067 Ontario Ltd.*²

(b) Redemption

20 The Receiver accepts that Ms. Singh is a mortgagor but states that she is not entitled to redeem at this stage of the proceedings. I agree.

21 The Receiver was appointed pursuant to section 47(1) of the BIA and section 101 of the Courts of Justice Act on March 31, 2009. The Court order empowered the Receiver to market the Property and to sell it out of the ordinary course of business with the approval of the Court if the purchase price exceeded \$250,000. It was ordered that notices under section 63(4) of the Personal Property Security Act and section 31 of the Mortgages Act were not required. In each case where the Receiver took such steps, it was exclusively authorized and empowered to do so, to the exclusion of all other persons including the debtors and without interference from any other person. The order also provided that proceedings against the debtor, Mass Properties Inc., or its property were stayed. The order specifically addressed the exercise of rights and remedies against the debtor as follows:

THIS COURT ORDERS that all rights and remedies against the Debtor, Mass Properties Inc., the Receiver or affecting Mass Property Inc.'s property, are hereby stayed and suspended except with the written consent of the Receiver or leave of this Court, provided however that nothing in this paragraph shall (i) empower the Receiver or the Debtors to carry on any business which the Debtors are not lawfully entitled to carry on, (ii) exempt the Receiver or the Debtors from compliance with statutory or regulatory provisions relating to health, safety or the environment, (iii) prevent the filing of any registration to preserve or perfect a security interest, or (iv) prevent the registration of a claim for lien.

22 In the face of these provisions, Ms. Singh does not have an automatic right to redeem. A mockery would be made of the practice and procedures relating to receivership sales if redemption were permitted at this stage of the proceedings. A receiver would spend time and money securing an agreement of purchase and sale that was, as is common place, subject to Court approval, and for the benefit of all stakeholders, only for there to be a redemption by a mortgagee at the last minute. This could act as a potential chill on securing the best offer and be to the overall detriment of stakeholders.

23 Secondly, I do not accept that the agreement of purchase and sale has been terminated. As in *Winick v. 1305067 Ontario Ltd.*³, it is clear from the parties' position in Court and from their conduct that they both relinquished their right to insist on and rely on the 21 day time requirement and waived any rights in that regard. This was a mutual, not a unilateral waiver. In any event, subject to my discussion of the principles associated with sale approval, I would approve the agreement of purchase and sale nunc pro tunc.

(c) Approval of Mr. Bharwalia's Agreement

24 The leading case on approval of receiver sales is *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.*⁴ In deciding whether a receiver has acted properly in the sale of property, the Court must consider:

- (i) whether the receiver has made a sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently;
- (ii) the interests of all parties;
- (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.

25 While it would have been preferable had the Receiver advertised in the Indian and South Indian newspapers, it did not act improvidently and it certainly made sufficient effort to get the best price. It placed the property on MLS where there were 1573 hits, advertised twice in the *Globe and Mail* and contacted 49 prospects. The Property was shown 97 times and was on the market for a month. As to the listing of one month, there was never any suggestion made to the agent, Mr. Kelos, by any prospective purchaser or agent that an additional offer would have been submitted had there been more time. Nine offers were received and the Property sold for more than both the appraised value and the listing price. Mr. Bharwalia is a serious buyer as evidenced by the deposit of \$600,000 that was paid and the absence of conditions to the offer.

26 The appraisal that was done by Lebow, Hicks Ltd., described the highest and best use of 75 Hedgedale Road as being continuation of its use as a banquet hall. The appraiser used a direct sales approach. Contrary to the submissions of the debtor corporations, an income approach was also used. Income approach indicates value based on the potential income stream that can reasonably be expected to result from the operation of the property. The validity of the income approach depends on the reliability of the underlying data. In that regard, the appraiser noted that no income or expense statements or operational information were supplied. A cursory income approach based on comparable lease rates and industry performance levels was included in the appraisal. The Receiver indicated that he sought information from the debtors but it was not forthcoming. The Receiver was of the view that it likely did not exist. The income approach used by the appraiser yielded a considerably lower value and was therefore dismissed as a proper approach to market value. As is customary in sale approval motions, the Receiver seeks an order sealing the appraisal until the transaction is completed. This ensures the integrity of the process and avoids any prejudice to stakeholders in the event that the transaction does not close and a new purchaser must be sought.

27 The Receiver considered the interests of all parties. As Galligan J.A. stated in *Soundair*⁵, it is well established that the primary interest is that of the creditors of the debtor but other persons' interests require consideration as well. This may include the interests of a purchaser such as Mr. Bharwalia who has negotiated an agreement with a Court appointed receiver. In this case, it is clear that the Receiver considered the interests of all relevant parties. It contacted Ms. Singh well before it entered into any agreement. Indeed, she was unopposed to the appointment of the Receiver. The Receiver also was in discussions with others including the debtors.

28 As to the efficacy and integrity of the process by which the offer was obtained, Macdonald J.A.'s commentary in *Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia*⁶ continues to be apropos:

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.

29 There is nothing in the evidence that causes me to question the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers were obtained. Furthermore, there was no unfairness in the process. In my view, the Receiver's recommendation that the purchase agreement with Mr. Bharwalia be approved should be accepted.

30 The proposed order is largely similar to the Commercial List Users' Committee model approval and vesting order and should be granted with the exception of paragraph 11 for which there is no compelling evidentiary support. The remaining provisions are reasonable in the circumstances.

Application granted.

Footnotes

- 1 (2000), 47 O.R. (3d) 234 (Ont. C.A.)
- 2 (2008), 41 C.B.R. (5th) 81 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).
- 3 *Ibid*, at paras. 7 and 8.
- 4 (1991), 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. C.A.).
- 5 *Ibid*, at paras. 39 - 40.
- 6 (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1 (N.S. C.A.) at p.11.

End of Document

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

B E T W E E N:
BANK OF MONTREAL

- and -

**THANE INTERNATIONAL, INC., THANE DIRECT, INC., THANE DIRECT
COMPANY, THANE DIRECT MARKETING INC., WEST COAST DIRECT
MARKETING, INC., THANE DIRECT CANADA INC. AND TDG, INC.**
Respondents

Applicant

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

(PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT TORONTO)

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE APPLICANT
(Returnable October 23, 2015)

GOWLING LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
1 First Canadian Place
100 King Street West, Suite 1600
Toronto, Ontario M5X 1G5

Clifton Prophet (LSUC #34845K)

Tel: (416) 862-3509

Fax: (416) 862-7661

Email: clifton.prophet@gowlings.com

C. Haddon Murray (LSUC #61640P)

Tel: (416) 862-3604

Fax: (416) 862-7661

Email: haddon.murray@gowlings.com

Solicitors for Bank of Montreal